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ABSTRACT

The present thesis describes and interprets a large corpus of ceramic material from the ongoing excavations of the University of Crete in the Iron Age necropolis of Orthi Petra, at Eleutherna, Crete. Given that the site is mostly known from preliminary reports, I offer an account of the geology and topography of Eleutherna and the surrounding region, as well as a detailed review of the archaeological remains, with particular emphasis to the Iron Age and the necropolis of Orthi Petra. The core of the study is, however, a formal analysis of ceramics from the latter site. Despite my sustained preoccupation with the chronology and typology of the Eleuthernian pottery, evidence from the whole of Crete is systematically integrated in the discussion. Hence, the analysis of the local ceramics is largely converted into a study of the Iron Age pottery of Crete. To meet the emerging challenges, I embark on building a format of ceramic analysis that facilitates and enhances the reader’s understanding of my interpretation of stylistic development. I further pursue a synthetic picture for the chaîne opératoire of the local pottery by laying emphasis on its technology, as well as on the modes of and the interplay between ceramic production, dissemination and consumption. The concept of consumption is also applied to imported pottery and other classes of artefacts from the necropolis to engender a holistic and diachronic assessment of social interaction manifested in the funerary ritual held at Orthi Petra. Imported pottery is further appraised against a Cretan-wide background with regards to its origins, type, distribution and impact on local wares. Issues pertinent to the dissemination of stylistic change, the Orientalizing phenomenon and the interactions between Eleutherna and sites in the Eastern and Central Mediterranean are explored. Lastly, the history of the necropolis is outlined and the issue of the date and cause of its abandonment is reviewed.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The present study regards eight hundred forty, mostly unpublished, clay vessels from the Iron Age necropolis of Orthi Petra in Eleuthernna, Crete, excavated within 1985-2003. The site is a true palimpsest of intensive human activity, the denser and most legible lines of which regard the 9th – 6th centuries. Although it has produced rich and varied remains, pottery is by far the most copiously represented class; this is, however, hardly surprising, given the well-known, relentless indestructibility of ceramics, which sharply contrasts the ephemeral nature of their primary function.

Although hardly promising - and consequently perhaps unsuited for the introduction of such a study - the earliest, and some of the latest, summarising assessments on the Iron Age pottery from Eleutherna are worth citing. Roughly three quarters of a century ago, Hartley concluded that ‘in this art Eleutherna was backward in the early Greek period; the pottery will not bear comparison with that of Knossos and the neighbourhood’. On the other hand, Stampolidis fairly recently claimed that despite the masterpieces of the local architecture and sculpture, the local ceramic production has provided no evidence that would support its classification among the leading regional workshops. To him, the local potters followed the Cretan conservative tradition with no significant climaxes or great experimentation (contrast his latest verdict, which is more balanced). However authoritative and pejorative, but also subjective and partly inaccurate, these verdicts involve an

---

2 Cf. the corpus of one thousand three hundred vases from Knossos that were studied by Brock (Fortetsa, xii, 142. Coldstream estimates they were nearly one thousand vases in Fortetsa and states that the North Cemetery produced more: KNC, 414) and the roughly one thousand vases from Lefkandi that have been published so far (Coldstream 1998b, 304).

3 This corpus includes more or less complete vases that have been given an excavation or museum catalogue number. Hence, a large amount of sherd material, as well as some vases that are currently being mended and restored, is excluded. Further, the large, coarse pithoi that contained burials and the lamps are also excluded. On the other hand, TH.1 and CJU.7, which turned up in trial trenches in a domestic quarter at Xeniana (for which see Section 2.2.2) have been included in the study to fill in the picture for under-represented shapes.

4 All dates are B.C. unless otherwise stated.

5 Sherratt 1999, 180, footnote 42.

6 Hartley 1930-1931, 111.


8 Stampolidis 2004d, 71.

9 The verdicts are considered subjective because they rely on impressionistic assessments of style and partly inaccurate mostly because Hartley’s term backward cannot be applied to the pottery from Eleutherna, which follows a line of development that clearly deviates from any pre-existing ceramic tradition, while Stampolidis’s identification of no experimentation is largely challenged by, for example, the local LPG-EG white on dark style, which is currently unparalleled (see Section 4.2).
unwarranted and questionable privileging of aesthetics,\textsuperscript{10} which is not shared by this study.

\textbf{1.1 Earlier scholarship on Cretan Iron Age pottery}

The earliest discussions of Cretan Iron Age pottery date to around 1900.\textsuperscript{11} Publications of pottery from one\textsuperscript{12} or more\textsuperscript{13} sites soon followed and two important works appeared just before the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century: N. Platon’s article on the pottery from a tomb at Agies Paraskies, which is admirable for its scope, and Levi’s synthetic piece on Cretan Iron Age pottery.\textsuperscript{14} Thereafter, Brock’s Fortetsa, published in 1957, formalised the Knossian sequence, while the chapters that Desborough\textsuperscript{15} and Coldstream\textsuperscript{16} dedicated to Cretan Iron Age pottery laid solid foundations for its study. Shorter discussions on the same theme were produced by Cook,\textsuperscript{17} Snodgrass\textsuperscript{18} and, lately, Boardman.\textsuperscript{19} Following, these publications, studies of Cretan material appeared more frequently. I single out here the series of publications of pottery from Italian excavations in South Central Crete (Phaistos, Gortyn, Prinias),\textsuperscript{20} as well as two important doctorate studies of ceramic material from East Crete, which unfortunately remain unpublished.\textsuperscript{21} Several British studies of material from Knossos gradually refined Brock’s work,\textsuperscript{22} while the publication (1996)\textsuperscript{23} of an unmatched amount of pottery recovered from the Knossos North Cemetery offered an excellent opportunity for a full revision of the Knossian ceramics.\textsuperscript{24} Later important works treat pottery from Khania,\textsuperscript{25} Kommos,\textsuperscript{26} Gortyn\textsuperscript{27} and Vrokastro.\textsuperscript{28} Evidently, the

\textsuperscript{10} For debates on aesthetics centred upon Aegean Iron Age pottery see: Whitley 1991, 13-14, 196-197. Shanks 1999, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{13} Hartley 1930-1931.
\textsuperscript{14} Levi 1945: the study elaborates on Levi 1927-1929, 551-623.
\textsuperscript{15} Desborough 1952, 233-271.
\textsuperscript{16} GGP, 233-261.
\textsuperscript{17} Cook 1997, 12-13, 36-38, 135-138.
\textsuperscript{18} Snodgrass 2000, 79-84.
\textsuperscript{24} Also see Coldstream 2001, a comprehensive review of the Knossian sequence.
\textsuperscript{25} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997.
cultural styles of most of Central and East Crete are adequately studied, in contrast to those of the western part of the island. In this respect, the present study fills a major gap in the archaeological landscape.

Perspectives that depart from formal analysis and classification have only lately been introduced to the study of Cretan (actually Knossian) Iron Age pottery. Whitley’s unpublished PhD dissertation explores the manipulation of ceramic style in funerary contexts and the interweaving between stylistic and social change in Knossos.\textsuperscript{29} On the other hand, Tsatsaki’s recent thesis pursues a study of the capacity of Knossian ceramics.\textsuperscript{30} Both these lines of inquiry are pursued to some degree in the present study.

1.2 Method and structure of the present study

This study of Iron Age pottery from Orthi Petra largely capitalizes on some of the diverse approaches to style in archaeology to assess the information the ceramic vessels and their context convey for several facets of the Eleuthemian society and Iron Age Greece in general. These approaches broadly follow two major methodological lines.

The first line treats style in the enduring perspective of the culture historian,\textsuperscript{31} which is primarily concerned with formal analysis, chronology and typology. Given that the local ceramic styles of Eleutherna, which are mostly treated in Chapters 3 and 5, display several idiosyncrasies, the need for a site-specific ceramic sequence seemed compelling. Although the treatment of this sequence introduces a new format (see below), I subscribe to the opinion\textsuperscript{32} that studies of Aegean (not only Cretan) Iron Age pottery suffer from the lack of a protocol that would stir researchers to look at the entire ceramic \textit{chaîne opératoire}.\textsuperscript{33} This involves studying the raw materials and techniques employed in ceramic production, assessing the generation of style and

\begin{itemize}
  \item Kommos IV.
  \item Johannowsky 2002.
  \item Hayden 2003.
  \item Whitley 1986, 251-353. Also Whitley 2004.
  \item Tsatsaki 2004, 342-567.
  \item Note that this tradition is at times heavily – but only occasionally rightfully – criticised (Conkey and Hastorf 1990a, 3. Shanks 1996, 128-131. Morris 2000, 19-20). Criticism mostly pertains to the interpretation of social change.
  \item van der Leeuw 1999. Cf. Morgan 1999a, 244-245.
  \item For the term see van der Leeuw 1999, 123.
\end{itemize}
stylistic change and the modes of their dissemination, as well as exploring the use of the finished item and the mechanisms of consumption that determined its removal from circulation and perhaps stimulated its reproduction. The format of this thesis is a contribution to this direction in itself.

On the other hand, the study of the *chaîne opératoire* and social interaction in general is influenced by approaches that stem from the agenda of the 'post-New Archaeology'. Despite the infinite, refreshing ideas this line unfolds, I only draw from particular lines of inquiry, largely avoiding the rhetoric that is occasionally embedded in them. These lines involve ceramic ethnography, technology and ecology (see mostly Chapter 4), as well as art history, anthropology and particularly the interpretation of ceramic style and stylistic variability (see Chapter 7). The recent formal address of such approaches on ancient Greek pottery 34 proved influential to my work. The latter further draws from Whitley's concerns regarding the articulation of style for the study of social developments and the interweaving between stylistic generation and social change. 35 It consciously overlooks, however, much of the theoretical approaches to stylistic variation, 36 partly due to my skepticism towards some of them 37 and partly due to restraints of space. It is actually most worrying that 'the overall pattern of archaeological thought on style since the mid-1960's is marked by repeated splintering into competitive schools', 38 even in spite of calls for bridging arguments integrating the diverse, high-level theories. 39 The approach adopted here is largely a contextual one and seeks to assess the role of ceramic style within the funerary ritual held in Orthi Petra; accordingly, ceramic style is studied against the dynamics of a multiclass artefactual system in this particular context, 40 despite the limitations explained below. This approach offers important insights in the diverse, shifting and contesting social strategies that governed the production and

34 Crielaard, Stissi and van Wijngaarden 1999.
36 See for example the range presented in Carr and Neitzel 1995.
37 I reject for example the suggestion that 'archaeological analysis of style would benefit, first, from a rejection of an "objective", qualitative and descriptive approach', given the 'recognised subjectivity in the definition of traits (within typology) and in the drawing of similarities and differences' (Hodder 1990, 50). No doubt, any such analysis is bound to a varying degree of subjectivity, but the suggestion cited above involves the replacement of a partly subjective approach by mere intuition, which could eventually lead to no more than fairy tales, according to Wiessner 1990, 111.
39 Carr 1995.
consumption of pottery in the cemetery of Eleutherna, but reaffirms the conviction that ‘if one is wedded to political history, Greek pottery styles are not any major utility’.\(^{41}\) To give some indication of how the methodology is integrated in the structure of this study, I offer a chapter-by-chapter summary.

Chapter 2 reviews the mythology and describes the geology and topography of Eleutherna. The Bronze-Iron Age remains from the site are presented and the archaeological landscape of the surrounding region during the LM IIIC-Archaic times is mapped. Emphasis is laid upon the layout of the necropolis of Orthi Petra, which has produced the pottery discussed here. Given that the site is not widely known and the region largely unexplored, the chapter provides essential background to the reader.

Chapter 3 reviews the relative and absolute chronology of Iron Age Knossos and the limited relevant evidence for the rest of Crete. It proposes some slight refinements in the Knossian scheme, emphasises regional diversity in Cretan ceramic styles and urges for the development of site-specific sequences. Furthermore, it presents the relative and absolute chronology of the Eleuthernian ceramics.

In Chapter 4, the evidence for ceramic production at Eleutherna is examined. Aspects of ceramic technology and modes of production and dissemination of style are assessed.

Chapter 5 presents a formal analysis of the local pottery according to vessel form and should be studied in connection with Appendix II. The format adopted draws heavily from the work of Coldstream on pottery from Knossian tombs,\(^{42}\) as well as of Catling and Lemos on pottery from the Toumba building at Lefkandi.\(^{43}\) By studying the influential work of these scholars, I identified aspects that could be added or modified to enhance a reader’s understanding and ventured to build a new format of ceramic analysis that fruitfully combines the advantages of similar studies, but also introduces two parameters that were only partly exploited before. The first regards the comprehensive presentation of the individual aspects of shape and decoration of all vases that belong to a particular type. This enables the reader to monitor stylistic development, without having to browse though several catalogue

\(^{42}\) KNC, 311-393.
\(^{43}\) Catling and Lemos 1990.
entries, which are consciously designed to be long and detailed,44 or depend entirely on my own reconstruction. The second parameter advanced is the persistent integration of ceramic material from the entire region. The citation of parallels from over seventy Cretan sites for features of shape or decoration is meant to be exhaustive and the distribution of each shape/type in the island is scrutinised. Emphasis is further laid upon the introduction and origins of each shape/type or particular motifs. Hence, this study assumes a regional, pan-Cretan scope, even though my personal, Eleuthemian angle leaves some aspects without proper treatment.

The pan-Cretan perspective is maintained in Chapter 6, which deals with the origins, type, distribution and impact of the pottery that was imported in Eleutherna and the rest of the island. The vessels are grouped according to the region of origin; where evidence is available, the discussion encompasses other artefacts imported from the same region to Eleutherna, as well as Cretan exports of any type to that region. Emphasis is laid upon the circulation of Cretan pottery within the island.

Chapter 7 seeks to identify the indirect links between society and material culture by monitoring the fluctuating and occasionally contesting attitudes that governed the deposition of local and imported ceramics, as well as artefacts made of other materials at Orthi Petra. The distribution of all ceramic shape classes is monitored in temporal and spatial terms and the manipulation of figured imagery is explored to engender an analysis of modes of social interaction in a diachronic perspective. An outline of the history of the necropolis is structured and the date and cause of its abandonment is reviewed.

Chapter 8 summarises the main arguments and conclusions of the study. The first part regards ceramic formal analysis and the production and dissemination of ceramic style. The second part reviews developments in the necropolis of Orthi Petra and the Eleuthemian society in general from a ceramic perspective.

Appendix I collects the literary and archaeological evidence for Eleutherna and the surrounding region from the Hellenistic to the Medieval and Modern times and describes the discovery of the site. Attention is further drawn to the limits of the

territory of the Hellenistic city, as well as on the harbours and land routes to animate an archaeological landscape that has been largely overlooked.

Appendix II is a catalogue of the local pottery and complements Chapter 5. The detailed catalogue entries are actually arranged according to the sequence adopted in Chapter 5. An overview of the characteristics of shape and decoration precedes the entries ascribed to each shape/type.

The catalogue of imported pottery is included in Appendix III. Entries are equally detailed, but also include comments on the origins, style and date of the individual vases. Appendix IV includes the bibliographic references.

The text is complemented by a series of maps, a table on absolute chronology and some charts that accompany the discussion in Chapter 7. Photographs and drawings follow.

1.3 Limitations

This study of ceramic styles and social interaction faces some serious limitations. The lack of any fabric analysis and the fact that no Iron Age kiln or potter’s workshop has been discovered in Eleutherna confine our understanding of local ceramic production and occasionally hinder the confident identification of imports. Furthermore, the dearth of publications of Iron Age pottery from other Eleuthernian contexts (whether burial, domestic or religious), as well as from a considerable region around the site, from Khania to the west and Knossos to the east, to Sybritos in the southwest and the Mesara in the southeast, hamper the understanding of local ceramic idiosyncrasies, sub-regional wares and the circulation of Cretan pottery within Crete. They further hinder a thoroughly contextual analysis at a local or sub-regional level, as well as the comprehension of local social structures. On the other hand, the lack of any organic residue analysis largely leaves the identification of the vessel’s contents to common sense speculations, which are generally avoided.

By focusing on typology, this study does not do justice to all aspects of context for both practical and tactical reasons. My personal acquaintance with the

---

45 A project of fabric analysis is planned, however, in cooperation with Dr. E. Nodarou of the INSTAP.
46 See, for example, Morgan and Whitelaw 1991 or Whitley 1994. Note, however, the constraints posed to such analyses by the qualitative difference between evidence from cemeteries and settlements or sanctuaries: Bietti Sestieri 1992, 18-19.
context of the vases is not uniform. I am very familiar with the context of the vases I saw being unearthed and I have studied the context of hundreds of others in detail. I feel less confident, however, about my comprehension of the context of other vases, given that the systematic and multifaceted study of the context of all artefacts at Orthi Petra has not finished, the mending of some vases is not complete and the excavation is ongoing. On the other hand, the publication of the site, as planned by Professor Stampolidis, has been structured according to context.

Furthermore, the analysis pursued in Chapter 7 cannot possibly be as holistic and thoroughly contextual as one would like, since no study of other classes of artefacts or related evidence (such as physical anthropological) from the cemetery of Orthi Petra and the rest of Eleutherna has been published up to now. Nevertheless, the rich record of preliminary reports, my acquaintance with the site and the information that was generously provided by Professor Stampolidis partly amend this drawback. The remaining uncertainties, however, will hopefully be resolved and the lack of proper emphasis on context will be remedied by a series of publications on the various monuments and sections of the cemetery, which has been designed by Professor Stampolidis to accommodate all classes of artefacts and related evidence.

In short, the aforementioned limitations highlight that the continuation of the excavations at Orthi Petra and the advances in the study and publication of Iron Age material from Eleutherna and the surrounding region, if not the whole of Crete, will eventually call for additions and amendments to this study.

1.4 Aims
The aims of this thesis can be summarized as follows:

1) To provide a chronological and typological framework for the Eleuthernian pottery of the Iron Age.
2) To offer a rich, up-to-date study of Cretan Iron Age pottery.
3) To advertise a ceramic analysis, the scope of which ranges from the production to the consumption of the material, and propose a new format for ceramic studies.

48 This hinders any analysis in the manner of Whitley 1986 and Whitley 1991, the results of which would be comparable to those Whitley produced for Knossos (Whitley 1986, 251-353).
4) To assess the nature, spread and impact of imported pottery in Eleutherna and the rest of Crete.

5) To promote the study of material remains, funerary ritual and society in Eleutherna of the Iron Age.

6) To contribute to, elaborate on and review discussions on the society and culture of Iron Age Greece and its interactions with other Mediterranean regions.
CHAPTER 2: ELEUTHERNA AND THE SURROUNDING REGION

This chapter introduces the mythology and geography of Eleutherna and examines the archaeological remains of the Bronze and Early Iron Age. Emphasis is given to the Early Iron Age and the necropolis of Orthi Petra to provide a comprehensive background for the ensuing study of the pottery and society of Eleutherna. The chapter further maps the fairly unknown and largely unexplored archaeological landscape of the surrounding region during the LM IIIIC-Archaic period. By discussing harbours, land routes and secondary sites in the region surrounding Eleutherna, the chapter offers potential insights into the importation and exportation of goods, particularly clay vessels, and hints at the communities that possibly acquired pottery produced in the workshops that supplied Orthi Petra.

Later testimonies, including the literary documents and archaeological evidence for Eleutherna and its territory from the Hellenistic to Modern times, are laid out in Appendix I.

2.1 Mythology and the name of Eleutherna

The toponym Eleutherna survived on a spur on the north-west foot of Mount Ida, by the modern village of Prines. It was thought to originate from the name of one of the Kouretes, the demonic warriors that danced noisily while clashing their shields in order to hide the cry of infant Zeus from Kronus. According to Stephanos of Byzantium, Satra and ΣάτραΣάτρα/Ασάρσαρα are earlier names of the city, while Απόλλωνια is a later one. Satra has been associated with the Linear B site Ka-ta-

---

49 Although two important volumes that demonstrate similar, diachronic concerns over the site and the region have recently been published (Themelis 2002. Stampolidis 2004: various contributions), they present no thorough review of all relevant scholarship due to inherent constraints related to their aims.
50 As recorded in a Venetian document of the 16th century A.D. and mentioned by 18-19th century A.D. travelers discussed in Appendix 1.1.2.
51 I will be calling this spur the 'Prines hill'.
ra, while the pelasgian (?) radix Sat- is taken to mean free/lord. Σασθραίος is cited as an epithet of Apollo in a late 3rd century inscription from Eleutherna, while Αωρα was considered a nymph. Απολλωνία is regarded as the place-name of a secondary site in the region of the ancient city, or an epithet attributed to Eleutherna due to the local predominance of the cult of Apollo. Besides, the city was the home of Linos, a son of Apollo and renowned musician. Faure, however, argued that Apollonia was the name of the Prines hill, which hosted Apollo’s cult. He further claimed that this name distinguished the Prines hill from the hill just west, which is today called Nisi (see below), but was according to Faure called Sipilen in antiquity. Faure associated Sipilen with the word σπύλος, which means rock/spur, but also sea-rock, and connected it to the modern toponym Nisi meaning island. He concluded that the existence of two habitation nuclei with different names explains the reference to Eleutherna in the plural form by some ancient sources.

57 Effenterre, Kalpaxis, Petropoulou, Stayrianopoulou 1991, 26, 28, 41-42.
58 Stephanus of Byzantium: Αωρος.
60 Stephanus of Byzantium: Απολλωνία κγ'. For other genealogies of Linos see: Hornblower and Spawforth 1996, 868. Eleutherna was also the city of Ametor, a famous guitar-player and composer of love songs, the descendants of whom (the Ametoridai) formed a special group (Athenaios XIV, 638B. Hesychius - Ametoridai. Guarducci 1939, 142. Effenterre, Kalpaxis, Petropoulou, Stayrianopoulou 1991, 42).
62 The argument relies on a reference to some Eleuthernians from Sipilen in a Hellenistic inscription from Kydonia (Guarducci 1939, 119, number 4). Although Sipilen is often considered a town in the vicinity of Kydonia or in between Kydonia and Eleutherna (Faure 1959, 197. Faure 1988, 86. Faraklas et al. 1998, 45, 78), Chaniotis suggests that it was a community dependent on Eleutherna (Chaniotis 1987, Appendix with tables of Cretan poleis and dependent communities. Chaniotis 1996, 112, 404).
63 Liddell and Scott 1996, 1628: σπύλος means rock, cliff. Contrary to what Faure argues, the term is not Homeric; the word σπύλας, sea-rock (Liddell and Scott 1996, 1628), is, however, found in the Homeric texts.
64 If Sipilen is to be located in Eleutherna, a connection with western Anatolia emerges, on the basis of this toponym (for its occurrence in Anatolia see Bürchner 1927), the oronym Ida (Stampolidis 1996, 122) and the cult of the mother goddesses (Anatolia: Bürchner 1927. Eleutherna: Effenterre, Kalpaxis, Petropoulou, Stayrianopoulou 1991, 46-49) in both areas. I owe this remark to Professor Stampolidis.
2.2 The physical and human landscape of Eleutherna

2.2.1 Geography

As already mentioned, the name of the ancient city survived just north of the modern village of Prines, which was renamed Ancient Eleutherna in 1987. It lies 25km. south-east of Rethymnon in the district of Mylopotamos and the deme of Arcadi. The nucleus of the site is an elongated erosional spur of Miocene marly limestone (referred to as kouskouras by the locals), about 40m. high. It stands between Mount Ida to the south, which is made up from crystalline limestone and marble, and the Mylopotamos plain, which is the second largest plain of Crete and is mostly filled with Neogene sediments, to the north. The marly limestone strata of the spur are nearly horizontal, with alternating soft and hard layers. The spur is connected to the area of the modern village by a narrow ledge, which has a minimum width of around 4m. and is guarded by a medieval tower discussed in Appendix I.1.2-3. The spur itself, which runs on a north - south axis, had previously been estimated to be 45m. long and 9-14m. broad. Its steep sides, the upper crust of which forms cliffs, are crowned by a relatively flat top that rises to an altitude of approximately 400m. above sea level. The site commands a view descending from Ida to the lowland areas of the western Mylopotamos plain, the northern coast of Crete and the Aegean Sea.

The Prines hill is flanked (east and west) by two spurs (Map 3), which run parallel to it. The ravines that separate the spurs are occupied by seasonal stream channels that have eroded through the limestone unit and into the underlying, slightly

---

65 Stampolidis 1994, 142-143. For the date of 1987 see Tsantiropoulos 1994, 46, footnote 3.
69 Psaropoulou 1996, 104. Although the fertility of the land is stressed by some authors (Spratt 1865, 89. Kalomenopoulos 1894, 188. Faraklas et al. 1998, 77), the Red Mediterranean soils of the area are actually of moderate productivity (Morris 2002, 10, with reference to fig. 2) and only a coastal alluvial strip stretching from Rethymnon to Cape Meletsi is considered particularly fertile (Naval Intelligence Division 1945, 205-206, 252).
70 Higgins and Higgins 1996, 198.
71 Spratt 1865, 91.
72 Spratt 1865, 91.
73 Map 2a suggests an altitude of 410m. An altitude of 370m. (Kalpaxis 2004, 105), 380m. (Stampolidis 1993, 21. Stampolidis 2004a, 20) and 390m. (Themelis 2002, 11. Themelis 2004, 47. Themelis 2004a, 37) has also been suggested. Defensibility is characteristic not only of this hill, but of the wider area of Eleutherna as well. It is for this reason that the Venetians ordered its abandonment in 1367 A.D. (Xanthoudidis 1939, 108).
metamorphosed rocks. The Farangitis or stream of Agia Kyriaki is on the eastern foot of the Prines hill and the Chalopota is on the western. The eastern stream runs between the Prines and Tripodo hills, while Chalopota lies between the Prines and Nisi hills. The modern village of Eleutherna (formerly Anachourdometocha) is located on the southern part of Nisi, which probably owes its name to its lying between two streams. All streams are dry from May until October, but could prove fierce during winter. They converge north of the Prines hill, forming a greater one that meets river Geropotamos (ancient Oaxos) further north-east.

Two springs are located on the east foot of the Prines hill; a productive one (already noted by Spratt) is found by the church of Agia Sotira, while another is located by the Farangitis stream. A third spring (of low productivity) is found high on the western slopes of the Prines hill.

2.2.2 Archaeology from the Prehistoric to the Classical Period

The earliest human activity in Eleutherna is documented by Late Neolithic pottery and four stone axes of Sub-Neolithic/Early Bronze Age date. Excavation on the top of the Prines hill has produced a long ceramic sequence, which runs from the Late Neolithic, but particularly from the MM II phase. The Prehistoric pottery, however, is not associated with any architectural remains. Connections with the Cyclades are indicated by obsidian blades and marble figurines of Cycladic type.

---

74 Myres, Myres and Cadogan 1992, 91.
76 The Tripodo hill rises 380m. above sea level, while Nisi 400m. according to Map 2a.
77 The name of the village changed in the early 1930’s: Tsantiropoulos 1994, 46, footnote 8.
78 Stampolidis 1993, 23.
80 Guarducci 1939, 43.
81 Spratt 1865, 90 (plan), 96.
Although ample LM IIIC pottery is reportedly found on the top of the Prines hill, little is known about the Bronze/Iron Age transition in Eleutherna, meaning that there is no backdrop for the establishment of the necropolis of Orthi Petra. The latter, which is discussed in the following section, lies on the west slopes of the Prines hill and was used from the 9th to the 6th century. Walls of Geometric and Archaic date, inscriptions that date from the LAR period onwards and evidence from sanctuaries, including the remains of a 7th century temple have been unearthed on the top of the hill. The latter probably functioned both as the Acropolis and the focal point of the Iron Age community.

Further evidence comes from the plateau on the eastern slopes of the Prines hill. Sporadic traces, mostly destroyed by later occupation, confirm that the area was inhabited during the Geometric-Archaic period. Most of the substantial foundations of a large rectangular building, which was probably erected in the 8th century and remained in use until the 4th, is preserved. It included a hearth and an internal colonnade, with wooden posts and stone bases. Nearby, four stone legs with ornamental carving, which belonged to an exceptional piece of furniture, as well as LG-Archaic clay figurines were revealed. The discovery of two stone moulds that were used in the production of bronze items suggests that metalworking was practiced in the wider area. Furthermore, the Geometric-Archaic figurines and sherds found in the Ostrakospilios cave, located higher on the same slope, support the identification of a cult.

97 Stampolidis 1993, 34.
A sanctuary deposit located on top of the Nisi hill has produced PG and later pottery and clay figurines. The cult was probably centred on an altar. Domestic quarters most likely appeared on this hill from the LG-Archaic period onwards and Kalpaxis has recently suggested that the houses included pottery kilns. Small, rectangular LG-Archaic rooms (greatly disturbed by later activity) that probably belonged to houses built on successive terraces were also found on the eastern slopes of the hill, at Xeniana, some 300-400m. north-west of Orthi Petra. Pits with fragmentary pottery of similar date were located nearby. On these grounds, the excavators assume that the Iron Age settlement of Eleutherna was actually formed by clusters of houses dispersed on the Prines and Nisi hills.

A sanctuary that was used during the Archaic-Roman period has been identified on a small crest called Ellenika (or Elleniko), south of the Prines hill. The cult was probably addressed to Demeter, judging by the predominance of lamps, which is paralleled at the goddess’s sanctuary in Knossos and Gortyn. The foundations of a rectangular construction of dressed stone probably belong to an altar. The deep, rectangular cavities, which occur on huge flat stones or on the bedrock in the vicinity of the altar, probably represent stone monuments, pillars or stelae. Economic concerns and issues of visibility account for the localisation of the sanctuary on this rocky crest. The latter is nowadays uncultivated and reserved for

---

101 Kalpaxis forthcoming.
105 Gontika 1990, 179-184 (also Stampolidis 1993, 26, 36. Stampolidis 2004d, 57). The site, which included a rectangular chamber with a bench, was largely destroyed in the 1960's, when the inhabitants of Eleutherna decided to establish their communal cemetery nearby. I was told that dozens of vases, mostly lamps, were collected by the villagers, but figurines were also reported (Gontika 1990, 184). Ellenika is a common Cretan toponym for sites with ancient remains (Spanakis 1991, 265).
the grazing of animals. It overlooks, however, the hills of Prines and Nisi, the necropolis of Orthi Petra and the Aegean Sea.

The LAR and Classical periods of Crete are notorious in terms of archaeological invisibility. The Eleuthernian evidence is, however, not confined to pottery (both imported and locally made), figurines and inscriptions as in some other Cretan sites, but encompasses individual pieces of sculpture and a few monumental buildings of public character. The Iron Age open-air sanctuary at Nisi was succeeded by a great rectangular enclosure with a propylon of five columns, dated on architectural grounds at around 400; public inscriptions were found on the spot. Furthermore, a Late Classical bridge was erected over the Farangitis stream, below the north-east edge of the Prines hill, on top of which spolia from a Classical-Hellenistic temple have been discovered. Lastly, a Classical terrace wall was located north of Orthi Petra.

The archaeological and literary evidence for Eleutherna from the Hellenistic to the Modern period are discussed in Appendix I.1.

2.2.3 The Iron Age necropolis of Orthi Petra

The necropolis of Orthi Petra lies on the originally rather steep, now terraced, west slopes of the Prines hill, 20-40m. above the Chalopota stream (Map 4). It is visible from most areas of Eleutherna that have produced Iron Age remains, including the
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107 It is perhaps no coincidence that this hardly productive land was offered (by at least three individuals) for the establishment of a modern cemetery, a non-productive cause.
109 Erickson 2000, 156-238.
116 Macmillan 1928-1930, 267-268. Although the 5th century date proposed for this wall relies on Attic pottery and is considered reliable, the Classical date suggested for the great terrace wall of the eastern slopes is incorrect; the monument is Hellenistic (Themelis 1994-1996, 278. Themelis 2002, 36).
117 Payne noted that 'the place was probably a necropolis, though we found no certain evidence for this' (Macmillan 1928-1930, 268. Also, Woodward 1929, 224-226).
top of the Prines and Nisi hills, Xeniana and Ellenika. Furthermore, lively conversations at Orthi Petra reach the top of both hills, due to the acoustics of the natural amphitheater formed by the ravine of the Chalopota stream. Consequently, the performance of a funeral, especially the burning of a pyre, was an almost unavoidable spectacle, with heavy mourning and cries of sorrow penetrating the houses of some Eleuthernians.

Although the necropolis (including its monuments and their date, as well as the rites performed) has thoroughly been discussed by Stampolidis on several occasions,\textsuperscript{118} I consider that a review of its layout is essential for this study. The picture presented below, however, is just a preliminary one, given that only a part of the cemetery has been excavated so far\textsuperscript{119} and some contexts are not fully studied yet since the excavation is ongoing. Nevertheless, the stratigraphy of two pyres in trench ΛΛ\textsuperscript{120} and tomb A1K1,\textsuperscript{121} which have produced approximately half of the vases treated here, has been examined in outstanding detail.

Leaving aside individual artefacts, the earliest material from Orthi Petra dates to the LPG period and comes from crematorium A\textsuperscript{122} and chamber tomb A1K1.

Crematorium A is formed by a rectangular pit that is surrounded by rough stones, which in turn are enclosed by a II-shaped monument of ashlar masonry. The east side opens towards a rectangular court, the perimeter of which is marked by stone blocks. Crematorium A had been used for more than one cremation, since there were traces of fire on the walls of the pit and superimposed layers of burned material, as well as evidence that earlier pottery had been pulled into the east side and the north-east or north-west corners. Stampolidis believes that the remains of those cremated in crematorium A were collected and placed in the urns that were deposited in tomb A1K1, which lies immediately west and was inaugurated in the same period.

(see below). This interpretation seems, however, probable to me only for the LPG-PGB period, to which most of the pottery from the crematorium is assigned (see Chapter 7). In contrast to the tomb, the crematorium produced no MG pottery, while the LG-EPAR material from both the crematorium and the courtyard originates from overlying primary cremations.\textsuperscript{123} One of the latter was probably connected with the deposition of ritual artefacts, including TH.4, TH.5 and TH.6 (pl. 33) in the courtyard.

Tomb A1K1 is a rock-cut chamber tomb with a dromos of unknown length (a modern terrace destroyed its west part). The entrance of the tomb faces west and was mostly closed by rough stones. Its upper part was, however, sealed by a large slab. Over three hundred clay vases, at least one hundred and four of which contained human remains, largely of adult males,\textsuperscript{124} as well as a notable range of finds, were deposited inside this tomb from the second quarter of the 9th to the mid-7th century.\textsuperscript{125} In later times, urns were deposited in the dromos, but also above the tomb, immediately west of the early 7th century monument A1K1, which had been erected over the east part of the tomb.\textsuperscript{126} Monument A1K1 is a small Π-shaped structure of ashlar masonry, set against the west side of monuments A and K (the latter is discussed below). It contained the EPAR AM.6 (pl. 1), which held cremated bones and was covered by a bronze bowl; a glazed lekythion was lying nearby.\textsuperscript{127}

Based on the discovery of bones inside storage and open vessels found inside or above tomb A1K1, I offer some rough estimates on the number of urns deposited per period.\textsuperscript{128} The relatively low number of urns assigned to the LPG and LPAR

\textsuperscript{123} By primary, I refer to all cremations where the bones were not removed from the area of the pyre, even if this occasionally involved the deposition of these bones in an urn placed by the pyre.

\textsuperscript{124} Agelarakis 2004.

\textsuperscript{125} Contrast Stampolidis’s claim that the entrance of the tomb was sealed for the last time in the first quarter of the 7th century (Stampolidis 2004c, 125).

\textsuperscript{126} The nearly four hundred clay vases that turned up inside or above tomb A1K1 (including its dromos) are labeled by an asterisk in the first line of their catalogue entry in Appendices II-III.

\textsuperscript{127} Stampolidis 2004c, 125. Although Stampolidis argues that AM.6 is no later than 675, I believe that any date in the first half of the 7th century should be considered probable before more examples of this shape, which is poorly represented in Eleutherna, are discovered.

\textsuperscript{128} LPG: 1 securely identified urn (2 more possible LPG urns) = a maximum of 3 urns; PGB: 13 (12)=25; EG: 9 (13)=24; MG: 10 (7)=17; LG: 13 (13)=26; EPAR: 44 (18)=62; LPAR: 16 (9)=25. The first number records the securely identified urns that are attributed to each period and therefore represents a minimum; the second number refers to large storage vessels that could have served as urns and are assigned to the period in question or to urns that perhaps date to the period in question, but could also be slightly earlier or later; the third number is the sum of the previous two and represents the maximum of urns assigned to each period (note that the periods are of unequal
phases suggest that tomb A1K1 was probably first used after the beginning of the LPG period, while the deposition of urns above its roof ceased before the end of the LPAR. During the PGB-LG period, the number of urns deposited per year remained fairly stable (-0.3 is the minimum average and ~0.6 is the maximum average), but there is a serious rise in EPAR times (~0.73 is the minimum average and ~1 is the maximum average). Both these figures and the discovery of bones of mostly adult males confirm that the tomb contained the remains of people from more than one family. To estimate the number of the latter, I rely on Bintliff's arbitrary estimates for the size of a family in ancient times (seven members) and the number of deaths that struck each family within a generation (five). Since, however, the tomb largely included adult males and not individuals of all ages and both sexes, the latter figure should be reduced to two. On these grounds, a minimum of three to five/six families were burying their dead in the tomb during the LPG-EG period, four-six/seven in the MG-LG and nine-twelvedirteen in the EPAR. There is currently no comparable data for the rest of the cemetery. Only a few LPG-MG burials, but dozens of LG-PAR ones have, however, been excavated so far.

The Π-shaped enclosure K is made of rough stones and rests against the north wall of crematorium A, forming a rectangle. The burned material found inside dates

duration). These rough estimates could not accommodate the nine cases, where more than one person was represented in a single urn (Agelarakis 2004, 78).

Although this conclusion is of major significance, given that most scholars attribute the Cretan (mainly Knossian) collective tombs to single families (see Whitley 1986, 275 for references. Add Cavanagh 1996, 666; this attribution has received some support by the identification of a hereditary familial trait in three urns from a single Knossian tomb: Musgrave 1996, 681. Coldstream and Huxley 1999, 291), it cannot be readily accepted to confirm the assumption shared by a few scholars that age and/or sex grades are represented in the Knossian tombs (Sallares 1991, 184-185. Whitley 1998, 613), since tomb A1K1 has produced many more urns than any published Knossian tomb. On the other hand, a few Knossian tombs, for example Fortetsa tomb P and KNC 107 that contained an irregularly high score of O urns, are unlikely to have been used by single families during (at least) this period (cf. Whitley 2004, 437).

Bintliff 1977, 639-641.

For the validity of these broad phases see Section 7.5. Given that the tomb was perhaps inaugurated after the beginning of the LPG period, the number of families in the LPG-EG and MG-LG phases is considered stable (the following figures rely on those of footnote 128). LPG-EG: the minimum number of urns is 23 and the maximum 44; the number of urns deposited per year during this century-long period ranges from 0.23 to 0.44. MG-LG: the minimum number of urns is 23 and the maximum 39; the number of urns deposited per year during this period, which lasted 75 years, ranges from 0.30 to 0.52. For the EPAR see footnote 128. No figure is provided for the LPAR phase, given that the serious drop that is attested is largely due to the halt in the deposition of urns over tomb A1K1 at some unspecified time before the end of the phase in question.
to the late 9th - 8th century and belongs to more than one funerary pyre or is discarded from elsewhere.

Building Λ-Λ1 is a relatively recent find, located north of monuments K and Κ1κ. It is made of rough stones and was originally rectangular in plan. The Π-shaped compartment that is attached to its west side is probably later. A layer of stones served as the floor of the rectangular part of the building, which produced several sherds from late 8th - 7th domed lids. This part also produced the PAR JU.9, containing cremated bones. Significantly, two cippi of Phoenician type were located in the vicinity of the building.134

Two superimposed pyres were located in trench ΛΛ, west of the previously mentioned building. The upper, EPAR-advanced pyre contained a considerable amount of pottery and a bronze fibula, but the lower, LG-late one produced more than two dozen vases and several weapons and tools made from bronze and iron, as well as a miniature bronze vessel. The latter pyre also yielded the cremated remains of an adult male of mature age and a young adult of indeterminate sex. On its fringes, the dry bones of an adult male who had been decapitated were discovered. On these grounds, Stampolidis suggested that the decapitated male had been ritually executed over the pyre for the former pair in an act of reprisals recalling the narration of the slaughter of twelve Trojans over the pyre of Patroclus in the Iliad.135

A heroic aura also surrounds the mid-7th century monument 4A, which is located west of the court related to crematorium A, albeit at a considerably higher level. It is built of ashlar masonry in a square plan and is enclosed in a rectangular courtyard. Several limestone pieces of a building’s superstructure with relief decoration, as well as fragments of Archaic sculpture, including several warriors with a shield on the breast, were found in the area. Stampolidis reconstructs the monument

---

133 The 8th century date proposed in Stampolidis 1993, 58 should be raised.
134 I am skeptical about Stampolidis’s hypothesis that the building functioned as an urn repository, given that the employment of domed lids as urn covers is unparalleled in Eleutherna and the function of the Cretan domed lid remains problematic (see the comments upon the local domed lids in Section 5.1.6). I also note that some of the sherds illustrated in Stampolidis 2003, fig. 10 seem imported, while the fragmentary vessel illustrated in Stampolidis 2003, fig. 7 probably dates to the PGB-EG period, considerably earlier than the date proposed on page 224.
135 Stampolidis 1996 (add and cf. Huxley 1973, 125-126). The vases from these pyres can be identified in Appendices II-III by the phrase ‘ΛΛ, pyre Α / pyre B’ that introduces the discussion of their context.
as a small naiskos, topped by the warrior sculptures, and assumes that it served as a heroon.

Most of the north wall of the courtyard of monument 4A lies below the southern edge of two or three rectangular monuments with stepped krepis, dating to the late 7th or the 6th century. Stone sculpture found in the area should perhaps be assigned to them. Just west of these monuments, the monolithic base of a fragmentary pillar (originally taller than 3.5m.) is preserved. Stampolidis has suggested that this upright pillar was erected to honour the dead of a battle at around 700 and probably gave the site its name (Orthi Petra meaning standing stone). In my view, that pillar is actually the ‘colonne quadrangulaire en tuf, haute de 2m.50 et profondément enfoncee dans le sol’, which Joubin saw at Orthi Petra in the late 19th century. Below it, he discovered an Archaic limestone torso. The pillar was perhaps destroyed in the 1950’s, when the modern terraces were built.

A large tumulus extends north of the pillar’s base and covers several primary cremations. A few inhumations and pithos burials, some of which are perhaps intrusive, have also turned up in the tumulus. It is an equally mixed picture in the area around, and occasionally between, the monuments described above, due to the numerous, occasionally superimposed, single or double burials. This picture involves primary cremations, inhumations and pithos burials dating to the late 8th – early 6th century. Stone pillars are often erected over burials of all rites, occasionally with incised, figured or painted decoration. Cremations are usually more richly furnished than other burials and are of adults, mostly male. On the other hand, pithoi usually contained children and adolescents, although adults aged over 55-60 were also found, but without any offerings. Stampolidis has noted that inhumations and pithos burials are uncommon in the core of the cemetery (around the structures), but multiply closer to its fringes, especially on the modern lower terrace. Furthermore, proximity to the core is generally related to a rise in the quality and quantity of the offerings.

136 Cf. the case of Krya (Kanta and Davaras 2004, 150).
137 Joubin 1893, 10.
138 These pithoi are mostly large, coarse vessels and should not be confused with the fine or plain ware pithoi treated in this study.
139 The cremated human remains are occasionally collected and deposited in an urn that is located by the pyre; in other cases, however, the remains are left untouched.
The date after which Orthi Petra was not regularly used as a burial site remains ambiguous. The excavator has recently confirmed that the latest burials accompanied by datable artefacts are assigned to around 570, even though some vases and several sherds date to the rest of the 6th century, as well as to the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Part of the LAR-Classical material was, however, studied by Erickson, who maintains that the necropolis was used throughout the 6th century. Although, his suggestion may well be right, I have some reservations about his interpretation of the ceramic record, which are laid out in Section 7.7. Also, I find most of his relevant arguments unconvincing and feel the need to illustrate this in some depth, particularly since other scholars are now building elaborate cases on this base. To start, I do not understand why Erickson avoids claiming that the cemetery was also used in the 5th century (and even later), since both local and imported material of this date is represented in Orthi Petra. Moreover, I am not convinced by his assertions that burials from the later 6th century are largely archaeologically invisible due to changes in the funerary customs and damage caused in Hellenistic times. First, his impression of a transition 'from elaborate multiple cremations in stone-built chambers to individual cremation or inhumation in a plain pithos container' in the first quarter of the 6th century is doubtful. Individual burials (whether cremations or inhumations) are found at Orthi Petra in the 8th (if not the 9th) century and the single chamber tomb discovered so far is rock-cut, not stone-built. Also, the 'intact pithos burial' he cites as an example of this change does not exist. Lastly, the assumed damage caused by Hellenistic buildings/builders should be reconsidered, since in the part of the cemetery that has already been excavated, no Hellenistic walls have been discovered (note, however, that burials
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140 Stampolidis 2004c, 118. Stampolidis 2004d, 57.
141 Erickson 2000, 158-159, 230-231, 235 (I am here only concerned with continuity or rupture in the use of the Orthi Petra cemetery, not continuity of habitation in Eleutherna, for which I have no doubt). LAR material is also included in this study.
142 Cf. for example Perlman 2004, 118-123.
144 Erickson 2000, 159.
146 For the actual contexts of the vases Erickson cites as offerings to the pithos burial see Stampolidis 1996, 28-29.
have been found below a Late Hellenistic/Early Roman paved road that runs over the south fringe of the excavated section of the cemetery).  

On the other hand, Stampolidis has recently suggested a gradual demise of the necropolis of Orthi Petra (related to the expansion of the domestic quarters on the Prines hill) and the relocation of the main burial ground north of this hill.  

I wish to add that the only burial monument of the LAR period that is known from Eleutherna (a stele carrying a warrior in relief) was discovered quite far from Orthi Petra, just north of the Prines hill. More insights are, however, gained from a study on sumptuary patterns, introduced in Section 7.7. Anticipating the conclusion of that study for reasons of clarity, I assert that the terminus of 570 currently seems valid to me.

2.3 LM IIIC to Archaic sites in the vicinity of Eleutherna

This section reviews the archaeological landscape of the Iron Age in the region surrounding Eleutherna. It aims to familiarise the reader with this part of Crete, which has not attracted much attention, and provide potential insights into the circulation of goods, particularly clay vessels. Since, however, no systematic survey has been conducted in the area and excavation, let alone publication, is limited, the evidence available is meagre. The review commences from Sybrita, the most important site south – south-west of Eleutherna and continues clock-wise.

Pre-Classical Sybrita occupies the summit of the Thronos/Kephala hill in the Amari valley and lies almost three hours walk south-west from Eleutherna. Although a dwelling site of the LM IIIC-Iron Age is located on the

---


149 Stampolidis 2004c, 142. Helenistic-Roman burials are discussed in Appendix I.1.3.

150 Lebessi 1973, 7-9. Lebessi 1976, 65, 100-102: The stele dates just after 500 and is overlooked in all discussions about the abandonment of Orthi Petra. Forerunners of the stele, with incised decoration, are found in Orthi Petra (Stampolidis 1996, 193. Stampolidis 2004, 239, number 258).

151 See Map 2. Although this section includes references to Prehistoric finds from the sites discussed, all later remains are treated in Appendix I.2.


153 For the geography of Sybrita see Guarducci 1939, 289. For the distance between Sybrita and Eleutherna see: Pashley 1837, 308-309, 311. Kanta 1994, 67. This route is documented by the Tabula Peutingeriana (Bosio 1983, 143, pl. 44) and was followed by Evans and Halbherr (references cited in Rocchetti 1994, 231-233). For a discussion of this route see: Kanta 1994, 67-68, 72. Scafa 1994 (particularly pages 179, 182). For the few archaeological traces between the Arcadi Monastery and Sybrita see Belgiorno 1994, 222, 225.
north plateau, the central sector is almost free of structures and includes forty-seven pits of LM IIIC - PG-advanced date. These were filled with animal bones, broken pottery and particles of coal, which are considered as remains of rituals involving food preparation. Just before 800, a large Π-shaped building was erected on the south plateau. It was used until around 700 and is thought to have served for the consumption of food and drink.

Further west, there is an unexplored settlement that was occupied throughout the LM-Medieval times and a cemetery represented by the late 11th - early 10th century tomb of Pantanassa. The tomb carried rich finds, including items that display Cypriot connections. Nearby is the Patsos sanctuary, a rock shelter used during the LM I-Roman period, which was dedicated to Hermes Kranaios in the latter phase. It has produced bronze and clay, anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines, many of which are assigned to the Iron Age. To the north – north-west, at Goulediana, a late 7th - early 6th century settlement was unearthed. Further north (west – south-west of Rethymnon), an Archaic sanctuary has been traced at Agia Eirini, while a bronze cauldron and few vases, including Attic G pieces, are said to come from Adele.

The sites mentioned so far were most probably lying outside the territory of Eleutherna at all times, in contrast to the following ones that are closer to our site and could have housed the dependent communities of later times. The area of Stavromenos-Chamalevri-Pankalochori has produced rich finds, at least from the EM III/MM IA period onwards. Significantly, a palatial centre is assumed to have been located at Stavromenos-Chamalevri during the LM I period. LM IIIA-LM IIIB

---

154 References collected in Tegou 2001, particularly 121-123. Add Tegou 2002.
159 Bennet 1990, 198, 209. Bennet further proposed the identification of Stavromenos with the site called da-*22-to in the Knossian Linear B documents (Bennet 1985, 243. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1995, 367-368. Andreadaki-Vlasaki and Papadopoulou 1997, 145. Godart also locates this site just east of Rethymnon: Godart et Tzedakis 1992, 266), which is, however, generally located just west of
tombs have been identified in the area, while numerous LM IIIC-early pits, occasionally related to architectural remains, including kilns, have been excavated on the hills that overlook the coast (mostly at locus Bolani, but also at Pateras, Chatzametis, Tzampakas and Arismari). Although the site is thought to have been abandoned at the close of the Bronze Age, like most Cretan coastal settlements, Geometric and perhaps Protogeometric pottery has been identified at Palaiokastro (on the seashore). Surface finds indicate activity in a wider area, while a Geometric necropolis with pithos burials has also been reported. The numerous accounts of the ongoing excavations of the Ephorate have, however, only mentioned some LG-Archaic sherds at Chatzametis. Lastly, an Archaic and later sanctuary identified at Manouses overlies a LM IIIB-C one, which has produced fragments from ‘Goddesses-with-Upraised-Arms’ and ‘snake-tubes’. Continuity of cult is possible, particularly since this phenomenon is also reported for the cave sanctuary at Prinos (LM-PG), just east of Stavromenos.

The remains of a small Iron Age settlement have been traced 1.5km. south-east of Chamalevri, at Trohala. Faure reasonably assumed that the two sites must have been related. Indeed, they were probably connected by a route following a north-west – south-east axis. Its northern end was undoubtedly on the harbour, while its southern should be sought at Eleutherna and/or Sybrita, through the site of


These recall the pits from Eleutherna and Sybrita discussed above, as well as the LM IIIC-Iron Age pits attested at Krousonas: Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 1987, 531. Metaxa-Prokopiou 1994, 253.


Nowicki 2000, mainly 263-265.


Kirsten 1942, 833.

Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1994, 737.


Faure 1962, 41.
Tsidhos/Tsidhais, less than 2km. south of modern Roupes and Skouloufia, where Archaic pithoi have turned up in a sizeable Hellenistic settlement, which commands an excellent view of the sea. Another, complete Archaic pithos comes from south-west of Roupes.

Stavromenos addresses the issue of the harbours that facilitated the overseas contacts of Eleutherna explored in Appendix 1.2.1. Modern scholarship generally accepts Panormo as a harbour of Eleutherna, while Stavromenos, Bali or both of them are occasionally attributed to this city. The archaeological evidence from Stavromenos has already been discussed. Panormo and Bali have produced ample Hellenistic-Roman remains, but hardly any earlier traces. Concerning geography, all three sites lie on the north coast of Crete, which was mostly unwelcoming to the ancient navigator. This is particularly true for the coastline of the modern Mylopotamos, which is further exposed to the north – north-west winds that prevail throughout the year. One should note, however, that the shoreline of antiquity lies some meters below the present one, as confirmed at Stavromenos and Panormo. Hence, the ancient landscape might have been considerably different, as shown in the case of Palaikastro, which is also located on the north coast of Crete. Significantly, Stavromenos occupies the centre of an alluvial strip of very

172 Pendlebury 1939, 366 (map 23), 37: Tsidhais/Tsidhais; Tsidhos according to Map 2a.
175 The references, which mostly concern the Hellenistic and later periods, are cited in Appendix 1.2.1.
178 According to Sanders, the coast of Mylopotamos from Perama and eastwards is ‘mostly very inhospitable’ (Sanders 1982, 25). From Stavromenos to Rethymnon, however, the coastline is mostly straight and sandy.
180 Pirazzoli 1988, 166-174. Also: Sanders 1982, 181-182. Myres, Myres and Cadogan 1992, 23. Others suggest that the figure was close to 2m., noting that in flat areas (as is the case in Stavromenos), the rise would be more notable (Talbert 2000, 920. Also Higgins and Higgins 1996, 199. In Myrtos, a rise of sea level of about 1-2m. is suggested since Hellenistic times: Wagstaff 1972, 281).
182 Pirazzoli 1988, 171: the rise of sea level is estimated at 0.5m.
183 Blackman 2001, 64-65.
fertile land that extends from Rethymnon to Cape Meletsi, in contrast to Bali, the fairly safe anchorage of which is surrounded by mountains. An average modern person needs two and a half hours to walk the 12km that separate Stavromenos from Eleutherna. The distance from Eleutherna to Panormo requires three or three and a half hours and to Bali four and a half hours. In both cases, the traveller has to cross river Geropotamos/Oaxos, a task which can prove difficult on rainy days. Also, it takes an hour and a half to walk from Panormo to Stavromenos and probably two hours or more to reach Bali. Nevertheless, the land west of the latter site is rock-strewn and Pendlebury noted that the route that connected Herakleion, Bali and modern Panormo ‘follows some of the worst tracks in Crete’. In conclusion, geography and archaeology suggest that Stavromenos was the main, if not the only, harbour of Iron Age Eleutherna, particularly since it is the closest and most accessible shore for the Eleuthernians. It is also the only one of the three sites that has produced Iron Age remains. On the other hand, geography largely precludes the importation of goods through Bali.

Probably the main ford of ancient Oaxos was located by the hill Grivila, which has a LM III – Iron Age settlement, as well as some earlier and Roman remains. Significantly, Pashley had commented on the advantageous nature of the riverbed in the area and modern Perama (=ford) lies only 1.5km. north-east, albeit on the opposite bank. People that arrived at the harbour of Panormo could have found their way to Grivila by following the river, Oaxos, south, keeping it on their

184 Naval Intelligence Division 1945, 205-206, 252.
185 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004, 27.
189 Pendlebury 1939, 29.
190 Guarducci 1939, 43.
191 Kalomenopoulos 1894, 187.
192 Faure 1960, 205.
193 Pendlebury 1939, 12.
195 Pashley 1837, 125.
right and perhaps even using one of the peaks of Mount Ida as a focus point. After crossing Oaxos, they would have turned south-west, towards Eleutherna.

The ford would have prospered by facilitating the movement of people and goods within the Mypomotamos plain, as well as serving the movement of pilgrims from Eleutherna to the cave sanctuary at Melidoni. A 3rd century inscription indicates that Hermes Talaios was worshipped in the cave, however, the numerous 7th century female figurines suggest an earlier cult of a goddess. Although human activity is attested in the cave from the Neolithic period and cult evidence goes back to the MM times, the Early Iron Age is only represented by some Subminoan-PG sherds and a single G figurine. Abundant pottery and figurines date, however, to 680-600. A few of the figurines, which were surrounding a stalagmite, have been identified as Axian, but the majority may prove to come from Eleutherna. Although Grivila lies very close to Melidoni, it seems that there was no salient connection between the two sites during the PG-G period and the 7th century popularity of the cave should perhaps be attributed to Eleuthernian interests.

In the Hellenistic and Roman period, Axos was the only eastern neighbour of Eleutherna. Although never systematically excavated, the site has attracted small-scale work, which produced rich Archaic, but poor Early Iron Age finds. The temple of Aphrodite, with its collection of bronze armour and terracottas (mostly of Archaic date), is the only published context. The Archaic finds reported from Gerakaro, Drosia, Chonos, Aimonas and Aloides, however, draw a line

---

196 Perama was transformed from Pashley’s ‘wretched village’ (Pashley 1837, 125) to the prosperous town of today mainly thanks to the now old highway that is crossing it (Spanakis 1993, 626).
197 For an EM-MM settlement located between Grivila and Melidoni see Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004, 32.
198 Guarducci 1939, 302-304, number 2.
202 Kephalidou forthcoming.
204 Levi 1930-1931.
through a valley that connects Axos to the bay of Sisses. This route, which is shorter than 20km., was a direct way to the sea for the Axians, the overseas connections of whom are implied by a story told by Herodotus, which involves a Theran merchant frequenting Axos in the early 7th century.

Mount Ida (Psiloritis), a no man’s land for most part, is in the southern limit of Eleutherna’s territory and hosted the cult of Zeus in the Idaean Cave sanctuary, which attracted pilgrims from most of the island in later times. Human activity is documented in the Cave from the Neolithic period, while cult is identified from the end of the MM times. The Cave was probably used by Eleuthernians during the Iron Age, judging by the rich collections of bronze vessels the two sites have produced. Occasionally vessels from the two sites are assigned to a single craftsman. Given, however, that a considerable distance (see Appendix I.2.3) separated the two sites and that some classes of artefacts, including pottery, from the Cave remain unpublished, I urge caution in assessments of Eleutherna’s links with the Cave. These links will be indirectly illuminated by the finds from an Archaic sanctuary, probably also dedicated to Zeus, that was identified by the peak of Mount Ida, Timios Stavros (2456m.). This lies south-east of, but fairly close to, Eleutherna.

To conclude, the evidence laid out above demonstrates that, although quite a few Iron Age sites have been traced in the region that surrounds Eleutherna, their material is mostly unpublished. The problem is most acute in the case of pottery, which is unusual for Aegean Iron Age standards. Thus, any assessment of the circulation of Iron Age ceramics within the area is only left with possible routes, envisaged mostly on the basis of geography (see also Appendix I), while the study of ceramic production and consumption at Orthi Petra is largely deprived of a regional context.

208 Herodotus, iv.154.2-155.1. Osborne’s argument (Osborne 1996, 8-17) that the story was made up in later times does not seem convincing to me.
210 Markoe 2003, 211-212.
211 The two clay vessels illustrated in Sakellarakis 1988, fig. 29-34 do not seem Eleuthernian.
212 Kritzas forthcoming.
CHAPTER 3: RELATIVE AND ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY

This chapter reviews the relative and absolute chronology of the Knossian sequence (Section 3.1) and collects all relevant information for other Cretan sites (Section 3.2) as a background for the study of the relative and absolute chronology of the Eleuthemian pottery (Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 respectively).

The absolute chronology for the transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age in Crete is insufficiently documented. There is no direct evidence for the absolute chronology of the LM IIIC period,\(^\text{213}\) the beginning of which is currently agreed to have coincided with that of the LH IIIC,\(^\text{214}\) within 1200-1180,\(^\text{215}\) while a date at around 1070 is proposed for its end and the dawn of the Cretan Iron Age.\(^\text{216}\)

The absolute chronology of Iron Age Crete is, however, largely based upon the Knossian sequence, which in turn relies on the Attic (and Euboean) sequence(s), the evidence for the absolute chronology of which is not always satisfactory.\(^\text{217}\) Further, given that Cretan pottery displays strong idiosyncrasies and sub-regional peculiarities (Section 3.2), the dependence of the entire island on the Knossian sequence is questionable. Although this dependence is largely due to insufficient data for building site sequences, Section 3.2 suggests that scholars have not always been keen on exploiting all evidence available. In any case, the obscurity created hinders our understanding of regional diversity, diffusion of ceramic and other influences, as well as historic developments. In this light, the establishment of a relative and absolute chronology for the pottery from Eleutherna, which departs considerably from the Knossian standards, offers an alternative yardstick for assessing the chronology of Iron Age Crete.

---


\(^{214}\) See the comments by Rutter in pages 255-256 of Deger-Jalkotzy and Zavadil 2003. For the meagre evidence on the absolute chronology of the LH IIIC see Yasur-Landau 2003.


3.1 Knossian chronology

The relative and absolute chronology of Knossian pottery was first studied by Payne,\(^{218}\) established by Brock,\(^{219}\) then refined by Coldstream\(^{220}\) and, in part, by Catling\(^{221}\) and Moignard.\(^{222}\) The following account is a phase-by-phase review of the latest analyses of the Knossian sequence.

The Subminoan period is thought to have lasted for most, if not all, of the 11\(^{th}\) century and into the early 10\(^{th}\).\(^{223}\) Its long duration is suggested by the number of sub-phases (four) identified in the domestic remains by the Stratigraphical museum\(^{224}\) and the burial data from the North Cemetery (three).\(^{225}\) The closing date of the Subminoan period is indicated by the discovery of an Attic EPG sherd below the floor of a Knossian EPG-MPG house, even though scholars disagree whether the pottery beneath the floor was Subminoan and mostly EPG,\(^{226}\) or the opposite.\(^{227}\) Accordingly, the Subminoan phase came to an end after a debatable amount of time following the beginning of Attic EPG. Coldstream's lower date is, however, supported by the impact the numerous Attic LPG imports\(^{228}\) exercised upon the formation of the Knossian PG style.\(^{229}\) Hence, the Knossian EPG must have started some time after the establishment of Attic LPG (1000), presumably after no more than a quarter of a century.\(^{230}\)

---


\(^{219}\) Fortetsa, 213-216.


\(^{221}\) Catling 1996, 305-310: Subminoan.


\(^{223}\) Desborough 1972a, 63, 115. Kanta 1980, 5. Betancourt 1985, 185. Warren and Hankey 1989, 169: they suggest a date after 1015 for the end of Subminoan. Rehak and Younger 1998, 99. Snodgrass (2000, 135) dates the end of the Subminoan period in Central Crete to 925, but has found no support. Although these studies often adopt an island-wide perspective, at the moment sufficient Subminoan material is only known from Knossos.


\(^{225}\) Catling 1996, 305-310. The first sub-phase was connected to the LM IIIC period, while the third was related to EPG. The pottery assigned to the second phase was neither the immediate successor of that of the first phase, nor the immediate predecessor of the one assigned to the third phase.

\(^{226}\) Coldstream 1972, 70, A30.

\(^{227}\) Warren and Hankey 1989, 92, 169.

\(^{228}\) See mostly KNC, 393-402. The aforementioned Attic EPG sherd is the only known Attic import of earlier date (KNC, 409).


The relatively long duration of the Knossian EPG is indicated by the successive deposits in the aforementioned EPG-MPG house.\textsuperscript{231} The Attic or Atticizing LPG-late imports that were found among Knossian EPG-MPG material in Fortetsa tombs VI, XI suggest that the Attic LPG spanned the transition between these two phases of the Knossian sequence.\textsuperscript{232} The latter case has been confirmed by the following two discoveries. The first is the identification of two burials, which were probably separated by the time-span of no more than one generation and were furnished with local EPG-MPG pottery and twenty-five Attic LPG vases, in KNC tomb J.\textsuperscript{233} The second is the presence of Attic LPG sherds on two successive floors of another house, the lower of which contained local EPG – MPG-early material and the upper one MPG-EG.\textsuperscript{234} Therefore, Knossian EPG must fall entirely within the Attic LPG period, while Knossian MPG begins at 920, before the Attic sequence advances into the EG (900). The discovery of Attic or Atticizing, EG I vases in KNC tomb 207\textsuperscript{235} (among local EPG-LPG material) and KNC tomb Q\textsuperscript{236} (which was inaugurated in the Knossian MPG) suggests that the Knossian MPG largely overlaps with the Attic EG I. On the other hand, the occurrence of a Cycladic EG II amphora\textsuperscript{237} among the Knossian LPG material of Fortetsa tomb L implies that the end of the Knossian MPG coincides with the end of the Attic EG I (at 875). Further, although Brock assumed that the Knossian LPG was contemporary with Attic EG II,\textsuperscript{238} Coldstream argued that the quantity of the LPG material from the KNC favours a slightly longer span for the Knossian LPG (875/870-840).\textsuperscript{239}

The suggestion that the LPG and PGB phases were of equal duration raises my main reservation on the Knossian chronology. I consider the PGB slightly longer than the LPG\textsuperscript{240} and I would argue that Coldstream’s extension of the LPG should be

\textsuperscript{231} Coldstream 1972, 66.

\textsuperscript{232} Two Attic LPG vases were found in tomb VI and one in tomb XI, which also contained a 'perhaps Cycladic' amphora of Attic LPG date (Fortetsa, 189, 213. KNC, 404, 409. Snodgrass 2000, 82). Both tombs do not seem to go far into the MPG.


\textsuperscript{234} Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 289-291, mostly B28, B31-33, B35; 234, C36. There are, however, few Knossian EPG pieces in the upper floor.

\textsuperscript{235} KNC 207.52.

\textsuperscript{236} KNC Q63.

\textsuperscript{237} Fortetsa, 213.

\textsuperscript{238} Fortetsa, 213.


\textsuperscript{240} I consider that LPG is slightly longer than EG and slightly shorter than PGB. Given that the North cemetery provided a large and varied corpus of LPG and EG material (KNC, 415-417), enriching the
connected with both a slight reduction of the MPG and a slight increase in the duration of the PGB. According to my first suggestion, the Knossian LPG still largely overlaps Attic EG II, but starts slightly earlier; the two phases, however, end at the same time. This adjustment currently has no major obstacle and offers a reasonable reconciliation between the duration of the MPG phase and the relatively small amount of large vessels (which mostly served as urns and are closely related to the number of burials) assigned to it. 241 Ultimately, this amends the impression of a sharp drop in Knossian burials during the MPG period, which seemed bizarre against the background of a general, notable increase in the numbers of Knossian burials attested from 1000 to 700. My second suggestion, the alignment of the beginning of the Attic MG I and the Knossian PGB, is supported by the lack of the numerous Attic MG I imports in LPG contexts in the KNC. 242 Moreover, this synchronisation relies on a much richer body of imports than a match of the beginning of the Attic EG II and the Knossian LPG, with which I disagree. Table 1 outlines the Attic, as well as the orthodox and revised Knossian chronology of the late 10th and 9th centuries.

Rich evidence associates the Knossian PGB with the Attic MG I, 243 suggesting that the Knossian EG was a short phase spanning the transition between the Attic MG I-II (at 800). 244 The ‘bilingual’ EG vases further confirm that a late stage of the Knossian PGB-EG curvilinear decorative repertory overlapped a central evidence from Fortetsa, I consider the approximate doubling of the duration of the LPG phase very generous in relation to the ascertaining of the short span of the EG (contrast Coldstream 2001, 22 and Fortetsa, 214. A slightly shorter extension of the LPG is proposed in KNC, 411).

241 Cavanagh 1996, 661.
242 Actually most of the Attic MG I vases was found in tombs that were not even used before the Knossian PGB (KNC, 411: tombs KNC G, 107, 283).
244 Fortetsa, 143-144, 214-215. GGP, 238-239. The reality of an EG phase was doubted in Coldstream 1980, 411-412, but accepted in KNC, 411.
stage of Attic MG. 245 There are, however, no safe correspondences for the rest of the 8th century and chronology relies on stylistic affinities. 246 Given that the Knossian MG style follows Attic MG II prototypes, Knossian MG is thought to overlap the rest of the Attic MG II and perhaps the beginning of the Attic LG I, coming to an end at 745. 247 Further, Knossian LG displays some affinities with Attic LG I and EPC, while the end of the EPC style, apparently coincides with the beginning of the Knossian O (the LG/EO transition is assigned to 710-700). 248

The lowering of the date of the beginning of Knossian EO to 700, instead of 735, necessitated the lowering of the end to 670, instead of 680, 249 to accommodate the ample EO material, particularly since the chronology of the O sequence is almost exclusively based on style. 250 The discovery of a PC hare arylballos, 251 dating no later than 680, inside an EO pithos 252 provides the only firm association. 253 Furthermore, although Brock established a LO phase, 254 he admitted serious difficulties in tracing the development of the LO polychrome pithoi. 255 Moignard, however, identified an intermediate (MO) phase in the KNC material, even though she could not determine the lower end date. 256 Nonetheless, the context that formed the core of her penetrating analysis, KNC tomb 285, is problematic. The material of the tomb, which was sparsely used from the EPG period, underwent a 'great rearrangement' after the deposition of the single EO burial. 257 This disturbance (which is probably responsible for the missing of the urn that carried the latter burial) and the fact that no class F arylballoi were found in the tomb offer no solid ground for establishing a MO phase. 258 Given, however, that other related suggestions (for example on the

---

247 KNC, 411, 418.
248 KNC, 411-412: the impression is based on stylistic correspondences and few thin associations.
249 Contrast Fortetsa, 214 and Coldstream 2001, 22.
251 KNC 107.47.
252 KNC 107.29.
254 Fortetsa, 213-216.
255 Fortetsa, 151.
256 Moignard 1996, 461-462.
258 Contrast Moignard 1996, 462.
development of the cup’s lip)\textsuperscript{259} are valid, I suggest an emphasis on the transitional character of certain vases (EO/LO), rather than their assignment to a MO phase, at least before more evidence is available.

Brock noticed that no Corinthian imports were found in Fortetsa after the LPC period and proposed a date of around 630 for the end of the LO period, as confirmed by a gold head of late Daedalic style.\textsuperscript{260} This date has been corroborated by the discovery of Corinthian, Chian and other East Greek imports dating to around 630 in the KNC and is hardly challenged by the occurrence of two fragmentary EC vases in disturbed or eroded tombs.\textsuperscript{261}

3.2 Chronologies in the rest of Crete

Although there is a lack of long-term, regional or site-specific studies on the absolute chronology of Iron Age Crete outside Knossos, the pottery sequences of some sites have received sufficient attention. The following section first reviews discussions concerning the relative chronology (even though absolute dates penetrate in the discussion of the Subminoan phase/style) and then focuses on evidence for absolute chronology, drawing attention to the unexplored significance of some deposits from Kommos.

The Subminoan, whether a style or a phase, has generated much discussion. Early assumptions for the persistence of the Subminoan style in East Crete until the 9\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{262} were challenged by Kanta, who assigned a century long period (1075-970) to this style.\textsuperscript{263} Lately, Tsipopoulou tentatively argued that East Cretan Subminoan covers a short time in the 10\textsuperscript{th} century,\textsuperscript{264} while Hayden noted that the Subminoan style of Vrokastro seems to be concurrent with much of the Knossian PG.\textsuperscript{265} Further, Mook has claimed that the term Subminoan ‘should be used only to refer to a ceramic style, one taxonomically distinct from the styles of Late Minoan

\textsuperscript{259} Moignard 1996, 462.
\textsuperscript{260} Fortetsa, 213-214.
\textsuperscript{261} Moignard 1996, 462.
\textsuperscript{262} Desborough 1972a, 235. Snodgrass 2000, 42, 135.
\textsuperscript{263} Kanta 1980, 5.
\textsuperscript{264} Tsipopoulou 1997, 483-484: this involves that LM IIIC lasted until around 1000 in East Crete.
\textsuperscript{265} Hayden 2003, 5-6, 12. Hayden et al. 2004, 153, 156.
IIIC and (early) Protogeometric pottery, but produced simultaneously with it. On the other hand, D’Agata, who studies material from Sybrita that lies just south-west of Eleutherna, has argued that ‘Subminoan is to be considered a conventional label to indicate a chronological phase which in pottery terms appears to be closely linked to LM III C’, but uses the term whole-heartedly and distinguishes two Subminoan phases, the earlier of which she considers coeval with LH IIIC late (1100-1065) and the later with Submycenaean.

Although East Cretan PG-G pottery displays considerable idiosyncrasies, Hayden basically follows the Knossian relative chronology. On the other hand, Tsiropoulou suggests that East Cretan PG lasts until around 800, PGB covers the first half of the 8th century while LG the second half. Furthermore, earlier Mook preferred the term SubPG for the material from Kavousi that is contemporary with Knossian PGB-MG, but now distinguishes a late 9th century SubPG phase and an early 8th century G one. Mook’s concerns recall Palermo’s remark that the Knossian PGB style is basically not identifiable in Phaistos, where PG trends persist in the 8th century, as well as Johannowsky’s distinction between a PGB1 and a PGB2 phase for South Central, as well as East Crete. The latter’s PGB1 is basically the equivalent of the Knossian PGB, while PGB2 essentially includes the non-Atticizing Cretan pottery of the ensuing period.


270 Hayden 2003 (in page 13, Hayden admits that ‘it has proved difficult, however, to separate PGB from EG’ at Vrokastro).

271 Tsiropoulou 1987, 299-300.

272 Mook 1993, 169-170. This suggestion was either overlooked or silently rejected by other members of the Kavousi team, who stick with the Knossian relative chronology (Haggis 1993, 167).


275 Rocchetti 1974-1975, 298.

276 Johannowsky 2002, 90-93. This notion is also attested in Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1990, 96-97.

This diversity in Cretan relative chronology is succeeded by a surprising, nearly unanimous reception of the LG and O phases. Only the Khania team has really faced the particularities of its pottery for the period in question and has wisely preferred the term LG II, instead of EO or Subgeometric, for material that is contemporary with the end of the LG and most of the EO phase in Knossos. This raises the issue of whether Cretan 7th century pottery is rightly called Orientalizing. Coldstream has stressed that the application of the term to the Knossian sequence is to some extent conventional, due to the rarity of Orientalizing ornaments on pottery from domestic deposits. The term has, however, been readily applied to post-G pottery from most sites in Central and East Crete in spite of the rarity of Orientalizing elements it often displays. If, however, terminology is meant to be meaningful, the term Orientalizing should be employed only where a current of Oriental influence is identified on a substantial part of the material, of whatever context. I believe this is the case for Knossos and some sites in its vicinity, most notably Agies Paraskies, as well as Afrati, Gortyn and probably Phaistos, but not particularly for any other site that has produced a substantial quantity of 7th century pottery.

278 One of the few vases he cites as typical of the PGB2 style (Levi 1927-1929, 296-297, fig. 387) is considered EG by Coldstream (GGP, 255-256).
279 Andreadaki-Vlasis 1997, 238-239. Andreadaki-Vlasis, Hahn, Hallager 1997, 49: unfortunately, the limited material of later (7th-6th century) date has discouraged fine distinctions.
280 Although Coldstream praises the rejection of the term Subgeometric, he seems unsatisfied with the term LG II and underlines that a) even the Knossian settlement material does not display O trends and b) the adopted sequence may prove unsatisfactory when pottery from a rich 7th century cemetery in the area is published (Coldstream 2000c, 390). Note, however, that a richly furnished burial from the inland site of Gavalomouri, close to Khania, has also produced Subgeometric pottery: Andreadaki-Vlasis 1987, 324-325.
282 See, for example, how Whitley refers to Orientalizing elements on Cretan pottery (Whitley 2001, 121. Whitley 2004), even though his comments only regard Knossos. Contrast the cautious approach in Snodgrass 1999, 28-29.
285 It is worth citing Mook’s comment for the Northwest building at Kavousi Kastro: ‘only 10% or less of the pottery from floor deposits, which can be dated to the Orientalizing period, is actually orientalizing in style’ (Mook 1993, 248).
The O material from Gortyn has formed the basis for Johannowsky’s suggestion for a tripartite division of the phase in question, which ties with the similar division of the ‘Daedalic’ figurines from the Acropolis sanctuary. Nevertheless, I am sceptical about this suggestion and I reject its application to Central and East Crete, which relies almost entirely on elaborate pieces and cannot accommodate the bulk of the material.

Evidence for absolute chronology is limited to Kommos, Phaistos and Khania and has been explored only in the case of the latter two sites. Consequently, my emphasis lies upon the material from Kommos.

The absolute chronology of the pottery from South Central Crete tends to rely on Knossos; Kommos and Phaistos, however, offer some important, albeit not close, associations between local and imported, 9th – 7th century material. The correlation of South Cretan PG pottery of late date and Attic MG I relied on the discovery of an Attic/Cycladic MG I skyphos in Phaistos room P, but was undermined by the occurrence of a Samian LG skyphos in the same level. This correlation is now confirmed by a deposit in Kommos, which produced Cretan LPG-PGB pottery and several sherds from Attic or Cycladic EG-MG I vases. Furthermore, the 7th century correspondences, which were limited to the presence of a fragmentary PC aryballos among Orientalizing material of advanced style in Phaistos room G, have now been increased by the discovery of several imported (mostly East Greek) 7th century sherds in some deposits with Cretan post-G material at Kommos. Also, Kommos building Q produced excellent associations between local late 7th century pottery and...
imports from various regions, including the Peloponnese, East Greece, Attica and the Cyclades. 293

Iron Age pottery is amply represented in Khania during a limited period; its absolute chronology is, however, richly documented. 294 The dating of the Khaniote LG I to 750-720 is based on the discovery of relevant material along with Attic LG I pottery, but not EPC or Argive LG II imports. The arrival of such imports marks the beginning of the Khaniote LG II (720), the end of which is placed at 680, largely on stylistic grounds.

In conclusion, the diverse evidence for the relative chronology and the limited information about the absolute chronology of other Cretan sites warn against a painless adopting of the Knossian sequence for the entire island and beg for regional and site-specific studies. Such a study is presented below.

3.3 The chronology of the Eleuthernian pottery 295

The rich and meticulously excavated ceramic material from Orthi Petra, which covers a period of three centuries (early 9th – early 6th century), offers ample information about the relative and absolute chronology of the local pottery sequence. The most valuable and wide-ranging evidence derives from the unplundered tomb AIK11, which was used during most of the aforementioned period. Apparently, the gradual accumulation of vases on top of each other inside the chamber resulted in what may be viewed as a sort of rather clear-cut ‘stratigraphy’. In this case, however, the term is not referring to the superimposition of layers of soil, but to the deposition of groups of urns in successive layers within the tomb. The study of the style of the urns of each layer led to the identification of the characteristics of the individual ceramic phases and the establishment of the relative chronology of the local sequence. Hence, the following phase-to-phase outline of stylistic development is combined with the relevant ‘stratigraphic’ evidence, namely the figures of level for

293 Johnston 2000.
295 For the technical characteristics of the Eleuthernian pottery see Chapter 4.
each layer.\textsuperscript{296} Furthermore, the discovery of imports within these layers allowed for the establishment of an absolute chronology.

3.3.1 Relative chronology

The evidence available suggests that the Orthi Petra cemetery was established during the LPG period, even though the belly-handled AM.14 (pl. 2) is considered MPG. Its shape is also represented among the storage vessels of the ensuing, LPG period, together with the necked pithos and the globular pyxis without handles.\textsuperscript{297} The repertory of pouring and open vessels includes peculiar shapes (lentoid flasks, stirrup-jar) or features (the side-spout, the strainer and the tripod foot) that are mostly unattested in later times. The body of the pouring vessels is usually not well-rounded; the hydria and the large oinochoe in particular are characterised by a flat-based, biconical body; the lekythion and the small oinochoe are also represented. Bell-shaped, dipped skyphoi and cups dominate the record of open vessels, even though a small number of coated and truly decorated cups are present. The base of the kyathion and the walls of the kalathos, convex in both cases, as well as the sharp carination of the low-based skyphos distinguish the LPG from later examples. Moreover, during the LPG-PGB period, the cooking jug and the baking tray are also represented. Dipping and coating are commonly applied to open vessels, vases of modest size often carry triangular patterns rendered on a clay or, less frequently, slipped ground, while AM.15 (pl. 2) confirms that white on dark decoration was already in use.

The PGB vases from Eleutherna pay their own contribution to the remarkable character of that period. All LPG types of storage vessels survive (the pyxis without handles stands on a lower base, the belly-handled amphora has sharper contours) and are supplemented by neckless and straight-sided pithoi, as well as rim-handled amphorae and pyxides with handles and inset lip. Despite this variety, which is also

\textsuperscript{296} These figures indicate the depth the vast majority of urns of each layer were standing at (the depth the urns were located at, which is usually the level of their rim, is - for our purposes - an unreliable indication, since it depends on their overall size); the few 'inconsistencies' are mostly due to the sliding of small vases among earlier pottery.
\textsuperscript{297} The two LPG urns from tomb A1K1 (AM.15, pl. 2; NDP.104) were standing considerably lower than any other urn, at a depth of 15.20-15.30m.
reflected in the numerous types of lids represented, the necked pithos is henceforth established as the most popular type of storage vessel (mostly serving as an urn). Pouring vessels demonstrate major novelties, including the adoption of foreign forms. Although the hydria and the large oinochoe are now mostly ovoid, the former shape assumes a low conical foot. A few oinochoai are now modelled on foreign prototypes (Attic, Phoenician), while smaller examples adhere to the LPG tradition. Jugs of various forms appear, while the production of lekythia is enriched by copies of Cypriot Black on Red prototypes. The standard lekythion and the aryballos, which is now introduced under Corinthian influence, regularly display an everted lip. The shape and the decoration of the bell skyphoi demonstrate notable improvements and a decrease in size, while the opposite is attested for coated cups. Both shapes, however, become shallower, in contrast to the dipped cups, which are indistinguishable from their LPG predecessors. The carination of the skyphos becomes softer and the base of the kyathion concave, while the kalathos adopts a shallow form with concave walls. The few examples of kraters are individual.

White on dark decoration is commonly applied on storage and fast-pouring vessels, but rarely on other shapes, the decoration of which is normally rendered on a light ground, slipped or clay surface. Conservative, typical PG patterns (mostly triangular motifs and concentric circles; concentric semicircles are limited to dark-ground oinochoai) and freehand curvilinear designs (wavy lines, rows of S’s, spirals) dominate the record. The decoration of the small open vessels displays no departure from LPG trends, while the aryballoi may carry triangular patterns, be plain or coated. Only the belly-handled amphora displays a rich and varied decorative matrix (Atticizing meanders, freehand patterns of Minoan or Near Eastern pedigree, as well as newly introduced motifs) that is uncommon on the rest of the material. Figured drawing is missing despite the stimulus provided by imports from other Cretan sites (I-KR.2, pl. 41; I-OIN.1, pl. 37).

298 Although the vast majority of the PGB storage vessels from the tomb were standing between 15.53 and 15.82m., AM.16 (pl. 2) was standing slightly lower (15.42m.), while NDP.5 (pl. 5) was surprisingly found at the uppermost level of the tomb.
Although the Knossian ceramic phase that follows the PGB suggests that 'a true Geometric style is in the making' through the introduction of Atticizing decorative trends, this is hardly attested in the relevant material from Eleutherna, raising the issue whether the particular Eleuthernian phase should really be called EG. Besides, the storage vessels assigned to this phase adhere to the PGB tradition in terms of both shape and decoration and barely foreshadow later developments. Given, however, that the phase is apparently a formative one for pouring and open vessels, since several PG shapes die out and new types or forms that would prove enduring are established, I decided to maintain the established nomenclature, at least until more West Cretan material is published.

The variety in the shape of storage vessels (including lids) attested in the PGB period survives in the EG: pyxides without handles and rim-handled amphorae disappear, but neck-handled amphorae are introduced. The amphorae, the straight-sided and neckless pithoi are slenderer than before. Besides, the repertory of pouring vessels is unaltered. Large oinochoai develop an almost flat shoulder, while small versions finally acquire a well-rounded, ovoid body. The hydria occasionally stand on a disc base, which, however, never replaced the low conical foot, while narrow-necked jugs develop an ovoid body and a rudimentary moulded lip, which are to appear on later broad-necked examples. The production of close copies of Cypriot lekythia continues, while standard type lekythia and aryballoi develop a flaring mouth, which survives throughout the G period (the lekythia stand on a lower base from now on; the aryballoi often display a flattened shoulder in this and/or the ensuing period). The latest dipped bell cups and bell skyphoi come from EG contexts, but are identical to their PGB predecessors. The coated cup is enlarged and assumes a new form with bellied body and offset lip, while cups with straight neck walls and patterned decoration appear. The demise of the PG low-based skyphos, which is gently carinated now, is recompensed by the introduction of another low-based type with low, offset lip and raised base, following Attic-Cycladic prototypes. The few kraters are individual, while the latest kalathoi, which are straight-sided, are

300 For a few notable correspondence with Knossian EG storage vessels see Section 5.1.1-5.1.4.
301 Although most of the EG storage vessels from tomb A1K1 were standing between 15.90 and 16.02m., AM.18 was standing lower (15.66m.), while the large NDP.19 and NDP.20 were standing at 16.10-16.13m.
probably replaced by the lipless basins that are normally unpainted. The EG version of these basins is equipped with convex walls and developed, pierced lug handles of reflex shape. Cooking jugs demonstrate the major trends of their development: the lowering of the neck and the introduction of a shallower body. Baking trays of this and the ensuing period carry a groove below the rim and a finger impression on their legs.

White on dark decoration persists on storage vessels, even though the dark ground is usually brown-red, not brown-black as on LPG-PGB vases. This scheme is also attested on pouring vessels, the decoration of which is, however, mostly rendered on a light ground, slip or clay surface. Triangular motifs, concentric circles and simple freehand ornaments survive, but novelties include the repetition of patterns in successive zones\(^{302}\) and the hatching of curvilinear motifs. NDP.20 (pl. 6) recalls some Knossian EG ‘bilingual’ vases, in carrying freehand, curvilinear patterns on one side and an Atticizing meander on the other. The triangular motifs of the aryballoi are abandoned, while the hydriai display two trends that would prove enduring: the gradual reduction in the number of decorative zones and the coating of the mouth’s interior (the latter replaced banding).

No amphorae, neckless or straight-sided pithoi are attributed to the MG period.\(^{303}\) The first two shapes re-appear later, but the third is abandoned. Necked pithoi, which now acquire an articulated, mostly conical base, predominate. The latest pyxides with inset lip coexist with a new type of pyxis, the MG version of which is characterised by a carinated shoulder and a grooved lip.\(^{304}\) Only a few of the pre-existing types of lids survive in the MG and none outlasts it. Large oinochoai disappear and small versions are rare, but all other pouring vessels survive and, together with the cooking vessels, develop along the trends that were established in the preceding period. None of the PG types of open vessels survive, in contrast to the new form of the coated cup, which is now enlarged, the cup with vertical neck and


\(^{303}\) This phase is under-represented (see Chapter 7).

\(^{304}\) Although most of the MG storage vessels from tomb A1K1 were standing at a depth of 15.96-16.16m., NDP.27 and NDP.29 (pl. 7) were standing lower, among PGB pottery. Nevertheless, their small size was ideal for filling the free space among, pre-existing vases. On the other hand, PY.10 (pl. 15) was standing at 16.29m., on top of the PGB I-KR.2 (pl. 41).
the skyphos of Attic-Cycladic type. Small basins adhere to the EG form, but large examples acquire straight walls and vestigial, pierced handles of reflex shape.

Decoration is mostly rendered by the application of brown-black paint on bright yellow slip and white on dark is only attested on broad-necked jugs. The decoration of the necked pithoi is arranged in two to four horizontal zones and patterns are normally simple, whether curvilinear or rectilinear. The zigzag with double, hatched outline is popular, but concentric circles and simple, freehand patterns are also attested.\textsuperscript{305}

The necked pithos, which now stands on a mostly disc base, and the pyxis with grooved lip, the carination of which withdraws, persist in the LG period; the necked pyxis is introduced and the neckless pithos makes a timid reappearance, perhaps stimulated by imports.\textsuperscript{306} The occurrence of few small, conical, knobbed lids confirms that the lid is not entirely missing from the post-MG repertory. Pouring-vessels generally develop along the aforementioned lines. Ovoid bodies and moulded lips are common on broad-necked jugs, a ridge appears on the lip of the latest hydriae, while the everted lip returns only on decorated aryballoi. The introduction of oinochoai, lekythia and aryballoi that loosely copy Cypriot prototypes\textsuperscript{307} is, however, a novelty. The coated cup grows larger and acquires a taller lip, but four decorative zones are applied to the form in question by a specific workshop during this or the ensuing period. Cups with a straight neck rest on a disc base, while the dipped cup, the kotyle and the tray with bellied walls make a short appearance (rather a re-appearance in the former case). The skyphos abandons the raised base and acquires a tall lip, while a new type of krater, with vertical handles rising from the deep body to the short neck or the rim is introduced and persists thereafter. Although some small basins preserve early features, most examples have straight walls and vestigial handles of reflex shape, only one or none of which is pierced. The thymiaterion, a

\textsuperscript{305} This array of motifs is best paralleled on the contemporaneous Geometric style of Kavousi, only the basic outline of which has recently been presented (Mook 2004, 173).

\textsuperscript{306} Although most of the LG storage vessels from tomb A1K1 were standing at a depth of 16.10-16.22m., NDP.32 and NDP.43 (pl. 7-8) were standing at \textasciitilde{}16.35m. and NDP.44 (pl. 8) at 16.62m. The latter two vases, however, date to the end of the LG period.

\textsuperscript{307} See the comments upon type C oinochoai, type C lekythoi and type E aryballoi in Chapter 5.
ritual vessel that stands on a pedestal, is introduced, while baking trays display a true lip and two or three finger impressions on their legs.

Although the style of the LG pottery generally adheres to the MG standards, the decoration of the necked pithoi is now confined to a shoulder panel, usually occupied by groups of concentric circles. The LG-late necked pithoi are distinguished by a slip of lower quality (thin and/or whitish) or a reserved lower body. Although metopes and chevron columns are introduced on several shapes, they do not occur on necked pithoi before the LG-late and EPAR period respectively. Figured drawing makes a first appearance (NDP.37, pl. 8).

The problems regarding the application of the term Orientalizing to 7th century Cretan pottery were discussed in Section 3.2. The term is unsuitable for the case of Eleutherna, where Orientalizing ornaments are limited to a few vases, several of which, including the most lavishly decorated, carry a strong Cycladic influence.308 Further, the reception of Orientalizing figured imagery on local pottery is largely indebted to Cycladic potters/painters.309 Terms such as Subgeometric or LG II are also to be rejected, particularly since the decoration of early 7th century pottery displays several new trends and is not an overdue or degenerated version of an earlier style. Some of these trends, however, like the introduction of some reserved (unslipped) areas and, from the mid-7th century, the simplification in the decoration, foreshadow major characteristics of the pottery of the 6th century, which is known as the LAR period throughout the island. On these grounds, the term PAR310 is adopted for the local material of the 7th century.

During the EPAR period, the size of the necked pithos decreases; its body is often globular (the plump ovoid body is most common throughout the development of the shape) and the lip normally broad. Finger-impressions are occasionally found on handle roots. The neckless pithos gains in popularity, while the rim-, neck- and belly-handled amphora reappears, the latter mostly as a hybrid between the amphora and the necked pithos. Shoulder-handled amphorae are introduced by the ‘Eleutherna

308 See type C amphorae, as well as AM.23, NDP.62, NDP.76 (pl. 1-2, 4, 9-10).
309 See Section 4.4. A notable exception is NDP.61 (pl. 10), the griffin composition of which was probably inspired by an Oriental portable object.
310 Although the term Early Archaic is another option, it seems (and sounds) unsuitable for the required division in sub-phases.
bird workshop'. The shape of the necked pyxis undergoes considerable change; the globular body, simple rim and raised base of the LG examples are replaced by a squat, flat-based profile, with everted lip. The grooved lip of the other pyxides becomes flat.\textsuperscript{311} The Creto-Cypriot repertory persists, while other pouring vessels are not much different than their LG predecessors. The small oinochoai acquire a round body and the decorated aryballoi develop a broad lip, a change barely adopted for plain and mostly coated examples. The bird vase appears for the first time, even though imported examples (I-BV.1, pl. 40) were known in the PGB period. All types of LG cups survive (the coated cup becomes deeper) and the cup with neck walls that taper upwards is introduced. Kraters follow the LG type, the thymiaterion gains in variety and popularity, the plate makes a timid appearance, while the skyphos and the tray with steep sloping walls are represented in this and the ensuing period. As far as lipless basins are concerned, the small examples follow the LG form, while the large ones drop the horizontal segment that connected the lugs of the handles. Also, a different type of lipless basin, carrying strap handles, is introduced, while basins with articulated lip or coarse basins are more numerous than ever. Baking trays adhere to the LG type, while cooking jugs have a cut on each leg.

The decorative trends on LG-late necked pithoi culminate now and appeal to all sizeable storage vessels (the paint of most PAR vases is, however, brown-red, not brown-black, as on most MG-LG examples). Nevertheless, the variation in the decoration of the two sides of a vase is popular only during the EPAR period, while the decorated neck and barred lip of some EPAR necked pithoi is barely attested on earlier or later examples. White on dark decoration re-appears,\textsuperscript{312} though on a limited scale and mostly combined with dark on light. Concentric circles are common only on the earlier part of the period; they may now include circles of varying width, enclose a cross or be rendered in white on dark. Metopes and chevron columns persist, while new patterns (horizontal rows of chevrons, zones with vertical wavy lines) and dotted motifs become popular. The austerity that was gradually imposed on the hydriai from the EG period onwards is now occasionally challenged. Although

\textsuperscript{311} The vast majority of the EPAR storage vessels occupied the upper part of tomb A1K1 and were standing at a depth of 16.40m. or higher. Only NDP.52 (pl. 8), NDP.58 (pl. 9) and NSP.7 (pl. 13) were found deeper, but the latter two were collected in sherds. Notably, only a few EPAR storage vessels were found above the tomb or in its dromos.

\textsuperscript{312} Cf. TR.1 (pl. 33) and TR.2, which turned up in a LG-late pyre.
uncommon, pictorial drawing is attested on amphorae and necked pithoi. Birds occur on some storage vessels that are attributed to two workshops (the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’), which were probably established by immigrant Cycladic potters/painters. Three horses, a lion and a wild goat adorn AM.23 (pl. 4), while two griffins appear on NDP.61 (pl. 10). Human figures are missing from the material discussed, but occur on a few sherds I have not examined.

The repertory of the LPAR pottery is limited, particularly with reference to pouring vessels. Necked and neckless pithoi, belly-handled amphorae and necked pyxides are represented; the necked pithoi are mostly globular, with flat base and flat lip, while the necked pyxides develop an even more squat body and distinct lip. As far as other shapes are concerned, only coated cups and lipless basins are amply represented. Coated cups follow the deep EPAR type, but are very large and carry a very tall lip. Basins abandon the lug handles; strap-handled examples become deeper, while a few vases with peculiar reflex handles occur. Small oinochoai and cups with neck walls that taper upwards are rarely found, while several shapes or types (hydria, large oinochoe, broad-necked jug, plain aryballos, cup with vertical neck, cooking jug, baking tray) are represented by examples assigned to the PAR period in general. Concerning decoration, slip is hardly attested and the few patterns that occur are simple; bands and coated areas adorn the large vessels, while some small ones are dipped. Significantly, the Eleuthernian sequence confirms a gradual demise of painted pottery, suggesting that the largely non-diagnostic character of Cretan 6th century ceramics is not a strange episode, but the climax of a certain process, which should not be obscured by the truly Orientalizing wares produced in a few sites.

A later, mostly LAR date, is suggested for a few small, strap-handled basins, trays with sloping walls, thymiateria and perhaps OIN.25 (pl. 34a), CU.174, CU.203

---

313 See Section 4.4.
314 Griffins also appear on a sherd from Eleutherna I have not seen: Stampolidis 1990, 388, footnote 29.
316 No LPAR storage vessel was found inside tomb A1K1, but several were placed above it.
Besides, the LAR repertory discussed by Erickson includes cups, trays and bowls; the latter include what I call small basins.\footnote{Erickson 2000, 192-216.}

The establishment of a relative chronology for the Eleuthernian ceramic sequence invites for an assessment of the local style against the background of the three Cretan regional workshops identified by Coldstream (Knossian or North Central Cretan, South Central Cretan and East Cretan)\footnote{GGP, 233-261.} and the fourth one that is represented by the material from Khania.\footnote{Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997.} So far, the Eleuthernian ceramics were thought to echo Knossian developments.\footnote{GGP, 234. Lebessi 1987, 158. Stampolidis 1993, 20. Stampolidis 1994, 141.} I believe, however, that ceramic links between the two sites were considerable during the 9th and the beginning of the 8th century (even though the popularity of the white on black style in Eleutherna remains unparalleled),\footnote{Notable links (explored in Chapter 5) in the repertory of shapes include the introduction of the straight-sided and the neckless pithos in the PGB period, the disappearance of the former shape and the belly-handled amphora after the EG period, as well as the similarities in the size of dipped cups and small bell skyphoi (these vessels are normally larger in the Mesara); the latter case suggests close correspondences in drinking/eating habits. Concerning decoration, a ‘bilingual’ vase (NDP.20, pl. 6) and a revived ? Minoan ornament (AM.16, pl. 2) attested in Eleutherna demonstrate some awareness of even the most peculiar Knossian vogues.} but dwindled thereafter despite the occurrence of ample Knossian LG-EO imports in Orthi Petra (see Section 6.1.1). By the establishment of light ground decoration in MG-LG Eleutherna, which involves mostly simple motifs, and the survival of the necked pithos, the local style approaches that of South Central Crete, even though I suspect that the resemblance is largely generic. In any case, Eleutherna did not develop an Orientalizing style in the 7th century, in contrast to some sites in both North and South Central Crete. On the other hand, the non-Orientalizing late 8th and early 7th century material from Khania, as well as the limited contemporary and earlier pottery that is published from its hinterland or further west\footnote{See mostly: Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1985. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1987.} displays no particular connection with Eleuthernian ceramics. The same applies to the East Cretan corpus, which has augmented significantly in the last two decades.\footnote{See mostly: Tsipopoulou 1987. Mook 1993. Hayden 2003.} In conclusion, the Eleuthernian style does not really fit in the established framework of Cretan regional workshops and publication of pottery from

\footnotesize{\bibitem{Erickson2000} Erickson 2000, 192-216.  
\bibitem{GGP} GGP, 233-261.  
\bibitem{Andreadaki-Vlasaki1997} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997.  
\bibitem{NotableLinks} Notable links (explored in Chapter 5) in the repertory of shapes include the introduction of the straight-sided and the neckless pithos in the PGB period, the disappearance of the former shape and the belly-handled amphora after the EG period, as well as the similarities in the size of dipped cups and small bell skyphoi (these vessels are normally larger in the Mesara); the latter case suggests close correspondences in drinking/eating habits. Concerning decoration, a ‘bilingual’ vase (NDP.20, pl. 6) and a revived ? Minoan ornament (AM.16, pl. 2) attested in Eleutherna demonstrate some awareness of even the most peculiar Knossian vogues.  
sites like Axos and Sybrita may allow for the identification of a West-Central (or Mid-West) regional workshop.

3.3.2 Absolute chronology

Eleutherna offers rich and important information about the absolute chronology of Crete in the 9th – 7th centuries. Although the following account provides phase-to-phase associations between the local and other, well-established sequences, sharp indications for the duration of each phase are not always obtainable (see Table 1). Hence, this study is considered a first endeavor that will undoubtedly require refinement.

There are three main kinds of associations between local and imported pottery. The discovery of a closely dated import inside (or in unambiguous connection to) an urn that is easily datable within the local sequence clearly provides most valuable information. Nevertheless, the association of a closely dated import with a local vase other than an urn and the discovery of such an import within a ‘layer’ of local pottery that is assigned to a single phase (see Section 3.3.1) also provide reliable information.

The absolute chronology of the local LPG period is fixed by the discovery of an Attic EG II import (I-PY.1 with I-LI.1, pl. 36, 89) inside the LPG NDP.104. Further, two Corinthian EG aryballoi (I-AR.1, I-AR.2, pl. 39) that were standing among local PGB vases (at a depth of 15.58-15.64m.) suggest that the LPG/PGB transition occurred around the mid-9th century, given that Corinthian EG covers the second and third quarter of this century. The local PGB phase is rich in associations with PGB vases from indeterminate Cretan workshops, as well as Cypriot wares, which are, however, of limited value as far as precise dating is concerned. The date of its lower end is illuminated by the discovery of the EG

325 My discussion relies solely on well-studied contexts: tomb A1K1 and the two pyres treated in Stampolidis I 996. More evidence will undoubtedly appear when the study of other contexts is completed.
327 See mostly I-OIN.1, I-LEK.1, I-BV.1, I-KR.2 (pl. 37-38, 40-41 respectively).
328 See the Grey Polished I-OIN.1a and the Black on Red I-OIN.2 (pl. 37).
329 The association of the Cycladic MG I I-SK.1 (pl. 42, 93) with local PGB vases is skewed by the insecure identification of the vase.
SLI.6 (pl. 16) inside the Attic MG I-late I-AM.2 (pl. 35), which suggests that the local EG phase partly coincides with the later part of Attic MG I. Further, the discovery of the East Greek MG-mature I-LEK.3 (pl. 38) inside the EG NDP.19 (pl. 5) confirms that the local EG dates around 800.

There is no evidence for the EG/MG transition and the MG period is poor in firm associations. The discovery of the East Greek LG I-AM.3 (pl. 35), the style of which recalls Attic LG I vases, among local EG-MG pottery suggests, however, that the Eleuthemian MG lasted until after the mid-8th century, though certainly not long after that date, as confirmed by the occurrence of the Corinthian LG I-PY.2 (pl. 36) among local LG vases. Consequently, the local EG and MG phases are roughly allotted three quarters of a century (810-740). On the other hand, the number of urns deposited in tomb A1K1 during each phase suggests that the EG and the MG were of roughly equal duration and probably slightly shorter than the PGB and the LG. Hence, I assume that each of the former two phases (EG, MG) lasted for approximately thirty-five years.

The local LG phase offers several associations: the Knossian LG I-NSP.1 (pl. 36) and I-LEK.6 (pl. 39) were found among local LG vases, the Phoenician, late 8th century I-LEK.5 (pl. 39) was probably found inside the local LG NDP.35 (pl. 7), while the Cycladic LG I-SK.2, the LG 'Argive monochrome ware' I-AR.5 and the Cretan LG-late I-SK.7 (pl. 41) turned up in the LG-late pyre A of trench AAA that produced a rich collection of local LG vases. The date of the end of the LG period is, however, indicated by the position of two Knossian LG/EO (I-NDP.2, I-NDP.3, pl. 36) and a Theran LG (I-NSP.3, pl. 36) urn, all dating to the very end of the 8th century, at what may be called a 'stratigraphic' horizon separating the majority of the LG urns from most EPAR urns. Furthermore, AM.23 (pl. 4), the iconography of

---

330 The discovery of the Cypriot Black on Red I-OIN.3 (pl. 37) inside the MG NDP.28 (pl. 6) only provides a terminus ante quem for the MG phase (that is before the end of the 8th century).
331 I-PY.2 was standing slightly above (16.26m.) most local LG vases (which were standing between 16.10-16.22m.), but certainly below the EPAR ones.
332 Section 2.2.3.
333 Note, however, that the scarcity of MG vases outside tomb A1K1 may eventually compel a shorter duration for this phase.
334 I-NSP.1 (pl. 36) was standing slightly below (16.07m.) most local LG vases, perhaps due to its fragmentary state.
335 The former were standing at 16.10-16.22m. and the latter at 16.40m. or higher. The discovery of the East Greek LG I-AM.4 (pl. 35), the EPC or Argive LG II I-AM.5 (pl. 35) and the Knossian LG-late I-LEK.7 (pl. 39) slightly above the aforementioned horizon poses no problem. The first two could
which finds close parallels on Early Protoattic pottery and Cycladic vases of the beginning of the 7th century, was standing only slightly higher, just below most EPAR urns. Consequently, I suggest that the LG/EPAR transition occurred in the final decade of the 8th century.

The duration of the local EPAR phase was long, judging by the number of urns from tomb A1K1 assigned to it. The tomb provided some associations between local EPAR pottery and EO vases from Central Crete, including Knossos, while valuable evidence comes from pyre A, trench ΛΛ, which contained some local EPAR vases (mostly aryballoi and lekythia), as well as the Cretan EO I-HYD.1 (pl. 37), two PC (I-AR.12, I-AR.13, pl. 40) and two Rhodian (LG)-Subgeometric ‘spaghetti ware’ (I-AR.6, I-AR.7, pl. 39) aryballoi. This evidence confirms that the local EPAR persisted in the second quarter of the 7th century. Given, however, that the context of most imports that date from the mid-7th to the early 6th century (mainly Corinthian aryballoi) is insufficiently studied, the only significant evidence for the dating of the EPAR/LPAR transition is provided by the Early Wild Goat I-OIN.8 (pl. 38), which dates at around 640. Nevertheless, I-OIN.8 turned up in a fragmentary state and its sherds were scattered on the upper level of tomb A1K1. Although its body is complete, the neck was not found. Hence, the vase was either lying just below the ceiling of the tomb and was smashed by its collapse, or, more likely, due to the missing neck, was placed over (outside) the tomb and partly rolled inside when the ceiling collapsed. Notably, the upper level of the tomb only contained EPAR pottery, while the area outside, mainly over the tomb was covered by LPAR urns, between which there were, however, a few EPAR ones. Given these uncertainties, I suggest an arbitrary date of 640 for the transition to the LPAR phase. Since the end of use of the chamber in tomb A1K1 occurred before the EPAR style was abandoned (as the discovery of EPAR urns in the dromos and above the tomb implies), this event is assigned to the second quarter of the 7th century. This date is confirmed by the presence of a gold ornament of advanced, but not late, 7th century style, inside

well have been produced after 700, while I-LEK.7, which dates to the end of the 8th century, was lying over a large EG vase (NDP.19, pl. 5).

336 Despite the LG/EPAR date assigned to some vases, this transition cannot yet be taken as a separate period.

337 I-NSP.2 (pl. 36), I-JU.3 (pl. 37), I-OIN.7 (pl. 38), I-AR.8 (pl. 39).

338 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 268-269, number 337 - Stampolidis 2003a, 569, number 1148.
the EPAR-advanced AM.12 (pl. 2), which was standing immediately behind the stone slab that blocked the tomb’s entrance. In conclusion, the chamber of the tomb was receiving burials from the second quarter of the 9th to the second quarter of the 7th century.

The deposition of LPAR urns over the tomb suggests that, for some Eleuthernians, its significance outlived its use. Since, however, these vases carried no import and their decoration is too simple to provide any stylistic correspondences, dating the LPAR phase proves difficult. I would provisionally place its end at around 570 (see Sections 2.2.3, 7.7).

### 3.4 Conclusions on the Cretan Iron Age Chronologies

Chapter 3 examines the character and problems of the existing Cretan Iron Age chronologies and lays the foundations of the relative and absolute chronology of the Eleuthernian 9th – 6th century pottery. The former task involves a review of the Knossian sequence, which includes a suggestion for a slight refinement in the absolute chronology of the 9th century (see Table 1), as well as a summary of the state of research in other Cretan sites. Accordingly, I challenge the dependence of the entire island on the Knossian chronology, emphasise the Cretan sub-regional ceramic idiosyncrasies and invite for closer attention to site-specific sequences. These arguments are further endorsed by the establishment of the local relative and absolute chronology, which departs considerably from the Knossian one. The significance of the latter task is further highlighted by the relative paucity of well-documented ceramic sequences in the whole of the Aegean.\(^{339}\) The contribution of the Eleuthernian relative and absolute chronology to the understanding of local and wider, ceramic, cultural and historic developments is evident in the following chapters, mostly in Chapter 7.

\(^{339}\) Whitley 2001, 63.
CHAPTER 4: CERAMIC PRODUCTION AT ELEUTHERNA

The study of production of Iron Age pottery in Eleutherna is hindered by the lack of any relevant epigraphic or iconographic evidence of the kind available for Archaic-Classical Athens and Corinth.\(^{340}\) In addition, no chemical analysis has yet been conducted on the relevant fabrics and no production site, such as a kiln, of similar date has been published.\(^{341}\) It has been confirmed, however, that significant quantities of pottery were produced locally during the Early Byzantine period,\(^{342}\) while Hellenistic\(^ {343}\) and perhaps Iron Age\(^ {344}\) ceramic kilns have been identified amidst the settlement at the Nisi hill.\(^ {345}\)

4.1 Fabric

The clay sources used by the potters of ancient Eleutherna have not been identified, but abundant, workable\(^ {346}\) clay beds are located in the area and nowadays support the traditional pottery industry at the village of Margarites, which lies 2km. north-east of Eleutherna.\(^ {347}\) The clay sources used by the potters of Margarites are located at Lepida-Stenolakkos and Orne-Mayro Choma, which lie 3-4km. and 6km. south of the village.\(^ {348}\) Nevertheless, clay can also be extracted from open quarries on the spur of Margarites, where beds or pockets of different kinds of workable clay occur in numerous shallow patches. The production at Margarites is further facilitated by the prevailing winds and the water resources available, while Mount Ida provides timber.\(^ {349}\) On these grounds, it has been assumed that the potter’s quarter of ancient

---


\(^ {341}\) For the significance of such evidence in discussions of production see for example Arafat and Morgan 1989, 314-329.


\(^ {344}\) Kalpaxis forthcoming.

\(^ {345}\) For a Late Byzantine kiln at Pyrgi see Kalpaxis 2004, 115.

\(^ {346}\) A clay ‘requiring little preparation and satisfactorily friable at temperatures up to 900°’ is considered workable (Morgan 1999a, 223).


\(^ {348}\) Giannopoulou, Gratsia and Padouva 2001, 13. The distance of these sources from Eleutherna suggests that pottery production probably involved no complex division of labour or special transport requirements (cf. Arafat and Morgan 1989, 316).

Eleutherna was located at Margarites,\(^\text{350}\) even though the few ancient remains discovered at this site (see Appendix I.2.3) provide no support for this suggestion.\(^\text{351}\)

It is reasonable to assume that the orange fabric of chalky consistency, which widely occurs on pottery from Eleutherna, is local.\(^\text{352}\) Although this fabric is often fired to orange-brown, orange-red or pink-brown, it is clear that these variations are due to discrepancies in firing conditions, particularly since they occasionally occur on a single vase.\(^\text{353}\) Impurities, the size and quantity of which may vary according to the size of the vessel, are very common, but mica is normally missing. Although white particles (called inclusions) are often fairly large and occasionally cause spalling on the surface of the vase, smaller impurities (called grits) of red or brown-black colour\(^\text{354}\) are more plentiful. Oxygen mostly penetrated the walls of the vases during the reoxidizing phase. Dark/grey interiors are, however, commonly found on G-PAR coated cups, as well as the walls of some large vessels and most handles. There is no noteworthy improvement through time in the preparation of the clay and in the elimination of impurities. Nevertheless, some LG-PAR cups or unguent vases are thin-walled. Coarse and cooking pottery is apparently made of the orange fabric that is common on fine ware vessels, though fired to a darker shade. In this case, however, the clay is poorly levigated and contains a pebbly grit (temper) that strengthens the walls of the vase.

Several of the earliest, LPG and to a less extent PGB vases (mainly pouring vessels of small or medium size) are made of a markedly different, pale brown fabric with a few dark grits of small size. Its self-slipped surface takes a polish of some quality and requires no slip, unlike the orange fabric that prevailed thereafter. The stimulus that led to the replacement of the pale brown fabric by the orange one,


\(^\text{352}\) Erickson (Erickson 2000, 193. Erickson 2004, 201) describes it as a bright orange-red fabric (Munsell 5YR 6/8 to 7/8) of chalky consistency with fine white calcite (?). Probably the same fabric is found on much of the local Early Christian pottery (Yangaki 2004, 139-142. Also, Vogt 2000, 67, 73).

\(^\text{353}\) This is best illustrated by OIN.4 and OIN.5 (pl. 19, 61), which are almost identical and probably come from the same hand. The clay of the former is bright orange, while that of the latter orange-brown.

\(^\text{354}\) This range is related to the conditions of firing; returning to the example of the previous footnote, the bright orange clay of OIN.4 contains red impurities, while the orange-brown clay of OIN.5 contains dark impurities.
which is apparently less beneficial, is uncertain. The former’s source might well have been exhausted, but I wonder whether the change is related to the establishment of the white on dark decorative technique, particularly since the introduction of new clay sources coincided with a major shift in painting style in 7th century Athens. Significantly, AM.15 (pl. 2), the only large LPG vase that carries white on black decoration is made of orange fabric.

The peculiarities of the fabric of the Creto-Cypriot pottery are discussed below.

4.2 Shaping and decorative technique

Although handmade pottery is rare in Iron Age Eleutherna (only a few early plain aryballoi are handmade), the wheelmade products mostly suggest a modest labour investment and skill (see below). Small and large vases may deviate from the vertical axis or display shallow cavities caused by their contact with another vase during drying or firing. Cups and bell skyphoi occasionally show an irregular rim diameter; bell skyphoi occasionally carry ridges or grooves on the foot and a knob or a cavity on the bottom of their interior, while a ridge often runs at the points of juncture on several shapes. Marks from the string that was used to remove a vessel from the potter’s wheel commonly occur on the base of cups and basins, while fingerprints are mostly found on the walls of cups. Most of the imperfections withdrew as time passed (especially in the case of the small, open vessels), but did not disappear. Besides, the Eleuthernian potters were not particularly willing to adapt foreign ceramic shapes or types (excluding some Cypriot wares discussed below) or copy the shape of containers made from other materials. Some vases, however, follow metallic prototypes (most notably KR.4, pl. 25; KR.5, pl. 72; OIN.34, pl. 34a, 62).

Although there were changes in decorative styles throughout the period of the cemetery’s use, the surface of plain ware vases was normally self-slipped or polished. The surfaces of most LPG-PGB vases made in the pale brown fabric are self-slipped, while a thin, dull yellowish slip is found from the PGB period on mostly

355 References collected in Morgan 1999a, 225.
356 Handmade pottery is rare in most of Iron Age Crete, excluding the Sitia area (Tsipopoulou 1987, mostly 101, 103-104, 156).
small vases. During the MG-LG period, a thickly applied slip of bright yellow colour becomes common on large and small vessels. There is a considerable decline in quality on LG-late – EPAR vases, mostly large (small vessels largely maintain the thick, bright yellow slip). Furthermore, only the upper part of the larger vessels is often covered with a mostly thin slip, which now resumes with a dull yellowish or brown-yellow colour. At this time, another, whitish or white-brown slip, which was rarely used before,\(^{358}\) is introduced. In both cases, however, the slip flakes off more easily than before, while, by the LPAR period, slip is uncommon. Although there is a gradual demise in the quality and use of slip from the MG to the LPAR period, I wonder if this was not only due to the general demise of painted pottery, but also a result of constraints affecting the availability or accessibility of the raw material that produced the yellow slip from around 700.\(^{359}\)

Although the paint of the Eleuthemian pottery is normally dull, a more lustrous effect is achieved on some MG-LG large vases, as well as on some smaller examples of varied date. The colour of the coating that is applied on most LPG-EG storage vessels ranges from black to red. Although this range is sometimes found on a single vessel, the overall impression is usually black to brown-black on LPG-PGB vessels and brown-red to red on (PGB)-EG examples. Brown-red was produced by the incomplete sintering of the paint during the reduction phase; fluctuations in kiln conditions during firing are the main cause: a draft disturbed the reducing atmosphere, or a part of the kiln proved cooler than the rest; alternatively, the paint was too thinly applied; red marks were caused by the contact of two vases during firing.\(^{360}\) Although a different decorative technique, involving the application of slip, prevailed from the MG period, the Eleuthemian potters of the Iron Age never fully mastered the firing circle (probably because they hardly used test pieces);\(^{361}\) the range in the colour of the paint persisted throughout the G-PAR period. Despite this range, however, brown-black paint normally accompanies the bright, thick slip of the MG-LG large vessels (suggesting optimal firing), while PAR examples, whether

\(^{358}\) Cf. the MG NDP.22 (pl. 6), LEK.8 (pl. 22).
\(^{359}\) Distance to slip resources is often considerably longer than distance to clay resources: Arnold 1985, 37, 52-52, 60.
\(^{360}\) Cf. Noble 1988, 158-161.
\(^{361}\) Contrast the use of test-pieces in Iron Age Athens: Papadopoulos 2003, 23-224.
slipped or unslipped, normally display brown-red paint (mostly thinly applied). Significantly, thick slip and dark paint was largely maintained on EPAR small vases.

Decoration was mostly achieved by the use of a brush, including a pivoted multiple brush. The use of a simple multiple brush was, however, apparently limited to two early 7th century workshops established by immigrant potters/painters, which I discuss below. Additionally, the caliper, which served for transferring and comparing measurements, as well as being an instrument for drawing straight lines, was perhaps used. Most of the PGB-EG vases, particularly the larger shapes, are decorated in an idiosyncratic technique, the popularity of which in Eleutherna is so far unparalleled in the entire Aegean of the Iron Age: their exterior is coated in paint, on which added white colour decoration is applied. The added colour may display a yellowish or pinkish tinge and has often flaked off, revealing the underlying paint that has incompletely reoxidised to a dark red colour. The early popularity of this kind of decoration in Eleutherna seems currently an isolated phenomenon. White on black occurs already on local LPG examples, but seems infrequent on Knossian, Gortynian and Phaistian pottery before the LG period; it was introduced on Khaniote pottery during the later part of the local LG I phase and on East Cretan pottery at the end of the LG period. On these grounds, I wonder whether the Eleuthemian painters of the LPG-EG period were inspired by the EM III-MM I white on dark ware; although more common in East Crete, the ware is amply represented at Chamalevri and sporadically at Eleutherna. The ornaments employed in both wares are fairly similar, albeit quite simple, but the Minoan white on dark, which mainly occurs on cups and, less commonly, pouring

362 Cf. Papadopoulos, Vedder and Schreiber 1998 (as they suggest in footnote 67, the use of more than one multiple brush on any particular vase is rare; there are few exceptions in Eleutherna, most notably NDP.53, pl. 9). I maintain the term compass-drawn for circles and semicircles painted by this device for convenience.
363 This is perhaps a case of secrecy in aspects of ceramic production (cf. Nicklin 1971-1972), which would be hardly surprising for potters/painters residing in a foreign community and relying on their craft for more than economic reasons.
367 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 238.
369 Betancourt 1985, 55-61, 68, 73, 81.
370 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997a, 40.
vessels, is regarded as a fine table ware. Its Eleuthernian counterpart, however, occurs mainly on storage and, less commonly, pouring vessels (mostly of medium or large size), but hardly ever on open vessels. In any case, white on dark was largely abandoned in Eleutherna after the EG period and survived only on MG-LG broad-necked jugs. Its wider attestation in the EPAR period often adheres to a different syntax and was probably influenced by imports from other Cretan sites.

The coating of the exterior of some PGB-EG storage vessels from Eleutherna was achieved by dipping from the handles, as coated bases and reserved interiors, occasionally (NDP.3, NDP.8, NDP.14: pl. 8) carrying trickles, suggest. This technique is, however, more widely found on LPG-PGB cups and bell skyphoi. In contrast, spattering only occurs on the interior of KR.4 (pl. 25) and NDP.44 (pl. 8).

The painters of the pottery from Orthi Petra were often careless. Some vases show blobs spilled on drawing or plain areas, while horizontal and vertical bands are occasionally not straight. Moreover, these painters were reluctant to produce figured and Orientalizing drawing or copy foreign motifs, such as the meander, even though imports with such ornaments were reaching the site (see Appendix III). Significantly, the meander is in one case (NDP.20, pl. 6) juxtaposed with curvilinear motifs of Cretan pedigree. Although this phenomenon (the ‘bilingual’ decoration), which is more widely identified in Knossos, has been interpreted as a sign of the painter’s awareness of distinctions between regional styles, its single occurrence in Eleutherna seems, currently, a superficial reflection of a Knossian trend. Another vase from Eleutherna, the PGB AM.16 (pl. 2), which displays a Minoanizing hatched quatrefoil net, recalls the interest in Minoan iconography that is found in contemporary Knossos. This Knossian interest is largely attributed to the discovery of Minoan larnakes, while the pattern of AM.16 appears on Minoan larnakes from tombs located (only) north-west of Eleutherna. Although ethnographic studies have demonstrated that the discovery of ‘ancient’ pottery may exercise an

---

372 I assume that some of the irregular horizontal bands were painted when the vase was stationary.
373 See Section 3.3.1.
374 The motif is popular on local belly-handled amphorae, but rare on the rest of the material (NDP.20, AM.23, NDP.62 – pl. 4, 6, 9; the latter two vases are attributed to immigrants from the Cyclades. Varieties of the pattern also occur on NDP.44 and HYD.14 – pl. 8, 17).
375 For references see the comments upon NDP.20 in Section 5.1.2.
377 For references see the comments upon AM.16 in Section 5.1.1.
innovative impact upon ceramic production. I doubt whether the Eleuthernian painter was directly inspired by Minoan larnakes, particularly since Minoan influence is barely identifiable on the decoration of the rest of the material.

Slip and paint are not the only means employed in the decoration of local pottery. Although the decoration of TH.6 (pl. 33) is indebted to clay or bronze, Oriental prototypes, the human face it carries was rendered by the application of wet, hand-worked strips of clay, a technique that is best paralleled on ceramic ritual equipment from LM IIIC Kavousi. On the other hand, the relief decoration on the base of the EG BA.1 (pl. 84) was produced by a mould. The attribution of BA.1 to the EG period raises the date of the introduction of such moulds in Crete. It further invites a review of the date proposed for all related pieces, which are assigned to the LG-EO period, even though they often find close parallels in earlier metalwork (the patterns of the moulds are more closely connected with the imagery on metal artefacts rather than with the motifs on painted pottery). The pattern of BA.1 is paralleled on unpublished basin sherds from Eleutherna, but fairly similar, relief decoration occurs on a disc from Prinias. The similarity may not be coincidental, particularly since such moulds (or their ‘owners’) circulated in Crete, as documented by the thus far unnoticed use of the same mould for the decoration of a Knossian plate and two Gortynian lids of the late 8th century. In my opinion, the concept of such moulds was introduced to the island by the Phoenicians, who also carried it further west, as confirmed by the wide presence of similar devices with comparable motifs in the Punic world of the 6th - 4th centuries.

Lastly, the PGB, wheel-made SLI.3 (pl. 16, 57) carries a handmade appliqué, a goat’s head. One of the goat’s horns broke during the making of the vase, but the break was smoothed over and painted before SLI.3 was fired. ‘Restoration’ work is

---

379 I have not examined a sherd that carries an incised figure and is considered local (Stampolidis 1996, 117); incised decoration is otherwise unattested on Eleuthernian pottery.
380 See the comments upon TH.6 in Section 5.5.3.
381 Gesell and Saupe 1997.
382 Cited in the comments upon BA.1 in Section 5.5.2.
384 Pernier 1914, 65, number 4.
386 Johannowsky 2000, 9, numbers 11-12.
also identified on one other vase from the cemetery, the Cypriot I-OIN.3 (pl. 37). The mending of the latter’s lip with a glue\(^{388}\) probably occurred in Eleutherna (rather than in Cyprus),\(^{389}\) suggesting care for a prized vessel.\(^{390}\) Apparently, distinct vases could be deposited in a tomb even when damaged.\(^{391}\)

4.3 Modes of production, workshops\(^{392}\) and potter’s marks\(^{393}\)

Despite the lack of much relevant information listed above, I assume that the mode of ceramic production in Iron Age Eleutherna largely fits the lowest level of the ‘individual workshop’, which involves the probably seasonal\(^{394}\) participation of families, led by semi-specialist members,\(^{395}\) in potting for profit, while also engaging in other economic activities (mostly agriculture)\(^{396}\) for subsistence.\(^{397}\) Only in the case of the early 7th century ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ (discussed below) is a full-blown ‘individual workshop’ satisfactorily documented.

Low labour investment in ceramic production, accompanied by fairly high standardisation (shape, size and decoration are fairly constant) and modest skill\(^{398}\) is

---

\(^{388}\) As far as I know, however, the use of a glue has not been reported from elsewhere in Iron Age Crete, in contrast to the use of metal clamps (see: Tsipopoulou 1987, 73-74. KNC 287.15). Nevertheless, most Cretan Iron Age tombs have been excavated under circumstances that would barely allow for the recording of such a case.


\(^{390}\) Stampolidis 1998, 122.

\(^{391}\) A possibly similar case is identified in Afrati: Levi 1927-1929, 331. Besides, I believe that one out of the two vases from East Crete that carry traces of mending, a lekythos from Agios Georgios (Tsipopoulou 1987, 73-74), is perhaps an import (see footnote 1215).

\(^{392}\) By employing the term workshop when discussing material from Orthi Petra, I speak in terms of particular production units (even though I am aware of inherent constraints: Morgan 1999a, 227) rather than stylistic groups (which is the case of my reference to regional workshops, such as the Knossian, the Attic workshop).


\(^{394}\) The relatively large amount of impurities on the fabric of the Eleuthernian pottery, as well as the technical and decorative flaws identified suggest ‘part-time’ production: cf. Costin and Hagstrum 1995, 624.

\(^{395}\) These members were probably males, cf. Nijboer 1998, 186-187.

\(^{396}\) For agriculture in Archaic Eleutherna see Perlman 2004, 102-103.

\(^{397}\) Cf. lately: Crielaard 1999, 58, with further references (add Shanks 1999, 42-50). Crielaard adds the mode of the ‘household industry’, overseeing some aspects (including the lack of a proper wheel or kiln) that make it unsuitable for Iron Age Greece. Nevertheless, the ‘complex household industry’ mode, introduced in Underhill 1991, is also close to the Eleuthernian case. The discussion of these modes relies heavily on Peacock 1982 (for the terms used here see pages 8-9, 17-38, 75-99. For other classifications of production modes, including some drawbacks, see: Costin 1991, 5-11. Knappett 1997, 309, footnote 30). Note that Peacock’s model and related variants have been accused of failing to recognise that specialised production can also be practiced at a household level (Feinman 1999. See also Inomata 2001, 322).

\(^{398}\) For the significance of these parameters in defining modes of ceramic production see Costin and Hagstrum 1995.
mostly demonstrated by cups (until the LG period) and bell skyphoi (though not low-based skyphoi). The fairly high standardisation was perhaps dictated by consumer requirements such as the desire to use these vessels as approximate volume or weight measures. It may also reflect the involvement of a relatively low number of potters in their production during the LPG-MG period. High labour input and skill, as well as high standardisation is, however, identified on the LG-(EPAR) type E cups, which may have been commissioned, given that all twenty-three examples of the type were produced by a single workshop and were deposited in a single context (the scale of this set is unparalleled in Eleutherna). Shallow open vessels display low labour investment and skill, as well as modest standardisation, but storage and pouring vessels regularly exhibit higher, mostly moderate, labour investment (note, for example, the rarity of plain wares) and notable diversification. The variety in the shape and decoration of the LPG-EPAR urns may reflect a desire to ‘personalise’ these vases. In conclusion, the several co-existing, but varied modes of production identified sketch the diverse demands of the consuming population. This picture, however, collapses during the LPAR period, when most modes are abandoned and the ceramic repertory is dominated by low labour investment and modest standardisation.

Standardisation and diversification occasionally encourage the attribution of some vessels to particular workshops and at times to one or two individuals. Although the output of each workshop identified is mostly limited to vessels of a single shape/type (implying some degree of specialised production and/or limited

399 This is mostly evident in the figures of size provided for each type. The trend is paralleled in Knossos, where, however, richly decorated cups are fairly common already in the MG period (KNC, 379-380, 385-390). I reject the simplistic argument (Borgna 2004, 271) that attributes the low labour investment and high standardisation of the Cretan PG cups and skyphoi to low-level competition within a relatively fixed political organisation.

400 Commissioning has hardly been applied to Iron Age ceramic production: it has been proposed for early 8th century Attic vases (Whitley 1991, 80) and the slightly later monumental Dipylon vases (Starr 1977, 85), as well as for some 7th century material of Orientalizing style from Afrati (Boardman 1999, 60). I disagree with fundamental aspects of the latter interpretation, however, as explained in Stampolidis and Kotsonas forthcoming.


403 In few cases, vessels of different shape are attributed (with varying degree of confidence) to a single workshop: a) NDP.27 (pl. 7), PY.10 (pl. 15); b) SK.1, SK.2, CU.227 (pl. 27, 31); c) PY.18, PY.19, AR.18 (pl. 15, 23); d) OIN.1, OIN.4, OIN.5, OIN.6, OIN.7, AR.5, AR.6 (pl. 19, 22, 61); e) AM.23, NDP.62, NDP.76 (the ‘saw pattern workshop’, pl. 4, 9-10). By specialisation I refer to an
copying of a fellow potter/painter’s work), I would not argue that specific potters/painters were only producing specific shapes/types; this is particularly because the occasional discovery of vessels from a single workshop in a single context suggests that the record is partly contaminated by sumptuary strategies explored in Chapter 7.

Although stylistic affinities have often encouraged the attribution of small groups of vases to particular workshops, I will only review here the cases in which stylistic correspondences are combined with potter’s marks.

The quality of the fabric and the self-slipped surface of roughly one third of the small, LPG-PGB/EG bell skyphoi (variety Aib) distinguish these vases from the rest and support their attribution to a particular workshop, particularly since they carry a potter’s mark on the underfoot (pl. 76). The larger BSK.41 (pl. 26), which carries a similar mark, is the only vessel from this workshop found outside tomb A1K1. It was probably the relatively high quality of these vases that prevented their disposal in crematorium A and favoured their deposition in the tomb. In any case, the significance of the distinction between V- and |-shaped marks on the underfoot is uncertain.

Another workshop marked the LPG-EG oinochoai (OIN.1, OIN.4, OIN.5, OIN.6, OIN.7, pl. 19, 61) and aryballoi (AR.5 and AR.6, pl. 22) it produced by painting a cross on the base (pl. 19, 59). Concerning stylistic correspondences, three of the oinochoai (OIN.4, OIN.5, OIN.6) are almost identical, while the aryballoi are a matching pair. Significantly, the number of the oinochoai from this workshop and the bell skyphoi from the aforementioned one represents one third-quarter of the overall number of bell skyphoi and large oinochoai attested in Orthi Petra during the LPG-EG period. This evidence may imply that the pottery deposited in the cemetery during the period in question derived from a few workshops, even though AR.5 and AR.6 represent less than one tenth of the PGB-EG aryballoi from Orthi Petra.

Other, less common cases of similar marks include the band on the base of SK.4 (pl. 27) and the single dot that occurs on the front and/or back side of the almost identical, Creto-Cypriot LEK.16 (pl. 69) and LEK.17 (the pair turned up in a single pyre).

Although rare, impressed and incised marks also occur. The circles on the PGB AM.1 (pl. 1, 34a) and the EG AM.4 (pl. 1) are impressed, but the use of a stamp is assumed only for the former case. Although stamped decoration is found on Knossian (coarse) pottery already in the Subminoan-PG period, it rarely occurs on (mostly coarse) vases from other Aegean sites, even during the 8th century. AM.1 probably represents the earliest use of a stamp on the handle of an amphora and introduces a trend that would prove popular in later times. Despite the identification of a similar stamp impression on an unpublished sherd from Orthi Petra, I believe it is unlikely that the stamp was a potter’s mark since it is so sparsely identified on the large ceramic corpus from Eleutherna. Only the study of material with similar impressions will advance the interpretation of these marks, which are probably connected with production rather than distribution.

OIN.7 (pl. 19), which belongs to the second workshop mentioned beforehand and carries a painted potter’s mark on the base, also displays four parallel, incised strokes on the base’s perimeter. This combination is probably related to the juxtaposition of a painted and an incised eye by its lip and finds no straightforward interpretation, even though the marks are probably connected with production-related causes. On the other hand, the eight to ten incised lines on the walls of BSK.29 (pl. 26) were made after firing and are not potter’s marks. They could represent a numeral, but any connection with the discovery of eight variety Aic bell skyphoi

---

404 A decorative purpose is unlikely, since a single circle occurs on AM.4, while the circles of AM.1 are placed on an inconspicuous position.
405 Coldstream 2001, 61
407 Also, the stamp is missing from LI.1 that was covering AM.1, even though the peculiar lip of the two vessels confirms that they were produced (and ‘bought’) as a set.
408 I see no direct connection between the four incised strokes and the discovery of OIN.7 along with two more vases (OIN.4, OIN.5) from the same workshop inside tomb A1K1. Besides, the ‘W’ that was incised before firing on the rim of a G amphora from Gavalomouri is considered a potter’s mark (Anatoliki Mesogeios, 140-141, number 86).
409 The use of numerals on Aegean Iron Age pottery is considered improbable (Papadopoulos 1994, 479-480), but see Morgan 1999a, 234.
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together with BSK.29 in tomb A1K1 is unlikely, given the different contexts of some of these vases.

In conclusion, potter’s marks were only applied on pottery from Eleutherna during the LPG-EG period. The dots on the LG LEK.16 and LEK.17 and some marks on the EPAR amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ (see below) do not confirm a revival of the trend.

4.4 Production-related cases of particular interest: the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’, the ‘saw pattern workshop’ and the Creto-Cypriot pottery

Most of the figured (animal) imagery of the pottery from Eleutherna was produced by two workshops, the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’, both named after a characteristic decorative ornament their products display. The shape and the decoration of the vases from these workshops, however, find no close parallel in the local ceramic tradition and strongly recall Cycladic pottery. Hence, I assume that both workshops were established by immigrant potters/painters, which came from Paros (‘Eleutherna bird workshop’) and Thera (‘saw pattern workshop’). Cycladic potters/painters display notable mobility in the late 8th – early 7th century: some immigrated to Athens, others to Knossos.

The ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’, which is represented by seven amphorae from tomb A1K1 and another that was identified in the Museum of Rethymnon and has no provenance, raises several issues regarding production. Despite the striking similarities of these vases, the involvement of at least two painters and perhaps

---

410 These workshops are fully treated in Sections 5.1.1-5.1.2 (type C and variety Diib amphorae, type D necked pithoi); I only review here production-related aspects.
411 For reference to the evidence and arguments that support these identifications see the previous footnote. Note that, on the other hand, an object (called bellow’s nozzle/tuyère, but see below) found at Hermonassa (Black Sea), which is made of local clay, but is inscribed in late 6th century Eleuthernian script, has generated speculation on the possibility of the migration of a potter (or metalworker) from Eleutherna and his participation in the establishment of this Greek colony: Treister and Shelov-Kovedayev 1989 (also: Erickson 2000, 249-250. For Hermonassa see lately Finogenova 2003: for reference to the nozzle/tuyère see page 1019). Later scholarship (collected in Papadopoulos 1992), however, considers these objects as kitchen chattels, not kiln firing utensils.
412 It is unclear whether this mobility was chosen by the craftsman or forced by some agent, even though such distinctions have proved rigid: Papadopoulos 1997, 460-461. For an unexpected approach on the mobility of people from the Cyclades in Medieval to Modern times see: Doumas 2004.
413 Papadopoulos and Smithson 2002, 191.
415 Stampolidis 2004, 150, number 7.
‘inexperienced personnel’ is identifiable. Supposing that these identifications are correct, an unparalleled insight into the structure of an early 7th century workshop is achieved. This workshop can justifiably be called specialised, since its products display high standardisation (all vases are shoulder-handled amphorae and carry very similar decoration), great efficiency (patterns are often repeated and the multiple brush is commonly used; over time, a device with six individual brushes, used on the early vases, was replaced by an eight-brushed device, thus increasing the output of the painter’s work. Further, few patterns were abandoned, while others were simplified) and unrivalled skill, compared with the local standards (the two fabrics identified are quite fine, the shapes are elegant and the rich, figured decoration covers most of the vase). The emergence of specialisation is often connected with economic and sociopolitical developments. I, however, emphasise that the identification of a single specialised pottery workshop (perhaps significantly founded by immigrants) should not be equated with the establishment of specialisation in the entire ceramic production, let alone in other facets of the Eleuthernian economy. Besides, specialised craftsmen (the local or foreign descent of whom remains undetermined) are mentioned in late 6th century inscriptions from Eleutherna, while specialised metalworking probably developed considerably earlier.

The identification of the ‘saw pattern workshop’, which is represented by AM.23 (pl. 4), NDP.62 and NDP.76 (pl. 9-10), as a local one is not well founded. Only the fabric of the EPAR-late NDP.76 is typically local, but this vase is not

416 For these parameters as indirect evidence for specialisation see Costin 1991, 33-40. Also, Rice 1984, 47-48.
417 A connection most formally expressed in Rice 1981.
419 Contrast Whitley’s unfounded positivism that craft specialisation ‘had already developed to a high degree in pottery production, textiles, gold-working and metallurgy in general by the ninth century’ in the Aegean (Whitley 1991, 44). Site-specific and/or regional studies should formally address the issue (which is often overlooked in studies of the Iron Age) and replace such generalisations. Interestingly, standardisation and decorative elaboration have allowed for the identification of ceramic ‘workshops’ specialising in the production of neckless pithoi in MG-LG Knossos (Fortetsa, 148-149. GGP, 246-249. KNC, 318-319, 322-324. Coldstream 2001, 27-28). Nevertheless, reference to a stylistic entity, rather than a production unit (cf. footnote 403) is inferred from the relevant scholarship, which focuses on style, overlooks some production-related questions and occasionally prefers the terms ‘group’ and ‘circle’. On specialised ceramic production in Iron Age Aegean see Crielaard 1999, 57-58.
420 Perlman 2004, 104-118.
421 Note the discovery of ample 9th – 7th century bronze vessels, iron tools and weapons (for example: Stampolidis 1993, 65-73. Stampolidis 1994, 101-118), as well as of two 8th - 7th century moulds for bronze items (Themelis 2002, 31). For the suggestion that Phoenician metalworkers were residing in Iron Age Eleutherna see Stampolidis 2003, 226.
attributed to the master craftsman, who was active earlier within the same period. On
the other hand, AM.23 and NDP.62 are made of different fabrics, which seem neither
local nor Theran (these vases resemble Theran ceramics), even though the fabric
of AM.23 vaguely recalls Theran material. These two vases, however, were
probably made by a single potter/painter, judging by the correspondences they
display. Significantly, a multiple brush with nine individual brushes was used on all
three vases.

Notably, the vessels from both workshops discussed above are not made of a
single fabric. Perhaps the immigrant potters were experimenting with clays, even
though other reasons, not necessarily identical in the two cases, may be conjectured.
Only, however, further study of the local fabrics will really illuminate such aspects.

The Creto-Cypriot repertory of Eleutherna includes LG-EPAR aryballoi and
oinochoai, but also various types of lekythia, the earliest of which date back to the
PGB period. Although the fine fabric and polished surface of these vases (excluding
a few examples, like AR.61, AR.62) is uncommon for the local standards, they are
treated as local, since similar discrepancies have been identified on Creto-Cypriot
ceramics from other sites. The technical peculiarities of the Creto-Cypriot vases
from Knossos and other Cretan sites and their occasional close resemblance to
Cypriot prototypes have generated much discussion pertinent to their production,
mostly focusing on two classes discussed below.

The first class, which is not represented in Eleutherna, but pertains to my
model for the production of Creto-Cypriot pottery, includes trefoil-lipped juglets in
Coarse Red micaceous fabric (usually carrying incised lines on neck and vertical ribs
or grooves on the body) that imitate Cypriot Black Slip I and II jugs and date to the
10th and mostly the late 9th century. Coldstream argued lately that these vessels were
produced in East Crete, perhaps by an immigrant Cypriot potter, to carry liquid
opium, bottled through Cypriot enterprise. Leaving aside the problems related to

---

422 The transport (and mixing) of clays is a possible explanation (cf.: Tiverios 1989, 620. Knauss,
423 Besides, when flaking, the slip of AM.23 leaves a grey shade, which is paralleled on Theran
amphorae.
425 Coldstream 2000b (for the problematic date of most examples see page 468) Also: Coldstream
the establishment of such an enterprise, I consider the identification of the fabric of the examples found in Knossos as East Cretan unlikely, for reasons implied by Coldstream himself. Even if the fabric is East Cretan, the importation of the raw material (or simply additives) is a possible alternative, particularly since the localisation of the workshop in East Crete is challenged by new finds. Coldstream mentioned several juglets from Knossos, single examples from Afrati, Kourtes and Kavousi and an amphoriskos of similar ware from Dreros (only the latter two sites lie in East Crete). Similar vases from Knossos Prinias, Rhytion and Eltyna, located in Central Crete, have, however, now been published. An even closer copy of Cypriot Black Slip jugs was located at a tomb at Pantanassa (Central-West Crete) that dates around 1000. Hence, the production of these vases commenced before the 9th century and was not as centralised as previously thought, let alone the work of an immigrant Cypriot potter. In addition, it should probably be localised in one or more Central Cretan sites, rather than in East Crete. Lastly, I reckon that a close study of the contexts and stylistic development of these vases will demonstrate that their production throughout the EPG-LPG period was more copious than previously thought.

The other, less homogeneous class includes Cretan imitations of Cypriot Black on Red juglets. These vessels are not attributed to foreign potters, but Coldstream has proposed that the finer copies were made to order for the bottling of unguents produced by a small factory manned by immigrant Phoenicians (perhaps from Kition) residing in Knossos. This suggestion, however, has lately been repeatedly challenged from various angles and I largely share the relevant

427 Coldstream 2000b, 466-467: several other Knossian vessels of various shapes were produced from this fabric. It is no surprise that the fabric analysis could not identify the fabric in question, which is rich in inclusions, with the fabrics attested on other Knossian pottery, which is mostly fine ware.
428 For bibliography on the transport of clay see footnote 422.
429 Coldstream 2000b, 467.
430 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 160-162, numbers 123, 125-128, 130. Englezou 2004, 427: the PGB-EG date proposed relies on the date of most Knossian parallels and should not be considered secure.
433 Jones 1993. Hoffman 1997, 176-185. Schreiber 2003, 293-306 (Schreiber has persuasively argued that the Black on Red imports and imitations in Crete and the Dodecanese are not related to the Phoenician expansion, but should be attributed to a Cypriot initiative). The notable variety in the
skepticism. In my view, the close copies of Black of Red juglets should be viewed as only one facet of the varied response of the Cretan potters/painters towards the imported originals and assessed not only in the light of the imitator’s interests, but also the potter’s skills. This is most clear in late 9th – early 8th century Eleutherna and Knossos, where the manufacture of close and freer copies was contemporaneous with the production of more imaginative versions by specific craftsmen. Significantly, it is one of the latter class of Knossian vessels (identified here as Cretan for the first time) that traveled on a possibly Phoenician ship to Pontecagnano during the early 8th century, while the close and freer Cretan copies went no further than the Cyclades.

However varied, the enthusiastic response of the Cretan potters/painters remains impressive. Although Hoffman has demonstrated that the nature of the evidence allows for several alternatives to Coldstream’s interpretation of this

capacity of Knossian close (and freer) imitations of Black on Red juglets that has recently been identified (Tsatsaki 2004, 505-507, 562; Tsatsaki prefers to stress the implication of the few correspondences) further undermines Coldstream’s interpretation.

On the questionable significance of the notion of ‘authenticity’ in pre-modern societies see van Wijngaarden 1999, 34. For related cases in Iron Age Aegean see Morgan 1999a, 229.

Eleutherna: type Ci lekythoi (see Section 5.3.3). Knossos: KNC, 353-354, types Cii-Ciii. Coldstream also mentions a broadly similar vase from Episkopi Pedhiadhos (Hartley 1930-1931, 71, number 29), which suggests that more than one potters/painters from North Central Crete preferred imaginative imitations.

D’Agostino 2001, 18, T. 7738.3; 34, number 3 (I am grateful to Professor D’Agostino for discussing this vase with me and providing a copy of D’Agostino 2001). The Attic connection suggested is questionable (the Attic parallels are larger and different in several details) and the reddish fabric carrying white grits, the slip, the shape and the style strongly favour (in my view) the attribution of the vase to the potter/painter that produced the Knossian lekythia of KNC, 353, type Ci. The example from Pontecagnano, which is fragmentary, stands on a slightly articulated (though still flat) base. The identification proposed here solves D’Agostino’s problems about the chronology of the tomb that contained the vase by favouring a date in the beginning of the local phase IIA (around 770): D’Agostino 2001, 13, 18. Note that this date is not entirely consistent with the PGB-EG date (840-790 in absolute terms according to Coldstream 2001, 22) proposed for the vases from Knossos, which is, however, not well-founded (KNC, 353).

The Phoenician role in this sea-route is supported by the occurrence of glazed/faience amphoroid lekythia in Eleutherna, Pontecagnano and Rhodes (Anatoliki Mesogeios, 212-214, numbers 236-239. Stampolidis 2003a, 487-488, numbers 893-895. Stampolidis 2004, 255, numbers 290-291), as well as by the discovery of a Sardinian askos in Knossos (Vagnetti 1989: as Vagnetti underlines in page 358, Sardinia was closely connected with the Tyrrenian seaboard, where Pontecagnano lies). The connections between Sardinia, Pontecagnano and the Phoenicians are examined in: D’Agostino 2001, 13, 17. Contacts between Crete and Tyrrenian Italy are examined, occasionally with questionable rigor, in Biondi 2004.

GGP, 382, footnotes 1-3. In Coldstream 1998a, 257, the same vases are considered Knossian without justification.
phenomenon that involve no foreign agents, the discussion has missed one important point: nearly all Knossian and Cretan lekythia produced after the beginning of the 8th century are Creto-Cypriot; the ware was henceforth tied with the shape. By the LG period, Creto-Cypriot lekythia, but also oinochoai and aryballoi, proved popular in several sites in Central and East Crete and, in my view, the production of sites like Knossos and Eleutherna was supplemented by that of Afrati, Kavousi, Phaistos and perhaps other sites. This spread was, however, primarily not fueled by Cypriot imports (for the rarity of which see Section 6.3.1), let alone Cypriot/Phoenician entrepreneurs, but by the products of potters/painters operating elsewhere in Crete, or even by East Greek vessels like I-LEK.4 (pl. 38).

I therefore believe that the discussion of the stimulus for the original introduction of the Creto-Cypriot pottery only applies to a few sites. This stimulus was probably soon neglected as the fashion for Cypriot-style pottery spread through most of Crete.

In conclusion, my model for the introduction of the two aforementioned types of Creto-Cypriot pottery (which was not coeval) emphasises that imitations of varied, including high, precision were originally produced in a few sites. During the ensuing phase, a fairly homogeneous type of imitations of mostly modest precision spread in much of the island. Although the connotations of the copies of Cypriot Black slip were probably maintained by the enduring resemblance of their body to a poppy capsule, this was probably not the case with the imitations of Black on Red. The copious LG-EPAR versions of the latter, which are characterised by inventive elaboration, would have obscured the tracing of the origins and the connotations of the ware.

---

440 Hoffman 1997, 182-182. Schreiber has lately repeated that the popularity of the Cypriot Black on Red juglets is due to the qualities of the perfumed oil they contained (Schreiber 2003, 56-81).

441 KNC, 352-355. Moignard 1996, 440-442: including references to earlier publications of Knossian material (especially Fortetsa), where a less consistent shape nomenclature is employed. For the rarity of standard, post-EG lekythia in Crete see the comments upon type B lekythoi in Section 5.3.3. Note that the rarity in question does not apply to the large, Praisos type lekythoi.

442 This view relies on the popularity of Creto-Cypriot vases on these sites (see the comments upon type C oinochoai, type C lekythoi and type E aryballoi in Chapter 5). Although this repertory is apparently unattested in the limited West Cretan Iron Age material that is published, Cypriot influences are not entirely missing from the pottery of this area: Tzedakis 1979.

443 The best evidence for the circulation of Creto-Cypriot pottery within Crete is provided by the discovery of a few early-7th century vases of this class in Mochlos, which was then uninhabited (Soles 2001). The mobility of potters/painters is another alternative, which has hardly been addressed in a Cretan context (but cf. Hampe 1967-1968: for the potters of coarse pithoi).
CHAPTER 5: FORMAL ANALYSIS AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE LOCAL POTTERY

This chapter is a formal analysis and classification of the Eleuthemian pottery. First, it treats closed (storage and pouring) and then open (deep and shallow) vessels. It generally progresses from taller to shorter forms. The varieties identified in the discussion of each shape are examined in chronological order, according to the date of their introduction. As in any classification, there is some degree of subjectivity in assigning particular vases to specific types. These choices are explained in the relevant parts of Appendix II.

Chapter 5 and Appendix II should be referred to throughout. The discussion of each shape is introduced in Chapter 5 and mostly regards its name (where appropriate), function, origins and distribution within Crete (for the location of the sites mentioned refer to Map 1). In cases where diverse types/varieties are identified, however, questions of distribution are only assessed in connection with each type/variety and not in the introductory notes for the shape in question. The reader is then advised to proceed to the relevant section regarding the shape, decoration and context in Appendix II. This section offers comprehensive reviews that are helpful to the reader for when they return to the comments in Chapter 5. The comments first outline the development of the shape and the decoration of each shape/type/variety. The style of the individual vases is then assessed and parallels are cited, while the discussion concludes with a register of the dates proposed. Reviews entitled ‘General Comments’ are introduced to summarise the development of specific shapes or types, because of the particularities of the Eleuthemian sequence (which is treated here for the first time), the variety in shapes/types and their lengthy treatments.

445 Cretan sites are cited in alphabetical order in cases where no particular distribution pattern is identified. Vases studied in Tsipopoulou 1987 are occasionally cited with an inclusive reference to East Crete due to the scope and structure of that study. Other East Cretan finds are, however, listed according to the particular place of discovery.
446 Note that: a) all vases from museums or private collections that are cited are considered Cretan unless otherwise stated; b) despite my scepticism on the relative and absolute chronology of pottery from some Cretan sites outside Knossos (see Chapter 3), I have largely followed here the choices made in the original publications (in particular cases criticism is offered in footnotes); c) whenever more than one reference is cited for a single vase, they are connected by a hyphen.
5.1 CLOSED VESSELS: Storage Vessels

5.1.1 Amphorae

A) RIM-HANDED AMPHORAE: three vases (pl. 1). Amphorae with vertical handles from shoulder to rim were common in the LH IIIB repertory, but almost fell out of use in the LH IIIC-late.\textsuperscript{447} The shape is uncommon in the PG Aegean,\textsuperscript{448} including Crete.\textsuperscript{449} Knossos, however, has produced quite a few examples.\textsuperscript{450}

Comments

The development of the shape cannot be assessed. The form of AM.1\textsuperscript{451} only finds few close Cretan parallels, which date early in the PG period,\textsuperscript{452} and is closely related to some Attic PG amphorae, particularly in being equipped with a lid.\textsuperscript{453} Although the size of an Attic EPG vase\textsuperscript{454} recalls AM.1, most of the Attic and Aegean examples are considerably smaller, roughly equal to AM.2. The shape and in certain cases the size of the latter vase, however, recall some Subminoan-PG amphoroid kraters,\textsuperscript{455} which follow LM prototypes.\textsuperscript{456} Perhaps AM.2 represents a late version of this shape.\textsuperscript{457} AM.3, the shape of which looks back to AM.2, documents the survival of the rim-handled amphora in the LG-EPAR period, which is currently unparalleled in Crete.

\textsuperscript{449} A few vases are cited in footnote 452; add: Tsipopoulou 1987, 97. Hayden 2003, 38, number 70. Englezou 2004, 425.
\textsuperscript{450} Boardman 1960, 145. Catling 1996, 302-303. KNC, 331-332, type A.
\textsuperscript{451} AM.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 244-245, number 272.
\textsuperscript{453} Desborough 1952, 41-42. Kourou 2002, 64.
\textsuperscript{455} Anatoliki Mesogeios, 70, number 32: Subminoan-EPG, 138, number 83: PG. Hall 1914, 128-129, fig. 77 – Hayden 2003, 41, number 78: Subminoan-EPG or later. Fortetsa 164: EPG-MPG vase, the dimensions of which are close to those of AM.2. Hadji-Vallianou 1979, pl. 194e: EPG.
\textsuperscript{456} For these see: Kanta 1980, 273-274. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 42-43, 69-70, 104 numbers 30-31.
\textsuperscript{457} Amphoroid kraters occur in East Crete until the O period: Tsipopoulou 1987, 130-131.
The white on dark decoration of AM.1 and AM.2 suggests a LPG-EG date. The chain of solid lozenges occurs on Knossian LPG-PGB pottery,\textsuperscript{458} while rows of S's were introduced in both Eleutherna and Knossos\textsuperscript{459} during the PGB period.\textsuperscript{460} On the other hand, the slip and the patterns of AM.3 recall the LG-(EPAR) type E cups. Triangles with alternate hatching are found on PGB-G pottery from Eleutherna (see the comments upon type Di amphorae), but their occurrence on the handle of AM.3 is surprising.

**PGB: AM.1, AM.2**

**LG-EPAR: AM.3**

**B) NECK-HANDLED AMPHORAE:** three vases (pl. 1). Although the neck-handled amphora was introduced in the LH IIIC-middle and replaced the rim-handled amphora before the end of the LH IIIC-late,\textsuperscript{461} Kanta has argued that the Cretan Iron Age type follows Minoan prototypes.\textsuperscript{462} The shape is common in the PG Aegean,\textsuperscript{463} as well as in Subminoan-PG Knossos,\textsuperscript{464} sites in North Central\textsuperscript{465} and South Central\textsuperscript{466} Crete. Although rare in East Crete during the PG period,\textsuperscript{467} it is quite common in the G-E0.\textsuperscript{468} The shape is well represented in Knossos\textsuperscript{469} and Khania\textsuperscript{470} during the same period, but seems rather uncommon south of Knossos.\textsuperscript{471}

Comments

The few examples available hinder any analysis of the development of the shape. Context favours an EG date for AM.4, which finds close Knossian PG-EG parallels. Its tall neck and slim form suggest a late date in the Knossian series, while its shape and proportions, its size, as well as the ridge on the neck root, the finger impressions on the handles and the impressed circle are paralleled on Knossian PGB-EG examples. On the other hand, the shape of AM.5 recalls PG vases from Vrokastro and Knossos, while that of AM.6 is best paralleled on two LG-EO amphorae from Phaistos.

The decorative scheme of AM.5, which is discussed in connection with the necked pithoi of variety Ai, favours a LPG-EG date. The repetition of a pattern in successive zones is, however, typical of the local EG pottery. Running spirals are found on Knossian PGB-EG vases, but also on later pottery from Eleutherna; hatched, horizontal and vertical leaves appear on EG vases from Eleutherna (LEK.7) and Knossos, while the two-line cable with inset circlets resembles a Knossian EG

1988-1989, 183-183, AA. 20: 216-217, R. 1: 293, where the reference to neck-handled amphorae – 'anse fra collo e spala' – is incorrectly replaced by the one to amphorae with 'anse fra orlo e spala'). Rocchetti believes that the two Phaistian amphorae are PG and does not comment on the LG-EO date proposed by Coldstream (GGP, 256, footnote 11). I believe that the vases themselves, as well as their contexts are in favour of Coldstream's date. Besides, Rocchetti himself admits while discussing the first amphora that some PG types of the Phaistian pottery survive to the LG-EO period (Rocchetti 1988-1989, 197-198).


473 Cf. KNC 280.1.
474 Cf. KNC 18.8.
475 Cf. KNC 18.8, Q3, Q58.
476 Cf. KNC Q59.
477 Cf. KNC 18.8.
479 Boardman 1960, 130, L2: PG coarse amphora, quite plump.
481 See footnote 471.
483 KNC 283.59, 306.25.
pattern. The white slip of AM.6 suggests an EPAR date. Also, light ground amphorae appear in Knossos during the EO period. Although the band of vertical wavy lines is discussed in connection with variety Diia amphorae, its occurrence on the neck of Knossian EO and Khaniote LG II closed vessels is of particular interest here. Further, concentric circles are popular on Knossian amphorae during the EO period, while triple concentric circles are mostly found on Cretan LG-EO vases. The chevrons of AM.6 are paralleled on the EPAR PY.14, as well as on a LG sherd from Agia Triadha and a Knossian O pithos.

EG: AM.4, AM.5
EPAR: AM.6

C) SHOULDER-HANDLED AMPHORAE: homogeneous group of seven vases (the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’, pl. 1-2, 43-44). The shape was introduced during the LPG period, when it mostly occurs in Attica and the Cyclades. Although its limited production in Attica only lasted until the MG II period, the shape is represented in the Cycladic Sub-PG and LG-Subgeometric repertory.

484 Fortetsa, 180, 11a: simple, not double.
485 Fortetsa, 179, 11t.
486 Johnston 2000, 206, number 53: MG-LG.
487 Tsipopoulou 1987, 203-204, pattern 8α-β: LG-EO.
488 Coldstream 2001, 23.
491 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 238.
493 Fortetsa, 175, 9i. GGP, 252.
494 Palermo 2003, 281, fig. 3, bottom.
495 Fortetsa 1318.
497 Coldstream and Macdonald 1997, 208, B42.
500 See below.
This homogenous group is distinguished from the rest of the amphorae both in terms of shape and decoration. Nevertheless, their clay appears to be a well-levigated variety of the fabric that commonly occurs in Eleutherna (for the peculiar fabric of AM.10 see below). Hence, all vases are assigned to a single workshop, conventionally called the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’. Another amphora, from unknown provenance, that is kept in the Museum of Rethymnon (henceforth ‘Rethymnon amphora’) is attributed to the same workshop (see below).

The amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ are divided in two groups on account of their peculiarities (for AM.10 and the ‘Rethymnon amphora’ see below). Group I amphorae (AM.7, AM.8, AM.9) share the following features: vertical handles, yellow slip, as well as the following patterns (from the lower body to the neck): a few bands, triglyphs and metopes with zigzags, a chain of dotted, outlined lozenges, two birds facing right and alternating three panels of chequers, a lozenge chain, similar to the aforementioned one. Most of the lozenges of AM.7 are, however, undotted. Another peculiarity of group I amphorae is the combination of groups of six lines on the lip, as well as triglyphs comprised of six vertical lines and zigzags with six apexes on the belly metopes. On the contrary, the remaining five amphorae carry eight lines, or apexes, on the relevant spots (further, AM.11, AM.12, AM.13 and the ‘Rethymnon amphora’ display three groups of eight vertical lines on the shoulder). Group II amphorae (AM.11, AM.12, AM.13) also share horizontal handles (the area around which is plain), white-yellow slip and a decorative scheme that is close to group I standards. It displays, however, more bands on the lower body, excludes the lower lozenge chain, introduces two confronted birds alternating three groups of lines on the shoulder and a chain of solid outlined lozenges on the neck. Nevertheless, AM.11 carries vertical handles, the area around which is covered by paint, like group I amphorae.

Context suggests an EPAR date and confirms that group I is earlier than group II. It further offers an important hint for the internal sequence: apparently the higher these vases were standing, the more bands they carried on the belly. Furthermore, a detail in the belly zone of triglyphs and metopes suggests that the

---

501 Stampolidis 2004, 150, number 7.
502 AM.7 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 244-245, number 272.
production of the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ was relatively short: on most vases, this zone displays a minor flaw of the otherwise meticulous painter. This is the elongation of one metope, which is always lying below one of the handles. In three cases (AM.8, AM.10, AM.12), this metope carries elongated zigzags, while in other three cases (AM.7, AM.11, the ‘Rethymnon amphora’), the extra space is filled by a dotted X. The occurrence of both devices on both groups of amphorae reinforces the impression that these vases cover a relatively short period. Clearly, these devices are not mere decorative choices or typical potter’s marks (although the dotted X would be regarded as such if the alternative device was unknown), but the potter/painter’s ‘mechanical attributes’, the study of which often illuminates the organisation of production. On these grounds, and provided that the difference between the two devices was recognised by the viewer and the painter, I propose that these represent two different painters working at the same time, in the same workshop, side by side.

AM.10 is peculiar in several respects. Its brown, gritty fabric is clearly different to that of the other vases from the same workshop, but recalls the fabric of the ‘Rethymnon amphora’. AM.10 is really slim (considerably slimmer than the slim AM.11, probably the earliest of group II amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’), while the ‘Rethymnon amphora’ is really plump. In addition, AM.10 displays no ridge on the transition to the neck, while one of its handles is irregularly attached. Further, AM.10 carries vertical handles and two birds facing right (like group I amphorae), but dull yellow, flaking slip, triglyphs on the shoulder, a belly frieze with triglyphs comprised of eight vertical lines and metopes bearing zigzags with eight apexes, as well as no belly zone with lozenge chain (like group II amphorae). The vase carries undotted lozenges, like AM.7 (some of the lozenges of AM.7 are dotted), probably the latest known group I amphora. It is the only amphora from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ displaying the following peculiarities: the number of lines on the shoulder triglyphs is inconsistent, while the lip carries six (not seven) groups of strokes. Each of these groups, however, consists of eight strokes (as

---

504 The elongation of the zigzags can easily escape attention and was probably intended to do so, but the dotted X catches the eye.
505 This suggestion finds no support in any peculiarities of shape or decoration.
on group II amphorae). The number of bands on the lower body of AM.10 is greater than the one on group I amphorae and smaller than the one on group II amphorae. On these grounds, AM.10 is regarded as transitional between the two groups of amphorae from the 'Eleutherna bird workshop'.

A brief discussion of the connection between the 'Rethymnon amphora' and the two groups of vases from the 'Eleutherna bird workshop' is worthwhile. This vase carries horizontal handles, dull yellow, flaking slip, three triglyphs comprised of eight vertical lines on the shoulder, a belly frieze with triglyphs with eight vertical lines and metopes carrying zigzags with eight apexes, as well as no lozenge chain on the belly (like group II amphorae), but two birds facing right and dotted lozenges (like group I amphorae). Although the number of groups of strokes on the lip is undeterminable, the only group that is fully preserved includes eight strokes (as on group II amphorae). The number of bands on the lower body is greater than the one on group I amphorae and smaller than the one on group II amphorae. On these grounds, the 'Rethymnon amphora' is regarded as transitional between the two groups of amphorae from the 'Eleutherna bird workshop' (although perhaps later than AM.10).

The peculiarities that AM.10 and the 'Rethymnon amphora' display provide hints for the organisation of production in the workshop that manufactured them. Ethnographic studies suggest that departures (occasionally related to numerical aspects) in the decoration of standardised vases are often the work of 'non-professionals', sporadically involved in ceramic production, while departures from metrical standardisation (as in the case of the body profile of the two vases) are mostly identified in the work of young and/or less experienced potters.

Although the history of the amphora with vertical handles on the shoulder was outlined above, I emphasise that the closest, contemporary parallels for the vases from Eleutherna are found in Delos group Ab, which is attributed to Paros.

---

507 Longacre 1999.
508 Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 29-30, numbers 6, 8. It is rarely found on Theran pottery: Dragendorff, 1903, 46, fig. 148. A Delos group Ab amphora (I-AM.6) of similar shape turned up in tomb A1K1, next to AM.9.
Besides, amphorae with horizontal handles on the shoulder (like AM.12, AM.13) are also found in Delos group Ab\textsuperscript{510} and Coldstream suggests that the latter shape replaced the former.\textsuperscript{511} Accordingly, the replacement of the vertical handles of the amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ by horizontal ones perhaps stems from this change of fashion in the Cyclades. Alternatively, it is attributed to the popularity of urns with horizontal handles in Eleutherna. In any case, the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ amphorae maintain the narrow neck that occurs on Cycladic LG prototypes, but display the ovoid body that occurs on Cycladic early 7\textsuperscript{th} century examples.\textsuperscript{512}

The decoration of the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ amphorae also exhibits a strong Cycladic influence. Metopes with birds separated by groups of vertical lines are popular in late 8\textsuperscript{th} – early 7\textsuperscript{th} century Cycladic pottery\textsuperscript{513} and are also found on an early 7\textsuperscript{th} century amphora from Kommos.\textsuperscript{514} The body of the birds of the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ is different to that of the Knossian examples, with the exception of the O pithos Fortetsa 888, on which strong Parian influence is identified.\textsuperscript{515} Besides, the depiction of a bird’s body on early 7\textsuperscript{th} century sherds from Afrati\textsuperscript{516} and Vrokastro\textsuperscript{517} is quite similar. Furthermore, although the birds that appear on Cycladic late 8\textsuperscript{th} – early 7\textsuperscript{th} century pottery generally do not have a raised wing, a few skyphoi from Naxos\textsuperscript{518} and a few vases from Delos group Bb, which is assigned to Naxos,\textsuperscript{519} depict birds with raised triangular wings, usually set in metopes separated by groups of vertical lines. A roughly contemporary Cypriot amphora depicts birds with solid body and cross-hatched wing, separated by a group of vertical lines.\textsuperscript{520} On the other

---

\textsuperscript{510} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 29-30, numbers 1-3, 7.  
\textsuperscript{511} GGP, 179.  
\textsuperscript{512} GGP, 179.  
\textsuperscript{514} Kommos IV, 248, number 377.  
\textsuperscript{515} Fortetsa, 80, 191.  
\textsuperscript{516} Levi 1927-1929, 430, fig. 578: right-middle.  
\textsuperscript{517} Hayden 2003, 72, number 196.  
\textsuperscript{518} Lambrinoudakis 1983a, 112-114, fig. 9: with Parian influence. Simantoni-Bournia 2002, 271-273, fig. 1b.  
\textsuperscript{519} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 79, 81-82, numbers 35 and 50 respectively.  
\textsuperscript{520} Karageorghis and Des Gagniers 1974, 322-323.
hand, birds flanking a chequered panel appear on a Boeotian pyxis of similar date,\textsuperscript{521} while chequered panels often occur on Cycladic late 8\textsuperscript{th} - early 7\textsuperscript{th} century pottery\textsuperscript{522} and Knossian O polychrome pithoi.\textsuperscript{523}

Metopes with zigzags are popular on Cycladic pottery.\textsuperscript{524} The correspondences in the number of various lines (including the wavy-lines apexes) noted above also looks to the Cyclades and is found on most of the ‘Euboean’ amphorae\textsuperscript{525} exhibited at the Museum of Thera. The handle pattern is also common on Cycladic vases and occurs on the Cycladic I-AM.6.\textsuperscript{526} On the other hand, chains of dotted lozenges with outline (AM.7, AM.8, AM.9) appear on Knossian MG-EO vases,\textsuperscript{527} chains of undotted lozenges with outline (AM.7, AM.10) were introduced on Knossian pottery at the end of the LG period,\textsuperscript{528} while chains of solid, outlined lozenges (AM.11, AM.12, AM.13) occur on Knossian mostly EO vases.\textsuperscript{529}

Although a Delos group Ab amphora has turned up in Eleutherna (I-AM.6), local imitation cannot satisfactorily explain the strong Cycladic influence exhibited by the vases from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’. This should probably be regarded as the produce of one or more potters/painters that emigrated from the Cyclades (Paros) to Eleutherna and established a workshop.\textsuperscript{530} Furthermore, the employment of inexperienced ‘personnel’ in the latter workshop can perhaps be identified in the brown, gritty fabric, the peculiarity of the shape, as well as the flaws in the shape and the decoration on AM.10 and the ‘Rethymnon amphora’.\textsuperscript{531} Only fabric analysis will,

\textsuperscript{521} Ruckert 1976, 98, FP 14.
\textsuperscript{522} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 61, number 62; 73, number 2; 86, number 3; 91, number 2.
\textsuperscript{523} Fortetsa, 169, 1v, 169, pithoi: panels. For their date see Fortetsa, 150-151.
\textsuperscript{524} Dragendorff 1903, 42, fig. 134a, b. Pfuhl 1903, pl. XXXVII. 3. Lambrinoudakis 1983, 166, fig. 12.
\textsuperscript{525} The laboratory analysis of an ‘Euboean’ amphora (GGP, pl. 37f) was unclear about its origins (Jones 1986, 665).
\textsuperscript{526} Also cf. Jones 1986, 658, pl. 8.9, number 1.
\textsuperscript{527} Fortetsa, 173, 5v.
\textsuperscript{528} KNC, 322 (absolute date 720-710, according to the prevailing chronology: Coldstream 2001, 22). Also, Fortetsa, 173, 5af. An undotted, outlined lozenge occurs on an EPAR sherd from Eleutherna (Stampolidis 2004, 191, number 100).
\textsuperscript{529} Fortetsa, 173, 5ar.
\textsuperscript{530} The occurrence of the aforementioned devices on the early products of the workshop suggests that the latter was perhaps established by two immigrants. For the mobility of Cycladic potters/painters in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} - early 7\textsuperscript{th} century see Section 4.4. For Panian artists/craftsmen in Hellenistic Crete see Spyridakis 1992, 113.
\textsuperscript{531} See above. Although the attribution of this pair to another workshop located within the territory of Eleutherna cannot be rejected, it is challenged by the aforementioned ‘marks’ in the decoration of the handle zone.
however, clarify the relation between the latter two vases and the rest of the amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’.

EPAR-early: AM.7, AM.8, AM.9
EPAR-early/EPAR-advanced: AM.10
EPAR-advanced: AM.11, AM.12, AM.13

D) BELLY-HANDLED AMPHORAE. The belly-handled amphora is traced back to the LH IIIC period and was quite common in the PG Aegean. The shape was introduced in Crete during the Subminoan period and remained quite popular until the EG. It largely disappeared thereafter, despite the persistence of G-O examples with simple handles in East Crete.

Di) Early belly-handled amphorae: six vases (pl. 2-3).

Comments
The shape of the Eleuthernian series is indebted to Attic and Cycladic LPG prototypes. Although the influence of these prototypes is identifiable on Knossian examples already in the EPG period, it was later, Attic MG I imports that established the slim ovoid form with a very tall neck and a well-defined ridge below the lip, as well as double-arched handles and dark ground decoration. The discovery of the Attic (or possibly Cycladic) MG I belly-handled I-AM.1 at Eleutherna suggests that the local potters were directly influenced from Attica and/or the Cyclades. The development of the local shape is clear: the bulky, PG form of AM.14, AM.15 and

536 The straight profile of the lower body of this vase is common on Knossian PG belly-handled amphorae (KNC, 336).
AM.16 became more elegant by the elevation of the centre of gravity and the subsequent elevation of the handles from belly to shoulder, as exemplified by AM.17, AM.18. Also, a sharply articulated neck replaced the rounded body-neck transition of the earlier vases (AM.14, AM.15). The neck gradually grew taller and the ridge below the lip became pronounced. The flat base of AM.14 and AM.16, the lack of rounded tip on the handles of AM.14 and the strap handles of AM.15 are hallmarks of an early date. On the other hand, AM.18 displays all late features, including the straightening of the lower body profile that is paralleled on Knossian mostly EG belly-handled amphorae. An EG date is also supported by the neck profile, especially the high ridge, of AM.19. Lastly, although the body profile (including the position of the double-arched handles) and the raised base AM.17 displays recall the EG AM.18, its low neck ridge and context favour a PGB date.

The Cretan adaptation of the Atticizing decoration of the belly-handled amphorae was eclectic. This is exemplified by some Knossian EG examples, as well as by AM.16 and AM.18.

Attic influence is evident on the MPG amphora AM.14. Although close Knossian parallels (Atticizing light ground belly-handled amphorae with the main decorative area, which includes patterns of semicircles, on the shoulder) date to the EPG period, the double-arched handles of AM.14 suggest a date no earlier than MPG. The chequered filling of the semicircles of AM.14 is also Attic in origin, as documented by an Attic LPG amphora from Lefkandi. The combination of cross-hatched and chequered rectangles in a central panel fits well in the Knossian MPG

537 The attachment of the handles to the belly was maintained until the PGB period in Knossos: Fortetsa 339. Hood and Boardman 1961, 72, number 3 (for the date of this vase see KNC, 337, footnote 107). KNC D14.

538 Coldstream 1992, 82. KNC, 337. The heavy neck with low ridge is preserved until the PGB period, cf. KNC 287.11.

539 The flat base was preserved on Knossian examples until the PGB period (Hood and Boardman 1961, 72, number 3; for the date see KNC, 337, footnote 107), while the strap handles until the LPG (KNC, 337).

540 KNC, 337.


542 KNC L7, J4 (the vases are possible imports: KNC, 336). For the semicircle pattern also cf. the MPG KNC Q62.

543 KNC, 337.

544 Lemos 2002, 58, pl. 49.1. Strokes grow from the outer semicircles of this vase, while the outer pair in each group of semicircles of AM.14 is connected by strokes.
repertory\textsuperscript{545} and finds a good MPG parallel,\textsuperscript{546} but is also found on LPG-PGB sherds from Kommos.\textsuperscript{547}

Dark ground decoration is rendered on belly-handled amphorae from both Eleutherna and Knossos\textsuperscript{548} from the LPG period onwards. Although the white on dark decoration of AM.15 is of local pedigree, its syntax reflects the style of Attic EG II neck-handled amphorae,\textsuperscript{549} judging by the dark ground, the occurrence of a single, relatively narrow decorative zone on the belly and the neck, as well as the quasi-battlement pattern.\textsuperscript{550} The decorative syntax of AM.15 also recalls a PGB amphora from Gortyn, which is fully covered by paint and carries added white colour decoration on the belly and the neck.\textsuperscript{551}

The occurrence of a zone on the upper shoulder of AM.16 and AM.18 is paralleled on Knossian MPG-LPG\textsuperscript{552} and PGB,\textsuperscript{553} but rarely on EG\textsuperscript{554} belly-handled amphorae. AM.16 is lavishly decorated: the mill sail, which is also found on the PGB KR.2, is paralleled on Knossian PGB-EG pottery.\textsuperscript{555} Although the pattern is drawn with straighter diagonals during the EG period in Knossos\textsuperscript{556} and Afrati,\textsuperscript{557} straight diagonals appear in Eleutherna (AM.16, KR.2) and Gortyn\textsuperscript{558} already during the PGB period. Further, hatched meanders were introduced on Knossian pottery as subsidiary elements during the PGB period;\textsuperscript{559} only chequered\textsuperscript{560} and cross-hatched\textsuperscript{561} versions are, however, found on PGB belly-handled amphorae, while a hatched meander occurs on an EG example.\textsuperscript{562} The hatched rectangles of AM.16 are

\textsuperscript{545} Coldstream 2001, 65.
\textsuperscript{546} KNC F1. Also cf.: KNC 48.7, 175.26, 207.3 (EPG-LPG).
\textsuperscript{547} Kommos IV, 218, numbers 39, 42; 220, number 59.
\textsuperscript{548} KNC, 337.
\textsuperscript{549} Cf. GGP, pl. 2h.
\textsuperscript{550} The battlement was popular on Knossian LPG pottery: Fortetsa, 174, 7a. Coldstream 2001, 66-67. Cf. particularly the LPG belly-handled amphora Fortetsa 301.
\textsuperscript{551} Alexiou 1966, pl. 164α.
\textsuperscript{552} KNC, 337.
\textsuperscript{553} Fortetsa 339. KNC D14.
\textsuperscript{554} KNC G2.
\textsuperscript{555} Fortetsa, 169, 1x.
\textsuperscript{556} Coldstream 2001, 66.
\textsuperscript{557} Contrast the PGB Levi 1927-1929, 352-353, fig. 460 and the EG Levi 1927-1929, 296, fig. 387. For their date see GGP, 255-256.
\textsuperscript{558} Alexiou 1966, 191, pl. 164α, 165β. Johannowsky 2002, 70, number 453.
\textsuperscript{560} KNC D14.
\textsuperscript{561} Hood and Boardman 1961, 72, number 3 (for its date see KNC, 337, footnote 107).
\textsuperscript{562} KNC G5.
paralleled on a PGB krater from Knossos,\textsuperscript{563} while the hatched quatrefoil net recalls a motif on a Knossian MG neckless pithos\textsuperscript{564} and revives a LM III pattern, which occurs on three larnakes in the Rethymnon museum.\textsuperscript{565} One of them has no provenance and dates to the LM IIIB period,\textsuperscript{566} the other is unpublished, dates to the LM IIIA2 and comes from Stavromenos,\textsuperscript{567} while the third dates from LM IIIA and comes from Pigi, east of Rethymnon.\textsuperscript{568} Significantly, the influence of LM III larnakes has been identified on the decoration of PGB urns from Knossos\textsuperscript{569} and individual vases from Afrati.\textsuperscript{570} Lastly, bands of triangles hatched in alternate ways occur on PGB-LG vases from Eleutherna\textsuperscript{571} and PGB-EO pottery from East Crete\textsuperscript{572} (although only on Knossian LPG-PGB ceramics),\textsuperscript{573} while standing hatched leaves appear on Knossian PGB vessels,\textsuperscript{574} as well as on AM.18.

The cross-hatched meander of AM.19\textsuperscript{575} is paralleled on a Knossian PGB belly-handled amphora,\textsuperscript{576} as well as on a LG pithos from Agios Georgios.\textsuperscript{577} The running spiral with hatching in the loops occurs on Knossian PGB-EG pottery,\textsuperscript{578} while the running, dotted spiral is unparalleled.\textsuperscript{579} Both patterns, however, conform to the local EG fondness for elaborate curvilinear motifs.

\textsuperscript{563} KNC N2.
\textsuperscript{564} Fortetsa 841.
\textsuperscript{565} For parallels from the rest of Crete see Baxevani 1995, 23. Also cf. a vase from Kourtes: Mariani 1901, pl. VI.
\textsuperscript{566} Mavriyannaki 1972, 57-61, number 5.
\textsuperscript{567} Baxevani 1995, 23, footnote 26.
\textsuperscript{568} Baxevani 1995.
\textsuperscript{570} Mavriyannaki 1972, 46.
\textsuperscript{571} AM.16 and KR.2 (PGB), NDP.20 (EG), NDP.37 (LG). For a vertical arrangement see: HYD.9 (EG), NDP.26 (MG), HYD.15 (LG).
\textsuperscript{572} See: a PGB oinochoe from Stavromenos Zou (Tsipopoulou 1987, 114, Σ 3826), two PGB-MG sherds (Mook 1993, 203, P3.119; 207, P5.7) and a MG (?) amphora (Gesell, Coulson and Day 1991, 159-160, fig. 4:2) from Kavousi, an EG-MG sherd from Vrokastro (Hayden 2003, 60-61, number 152), a LG hydria from Praisos (Tsipopoulou 1987, 106, A.N. 1580) and an EO amphoriskos from Agios Georgios (Tsipopoulou 1987, 101, Σ 4077).
\textsuperscript{573} Fortetsa, 171, 3ac, numbers 277, 340 – see pages 147, 153 for their date. Coldstream 1992, 68, GB.12. Add a PGB hydria from Archanes: Alexiou 1950, 441-442, number 2, pl. ΛA’ number 3, fig. 7 - Sakellarakis 1987, 56, Σ 378.
\textsuperscript{574} Coldstream 1992, 70, GC.4. KNC, 342-343: KNC D31, 283.38.
\textsuperscript{575} AM.19 is mentioned in Stampolidis 1990, 388, footnote 29 and is incorrectly called a MG cup in Johnston 2000, 219, number 111.
\textsuperscript{576} Hood and Boardman 1961, 72, number 3 (for its date see KNC, 337, footnote 107).
\textsuperscript{577} Tsipopoulou 1987, A.N. 1792.
\textsuperscript{578} Fortetsa, 179, 11m. KNC G15.
\textsuperscript{579} The pattern sporadically recalls the hatched spiral, which occurs on (PGB)-EG pottery from Eleutherna (NSP.3), Afrati (Levi 1927-1929, 432, fig. 580) and Knossos (KNC 218.44. Coldstream 2000, 273, E10).
The coating of the exterior of AM.18 in red paint, on which added white
colour decoration is applied, occurs on PGB, but mostly on EG vases from
Eleutherna. The addition of a shoulder zone is mostly found on PGB vases of this
type (see above). Although a hatched meander appears on the PGB AM.16, the
dominant position it occupies on AM.18 favours an EG date. Further, its
introduction on the neck of AM.18 is surprising, given that Atticizing patterns
proved unwelcome on the neck of Knossian examples. Hatched arcs (for which see
NDP.20 in Section 5.1.2) occur on Knossian PGB-EG pottery and are combined
with hatched leaves (for which see above) on an EG pithos. Besides, hatched
curvilinear patterns are popular on EG pottery from Eleutherna, while rows of S's are
common on PGB-EO pottery from Eleutherna and Knossos.

MPG: AM.14
LPG: AM.15
PGB: AM.16
PGB-EG: AM.17
EG: AM.18, AM.19

Dii) Late belly-handled amphorae: nine vases divided in two varieties according to
the form of the handles.

Diia) Late belly-handled amphorae with double-arched handles: three vases (pl. 3).

Comments
Although the shape of these vases broadly conforms to the tradition of the local
necked pithos, the form of the body, the neck and the lip recall a type of Theran LG-

581 KNC, 337.
582 Coldstream 2001, 66.
583 KNC 107.178.
584 Fortetsa, 179, 11q, 11w.
Subgeometric amphorae. Further, the inspiration for the double-arched handles should probably be sought in Thera, rather than in the early, type Di amphorae. Judging by their shape, AM.20 and AM.21 are contemporary, while AM.22, with its slim body, flat base, diminished neck ridges and simplified handles is later.

The quality of the slip and the dissimilarity in the decoration of the two sides of AM.20 and AM.21 (as well as the finger impressions on the handle roots of AM.21) are paralleled on EPAR necked pithoi (type D). This pair also carries double concentric circles, which are popular on Cretan LG-O pottery, and a band with vertical wavy lines. The latter pattern was introduced in the Corinthian MG II repertory and quickly reached Crete, as a Corinthian (?) MG II krater from Knania, a Knossian MG amphora and the Corinthian LG I-PY.2 suggest. It only became popular, however, from the end of the 8th century on Khaniote, Knossian and East Cretan pottery.

AM.20 also displays metopes that are filled with four rows of zigzags and are paralleled on Knossian, mostly EO vases and metopes carrying an X, which were introduced on Knossian pottery at the end of the LG period. The latter pattern is, however, found on a group of skyphoi from a MG – LG-early context at Kommos, a LG I amphora from Knania and a LG krater from Khalasmenos. Chevron columns appear on small LG vases and large EPAR vessels from Eleutherna, as

585 Pfuhl 1903, 98-101, type a. Dragendorff 1903, 134-142, type a. See also GGP, 186-187: the plump form suggests a Theran LG date.
587 The thickening of the outer circle that occurs on AM.21 is popular on Knossian O pottery (Coldstream 2001, 70).
588 Fortetsa, 175, 9j. GGP, 252.
591 Coldstream 1972, 88, G7: on the neck of an amphora under Corinthian influence.
592 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 238.
593 Fortetsa, 175, 8c.
595 Fortetsa, 170, 3h.
597 Johnston 2000, 212, numbers 85, 87-88.
600 CU.195, CU.196, PY.16.
601 AM.24, NDP.48, NDP.61, NDP.73, NDP.79.
well as on Cretan G-O pottery. Two-line, vertical cables occur on Knossian LPG-EO vases, but the horizontal version mostly appears on EO.

The reserved lower body of AM.21 is paralleled on EPAR necked pithoi (type D). Although its circle pattern seems unique, a similar motif is reported on vases from Goulediana that date around 600. The hatched cross of unequal parts is paralleled on the EPAR NDP.47, NDP.49, while vertical chains of cross-hatched lozenges appear on the LG NDP.33 (but also on Knossian PG pottery). Double, dotted zigzags occur on Knossian PGB-EG, East Cretan LG and Theran Subgeometric pottery, while vertical zones with rows of dots appear on Knossian O vases. Besides, dotted patterns are characteristic of the EPAR pottery from Eleutherna.

AM.20 and AM.21, which were standing lower than almost any other EPAR urn in tomb A1K1, carry most of the ornaments appearing on EPAR storage vessels from Eleutherna, including some motifs of non-Cretan pedigree: bands with vertical wavy lines, metopes that carry rows of zigzags and chevron columns, which occur on Corinthian LG pottery, as well as bands with vertical wavy lines and metopes with zigzags or X’s, which appear on Attic LG pottery and on late 8th – early 7th century ceramics from various Aegean islands. Hence, context and style suggest that the workshop(s) of AM.20 and AM.21 perhaps played a prominent role in the introduction of the local EPAR decorative repertory, drawing with restraint from diverse regional workshops.

---

602 Fortetsa, 174, 6o. Johnston 2000, 201, number 27; 219, number 111.
603 Fortetsa, 180, 11ai.
604 Fortetsa, 179, 11y.
605 Platon 1955, 300.
606 A hatched cross of equal parts appears on the Knossian EG amphora KNC G1.
607 Fortetsa, 172, 5h.
608 KNC G15, 107.105.
609 Tsipopoulou 1987, 167, 169.
610 Pfuhl 1903, 102-103, number 32; 104, number 37.
611 Fortetsa, 179, 9en. KNC 14.6, 19.11, 107.25, 292.196.
612 GGP, 99-100.
613 For example: Young 1939, 46, XI 2. GGP, pl. 11d, 12a. Büsing-Kolbe 1977, 24-25, pl. 8, number 3.
Although the shape of AM.22 favours a LPAR date, its decoration adheres to EPAR standards. The rendering of details in added white colour and the bars on the lip are paralleled on local EPAR-(LPAR) necked pithoi (types D-E), while chequered panels appear on some EPAR type C amphorae. Lastly, the pattern below the handles recalls a Knossian O motif.\textsuperscript{615}

**EPAR-early:** AM.20, AM.21  
**LPAR:** AM.22

**Diib)** Late belly-handled amphorae with simple handles: six vases (pl. 4).

**Comments**

No comment on the development of the shape is provided for this ill-assorted group of vases.

Although the shape and the decoration of AM.23\textsuperscript{616} finds no close parallel on pottery from Eleutherna and recalls Cycladic, mostly Theran pottery, the vase is attributed to a workshop that is tentatively identified as local and is conventionally called the ‘saw pattern workshop’ after the homonymous subsidiary motif (see Section 4.4 and below). The shape recalls the slim Theran LG amphorae,\textsuperscript{617} but the peculiar handles find no match on Theran pottery; they occur, however, on NDP.62 and NDP.76.\textsuperscript{618}

The main animal frieze is paralleled on neck-handled amphorae and hydriai from Delos group Ad,\textsuperscript{619} as well as on Protoattic pottery.\textsuperscript{620} The horses\textsuperscript{621} of AM.23 are quite different to those on Knossian MG pottery\textsuperscript{622} and on an EO sherd from Kavousi,\textsuperscript{623} but recall the horses of two late 8\textsuperscript{th} - 7\textsuperscript{th} century sherds from Khania.\textsuperscript{624}

\textsuperscript{615} Fortetsa, 183, 16v. Cf. the LG lekythos KNC 292.192 for the pendent spiral hooks.  
\textsuperscript{616} AM.23 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 247, number 276.  
\textsuperscript{618} Also cf. KNC 283.23.  
\textsuperscript{619} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 45-49, numbers 1-5, 9-11.  
\textsuperscript{620} See for example Boardman 1998, 98-101.  
\textsuperscript{621} For horses on Greek (mainly Attic) Geometric pottery see Benson 1970, 32-59.  
\textsuperscript{623} Gesell, Day and Coulson 1985, 342, 343, 348, 355, K10.
(all examples are rendered in silhouette). The sherd from Kavousi probably dates to the second quarter of the 7th century, judging by the reserved area just over the front legs, and sets a terminus ante quem for the horses of AM.23, which are best paralleled by the horses of some ‘Euboean’ amphorae. The shape of their eye and head, as well as the thin (but not stylised) legs are found on horses of rather early ‘Euboean’ amphorae. Their angular head and hatched mane recall the horses on an amphora from Perissa, dated by Zaphiropoulos at 720-710 (Lebessi prefers a date within 710-700, while other scholars assign this and the Thera amphora mentioned below to the first quarter of the 7th century). Moreover, the articulation of the body, as well as the naturalism in the rendering of the front legs and the forelock connect the horses of AM.23 to the horse of an amphora from ancient Thera, dated at 700-690 by Zaphiropoulos. The horses of AM.23 recall those on the earliest vases of the ‘Melian’ style, which date to the end of the first or the second quarter of the 7th century. They further seem slightly later than the Attic LG horses, but display some affinities with the horses of the Analatos painter and other Early Protoattic painters. In conclusion, the horses of AM.23 suggest that the vase dates to the first quarter of the 7th century, though probably not to the earliest part.

The rendering of the lion with a solid body and an outlined head is commonly found on Greek (though not Corinthian) 7th century pottery. The front leg that is extended forward follows Oriental prototypes and is common on

625 Zaphiropoulos 1983.
627 Zaphiropoulos 1983, 164, fig. 16.
630 Zaphiropoulos 1983, 157, fig. 6.
631 Zaphiropoulou 2003, 17-18, numbers 1-3; for the date see page 148.
634 Eilmann und Gebauer 1938, 19-20, A32, pl. 18-21; 21-22, A35, pl. 25.
635 For lions on Cycladic 7th – early 6th century vases see Zaphiropoulou 2003, 20-23, but mostly cf. Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 46, number 4 (also discussed in Sheedy 1985, 163-166). For lions in 7th century Cretan art see the comments upon I-PV.1 in Section III.3.5.
636 Strom 1962, 232.
Phoenician metal bowls. The scheme also occurs on Attic LG, but mainly on (mostly early) Protoattic vases.

A wild goat with solid body and outlined head appears on an EO sherd from Knossos, as well as on a clay statue from Gortyn. Another parallel is found on a pithos from Gela that imitates Cretan pottery. Nevertheless, the goat on the latter two parallels is clearly later than that of AM.23. Goats rendered in a different technique occur on a jug from Afrati that is also later than AM.23. Both this jug and the pithos from Gela have their goat(s) attacked by a lion/dog. The date of the Gortyn statue and the vases from Afrati and Gela sets a terminus ante quem for AM.23 and confirm its attribution to the first quarter of the 7th century.

The groups of short, vertical strokes intersected by a horizontal line that appear above the animals find no close parallel outside Eleutherna (for the occurrence of the pattern on Eleuthernian pottery see below). They appear on Attic LG IIb jugs, in the panel of an Euboean kotyle that imitates Corinthian prototypes, in the panel of a Cycladic kotyle from Aigina, on two LG sherds from Naxos as well as on the neck of an amphora from Thera that is not assigned to any regional workshop. They are quite popular, however, on Chian Archaic pottery.

Although the birds of the amphora find no close parallel on Cretan ceramics (excluding NDP.76, NDP.62 and a probably Cretan aryballos of unknown provenance that is kept in Oxford) similar birds are known from Attic.

---

639 Coldstream 1973, 44, K2.
640 Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 168, number 103. The statue is of Middle Daedalic style that is approximately dated to 670-640: Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 244.
642 Levi 1927-1929, 338-341, fig. 443. It was located in a tomb that dates to 675-640: Rizzo 1984, 260.
643 Prange 1993, 31, pl. 19, numbers 5 and 7: placed vertically.
644 Andriomenou 1977, 150, number 122 (she considers the pattern as a simplified version of the ‘soldier birds’).
645 Kraiker 1951, 33, numbers 97-98.
646 Villard 1993, 163, numbers 15-16.
647 Pfuhl 1903, 209-210, number 2: the vertical pattern to the left on pl. XXXVII.2.
648 Cook and Dupont 1998, 49.
649 For birds on O pottery see Benson 1970, 60-76.
650 Boardman 1961, 100, number 465: the head of the birds on this vase is peculiar.
Euboean\textsuperscript{652} and Cycladic\textsuperscript{653} LG vases. Interestingly, hatched triangles (without volutes) appear below the tail of the birds on a Cycladic LG vase.\textsuperscript{654} The disappearance of the triglyph that separated the birds was introduced on Euboean amphorae in the LG-late period.\textsuperscript{655}

The neck decoration of AM.23 is paralleled on Theran amphorae.\textsuperscript{656} Further, the pattern of triglyphs and metopes with groups of concentric circles is popular on Cycladic LG-Subgeometric pottery,\textsuperscript{657} but rare on Knossian pottery.\textsuperscript{658} Moreover, the thickening of the external lines of the triglyphs is common on Cycladic pottery.\textsuperscript{659}

The rare shape of the handles and to some extent their decoration, the ridge below the lip (and the paint between the ridge and the lip), the quality of the slip and the paint, the groups of nine strokes on the lip, the hatched meander patterns, the type of the birds, the cross-hatched triangles with single outline, the rare motif that is found above the animals, the friezes of triglyphs and metopes and the notable Cycladic (mostly Theran) influence connect AM.23 to the NDP.62. Probably the same hand painted the two vases, while the EPAR-late NDP.76 derives from the same workshop. I assume that this workshop was established by a potter/painter that acquired his expertise in the Cyclades (Thera) and immigrated to Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{660}

The white slip and ornamental zones of AM.25 recall the EPAR LEK.1 and LEK.2. Zones with groups of vertical strokes are found on MG-EPAR vases from Eleutherna (see the comments upon the MG NDP.27 in Section 5.1.2), while chevron

\textsuperscript{651} GGP, pl. 10b-c.
\textsuperscript{652} GGP, 41a, d-e. Andriomenou 1981, fig. 27, 57, 91.
\textsuperscript{653} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 30, group Ab, number 12; 61-62, 65 group Ae, numbers 72, 87 respectively. GGP, 37f, 38b. Knauss 1997, 101, A6, pl. 3.
\textsuperscript{654} Knauss 1997, pl. 22a. See also GGP, pl. 41d: a triangle filled with diminishing chevrons lies below the bird’s tail.
\textsuperscript{655} GGP, 192-193, pl. 41e: interestingly, the triglyphs of this vase are flanked by broader lines, as on the bottom frieze of AM.23. Boardman 1998, 58, fig. 85.
\textsuperscript{656} Cf. Pfuhl 1903, pl. II, III.1-2.
\textsuperscript{657} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 60, group Ae, number 64; 79, group Bb, number 34. Lambrinoudakis 1983, 166. Lambrinoudakis 1983a, fig. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{658} Hood and Boardman 1961, 72, number 6. Coldstream 1973, 38-39, H36: EO.
\textsuperscript{659} Pfuhl 1903, pl. XXIX (Thera). Lambrinoudakis 1983a, fig. 12 (Naxos). Zaphiropoulos 1983, fig. 4-5, 12-13 (‘Euboean’ amphorae from Thera). Knauss 1997, fig. 25a (‘Euboean’ amphorae).
\textsuperscript{660} For the mobility of Cycladic potters in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} - early 7\textsuperscript{th} century see Section 4.4. The possibility that a Cretan (non-Eleuthemian) potter/painter made the vase should not be dismissed, particularly since the rendering of the lion and the goat recalls Cretan work (note the popularity of the wild goat in Cretan art: Eiring 2004).
columns (see type Diia amphorae), horizontal rows of chevrons and circles enclosing a cross (see type D necked pithoi) occur on EPAR vases, including AM.24. Besides, the wavy line zone of AM.26 is common on local EPAR storage vessels (see type Diia amphorae). On the other hand, although light ground decoration with concentric circles is commonly found on LG-EPAR, type C-D necked pithoi from Eleutherna and is paralleled on Knossian EO amphorae, the lack of any slip AM.27 displays suggests a LPAR date. The simple decoration of AM.28 also favours a LPAR date.

**EPAR-early:** AM.23  
**EPAR:** AM.24, AM.25, AM.26  
**LPAR:** AM.27, AM.28

**General comments on the amphorae**

The rim-, neck- and true belly-handled amphora mostly occur in the PG-EG period (the MPG AM.14 is the earliest known vase from Orthi Petra) and scarcely in the LG-PAR (some of the PAR belly-handled amphorae are actually hybrids between the amphora and the necked pithos). The EPAR AM.23, however, is the most heavily adorned vase from Eleutherna and displays Cycladic trends. Cycladic influence is also identified on the EPAR shoulder-handled amphorae, all of which are assigned to a single workshop. This group, as well as AM.23, is identified as work of immigrant Cycladic potters, probably from Paros and Thera respectively. Theran influence is also identifiable on the EPAR-early, richly decorated AM.20 and AM.21, the potters/painters of which perhaps played a leading role in the introduction of the local EPAR style.

---

661 Nevertheless, chevrons facing down occur on the MG LEK.8, as well as on Knossian LO pithoi: Fortetsa, 174, 60.
5.1.2-4 Pithoi

According to the authoritative nomenclature of the Knossian sequence, the term pithos is regularly employed in studies of Cretan ceramics of the Iron Age to describe a coarse, usually very large, storage vessel that commonly occurs in domestic contexts, as well as three shapes of fine ware storage vessels, which display some differences in structure. Some scholars have preferred to depart from this nomenclature and coin alternative terms for one or more of the fine ware classes, but they have provided no arguments for their choices. Although I share the undeclared skepticism, I prefer to raise the issue rather than rush to employ a new terminology, before a consensus is achieved among scholars studying Cretan Iron Age pottery.

I feel that the heavy look of straight-sided vessels justifies their calling as pithoi. On the other hand, I prefer the necked pithos to be called necked jar, particularly since the latter term has no rigid implications about size and traces the origins of the shape back to its genuine predecessors, the Karphi jars. I also consider it prudent to substitute the name neckless pithos, with large pyxis, to bring the Cretan examples closer to their Mainland counterparts.

5.1.2 Necked Pithoi

This term necked pithos was introduced by Payne and established by Desborough, Brock (who noted, however, the resemblance of some examples to amphorae or kraters) and Coldstream. The term is rarely employed by other scholars, who mostly prefer alternative ones: necked jar, pithos-amphora or simply pithos.

---

663 The relevant scholarship is cited below, in connection with each shape.
664 Seiradaki 1960, 5-6. The term necked jar is employed in Hayden 2003, 53, number 120.
667 Fortetsa, 147.
668 GGP, 235, 239, 257. KNC, 312-314.
669 Excluding Mook 1993, 186.
670 Hayden 2003, 53, number 120.
672 Tsipopoulou 1987, 94-95.
Although Desborough considered the origins of the necked pithos obscure, he assumed it was a Cretan development. His view seems to be verified by a few LM IIIB vases that predate the numerous examples from LM IIIC-Subminoan Karphi. The shape was popular in Knossos during the Subminoan-PG period, disappeared after the EG and enjoyed a modest revival in the O period. Nevertheless, the nearby tomb of Mastabas has produced LPG-PGB, as well as LG-EO necked pithoi. As far as the rest of North Central Crete is concerned, PG examples have turned up at Archanes and O ones at Agies Paraskies, Gouves and Elia, while a long series is reported from Eltyna. Further south, only a few PG vases are known from Prinias. It is unclear, however, whether the history of the shape in these sites is consistent with what is attested in Knossos, or follows that of its counterparts from South Central Crete, which survived from the EPG to the O period. The shape is documented from the LPG-PGB to the EO period in East Crete, while individual vases that date to around 700 are known from West Crete.

The necked pithos is amply represented in Eleutherna throughout the LPG-EG period. Given, however, that its development was slow and inconsistent, the following classification relies on dates obtained from decoration. Although the size

---

673 Desborough 1952, 243-244.
674 Vagnetti 2003, 57, footnote 6: The single parallel from Mycenaean Greece is a fragmentary vase from Delphi: Mountjoy 1999, 785, number 265.
675 Seiradaki 1960, 5-6.
679 Lebessi 1970, 277, number 21; 282-283, numbers 42, 46, 52; 285-286, number 58.
680 No date is offered for the necked pithoi from the Atsalenio tomb; a few are assigned to the E period: Davaras 1968, 136-137, A8, A21; 141-142, B4-B5, B8-B10.
681 Sakellarakis 1986, 17-19, II.24359, II.24357.
682 Platon 1945-1947, 52, numbers 8-12.
683 Lebessi 1971, 387-388, fig. 8.
685 Englezou 2004, 421-422.
686 Rizza 1969, 30, pl. XIII.7, XVII.1.
(0.17-0.24m.) of some local, necked, storage vessels lies between that of the Knossian necked pithoi and necked pyxides. I have called them necked pithoi, since they are only slightly smaller than the local, undersized, genuine necked pithoi (0.25-0.30m.).

A) Decorated LPG-EG necked pithoi: twenty vases divided in two varieties according to size.

Ai) Small-medium size: sixteen vases (pl. 5, 45).

Comments
The shape displays no consistent development and the raised base is related to size, not date (larger examples often display a raised base and/or a base with reserved bottom). The reflex handles of NDP.7 recall those of the PGB NDP.17 and NSP.1.

The application of added white colour decoration on a brown-black coat occurs on LPG-EG vases (NDP.1, NDP.2, NDP.3, NDP.5, NDP.6, NDP.7, NDP.8, NDP.15, NDP.16), while a brown-red coat is found on PGB and mostly EG vases (NDP.9, NDP.10, NDP.11, NDP.12, NDP.13, NDP.14). Although semicircular marks of paint confirm that NDP.2 and NDP.3 were dipped in paint, the coating of most of the rest is also likely to have been achieved by dipping from the handles, as coated bases and reserved interiors, occasionally (NDP.3, NDP.8, NDP.14) carrying trickles, suggest (the PGB-EG AM.5, PY.5 and PY.7 were also dipped). Hence, dipping in PG-EG Eleutherna was not limited to cups (type A) and skyphoi (type A).

Simple ornaments discourage precise dating. The vases that are solely decorated with bands (NDP.1, NDP.2, NDP.3, NDP.4, NDP.7, NDP.9) are assigned to the LPG-EG period; a PGB-EG date is, however, suggested by the red coat of

---

691 Fortetsa, 147, type A. KNC, 313, type Bii. Moignard 1996, 423, type D.
692 KNC, 361, type Bv: mostly shorter than 0.10m. Moignard 1996, 448, type Ai. Nevertheless, KNC 13.33 is 0.19m. tall.
695 NDP.12 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 249, number 279.
696 Although the colour of the paint ranges from black to red on parts of most vases, the overall impression is usually one-sided. This decorative scheme is discussed in Section 4.2.
NDP.9 and a PGB one by the handles of NDP.7 (see above). Furthermore, although
the simple pattern of NDP.12 is found on pottery from various periods, an EG date
is favoured by its cover (BA.1). The stratigraphy of tomb A1K1 suggests that the
wavy line was common on PGB storage vessels (NDP.5, NDP.6, NDP.11, also
PY.5), while EG ones preferred rows of S's (NDP.14, NDP.15, NDP.16; also
PY.6). The concentric circles and careless, white on dark dots of NDP.8 are
paralleled on Knossian PG pottery. NDP.8 and NDP.13 carry rows of loops, the
rendering of which in white on dark is paralleled on the PGB-EG NDP.17 and
LI.2, while NDP.13 and NDP.10 display running spirals, which are only found in
Knossos during the PGB-EG period, but persist much longer in Eleutherna.

**LPG-EG:** NDP.1, NDP.2, NDP.3, NDP.4
**PGB:** NDP.5, NDP.6, NDP.7
**PGB-EG:** NDP.8, NDP.9, NDP.10
**(PGB)-EG:** NDP.11, NDP.12
**EG:** NDP.13, NDP.14, NDP.15, NDP.16

Aii) Large size: four vases (pl. 5-6).

**Comments**

The shape of these necked pithoi is individual. The high ridge below the lip of
NDP.17 suggests the influence of belly-handled amphorae, while its handles

---

698 Fortetsa, 188, 1b.
699 Although the reserved lower body of NDP.11 is paralleled on PGB-EG storage vessels (AM.5, PY.5), its interruption by a band is only found on PAR (NDP.55, NDP.93).
700 Rows of S's are popular on PGB-PAR/O pottery from Eleutherna and Knossos (Fortetsa, 179, 11q, 11w), but quite uncommon in East Crete before the LG period (Mook 1993, 226). Given that wavy lines and rows of S's are common on 9th - 7th century pottery from Eleutherna, they are not discussed any further below.
701 Fortetsa 175, 9a-9f. GGP, 252. groups of triple circles, as on NDP.8, become common in the LG period Fortetsa, 175, 9i.
702 KNC D6: PGB.
703 Loops are similarly rendered on broad-mouthed jugs throughout the PGB-EPAR period. The hastily drawn, outlined loops of NDP.13 are, however, paralleled on the Knossian EG KNC 107.106, 107.138.
resemble those of the smaller NDP.7. Also, the shape and dimension of NDP.19 recall those of a Knossian EG pithos.\textsuperscript{705}

Although the white on dark decoration of NDP.17 and NDP.18 is popular on LPG-EG pottery from Eleutherna, their spirals (for which, as well as for the loops of NDP.17, see the comments upon variety Ai necked pithoi) favour a PGB-EG date. Further, the hatched columns of NDP.18 occur on Knossian PGB-O pottery.\textsuperscript{706} On the other hand, the chequered zone on the neck of NDP.17 is best paralleled on the neck of a LPG belly-handled amphora from Knossos\textsuperscript{707} and a LPG-PGB amphora from Kommos,\textsuperscript{708} while its barred lip only occurs on local PAR necked pithoi.

The decorative syntax of NDP.19 is paralleled on Knossian PG pottery.\textsuperscript{709} Cross-hatched triangles are popular on Knossian LPG vases\textsuperscript{710} and concentric circles are mostly found on Knossian PG-EG necked pithoi.\textsuperscript{711} Concentric circles enclosing a simple cross commonly occur on Cretan early 7th century pottery,\textsuperscript{712} but occasionally appear on earlier vases.\textsuperscript{713} Further, a circle pattern, which recalls that of NDP.19, is found on a Knossian EG necked pithos.\textsuperscript{714} Hence, although its decoration adheres to the PG tradition, NDP.19 is considered EG.

The meander with perpendicular hatching of NDP.20 is paralleled on Knossian EG-MG vases.\textsuperscript{715} The hatched double arcs resemble a Knossian EG pattern\textsuperscript{716} and find close parallels in Kourtes\textsuperscript{717} and Afrati.\textsuperscript{718} A similar pattern appears on a LG I sherd from Khania\textsuperscript{719} and a 7th century sherd from Kommos.\textsuperscript{720} The juxtaposition of curvilinear motifs of Cretan pedigree and Atticizing, mostly meander patterns is called ‘bilingual’ decoration and occurs on Knossian EG belly-

\textsuperscript{705} KNC 286.3.\textsuperscript{706} Fortetsa, 169, 2c.\textsuperscript{707} Fortetsa 301.\textsuperscript{708} Johnston 2000, 193, number 1.\textsuperscript{709} KNC 13.16 (PGB). Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 288, B5 (PG).\textsuperscript{710} Fortetsa, 171, 4l.\textsuperscript{711} Fortetsa, 147, type A, KNC, 313, type Bii.\textsuperscript{712} AR.61, AR.62, NDP.50. Fortetsa, 171, 9aw.\textsuperscript{713} Anatoliki Mesogeios, 139-140, number 85 - Kanta and Karetsou 1998, 166, fig. 11: PG.\textsuperscript{714} KNC 129.5: the cross is different.\textsuperscript{715} KNC G.80, 24.5, 75.195, 107.182, 292.225, 292.226.\textsuperscript{716} Fortetsa, 178, 10-l.\textsuperscript{717} Levi 1927-1929, 562, fig. 619 - Rocchetti 1988-1989, 216, number 112.\textsuperscript{718} Levi 1927-1929, 352-353, fig. 460 - GGP, pl. 56a.\textsuperscript{719} Hallager, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 217, 71-P 0331: the sherd is given a wrong catalogue number on pl. 114.\textsuperscript{720} Kommos IV, 242, number 296.
handled amphorae, neckless pithoi and a single krater.\textsuperscript{721} The introduction of ‘bilingual’ decoration on NDP.20 and (less eloquently) on a belly-handled amphora from Vrokastro\textsuperscript{722} suggests the spread of the Knossian trend. NDP.20 also carries columns hatched in oblique ways, which occur on Knossian PGB-O pottery,\textsuperscript{723} and bands hatched in alternate ways (for which see the comments upon AM.16).

**PGB:** NDP.17  
**PGB-EG:** NDP.18  
**EG:** NDP.19, NDP.20

\textbf{B)} Decorated MG and MG-LG necked pithoi: eleven vases (pl. 6-7, 34a).

**Comments**  
Although the local necked pithos refuses to conform to any consistent development and the shape of the MG examples generally follows that of their LPG-EG predecessors (a vestigial neck is, however, only found on MG necked pithoi: NDP.24, NDP.26, NDP.29), the former are mostly larger than the latter. NDP.24 and NDP.29 document the survival of a PGB handle type (cf. NDP.7, NDP.17, NSP.1), while the non-integrated handles of NDP.24 are paralleled on the LG NSP.4.

The white on dark style of the LPG-EG necked pithoi is now abandoned in favour of light ground decoration. The relatively high quality of paint and slip differentiate the MG-LG necked pithoi from their PAR successors. Further, syntax distinguishes the MG necked pithoi from the LG ones: the decoration of the former is organised in more than one zone and a significant part of the lower body is coated, while the latter generally carry a single shoulder panel and the coating of their lower body is contracted. Consequently, the date of vases like NDP.24 and NDP.29 relies on syntax (decorative zones, coated lower body), rather than on individual patterns.

\textsuperscript{722} Hayden 2003, 63, number 160.  
\textsuperscript{723} Fortetsa, 169, 2c.
The hatched zigzag, which seems typical of the MG necked pithoi (NDP.28, NDP.22, NDP.23, NDP.25;\textsuperscript{724} the pattern survives on the LG NDP.32 and PY.13), is commonly found on East Greek MG pottery\textsuperscript{725} and recalls two Knossian patterns.\textsuperscript{726} Further, the spiral-like S’s of the MG NDP.25, which also occur on the LG NDP.38, NDP.39, NDP.40, suggest the survival of a pattern that is typical for Eleuthernian and Knossian PGB-EG pottery. The rows of (small) groups of concentric circles that appear on NDP.21, NDP.28 document the unfailing popularity of the pattern, which was to peak in the ensuing LG period. The shoulder pattern of NDP.21 resembles a motif on a LG-early aryballos from Agios Georgios in Sitia,\textsuperscript{727} as well as on the (LG)/EPAR AR.61 (probably a comb).\textsuperscript{728} The vertical divisions on the panel of NDP.22 herald the introduction of metopes on LG vases and resemble a Knossian pattern that was introduced on large vessels during the MG period.\textsuperscript{729}

The scale pattern of arcs that occurs on NDP.26 is popular on Knossian EG pottery\textsuperscript{730} and is also found on a (PGB)-EG amphora from Vrokastro,\textsuperscript{731} a G sherd from Gortyn\textsuperscript{732} and a LG-EO sherd form Kavousi.\textsuperscript{733} Although hatched hourglasses are rare,\textsuperscript{734} solid hourglasses are arranged in a similar manner on Knossian MG vases.\textsuperscript{735} The combination of circles and hourglasses, as well as the band of triangles hatched in alternate ways (for which see the comments upon AM.16) recalls the LG NDP.37.

The juxtaposition of three groups of vertical lines\textsuperscript{736} (on one side) and a zigzag (on the other) NDP.27 displays, recalls the decoration of the MG PY.10, which also carries a groove on the transition to the shoulder. Perhaps the same workshop, if not the same hand, produced the pair.

\textsuperscript{724} NDP.25 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 249, number 280.
\textsuperscript{725} GGP, 271. East Greek MG pottery dates to 850-750: GGP, 330. Coldstream 2003, 435.
\textsuperscript{726} Fortetsa, 170, 3o: LG-EO; 174, 6b: PGB-EG.
\textsuperscript{727} Tsipopoulou 1987, 33, 124, A.N. 2423.
\textsuperscript{728} Also cf. a simpler motif on PY.16.
\textsuperscript{730} Hall 1914, 168-169, number 4 – Hayden 2003, 53, number 121.
\textsuperscript{731} Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 42, fig. 62, 1a.
\textsuperscript{732} Gesell, Day and Coulson 1985, 346, 355, K154.
\textsuperscript{733} Cf. a MG ? sherd from Dreros: Effenterre 1948, 36-37, pl. XX, 3.
\textsuperscript{734} Fortetsa, 169, 2f. KNC 175.39.
\textsuperscript{735} The pattern occurs on Knossian PG-MG pottery (Fortetsa, 168, 1a), as well as on the EPAR AR.23.
Although the circle panel of NDP.30 and NDP.31 is commonly found on local LG necked pithoi, the extra decorative zones these two vases carry, particularly the narrow zigzag zone that runs above or below the main pattern, favour a MG date.

**MG:** NDP.21, NDP.22, NDP.23, NDP.24, NDP.25, NDP.26, NDP.27, NDP.28, NDP.29

**MG-LG:** NDP.30, NDP.31

C) Decorated LG and LG-EPAR necked pithoi: fifteen vases (pl. 7-8).

**Comments**

Although the shape adheres to a conservative tradition, the rarity of the flat base and the popularity of the disc base (the latter is hardly found on MG examples) are considered as LG trends. Also, some LG vases are truly globular, unlike their MG predecessors. Although the main decorative trends of the LG necked pithoi were outlined in connection with the MG examples, I emphasise the recurring setting of the patterns (mostly groups of concentric circles) in a shoulder panel. Besides, the coating of the upper end of the neck’s interior is only popular on LG necked pithoi. Lastly, trends identified on LG vases foreshadow EPAR fashions. These include the reserving of the lower body (NDP.43), the application of slip of inferior quality (NDP.42) and dissimilar decoration on the two sides (NDP.32, NDP.44, NDP.45), the introduction of metopes (NDP.33, NDP.37, NDP.42, NDP.44) and bars on the lip (NDP.42).

The persistence of MG (and earlier) patterns is exemplified by the spiral ornaments of NDP.38, NDP.39, NDP.40\(^{737}\) and the hatched zigzag of NDP.32.\(^{738}\) Further, concentric circles occur on NDP.34, NDP.35, NDP.36, NDP.43\(^{739}\) and

\(^{737}\) NDP.39 and NDP.40 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 1996, 56-57, numbers 29-30 – Stampolidis 2004, 264, numbers 310-311.

\(^{738}\) For the occurrence of intersecting wavy lines on NDP.32 and other Cretan LG-EPAR/EO vases see the comments upon AM.5.

\(^{739}\) NDP.43 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 248, number 277.
NDP.46;\textsuperscript{740} they are typical of the Knossian O necked pithoi\textsuperscript{741} and common on LG-O examples from South Central Crete.\textsuperscript{742} Apparently, concentric circles ‘were never displaced’ in the latter area,\textsuperscript{743} as in Eleutherna. Also, loops occur on pottery from various periods,\textsuperscript{744} but groups of pendent loops are common on Eleuthernian LG-EPAR necked pithoi (NDP.41,\textsuperscript{745} NDP.45, as well as NDP.48, NDP.56, NDP.75).

Metopes were introduced on pottery from Eleutherna during the LG period, as in Kavousi.\textsuperscript{746} The zigzag metopes of NDP.42, which are paralleled on NDP.37 and the LG-late PY.13, occur on Knossian MG EO pottery.\textsuperscript{747} The short meander that is flanked by quatrefoils on the one side of NDP.44 is paralleled on a Knossian LG krater displaying Argive influence.\textsuperscript{748} The peculiar, chaotic form\textsuperscript{749} of the meander pattern on the other side probably imitates the step meander, a typical Argive LG II pattern,\textsuperscript{750} the arrival of which in Crete is documented by an Argive LG II krater from Khania.\textsuperscript{751} A quatrefoil resembling that of NDP.44 occurs on the LG HYD.15. Quatrefoils, occasionally with triangular leaves, were introduced on Knossian pottery during the LG period,\textsuperscript{752} while quatrefoils that grow from double concentric circles appear on Knossian LG/EO vases.\textsuperscript{753} Lastly, the column with vertical, triple zigzag is paralleled on a LG sherd from Khania.\textsuperscript{754}

NDP.33 and NDP.37\textsuperscript{755} share a distinctive type of foot, a neck with concave walls (with ridge at its root and top) and a broad, everted lip. Both vases carry two metopes that alternate three vertical zones (decorated with cross-hatched lozenges or

\textsuperscript{740} The very short lip and the coated neck’s interior of NDP.46 favour a LG date, but its relatively rich decoration, as well as its context support a LG-EPAR one.
\textsuperscript{741} Fortetsa, 150, type C. Moignard 1996, 423, type D. The necked pithoi from Agies Paraskies that carry circles are considered O (GGP, 257, footnote 6).
\textsuperscript{742} GGP, 257.
\textsuperscript{743} GGP, 257.
\textsuperscript{744} Stampolidis 1994, 86-87, number 32.
\textsuperscript{745} NDP.41 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 57, number 31 – Stampolidis 2004, 264, number 312.
\textsuperscript{746} Mook 1999, 228, P2.179.
\textsuperscript{747} Fortetsa, 170, 3j.
\textsuperscript{748} KNC 75.82. See KNC, 376.
\textsuperscript{749} Cf. a G sherd from Prinias: Rizza 1991, 336, fig. 11, bottom right.
\textsuperscript{752} Coldstream 2001, 69, fig. 1.25e.
\textsuperscript{753} KNC, 324. Cf. KNC 79.4, 292.159, 292.235.
\textsuperscript{754} Hallager, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 124, 70-P 0589. For this sherd see also Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 237: perhaps Coan.
\textsuperscript{755} Stampolidis 2004, 250, number 281.
triangles), as well as a shoulder band with triangles hatched in alternate ways. Unlike
the other LG necked pithoi (except NDP.44), NDP.33 and NDP.37 have their
handles and the area around them covered by paint, while their neck is not painted
externally, but internally. Consequently, the pair is assigned to a single workshop,
the roots of which in the local tradition are identified on the MG NDP.25. The latter
vase is connected to the LG pair by the form of its base, the coating of its handles
and the area around them, as well as its slipped neck (which carries S’s, like that of
NDP.37). The EPAR NDP.59 perhaps represents a later product of the same
workshop.

Concerning the individual ornaments of NDP.33,\textsuperscript{756} the cross with volute
ends is paralleled on a Knossian lekythion found inside a LG pithos.\textsuperscript{757} Columns
filled with a vertical chain of cross-hatched lozenges occur on Knossian PG
pottery,\textsuperscript{758} while cross-hatched columns appear on LG-EO pottery.\textsuperscript{759} Interestingly,
the vertical chain of cross-hatched lozenges and the cross-hatched column are found
on a ‘bowl’ sherd from Payne’s excavations at Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{760} This sherd is also
decorated with a narrow panel filled with zigzags that recalls the central panel on one
side of NDP.37. This connection suggests that the sherd probably comes from the
workshop of NDP.33 and NDP.37.\textsuperscript{761} The cross-hatched hourglasses of the latter
vase recall a neckless pithes from Anopolis\textsuperscript{762} and are commonly found on East
Cretan G pottery.\textsuperscript{763} Lastly, although the metopal decoration of NDP.37 is paralleled
on Euboean LG pottery,\textsuperscript{764} the raised wing and the fun tail of its birds are typical of
Cretan bird iconography.\textsuperscript{765}

\textsuperscript{756} For the shoulder band see the comments upon AM.16 (Section 5.1.1).
\textsuperscript{757} Coldstream, Callaghan and Musgrave 1981, 146, number 13.
\textsuperscript{758} Fortetsa, 172, 5h.
\textsuperscript{759} Fortetsa, 169, 2s.
\textsuperscript{760} Hartley 1930-1931, 110, fig. 34.3-35.
\textsuperscript{761} The identification of the sherd as Naxian (Boardman 1961, 153. Hood and Boardman 1961, 77,
footnote 8) is unconvincing, particularly since the Naxian parallels cited for the zigzag panel clearly
adhere to a different syntax.
\textsuperscript{762} Wide 1899, 36, number 1, fig. 14.
\textsuperscript{763} Cf. a LG sherd (Mook 1993, 226, P3.190 - Coulson, Haggis, Mook and Tobin 1997, 379, fig. 38.4)
and vase (Tsipopoulou 1987, 23, 127, H 694) from Kavousi, as well as a LPG-EG ? sherd (Hayden
2003, 56, number 131) and a MG-LG vase (Hall 1914, 163, number 3, fig. 98 - Hayden 2003, 63-64,
number 161) from Vrokastro.
\textsuperscript{765} Coldstream 1972, 84, E1.
**LG:** NDP.32, NDP.33, NDP.34, NDP.35, NDP.36, NDP.37, NDP.38, NDP.39, NDP.40, NDP.41  
**LG-late:** NDP.42, NDP.43  
**LG/EPAR:** NDP.44  
**LG-EPAR:** NDP.45, NDP.46

D) Decorated EPAR necked pithoi: thirty-three vases (pl. 8-11, 46-47).

**Comments**

Although the EPAR necked pithos adheres to a long tradition, it is generally smaller than its LG predecessor and displays an increased variety in body profiles. A broad, mostly flat lip becomes common, while the ring base, which was rare before, becomes most widespread. Finger impressions are introduced on handle roots. 766

Concerning decoration, there is a marked decline in the quality of the slip, while the paint is often fired to brown-red instead of brown-black. Added white colour decoration re-appears, but is mostly used for the rendering of details, unlike on the LPG-EG necked pithoi. Although the LG trend for the concentration of patterns in a shoulder panel persists, the decoration on the two sides of the vase now often varies. Metopcal compositions, reserved areas on the lower body, non-coated necks and barred lips, which were rare before, become widespread. The upper part of the neck’s interior is usually coated (contrasting the LG trend for coating only the upper end), while a plain neck’s interior is introduced after the beginning of the EPAR period and persists in the LPAR). In contrast, concentric circles are popular on EPAR-early necked pithoi, but quite uncommon thereafter. 767

Only a few EPAR necked pithoi are treated in detail, since most display some of the aforementioned traits and carry patterns that have been discussed in connection with earlier necked pithoi (groups of concentric circles, S’s, pendent

---

766 Finger impressions occur on Subminoan and G, but only rarely on O pottery from East Crete (Tsipopoulou 1987, 71).

767 The pattern mostly occurs on necked pithoi that were standing at 16.55m. or lower inside tomb A1K1.
loops, wavy lines, zigzag metopes)\textsuperscript{768} or the EPAR type Diia amphorae (chevron columns, metopes with zigzags or an X, the cross of NDP.47 and NDP.49).

The variety in the rendering of groups of concentric circles connects Knossian\textsuperscript{769} and Eleuthernian early 7\textsuperscript{th} century pottery. I note the varying breadth of the circles of NDP.53, the empty central space of the circles of NDP.63, the enclosed cross in the circles of NDP.50,\textsuperscript{770} as well as the white on dark circles of NDP.47, NDP.51.\textsuperscript{771}

Three rectilinear ornaments deserve particular attention. The cross-hatched hourglasses of NDP.52 occur on Knossian PGB pottery,\textsuperscript{772} while the solid hourglasses of NDP.48 are paralleled on Knossian MG vases,\textsuperscript{773} a LG sherd from Agia Triadha\textsuperscript{774} and the LG NSP.4. Lastly, the neck pattern of NDP.51 occurs on Knossian O vases.\textsuperscript{775}

The panel that is divided in two metopes alternating three vertical ornaments, the vertical chains of cross-hatched lozenges and the row of S's on the neck relate the EPAR NDP.59 to the LG NDP.33, NDP.37. Also, the diagonally hatched panels of NDP.59 resemble the bands with triangles hatched in alternate ways that appear on NDP.33, NDP.37. Hence, NDP.59 is tentatively attributed to the workshop of NDP.33 and NDP.37.

Although the shape of the lip and the base, as well as the decorative syntax of NDP.60 recall the MG necked pithoi, the vase is tentatively considered EPAR due to the zigzag with dots it carries.\textsuperscript{776} Dotted patterns are common on Eleuthernian EPAR vases, including NDP.57 and NDP.58, which carry lozenges with dotted border.\textsuperscript{777} The latter pair also shares the lozenge from the angles of which branches grow, a

\textsuperscript{768} For most patterns see the comments upon the LG necked pithoi (type C), for S's and wavy lines see the comments upon type Ai necked pithoi.
\textsuperscript{769} Coldstream 2001, 70. Also, Moignard 1996, 421-423.
\textsuperscript{770} Cf. the EPAR AM.24, AR.61, AR.62 and the EG NDP.19. The pattern was introduced in the Knossian repertory at the end of the LG period (KNC, 389. Also, Fortetsa, 177, 9aw).
\textsuperscript{772} KNC, 312. Cf. KNC D5, 13.16.
\textsuperscript{773} Fortetsa 452. KNC 175.39. Also cf. a LG ? sherd from APTera: Drerup 1951, 105, pl. 72.2.
\textsuperscript{774} Palermo 2003, 281, fig. 3, upper left.
\textsuperscript{775} Fortetsa, 168, 1n.
\textsuperscript{776} Cf. the O aryballos KNC 75.159.
\textsuperscript{777} The pattern is only paralleled on a sherd from a late 9\textsuperscript{th} century context at Kommos (Kommos IV, 229, number 164).
pattern that is popular on Cretan EO pottery. Also, the column carrying X's NDP.57 displays recalls a Knossian LG-EO pattern, while the solid, outlined lozenges of NDP.58 occur on the EPAR-advanced type C amphorae. NDP.58, as well as NDP.67 further carry a horizontal row of chevrons, which is popular on Cretan LG-PAR/O pottery. The blind lozenge and the row of dots of NDP.67 confirm its EPAR date.

A treatment of the vases that carry figured drawing (these are larger than the rest), particularly NDP.61, follows. An occasionally chequered lozenge, flanked by two animals, appears on Greek pottery of the late 8th – early 7th century. Heraldic griffins are popular on Oriental metal bowls and ivory pieces, on which, however, they flank (and ‘climb’ on) a floral motif. The griffins of NDP.61 follow the late type of the Phoenician griffin that appeared in the late 8th century: griffins of this type display a pronounced feather falling to the back of their head, but no ears; although the eye-let on the forehead is generally abandoned at the time, it survives in Urartian art. Although the feather and the knob of the head are also identified on Minoan griffins, Minoan influence is unattested on Cretan Iron Age griffins. The rendering of the griffins of NDP.61 in outline and their iconography are closely paralleled on the griffin of an O sherd from Gortyn and a CA I

779 Fortetsa, 169, 2s.
781 KNC, 322. Also, Fortetsa, 172, 5r.
782 Cf. Fortetsa, 178, 9cj: O.
785 Markoe 1985, 38.
789 Johannowsky 2002, 70, number 473.
They further recall the body of a quadruped that is drawn in outline on a 7th century sherd from Khania. A Knossian LG/EO sherd decorated in white on dark depicts griffins that are fairly similar to, but earlier than those on NDP.61. Their similarities involve the wing that is hatched and divided in two parts, the long curved feather falling to the back of the head and the tail that runs between the legs. The griffins on the Knossian sherd, however, also convey the influence of prototypes rendered on metal artefacts. Interestingly, griffins are quite rare on both clay vases and bronze artefacts from Iron Age Crete.

The rendering of the griffins in profile, with an emphasis on the volute of the head, is paralleled on Cretan votive plaques. The volute is also found on the griffins that appear on the aforementioned Knossian LG/EO sherd and on a 7th century bronze 'shield' of Idaean Cave type from Afrati, as well as on a Knossian LO bird askos and the sphinxes of a gold foil from Eleutherna. Interestingly, the griffins of the 'shield' recall those of NDP.61 in having their mouth closed, unlike their Oriental prototypes. The drawing of curved lines on the body of the griffins of NDP.61 imitates the rendering of animals on engraved bowls or carved ivories and was first introduced on Cypriot pottery already in the 13th century. Interestingly, the slightly curved, hatched motif on the body of the griffins is paralleled on roughly contemporary Cypriot pottery. Besides, the division of the wings in two parts and

---

792 Coldstream 1974, 163-164, fig. 4, pl. 40.4 - Coldstream 1992, 76, GH.19, but also GH.25.
793 Coldstream 1974, 163-164.
794 Add a white on dark sherd from Eleutherna (Stampolidis 1990, 388, footnote 29) and a cauldron from Afrati (the griffins of this vase, which is discussed below, are only partly rendered in paint) to the painted griffins treated above. Griffin protomes employed as attachments to clay vases are excluded here.
796 Deplace 1980, 53. Dierichs 1981, 134-149. Also cf. the griffins on a clay figure from Siphnos dated early in the second quarter of the 7th century (Brock and Mackworth Young 1949, 19-21), which are, however, rendered in silhouette.
797 Levi 1927-1929, 372-376, fig. 489.
798 KNC 75.55.
800 Also cf. the griffin on an O sherd from Gortyn: Johannowsky 2002, 70, number 473.
801 Bisi 1965, 223. Griffins with closed mouth only occur in Urartian art: Wartke 1993, pl. 62, fig. 65.
802 Karageorghis 1985, 237-238.
803 Karageorghis and Des Gagniers 1974, 163.
the rendering of the upper part recall the wings of the griffins on a clay cauldron from Afrati that dates to the mid-7th century.\textsuperscript{804} The style of the griffins of NDP.61 favours a slightly earlier date, within the second quarter of the 7th century.

The triangles that stand below the griffins find no close parallel. Triangles topped in a similar way, mostly with meander ends,\textsuperscript{805} but scarcely with volute-shaped ends\textsuperscript{806} occur on East Greek Geometric pottery. Vaguely similar motifs, with a floral character, appear on Knossian LG-EO pithoi.\textsuperscript{807} On the other hand, triangles crowned by a horizontal line with volute-shaped ends are found in Hittite art of the 15th – 13th centuries,\textsuperscript{808} mostly in pairs, and stand for ‘Great King’.\textsuperscript{809} Judging by the occurrence, of daemonic, bird-like creatures in Hittite Art\textsuperscript{810} and the imagery on a Hittite ring in Oxford,\textsuperscript{811} I assume that the local potter of NDP.61 was inspired by a portable Hittite object that reached Eleutherna.

Concerning the remaining motifs, the neck pattern is paralleled on a Knossian LO lid,\textsuperscript{812} while the horizontal cable is found on Knossian, mostly EO vases.\textsuperscript{813}

NDP.62 and NDP.76 are attributed to ‘the saw pattern workshop’, which is tentatively considered local. NDP.62 and AM.23, which is also assigned to this workshop, were probably made by a potter/painter that acquired his expertise in the Cyclades (Thera) and immigrated to Eleutherna (see the comments upon Section 4.4 and AM.23). NDP.76 is a later product of this workshop, but all three vases share the peculiar flattened handles. Significantly, the shape of NDP.62 and NDP.76 slightly deviates from the Eleuthernian standards, but is closely paralleled on Thera.\textsuperscript{814}

The stylistic affinities between NDP.62 and AM.23 were treated in the discussion of the latter vase. Although the decorative syntax on the upper body of NDP.62 recalls the amphorae from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ (type C), its

\textsuperscript{804} Levi 1927-1929, 323-326, fig. 420. Rizzo 1984, 262-263. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 142-143, number 89. The division of the wings is also found on the griffins of the aforementioned ‘shield’ from Afrati.\textsuperscript{805} GGP, 273, 284-285: he considers the pattern as a stylised tree. Morricone 1978, 427.\textsuperscript{806} Papapostolou 1968, 93, footnote 76.\textsuperscript{807} Fortetsa 1495 - pl. 23, Fortetsa 1503 - pl. 165.\textsuperscript{808} I owe this reference to Professor Stampolidis.\textsuperscript{809} Akurgal 1962, 62 (also pages 61, 74, 85 - pl. XIX, fig.: 45, 52, 78, 85). Börker-Klähn 1993.\textsuperscript{810} Akurgal 1962, 114.\textsuperscript{811} Akurgal 1962, pl. 52. Bittel et al. 1964, 115, number 208. For the influence of Oriental, portable objects upon Cretan Iron Age figured drawing cf. Coldstream 1979, 260.\textsuperscript{812} Fortetsa, 172, 5t.\textsuperscript{813} Fortetsa, 179, 11y.\textsuperscript{814} Pfuhl 1903, 100-101, numbers 23-24.
central, meander metope is paralleled on Theran LG-Subgeometric vases.\textsuperscript{815} The birds with a solid body, the inner part of which is hatched, and the motif of the vertical strokes that are intersected by a horizontal line are discussed in connection with AM.23. Similar birds flank a meander pattern on a skyphos that belongs to Delos group Ae,\textsuperscript{816} while birds with a cross-hatched body flank a meander pattern on a Rhodian LG kantharos.\textsuperscript{817} Although the birds of the other side find no match, their body is paralleled on Knossian LG-EO birds.\textsuperscript{818} Their neck and head recall the birds on a Theran (?) early 7\textsuperscript{th} century pyxis in Heidelberg.\textsuperscript{819} Further, a bird with hatched neck appears on a LG-EO sherd from Vrokastro\textsuperscript{820} and an EO sherd from Kavousi.\textsuperscript{821} Hatched battlements adorn the neck of Theran amphorae.\textsuperscript{822}

Although NDP.62 and NDP.76 share metopes with similar birds and cross-hatched triangles, the inferior quality of the decoration of the latter vase and its assimilation of characteristics of the local necked pithoi suggest that it is later than NDP.62. The peculiar arrangement of the cross-hatched triangles of NDP.76 is paralleled on an Attic amphora that dates to the end of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{823} The wavy lines of the neck are discussed in connection with AM.6 and AM.20 (Section 5.1.1) and are paralleled on the neck of a Theran\textsuperscript{824} and some 'Euboean'\textsuperscript{825} amphorae.

\textbf{EPAR-early}:\textsuperscript{826} NDP.47, NDP.48, NDP.49, NDP.50, NDP.51, NDP.52, NDP.53

\textbf{EPAR early or advanced}: NDP.54, NDP.55, NDP.56, NDP.57, NDP.58, NDP.59, NDP.60

\textbf{EPAR-advanced}: NDP.61, NDP.62, NDP.63

\textbf{EPAR advanced or late}: NDP.64, NDP.65, NDP.66, NDP.67, NDP.68, NDP.69, NDP.70, NDP.71, NDP.72, NDP.73, NDP.74, NDP.75

\textsuperscript{815} Pfuhl 1903, 106, numbers 43, 47.
\textsuperscript{816} Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 54, number 84.
\textsuperscript{817} Kauffmann-Samaras 1976, 25-26, pl. 37, number 1.
\textsuperscript{818} Fortetsa 888 (with Parian influence, discussed in Fortetsa, 80, 191), Fortetsa 1402.
\textsuperscript{819} Canciani 1966, 67-68, pl. 124, number 4.
\textsuperscript{820} Hayden 2003, 72, number 196.
\textsuperscript{821} Coulson, Haggis, Mook and Tobin 1997, 320-322, fig. 4.3 - Mook 2004, 177, fig. 12.12.L.
\textsuperscript{822} Pfuhl 1903, 101-102, number 30. Dragendorff 1903, 135, fig. 312.
\textsuperscript{823} Canciani 1966, 42-43, pl. 107, number 1.
\textsuperscript{824} Pfuhl 1903, 100-101, number 24.
\textsuperscript{825} Pfuhl 1903, 183-185, numbers 1-6. GGP, pl. 37f.
\textsuperscript{826} This fairly precise dating relies on the various characteristics of the EPAR necked pithoi, as well as on a study of the stratigraphy of tomb A1K1.
**EPAR-late:** NDP.76, NDP.77, NDP.78, NDP.79

E) Decorated LPAR necked pithoi: twenty-four vases (pl. 11-12, 48).

*Comments*
A modest overall size, as well as finger impressions on handle roots persist from EPAR times. The LPAR popularity of the globular body and the flat lip, however, markedly contrast the preference for a plump ovoid body and everted lip that had dominated since the 9th century.

The rejection of slip and the limiting of the decoration to bands and coated areas that occur on LPAR necked pithoi suggest simplification and restraint. The interior of the neck is almost never coated any more; it may be entirely plain or carry paint on the upper part, as on some EPAR examples. The only patterns identified, the wavy line of NDP.80 and the circles of NDP.82, have a long history on local necked pithoi. Significantly, the decoration and context of this pair, as well as the context of NDP.80, favour a LPAR-early date.

**LPAR-early:** NDP.80, NDP.81, NDP.82

**LPAR:** NDP.83, NDP.84, NDP.85, NDP.86, NDP.87, NDP.88, NDP.89, NDP.90, NDP.91, NDP.92, NDP.93, NDP.94, NDP.95, NDP.96, NDP.97, NDP.98, NDP.99, NDP.100, NDP.101, NDP.102, NDP.103

F) Plain necked pithoi: twelve vases (pl. 12).

*Comments*
Judging by contextual evidence available for the examples from tomb A1K1, the neck of the plain necked pithoi, which are mostly larger than their decorated counterparts, gradually became shorter.\(^{827}\) The distinction between a short and a

---

\(^{827}\) The ratio between the overall height of the vase and the height of the neck ranges from approximately 5 (NDP.104) to 7.5-8.5 (NDP.107, NDP.108), 11.5 (NDP.106), 16.5 (NDP.111), 20.5 (NDP.113). The ratio of the fragmentary NDP.115 exceeds that of NDP.113, but cannot be estimated.
broad lip is only related to the size of the vessel, while wheel-marks favour a PGB date. Although the finger impressions on the handles of NDP.104 and NDP.113 are paralleled on decorated EPAR necked pithoi, only the latter vase is of that date.

Knossian plain necked pithoi served as urns until the EG period and are later only attested in domestic contexts.\footnote{Fortetsa, 152, type Bii. KNC, 312-313. Coldstream 2001, 61.}

**LPG:** NDP.104  
**PGB:** NDP.105, NDP.106, NDP.107  
**PGB-EG:** NDP.108, NDP.109  
**EG-MG:** NDP.110  
**MG-LG:** NDP.111  
**G:** NDP.112  
**EPAR:** NDP.113  
**LPAR:** NDP.114, NDP.115

*General comments on the necked pithoi*

The Eleuthernian necked pithos proved long-lived and is by far the most popular type of urn at Orthi Petra. The earliest version mostly includes small, plump ovoid, flat-based examples with short or vestigial neck and short, everted lip. A notable increase in size occurs in the MG-LG period, during which the profile of the body and the neck is basically unchanged; broad, everted lips and raised bases, mostly conical in the MG period and disc-shaped in the LG, are, however, common. A move towards smaller size emerges in the EPAR period and culminates in the LPAR. Although plump ovoid bodies remain most common, globular profiles become quite popular in the EPAR period. The neck is not very short any more and the lip is almost always broad, whether everted or flat. All types of bases are widespread (the conical base is the most uncommon, while the ring one is the most popular) and finger-impressions are occasionally found on handle roots. The LPAR period witnesses the predominance of the globular, flat-based body (other types of base are also common) with flat lip. Interestingly, the development of the plain examples, which are mostly

\footnote{NDP.104 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 248, number 278.}
larger than their decorated counterparts and always flat-based, does not adhere to these trends and is best monitored through the shrinking of the neck.

This outline of the development of the shape conceals the considerable conservatism that the local necked pithos displays. Dating is mostly based on decoration, including the general decorative scheme employed, the use or lack of slip and its quality, as well as the syntax, rather than on the individual patterns, which are mostly simple and occur on vases from different periods.

Regarding the decorative scheme, white on dark is the rule on LPG-EG examples. Light on dark decoration prevails thereafter, but slip and (to a lesser extent) paint provide keys for dating the MG-LPAR vases. In MG-LG times, the decoration normally involves thick, bright yellow slip and black or brown-black paint. On the other hand, the EPAR vases, the lower body of which is occasionally reserved, carry thin, mostly whitish or brown-yellow slip, while the LPAR examples are hardly slipped. Further, the PAR vases normally carry brown-red paint.

Concerning the decorative syntax, the LPG-EG necked pithoi normally carry one or two decorative zones between the handles, while the MG ones bear two to four zones that cover the entire upper body. In the LG-EPAR times, patterns are limited to a panel in the handle zone (the decoration is often different on the two sides on EPAR necked pithoi), while only bands and coated areas adorn the LPAR vases. The adornment of the neck offers chronological indications. During the LPG-LG period the neck is normally fully coated and carries no pattern. In the LG period, however, coating often covers only the upper end of the neck’s interior. In contrast, the exterior of the neck of the EPAR necked pithoi is normally decorated and the interior is only partly coated or left plain (strokes/bars on the lip go in hand with these developments). On LPAR vases, the exterior and the upper part of the interior of the neck are usually coated.

Simple curvilinear patterns, drawn freehand, dominate the record. The row of chevrons or zigzags with double, hatched outline is the hallmark of the MG necked pithoi, while the panel with concentric circles is typical of the LG examples and remains popular until the EPAR-early period (concentric circles appear from the PGB period onwards). Metopes are introduced on LG examples and mostly occur on EPAR ones, while figured drawing is limited to a few LG-EPAR vases.
Papadopoulos recently stressed the confusion caused by the variety of terms attributed to sizeable, neckless storage vessels of the Aegean Iron Age and revived the issue of the origins of the Cretan neckless pithos. He challenged the ‘traditional’ view, which attributes the introduction of the shape to Attic MG imports like Fortetsa 454, and suggested that this vase and other similar examples found in Athens are damaged and reshaped Attic amphorae or hydriai. He, however, offered no interpretation for the popularity the shape gained in Knossos already in the PGB-EG period. Hence, the issue remains open and demands some treatment, particularly in the light of the Eleuthernian material.

I believe that the introduction of the shape in both Eleutherna and Knossos during the PGB-EG period is unlikely to have been triggered by imported, damaged and reshaped Attic vessels. In my view, the shape is a revival of a Minoan form that was employed as an urn in the Post-palatial cremations of Olous, just as the Cretan PGB-EG straight-sided pithos derives from a type of Post-palatial pyxis that had served some of the earliest cremations on the island. The Cretan pedigree of the neckless pithos explains the local characteristics in the shape of some of the earliest Iron Age vessels from both Eleutherna and Knossos and perhaps accounts for the importation of Fortetsa 454. Although the arrival of the latter vessel in Knossos exercised some impact upon the local shape, its major effect was, in my view, to stimulate the abandonment of the eclectic style displayed by some early examples, in favour of uniform, Atticizing decoration. Besides, no such Attic vases are

830 Papadopoulos 1998 (for the names see page 117). The confusion is also identifiable in Morgan 1999a, 236.
832 Papadopoulos 1998. As Professor Coldstream suggested to me, however, the proportions of Fortetsa 454 are quite different from those of any Attic amphora type, as is the placing of the handles. For a new Attic pyxis see Platonos-Giota 2004, 119-120, fig. 35.
833 Kanta 2001, 61, fig. 4. The possibility of a survival finds no ground.
834 See Section 5.1.4.
835 See the shape of the body and the handles of the PGB NSP.1.
836 KNC, 317. See, for example, the lip and the handles of Fortetsa 691.
837 See the discussion in KNC, 317-318. Even the white on dark scheme, which is rarely represented in Knossos before the LG period (Fortetsa, 188. KNC, 412-413), but is amply attested on Eleuthernian LPG-EG pottery (including the PGB-EG NSP.1, NSP.2, NSP.3), is applied on a Knossian EG
identified in Eleutherna, where the neckless pithos carries ornaments of local pedigree.

The history of the occurrence of the shape in various Cretan sites is diverse. The shape was introduced in Knossos during the PGB period and became the most popular type of urn throughout the G-O. Concerning the rest of North Central Crete, the limited material from Agies Paraskies, Archanes, Elia and Eltynda suggests that neckless pithoi in the Knossian style were popular in the LG-EO period. Knossian influence is also identified on examples from South Central Crete, where the shape was introduced in the MG period and survived until the G, but not on an EG vase from Prinias. Neckless pithoi occur in the Khaniote LG II repertory and appear in East Crete by the LG-EO period.

Ten PGB-PAR neckless pithoi were identified in Eleutherna (pl. 12-13, 49-50). The early introduction of the shape did not result in its popularity. Neckless pithoi only became common in the (LG)-EPAR period, following the late 8th – (early 7th) century importation of similar vases from Cretan sites (I-NSP.1, I-NSP.2), as well as Corinth (I-PY.2) and Thera (I-NSP.3).

Comments

The body profile displays no consistent development. Nevertheless, the groove that surrounds two of the forms of lip (a-b) identified in Section II.1.3 gradually became

---

neckless pithos (Fortetsa 657). This is a rare case of possible Eleuthernian influence upon Knossian pottery.


Platon 1945-1947, most vases in pages 50-55.

Sakellarakis 1986, 23-29, П.24351, П.24355, П.24354.

Lebessi 1971a, 291, number 1.

Englezou 2004, 424 (including MG examples).


Rizza e Rizzo 1984, 251-252, fig. 473.

Hallager, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 221, 70-P 0482; 222, 70-P 1219. Although these vases are catalogued as kraters, they are discussed (Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 234) as pyxides. An early 8th century example is reported from Astrikas: Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1993a, 475), while a 7th century one is known from Tarra (Tzedakis 1971, 511, pl. 520e).

Tsipopoulou 1987, 95, H 2057; 112, discussed as pyxides. Hayden 2003, 71-72, number 188. Mook 2004, 176, fig. 12.11.L.
shallower and vanished in the LPAR period, as confirmed by NSP.9, NSP.10.\textsuperscript{847} The lip of form c originally had an internal flange with a ridge on the edge to secure the lid (NSP.1). Later, however, (perhaps already in the MG period, as the lip of the MG-LG variety Bii pyxides suggests) the ridge disappeared (NSP.5). Furthermore, a raised base is only found on LG-EPAR examples, while PGB-EG and LPAR ones rest on a flat base. The decorative syntax provides some further evidence for dating: patterns occupy the upper body of the PGB-G vases, but are confined to a shoulder panel on PAR ones. Lastly, only PGB-G vases carry patterned decoration on their handles.

There is not much to comment on the shape of the individual vases. The shape of the body of NSP.3 is perhaps indebted to Attic or Knossian examples. The inset lip (form a) seems to be the norm for the neckless pithos in most Cretan sites and the short vertical lip (form b) is also very popular,\textsuperscript{848} as in Eleutherna. In contrast, the lip with inner flange (form c) seems rare outside Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{849} Besides, the handles of NSP.1 are rarely found on Cretan neckless pithoi,\textsuperscript{850} while the non-integrated handles of NSP.4 are paralleled on the MG NDP.24.

The coating of the exterior of a vase in brown-black (NSP.1, NSP.2) or red (NSP.3) paint, on which added white colour decoration is applied, occurs respectively on local LPG-EG and (PGB)-EG pottery. In contrast to the simple bands of NSP.2, the rich decoration of NSP.1 deserves some comment: the lozenges are paralleled on a Knossian LPG vase,\textsuperscript{851} while diagonally hatched columns\textsuperscript{852} and dots set between horizontal lines\textsuperscript{853} occur on Knossian PGB-O pottery. On the other hand, although the cross-hatched battlement of NSP.3 was introduced on Cretan pottery

\textsuperscript{847} All three forms of lip occur on the local PGB-EG vases, as well as on imports of similar shape that date to the 9th – 7th century.

\textsuperscript{848} This argument is based on a survey of Cretan neckless pithoi (for references see above and note that in several cases the form of the lip is uncertain due to low quality illustrations and/or brief descriptions). Although, the popularity of the two forms does not adhere to any chronological or regional patterns, the popularity of the short lip that is surrounded by a groove (variant of form b) in South Central (Afrati: Levi 1927-1929, 221-222, fig. 249-250; 226, fig. 257; 234, fig. 272. Phaistos: Rocchetti 1974-1975, 271, MM.8; Prinias: Rizza, Palermo e Tomasello 1992, 68, numbers 167-173; 98) and East (most vases in Tsipopoulou 1987, 112) Crete is notable.

\textsuperscript{849} Solely one parallel was identified (KNC, 318: KNC 283.14).

\textsuperscript{850} Cf., however, the broadly similar handles of KNC G13.

\textsuperscript{851} Fortetsa 288 - Fortetsa, 172, 51.

\textsuperscript{852} Fortetsa, 169, 2c.

\textsuperscript{853} Fortetsa, 172, 9cj: also identified on some LPG vases.
during the LPG period, the hatched spiral with double outline occurs on EG vases from Eleutherna and Knossos, as well as on a sherd from Afrati. Chequered triangles with multiple outlines appear on a PG hydria from Kavousi, while a similar pattern (with no outline) is found on Knossian LPG-EG vases. Hatched spiral hooks occur on a PGB pithos from Afrati, on PGB-EG sherds from Knossos, as well as on an EO lid from Adromyloi. A spiral hook that grows from the lower angle of a triangle is found on a Knossian PGB lekythion. Hatched curvilinear patterns appear on Knossian PGB-EG vases and are typical of the Eleuthernian EG pottery.

NSP.4 is connected to the workshop that produced the LG NDP.33, NDP.37, due to their sharing of patterns that are otherwise rare on local pottery, also, due to the coating of the area around its handles, which is rarely found on Eleuthernian MG-EPAR (sizeable) storage vessels. Furthermore, its decoration echoes the style of a group of Knossian LG parallels, which involves 'lighter motifs only, drawn in a fussy and miniaturistic manner'. Cross-hatched lozenges appear on Knossian MG-EO neckless pithoi, while standing, hatched leaves occur on MG and mostly LG examples. Solid hourglass friezes are found on Knossian MG vases and a LG

sherd from Agia Triadha,\textsuperscript{872} while hourglass friezes overlying zones with leaves appear on two Knossian LO aryballoi.\textsuperscript{873}

NSP.5 probably dates to the transition from the LG to the EPAR period. Although, its slip and the limiting of its patterns to the shoulder recall the local LG necked pithoi, red paint is mostly found on PAR storage vessels (like NSP.6). Also, columns filled with horizontal lines are popular on Knossian O pithoi, despite their occurrence on earlier periods.\textsuperscript{874} The shape and decorative scheme of NSP.6 are matched on an EO neckless pithos in the Mitsotakis collection,\textsuperscript{875} while its hatched lozenges are paralleled on Cretan MG-EO vases.\textsuperscript{876} An EPAR date is suggested for NSP.7 and NSP.8 on the basis of the application of slip solely on the shoulder. NSP.7 is closely associated with a class of Knossian O neckless pithoi\textsuperscript{877} and matches an EO vase from Praisos,\textsuperscript{878} while the vertical wavy lines of NSP.8 occur on local EPAR pottery (see the comments upon Dia amphorae). Lastly, the simple decoration and lack of slip NSP.9 displays favour a LPAR date.

\textbf{PGB:} NSP.1
\textbf{PGB-EG:} NSP.2
\textbf{EG:} NSP.3
\textbf{LG:} NSP.4
\textbf{LG/EPAR:} NSP.5
\textbf{EPAR:} NSP.6, NSP.7, NSP.8
\textbf{LPAR:} NSP.9, NSP.10

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{872} Palermo 2003, 281, fig. 3, upper left.
\textsuperscript{873} Fortetsa 933 and 961. See Fortetsa, 85 for their date: their leaves are, however, solid and lozenge-shaped.
\textsuperscript{874} Fortetsa, 169, 2c.
\textsuperscript{875} Marangou 1992, 139, number 145: said to come from Sitia. Also cf. a LG-EO smaller version from Vrokastro: Hayden 2003, 70-71, number 188.
\textsuperscript{876} Coldstream 1992, 72, GD.30. KNC 175.39, 292.153, 306.7. Hayden 2003, 62, number 157. Only the first is EO.
\textsuperscript{877} Fortetsa, 150, type V.A. Moignard 1996, 422-423, type C.
\textsuperscript{878} Tsipopoulou 1987, 112, pl. 210, H: no number.
\end{flushright}
5.1.4 Straight-Sided Pithoi

The shape is regarded as an enlarged version of the LM IIIB - LM IIIC straight-sided pyxis, as well as a symptom for the interest in the Minoan past that emerged during the PGB period.879 This type of pyxis survived in Subminoan-PG Crete880 and was introduced to the Late Cypriot IIIB repertory.881 Contrary to what is widely assumed, genuine straight-side pithoi are found in Crete, particularly in Phaistos,882 in the beginning of the PG period. Further, there are some smaller, Knossian EPG examples.883 All five straight-sided pithoi from Eleutherna (pl. 14, 51-52)884 date, however, to the PGB-EG period, like most of their counterparts from Knossos885 and Eltyna.886 The shape was introduced in Prinias887 and South Central Crete in the PGB period and remained popular in the latter area until the O period.888 MG-EO examples are known from East Crete.889

Comments

Although most vases are individual, SSP.3 and SSP.5 are fairly similar and the latter seems later than the former due to its tapering walls. The shape of both vases and probably the dimensions of SSP.3 recall the LPG-PGB coarse pyxis KNC 294.43.890

881 Lemos 2002, 78.
883 Although these vases are called jars (Fortetsa, 162-162) or pyxides (KNC, 359), their height is comparable to that of few Knossian PGB-EG straight-sided pithoi (Fortetsa 345, 350).
884 SSP.3, SSP.4, SSP.5 could have been regarded as straight-sided pyxides. The walls of the former and the latter are slightly curved.
886 Englezou 2004, 422-424.
887 Rizza 1974. Rizza e Rizzo 1984, 242-244, fig. 451-454; 250-251, fig. 469-470, 472: PGB-EG. The shape is also represented in a context that dates around 600: Rizza, Palermo e Tomasello 1992, 77, number 246; 98.
888 GGP, 255-257.
890 KNC, 359. The shape is also paralleled on a coarse vessel from Episkopi Pedhiados: Hartley 1930-1931, 70, number 22.
On the other hand, the broad base and stout shape of SSP.1 suggest a PGB date. Its proportions are paralleled on two Knossian PGB straight-sided pithoi, while its peculiar handles are attested on Knossian PGB-EG examples. The neck collar of SSP.2 is strongly reminiscent of the pyxis prototypes, while the conical body of SSP.4 that tapers towards the ring foot favours an EG date.

The concentric circles of SSP.1 favour a PG date, while the semicircle pattern of SSP.2 is paralleled on PGB pottery from Knossos and Vrokastro. Regarding the other three vases, the coating of the exterior of a vase in brown-black (SSP.3) or red (SSP.4, SSP.5) paint, on which added white colour decoration is applied, is respectively found on local LPG-EG and (PGB)-EG pottery. The patterns of SSP.3 are not illuminating in terms of dating. Wavy lines are found on the neck of much later, Iron Age amphorae from Kommos, while rows of S’s appear on PGB-PAR/O pottery from Eleutherna and Knossos. The cross-hatched triangles of SSP.4 are popular on Knossian LPG pottery, while hatched S’s appear on Knossian PGB-EG vases, as well as on the EPAR HYD.20. Two running spirals with hatching in between are attested on Cretan PGB-EG pottery, but hatched curvilinear patterns are typical of the Eleuthernian EG pottery. Besides, the repetition of curvilinear patterns on superimposed zones favours an EG date for SSP.5, the loops on the neck of which are paralleled on the PGB NDP.17.

**PGB:** SSP.1, SSP.2, SSP.3  
**EG:** SSP.4, SSP.5

---

892 Fortetsa 343 and 345 (for their date see KNC, 314, 316).  
893 Hartley 1930-1931, 60, number 10. KNC 107.178.  
896 Hayden 2003, 57, number 136.  
897 Johnston 2000, 201, 222, numbers 22 and 129 respectively.  
898 Fortetsa, 179, 11q, 11w.  
902 Coldstream 2001, 66.
5.1.5 Pyxides

Although the pyxis, a small vessel with narrow mouth, was perhaps used for the storage of small, precious items,\(^{903}\) the Eleuthernian pyxides did not contain any artefacts. At least three examples (PY.7, PY.10, PY.14) served as urns, while one of them (PY.14), as well as two more pyxides (PY.2 and the Attic 1-PY.1) were found inside urns.\(^{904}\) Although the pyxides were rarely carrying covers,\(^{905}\) two almost identical lids, SLI.1 and SLI.2, accompanied PY.5 and PY.4 respectively.\(^{906}\) All local pyxides have round walls\(^{907}\) and are divided in two types on the basis of whether or not they carry handles. The handled type is sub-divided in three varieties according to the form of the mouth.

A) PYXIDES WITHOUT HANDLES: four vases (pl. 14, 53).

Comments

This type of pyxis was introduced in Crete by Attic and Corinthian prototypes.\(^{908}\) PY.1, with its high foot, globular body and two pairs of suspension holes is closer to the Mainland prototypes and dates to the LPG period. During the PGB period, however, the body becomes squat, carries two holes on the rim and stands on a lower foot (PY.2,\(^{909}\) PY.3) or a flat (PY.4) base. The early shape finds several Knossian MPG-LPG parallels,\(^{910}\) as well as a PGB one from Kommos.\(^{911}\) Squat pyxides (of other types) appear in Knossos during the PGB period,\(^{912}\) while flat-based examples

\(^{903}\) Coldstream 2001, 35.
\(^{904}\) The discovery of PY.2 inside 1-KR.2 is paralleled in Knossos: Payne 1927-1928, 263, number 166.
\(^{905}\) Even the pyxides of variety Bii, the lip of which was designed to hold a lid, had no cover.
\(^{906}\) Although PY.2 matches SLI.3, their connection is not supported by their context (even though both come from tomb A1K1).
\(^{907}\) Although SSP.3, SSP.4 and SSP.5 are quite small, they are classified as straight-sided pithoi, not pyxides.
\(^{909}\) PY.2 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 260, number 299.
\(^{911}\) Kommos IV, 230, number 176: its dimensions are close to those of PY.3.
\(^{912}\) KNC, 360. Coldstream 2001, 35.
without handles come from Afrati, Archanes, Ierapetra, Knossos, Kourtes and Mastabas in Herakleion. A probably Cretan vase of similar shape is kept in a collection at Groningen.

Not only the shape, but also the decoration of PY.1 recalls Mainland parallels. Triangular patterns are also found, however, on Knossian examples and solid triangles appear on LPG-MG Knossian pottery, particularly on three LPG pyxides (of other type). Its pale fabric further supports the LPG date of PY.1. On the other hand, the zigzag of PY.2 and PY.4 appears on similar pyxides from Afrati, Knossos and Kommos. Besides, PY.2 recalls a pyxis from a SubPG I tomb at Lefkandi. The pattern of strokes PY.3 carries is found on a pyxis from Kourtes, as well as on Knossian PGB pyxides and pyxis lids.

LPG: PY.1
PGB: PY.2, PY.3, PY.4

B) PYXIDES WITH HANDLES: seven vases, divided in three varieties, according to the form of the mouth.

913 Levi 1927-1929, 211, fig. 233.
914 Alexiou 1950, 444, number 4, pl. ΑΒ' 1.6 - Sakellarakis 1987, 56-58, ΣΓ 388: PGB. Contrary to its description, another parallel from Archanes stands on a disc, not a flat base (Sakellarakis 1986, 31-32, Π.24342: although the date reads Late Geometric A, Late Protogeometric A was probably intended).
915 Unpublished vase mentioned in Desborough 1967, 78.
916 Payne 1927-1928, 263, number 167. Hutchinson and Boardman 1954, 225, number 57. KNC, 360, type Bi: PGB-EG.
917 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 228-229, numbers 143-145 (the shape and dimensions of number 145 are very close to those of PY.4).
918 Lebessi 1970, 275, number 7: PGB.
919 Desborough 1967. Also see a peculiar, 9th century, necked example that was imported to Khania Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 22, fig. 2a.
921 See those listed in KNC, 360, type Bi.
922 Fortetsa, 171, 4d.
923 Fortetsa 246, Fortetsa 1030, KNC 219.28.
924 Levi 1927-1929, 211, fig. 233.
925 Payne 1927-1928, 263, number 168. KNC 285.2, 287.26: PGB.
926 Kommos IV, 230, number 176: PGB.
928 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 228, number 144 - Rocchetti 1990, 264, pl. 50c.
929 Pyxis KNC 28.16 and its lid KNC 28.14, lid KNC G89. Add Boardman 1961, 98, number 440: the late 8th century date proposed for this lid is perhaps low.
**Bi) Pyxides with handles and inset lip: five vases (pl. 14-15, 54).**

*Comments*

Although Coldstream has suggested that the type copies the Attic flat or pointed pyxis, \(^{930}\) I maintain that the prototype was the Attic EG globular pyxis. \(^{931}\) The earliest Cretan examples carried no handles, \(^{932}\) like their Attic prototypes, but soon handles were added (as on PY.5) in deference to Cretan taste. \(^{933}\) In Eleutherna, the rounded body and high foot of the PGB PY.5 were succeeded by a slightly depressed body resting on a flat base (PY.7, PY.8), or a truly depressed body standing on a low base (PY.6) in the EG period. \(^{934}\) The truly depressed body and the flat base were inherited by the latest version of the shape (PY.9). \(^{935}\)

The coating of the exterior of a vase in dark (PY.5, PY.7, PY.8) or red (PY.6) paint, on which added white colour decoration is applied, occurs respectively on LPG-EG and (PGB)-EG vases from Eleutherna. For the dipping of PY.5, PY.7, as well as for the pattern of the former vase and PY.6 see the comments upon type Ai necked pithoi. The spiral of PY.8 is paralleled on Knossian PGB-EG pyxides, \(^{936}\) while the coating of PY.9 suggests a G date.

**PGB: PY.5**

**EG: PY.6, PY.7, PY.8**

**MG: PY.9**

**Bii) Pyxides with handles and different forms of lip: five vases (pl. 15, 55).**


\(^{931}\) See Smithson 1968, 87-88 for the Attic shape. Also cf. the Attic EG I-PY.1.

\(^{932}\) KNC 28.16, G105, G106: PGB-EG.


\(^{934}\) A depressed body and a low base are typical of the Knossian PGB-EG examples: KNC, 361-362, type Bvi (KNC 100.20, 107.105, 13.24). Coldstream 2001, 37.

\(^{935}\) The variety survived longer elsewhere, as a LO pyxis from Agios Georgios suggests (Tsipopoulou 1987, 30, Π 74).

\(^{936}\) Fortetsa 461. KNC 13.36.
Comments

This class is probably of local inspiration and the single parallel from Knossos may originate from Eleutherna.\(^\text{937}\) The development of the shape is clear: the sharp carination of the MG PY.10\(^\text{938}\) survived until the LG-early period (PY.12); thereafter, a squat (PY.13: LG-late)\(^\text{939}\) or better-rounded (PY.14: EPAR) form prevailed. Besides, the lip of the G examples that was designed to carry a lid\(^\text{940}\) was replaced by an everted one in the EPAR period. Carinated shoulders and lips designed to carry a lid occur on Khaniote LG I (but, perhaps significantly, not LG II) pyxides.\(^\text{941}\)

The quality of the slip of these pyxides (excluding PY.14) suggests a MG-LG date. The slip and the pattern\(^\text{942}\) of PY.11 favour a MG date. A similar date is suggested for PY.10, the hatched zigzag of which is popular on local MG necked pithoi, but also occurs on the LG PY.13.\(^\text{943}\) The decoration and the groove on the shoulder of PY.10 recall the MG NDP.27. The two vases were produced by the same workshop, if not the same hand.

Although chevron columns (PY.12) occur on Knossian G-O pottery,\(^\text{944}\) they were introduced in the Eleuthernian repertory during the LG period.\(^\text{945}\) The chevron column and the row of loops PY.12 displays are combined on the LG CU.195. Although the zigzag of PY.13 recalls PY.10, its metopal decoration favours a LG date.\(^\text{946}\) On the other hand, the brown slip of PY.14 suggests a PAR date; its groups of standing chevrons occur on Knossian, mostly PGB\(^\text{947}\) but also O\(^\text{948}\) vases.

\(^{937}\) For the vase see Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 304, S42. I could trace no Knossian parallel for its shape (Knossian post-PG pyxides are normally necked: KNC, 361, type Bv. See also Moignard 1996, 448. Coldstream 2001, 37. Cf., however, the vestigial neck of the miniature KNC 218.38), which strongly recalls that of PY.14 (the decorative syntax of the two vases is also very similar). Besides, the elongated spiral that vase carries is uncommon on Knossian pottery after the PGB-EG period, but fairly widespread on Eleuthernian vases (cf., for example, the LG-EPAR NDP.39, NDP.59).

\(^{938}\) For the shape and dimensions of PY.10 cf. Fortetsa 1450.


\(^{940}\) This type of lip is paralleled on NSP.1, NSP.5.

\(^{941}\) Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 234.


\(^{943}\) Cf. the pyxides: Coldstream 1972, 91, G65 (LPG-EG). KNC 26.6 (LG).

\(^{944}\) Fortetsa, 174, 60.

\(^{945}\) See the comments upon AM.20.

\(^{946}\) Metopes with cross-hatching occur on Knossian O pottery: Fortetsa, 169, 2u. For the metopes with multiple zigzags see the comments upon variety Diia amphorae. A cross-hatched band appears on the LG HYD.14.

\(^{947}\) Fortetsa, 171, 4i.
Biii) Necked pyxides with handles (miniature necked pithoi): eleven vases (pl. 15, 56).

Comments

Although necked pyxides are common in Iron Age Crete, I only cite here vases shorter than 0.1Om.,\(^949\) since larger examples approach the size of the smaller Eleuthemian necked pithoi.\(^950\) Necked pyxides occur in Knossos during the G-EO period,\(^951\) as well as in Afrati\(^952\) and Kourtes.\(^953\) East Crete has produced a rich series that is traced back to the Early Iron Age.\(^954\)

Leaving aside PY.20, the shape of which is individual, the profile of the Eleuthemian vases, which seem no earlier than LG, develops as follows: The LG form, which is characterised by a globular body, a simple rim and a raised base, is represented by PY.15, PY.16\(^955\) and PY.18 (the flat-based PY.17 is probably of similar date, judging by the form of its body and rim). During the EPAR period, however, when the type was most popular, a squat, flat-based profile, with everted lip, takes over (PY.19, PY.21, PY.23; despite their simple rim, PY.22 and PY.24, are probably EPAR). These trends culminate on the LPAR PY.25, which displays a broadened, squat form and a sharply articulated lip.

The spiral and S’s of PY.17 are found on local necked pithoi from the PGB to the LG and EPAR periods respectively. Although the patterns of PY.15 occur on

\(^{948}\) Fortetsa 1318.

\(^{949}\) Most of the Eleuthernian vases are 0.06-0.08m. tall, but PY.17 measures 0.10m.

\(^{950}\) Vases of unknown size are also cited.


\(^{952}\) Levi 1927-1929, 146-147, fig. 144; 265-266, fig. 322; 436, fig. 582 (the first in the second row).

\(^{953}\) Rocchetti 1988-1989, 226, numbers 137, 140.


\(^{955}\) PY.16 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 59, number 34 - Stampolidis 2004, 265, number 313.
pottery from various periods and require no special comment, the popularity of the zigzag on necked pyxides from Eleutherna (PY.15, PY.21, PY.22) and Knossos\textsuperscript{956} is notable. The white on dark decoration of PY.15 recalls two similar Knossian pyxides\textsuperscript{957} found in LG/EO urns, as well as an EPAR pyxis from Agios Georgios.\textsuperscript{958} On the other hand, the circle panel and the chevron columns of PY.16 occur on local LG-EPAR pottery\textsuperscript{959} (the latter pattern also appears on the EPAR PY.23), while its pendent cross-hatched triangle is paralleled on the MG NDP.21.

The decoration of PY.18 and PY.19 is almost identical, but their shape suggests a LG date for the former and an EPAR one for the latter. Zigzag panels are found on LG larger storage vessels from Eleutherna,\textsuperscript{960} as well as on the aforementioned pyxis from Agios Georgios, but the decoration of PY.18 and PY.19 is best paralleled on the LG AR.18, which also comes from trench K. All three vases are attributed to a single workshop and the pyxides are considered LG-EPAR.

The EPAR date suggested for PY.21 and PY.22 relies on the form of their body and base. Nevertheless, the rounded rim and the dissimilarity in the decoration of the two sides of PY.22 look back to the LG examples and favour an EPAR-early date. Furthermore, the row of chevrons of PY.23 suggests an EPAR date (see the comments upon type D necked pithoi), while the lugs of PY.24 occur on Knossian G-EO examples.\textsuperscript{961} The shape of PY.25 is closely paralleled on a Knossian pyxis that dates to around 600\textsuperscript{962} and its simple decoration supports a LPAR date. Lastly, despite its simple form, PY.20 finds no close parallel; its broad lip favours a LG-EPAR date.

**LG:** PY.15, PY.16, PY.17

**LG-EPAR:** PY.18, PY.19

**LG-PAR ?:** PY.20

\textsuperscript{956} Fortetsa 534, 643; KNC 218.8, 218.104, 218.114, 292.77.

\textsuperscript{957} Fortetsa 733, KNC 218.38. Unlike these vases, however, PY.15 carries no paint coat and its dark ground is the clay surface (cf. the vase from Agios Georgios cited in footnote 958).

\textsuperscript{958} Tsipopoulou 1987, 111, A.N. 2366.

\textsuperscript{959} See the comments upon type D necked pithoi (for the chevron column also see the comments upon type C cups).

\textsuperscript{960} NDP.37, NDP.42, PY.13.

\textsuperscript{961} Fortetsa 733, Fortetsa 1436. KNC, 361-362, some examples in types Bv-Bvi. The shape of PY.24 copies EM prototypes (see references in KNC, 362).

\textsuperscript{962} Coldstream and Sackett 1978, 56, number 26.
General comments on the pyxides

The globular pyxis with everted lip and no handles (type A) was introduced in PG Crete from the Mainland. The earliest Eleuthernian copies adopt the Mainland shape, but a depressed form and a low base appear before long. Another Mainland prototype, represented in Eleutherna by the Attic EG II I-PY.1, stimulated the production of pyxides with inset lip (variety Bi). The suspension holes of the original were abandoned and handles were introduced, while the shape gradually adopted a depressed form with low or flat base. Handles also appear on varieties Bii-Biii. The former is apparently of local inspiration and develops through the replacement of a carinated body with grooved lip by a rounded body with everted lip. The latest variety (Biii) is limited to the LG-PAR period. The globular profile with simple rim and raised base characterises the LG shape and is succeeded by a squat form with articulated lip and flat base in the PAR period. The pyxides of all types/varieties except Biii display a gradual decrease in size.

5.1.6 Lids

Although lids, the diameter of which exceeds 0.15m., are uncommon in Eleutherna, two types are identified: conical, and domed. The use of conical lids as covers for urns is confirmed by the association of LI.1 with AM.1 and LI.3 with AM.5. Interestingly, the decoration of the latter pair is somewhat homogeneous, unlike that of the former pair, which was, however, probably produced as such

962 Smaller lids are discussed below.
964 Several lids were, however, represented in building A: Stampolidis 2003, 224.
966 In both cases the urn was an amphora with vertical handles, a shape that is rarely found in Eleutherna. Although the MG LI.5 fits the EG NSP.3 and both come from tomb A1K1, their association is discouraged by their different date and context.
(judging by the form of the lip of both vases). In contrast, the decoration of 9th – 7th century urns and lids from Knossos\textsuperscript{967} and Eltyna\textsuperscript{968} displays notable homogeneity.

The function of the domed lid is unclear. Scholars have long noted that it was not always used as a cover and assumed that it occasionally served for ritual purposes\textsuperscript{969}. Their view is corroborated by the occurrence of homogeneous sets in Knossos\textsuperscript{970} and a matching pair in Eleutherna (LI.6, LI.7) and mostly by the wide attestation of the shape in the Acropolis sanctuary at Gortyn\textsuperscript{971}.

**A) CONICAL LIDS:** five vases (pl. 1, 15-16, 57).

*Comments*

The development of the shape is unclear. Perhaps the distinct lip is a PGB feature, while the plain interior is typical of G vases.

The introduction of a knob that is shaped as a miniature vase on LI.1\textsuperscript{972} is attributed to the influence of Attic MG I pyxis lids\textsuperscript{973} and is paralleled on Knossian PGB-O lids.\textsuperscript{974} The straight-sided miniature vase of LI.1 is paralleled on two Knossian EG lids,\textsuperscript{975} the shape and the decoration of which are, however, dissimilar to those of LI.1.

The white on red decoration of LI.2, LI.3 and LI.4 is found on local PGB and mostly EG pottery and the context of the latter two vases favours an EG date. Rows of S’s (LI.2, LI.4) commonly occur on Knossian G lids,\textsuperscript{976} while the rendering of rows of loops in white on dark (LI.2) is paralleled on local PGB-EG vases (NDP.8, NDP.13, NDP.17).\textsuperscript{977} Lastly, although the arc pattern of LI.5 occurs (in an elaborate

---

\textsuperscript{967} Coldstream 1994, 106, 108.
\textsuperscript{968} Englezou 2004, 425.
\textsuperscript{969} Hutchinson and Boardman 1954, 222. Fortetsa, 164-165. KNC, 327. Coldstream 2001, 31, 33: Knossian domed lids sporadically occur in homogeneous sets.
\textsuperscript{970} Coldstream 2001, 33.
\textsuperscript{971} Johannowsky 2002, 4-22.
\textsuperscript{972} LI.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 244-245, number 272.
\textsuperscript{973} KNC, 326. Coldstream 2001, 31.
\textsuperscript{974} Fortetsa, 164, type G. KNC, 325-326, type B. Similar vases are rare outside Knossos; O examples are known from Agies Paraskies (Platon 1945-1947, 55, number 24) and Archanes (Sakellarakis 1986, 29, PI. 24354.1). For Aegean, Iron Age lid knobs shaped as miniature vessels see Muskalla 2002.
\textsuperscript{975} KNC 107.106, 107.138; the latter carries a zigzag. See also Muskalla 2002, 61-62.
\textsuperscript{976} Fortetsa, 179, 11q.
\textsuperscript{977} The pattern is similarly rendered on broad-necked jugs throughout the PGB-EPAR period. Besides, loops (outlined, however) occur on two Knossian EG lids: KNC 107.106, 107.138.
version) on Knossian EG lids,\textsuperscript{978} the dotted lozenge, which was introduced on
Knossian pottery during the MG period\textsuperscript{979} under the influence of Attic MG II
vases,\textsuperscript{980} favours a MG date.

**PGB:** LI.1

**EG:** LI.2, LI.3, LI.4

**MG:** LI.5

**B) DOMED LIDS:** two vases (a matching pair, pl. 16).

*Comments*

The peculiar form of the handle finds no close parallel. The white on dark scheme
characterises the Eleuthemian LPG-EG pottery, but the S’s preclude a LPG date. The
pattern on the top of LI.6 is found on Knossian PGB-EO pottery,\textsuperscript{981} while the row of
solid triangles on LPG-MG,\textsuperscript{982} they are, however, combined on a set of EG
kalathoi.\textsuperscript{983}

**PGB-EG:** LI.6, LI.7

*General comments on the lids*

A review of the lids from Eleutherna is hampered by their scarcity. They are mostly
decorated in white on dark and are largely limited to the PGB-EG period. The
ensuing demise is perhaps related to the employment of the lipless basin, which was
introduced in the EG period, as a lid.

\textsuperscript{978} Fortetsa 1419, 178, 10n. Coldstream 1992, 77, GH.44.


\textsuperscript{980} KNC, 334.


\textsuperscript{982} Fortetsa, 171, 4d.

\textsuperscript{983} KNC 75.48, 75.51, 75.54, 75.61, 75.77, 75.80, 75.118, 75.139, 75.147.
5.1.7 Small Lids

The small (diameter < 0.13m.) lids are divided into conical and domed. As shown by the large examples, most conical lids were covering storage vessels, while domed examples had no clear function.

A) CONICAL: five lids, divided in three varieties. Variety Ai-Aii lids carry a knob, in contrast to the single, variety Aiii vase. Suspension holes occur on variety Ai lids.

Ai) Small, conical lids carrying a knob and suspension holes: three vases (pl. 16, 57).

Comments
Judging by their fabric and style, these lids come from a single local workshop. The shape and decoration of SLI.1 and SL.2 find close parallels at Archanes, Gortyn, Knossos and Vrokastro. The delight in miniature modeling SLI.3 expresses is considered typical of Cretan PGB pottery and is paralleled on Knossian PGB small lids, as well as on later lids from Gortyn, East Crete and Knossos. No close parallels were located for the goat’s head, but ram’s heads occur on O lids from Knossos and Gortyn. Besides, solid triangles appear on Knossian LPG-MG vases, including PGB small lids with ornamental knobs.

PGB: SLI.1, SL.2, SLI.3

---

984 For the decorative correlation between storage vessels and their small lids see the comments upon the large lids (Section 5.1.6).
985 Sakellarakis 1987, 62, ΣΤ 660: the reference to Alexiou is incorrect. Alexiou briefly mentions the vase in question in relation to a pyxis (Alexiou 1950, 444).
986 Alexiou 1966, 190, pl. 165α.
988 Hall 1914, 141-2, number 4, pl. XXVII, 2 - Hayden 2003, 50, number 110: PG.
992 Tsiropoulo 1987, 140-142, types α-β.
993 Fortetsa, 164, type F.
994 Fortetsa, 164, type F.
996 Fortetsa, 171, 4d: LPG-MG.
Aii) Small, conical lids carrying a knob: two vases (pl. 13).

Comments
The pair recall some Knossian PG-G type lids,\(^998\) the decoration of which is often limited to bands and lines. Although the quality of the slip of SLI.5 suggests a MG-LG date, its red paint is mostly paralleled on local PAR vases. Rows of S’s are popular on Knossian G lids.\(^999\)

LG: SLI.4
LG/EPAR: SLI.5

Aiii) Small, conical lids without a knob: one vase (pl. 16).

Comments
Parallels are known from Knossos\(^1000\) and Archanes.\(^1001\) The shape of SLI.6 mostly recalls a Knossian EG vase,\(^1002\) which is regarded as a hybrid between a kalathos and a conical lid,\(^1003\) as well as a Knossian MG-late small kalathos.\(^1004\) Also, the raised base of SLI.6 resembles that of some Knossian EG kalathoi.\(^1005\)

The application of added white colour decoration on a dark ground is typical of local LPG-EG pottery and the curvilinear pattern of SLI.6 fits in the Cretan PGB-EG repertory.

EG: SLI.6

\(^{998}\) KNC, 362-363, type Ai (the cylindrical knob of SLI.4 finds parallels on vases of this type; also cf. Fortetsa, 163, type Ciii: LG-EO). Coldstream 2001, 37.
\(^{999}\) Fortetsa, 179, 11q.
\(^{1000}\) KNC, 364, type Aiii: PG-G.
\(^{1001}\) Sakellarakis 1986, 31-32, Π.24342: although the date reads Late Geometric A, it is meant to be Late Protogeometric A.
\(^{1002}\) KNC 283.90.
\(^{1003}\) Coldstream and Catling 1996, 236.
\(^{1004}\) KNC 134.35.
\(^{1005}\) KNC, 378.
B) DOMED: two vases (pl. 16).

Comments
Although the development of the shape is unclear, the disparities in the form of the lip and the top, as well as in the number of suspension holes are potential dating criteria. SLI.7 has been given a PGB date due to the fact that it is unslipped. On the other hand, the shape of SLI.8 recalls a Knossian G type.\textsuperscript{1006}

PGB: SLI.7
PGB-MG: SLI.8

General comments on the small lids
Small lids are rare in Eleutherna and only occur in tomb A1K1. The relative popularity of the conical type in the PGB period is probably related to the contemporary popularity of the pyxis. The goat's head of SLI.3 offers a notable manifestation of Cretan PGB trends.

\textsuperscript{1006} KNC, 364, type Bi. Also. Coldstream 2001, 37.
5.2 CLOSED VESSELS: Fast-Pouring Vessels

5.2.1 Hydria

The hydria combines two horizontal handles on the belly and a vertical handle that arches from the shoulder to mid-neck. The shape has a long history, but is rarely found in LM III Crete and the Submycenaean-PG Aegean. In contrast, it is fairly common in Crete already in the Subminoan-PG period. Almost none of the twenty-two Eleuthernian hydriai (pl. 17-18, 58) is regarded as domestic/coarse, due to their small shape and painted decoration.

Comments

The development of the shape is fairly clear. The biconical body is limited to the LPG examples, while the ovoid profile predominates thereafter. Further, the LPG hydriai stand on a flat base, while their PGB counterparts prefer a conical base with broad ring perimeter. From then on, the conical base prevails; a few small G examples stand, however, on a disc base. Moreover, a vertical handle that is strap or rectangular in section is mostly found until the EG period; subsequently, it is commonly replaced by a handle that is elliptical in section. The ridge on the lip of HYD.14, HYD.22, which recalls the sharp undercutting on the lip of 7th century hydriai from Knossos and Kommos, characterises the later vases of the series.

1007 Although the plural form of hydria should perhaps have been hydriae (as in Coldstream 2001, 37-38), I preferred the term hydriai, in accordance with the Fortetsa and Knossos North Cemetery publications.
1013 HYD.9 and HYD.12 are, however, large, while HYD.22 is plain.
1015 Coldstream 2001, 37.
Decoration provides further evidence for dating. The interior of the lip is usually banded on PG hydriai, but coated on later examples. Further, quite a few zones adorned the body of the PG-EG hydriai, but their number gradually decreased thereafter and linear decoration prevailed on some EPAR examples (HYD.18, HYD.19). Nevertheless, elaborate decoration persists on a few G-PAR vases.

The shape of HYD.2\textsuperscript{1017} deserves particular attention. Its closest parallels are found on LH IIIC-middle strainer jugs from Naxos and Cos,\textsuperscript{1018} which carry two horizontal, as well as a vertical handles, opposite the lower attachment of which a strainer spout is attached. The juxtaposition of a vertical handle and a similar spout is paralleled on a LM IIIC stirrup-jar from Sybrita.\textsuperscript{1019} Nevertheless, the spouts of these vases are open, not tubular like the one of HYD.2. The strainer on the top of the vase recalls a few stirrup jars (probably of LPG date) from Kourtes\textsuperscript{1020} and Afrati.\textsuperscript{1021} Strainer tops are, however, consistently combined with tubular side (though non-strainer) spouts on Knossian PGB-G vases,\textsuperscript{1022} the combination is also found on a PG vase from Afrati.\textsuperscript{1023} Hence, the shape of HYD.2 represents an eclectic combination of South Aegean elements from the end of the Bronze Age and the Iron Age and seems unrelated to the Iron Age strainer jugs from Cyprus and the Levant,\textsuperscript{1024} which are normally equipped with a single vertical handle and carry no strainer top. Additionally, the pendent bracket ('moustache') of HYD.2 and HYD.1,\textsuperscript{1025} which occurs on Knossian hydriai from the Subminoan to the O period,\textsuperscript{1026} derives from the LH IIIC tassel ornament.\textsuperscript{1027} For the double, hatched chevrons on the shoulder of the aforementioned pair, which is attributed to a single workshop, see the comments

\textsuperscript{1016} Johnston 1993, 344-346. The feature also occurs on 6\textsuperscript{th} century hydriai from the territory of Phaistos: La Rosa e Cucuzza 2001, 151.

\textsuperscript{1017} HYD.2 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 72-73, number 6 - Stampolidis 2004, 240, number 261.

\textsuperscript{1018} Respectively: Mountjoy 1999, 949, number 37; 1113, number 137 (Mountjoy also refers to similar jugs from Rhodes in pages 1041, 1043).

\textsuperscript{1019} Metaxa Prokopiou 1991, 399.

\textsuperscript{1020} Levi 1927-1929, 504, fig. 594-595. For the latter see also Rocchetti 1988-1989, 182, 184, number 19.

\textsuperscript{1021} Benaki Museum, Hall 2, Case 2, number 83: the date proposed reads 950-850.

\textsuperscript{1022} KNC Q49, 26.2-3, 292.140, 292.21 (see KNC, 349-350, particularly footnote 162, where KNC 294.21 is mis-spelled 292.21).

\textsuperscript{1023} Anatoliki Mesogeios, 139-140, number 85 – Kanta and Karetso 1998, 166, fig. 11.

\textsuperscript{1024} For these vases and their influence on Knossian pottery see KNC, 350.

\textsuperscript{1025} HYD.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 73-74, number 7.


\textsuperscript{1027} Coldstream 1972, 66. Hayden 2003, 39, number 71.
upon OIN.22, while for the swastika of HYD.2 see the comments upon the LPG LF.1 (Section 5.3.2). The neck pattern of HYD.2 appears on Knossian LPG-PGB vases. The cross-hatched triangles of HYD.3 and HYD.8 are paralleled on Knossian LPG-EG hydria, while the solid triangles of HYD.3 occur on Knossian PGB examples. A PGB-EG hydria from Vrokastro, however, recalls HYD.3 in combining solid and cross-hatched triangles. The vertical stroke that grows from the apex of the triangles of HYD.8 recalls the pattern on the handle zone of a Knossian PGB hydria. The rows of simple S’s that occur on HYD.3, HYD.8 and many other hydria from Eleutherna, are common on East Cretan LG-EO hydria, but rare on Knossian examples. Besides, the ‘compressed’ S’s of HYD.11 occur on Knossian EG pottery and its loops are paralleled on Knossian PGB-EG hydria, but the overall decorative austerity favours a MG date.

The white on dark decoration of HYD.4, HYD.6 and HYD.7, as well as their conical base and patterns like the rows of S’s (HYD.4, HYD.7) favour a PGB-EG date. HYD.4 and HYD.7 resemble the PGB HYD.3 in carrying rows of S’s alternating with zigzags. The shoulder pattern of HYD.4 (a vertical zigzag in a panel, from the corners of which a spiral hook grows) recalls the shoulder pattern of the PGB OIN.33, while the outlined cross on its neck occurs on a Knossian MG hydria, but mostly on 7th century pottery. The simple battlement on the neck of HYD.4 is paralleled on a roughly contemporary hydria from Archanes. The pattern also appears on the neck of HYD.10, the shoulder decoration of which

---

1028 For single hatched chevrons cf. hydria: KNC N3 (PGB). Hall 1914, 164, pl. XXVII, 3 - Hayden 2003, 52, number 117 (LPG-EG).
1029 Fortetsa 523, KNC 219.1.
1032 Hall 1914, 169-170, fig. 103 – Hayden 2003, 59-60, number 147.
1033 KNC 107.185. Also cf. the PGB: KNC Q15, Q38. Coldstream 2002, 212, 6.4.
1034 Tsipopoulou 1987, 197.
1035 KNC 292.83 (LG/EO).
1036 KNC 104.119, 283.14.
1038 KNC 104.90.
1039 See the comments upon OIN.31 in Section 5.2.3.
(hatched arcs with solid leaves) recalls a Knossian PGB hydria,\textsuperscript{1041} as well as the EG NDP.20, and conforms to the local EG trend for hatched curvilinear patterns. Although the hatched lozenge and the nipple of HYD.5 occur on East Cretan LG hyriai,\textsuperscript{1042} its clay ground and context favour a PG date.

The decoration of HYD.9 is exuberant and favours an EG date. The panel, from the corners of which a spiral hook grows, recalls a motif of the PGB HYD.4 (see above), while the lozenge with hatched outline that is surrounded by small circles is matched on the PGB NSP.1. Intersecting wavy lines with an inset dot occur on Knossian EG\textsuperscript{1043} and LG\textsuperscript{1044} vases. The patterns of the lower shoulder zone of HYD.9 (and to a less extent of HYD.4 as well) seem to conform to a metopal arrangement that foreshadows the introduction of metopes on local LG pottery. The vertical panel with triangles hatched in alternate ways occurs on G pottery from Eleutherna\textsuperscript{1045} and Knossos.\textsuperscript{1046} The pairs of vertically opposed, hatched chevrons, as well as the row of standing and pendent hatched chevrons that are linked by a large leaf with outlined border, which is set diagonally, find no close parallel,\textsuperscript{1047} but fit in the Cretan PGB-EG repertory. Lastly, the spiral of the neck is commonly found on Knossian PGB and mostly EG hydriai.\textsuperscript{1048}

Although roughly as large as HYD.9, HYD.12 is austerely decorated. Its pairs of intersecting lines\textsuperscript{1049} and the line with standing and pendent arcs\textsuperscript{1050} are paralleled on Knossian EG pottery, but the latter pattern is best matched on the MG LI.5. The

\textsuperscript{1042} Hatched lozenge: Tsipopoulou 1987, 107, H 712. Also cf. the chain of hatched lozenges on the EG pithos KNC O4. Knossian hydriai carry chains of lozenges, which are, however, cross-hatched: Fortetsa 304. KNC 287.8, 283.92). Nipples: Tsipopoulou 1987, 106, 237-238: perhaps following PG prototypes. Nipples are rare on pottery from Eleutherna (cf. the LG CU.198), but appear on vases from Central Crete that date to the PGB and mostly the MG period (Fortetsa, 188. Also, Johnston 2000, 205, number 43), as well as on East Cretan LG pottery (Tsipopoulou 1987, 237-238). For the connection of nipples to aspects of gender see Kourou 1999, 61, 176.
\textsuperscript{1043} Fortetsa 1439.
\textsuperscript{1044} KNC 175.35. Coldstream 2002, 207, number 3.6.
\textsuperscript{1045} NDP.26, HYD.15. The pattern occurs more commonly in a horizontal arrangement (see the comments upon AM.16 in Section 5.1.1 and cf. a LG hydria from Praisos: Tsipopoulou 1987, 60, 106, A.N. 1580).
\textsuperscript{1046} KNC 306.26.
\textsuperscript{1047} Diagonally set leaves occur on the EG KNC 75.110, 134.74. For the hatching of a few chevrons in alternate ways cf. the handle pattern of the EG KNC 75.110.
\textsuperscript{1048} Fortetsa 342, 349, 493, 505 (Fortetsa 179, 11-I: mostly PGB-EG). KNC G33, G34, 218.53. See also: Tsipopoulou 1987, 107, 200, H 1992-1993: EO.
\textsuperscript{1049} Fortetsa, 179, 11t.
\textsuperscript{1050} Fortetsa 1419, 178, 10n. Coldstream 1992, 77, GH.44: elaborate versions.
motifs of HYD.13 and HYD.16 (cross-hatched panels, chevron columns, blind metopes and a zigzag) were introduced on Eleuthernian pottery during the LG period (this excludes the zigzag).\textsuperscript{1051} Cross-hatched panels and blind metopes also appear on HYD.14, which turned up in a LG-late pyre and carries an individual pattern resembling meander hooks. The hatched\textsuperscript{1052} and cross-hatched\textsuperscript{1053} leaves on its neck occur on Knossian LG-EO vases. Cross-hatched panels, chevron columns, metopes that are not blind and yellow slip appear on HYD.15. The horizontal row of chevrons that also occurs on the latter vase is found on local LG-EPAR pottery, including HYD.19, which is discussed below.\textsuperscript{1054} The richly decorated HYD.15 carries some ornaments discussed above, demonstrating their persistence in the LG period.\textsuperscript{1055} Its quatrefoil with triangular, hatched leaves is, however, paralleled on the LG/EPAR NDP.44 and seems popular on Knossian LG-EO pottery.\textsuperscript{1056} Quatrefoils with central concentric circles occur on Knossian LG/EPAR vases.\textsuperscript{1057} The leaves with midrib and veins of HYD.15 are best paralleled on a LG-EO hydria from Kourtes.\textsuperscript{1058}

The white slip and linear decoration connect HYD.18, HYD.19\textsuperscript{1059} and HYD.21 and favour an EPAR date, which is supported by the horizontal row of chevrons of HYD.19\textsuperscript{1060} and the row of double circles of HYD.21.\textsuperscript{1061} HYD.17\textsuperscript{1062} is also covered by white slip, but carries a double zigzag, which occurs on Knossian G-O pottery,\textsuperscript{1063} and double outline tongues, which are paralleled on EO hydriai from

\textsuperscript{1051} Cross-hatched panels appear on local LG-EPAR pottery (cf. PY.13, HYD.14), as well as on East Cretan LG-EO hydriai (Tsipopoulou 1987, 107-108, Η.Ω. 40, Η 1951-1952) and Knossian O polychrome pithoi (Fortetsa, 169-170, 2u). Chevron columns occur on Knossian G-O pottery (Fortetsa, 169-170, 2u) and were introduced in Eleutherna during the LG period; cf. CU.195 and CU.196, the decorative syntax of which recalls that of HYD.13.

\textsuperscript{1052} Fortetsa, 180, 12f.

\textsuperscript{1053} Fortetsa 1353 (Fortetsa, 180, 12h. Date after Coldstream 2001, 46). Lebessi 1970, 277, number 16.

\textsuperscript{1054} For the pattern, which occurs on two LG-EO hydriai from East Crete (Tsipopoulou 1987, 170), see the comments upon type D necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2).

\textsuperscript{1055} For the cross-hatched triangle, from the apex of which a vertical stroke rises, see HYD.8, while for the vertical panel with triangles hatched in alternate ways see HYD.9.

\textsuperscript{1056} Coldstream 2001, 69, fig. 1.25e.

\textsuperscript{1057} KNC, 324. Cf. KNC 79.4, 292.159, 292.235.

\textsuperscript{1058} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 215, number 109 (on the date and the possible Knossian origins of the hydria see GGP, 257). Also cf. Fortetsa, 181, 12t (LG).

\textsuperscript{1059} HYD.18 and HYD.19 are discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 75-76, numbers 9-10 respectively.

\textsuperscript{1060} See above, the comments upon HYD.15.

\textsuperscript{1061} Fortetsa, 175, 9j. GGP, 252.

\textsuperscript{1062} HYD.17 is discussed in: Stampolidis 1990, 384, fig. 12 - Stampolidis 1990b, 295, pl. 61γ - Stampolidis 1994, 74-75, number 8. Although treated as local, the vase is perhaps a Cretan import.

\textsuperscript{1063} Fortetsa, 170, 3b. Also cf. a mid-7th century fast-pouring vessel from Prinias: Lebessi 1976, 45, pl. 54d.
Agios Georgios, as well as on Knossian O vases, the standing loops on the neck find no close parallel, but the pendent triangles on the belly recall a Knossian LG/EO hydria.

Although the row of thick, hatched S's on HYD.20 resembles a hatched wavy line and finds parallels on the PGB SSP.4 and a Knossian PGB hydria, the white slip and metopal decoration favour an EPAR date. Lastly, the ridge on the lip and the context of the undecorated HYD.22 suggest a PAR date.

The patterns on the vertical (S or horizontal bars) and horizontal (band or vertical bars) handles of the Eleuthemian hydriai are commonly found on Cretan parallels. Although vertical strokes/bars only occur on the lip of HYD.6 and HYD17, they seem common on parallels from the rest of Crete.

LPG: HYD.1, HYD.2
PGB: HYD.3, HYD.4, HYD.5
PGB-EG: HYD.6, HYD.7
EG: HYD.8, HYD.9, HYD.10,
MG: HYD.11, HYD.12
LG: HYD.13, HYD.14, HYD.15, HYD.16
EPAR: HYD.17, HYD.18, HYD.19, HYD.20, HYD.21
PAR: HYD.22

---

1064 Tsipopoulou 1987, 107, A.N. 1787, H 7418.
1065 Fortetsa, 181, 13k.
1067 KNC 292.83.
1068 KNC N3.
5.2.2 Jugs

Jugs are all fast-pouring, round-mouthed vessels with a vertical handle attached to the rim or (rarely) just below.\textsuperscript{1074} The Eleuthernian jugs are divided in two types according to the breadth of their neck. The large size and minimal decoration of JU.13 and JU.20 supports their identification as domestic chattels.

A) BROAD NECKED JUGS: the fifteen jugs with broad neck (RD ≥ 2/3 GD) are divided in two varieties according to the articulation of the neck.

Ai) Jugs with broad, articulated, conical neck: nine vases (pl. 18, 59).

Comments

Although the development of the shape is clear, the discovery of most of these jugs in loosely dated contexts and the persistence of white on dark decoration (involving simple motifs) for long after its disappearance from the rest of the local pottery, hinders the establishment of a fine relative chronology. The conical foot, however, replaced the flat base and the neck gradually grew shorter. Two other developments, the introduction of the ovoid body and the moulded lip, are regarded as late features, but could also stem from an increase in size. Lastly, the overall coating of the interior seems a late feature. Accordingly, JU.1 and JU.2 seem the earliest, while JU.7, JU.8 and JU.9 the latest. As far as the rest of the jugs are concerned, JU.3 and JU.4 are apparently earlier than JU.5 and JU.6.

The shape and decoration of these vases are of local inspiration and display little correspondence with jugs from other Cretan sites.\textsuperscript{1075} The patterns are simple and favour no specific date. On these grounds, no parallels are cited.

PGB-(EG): JU.1, JU.2

EG-MG: JU.3, JU.4

\textsuperscript{1074} KNC, 347. Coldstream 2001, 39.

\textsuperscript{1075} The shape vaguely recalls the Knossian mugs, which are, however, always resting on a flat base (Fortetsa, 155, type Bi. KNC, 348, type C), as well as two G 'cups' with conical foot from Papoura (Watrous 1980, 275, numbers 16-17).
Aii) Jugs with broad, non-articulated neck (the profile is a triple curve): six vases (pl. 18, 59).

Comments
The parameters that hinder the precise dating of variety Ai jugs also apply to vases of the variety in question. Both varieties conform to a local tradition and find no close parallels elsewhere. The development of the shape of variety Aii jugs involves the replacement of the globular by an ovoid body after the EG period and the move towards a shorter neck. The conical foot of JU.15, as well as the moulded lip (and the decoration) of JU.14 are loans from the late version of variety Ai jugs and favour a LG-EPAR date; interestingly, the latter vase turned up close to two variety Ai jugs (JU.7, JU.8). Although the profile of the plain JU.13 is paralleled on PG and O cooking jugs from Kommos, a G date is more probable within the local sequence.

B) NARROW NECKED JUGS (RD = 1/3 MD): six vases (pl. 19, 60).

Comments
The globular body (JU.16, JU.17) and the rudimentary moulded lip (JU.17, JU.18) of the PGB-EG narrow-necked jugs were replaced by a plump ovoid body with

---

1076 Kommos IV, 229, number 169: PG; 248, number 381: O.
articulated moulded lip (JU.19, JU.20) during the EG-MG period. JU.21 represents a later form.\textsuperscript{1077}

The rough base and porous clay of JU.16 strongly recall two PGB aryballoi (AR.41, AR.45), while the shape\textsuperscript{1078} and the white on dark decoration of JU.17 and JU.18 favour a PGB-EG date. The shape of JU.19 recalls a Knossian PGB jug,\textsuperscript{1079} while JU.20 finds close parallels at Afrati\textsuperscript{1080} and Phaistos,\textsuperscript{1081} the occurrence of a vertical wavy pattern on the handle of the latter two vases is paralleled on Knossian pouring vessels.\textsuperscript{1082} JU.21 recalls a LG Ib jug from Khania\textsuperscript{1083} and mostly a LG example from Kavousi.\textsuperscript{1084}

PGB: JU.16
PGB-EG: JU.17, JU.18
EG: JU.19
EG-MG: JU.20
LG: JU.21

\textit{General Comments on the jugs}

Although no LPG jug is hitherto attested at Eleutherna, all types identified persisted throughout the PGB-PAR period. Jugs from all types abandoned the globular body in favour of an ovoid one from the MG period onwards. Additionally, the G period witnessed the introduction of a true, usually moulded lip. The close correspondences identified between variety Ai and Aii jugs include the gradual decrease in the height of the neck and the introduction of variety Ai trends (like the conical foot and the moulded lip) to the latest variety Aii jugs. All jugs carry simple ornaments, but type A jugs uphold the white on dark decorative scheme in the G-PAR times, in defiance of its disappearance from the rest of the local pottery after the EG period.

\textsuperscript{1077} JU.21 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 68-69, number 55 – Stampolidis 2004, 266, number 315.
\textsuperscript{1078} Cf. Coldstream 1960, 160, numbers 5-6 (MPG-LPG).
\textsuperscript{1079} Fortetsa 375.
\textsuperscript{1080} Levi 1927-1929, 265-266, fig. 256.
\textsuperscript{1081} Rocchetti 1974-1975, 220-221, R3.12.
\textsuperscript{1083} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 25-26, fig. 6β.
\textsuperscript{1084} Gesell, Coulson and Day 1991, 172, K88.51.
5.2.3 Oinochoai

The oinochoe is a pouring vessel with trefoil lip, to which a vertical handle is attached. This definition, however, encompasses vases of different sizes, not all of which are likely to have been used for the pouring of wine. Some small, slow-pouring examples (sub-type Aii) probably contained unguents.

The shape was introduced in the LH IIIC-middle and became popular by the PG period. Small oinochoai appeared in Crete in the Subminoan period, while large ones in the EPG. The oinochoai from Eleutherna are divided into four types. Vases of types A and B conform to the Cretan Iron Age tradition. The former type includes all oinochoai with standard profile, while the latter some carinated or composite vessels. Type C regards the Creto-Cypriot class, while type D includes miscellaneous vases.

A) STANDARD TYPE OINOCHOAI: The twenty-six vases assigned to this type are divided in two sub-types according to size. The larger class (Ai) is further divided in two varieties according to the decorative scheme employed.

Ai) Standard type, large oinochoai (H ≥ 0.175m.): seventeen vases.

Aia) Standard type, large, light ground oinochoai: eight vases (pl. 19, 61).

Comments

The context of the oinochoai from tomb A1K1 provides ample evidence for distinguishing a PGB and an EG form. OIN.2, the body of which is plump ovoid, comes from a PGB context, while OIN.4, OIN.5 and OIN.7, which were found slightly higher, are characterised by a globular body with squat shoulder and are considered EG. The context of some variety Aib examples confirms that the PGB

---

1086 Mountjoy 1986, 155, 167.
version of the shape has a plump ovoid or globular body. On the other hand, the biconical body and the shoulder decoration of OIN.1 strongly recall the LPG HYD.1, HYD.2. Lastly, the very short neck and broad mouth of OIN.8 favour a PAR date,\textsuperscript{1090} which is confirmed by the dipping,\textsuperscript{1091} as well as the context of this vase.

The LPG date proposed for OIN.1 entails that the pattern of the eyes that flank the spout, which is Cypriot in origin, was copied in Knossos from the PGB period onwards\textsuperscript{1092} and is common on Eleuthernian PGB-EGoinochoai (OIN.4, OIN.5, OIN.7, OIN.10, OIN.15, OIN.16, OIN.17, OIN.33), had reached Crete slightly earlier than previously thought. Besides, the shoulder pattern of OIN.1 is paralleled on Knossian LPG-MG vases.\textsuperscript{1093} The groups of concentric circles that OIN.3 carries find a Knossian PGB parallel,\textsuperscript{1094} but are otherwise rare on early oinochoai. Although the introduction of a horizontal chain of cross-hatched lozenges on oinochoai was once assigned to the LG period,\textsuperscript{1095} OIN.2, as well as an example from Kourtes\textsuperscript{1096} suggest that the pattern also adorns PGB oinochoai. Besides, the neck pattern of OIN.2 appears on Knossian LPG-MG pottery.\textsuperscript{1097} On the other hand, the shoulder decoration of OIN.7 (solid triangles or triangles with thick outline that contain diminishing chevrons)\textsuperscript{1098} is paralleled on Knossian PGB pottery.\textsuperscript{1099}

Although the loop pattern on the neck of OIN.5 occurs on pottery from various periods,\textsuperscript{1100} the bracket ornament of OIN.4, OIN.5 and OIN.6 is an elaborate version of a Knossian PGB pattern.\textsuperscript{1101} The great similarities these three oinochoai display support their attribution to a single potter/painter, particularly since the cross on their base belongs to a common type of potter's marks and has been identified

\textsuperscript{1090} See for example Moignard 1996, 434-436, types A, B, C.
\textsuperscript{1091} KNC 292.39: LO (KNC, 435, type Bii). Knossian Early Archaic slow-pouring vases are often dipped: Coldstream and Sackett 1978, 51, numbers 10-11; 56, number 23; 59.
\textsuperscript{1092} Coldstream 1979, 259. Demetriou 1989, 12.
\textsuperscript{1093} Fortetsa, 171, 4g.
\textsuperscript{1094} Fortetsa 341. See KNC, 342.
\textsuperscript{1095} Sakellarakis 1986, 31-32, II.24352.
\textsuperscript{1096} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 197, number 61.
\textsuperscript{1097} Fortetsa, 168, 1-1. Also cf. the PGB-EG krater KNC G.114.
\textsuperscript{1098} For the incised strokes on the base of OIN.7 see Section 4.3.
\textsuperscript{1099} For the former pattern see Fortetsa, 171, 4d: LPG-MG, while for the latter see Fortetsa, 171, 4i: mostly PGB.
\textsuperscript{1100} Stampolidis 1994, 87.
\textsuperscript{1101} Fortetsa, 179, 11j. Coldstream 1972, 90, G48: PGB ?. Also cf. a jug from Archanes: Alexiou 1950, 443-444, number 1, pl. AA' number 6, fig. 8 left - Sakellarakis 1987, 64, ΣΓ 379.
mostly on the underside of vases from Attica, Lefkandi, Argos\textsuperscript{1102} and Cos,\textsuperscript{1103} as well as from Agios Georgios,\textsuperscript{1104} Archanes\textsuperscript{1105} and Kavousi.\textsuperscript{1106} The occurrence of this mark on OIN.1 (LPG) and OIN.7 (EG), as well as on the PGB AR.5 and AR.6 that may originate from the same workshop, suggests that the cross might have been the long-lasting emblem of a workshop that either specialised in the production of pouring vessels, or only chose to mark vases of this kind.\textsuperscript{1107} The discovery of OIN.4 and OIN.5 (and OIN.7) inside tomb A1K1 recalls the occurrence of a pair of oinochoai with potter’s marks of a different type in a tomb at Praisos.\textsuperscript{1108}

**LPG:** OIN.1  
**PGB:** OIN.2, OIN.3  
**EG:** OIN.4, OIN.5, OIN.6, OIN.7  
**PAR:** OIN.8

**Aib)** Standard type, large, dark ground oinochoai: nine vases (pl. 19-20).

**Comments**

The shape develops along the lines described in connection with variety Aia oinochoai. Accordingly, most vases are considered PGB (as confirmed by the context of OIN.9, OIN.10), while OIN.17 EG.\textsuperscript{1109} The fragmentary OIN.16 is regarded PGB-EG.

The decorative schemes of these vases are of local inspiration and find no close parallels elsewhere, even though dark ground oinochoai carrying concentric semicircles are common in the PG repertory of various Aegean areas.\textsuperscript{1110} Attic LPG

\textsuperscript{1102} Papadopoulos 1994, 463: the cross is usually set diagonally (X).  
\textsuperscript{1103} Morricone 1978, 120, number 61 (personal inspection); 180, number 19.  
\textsuperscript{1104} Tsipopoulou 1987, 239, Σ 4030 - Tsipopoulou 1992, 150, fig. 3.16. Potter's marks are uncommon on Cretan Iron Age pottery but see: Tsipopoulou 1987, 74. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 140-141, number 86.  
\textsuperscript{1105} Sakellarakis 1986, 45-46, Π.24339.  
\textsuperscript{1106} Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 283, V87.89.  
\textsuperscript{1107} The Knossian bracket ornament (Fortetsa, 179, 11j) is also perhaps related to a specific, Knossian workshop. It occurs on three unguent vases (Fortetsa 430, 431, 482) that come from Fortetsa tomb X and display some correspondences; the former two were further found in the same urn (Fortetsa 428).  
\textsuperscript{1108} Tsipopoulou 1987, 74: oinochoai A.N. 8752 and A.N. 8753.  
\textsuperscript{1109} OIN.17 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 70-71, number 5.  
imports\textsuperscript{1111} inspired the production of similar vases in Knossos,\textsuperscript{1112} Gortyn,\textsuperscript{1113} Kourtes\textsuperscript{1114} and Vrokastro,\textsuperscript{1115} during mostly the LPG-PGB period. Concentric semicircles are also found on MPG-(PGB) light ground oinochoai from Khania,\textsuperscript{1116} Knossos,\textsuperscript{1117} Kourtes,\textsuperscript{1118} Krya\textsuperscript{1119} and the Mitsotakis collection.\textsuperscript{1120} Interestingly, the Cretan dark ground examples rest on a foot, while the light ground ones on a flat base. Hence, the rendering of semicircles on a dark ground, flat-based oinochoe is another Eleuthernian peculiarity. The conical foot of OIN.10 suggests, however, that the local potters/painters were not unaware of developments elsewhere.

The decoration of OIN.9, OIN.15 and OIN.17, which is rendered on grey slip, is almost identical (excluding the adornment of the spout): a band surrounds the base, a pair of slim bands runs on the belly, while a group of three slim and a broad band mark the transition to the shoulder, which displays groups (two on OIN.9, three on OIN.15, OIN.17) of sevenfold semicircles. A band marks the transition to the neck, which carries a wavy line. On these grounds, I assume that the three oinochoai may originate from a single workshop.

Concerning the decoration of the remaining vases, the running spiral of OIN.10 and OIN.12 is paralleled on Knossian PGB-EG oinochoai,\textsuperscript{1121} while the pendent spiral hooks (if correctly identified as such) on the shoulder of OIN.14 are paralleled on Cretan PGB-EG pottery.\textsuperscript{1122} For the loop neck pattern of OIN.16 and the eyes that flank the spout see the comments upon variety Aia oinochoai.

**PGB:** OIN.9, OIN.10, OIN.11, OIN.12, OIN.13, OIN.14, OIN.15

\textsuperscript{1111} See KNC, 342.
\textsuperscript{1112} Fortetsa, 154, type Bii: Fortetsa 443, 1363, 1433. KNC, 342-343, type Aii. Coldstream 2001, 39.
\textsuperscript{1113} Coldstream 2002, 207, 3.4.
\textsuperscript{1114} Alexiou 1966, pl. 165B.
\textsuperscript{1115} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 208, numbers 95-96.
\textsuperscript{1116} Hall 1914, 141, numbers 1-2, pl. XXVII, 4. For number 2 see also: Hayden 2003, 54-55, number 127: LPG-EG.
\textsuperscript{1117} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 22, fig. 2a.
\textsuperscript{1118} KNC, 342, type Ai.
\textsuperscript{1120} Kanta and Davaras 2004, 152-153.
\textsuperscript{1121} Tsipopoulou 1978, 150, 1125.
\textsuperscript{1122} Cf. a pithos from Afrati (Levi 1927-1929, 352-353, fig. 460 - GGP, 255-256, pl. 56a) and a hydria from Knossos (KNC 218.53). The motif also appears on O pottery: Fortetsa 963, KNC 292.60.
**PGB-EG:** OIN.16  
**EG:** OIN.17

Aii) Standard type, small (H ≤ 0.13m.) oinochoai: nine vases (pl. 20, 34a, 62).

**Comments**

The non-elegant forms are typically PG and were succeeded by well-rounded, well-proportioned ones, ovoid at first (OIN.22, OIN.23), and globular later (OIN.24, OIN.26).\(^{1123}\) The conical body of OIN.25 probably represents the latest version of the shape.

The dipping of OIN.18 recalls PG small oinochoai from Knossos and Kourtes,\(^ {1124}\) while its flat base that carries string marks, as well as its neck ridges occur on Knossian MPG-LPG parallels.\(^ {1125}\) The shape and decoration of OIN.19 and OIN.20 find several LPG-EG parallels in Knossos\(^ {1126}\) and Kourtes,\(^ {1127}\) while single vases with almost biconical body come from Episkopi Pedhiados\(^ {1128}\) and Zakros.\(^ {1129}\)

On the other hand, the plump body and rough base of OIN.21 are paralleled on the PGB plain aryballoi AR.40, AR.41, while the shoulder pattern of OIN.22 is a doubled up version of a pattern identified on Knossian PGB-EG oinochoai.\(^ {1130}\) The overall coating of OIN.23 and OIN.24 finds Cretan G\(^ {1131}\) and O\(^ {1132}\) parallels, but the shape and context of the former vase favours the earlier date, while the elegance of the shape of OIN.24 recalls Creto-Cypriot unguent vessels and supports a PAR date.

---

\(^{1123}\) OIN.26 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 28, 44, number 1.  
\(^{1125}\) KNC Q.9, 207.4.  
\(^{1128}\) Hartley 1930-1931, 71, number 26.  
\(^{1129}\) Boardman 1961, 97, number 432.  
\(^{1130}\) Fortetsa 348, 351, see Fortetsa, 174, 6b. Coldstream, Callaghan and Musgrave 1981, 151, number 56. The crosses that flank the spout of OIN.22 find no match.  
\(^{1131}\) Johnston 2000, 206, numbers 48, 55.  
A PAR date is also suggested for OIN.25 and OIN.26; their dipped decoration (and thin red paint), which recalls the larger, PAR OIN.8, is paralleled on a Knossian LO small oinochoe.\footnote{KNC 292.39. Also cf. two 7th century jugs from Kommos: Kommos IV, 237, number 243; 242, number 289. Dipping is commonly identified on Knossian Early Archaic slow-pouring vases (Coldstream and Sackett 1978, 51, numbers 10-11; 56, number 23; 59).}

**LPG:** OIN.18  
**PGB:** OIN.19, OIN.20, OIN.21  
**EG:** OIN.22  
**G:** OIN.23  
**PAR:** OIN.24,  
**PAR-(LAR):** OIN.25  
**LPAR:** OIN.26

### B) CARINATED AND COMPOSITE OINOCHOAI: three vases (pl. 20, 62).

**Comments**

These vases are individual. The shape\footnote{Coldstream 2001, 65.} and the rectilinear decoration\footnote{Cf. the LPG juglet with tripod foot KNC 219.73.} of OIN.27 are paralleled on Knossian LPG pottery;\footnote{OIN.27 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 92-93, number 37 - Stampolidis 2004, 241, number 264.} this date is in agreement with the pale fabric of the vase, which is typical of the LPG pottery from Eleutherna. The composite shape and the decoration of OIN.28\footnote{OIN.28 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 93, number 38 - Stampolidis 2004, 241, number 265.} recall a class of PGB small oinochoai from Knossos\footnote{Fortetsa, 157, type Di (also, Fortetsa 537). KNC, 344, type Civ. Mostly cf. Fortetsa 432, KNC 100.14, 218.82.} and Kourtes.\footnote{Rocchetti 1988-1989, 203-204, numbers 80-81.} Although the form of OIN.29 falls within this spirit,\footnote{Cf. for example a PG vase from Kourtes: Rocchetti 1988-1989, 255, number 231.} the vase may be as late as MG.

**LPG:** OIN.27  
**PGB:** OIN.28  
**PGB-MG:** OIN.29
C) CRETO-CYPRIOT OINOCHOAI: three vases (pl. 21, 63), individually treated. Although their fabric and surface treatment are peculiar for the local standards, these vessels are considered local (for the production of Creto-Cypriot pottery see also Section 4.4).

Comments

The type is Cypriot in origin, but the vases in question are Cretan. Although, Cypriot oinochoai were imported in Eleutherna during the late 9th – early 8th century (I-OIN.1a, I-OIN.2, I-OIN.3), only later were local imitations produced. Creto-Cypriot oinochoai have also turned up at Afrati, East Crete, Knossos and Phaistos.

The various fillings of the circles of OIN.30 are unique, while the central filling of a solid hourglass is only found on Knossian PG pottery. OIN.30 and OIN.32 share the dots that fill the space between pairs of concentric circles and the chevron column below the handle. The former motif is paralleled on Knossian O oinochoai, while the latter occurs on Creto-Cypriot lekythia. Although the decoration of OIN.32 is closely paralleled on a Knossian O Creto-Cypriot jug, its encircled cross finds no match. Circles enclosing a simple cross occur on PAR vases from Eleutherna, including the Creto-Cypriot AR.61, AR.62.

Although the double rib handle of OIN.31 recalls the Cypriot prototypes, its tall neck is a Cretan input. The decoration of this vase finds ample Cretan parallels: the horizontal arrangement of small circles is best matched on two Creto-Cypriot O oinochoai from Afrati and recalls some more elaborate, Knossian LO

---

1141 The fabric of OIN.31 is lighter in colour than the pink-brown one that is commonly found on Eleuthernian pottery, but equally rich in grits.
1142 Levi 1927-1929, 224, fig. 253; 229-230, fig. 261.
1146 Fortetsa, 176, 9al.
1147 Fortetsa, 176, 9v (cf. particularly the Creto-Cypriot oinochoe Fortetsa 1310). Also cf.: Davaras 1968, 141, B3 (jug); KNC 292.195. Dotted patterns are common on Eleuthernian EPAR pottery.
1148 See type Ci1 lekythia in Section 5.3.3.
1149 Davaras 1968, 141, B3.
1151 Levi 1927-1929, 225, fig. 255; 281-282, fig. 357.
vases of this class. The double concentric circles, the inner of which is thicker, as well the groups of lines that are set between bands occur on Knossian O pottery. The outlined cross of the neck is rare on Cretan pottery, but quite popular on Cycladic early 7th century vases. Besides, ornaments were introduced on the neck of Knossian Creto-Cypriot oinochoai during the LG/EO transition.

**LG-EPAR:** OIN.30

**EPAR:** OIN.31, OIN.32

**D) MISCELLANEOUS OINOCHOAI:** two vases (pl. 21, 34a, 62, 64).

**Comments**

The shape of the PGB OIN.33 freely imitates the Attic EG II-MG broad-based oinochoe, which was exported in Knossos. The Eleuthernian vase suggests that the Attic prototype, which proved appealing to several Aegean regions, was not entirely overlooked by the Cretan potters of the late 9th century. Although the shape was imitated in 8th century Knossos, OIN.33 is differentiated from the Knossian vases by its steep shoulder, which is paralleled on a fragmentary Knossian PGB ? broad-based pouring vessel, and white on dark decoration, which is typical of the Eleuthernian LPG-EG pottery. Although the shoulder pattern of OIN.33 finds no match, it resembles a motif on an EO lid from Adromyloi. Its spirit recalls the shoulder pattern of the PGB HYD.4 and the (more elaborate) spiral hook that grows

---

1152 Moignard 1996, 436-437, type Dii.
1153 Fortetsa, 176, 9s.
1157 KNC, 347, type F.
1158 GGP, 14, 17, 22.
1159 KNC, 396-397.
1160 Contrast GGP, 236.
1162 KNC N14.
1163 Droop 1905-1906, fig. 22, bottom right. Tsipopoulou 1987, 39, 143, H 3258.
from the corner of a triangle on the EG NSP.3. The outlined eyes are paralleled on PGB-EG type A oinochoai.

The shape of OIN.34 was probably inspired by metal or clay oinochoai from the Eastern Mediterranean. The shape of OIN.34 was probably inspired by metal or clay oinochoai from the Eastern Mediterranean. Although these vases date mostly to the late 8th or the 7th century, some go back to the 9th, while a 9th – 8th century bronze oinochoe with a ridge on the shoulder turned up in the Idaean Cave. The coating of the Eleuthernian vase favours a PGB-EG date.

PGB: OIN.33
PGB-EG ?: OIN.34

General Comments on the oinochoai
The shape is only amply represented in the LPG-EG period. The body of the larger vessels develops from biconical (LPG) to plump ovoid or globular (PGB), and then to a rounded form with almost flat shoulder (EG). Thereafter, large oinochoai almost disappear and only the introduction of the Creto-Cypriot class partly recompenses for the ‘loss’. Concerning small examples, simple forms with ovoid body at first and globular later, succeeded the varied and non-elegant, PG forms.

Regarding the decoration of the large oinochoai, dark ground examples regularly carry concentric semicircles, a pattern that is rarely found on other local shapes and is altogether missing from light ground oinochoai, which mostly display rectilinear, usually cross-hatched patterns. Although less common, freehand, curvilinear patterns occur on both light and dark ground examples. The early (LPG-EG) small oinochoai that carry patterned decoration are light ground and display rectilinear ornaments, like their large, light ground counterparts. Later examples are normally coated or dipped.

1165 Matthäus 1985, 243.
1166 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 230, number 272 – Matthäus 2000, 270-271, fig. 5 - Matthäus 2000a, 524, fig. 5 - Stampolidis 2003a, 447, number 774.
5.3 CLOSED VESSELS: Slow-Pouring Vessels

5.3.1 Stirrup-Jar

The stirrup-jar is an oil container that owes its name to a peculiar handle attached to a false neck, by which a true mouth is located. The shape was introduced in the MM III period\textsuperscript{1167} and was copied in the Mainland by the LH IIA.\textsuperscript{1168} It was popular in Crete\textsuperscript{1169} and Mycenaean Greece\textsuperscript{1170} during the Late Bronze Age. Despite its demise in all other areas during the Iron Age, the shape survived in Crete until the LPG period.\textsuperscript{1171}

Desborough's survey demonstrated that Iron Age stirrup vases occur in several Cretan sites.\textsuperscript{1172} Since then, several more examples have turned up in Chamaisi,\textsuperscript{1173} Eltyna,\textsuperscript{1174} the Inatos Cave,\textsuperscript{1175} Kavousi,\textsuperscript{1176} Khania,\textsuperscript{1177} Knossos,\textsuperscript{1178} Kourtes,\textsuperscript{1179} Krya,\textsuperscript{1180} Phaistos,\textsuperscript{1181} Phoinikia,\textsuperscript{1182} Vasiliki\textsuperscript{1183} and Vrokastro.\textsuperscript{1184} Only one stirrup jar comes from Eleutherna (pl. 21, 65).

Comments

The fabric of SJ.1 is typical of the local LPG pottery. Its plump ovoid body and concave disc, as well as the triangles that are drawn apart, suggest a MPG or later date.\textsuperscript{1185} The introduction of a central motif between the triangles on the back of the

\textsuperscript{1167} Betancourt 1985, 105. Mountjoy 1993, 42.
\textsuperscript{1168} Mountjoy 1993, 43.
\textsuperscript{1169} Kanta 1980, 244-257.
\textsuperscript{1170} Mountjoy 1993, 41, 71, 80, 90, 97, 109, 114.
\textsuperscript{1171} Coldstream 2001, 40.
\textsuperscript{1172} Desborough 1952, 238-239, 251-269.
\textsuperscript{1173} Tsipopoulou 1987, 343. Tsipopoulou 1997, 459, fig. 3; 461, fig. 4; 467-468, fig. 10-11; 476, fig. 15.
\textsuperscript{1174} Englezou 2004, 429.
\textsuperscript{1175} Papasavvas 2003, 76.
\textsuperscript{1176} Tsipopoulou 1987, 329, 331.
\textsuperscript{1177} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 22.
\textsuperscript{1179} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 176-184.
\textsuperscript{1180} Kanta and Dara 2004, 152.
\textsuperscript{1182} Alexiou 1967, 213, pl. 202a.
\textsuperscript{1183} Tsipopoulou, Vagnetti and Liston 2003, 95, numbers 4-5.
\textsuperscript{1184} Hayden 2003, 36-37, numbers 61-63.
\textsuperscript{1185} Fortetsa, 153. KNC 339. Coldstream 2001, 40.
shoulder connects SJ.1 to the Knossian LPG open-necked stirrup jars. The non-composite, stacked triangles and their fringe edge are best paralleled on Knossian LPG stirrup-jars, while vertical chevrons occur on a Knossian MPG example.

LPG: SJ.1

5.3.2 Lentoid Flasks

The lentoid or pilgrim flask, a baseless unguent vase with flattened body, is Levantine in origin, but was copied in Cyprus and the Aegean. The shape appears in East Crete in the Subminoan-LG period. The Central Cretan vases are LPG-EG, while the West Cretan examples date to the 8th - early 7th century and usually display a trefoil mouth. Two flasks come from Eleutherna (pl. 21, 34a, 66).

Comments

The pale fabric of LF.2 is typical of the local LPG pottery. Both vases recall a Knossian LPG-PGB flask in combining a convex and a flat side, while their air-hole is apparently paralleled only on East Cretan examples.

1186 Coldstream 2001, 42. Also cf. two LPG false-necked examples: Payne 1927-1928, 232, number 2.
1187 Fortetsa 287.
1188 Cf. KNC 175.29.
1189 Cf. the fringed central motif of Payne 1927-1928, 232, number 2.
1190 KNC 219.9.
1194 Although a fragment from a two-handled flask turned up in a Hellenistic house on the Nisi hill and was published as 'Geometric-Archaic' (Kalpaxis, Furtwängler, Schnapp et al. 1994, 80, K4), the parallel cited is Early Hellenistic.
1195 LF.2 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 97-98, number 45 - Stampolidis 2004, 240, number 262.
Two cross-hatched triangles that alternate two triangles filled with diminishing chevrons (LF.1, LF.2) are found on two LPG flasks from Cos.\textsuperscript{1198} The plain zigzag on the outer zone of the circles of LF.2\textsuperscript{1199} and the horizontal strokes on its narrow sides\textsuperscript{1200} occur on Knossian LPG flasks. The dots on the narrow side of LF.1\textsuperscript{1201} recall a Knossian LPG-PGB flask,\textsuperscript{1202} while the pattern of the encircled cross appears on Knossian LPG parallels.\textsuperscript{1203} The swastika of LF.1 occurs on Knossian pottery of mostly the PGB period, as well as on earlier and later Cretan vases.\textsuperscript{1204} The barred handle of LF.1 is paralleled on Knossian LPG-PGB flasks.\textsuperscript{1205}

**LPG: LF.1, LF.2**

5.3.3 *Lekythoi*

The Greek term lekythos, which signifies an oil container, is used here for all unguent vases with tall and narrow neck, narrow mouth and a vertical handle attached well below the lip. Coldstream attributes the birth of the Cretan lekythos to a transformation of the PGB open-necked stirrup jar under the influence of Attic LPG or Phoenician Bichrome prototypes.\textsuperscript{1206}

\textsuperscript{1196} KNC 75.71. Also cf. two flasks from Adromyloi (Droop 1905, 55, number 3215 – Tsipopoulou 1987, 39, 148) and Gavalomouri (Andeadaki-Vlasaki 1987, 320, number 7).

\textsuperscript{1197} Tsipopoulou 1987, 147.


\textsuperscript{1199} Cf. Fortetsa 312. Date after KNC, 365.

\textsuperscript{1200} Cf. KNC 219.16 (LPG), KNC 75.71 (LPG-PGB).

\textsuperscript{1201} LF.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 1990b, 293, pl. 59β.

\textsuperscript{1202} KNC 100.21.

\textsuperscript{1203} Fortetsa 312. KNC 285.30, 219.16, 75.71 (the latter LPG-PGB). The cross is, however, not cross-hatched.

\textsuperscript{1204} Fortetsa, 172, 4ab (=Fortetsa 219, MPG according to Coldstream 2001, 40-41); 169, 1s (PGB); 179, 110 (PGB); 177, 9by (O). KNC Q115 (PGB), 13.10 (PGB), 104.91 (LG). Also: Wide 1897, 241, fig. 10 (G vase from Anopolis). Tsipopoulou 1987, 180-181: LG.

\textsuperscript{1205} KNC 285.30, 100.21. Add a LPG-G flask from Vrokastro: Hayden 2003, 59, number 146.

\textsuperscript{1206} KNC, 351-352. Coldstream 2001, 42.
A) LARGE LEKYTHOI: two vases (a matching pair, pl. 21).

Comments

Despite the larger size of LEK.2, the vases are a matching pair. The pattern of intersecting wavy lines is mostly found on LG-EPAR vases from Eleutherna, as well as on Cretan lekythoi of PGB and LG-EO date. Zones with zigzags occur on Cretan PGB-EG and LG-EO lekythoi. Besides, the white slip and zigzag zones of LEK.1 and LEK.2 recall the decoration of the EPAR AM.25. The bands of the latter vase are, however, carelessly drawn and its zigzags are set between two lines, not pairs of lines.

The large lekythos seems very common in Knossos, but quite rare in the rest of Crete, including Afrati, Gortyn, Kavousi, Kommos, Kourtes and possibly Phaistos. An example from the Psychro Cave is possibly a Knossian import. Although the Eleuthernian potters disregarded the lekythos, imported examples (I-LEK.1, I-LEK.2) occur in Orthi Petra already in the late 9th century.

EPAR: LEK.1, LEK.2

---

1207 See the comments upon type E cups (Section 5.4.4).
1208 I-LEK.2. Fortetsa 654.
1212 Fortetsa, 155, type E. Lebessi 1970, 288, number 67. KNC, 351-352, type A; 355, type D. Moignard 1996, 442, type D.
1213 Levi 1927-1929, 282, fig. 358; 284, fig. 363.
1214 Johannowsky 2002, 65, number 408; 67, number 418.
1215 Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 283, V87.89, V87.84 (the former imported). Mook 2004, 177, fig. 12.12. I believe that the single lekythos that is known from the rest of East Crete (Agios Georgios) is an import, though not necessarily from outside the region: Tsiropoulou 1985, 39, number 4; 44 - Tsiropoulou 1987, 122, AN 1843 (two more lekythoi are included in the latter publication; one of them is, however, fragmentary and is oddly classified as a jug, while the other vase is Knossian).
1216 Kommos IV, 228, number 157; 241, number 286.
1217 Mariani 1901, pl. IX. 14 - Rocchetti 1988-1989, 204, number 84: Rocchetti also mentions a parallel from Prinias.
1219 Watrous 1996, 43, number 129.
1220 Nevertheless, a vase that is currently being restored traces the local production of the shape to the PGB-EG period.
B) LEKYTHIA: eight vases (H: 0.12-0.17m., pl. 21-22, 67).

Comments

The development of the shape is fairly clear. The everted lip and the conical base of the PG-EG examples were replaced by a flaring mouth and a lower base in the EG-EPAR period. The EG period further witnessed the replacement of a handle that is elliptical in section, by one that is rectangular in section. Lastly, the shrinking of the coated area on the lower body is also a MG-EPAR development.

Although the dotted triangles of LEK.3 find no match, they recall two Knossian LPG lekythia, the decoration of which resembles that of some LPG stirrup-jars. Further, the concave sides of the triangles of LEK.3 are particularly reminiscent of the triangular decoration of some stirrup-jars, while its cross-hatched triangles, between which there is a lozenge, recall a few Knossian LPG stirrup-jars. The rendering of the decoration of LEK.4 and LEK.5a in white on dark favours a LPG-EG date. The band with vertical strokes of the former is similarly rendered on the PGB AR.8, while the chevrons of the latter are popular on local MG necked pithoi. Besides, although the carinated body of LEK.5 finds Knossian PGB parallels, its flat base is in favour of a slightly later date in both local and Knossian terms.

The shape of LEK.6, which combines the attachment of the handle to the lip and a conical foot, finds few Cretan PGB parallels. The shoulder pattern of this vase is close to that of a LPG hydria from Knossos and a LG amphora from Adromyloi. On the other hand, the depressed body of LEK.7 is paralleled on Knossian EG lekythia, while its shoulder patterns, particularly the gridded columns and the hatched leaves, also favour an EG date. Although circle

1221 In Knossos, the conical foot was replaced by a flat base after the PGB period (KNC, 352-353, type B).
1223 KNC 218.67, Q31 (see KNC 352).
1224 Fortetsa 141. KNC D1.
1225 Fortetsa 371. KNC, 352, type B (carinated variants).
1226 KNC, 352-353.
1228 Fortetsa 1483 (Fortetsa, 170-171, 3z).
1229 Tsipopoulou 1987, 99, H3181: an earlier date is more probable for this vase.
1230 KNC, 352.
1231 Fortetsa, 168, 1-1: LPG-MG.
patterns with radiating strokes were introduced on Cretan pottery during the EG period.\textsuperscript{1233} LEK.8 is considered MG on the basis of its shape and chevron columns, the apex of which faces down.\textsuperscript{1234} The neck pattern of a zigzag that is traversed by a line is best paralleled on a MG oinochoe from Knossos\textsuperscript{1235} and a LPG-EG hydria from Vrokastro.\textsuperscript{1236} Lastly, a Knossian EO lekythion\textsuperscript{1237} is close to LEK.9 in terms of height and shape (including the shape of the base). The shoulder pattern of LEK.9 occurs on Knossian PGB (?)\textsuperscript{1238} and MG\textsuperscript{1239} vases, while loop patterns generally appear on Knossian LG-O pottery.\textsuperscript{1240}

The barred handle of most of these vases is paralleled on Knossian lekythia.\textsuperscript{1241}

Interestingly, the Knossian standard type lekythia probably do not outlast the EG period.\textsuperscript{1242} Similar vases from Archanes,\textsuperscript{1243} Kommos,\textsuperscript{1244} Kourtes,\textsuperscript{1245} Phaistos\textsuperscript{1246} and Prinias\textsuperscript{1247} are mostly assigned to the PGB period.

LPG: LEK.3

PGB-EG: LEK.4

PGB-MG: LEK.5

EG: LEK.5a, LEK.6, LEK.7

MG: LEK.8

EPAR: LEK.9

\textsuperscript{1232} Vertical hatched leaves occur on the PGB oinochoe KNC 283.38 and the PGB-EG oinochoe KNC D31, while horizontal hatched leaves appear on the EG pithos KNC 306.25. Vertical and horizontal hatched leaves occur on the EG amphora KNC 283.59.

\textsuperscript{1233} GGP, 257. Coldstream 2001, 66: circles with billets.

\textsuperscript{1234} The pattern occurs on the MG neckless pithoi Fortetsa 452, 530.

\textsuperscript{1235} Fortetsa 614 (for the date see Coldstream 1972, 89, G27). The pattern also occurs on a Knossian LPG pyxis (KNC 287.27) and an EG lid (Coldstream 1972, 89, G27).

\textsuperscript{1236} Hall 1914, 164, pl. XXVII, 3 - Hayden 2003, 52, number 117. 

\textsuperscript{1237} KNC 218.15.

\textsuperscript{1238} Fortetsa 523 (Fortetsa, 170, 3v).

\textsuperscript{1239} KNC 107.77.

\textsuperscript{1240} Fortetsa, 181, 13k. Coldstream 2001, 68-69.

\textsuperscript{1241} Fortetsa, 157, types Aii-Aiii. KNC, 352, type B.

\textsuperscript{1242} Payne 1927-1928, 251, number 86. Fortetsa, 157, types Aii-Aiii. Hood and Boardman 1961, 73, number 12. KNC, 352, type B, particularly footnote 181.

\textsuperscript{1243} Alexiou 1950, 442, pl. AA', numbers 4, 7 - Sakellarakis 1987, 58-59, ΣΓ 380, ΣΓ 385.

\textsuperscript{1244} Kommos IV, 223, number 96.

\textsuperscript{1245} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 193, number 46.

\textsuperscript{1246} Rocchetti 1967-1968, 190, 192, number 34.

\textsuperscript{1247} Rizza 1973, pl. 75α-right.
C) CRETO-CYPRIOT LEKYTHIA: Although their fabric and surface treatment are peculiar for the local standards, these vessels are considered local (for the production of Creto-Cypriot pottery see also Section 4.4). The plentiful sherds from variety Ciii lekythia identified in Orthi Petra support the local origins of (at least) this variety.

Ci) Early copies of Cypriot lekythia: three vases (pl. 22, 67).

Comments
These vases loosely imitate Cypriot Black on Red prototypes, the profile of which is quite different, however.\(^\text{1248}\) The shape of Rhodian,\(^\text{1249}\) Central Cretan\(^\text{1250}\) and other Eleuthemian (variety Cii) imitations of Cypriot prototypes is also different to that of the three aforementioned examples. If the body profile is not an invention of the Cretan potter and originates from Cyprus, it should be traced back to some White Painted I slow-pouring vessels.\(^\text{1251}\) Besides, the pair of ridges on the neck of LEK.10 and LEK.11 finds no parallel and the lack of groups of concentric circles on the shoulder or side circles intersected by horizontal lines is uncommon. Some of the earliest Knossian Creto-Cypriot lekythia, however, also display idiosyncratic trends.\(^\text{1252}\) As in the case of those Knossian vases, the three lekythia from Eleutherna are attributed to a particular workshop, if not a single potter/painter.

PGB: LEK.10, LEK.11, LEK.12

Ciii) Close copies of Cypriot lekythia: three vases (pl. 22, 68).

\(^{1248}\) See for example: KNC, 407. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 170-172, numbers 154-160.


\(^{1251}\) Cf. for example Karageorghis 1983, T.44: numbers 26, 47, 51; T.51: numbers 15, 35; T.67: numbers 37, 52, 128-129; T.84: numbers 3, 10, 16; T.85: numbers 38, 41, 48. I owe this remark to Professor Iacovou.

\(^{1252}\) Coldstream 1984, 134-135, numbers 62-68 - KNC, 353, type Ci.
Comments

The lekythia of this variety imitate imported, one-handed or two-handled, Cypriot Black on Red prototypes that are well represented in Knossos. The rounded shoulder of LEK.15 recalls CG III and CG III/CA I globular prototypes. Accordingly, LEK.13 that has a rounded shoulder is earlier than LEK.14, the shoulder of which is flattened; this is confirmed by the context of the pair.

Two-handled Creto-Cypriot lekythia are rare; only two vases are known from Knossos and Ligortino. In contrast, one-handed vases are common and the shape and the decoration (even the dimensions) of LEK.13 and LEK.14 are matched on Knossian examples. Although these two vases are close copies of Cypriot originals, their flat base that is surrounded by a band and their light ground surface confirm that they were produced in Crete. Also, the Cypriot originals are usually shorter than 0.10m., while the Creto-Cypriot vases are generally taller than 0.11m. Moreover, the broad neck of LEK.14 is at odds with the narrow-necked Cypriot examples. Lastly, an unnoticed decorative detail perhaps distinguishes the close copies from the originals: the latter carry a slim band below and above the neck ridge, as well as a band between the ridge and the rim; the latter band is, however, missing from the Creto-Cypriot series.

---

1255 LEK.15 is discussed in: Anatoliki Mesogeios 1998, 170, number 152 (see also the comments in pages 122-124, 167-170, for numbers 143-153) - Stampolidis 2003a, 258, number 139 (see also the comments in pages 257-258, for numbers 133-140).
1256 Karageorgis 1983, T. 62: number 96, T. 75: number 42, T. 81, numbers 68, 90. During the CA I period, the shoulder of the Cypriot two-handled lekythia is rather flattened and a biconical body is developed: Coldstream 1984, 129. KNC, 407-408. Cf. Fortetsa 1411, KNC 292.244.
1257 Coldstream 1984, 132. KNC, 354.
1258 KNC 292.202: MG-LG.
1259 Anatoliki Mesogeios 1998, number 153: LG.
1260 Coldstream 1984, 131-133, numbers 38-52 (particularly numbers 38-39) - KNC, 407, particularly KNC 218.41, 219.56.
1261 See: Coldstream 1984, 132. KNC, 353.
1262 Coldstream 1984, 131. Cypriot lekythia taller than 0.11m. are rare, but see Karageorghis 1983, T.75: numbers 3, 15, 18.
1263 Contrast, for example, the Cypriot and Creto-Cypriot lekythia listed in: Coldstream 1984, 130, fig. 2, pl. 25. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 170-174, numbers 154-166.
The second neck ridge of LEK.13 is peculiar, given that the Cypriot prototypes and their Cretan imitations only carry one. It probably served as an extra reinforcement for the elegant neck of the vase. An alternative hypothesis attributes the ridge to a misunderstanding of the Cretan potter/painter: as already stated, the neck ridge of the Cypriot prototypes carries one or two bands, but another band runs higher; the Cretan potter/painter perhaps mistook the upper band of the Cypriot vases for a second ridge.

PGB: LEK.13  
EG-MG: LEK.14  
MG: LEK.15

Ciii) Evolved copies of Cypriot lekythia: six vases (pl. 22, 69).

Comments
Leaving aside LEK.19, which is individual, the development of the shape is revealed by a comparison of the pair from trench 4A/3M (LG) to LEK.21 (EPAR). The body gradually grows plumper, while the shoulder is slender in the LG (LEK.16, LEK.17, LEK.18) and pronounced in the EPAR (LEK.20, LEK.21) period. The everted lip develops from short (LEK.16) to broad (LEK.17) during the LG period and is replaced by a broad, flat lip in the EPAR (LEK.21). The LG ring base (LEK.16, LEK.17) grows higher (LEK.20) and becomes disc-shaped in the ripe EPAR period (LEK.21). The round handle that is attached to the neck ridge of the LG vases (LEK.16, LEK.17, LEK.18) is replaced by a handle that is elliptical in section and is attached to just below the ridge (LEK.21). Accordingly, LEK.16, LEK.17, LEK.18 are considered LG, while LEK.20 and LEK.21 EPAR (the former perhaps early). LEK.19, which combines early (everted lip, low base) and late (a handle that is attached below the neck ridge and is elliptical in section) features, is a transitional piece, as confirmed by context.

---

1265 LEK.21 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 47-48, number 10.
Although the pair from trench 4A/3M is not a matching one (the form of the body and the lip, as well as the decoration, are not identical and LEK.17 seems slightly earlier), the single dot both vases carry on their front and/or back side favour their attribution to a single workshop.

Creto-Cypriot lekythia with side circles and small circles or chevrons on the front and the back have been discovered in Afrati, Agia Triadha, Agies Paraskies, Episkopi Pedhiados, Kavousi, Knossos, Kommos, Ligortino, Phaistos, Prinias, the Psychro Cave and Sybrita. The thicker outer circle of LEK.20 and LEK.21 suggests an EPAR date. The row of numerous densely spaced circles LEK.19 displays finds no match, despite the occurrence of circles on the shoulder of some Creto-Cypriot O lekythia.

LG: LEK.16, LEK.17, LEK.18
LG-late: LEK.19
EPAR: LEK.20, LEK.21

---

1266 Although chevrons are mostly found on LG and circles on EO parallels from Knossos (Fortetsa, 158-159, type Eiii. Coldstream 1984, 135-136, numbers 69-75. KNC, 354-355, type Civ. Moignard 1996, 440-441, type A. Coldstream 2001, 42), no such pattern is identifiable in the Eleuthemian series. Other motifs are uncommon.

1267 Levi 1927-1929, 107, fig. 84; 301, fig. 399-400. Boardman 1961, 99, number 452.

1268 Palermo 2003, 280.


1270 Hartley 1930-1931, 71, number 28.

1271 Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 283, V87.69.


1273 Kommos IV, 242, number 290.

1274 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 174, number 167.

1275 Rocchetti 1975-1975, 219, Re.7. La Rosa 2002, 673, fig. 313.

1276 Rizza 1973, pl. 75a-centre. Rizza e Rizzo 1984, 251, number 471.


1279 Rocchetti e D’Agata 1999, 220, fig. 9.


1281 Cf., however, Levi 1927-1929, 410, fig. 529, as well as the EPAR OIN.31.

General comments on the Creto-Cypriot lekythia

Although no Cypriot juglet has yet been discovered in Eleutherna, the earliest attestation of Creto-Cypriot lekythia (in the late 9th century) coincides with the arrival of the earliest imports from Cyprus (the Black on Red I-OIN.2, but also I-OIN.1a). The early, type Ci lekythia are idiosyncratic, find no close Cypriot or Aegean parallels and are attributed to a single workshop. Closer copies of the Cypriot prototypes were soon introduced, while East Greek copies of Cypriot examples arrived (I-LEK.4). By the late 8th – early 7th century, however, the early forms had been displaced by the evolved variety, which proved popular throughout Crete.

5.3.4 Aryballoi

The aryballos is a small, normally flat-based pouring vessel with a single handle arching from the shoulder to the rim or just below.

A) EARLY DECORATED ARYBALLOI: seven vases with tall neck and triangular decoration on the shoulder (pl. 22).

Comments

Despite the considerable variety in body profiles, which cannot be taken to represent differences in date, these early versions of the shape are fairly similar. This evidence, as well as the context of the group from trench A suggest that all type A aryballoi date from a single phase, the PGB. Besides, the parallels from Knossos, Kommos and Papoura are mostly PGB. The simple chevrons of AR.1 and the composite ones of AR.3 and AR.4 find Knossian PGB parallels, while pendent solid triangles (AR.2, AR.5, AR.6) occur on Knossian PGB-MG pottery.

1283 Fortetsa, 157, type Aiv. KNC, 356, type Aii.
1284 Kommos IV, 227-228, number 153.
1286 KNC Q16.
1287 KNC Q32, 283.79-80.
1288 Fortetsa, 171, 4a.
particularly on PGB small oinochoai.\textsuperscript{1289} The outlined chevrons of AR.7 find no parallel, but fit in the same repertory.

The profile of the body, the shoulder pattern and the cross on the base of AR.5 and AR.6 suggest that the pair comes from a single workshop. Given that the cross, which is considered a potter’s mark, also occurs on the base of some local LPG and EG oinochoai (see the comments upon type Aia oinochoai in Section 5.2.3), the oinochoai and the aryballoi probably originate from a particular workshop.

**PGB**: AR.1, AR.2, AR.3, AR.4, AR.5, AR.6, AR.7

**B) DECORATED ARYBALLOI**: seventeen vases (mostly post-PG aryballoi with varied decoration, pl. 23).

*Comments*

Although the profile of the body displays no consistent development, the flattened shoulder appears quite common on MG (AR.12, AR.13) and EPAR (AR.21, AR.23) vases. The profile of the neck and lip, however, seems more important in terms of dating: the tall neck and broad, everted lip of the earliest, PGB form (AR.8), was replaced by a shorter (occasionally really short) neck that rose to a flaring mouth during the EG-MG period (AR.10, AR.11, AR.12, AR.13, AR.14). The height of the neck seems modest during the LG phase, when a narrow, everted lip (AR.16, AR.17,\textsuperscript{1290} AR.18) was introduced. During the EPAR period, the neck grew taller and the lip, whether everted (AR.19, AR.23)\textsuperscript{1291} or flat (AR.20, AR.21, AR.22),\textsuperscript{1292} became really broad. Interestingly, the small aryballoi are mostly LG-EPAR (AR.12 is, however, MG).

The decoration offers some more evidence for dating. The white on dark style and the adornment of the neck occur on PGB-EG and EPAR vases (the early vases

\textsuperscript{1289} KNC D30 (PGB-EG), G23, 285.146. Also cf.: Rocchetti 1988-1989, 210, number 102 (Kourtes). Johnston 2000, 206, number 49 (Kommos).

\textsuperscript{1290} AR.17 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 69, number 56 – Stampolidis 2004, 267, number 319.

\textsuperscript{1291} AR.23 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 51, number 17.

\textsuperscript{1292} AR.20, AR.21 and AR.22 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 1996, 47-48, numbers 9, 11, 12.
prefer a wavy line on the neck, while the EPAR ones one or more bands). Also, the combination of a horizontal and a vertical pattern on the shoulder is popular in the MG-EPAR period (AR.13, AR.15, AR.17, AR.24), while the adornment of the upper side of the lip is limited to LG-EPAR vases (AR.17, AR.18, AR.19, AR.20, AR.21).

The white on dark decoration of AR.8, AR.9, AR.10 and AR.11 favours a LPG-EG date. The concentric semicircle pattern of AR.8, however, which is otherwise rare on local vases other than oinochoai and unparalleled on Cretan small, unguent vases, is probably inspired by Mainland PG lekythoi;\textsuperscript{1293} the closest parallel for the linked semicircles is found on a Knossian LPG hydria,\textsuperscript{1294} while the band with strokes occurs on the PGB-EG LEK.4. The rendering of rows of loops in white on dark (AR.9) is paralleled on PGB-EG pottery from Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{1295} The context of AR.10 and the shape of AR.11 favour an EG date; their patterns, however, occur on pottery from various periods. This excludes the row of dots that is rendered on the dark ground of AR.10 and a Knossian PGB bell skyphos.\textsuperscript{1296}

AR.14, the motif of which adorns Knossian small pouring vessels throughout of PGB-O date,\textsuperscript{1297} is considered EG on the evidence of shape. The shape and the gridded columns\textsuperscript{1298} of AR.12 suggest a MG or earlier date, while its decorative syntax foreshadows the introduction of metopes on LG-EO aryballoi. The vertical row of chevrons that occurs on this vase, as well as on AR.13 and AR.15, is mostly found on Cretan LG-EO Creto-Cypriot slow-pouring vessels,\textsuperscript{1299} but probably goes back to the MG period.\textsuperscript{1300} Lastly, although AR.13 carries a band with diagonal hatching, which is paralleled on Knossian O vases,\textsuperscript{1301} is considered MG on the basis of its shape.

\textsuperscript{1293} Lemos 2002, 72-74. An Attic LPG lekythos that reached Knossos (Fortetsa 76) carries triangles.
\textsuperscript{1294} KNC 283.92. Also cf. the linked circles of the LPG KNC O 37.
\textsuperscript{1295} See the comments upon type Ai necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2), but note that pendent loops survived on type A jugs (Section 5.2.2) throughout the PGB-EPAR period.
\textsuperscript{1296} KNC D6.
\textsuperscript{1297} Fortetsa, 168, 1b, 1e.
\textsuperscript{1298} For the pattern see the comments upon the EG LEK.7 in Section 5.3.3.
\textsuperscript{1299} See, for example, the comments upon type Ciii lekythia (Section 5.3.3).
\textsuperscript{1300} The chevrons of the Creto-Cypriot vases are of Cretan (not Cypriot) inspiration and perhaps derive from a Cretan MG tradition that is not represented in Knossos. Also cf.: Platon 1945-1947, 91, fig. 17, pattern 46. Kommos IV, 227, 152 (late 9\textsuperscript{th} century ?); 237, number 246 (early 7\textsuperscript{th} century). Johannowsky 2002, 69, number 437a (7\textsuperscript{th} century).
\textsuperscript{1301} Fortetsa, 169, 2b.
AR.15 and AR.24 come from the same context, display similar fabric and slip and should probably be assigned to a single workshop. Although, however, the vertical row of chevrons of AR.15 recalls the MG AR.12 and AR.13, the lozenge pattern of AR.24 is considered EPAR.\textsuperscript{1302} AR.24 also carries a row of S's, a pattern that is rare on Cretan small, slow-pouring vases and favours an early 7\textsuperscript{th} century date.\textsuperscript{1303}

Although the patterns of AR.18\textsuperscript{1304} and AR.19 are almost identical, the profile suggests a LG date for the former and an EPAR one for the latter. Their zigzag metopes are highly uncommon on Cretan aryballoi,\textsuperscript{1305} the circles recall the Creto-Cypriot aryballoi of variety Ei, while the herringbone pattern of AR.18 is found on Knossian G pottery.\textsuperscript{1306} The decoration (including the white slip, the syntax and the patterns) of the latter vase is closely paralleled on the LG-EPAR PY.18 and PY.19. Although the connection is examined in Section 5.1.5, I repeat that all three vases are attributed to a single workshop and are assigned to the LG-EPAR period.

The shape of AR.16 favours a LG date, while its shoulder motif (if correctly identified as a row of dotted loops) is rendered as a scale pattern on East Cretan LG-EO pottery.\textsuperscript{1307} The triple W on the shoulder of AR.17 is paralleled on a 7\textsuperscript{th} century small, pouring vessel from Gortyn\textsuperscript{1308} and its combination with a leaf recalls a Knossian LG pattern.\textsuperscript{1309} The leaf with midrib is found on Knossian LG-O pottery.\textsuperscript{1310} The shape and the decoration (excluding the intersecting wavy lines, which occur on local LG-EPAR pottery)\textsuperscript{1311} of AR.22 strongly recall the Rhodian, 'spaghetti ware' aryballoi that turned up close to it, in an EPAR pyre.\textsuperscript{1312} The EPAR date of AR.23, which also comes from the pyre in question, is suggested by the

\textsuperscript{1302} See the comments upon the EPAR NDP.57, NDP.58 (Section 5.1.2), CU.200 (Section 5.4.4).
\textsuperscript{1303} Cf.: Levi 1927-1929, 436, fig. 583, second row, third vase. KNC 75.87.
\textsuperscript{1304} AR.18 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 96-97, number 44 - Stampolidis 2004, 242, number 266.
\textsuperscript{1305} Cf. the EO aryballos Gesell, Coulson and Day 1991, 175, fig. 13.2 - Mook 1993, 236, P2.176 - Mook 2004, 177, fig. 12.12.J.
\textsuperscript{1306} Fortetsa, 174, 6k, cf. particularly the G aryballos Fortetsa 787. Also cf. Levi 1927-1929, 370-371, fig. 487 (perhaps LG).
\textsuperscript{1307} Tsipopoulou 1987, 208-209, 12\textsuperscript{a}. Also cf. the O aryballos Fortetsa 1338.
\textsuperscript{1308} Johannowsky 2002, 69, number 437.
\textsuperscript{1309} Fortetsa, 180, 12g.
\textsuperscript{1310} Fortetsa, 180, 12k.
\textsuperscript{1311} See the comments upon type E cups (Section 5.4.4).
\textsuperscript{1312} Stampolidis 1996, 50, numbers 15-16.
horizontal row of chevrons it carries.\textsuperscript{1313} Besides, zones with groups of vertical strokes occur on local MG-EPAR vases.\textsuperscript{1314}

AR.20 and AR.21 represent the EPAR revival of white on dark decoration, which also occurs on EPAR necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2, type D). Only a few small unguent vases with such decoration are known from early 7\textsuperscript{th} century Crete.\textsuperscript{1315} The horizontal row of dots\textsuperscript{1316} and the dotted rosette\textsuperscript{1317} of AR.21 support an EPAR date, given that dotted patterns are common on Eleuthernian EPAR pottery. The pendent motif of AR.20 fits in the Cretan O repertory.\textsuperscript{1318}

PGB: AR.8
PGB-EG: AR.9
EG: AR.10, AR.11
MG: AR.12, AR.13, AR.14
MG-EPAR: AR.15
LG: AR.16, AR.17, AR.18
EPAR: AR.19, AR.20, AR.21, AR.22, AR.23, AR.24

C) \textbf{COATED ARYBALLOI:} twelve vases (pl. 23, 34a, 70).

Comments

A LPG date is probable for the ill-shaped AR.25. The PGB form (AR.26, AR.27) is characterised by a well-rounded body, an everted lip and a distinct base. The EG-MG period (AR.29, AR.30, AR.31) witnesses a number of changes: the flaring mouth is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1313} For the pattern see the comments upon type D necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2) and cf. the Cretan O aryballoï: Levi 1927-1929, 334, fig. 439. Fortetsa 967, 1268.
\item \textsuperscript{1314} See the comments upon the MG NDP.27 (Section 5.1.2) and cf. a LG-late aryballos from Agios Georgios: Tsipopoulou 1987, 124, A.N. 2390.
\item \textsuperscript{1315} Fortetsa, 158, type Dii (Knossos). Boardman 1961, 57, number 242 (Psychro Cave). Also cf. I-LEK.8.
\item \textsuperscript{1316} Fortetsa, 178, 9cj. Also cf. KNC 14.6, 19.11, 26.8-9.
\item \textsuperscript{1318} Cf. KNC 26.10.
\end{itemize}
introduced,\textsuperscript{1319} the base becomes flat and the shoulder is usually flattened. AR.28, however, recalls the PGB AR.27 in preserving the everted lip and a handle that is attached just below it. In contrast, the shape of the MG AR.33 foreshadows the LG- PAR well-rounded, elegant aryballoi with flaring mouth (AR.34, AR.35). The shape of AR.36, which is entirely indebted to the PC conical aryballos that was reaching Eleutherna (see Section 6.2.1), endorses an advanced 7\textsuperscript{th} century date.\textsuperscript{1320}

Although coated aryballoi are common in Cretan O contexts,\textsuperscript{1321} they seem rare in earlier times.\textsuperscript{1322}

**LPG-PGB**: AR.25  
**PGB**: AR.26, AR.27  
**EG**: AR.28  
**EG-MG**: AR.29, AR.30, AR.31  
**MG**: AR.32, AR.33  
**LG-PAR**: AR.34, AR.35  
**EPAR-middle/late**: AR.36

**D) PLAIN ARYBALLOI**: The plain aryballoi from Eleutherna are divided according to size.

**Di) The plain jug-aryballos**\textsuperscript{1323} (H: 0.135-0.165m.): three vases (pl. 24, 71).

*Comments*

All three vases come from tomb A1K1: AR.37, AR.38 were found at a level that favours a PGB date, while AR.39 was discovered slightly higher. The plump body of

\textsuperscript{1319} The fusion between the everted lip and the flaring mouth (AR.30, AR.31) is typical of this phase and perhaps favours an EG date (the rough base of AR.30 also supports such a date). In contrast, the truly flaring mouth of AR.33 is a MG characteristic, paralleled on decorated aryballoi like AR.33.

\textsuperscript{1320} For the absolute chronology of the Corinthian conical aryballos see Neeft 1987, 380.


\textsuperscript{1322} Only two G examples are known from the Knossos North Cemetery (KNC, 442, type Ai), a PGB-MG one from Smari (Hadji-Vallianou and Efthimiou 2000, 540: with tall neck) and a LG one from Kavousi (Gesell, Coulson and Day 1991, 172, K88.52) and Mastabas in Herakleion (Lebessi 1970, 277, number 20).

\textsuperscript{1323} The shape is called a jug-aryballos due to its large size and tall neck.
the latter vase seems to represent the EG version of this type. Jug-aryballoi (often plain) have been located in Knossos,\textsuperscript{1324} occasionally within libation sets.

**PGB:** AR.37, AR.38  
**EG:** AR.39

\section{Large}  
(H: 0.095-0.105m.) plain aryballoi: five vases (pl. 24, 71).

**Comments**  
The development of the shape is clear. The PGB handmade form, which follows a Corinthian prototype represented in Eleutherna by I-AR.1, is characterised by a plump body, an everted lip and a rough base (AR.40, AR.41).\textsuperscript{1325} In the G period, however, a wheelmade, better-articulated shape with flaring mouth and flat base is introduced. The surface is now self-slipped. The nearly flat shoulder distinguishes the earlier G vases (AR.42, AR.43) from the truly rounded later ones (AR.44).

As already noted, Corinthian handmade prototypes like I-AR.1 stimulated the production of plain aryballoi in Eleutherna, as well as in Knossos,\textsuperscript{1326} during the PGB period. A few plain aryballoi of mostly late date have turned up in Archanes,\textsuperscript{1327} East Crete,\textsuperscript{1328} Episkopi Pedhiados\textsuperscript{1329} and Kommos.\textsuperscript{1330}

**PGB:** AR.40, AR.41  
**EG-MG:** AR.42, AR.43  
**MG-LG:** AR.44

\textsuperscript{1324} Fortetsa, 157, types II.Ai, II.Aiv, II.Bi. KNC, 356, type Ai.  
\textsuperscript{1325} Parallels come from Knossos (KNC Q20, 13.8: PGB) and Kourtes (Rocchetti 1988-1989, 210, A101). Handmade aryballoi with micaceous clay, squat globular body, rough base and flat handle, were produced in Attica throughout the G-Archaic period (cf. for example: Young 1951, 89, A5-2).  
\textsuperscript{1326} Fortetsa, 158, type Di. KNC, 357, type B. Coldstream 2001, 44.  
\textsuperscript{1327} Sakellarakis 1986, 46-47, Π.24331.  
\textsuperscript{1328} Tsipoupolou 1987, 125, group δ. Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 296, V87.92.  
\textsuperscript{1329} Hartley 1930-1931, 71, number 24.  
\textsuperscript{1330} Kommos IV, 248, number 376. Johnston 2000, 205, number 46.
Diii) Small (H: 0.054-0.08 m.) plain aryballoi: twelve vases (pl. 24, 71).

Comments
Although the PGB AR.45, perhaps the earliest of these vases, is handmade and rests on a rough base, wheelmade versions appeared already in the PGB period and prevailed thereafter. Walls that taper towards the base and a tall neck with everted lip distinguish the PGB wheelmade vases (AR.46, AR.47). From the G period onwards, however, the lower body is rounded. Also, the neck of the G plain aryballoi (AR.48, AR.49, AR.50, AR.52, AR.53)\(^{1331}\) is shorter than that of their PGB predecessors and a flaring mouth replaces the everted lip. The everted lip and the tall neck revive, however, in the EPAR period (AR.54, AR.55).\(^{1332}\) AR.56, which is distinguished by its gritty fabric and non self-slipped surface, is probably LPAR. The date of the fragmentary AR.51 is uncertain.

For the origins of the type, as well as for parallels from elsewhere in Crete see the comments upon variety Dii aryballoi.

**PGB**: AR.45, AR.46, AR.47

**EG**: AR.48

**G**: AR.49, AR.50

**G-EPAR**: AR.51

**LG**: AR.52, AR.53

**EPAR**: AR.54, AR.55

**LPAR ?**: AR.56

**General Comments on the plain aryballoi**
The plain jug-aryballos is a Cretan forerunner of the true aryballos and did not outlast the 9th century. The earliest plain aryballos from Eleutherna was, however, influenced by Corinthian prototypes, as the handmade AR.40, AR.41, AR.45 suggest. A preference for wheelmade plain aryballoi with self-slipped surface emerged, however, already in the PGB period and prevailed thereafter. The PGB

---

\(^{1331}\) AR.53 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 68, number 54 – Stampolidis 2004, 267, number 318.

\(^{1332}\) The move for the revival of the everted lip is identifiable on the form of the flaring mouth of the LG-late AR.53.
vases are characterised by an everted lip, the G examples by a flaring mouth, while
the EPAR ones by an intermediate form of lip. The body profile is also significant in
terms of dating. In Knossos, the only other Cretan site that has produced a series of
plain aryballoi, the development of the shape generally involves the replacement of a
depressed body and a flaring mouth by a truly globular body and an everted lip.  

E) CRETO-CYPRIOT ARYBALLOI: six vases, divided in two varieties,
according to their Creto-Cypriot lekythion prototypes. Although their fabric and
surface treatment are peculiar for the local standards (this excludes AR.61, AR.62),
these vessels are considered local (for the production of Creto-Cypriot pottery see
also Section 4.4).

Ei) Creto-Cypriot aryballoi following type Cii lekythia: three vases (pl. 24).

Comments
The three vases should probably be attributed to a specific workshop, despite the
variety in body profiles. Their decoration is indebted to the Creto-Cypriot type Cii
lekythia (Section 5.3.3). Aryballoi of this variety are commonly found in Central
Crete, including Afrati, Agies Paraskies, Gortyn, Knossos, Kommos, Phaistos,
the Psychro Cave and Rhytion. Several examples come from

---

1333 KNC, 357, type B. Coldstream 2001, 44.
1334 AR.57, AR.59 and AR.58 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 1996, 65-66, numbers 47-49 –
1335 By originating from a single pyre and displaying different profiles, these aryballoi question
Moignard’s impression of a linear development of the shape of their Knossian counterparts (Moignard
1996, 444, type Bii).
1336 Levi 1927-1929, 107, fig. 83; 142, fig. 136; 167, fig. 181; 169, fig. 185, 187; 214, fig. 239; 244,
fig. 288; 281, fig. 356; 283, fig. 368; 294, fig. 383; 332, fig. 433; 334, fig. 437-438; 347, fig. 453; 357,
fig. 468; 411-415, fig. 534-535, 539, 545.
1337 Platon 1945-1947, 65, numbers 92-94.
1339 Fortetsa, 157, type Bii. Moignard 1996, 444, type Bii. See also the comments in KNC, 358, type D
(the reference to O aryballoi type Cii is incorrect; type Bii is intended).
1340 Kommos IV, 235, number 224; 237, number 245; 242, numbers 291-292.
1343 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 180, number 181; numbers 178-180, 182 are included in other references
cited here.
Kavousi and Vrokastro, while single finds have turned up elsewhere in East Crete. A few similar vases are found in the Museum of Cassel and the Goulandris Museum. Interestingly, this variety was introduced to Cyprus from the Aegean during the CA I period.

**LG:** AR.57, AR.58, AR.59

**Eii) Creto-Cypriot aryballoi following type Ciii lekythia: three vases (pl. 24).**

**Comments**

The decoration of these aryballoi (especially the side circles) is indebted to the Creto-Cypriot lekythia of type Ciii (Section 5.3.3). The shape advances from a form that recalls the aforementioned lekythia (AR.60) towards that of a true aryballos (AR.62), with AR.61 lying in between.

Although the pattern on the front side of AR.60 finds no match, a band with vertical strokes appears on both AR.60 and AR.61. The latter vase shares with AR.62 the side-circles that enclose a cross and the vertical row of chevrons. The former pattern, which occurs on local EPAR vases, was introduced in the Knossian repertory at the end of the LG period and finds close parallels on pottery from Afrati. The latter pattern is discussed in connection with the Creto-Cypriot lekythia of type Ciii. Concerning the remaining motifs of AR.61, the vertical

---

1344 Tsipopoulou 1985, 37, number 8 (more examples reported); 44: a (add pl. X.20) - Tsipopoulou 1987, 124, H 719-720: H 719 is mis-spelled H 714 on pl. 23. Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 283, fig. 2.3-4. Coulson, Haggis, Mook and Tobin 1997, 331, fig. 11.7.
1345 Hayden 2003, 73-74, numbers 204-205: more examples are reported, but some of those cited are lekythia.
1347 Gercke 1983, 484-485, numbers 8-10.
1348 Marangou 1985, 67-68, numbers 84-85.
1350 AR.60 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 66-67, number 50 – Stampolidis 2004, 268, number 323.
1351 The pattern occurs on Knossian pottery almost throughout the Iron Age (Fortetsa, 168, 1b).
1352 AM.24, NDP.50; also cf. the EG NDP.19.
1353 KNC, 389. Fortetsa, 177, 9aw.
1354 Levi 1927-1929, 182, fig. 20; 201, fig. 222.
row of S’s occurs on Knossian G vases,\textsuperscript{1355} while the tongues are paralleled on a Knossian LG aryballos.\textsuperscript{1356} The solid triangle, from the base of which vertical lines grow, is probably a comb,\textsuperscript{1357} a pattern that is Cypriot in origin, appears in Crete during the late 10\textsuperscript{th} century and becomes quite popular in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} – early 7\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1358} Turning to the remaining patterns of AR.62, the zigzags, which are quite common on Knossian O aryballoi,\textsuperscript{1359} and (mostly) the row of dots, which is popular on Knossian O small vases,\textsuperscript{1360} favour an EPAR date; dotted patterns are common on local EPAR pottery.

This variety of Creto-Cypriot aryballoi is uncommon in Crete,\textsuperscript{1361} excluding Knossos.\textsuperscript{1362}

\textbf{LG: AR.60}

\textbf{(LG)/EPAR: AR.61}

\textbf{EPAR: AR.62}

\textit{General Comments on the aryballoi}

The introduction of four out of five local types of aryballoi in the PGB period is related to the contemporary importation of such vases (I-AR.1, I-AR.2, I-AR.3). The Corinthian I-AR.1 in particular stimulated the production of a long-lived series of plain aryballoi. The formative character of the PGB phase is further enhanced by the occurrence of some classes that did not outlast the 9\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1363}

The PG classes that survived in the G period had their everted lip replaced by a flaring mouth (the latter is the hallmark of the local G aryballoi) and occasionally (types B, C, Dii) witnessed (in the EG-MG phase) the introduction of a flattened

\textsuperscript{1355} Fortetsa, 179, 11ag.

\textsuperscript{1356} Fortetsa 410. Fortetsa, 181, 13i.

\textsuperscript{1357} Cf. the comb on the tail of bird vase KNC Q115.


\textsuperscript{1359} Fortetsa, 170, 3a.

\textsuperscript{1360} Fortetsa, 178, 9cj.

\textsuperscript{1361} A few examples are known from Afrati (Levi 1927-1929, 272, fig. 337; 302, fig. 401), Phaistos (Rocchetti 1974-1975, 269, MM.3: perhaps a lekythion) Prinias (Rizza 1973, pl. 75a-left) and East Crete (Tsipopoulou 1985, 36-37, numbers 2 (Δ 17), 8; 44 - Tsipopoulou 1987, 124, H.Δ. 17, H 719).

\textsuperscript{1362} See the Knossian EO type H aryballoi (Moignard 1996, 446) and type Aiii lekythia (their handle is attached to the lip: Moignard 1996, 441). Also cf.: Fortetsa 1052. Davaras 1968, 142, B23. KNC 100.33.

\textsuperscript{1363} Type A, type Di, as well as the handmade vessels of types Dii-Diii.
shoulder. By the LG period, however, the decorated examples (type B) were again developing an everted lip, but coated and plain vases were unwilling to conform this time. The LG period also introduced two varieties of the Creto-Cypriot aryballos. One of these varieties persists in the EPAR period, during which the PC aryballoi that were arriving in Eleutherna influenced the form of few, mostly type B vases. Although LPAR examples are scarce, the demise of the shape conforms to broader patterns discussed in Chapter 7. It is, however, during this period that the influx of imported (mostly Corinthian) aryballoi peaks.1364 Interestingly, the larger aryballoi, without patterned decoration, were usually coated, while smaller versions were normally left plain.

5.3.5 Bird Vase

The bird vase is a much discussed1365 pouring vessel of animal shape. It is uncommon in domestic contexts and mostly occurs as a burial offering, perhaps after having served for libations.1366 A single example comes from Eleutherna (pl. 25).

Comments

The discovery of the vase in a child burial recalls Lemos’s remark that in Mycenaean Greece, as well as in Iron Age Serraglio (Cos), bird-vases with bird’s head usually served as offerings in child burials.1367 Also, a Knossian PGB parallel was tentatively assigned to a child burial.1368

According to Desborough’s typology,1369 BV.1 is a type Ia bird vase (with a bird’s head and three legs). Although bird vases with a spout instead of a head (Desborough’s type II) appear in Crete already in the Subminoan period, all known

1364 Erickson 2000, 162-166. Add Section 6.2.1.
1369 Desborough 1972.
type Ia examples date to the LPG-EG period. The Cretan PGB I-BV.1 is the earliest attestation of the type in Eleutherna, while BV.1 represents a 7th century revival (?), which is also documented in Knossos. The placing of a two-handed, lekythos neck on the back of the vase is of Cypriot inspiration and finds no match on Knossian parallels, the filling spout of which is placed on the tail. Nevertheless, two O bird vases from Afrati combine tripod legs and a single-handled neck on their back. The taller tripod legs of BV.1 adhere to the PG tradition and defy the Cretan O trend for single-footed examples. The PG tradition is also identifiable on the rendering of the face of BV.1, which is, however, also paralleled on 7th century examples. Lastly, the moulding on the body is found on a probably PG bird vase from Papoura. The finger impressions on the legs find no match. They recall, however, the impressions on the legs of local PAR tripod cooking jugs.

The pink-white slip of BV.1 suggests an EPAR date, which is confirmed by the syntax of the decoration and the individual patterns. Metopes, chevron patterns and cross-hatched bands are found on Cretan O bird vases. Hatched leaves forming a standing chevron occur on a Knossian EG vessel. Although no Cretan bird vase carrying standing chevrons or groups of concentric circles was located, the spirit of the latter motif, which generally favours a LG-EPAR date, is reflected on the decoration of a Knossian LO bird vase.

**EPAR: BV.1**

---

1370 KNC, 366. Coldstream 2001, 46. Cf., however, a LM III/Subminoan example from Afrati that probably belongs to type Ia (Kanta and Karetsou 1998, 163, fig. 5) and a possibly similar, Subminoan askos from Axos (Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004, 34): the front part of both examples is missing.
1372 Pieridou 1970, 100-101, numbers 5, 10.
1373 KNC, 366. The plastic vases Fortetsa 1353 and KNC 40.9, which represent birds (but are not bird vases), carry a single-handled neck on the back.
1374 Levi 1927-1929, 91, fig. 65; 385, fig. 496.
1375 Levi 1927-1929, 278, fig. 351; 302-303, fig. 402. KNC 14.4, 75.55.
1376 Levi 1927-1929, 91, fig. 65; 385, fig. 496. Moignard 1996, 450 for KNC 283.36, 283.37.
1378 Levi 1927-1929, 91, fig. 65. KNC 14.4 (EO).
1379 Levi 1927-1929, 91, fig. 65. Fortetsa 1353 (for its date see KNC, 367, footnote 266).
1380 Fortetsa 1353.
1381 KNC 134.74.
1382 Moignard 1996, 450 for KNC 75.55.
5.4 OPEN VESSELS: Deep Open Vessels

5.4.1 Kraters

The krater is a large open vessel (with a rim diameter ≥ 0.2m.) that served for mixing wine and water.\textsuperscript{1383} Despite the large number of cups and related vessels identified at Orthi Petra, the site has only produced a few local kraters of PG-PAR\textsuperscript{1384} or LAR-Classical date.\textsuperscript{1385} The seven examples from Orthi Petra (pl. 25, 72-74) are individually discussed below.

Comments

KR.1 is identified as the foot of a common type of krater.\textsuperscript{1386} Although its decorative scheme is peculiar, it recalls the rendering of added white colour decoration on dark ground that is typical of the local LPG-EG pottery and occurs on KR.2 and KR.3. The ornamental zone of KR.1 recalls the pattern of the LPG amphora AM.15 (the two vases were located nearby), while its pairs of vertical rows of small rectangles are paralleled on Knossian pottery, including a LPG-PGB pyxis\textsuperscript{1387} and the fragment of an 8\textsuperscript{th} century tripod stand, the decoration of which displays PG overtones.\textsuperscript{1388}

KR.2 is attributed to a bell krater, to which the aforementioned foot (KR.1) may belong, judging by the decorative homogeneity and the grey interior of the walls that the two pieces display. The decorative syntax of KR.2, which involves a narrow rectilinear pattern separating circle panels, was introduced on Knossian pottery during the MPG period under Attic influence.\textsuperscript{1389} The mill-sail panel\textsuperscript{1390} that separates two groups of concentric circles, in particular, occurs on Knossian PGB

\textsuperscript{1383} Coldstream 2001, 46-47.
\textsuperscript{1384} See below; add a LG-EPAR example from Nisi: Kalpaxis, Furtwängler, Schnapp et al. 1994, 80, K1.
\textsuperscript{1385} Erickson 2000, 210-211. Add two 5\textsuperscript{th} (?) century examples from Nisi: Kalpaxis, Furtwängler, Schnapp et al. 1994, 81, K12-13.
\textsuperscript{1387} KNC 100.52.
\textsuperscript{1388} Boardman 1961, 95, 97, number 435.
\textsuperscript{1389} KNC, 374. Coldstream 2001, 23, 47.
\textsuperscript{1390} For the mill-sail and the band of triangles hatched in alternate ways KR.2 displays see the comments upon AM.16 (Section 5.1.1).
pottery,\textsuperscript{1391} while circles interlaced with bars and similarly arranged were introduced in the Knossian repertory during the PGB period.\textsuperscript{1392} Rows of S's are popular on PGB-PAR/O pottery from Eleutherna and Knossos,\textsuperscript{1393} but quite uncommon on East Cretan vases before the LG period.\textsuperscript{1394}

Although KR.3 is very fragmentary, the coating in dark paint and heavy string marks on the base suggest a LPG-EG date. The modest size, relatively deep body, broad lip and flat base of this vase recall some Knossian kraters of mostly PGB-EG date.\textsuperscript{1395}

The shape of KR.4 follows bronze prototypes and finds many Knossian parallels.\textsuperscript{1396} The evolved, flat shoulder and strap handles favour an EG date.\textsuperscript{1397} Cross-hatched triangles occur on a similar krater from Kourtes,\textsuperscript{1398} as well as on a sherd from a PG krater at Knossos;\textsuperscript{1399} the pattern is popular on Knossian LPG pottery.\textsuperscript{1400} Solid triangles appear on two PG kraters from Knossos\textsuperscript{1401} and another from Gortyn.\textsuperscript{1402} Accordingly, KR.4 is considered as PGB/EG.

KR.5 probably copies tripod-kraters like the PGB-late I-KR.2. The shape seems common in LG Khania.\textsuperscript{1403} The rendering of a hatched curvilinear pattern in added white colour\textsuperscript{1404} and the repetition of a curvilinear motif in narrow zones\textsuperscript{1405} favour an EG date.

After these early, diverse examples, a new form with vertical handles was introduced. It is represented by KR.6 and KR.7,\textsuperscript{1406} as well as by a few early 6th

\textsuperscript{1391} Cf. the bell kraters KNC 100.44, 283.54.
\textsuperscript{1392} KNC, 374. Coldstream 2001, 47, 51. Cf. a PGB krater from Kommos: Kommos IV, 220, number 60.
\textsuperscript{1393} Fortetsa, 179, 11q, 11s, 11w.
\textsuperscript{1394} Mook 1993, 226.
\textsuperscript{1395} KNC, 373, type Biiri.
\textsuperscript{1396} KNC, 373-374, type Bii: KR.4 is close to the second variety discussed.
\textsuperscript{1397} KNC, 374. The ridge below the rim of KR.4 is paralleled on the PGB-EG krater KNC G114.
\textsuperscript{1398} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 256-257, number 147.
\textsuperscript{1399} Hallager, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 156, 70-P 1244. For this sherd see also Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 233.
\textsuperscript{1400} Fortetsa, 171, 4m. Coldstream 2001, 65.
\textsuperscript{1401} KNC L15, G42.
\textsuperscript{1402} Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 16, 1a, fig. 24.
\textsuperscript{1403} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 232.
\textsuperscript{1404} See the comments upon NSP.3 (Section 5.1.3).
\textsuperscript{1405} Coldstream 2001, 66.
\textsuperscript{1406} KR.7 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 46, number 7.
century examples. Its development involves the growing of the lip. Accordingly, the relatively short lip of KR.6 (H/H of lip: 6.4) was succeeded by the taller lip of KR.7 (H/H of lip: 5.9), which in turn gave way to the even taller lip of the 6th century examples cited above. Although the lowering of the upper handle attachments of KR.7 is peculiar, the form of the two vases finds parallels in Afrati (7th century), Goulediana (around 600), Khania (around 700), Kommos (7th century), the territory of Phaistos (late 8th century) and Prinias (around 600). There are also some fairly close, Argive parallels of similar date.

LPG-PGB: KR.1
PGB: KR.2
PGB-EG: KR.3
PGB/EG: KR.4
EG: KR.5
(MG)-LG: KR.6
EPAR: KR.7

5.4.2 Skyphoi

These open vessels carry two horizontal handles. They are often found in association with kraters and served for drinking; they must also have served as eating.

---

1407 Erickson 2000, 210-211 (the discovery of 8th – 7th century krater with vertical handles in Orthi Petra argues against Erickson's assumption for a 'complete rethinking of the shape' in early 6th century Eleutherna: Erickson 2000, 210). The LAR-Classical version of this shape, which stands on a foot, is known as the 'Household Krater Type I': Callaghan 1978, 11-12. Coldstream and Eiring 2001, 82.
1410 Levi 1927-1929, 132, fig 118.
1411 Platon 1955, 300, pl. 113a.
1412 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 232, for krater 70P-12042.
1413 Kommos IV, 238, number 255.
1415 Rizza, Palermo e Tomasello 1992, 70, number 179; 97: the shape is common in Prinias.
1416 Charitonides 1954, 238. Courbin 1966, 203-204, C. 1644. Argive influence is identified on one of the few Knossian kraters with simple vertical handles, the LG KNC 75.182 (see KNC, 376). For other Knossian examples see: Fortetsa 67, KNC, 373, type Bi (PG), Coldstream 2000, 273, E16 (MG-LG).
crockery, judging by the discovery of olives, figs and grapes in two imported examples (I-SK.2, I-SK.7) from Orthi Petra,\textsuperscript{1418} as well as by the rarity of plates in Iron Age Crete.\textsuperscript{1419} Three types are identified.

\textbf{A) BELL SKYPHOI}

The dipped bell skyphos appeared in the LH IIIC period and spread during the PG.\textsuperscript{1420} Although it proved very popular throughout Crete (in domestic, burial and ritual contexts) during the PG period,\textsuperscript{1421} later, mostly light ground examples are largely limited to East Crete,\textsuperscript{1422} even though a single vase is known from the top of the Prines hill.\textsuperscript{1423} The vases from Orthi Petra are sub-divided according to size.

\textbf{A1) Small (H ≤ 0.088m.) bell skyphoi: thirty-three vases divided in three varieties according to differences in details of shape and decoration treated in the discussion of each variety, as well as in the general comments on the small bell skyphoi.}

\textbf{A1a) This variety includes fourteen bell skyphoi (pl. 26, 76).}

\textbf{Comments}

Their clay, which is often grey and occasionally gritty, distinguishes the bell skyphoi of this variety. These are clearly deeper and thus probably earlier than the bell skyphoi from the other varieties. The grooves or ridges that occur on their foot are

\textsuperscript{1418} Stampolidis 1996, 40.
\textsuperscript{1419} See Section 5.5.5.
\textsuperscript{1422} Tsipopoulou 1987, 128-130.
\textsuperscript{1423} Stampolidis 2004, 196, number 117.
paralleled on several EPG and a few LPG parallels from Knossos, as well as on examples from Sybrita (EPG), Vrokastro (EPG-MPG), Kourtes (PG) and Kavousi (PG-(SubPG)). The relatively deep shape and technical flaws variety Aia vases display, as well as their context suggest that they are earlier than most of the other small bell skyphoi and date to the LPG period.

LPG: BSK.1, BSK.2, BSK.3, BSK.4, BSK.5, BSK.6, BSK.7, BSK.8, BSK.9, BSK.10, BSK.11, BSK.12, BSK.13, BSK.14

Aib) This variety includes ten bell skyphoi (pl. 26, 76).

Comments

The pink-brown clay with a few grits and the polished surface that occur on the vases of this variety distinguish them from the rest of the local bell skyphoi. They further convey an impression of homogeneity and together with the potter’s mark on the underfoot support the attribution of the variety in question to a single local workshop. Significantly, a painted X occurs on the underfoot of a fragmentary open vessel from Vrokastro, while the habit of marking the underfoot of a bell skyphos with incision is identified on examples from Knossos and Sybrita. The deep form of BSK.15 and BSK.16 recalls variety Aia bell skyphoi and suggests that the workshop in question was already active in the LPG period, while the shallower form of the rest (which favours a PGB date) and the context of BSK.22, BSK.23, BSK.24 suggest that its production persisted until the end of the 9th century.

LPG: BSK.15, BSK.16

1425 KNC F3, Q107, the latter is large.
1427 Hayden 2003, 45, number 92.
1428 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 246, number 199.
1430 Hayden 2003, 52, number 116. The foot is attributed to a cup, but it can well be assigned to a bell skyphos. In any case, it is not an Eleuthemian product.
1431 KNC G122, PGB, cross.
1432 D’Agata 1999, 208, 10.3, EPG, X pattern.
1433 BSK.22 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 260, number 300.
LPG-PGB: BSK.17, BSK.18, BSK.19
PGB: BSK.20, BSK.21
PGB-late: BSK.22
PGB/EG: BSK.23, BSK.24

Aic) This variety includes nine bell skyphoi (pl. 26).

Comments
The clay is light brown and includes several grits. Variety Aic vases are smaller than the rest of the bell skyphoi and shallower than the vases of variety Aia. The lump on the underfoot is paralleled on Subminoan bell skyphoi from Knossos and Subminoan-PG parallels from Kavousi, as well as on a single, LPG bell skyphos from Kommos. For the incised strokes on BSK.29 see Section 4.3.

PGB: BSK.25, BSK.26, BSK.27, BSK.28, BSK.29
PGB-late: BSK.30, BSK.31
PGB/EG: BSK.32
EG: BSK.33

General Comments on the small bell skyphoi
Small bell skyphoi were only found in trench A and tomb A1K1. While, however, all three varieties are represented in the tomb, only vases from the earlier variety Aia come from trench A. This distinction probably reflects slight chronological variations, rather than any pattern of exclusive access to a specific variety of containers (or ‘patronage’ of their production), particularly since the large BSK.41, which comes from trench A, confirms that the workshop that produced variety Aib skyphoi is also represented outside the tomb.

1434 The difference in the colour of the clay and the paint that the roughly contemporary bell skyphoi from varieties Aib and Aic display is due to the different conditions of firing (not different fabrics).
1435 BSK.30 and BSK.31 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 2004, 260-261, numbers 301-302.
1438 Kommos IV, 219, number 48.
Variety Aia bell skyphoi represent the earliest, LPG version on the shape, which is characterised by a deep form, grooves on the foot, careless application of paint and reserved (or self-slipped) lower body. The bottom of the bowl of these vases is almost flat, unlike that of the others, which carries a central cavity. Within the LPG period, variety Aib is introduced, but variety Aic is no earlier than PGB. The vases from these two varieties are generally shallower than variety Aia examples; their decoration is applied with care and their reserved surface is self-slipped (variety Aic) or polished (variety Aib). Variety Aic examples are generally smaller than the rest. They further stand on a relatively higher foot and are decorated with black paint (which differs from the brown-black paint that applied on the other bell skyphoi). The production of all varieties demised after around 800.

Aspects of weight and capacity deserve some discussion. Variety Aia bell skyphoi weigh 100gr.,\footnote{All figures cited in this paragraph are approximate.} while variety Aib-Aic skyphoi are lighter (80-90gr.). This is due to the finer fabric of variety Aib-Aic bell skyphoi and the smaller size of the latter variety. On the other hand, variations in capacity\footnote{Capacity is based on experiments made by filling the vases with water.} are more notable: variety Aia vases carry approximately 0.230lt., variety Aib examples carry slightly less (0.210-0.220lt.), while variety Aic specimens only hold 0.140lt.\footnote{Although greater variety is identified in the capacity of the Knossian LPG-PGB small bell skyphoi, most examples discussed in Tsatsaki 2004 carry 0.150-0.175lt. (Tsatsaki 2004, 430-431, 517-518).} I return to this topic in Section 7.3.

The size of the Eleuthemian small bell skyphoi (0.068–0.088m.) is fairly close to that of their Knossian counterparts (0.075-0.095m.), but smaller than that of the examples from South Central Crete (0.08-0.095m.).\footnote{The figures are based on the information provided for examples cited in footnote 1421.} The relatively shallow form of the Eleuthemian vases was introduced in Knossos\footnote{KNC, 379.} and possibly in Kavousi\footnote{Mook 1993, 174-175.} in the LPG period to replace the deep shape of the earlier PG vases. The H/RD ratio of the Eleuthemian small bell skyphoi is paralleled on LPG-PGB vases from Knossos\footnote{KNC, 379-380, the later vases from type B.} and Kommos,\footnote{Kommos IV, 222, numbers 83-84.} as well as on probably contemporary vases from...
Kourtes and Phaistos. Also, the height of most of the Knossian LPG-PGB bell skyphoi is slightly greater than their rim diameter and the reverse is only found on a few examples. The latter case is, however, the norm in Eleutherna.  

Aii) Large (H ≥ 0.105m.) bell skyphoi: nine vases (pl. 26).

Comments
The development of the shape is unclear. The variation in profile outlined in Section II.4.2 is related to differences in size, rather than date. BSK.37 is strongly connected to the small examples of variety Aia by its grey, gritty fabric and the grooves on the foot. A groove is also found on the foot of BSK.41, which carries a mark on the underfoot that recalls variety Aib bell skyphoi. Grooves further run on the foot of BSK.39 and BSK.40, the context of which favours a PGB and LPG-PGB date respectively. The rest of the large bell skyphoi from trench A are perhaps LPG, judging by the date of the smaller versions that come from the same context.

Large bell skyphoi have turned up in several sites, including Afrati, Knossos, Kommos, Kourtes, Mastabas in Herakleion, Papoura, Phaistos and the area of Sitia. The H/RD (0.92-1.23) of the Eleuthernian series is identified on Knossian LPG-PGB parallels, as well as on the aforementioned example from Mastabas and some vases from Kourtes and Phaistos. The almost vertical lip and the rim diameter of BSK.40 strongly recall a class of PG bell

---

1448 Rocchetti 1974-1975, 200, P.3-4; 204-205, P.16, P.20; 223, R.22; 239, ra.2; 272-273, St.6, St.11.
1450 BSK.3 and BSK.4 are the only exceptions.
1451 Although development towards a larger size is possible, such a dating criterion is insecure.
1452 Levi 1927-1929, 392-393, fig. 504.
1453 Fortetsa, 161, some vases in types Biii-iv. KNC, 379, type Ai. Also, Coldstream 2001, 51.
1454 Kommos IV, 224, number 117.
1456 Lebessi 1970, 274, number 4: LPG; 278, number 24: no date.
1459 Tsipopoulou 1991, 479, number 4999; 482, number 5054.
1460 Fortetsa 292, 303. KNC, 379.
1461 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 243, numbers 199, 204-205.
skyphoi from Kavousi, while the straight walls, incipient lip and rim diameter of BSK.35 and BSK.36 are also paralleled on examples from Kavousi.

**LPG-(PGB):** BSK.34, BSK.35, BSK.36, BSK.37, BSK.38  
**(LPG)-PGB:** BSK.39, BSK.40, BSK.41  
**PGB-EG:** BSK.42

**B) SKYPHOI FOLLOWING CAULDRON TYPES:** seven vases (pl. 27, 74-75).

**Comments**

The rounded, deep form of SK.1, which copies a type of krater, finds Knossian LPG-EG parallels. On the other hand, the carinated examples imitate carinated kraters like KR.4. Judging by its sharp carination and simple decoration, SK.3 is earlier than the other carinated examples. In contrast, the soft carination of SK.7 suggests a late stage of development. Notably, both the shape and the dimensions of SK.3 and SK.4 are paralleled on PGB examples from Knossos and Kourtes.

Although the shape of SK.2 recalls some Cretan coarse ware jars, the idea of a fine ware globular bowl on a high foot, with an excrescent cup on the rim, is best paralleled on a late 9th century pedestaled bell skyphos (with vertical handles rising to just below the rim) from Donousa, as well as on G pedestaled cups from Rhodes and Cos. Miniature elements were added to Cretan vases since the MM period, but an excrescent cup like the one on SK.2 was applied to the rim of an open

---

1463 Mook 1993, 175-176 (the fabric of these skyphoi is, however, different to that of BSK.40).  
1467 KNC D1.  
1468 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 226, number 141.  
1471 Girella 2002, 182.
vessel (the kalathos with a single horizontal handle) by the LM IIIA2 period. This feature also appears on a LM IIIC-late - Subminoan kalathos from Vrokastro with a single vertical handle, as well as on EPG-MPG Knossian straight-sided kalathoi with two vertical handles. Its survival in the 9th century (or even later) is documented in Kavousi. PGB-LO kernoi with miniature vases on the rim turned up on the Acropolis sanctuary at Gortyn.

The pendent, solid triangles of SK.1 and SK.2 (the pale fabric of which favours a LPG date) are paralleled on the LPG CU.227, as well as on Knossian LPG-MG vases and a MPG-LPG skyphos from Sybrita. Standing solid triangles (SK.4, SK.5) appear on Knossian LPG-MG pottery, particularly on two LPG-PGB kraters of similar shape. The bands and lines of SK.3 recall a PGB carinated skyphos from Knossos, while the zigzag of SK.6 is paralleled on carinated skyphoi from Kourtes and Phaistos. The added white colour decoration and curvilinear pattern of SK.7 favour a PGB-EG date.

The band along the base diameter of SK.4 is probably a potter’s mark. Three East Cretan skyphoi carry a cross on the base, while a group of three bands marks the base diameter of two jugs from Agios Georgios.

LPG: SK.1, SK.2, SK.3
PGB: SK.4, SK.5, SK.6
PGB-EG: SK.7

1473 Hall 1914, 110, number 2 - Desborough 1952, 260 - Hayden 2003, 37, number 64.
1477 Fortetsa, 171, 4a.
1478 D’Agata 1999, 208, 29.4.
1479 Fortetsa, 171, 4d.
1480 KNC L15, G42.
1481 KNC D1.
1482 Rocchetti 1988-1989, 226, number 141.
1484 Tsipopoulou 1987, 135. Cf. a plate from Afrati: Levi 1927-1929, 170, fig. 188.
1485 Tsipopoulou 1987, 121, A.N. 1797, Σ 3814.
C) SKYPHOI FOLLOWING MAINLAND TYPES: seven vases (pl. 27, 34a).

These skyphoi follow imported Attic and Euboan-Cycladic prototypes with low disc base and coated interior. These reached Crete (mostly Knossos) in the late 9th century and inspired local imitations throughout the island. 

Comments

The development of the shape is best monitored through the development of the lip. The short, almost vertical lip and the disc base of SK.8 suggest the influence of an Attic MG II prototype. The short lip is maintained on SK.9, SK.11 and the disc base is preserved on SK.12, even if lower. A slightly taller lip occurs on SK.12 and SK.13, and a much taller one on SK.10 and SK.14. The growing of the lip of the local skyphoi commenced in the LG period, as in Knossos. In Kavousi the change is identifiable during the local SubPG/LG transition.

The row of S’s SK.8 carries is paralleled on MG-LG skyphoi from Agios Georgios, Archanes, Kavousi, Knossos, Kommos, Mastabas in Hearakleion and Vrokastro. The pattern also occurs on a Knossian MG krater of similar shape, while a few Knossian MG-LG skyphoi combine this pattern with a disc base and an almost vertical lip (like SK.8). Rows of S’s are missing from the rich repertory of the Khaniote skyphoi.

---

1488 Cf. KNC, 384.
1489 SK.10 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 61, number 38 – Stampolidis 2004, 269, number 327.
1492 Tsipopoulou 1987, 34, 133-135, Σ 3965 perhaps imported, Σ 4097.
1493 Sakellarakis 1986, 37-38, Π 24335.
1496 Johnston 2000, 222, number 126.
1500 Payne 1927-1928, 261, number 151. KNC 75.97, 14.24.
The decoration of SK.11 and SK.12, which involves the interruption of the overall coating by a reserved panel in the handle zone, is common in Crete.\textsuperscript{1502} The horizontal row of chevrons and the single zigzag of SK.11 derive from Attic skyphoi and respectively occur on copious Knossian MG-LG and MG-late - EO examples\textsuperscript{1503} (no Knossian vase carries both patterns, however). Nevertheless, the former motif was introduced in Eleutherna during the LG period.\textsuperscript{1504} On the other hand, rows of concentric circles (SK.12) were common on Cretan skyphoi from the end of the LG period,\textsuperscript{1505} while a simple battlement occurs on advanced LG-EO pottery from East Crete.\textsuperscript{1506}

The height of the lip is essential for dating plain or coated skyphoi, particularly since coated examples were common in Crete throughout the G-O period.\textsuperscript{1507} The short lip and early look of SK.9 favour a pre-LG date, while the tall lip, thin walls and context of SK.10 and SK.13 support a LG one. Lastly, the tall lip and self-slipped surface of SK.14 establish a PAR date.\textsuperscript{1508}

**EG:** SK.8

**MG (?):** SK.9

**LG:** SK.10, SK.11, SK.12, SK.13

**PAR:** SK.14


\textsuperscript{1504} See the comments upon type D necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2).


\textsuperscript{1506} Tsiropoulou 1987, 187, 189, pattern 14a.


\textsuperscript{1508} Cf. a few 7th century examples from Praisos (Tsiropoulou 1987, 135, H 2013) and Kommos (Kommos IV, 240, numbers 273, 360).
5.4.3 Kotyle

The kotyle was introduced in the Corinthian LG repertory as a version of the chevron skyphos and evolved with the gradual elimination of the lip. Corinthian kotylai are found throughout Crete: several vases have been found in Knossos, Kommos and Khania, while sporadic, mostly single finds come from Amnisos, Anavlochos, Gouves, Itanos, Praisos and the Idaean Cave. The type is also represented in Eleutherna, where Cycladic examples (I-KO.1) have also turned up. Only one local kotyle has, however, been identified in Orthi Petra (pl. 27, 75).

Comments

The vase imitates the shallow hemispherical form and the decoration of the earliest Corinthian kotylai (Aetos 666) and finds close Knossian LG parallels. The shape is well represented in LG-O Knossos, but seems rare elsewhere in Crete.

LG: KO.1

5.4.4 Cups

Orthi Petra has produced numerous clay cups with vertical handle arching from belly to rim. These cups fall into six types, differentiated by shape and decoration.

---

1513 See respectively: Jones 2000, 250, 252, 260, 261, 265, 278.
1514 Hartley 1930-1931, 111. Erickson 2000, 163-165. See also footnote 1934.
1515 See Morgan 1999, 264-265.
1516 KNC, 384.
1518 Mostly 7th century examples come from Agios Georgios (Tsipopoulo 1987, 134, Π 273), Kavousi (Mook 1993, 232, although vase P.11.151, discussed in pages 200-201, is identified as a kotyle, the parallel cited is a skyphos; the MG date proposed is probably too early), Khania (Haller, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 222, 70-P 1294. For this sherd see also Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 232. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 22-23, fig. 2β, Π6123) and Kommos (Kommos IV, 241, 284-285).
A) DIPPED CUPS: These cups were decorated by being dipped twice in paint. The earliest dipped cups come from Knossian LM II contexts. The type appears throughout the LM III period and is quite popular in the Aegean of the PG period. The earliest Cretan dipped cups with bell-shaped body, flat base and everted lip appear, however, in Subminoan Knossos, where the type was particularly favoured during the LPG period. PG dipped cups of similar shape also come from Afrati, East Crete, Gortyn, Gria Vigla, Kavousi, Kommos, Kourtes, Krya, Phaistos, the Psychro Cave, Vryses and the Mitsotakis collection.

Three varieties have been identified in Eleutherna on the basis of differences in shape and decoration and are largely followed here. A fourth variety, which includes large cups, is added.

The discovery of the vast majority of the forty-four dipped cups (varieties Ai-Aiiii) from tomb A1K1 at a similar level (15.5-15.6m.) suggests that they should be associated with the earliest (LPG-PGB) urns, but obstructs any study of their development. The latter case is further hindered by the lack of any traces of change on the few examples found inside LPG, PGB and PGB/EG vases. Significantly, all

---

1519 Two bronze, late 9th century examples are also known (Stampolidis 2004, 275, numbers 342-343); they are fairly similar to the contemporary clay examples, despite their shallow body and raised base. Popham 1984, 162. Also, Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1987a, 60, 63. Conical cups were, however, dipped already in Middle Minoan times: Betancourt 1985, 87, fig. 61A-B. Kanta 1980, 267.
1521 Levi 1927-1929, 397-398, fig. 515 right.
1523 Alexiou 1966, pl. 166a.
1525 Mook 1993, 178.
1529 Jantzen 1964, 61, P.826. Although Andreadaki-Vlasaki has argued that this vase seems no earlier than the late 8th century (Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1987, 319-320), I maintain Jantzen’s date, which has been accepted by Coldstream (GGP, 234).
1531 Stampolidis 1994, 78-82 (the body and the lip of the cups are incorrectly described).
three varieties (Ai-Aiii) were represented in the sets found inside the late 9th century I-KR.2 and KR.4 (two varieties were represented in each krater).

Ai) Dipped shallow cups: eighteen vases (pl. 27-28).

Comments

The shape, dimensions and H/RD of variety Ai cups\textsuperscript{1538} are matched on vases from Knossos,\textsuperscript{1539} Kommos\textsuperscript{1540} and Kourtes.\textsuperscript{1541} The false disc base they (as well as some variety Aii cups) occasionally display is paralleled on examples from Gria Vigla,\textsuperscript{1542} Knossos,\textsuperscript{1543} Kourtes\textsuperscript{1544} and the Psychro Cave,\textsuperscript{1545} while the true disc base of CU.16 is paralleled on cups from Kourtes\textsuperscript{1546} and Phaistos.\textsuperscript{1547} Concerning decoration, the manner according to which variety Ai cups (except CU.10) were dipped is commonly found on their counterparts from South Central Crete. On the other hand, CU.10, CU.50 (variety Aii), as well as most variety Aiii cups recall the Knossian dipped cups in having their flanks dipped.\textsuperscript{1548}

LPG-PGB: CU.1, CU.2, CU.3, CU.4, CU.5, CU.6, CU.7, CU.8, CU.9, CU.10, CU.11, CU.12, CU.13, CU.14, CU.15, CU.16, CU.17

PGB-late: CU.18

Aii) Dipped shallow cups with one or more ridges/grooves below the lip: forty vases (pl. 28, 77).

\textsuperscript{1538} CU.18 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 262, number 305.
\textsuperscript{1539} Fortetsa, 166, type Bi: cups from tomb L. KNC, 385: the LPG-PGB cups.
\textsuperscript{1540} Kommos IV, 233, number 98.
\textsuperscript{1541} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 237, numbers 166-167.
\textsuperscript{1542} Vasilakis 2000, 75, pl. 11a. Vasilakis 2004, 99, fig. 12.
\textsuperscript{1543} Fortetsa 1060. KNC D39, G66: LPG.
\textsuperscript{1544} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 237, number 167.
\textsuperscript{1545} Boardman 1961, 56, number 239 – Watrous 1996, 43, number 126.
\textsuperscript{1546} Rocchetti 1988-1989, 240, number 181.
\textsuperscript{1547} Rocchetti 1974-1975, 261, G.2 (probably G).
\textsuperscript{1548} Both schemes are represented on the relatively few known East Cretan dipped cups (Tsipopoulou 1987, 136. The relevant information is missing from Mook 1993, 178).
Comments

The shape, dimensions and H/RD ratio of these cups\textsuperscript{1549} is similar to that of variety Ai cups.\textsuperscript{1550} Although the Eleuthernian dipped cups carry one or more ridges below the lip more often than not, ridges are rarely found on dipped cups from elsewhere in Crete.\textsuperscript{1551} For the false or true disc base of some variety Aii cups and the manner variety Aii vases were dipped see the comments upon variety Ai.

LPG: CU.19
LPG-PGB: CU.20, CU.21, CU.22, CU.23, CU.24, CU.25, CU.26, CU.27, CU.28, CU.29, CU.30, CU.31, CU.32, CU.33, CU.34, CU.35, CU.36, CU.37, CU.38, CU.39, CU.40, CU.41, CU.42, CU.43, CU.44, CU.45, CU.46, CU.47, CU.48, CU.49, CU.50, CU.51, CU.52, CU.53, CU.54
PGB-late: CU.55
PGB/EG: CU.56, CU.57, CU.58

Aiii) Dipped deep cups: twenty-eight vases (pl. 28, 77).

Comments

The fabric of variety Aiii cups\textsuperscript{1552} is finer than that of the other varieties. Their shape follows an early form that occurs in EPG Knossos,\textsuperscript{1553} as well as in other Cretan PG sites,\textsuperscript{1554} and survives to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century in Sybrita\textsuperscript{1555} and Kommos.\textsuperscript{1556} The majority

\textsuperscript{1549} CU.55 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 262, number 306. Some of these cups are discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 81, numbers 13-18 (for CU.42, CU.44, CU.48, CU.49, CU.52, CU.43 respectively), where CU.42 is wrongly assigned to his type A/my variety Ai.

\textsuperscript{1550} For Cretan parallels see the comments upon variety Ai.


\textsuperscript{1552} Some of these cups are discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 82, numbers 19-23 (for CU.72, CU.73, CU.76, CU.67, CU.81 respectively).

\textsuperscript{1553} Coldstream 1972, 69, A26. KNC 207.20, 207.21.


\textsuperscript{1555} D'Agata 1999, 208, 29.2: MPG-LPG. Although this is the closest parallel in terms of shape and dimensions, it is coated and displays a reserved lower part.

\textsuperscript{1556} Kommos IV, 228, number 161.
of variety Aiii cups are dipped on the flanks, unlike their counterparts from varieties Ai-Aii, excluding CU.10 and CU.50 (see the comments upon variety Ai).

**LPG-PGB:** CU.60, CU.61, CU.62, CU.63, CU.64, CU.65, CU.66, CU.67, CU.68, CU.69, CU.70, CU.71, CU.72, CU.73, CU.74, CU.75, CU.76, CU.77, CU.78, CU.79, CU.80, CU.81, CU.82, CU.83, CU.84, CU.85

**PGB:** CU.86

**PGB/EG:** CU.87

Aiv) Large (H ≥ 0.079 m.) dipped cups: four vases (pl. 28).

**Comments**

Although roughly contemporary with variety Ai-Aiii dipped cups, CU.88 is larger. Its very short lip and relatively narrow base further recall variety Aiii cups. The very short, everted lip that is almost offset suggests a PGB date, while the dipping of the front part is paralleled on Knossian PGB cups.

The deep shape and high lip of CU.89 and CU.90, as well as the large size of CU.91 suggest a LG-EPAR date (cf. the coated cups of varieties Biv-Bv). The production of these cups (whether as survivals or revivals of a PG type) is perhaps related to the importation of dipped cups like I-CU.1.

**PGB:** CU.88

**LG-EPAR:** CU.89, CU.90, CU.91

**General Comments on the dipped cups**

Dipped cups of varieties Ai-Aiii were only discovered in tomb A1K1 and trench A (cups from variety Aiv also appeared in trench K). Although each variety is well represented in both contexts, variety Aii proved more popular in the tomb, while variety Aiii in trench A.

---

1557 CU.88 is the only dipped cup that carries orange-red paint.
1558 KNC, 385.
1559 KNC 18.2, 18.9.
The shape of the dipped cup displays no development within the LPG-PGB/EG period; decoration also offers no hints for dating. On the other hand, a comparison of varieties Ai-Aiii provides interesting information: While the H/RD ratio of variety Ai and Aii cups generally ranges from 0.65 to 0.81, the ratio of variety Aiii cups is 0.80-0.97. Also, while variety Ai and Aii cups have a RD that is greater than their MD, variety Aiii cups have a MD that is smaller than or equal to their MD. This remark is related to the height of the lip, which is normally 0.005-0.007m. tall on variety Aiii cups, but 0.009-0.012m. tall on variety Ai-Aii cups. Further, the base of variety Aiii cups is narrower than that of variety Ai-Aii cups and carries no string marks. To sum up, variety Aiii cups are deeper than variety Ai and Aii cups, while equipped with a shorter rim and narrower base (as well as with a truly round handle). In addition, variety Aiii cups rarely displays any deformities, in contrast to variety Ai-Aii cups. Lastly, variety Ai-Aii cups weigh 130-140gr. and carry 0.310-0.320lt., while variety Aiii cups weigh 100gr. and hold 0.230-0.240lt., roughly as much as the most capacious, variety Aia bell skyphoi.

The height of the Eleuthemian dipped cups ranges from 0.06-0.078m. and is close to that of their Knossian parallels (0.06-0.09m.); dipped cups from South Central Crete are, however, usually larger (0.08-0.115m.). On the other hand, paint occupies the area of the handle and the area opposite it on dipped cups from Eleutherna and South Central Crete, but the flanks of their Knossian counterparts.

At around 800, dipping cups went out fashion in Eleutherna, as in Knossos. In contrast, dipped cups persisted in South Central Crete (Kommos, Prinias, Phaistos) during the G phase and seem common in LG II Khania. Imports from Cretan sites that kept on dipping cups (like I-CU.1) perhaps stimulated the production of the Eleuthernian LG-EPAR examples of variety Aiv.
B) COATED CUPS: Coated cups occur throughout the LM III period. The type was common in the Aegean during the PG period, by the end of which it acquired a flat base. The early Cretan flat-based, coated cup follows an Attic MG I model, which is represented in Knossos and Kommos. The Eleuthemian coated cups are divided in seven varieties, on the basis of differences in shape.

Bi) Very small coated cups with bell-shaped body and everted lip: nine vases (pl. 29, 34a, 78).

Comments

The cups of this variety largely share the shallow bell-shaped body, the flat base, the everted lip and occasionally the ridge/groove of the PG variety Ai-Aii dipped cups. This excludes CU.95 and CU.100, which are deformed miniatures that lack an articulated lip. The discovery of the former inside a krater that contained a drinking set perhaps reflects 'the Greek symposium habit of beginning a feast by drinking watered wine from large cups and moving on to unmixed wine in small cups after the meal'. Miniature Cretan Iron Age cups have also been regarded as toys for children. The rest of the coated cups can be classified as follows:

Three (CU.92, CU.93, CU.94) are assigned to group I since they share the following features: height 0.041-0.048m., H/RD 0.7-0.77, single groove below the lip and no marks from the shaping process on the base, the walls or the bottom of the bowl.

Four coated cups (CU.95, CU.96, CU.98, CU.99) are assigned to group II, judging by the following characteristics: height 0.045-0.060m., H/RD 0.59-0.69 (the H/RD of CU.99 is 0.64-0.74), uneven bowl bottom, walls carrying marks from the shaping process and occasionally (CU.95, CU.97) string marks on the base.

1571 KNC, 401-402.  
1572 Kommos IV, 227, number 144.  
1573 Given that the coated cup is the most widely represented vessel in Iron Age Crete, only parallels that match the Eleuthernian varieties are cited where appropriate.  
1574 CU.100 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 261, number 304.  
1575 Kommos IV, 241, comments upon number 279.  
1577 CU.99 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 261, number 303.
Given that group II cups were found well over group I cups inside tomb A1K1 (CU.98, however, was found near group I cups), I suggest that group I dates to the LPG period and group II to the PGB, while the shape evolved as follows: the relatively small and deep, well-shaped LPG cup that carried a groove below the lip grew larger and shallower and lost its groove during the PGB period, when it was often carelessly made. This suggestion finds external confirmation: the shape, dimensions and proportions of group I cups are paralleled on Knossian LPG examples, while the shape, dimensions and proportions of the well-shaped cups from group II (CU.97, CU.99) recall some Knossian PGB vases.

PG, shallow, bell-shaped, coated cups with flat base and everted lip have turned up in Afrati Kavousi, Knossos, Kommos, the area of Phaistos and Praisos. Roughly made or deformed coated cups are found in Knossos during the PGB period, while ridges/grooves run below the lip of some Knossian PGB-EG small coated cups, the lip of which is, however, offset. A pair of incised lines runs below the lip of some early coated cups from Kavousi.

Although their production generally increased in Crete, including Eleutherna, during the G-O period, coated cups (excluding CU.150) were apparently not deposited in tomb A1K1 after the PG period. This pattern adheres to a wider phenomenon discussed in Chapter 7.

**LPG:** CU.92, CU.93, CU.94

**LPG-PGB:** CU.95

**PGB:** CU.96, CU.97, CU.98

---

1578 Fortetsa 1059, 1060, but also Fortetsa 284 solely for the proportions.
1579 Fortetsa 363. KNC, 386, type Di: 287.4. KNC 387, type Diib: 182.2.
1580 Levi 1927-1929, 421, fig. 557.
1582 Boardman 1960, 130, 1.44. Fortetsa 284, 332-333. KNC 175.16, 283.105: mostly LPG.
1583 Kommos IV, 227, number 150: 9th century.
1584 Rocchetti 1967-1968, 199-200, number 58.
1585 Tsipopoulou 1987, 62, A.N. 8761.
1590 Interestingly, two coated cups were among the open vessels contained in the Cretan PGB-late I-KR.2, but none in the otherwise similar drinking set of the PGB/EG KR.4.
PGB-late: CU.99, CU.100

Bii) Small coated cups with bellied body and offset lip: twenty-four vases (pl. 29, 79).1591

Comments
This variety represents an early, fairy close adaptation of an Attic model1592 and finds PGB-MG parallels in terms of shape and dimensions in Archanes,1593 Knossos,1594 Kourtes,1595 Papoura,1596 Prinias1597 and possibly Kavousi1598 and Mastabas in Herakleion.1599 An EG-MG date is suggested for the Eleuthemian vases, given that variety Bii cups seem later than variety Bi examples and were not represented in the drinking sets found inside the late-9th century I-KR.2 and KR.4. On the other hand, variety Bii (and Biii) foreshadows the LG-EPAR variety Biv.


Biii) Shape as in Bii, but larger: twelve vases (pl. 29, 79).

Comments
The increased size suggests some development from variety Bii. Both the size and the shallow form, however, strongly favour a date before the LG period. Close

1591 I trust that the variety in question includes (at least) one cup that Erickson assigns to the late 7th century (Erickson 2000, 205, fig. 17.1.i), particularly since this vessel comes from the same zembil as most variety Bii cups found in trench K.
1592 Cf. KNC, 386.
1593 Sakellarakis 1986, 38, Π.24324: a LG-EO date is suggested.
1596 Watrous 1980, 275, number 18.
1598 Some of the MG, fragmentary, early, bellied cups mentioned in Mook 1993, 202.
1599 Lebessi 1970, 275-276, number 10 (most examples).
parallels in terms of shape and dimensions come from Knossos, Kommos, Kourtes and possibly Kavousi and Mastabas in Herakleion.

**MG:** CU.125, CU.126, CU.127, CU.128, CU.129, CU.130, CU.131, CU.132, CU.133, CU.134, CU.135, CU.136

**Biv** Very large, shallow, bellied shape with tall lip: twelve vases (pl. 29, 80).

**Comments**

CU.137, CU.138 and CU.139, which turned up in a LG-late pyre in trench ΛΛ confirm that the height of the lip cannot be regarded as a rigid criterion for the distinction between LG and EPAR shallow examples, since CU.139 displays a short lip (0.07-0.08m.), while CU.138 a tall one (0.014-0.015m.). On the other hand, Coldstream and Moignard basically assign the very large, shallow cups to the LG period and the deep ones to the LG/EO-EO. This distinction is perhaps valid for the Eleuthernian series as well, since variety Bv cups mostly have a taller lip than the deeper, variety Biv examples and pave the way to the LPAR, variety Bvi cups. Besides, variety Biv is represented in trench A (which produced the vast majority of the early, variety Bii-Biii cups), in contrast to variety Bv. An overlapping between the two varieties is, however, probable, judging by the occurrence of three variety Biv cups and a variety Bv example (CU.149) in the aforementioned LG-late pyre.

Variety Biv cups find close LG-EO parallels in terms of shape and dimensions at Afrati, Agies Paraskies, Archanes, Khalasmenos,...

---

1600 KNC 134.64: LG (perhaps MG, judging by its shallow form): Coldstream and Catling 1996, 176.
1601 Johnston 2000, 222, number 127: MG.
1603 Gesell, Day and Coulson 1995, 85, fig. 5:4, LPG-MG; 85-86, fig. 5:6, MG. Add some of the MG, very fragmentary, early bellied cups mentioned in Mook 1993, 202.
1604 Lebessi 1970, 275-276, number 10 (a few vases).
1605 A cup from the top of the Prines hill probably belongs to this type: Stampolidis 2004, 197, number 119.
1607 Check the dimensions in: KNC, 387, type Diiia. Moingard 1996, 457, type A. The reverse is rarely documented.
1608 Levi 1927-1929, 292, fig. 378; 421, the last vase catalogued in that page.
A number of LG-EO coated cups from various Cretan sites is associated with varieties Biv and Bv, but cannot be linked to any of the two, mostly due to insufficient measurements provided in the relevant publications, but occasionally because the cups in question fall between the two varieties.

**LG:** CU.137, CU.138, CU.139

**LG-(EPAR):** CU.140, CU.141, CU.142, CU.143, CU.144, CU.145, CU.146, CU.147, CU.148

**Bv)** Very large, deep, bellied shape, with tall lip: sixteen vases (pl. 30, 80).

**Comments**

For the chronology of variety Bv cups see the comments upon variety Biv. The very tall lip (0.02m.) of CU.163 and CU.164 heralds the introduction of variety Bvi cups. Variety Bv cups find close LG-EO parallels in terms of shape and dimensions at Agies Paraskies, Kavousi, Knossos, Kommos, Mastabas in Herakleion and Phaistos.

**LG:** CU.149

---

1610 Sakellarakis 1986, 38, II.24324.
1611 Tsipopoulou 2004, 139, number 12.
1612 Mook 2004, 176, fig. 12.11.C, E.
1614 Johnston 2000, 222, number 123: perhaps later than MG.
1617 A cup from the top of the Prines hill probably belongs to this type: Stampolidis 2004, 197, number 120.
1619 Platon 1945-1947, 61, numbers 61, 64-66. 
1620 Gesell, Day and Coulson 1995, 87, fig. 6:3.
1622 Johnston 2000, 219, number 115.
1623 Lebessi 1970, 277, number 19; 289, number 74.
1624 Rocchetti 1974-1975, 178, AA.7a; 259, Con.3.
Bvi) Very large, deep, bellied shape with very tall lip: ten vases (pl. 34a).

Comments

Erickson has discussed the development of these cups from the LPAR to the Early Hellenistic period. The vases examined here mostly illuminate the earliest part of this time-span, during which the base was still flat. The disc foot that CU.174 displays was introduced in the beginning of the 6th century. The position of its upper handle attachment on the root of the lip finds no match.

Flat-based, coated cups with very tall lip were introduced in Knossos during the LO period and survived throughout the LAR. Similar vases from elsewhere in North Central Crete are considered (EO)-LO. On the other hand, coated cups with tall lip and disc foot are common in late 7th and 6th century contexts. A Cretan cup of the latter form reached Taucheira/Tocra.

LPAR: CU.165, CU.166, CU.167, CU.168, CU.169, CU.170, CU.171, CU.172, CU.173

LPAR-late - LAR: CU.174

---

1625 Erickson 2000, 192-205.
1628 Coldstream and Eiring 2001, 78.
1629 Lebessi 1970, 278, number 28; 288, number 66 (Mastabas in Herakleion). Lebessi 1971, 387-388, fig. 7 (Gouves). Although some flat-based cups with high lip come from a late 8th - early 7th century burial at Gavalomouri (Andreadaki-Vlasi 1987, 309-311, 318, numbers 1-6), they are smaller and shallower than the Eleuthemian examples.
1631 Boardman and Hayes 1966, 80, number 927.
Bvii) Small (< 0.07 m.) post-PG cups: seventeen vases (pl. 30, 78).

Comments

Small cups of post-PG date are recurrently associated with infant/child burials, regardless of the particularities of the rite performed. ¹⁶³²

Although variety Bvii cups are roughly equal in size to their PG predecessors (variety Bi), their MD exceeds their RD. Neither the height of the lip nor the depth of the form can be treated as rigid dating criteria for variety Bvii cups, as exemplified by the varied profile of the cups from the pithos burial in baulk N-Ξ. On the other hand, the early look and rough base of CU.175, CU.176 and CU.177 suggest a pre-LG date. This is corroborated by the everted lip of CU.175 and CU.177 and the resemblance of CU.176 to variety Bii-iii cups. CU.178, CU.179 and CU.180 seem contemporary to or slightly later than the aforementioned examples, but clearly earlier than the well-shaped EPAR cups from baulk N-Ξ (string marks occur on the base of CU.179 and CU.180, while the walls of CU.180 are relatively thick). The tall lip of CU.181 (0.011 m.) is paralleled on local LG-EPAR coated cups, while the very tall, concave lip of CU.191 suggests a PAR date.

In Knossos, as in Eleutherna, rough and heavy small cups with string marks on the base are considered earlier than LG, ¹⁶³³ while cups with thinner fabric and refined form are assigned to the LG-O period. ¹⁶³⁴ The concave lip of CU.191 is paralleled on Knossian O cups. ¹⁶³⁵

EG-MG: CU.175, CU.176, CU.177
MG-LG: CU.178, CU.179, CU.180
LG-EPAR: CU.181
EPAR: CU.182, CU.183, CU.184, CU.185, CU.186, CU.187, CU.188, CU.189, CU.190

¹⁶³² No such pattern has been identified in Knossos, where small cups are more common.
¹⁶³³ Fortetsa, 166, type Bii, particularly Fortetsa 333, 1032, 1059-1060, 510, 602-604. KNC, 386-387, type Diib.
**General Comments on the black cups**

After fully replacing its dipped counterpart at around 800, the coated cup proved by far the most popular type of vessel at Orthi Petra. Its development is fairly clear. The earliest, PG examples are small and shallow, like their Attic prototypes, but occasionally deformed. Already in the PGB period, however, a development towards larger and more refined forms commenced; an offset lip was introduced at around 800 and gradually grew taller thereafter, while a deep form prevailed from around 700.

Interestingly, the height of even the largest Eleuthemian coated cups rarely exceeds 0.11m., in accordance with what is attested for their Knossian G-EO parallels. Nevertheless, quite a few Knossian MO-LO coated cups, as well as examples from elsewhere in Crete, including Agies Paraskies, Mastabas in Herakleion and Phaistos are larger than 0.11m.

The notable increase in size had a marked impact on the capacity of the coated cups. The early 8th century, variety Bii examples weigh 190gr. and carry 0.440-0.450lt. (considerably more than the LPG-PGB dipped cups of varieties Ai-Aiii and the coated cups of variety Bi), while the late 8th – early 7th century variety Biv-Bv cups weigh 450-470gr. and hold 1.150-1.450lt. I return to this issue in Section 7.3.

---

1636 CU.150 is slightly larger, while an Archaic cup from the top of the Prines hill is 0.15 tall (Stampolidis 2004, 197, number 118).
1637 KNC, 387. Also see the EO vases in Moignard 1996, 457.
1638 See the MO-LO vases in Moignard 1996, 457.
1639 Platon 1945-1947, 61, number 58.
1640 Lebessi 1970, 277-278, numbers 18, 26; 281, number 37.
1642 All figures cited are approximate. Capacity is based on experiments made by filling the vases with water. No figures are provided for the LPG-PGB variety Bi cups (the size and capacity of which vary considerably) and the LPAR-LAR variety Bvi cups (all of which are fragmentary).
1643 Variety governs the capacity of the Knossian EG-MG coated cups discussed in Tsatsaki 2004, 455-456, 541-542.
1644 Variety governs the capacity of the Knossian EG-MG and LG-EO coated cups discussed in Tsatsaki 2004, 455-456, 541-542 (EG-MG); 456-459, 542-545 (LG-EO).
C) CUPS WITH VERY TALL, VERTICAL NECK: eight vases (pl. 30, 82).

Comments

The gradual height of the base provides the best evidence for the development of the type. The PGB-MG examples stand on a flat base (CU.192, CU.193, CU.194), a disc base is introduced in the LG period (CU.195, CU.196, CU.197) and the conical foot (CU.199) is the latest development.

The Cretan cup with vertical neck, which is perhaps influenced by Attic 8th century mugs, occurs in Knossos during the G-O period, while in East Crete during the O. A Cretan vase of similar shape (I-CU.2) reached Eleutherna in the 7th century. Nipples (CU.198) were introduced on Attic EG large cups and were later adopted in the Argolid and the Cyclades. They occur on Knossian MG-LG and East Cretan LG cups.

The white on dark spiral of CU.192 favours a PGB-EG date; a spiral occurs on a Knossian EG cup. The zigzags of CU.193 are paralleled on some Knossian LPG-EG cups, while the loop pattern of CU.194 and CU.195 is commonly found on local LG-EPAR necked pithoi (Section 5.1.2) and appears on the body-neck transition of a similar vase from Phaistos.

Some of the patterns that occur on LG-PAR vases, including the two intersecting wavy lines (CU.198), the row of S’s (CU.199) and the zigzag (CU.196, CU.197), are discussed in connection with type E cups. Judging by the plain metopes

1645 CU.195 and CU.196, which are contemporary and probably come from the same workshop, confirm that the height of the neck, the depth of the form and the profile of the lip are unreliable dating criteria.
1646 CU.197 and CU.198 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 1996, 63-64, numbers 43-44 – Stampolidis 2004, 270-271, numbers 331-332.
1647 Kübler 1954, 257, number 350: LG. An Attic MG II mug (KNC 294.12) turned up in Knossos and exercised some influence on local potters (KNC, 348-349, 397).
1651 See the comments upon the nipple of HYD.5 in Section 5.2.1.
1652 Coldstream 1972, 83-84, D32.
1653 Fortetsa, 188. Coldstream 1972, 83-84, number 32.
1654 Tsipopoulou 1987, 137, type e; 237.
1655 Fortetsa 656.
1656 KNC, 385-386, type C cups.
1657 Rocchetti 1974-1975, 253, DD.17.
and chevron columns they share, CU.195 and CU.196 are attributed to a single workshop. Metopes first appeared on local pottery during the LG period and are commonly found on EPAR necked pithoi, occasionally flanked by chevron columns. Besides, metopes were introduced on Knossian cups during the LG period, while metopes flanked by chevron columns appear on Knossian LG open vessels. A LG date is also suggested for CU.197 and CU.198, which carry more decorative zones than the rest. The pendent loops with arcading CU.197 displays are paralleled on the PGB-EG NDP.13 and NDP.17, as well as on Cretan G pottery, and recall a Knossian LG-O pattern. The handle pattern of CU.197, which appears on the body of the EPAR CU.200, is matched on the handle of Knossian MG-EO storage vessels. The high base, white slip and red paint of CU.199 favour a PAR date.

PGB-EG: CU.192
EG: CU.193
MG: CU.194
LG: CU.195, CU.196, CU.197, CU.198
PAR: CU.199

D) CUPS WITH TALL NECK WALLS THAT TAPER UPWARDS: four vases (pl. 31, 82).

Comments
The development of this type, which is rarely represented in Knossos and East Crete during the G-O period, is clear. The neck grows taller, the lip becomes more distinct, the groove on the body-neck transition is replaced by carination and the flat base by a conical foot.

1659 Fortetsa 1378 (cup), KNC 106.3 (krater). Chevron columns commonly occur on Knossian G-O pottery: Fortetsa, 174, 60.
1660 Examples are cited in Stampolidis 1996, 63, number 43.
1661 Fortetsa, 181, 13k. Coldstream 2001, 69, fig. 1.25d.
1662 Fortetsa, 186, 21g.
1663 CU.199 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 86, number 31.
The shape, the H/RD ratio and the X pattern of CU.200 are paralleled on a Knossian EO cup. Its hatched triangles are uncommon on Cretan, especially post-PG pottery. The line that rises from their apex occurs on PGB-EG vases from Eleutherna (HYD.8) and Knossos, while curved lines growing from the angle of triangles (or lozenges) appear on Knossian O pottery.

Although the hatched battlement of CU.201 is paralleled on Knossian and East Cretan LG pottery, the shape of the vase favours an EPAR date. A LPAR date is suggested for CU.202, on the basis of its shape and the lack of slip. A Gortynian O vase with conical body, everted lip and conical foot strongly recalls CU.202. The arrangement of pendent loops in groups is popular on local LG-EP AR pottery (see the comments upon type C necked pithoi in Section 5.1.2).

The very deep form, the high neck, the low conical foot and the painted underfoot of CU.203 recall the Cretan high-necked cups of the LAR-Classical period. The Eleuthemian version of this type is, however, equipped with a relatively low neck. Besides, the position of the upper handle attachment of CU.203 below the lip finds no match. Furthermore, the Cretan high-necked cups are always coated (or plain), in contrast to CU.203, the decoration of which is rendered on a slipped ground. It is hard to determine whether CU.203 represents a forerunner of a Late Archaic shape or a survival of the G-P AR decorative scheme.

**EPAR:** CU.200, CU.201

**LPAR:** CU.202

---

1665 KNC H24. The X pattern also occurs on the LG CU.197 (type C).
1668 Cf.: Fortetsa, 173, 5bf-5bh: elaborate versions.
1670 Tsipopoulou 1987, 187, 189-190, pattern 14y.
1671 CU.202 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 86-87, number 32.
1672 For LG-EO cups with conical body see: Fortetsa 1057, KNC 106.18 (Knossos). Levi 1927-1929, 181, fig. 199-right (Afrati).
1673 Johannowsky 2002, 60, number 387 (also cf. number 388).
1675 Erickson 2000, 193.
E) FOUR-ZONED CUPS: twenty-three vases\textsuperscript{1676} (an amazingly homogeneous set, pl. 31, 82).

Comments
Their striking similarity and their discovery in a single context suggest that these cups were produced within a short time-span, by the same workshop, if not the same hand. Although they have no obvious predecessors or successors, their shape and dimensions are paralleled on the coated cups of variety Biv.

These vases probably represent a late version of the cups with reserved panel. The type originates in the Attic EG II repertory and was copied in the Argolid and the Cyclades.\textsuperscript{1677} Imports from the latter area introduced the type to Knossos in the early 8\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{1678} and to East Crete later in the same century.\textsuperscript{1679} The Eleuthemian and Knossian examples display similar shape and (to some extent) size. Although there are also some decorative affinities (the panel, the bars on the handle) between the Eleuthemian and the Knossian examples, the former differ from the latter in displaying a taller panel that is not enclosed by solid paint and a lip that is fully coated, not banded. Further, the filling ornaments are dissimilar.

There are only two cups from Knossos,\textsuperscript{1680} the style of which is close to that of the Eleuthemian series: the decoration is arranged in two zones and includes patterns that occur on Eleuthemian type E cups (intersecting wavy lines, groups of vertical strokes, stelae with horizontal strokes). Further, the decoration of the lower part is quite uncommon for Knossian standards, but recalls the Eleuthemian examples. Only an examination of the fabric of this pair would allow for an assessment of the contacts that led to its production.

\textsuperscript{1676} Some of these cups are discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 82-86, numbers 25-30 (for CU.211, CU.214, CU.215, CU.206, CU.209, CU.207 respectively). Also: Stampolidis 1990, 383, 388, fig. 13, 16. Stampolidis 1990b, 293, pl. 58a-β. Stampolidis 1994a, 52.
\textsuperscript{1677} Tsipopoulou 1987, 137. KNC, 388.
\textsuperscript{1678} KNC, 388, type Ei.
\textsuperscript{1679} Tsipopoulou 1987, 137, type e.
\textsuperscript{1680} Fortetsa 1130 (the vase is considered as G, despite its O context: Fortetsa, 179, 11t). Hayes 1983, 138, number 231 (PGB ?).
Rows of triple concentric circles are common on Cretan LG-O pottery and appear on LG cups from Kavousi and O ones from Knossos. The pattern of the alternating diagonals occurs on the EPAR LEK.9, as well as on Knossian PG-G vases. Groups of vertical strokes appear on Knossian PG and LG-EO pottery, but were introduced in East Crete in the end of the LG period. Rows of columns with horizontal strokes occur on Knossian O pottery, while bands with continuous vertical strokes appear on a Knossian EO cup. Two-line cables are common on Knossian O vases, while two intersecting wavy lines occur on Cretan 8th – early 7th century pottery. A spiral appears on a Knossian EG cup, while rows of S’s are uncommon on Knossian cups, but adorn some LG-EO cups from East Crete. Zigzags are popular on Cretan Iron Age pottery.

**LG-(EPAR):** CU.204, CU.205, CU.206, CU.207, CU.208, CU.209, CU.210, CU.211, CU.212, CU.213, CU.214, CU.215, CU.216, CU.217, CU.218, CU.219, CU.220, CU.221, CU.222, CU.223, CU.224, CU.225, CU.226

**F) MISCELLANEOUS CUPS:** one vase (pl. 31).

*Comments*

The fabric and the decoration of CU.227 recall the LPG SK.1, SK.2. Perhaps the three vases come from the same workshop. The triangle pattern resembles Knossian LPG-MG motifs. Decorated flat-based cups are rare in PG Crete.

---

1681 Fortetsa, 175, 9i. GGP, 252.
1683 Fortetsa 1515, 1249.
1684 The PGB (?) kalathos Fortetsa 523 (Fortetsa, 170, 3v) and the MG skyphos KNC 107.77.
1685 Fortetsa, 168, 1a.
1686 Tsipopoulou 1978, 161, pattern γ.
1687 Fortetsa, 168, 1n. A similar pattern occurs on an East Cretan O cup: Droop 1905-1906, 35, M.
1688 Fortetsa 1249.
1689 Fortetsa, 179, 11y.
1690 See the comments upon AM.5 in Section 5.1.1.
1691 Fortetsa 656.
1693 Coulson, Haggis, Mook and Tobin 1997, 326, fig. 8:1-2.
1694 CU.227 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 80, number 12.
This name is conventionally applied to four vases (pl. 31, 83) of a shape that is hitherto found only in Eleutherna: a small open vessel with two horizontal handles of reflex shape, one of which is intersected by a vertical handle. Its use remains uncertain but the size, the grooves below the lip and the overall coating recall the PG, small, coated cups and suggest a similar function.

Comments
The form of the base provides the best evidence for the development of the shape. The convex base of KY.1 was replaced by the better-articulated, slightly concave base of KY.2 and KY.3, which was in turn succeeded by the almost flat base of KY.4. Although all vases might have been produced in a single workshop, the fabric and paint suggest strong correspondences only among KY.2, KY.3 and KY.4.

The shape finds no match outside Eleutherna. Some Knossian coated cups are, however, equipped with a similar, lipless, hemispherical bowl. The peculiar horizontal handles of the kyathion recall the handles of local G basins (type Ai) and Knossian PG-O trays and basins.

LPG: KY.1
PGB: KY.2, KY.3
EG: KY.4

\[ \text{Boardman 1960, 134, V.16, V.20; 140, VIII.12: EPG-MPG ?.} \]
\[ \text{KNC, 391. Coldstream 2001, 59.} \]
5.5 OPEN VESSELS: Shallow Open Vessels

5.5.1 Kalathoi

The kalathos is a fairly large open vessel with conical body. Although it has a long history in Crete, the introduction of the type with the two horizontal handles below the lip in the LM IIIC period\(^1\) has been attributed to a Cypriot stimulus.\(^2\) Nevertheless, a Mycenaean parentage has also been suggested.\(^3\) Indeed, the kalathos was common in the LH IIIC period,\(^4\) even though it did not enter the Submycenaean-PG repertory of the rest of the Aegean.\(^5\) The Cretan Iron Age kalathos was perhaps originally a bowl for food, as documented in the Spring Chamber of Knossos.\(^6\) Later, however, it also served as a lid for urns,\(^7\) as confirmed by KAL.2, KAL.3. All six kalathoi from Eleutherna (pl. 31) belong to the type described above, which is well represented in Cretan tombs, but hardly in other contexts.\(^8\)

Comments

The profile of the walls (convex in the LPG, concave in the PGB and straight in EG period) documents the development of the shape. The EG period also witnessed the replacement of the earlier, shallow form by a considerably deeper one. The LPG date of KAL.1 is supported by its convex walls, high ridge and broad groove, as well as by its pale fabric. KAL.4 recalls KAL.2 and KAL.3, which are PGB by context, in

\(^5\) Lemos 2002, 55.
displaying a shallow form with concave walls. On the other hand, the deep form with straight walls and narrow groove of KAL.5 and KAL.6, as well as the ring base of the former, suggest an EG date.

Interestingly, the Knossian kalathoi also display the replacement of the concave profile by a straight one in the EG period, when a ring base is occasionally introduced.1705 Unlike their Eleuthernian counterparts, however, the Knossian kalathoi gradually adopt a shallower form with narrower base, as well as a shorter RD.

Leaving aside the pair from trench A, the kalathoi from Eleutherna carry a horizontal wavy line. The pattern appears on similar kalathoi already in the Subminoan period1706 and proves popular throughout the PG.1707 The motif also occurs on KAL.6, the shape and white on red decoration of which, however, favour an EG date. The S’s of KAL.5 suggest a PGB-EG date, while the pattern of KAL.11708 is paralleled on a Knossian PGB-EG kalathos.1709 The decoration on the lip of the local kalathoi, whether this is strokes/bars (KAL.2, KAL.3, KAL.5, KAL.6)1710 or solid triangles (KAL.4),1711 is amply paralleled. The adornment of the base (KAL.2, KAL.5, KAL.6) and the banded interior of all local examples were introduced on Knossian parallels during the (LPG)-PGB period, in connection with the use of the kalathos as a lid.1712

LPG: KAL.1

1708 KAL.1 is discussed in: Stampolidis 1993, 59-60, number 3 - Stampolidis 1994, 89, number 34.
1709 Payne 1927-1928, 258, number 133.
5.5.2 Basins (Lekanai-Lekanides)

Basins with straight or convex walls were produced in Crete from the LM period to the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{1713} The shape is also represented in the LH repertory, but largely disappears in the Submycenaean period\textsuperscript{1714} and seems rare in the PG Aegean.\textsuperscript{1715} In contrast, a large number of plain, mostly fine-ware basins of varying size and form have been discovered in Eleuthema. They probably replaced the kalathos both as a bowl and a cover. Types A and B include lipless basin with reflex and strap handles respectively.\textsuperscript{1716} Type C is a miscellaneous group of basins with distinct lip.

A) LIPLESS BASINS (LEKANAI-LEKANIDES) WITH REFLEX HANDLES:

Two sub-types, Ai and Aii, are distinguished according to the form of the handles. The former is further divided in two varieties according to size.

Ai) Although lug handles of reflex shape appear on an Attic 10\textsuperscript{th} century bowl,\textsuperscript{1717} I am skeptical about Demetriou’s suggestion that a very rare Attic shape generated the Cretan series of basins with similar handles.\textsuperscript{1718} On the other hand, the Cypriot parallels, which appear at around 800, are perhaps indebted to Crete.\textsuperscript{1719}

Basins or shallower (mostly plain) open vases with similar handles come from Afrati,\textsuperscript{1720} Agies Paraskies,\textsuperscript{1721} Archanes,\textsuperscript{1722} Gavalomouri,\textsuperscript{1723}

\textsuperscript{1714} Mountjoy 1993, 48, 114.
\textsuperscript{1715} Lemos 2002, 88.
\textsuperscript{1716} Given that the lipless BA.48, BA.49, BA.50, BA.51 preserve no handles, they cannot be assigned to type A or B. The former two come from a LPAR context, while the third from an EPAR (?) one.
\textsuperscript{1717} Ki.lbler 1954, 228, number 271.
\textsuperscript{1718} Demetriou 1989, 44.
\textsuperscript{1719} Demetriou 1989, 44.
\textsuperscript{1720} Levi 1927-1929, 497-498, fig. 592-D, form i.
\textsuperscript{1721} Platon 1945-1947, 60, number 55.
\textsuperscript{1722} Sakellarakis 1986, 47, Π.24353.
\textsuperscript{1723} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1987, 311, number 8.
Khalasmenos, Kavousi, Knossos, Mastabas (Herakleion), Mirabello area and Vrokastro. So far, however, no site has produced a sequence of complete examples that would allow for a thorough study of their development.

**Aia** Lipless large basins/lekanai (H ≥ 0.08m.) with lug handles of reflex shape: seventeen vases (pl. 32, 84).

**Comments**

The context of the vases from tomb A1K1 provides abundant information on the development of the shape, which was apparently introduced in the EG period. The earliest (EG-MG) examples are equipped with fully developed handles (BA.1, BA.5), both of which may be pierced (BA.1, BA.2, BA.3, BA.4), and occasionally with convex walls (BA.1, BA.2). Vestigial lug handles of reflex shape appear from the MG period onwards (BA.2, BA.3, BA.4, BA.6, BA.7, BA.8, BA.9, BA.10, BA.11, BA.12, BA.13). From the LG period, however, only one or none of these handles may be pierced (BA.8, BA.9, BA.10, BA.12, BA.14). Lastly, the horizontal segment that connects the lugs is abandoned on the EPAR basins (BA.14, BA.15, BA.16, BA.17). Besides, the only basins that carry no surface treatment (BA.15, BA.17) are EPAR.

The date of some vases is insecure. Although the fragmentary state of BA.6, BA.7 does not allow for a firm dating, the fragmentary BA.11 and BA.13 that carry vestigial handles, no more than one of which is pierced, are considered LG (such a date is confirmed by the decoration of BA.13, which is treated below). The fully developed handles of BA.5 favour an early date, but its straight walls are a late feature; the peculiar piercing of its handles further baffles the issue. I consider the vase (MG)-LG.

---

1726 Fortetsa 890, 891. KNC, 391, type B. Moignard 1996, 452.
1727 Lebessi 1970, 286, number 58; 288, number 63; 289-290, number 75.
1729 Hayden 2003, 70, number 186.
1730 A basin from the top of the Prines hill belongs to this type: Stampolidis 2004, 200, number 130.
1731 The survival of fully developed handles and convex walls until the LG period is confirmed by a fragmentary, large basin from the top of the Prines hill (Stampolidis 2004, 200, number 130).
The relief decoration of BA.1 is paralleled on unpublished basin sherds from Eleutherna. Fairly similar decoration occurs on a tray from Knossos and a disc from Prinias. Relief decoration is also found on the base of basins or trays with reflex handles from Agios Nikolaos and Knossos, as well as on a Cretan basin in Missouri. The painted decoration of BA.13 favours a LG-EPAR date, since both cross-hatched panels and groups of double concentric circles are popular on Cretan LG-O vases. The groove below the rim of BA.1 and BA.3 recalls BA.21 (variety Aib), CBA.1 and occurs on basins from Knossos and Afrati.

EG: BA.1
MG: BA.2, BA.3, BA.4
MG-LG: BA.5, BA.6, BA.7
LG: BA.8, BA.9, BA.10, BA.11, BA.12, BA.13
EPAR: BA.14, BA.15, BA.16, BA.17

Aib) Lipless, small basins/lekanides (H ≤ 0.07m.) with lug handles of reflex shape: seven vases (pl. 32).

Comments

The development of the shape is illuminated by a comparison of the handles of BA.18, BA.19, BA.20, which are G by context, to those of the EPAR BA.24. The

1732 BA.1 is discussed in Section 4.2, as well as in Stampolidis 2004, 262-263, number 307.
1733 Hartley 1930-1931, 92-93, pl. XVIII.4.
1734 Pernier 1914, 65, number 4. For a later disc with relief decoration see Boardman 1961, 63, Heraklion 2135.
1736 1) Orsi 1897, 261, VIII. Although a similar tray is reported in Hartley 1930-1931, 93, fig. 23, Boardman (Boardman 1961, 86, footnote 1) is probably right to assume that she refers to the same vase, particularly since the latter was not located to be published in Coldstream 2002 (several vases from the tombs excavated in 1899 are, however, missing). Add: Anatoliki Mesogeios 207, number 230 - Stampolidis 2003, 366, number 522. I believe (see Section 4.2) that the mould that produced the relief decoration on the latter, LG-EO example was also used on two LG lids from Gortyn (Johannowsky 2000, 9, numbers 11-12).
1737 Reed 1981, 60-62 (early 7th century).
1740 Fortetsa, 175, 9j. GGP, 252.
1741 KNC 229.4.
1742 Levi 1927-1929, 126, fig. 108.
handles of the former group are fully developed and pierced, while those of BA.24 are vestigial and only one of them is pierced. This evidence basically conforms to what is attested for the larger examples of variety Aia, even though the small examples were probably slower to abandon the fully developed lug handles and the piercing of both handles and never dropped the horizontal segment that connects the lugs. On these grounds, the fully developed, pierced handles of BA.18, BA.19, BA.20 suggest an EG-MG date, while the vestigial handles of BA.24, only one of which is pierced, an EPAR-advanced one (perhaps the straight walls of BA.24 support this date). Two examples that combine early and late features (BA.21, BA.22, BA.23) are assigned to the LG-EPAR period.

EG: BA.18
EG-MG: BA.19
MG-LG: BA.20
LG-EPAR: BA.21, BA.22, BA.23
EPAR-advanced: BA.24

Aii) Lipless basins with reflex handles other than lugs: three vases (pl. 32).

Comments
These vases were produced at a time when basins with reflex handles (type A) were generally abandoned and basins with strap handles (type B) were becoming more popular. This change of fashion is particularly clear on the handles of BA.27, which represent a fusion of the handles of the two types. The handles of BA.25 and BA.26 find parallels in Afrati and Prinias.

1743 BA.23 finds a close local parallel that Erickson dates to the 6th century (Erickson 2000, 213, 215, fig. 17.5.i: bowl); this date is, however, based on a sequence, the building of which relies on an unjustified attribution of the plastic head of TH.6 to the LO-Late Daedalic style. The early 7th century date of TH.6, which was first proposed by Stampolidis (Stampolidis 1993, 64. Erickson cites Stampolidis in page 213, but does not refer to his suggestion or explain why he favours a lower date), seems, however, undeniable to me.
1744 BA.21 was covering the MG-LG NDP.111.
1745 Levi 1927-1929, 498, fig. 592-D, form l.
B) LIPELESS BASINS (LEKANAI-LEKANIDES) WITH STRAP HANDLES:
Although strap-handled basins have been found in Agies Paraskies and Knossos, they are rarely lipless.

Bi) Lipless large basins/lekanai (H ≥ 0.075m.) with strap handles: nine vases (pl. 32).

Comments
Context suggests that variety Bi is probably an innovation of the PAR period, as well as that large basins with strap handles mostly served as urn covers. Context further confirms that the shallower (H/RD: 0.31-0.4) basins (BA.29, BA.30) were associated with EPAR vases, while deeper examples (H/RD: 0.42-0.52) were covering LPAR vessels (BA.33, BA.34, BA.35, BA.36). Nevertheless, the deep BA.28 was covering the EPAR-advanced or late NDP.64.

EPAR: BA.28, BA.29, BA.30
PAR: BA.31
LPAR: BA.32, BA.33, BA.34, BA.35, BA.36

Bii) Lipless small basins/lekanides (H < 0.065m.) with strap handles: nine vases (pl. 32, 85).

1747 Platon 1945-1947, 60, numbers 53-54: coarse.
1750 The fragmentary state of BA.31 and BA.32 does not allow for a calculation of their H/RD; the latter vase was covering the LPAR NDP.83.
1751 Two similar, LAR vases are discussed in Erickson 2000, 213, 216, fig. 17.5.ii-iii.
Comments

Context favours a PAR-LAR date and further suggests that the shallower (H/RD: 0.30-0.35) basins (BA.37, BA.38) are EPAR, the deeper ones (H/RD: 0.38-0.43) are LPAR (BA.39, BA.40, BA.41) and the very deep ones (H/RD: 0.59-0.60) LAR (BA.44, BA.45).\(^{1752}\) Accordingly, the fairly deep BA.42 (H/RD: 0.48) is considered LPAR-LAR. The development towards a deeper form is associated with an increase in size.

Simple decoration appears on most LPAR-LAR vases. The dipping of the LPAR-LAR BA.42, BA.43 and the LAR BA.44, BA.45 is paralleled on Knossian LAR, domestic, open vessels.\(^ {1753}\)

EPAR: BA.37, BA.38,
LPAR: BA.39, BA.40, BA.41
LPAR-LAR: BA.42, BA.43
LAR: BA.44, BA.45

C) MISCELLANEOUS BASINS (LEKANAI-LEKANIDES): two vases.

Comments

These two are the only non-coarse basins from Eleutherna that carry a true lip. They are very similar to each other and their profile finds close \(^7\)th century parallels from Knossos\(^ {1754}\) and Prinias.\(^ {1755}\) Such a date is in agreement with the context of BA.46.

EPAR: BA.46, BA.47

\(^{1752}\) The very deep vessels are hybrids between the basin and the skyphos (cf. the Knossian PG-EG skyphoi: Fortetsa 1187. Coldstream 1972, 76, C41); this is best exemplified by BA.42, which combines a vertical and a horizontal handle (cf. a LAR example from Eleutherna: Erickson 2000, 213, 216, fig. 17.5.iii. Also, see Kourou 1999, 62 and cf. a LG/EO skyphos from Mastabas: Lebessi 1970, 290-291, number 80) and recalls a type of Attic skyphoi, represented in Crete by the Attic LG II KNC 106.19.

\(^ {1753}\) Coldstream 1972, 47-48.


\(^ {1755}\) Rizza, Palermo e Tomasello 1992, 66, numbers 140, 142.
General Comments on the basins

Fine-ware (nearly always lipless) basins appeared in Orthi Petra in the EG period and replaced the kalathos in its use as a lid. The shape was originally equipped with developed lug handles of reflex shape, both of which were pierced, and convex walls. Gradually (but earlier on large examples) the lug handles became vestigial and only one (or none) of them was pierced, while straight walls were established. In the EPAR period, the horizontal segment that connected the lugs of the large vessels vanished.

The EPAR period, which witnessed the demise of the basin with reflex handles (some later experiments with reflex handles are rare), introduced the strap-handled type. The development of the new type is marked by a gradual deepening of the form. The LAR small version is deep enough to be considered as a fusion of the basin and the skyphos.

The notable variety in handle types that occurred in the early 7th century is paralleled in Knossos, even though the Knossian sequence displays considerable differences to the Eleuthernian one. For example, the height of the Knossian basins is about one third or less of the rim diameter, while the height of the Eleuthernian basins is half or about one third of the rim diameter. Lastly, the regular Knossian basins are considerably larger than the Eleuthernian ones. The smaller size of the vases from Orthi Petra is probably related to their principal use as lids.

5.5.3 Thymiateria

The name thymiaterion (incense burner) is applied to a group of six open vessels, which find no close parallel in Iron Age Crete. These vases, which stand on a high foot and often carry traces of fire, probably served for burning incense or producing burnt offerings. Their ritual function is further supported by the relief face and plinth of TH.6, as well as the bosses on the rim of TH.3. Thymiateria of roughly

\[\text{Coldstream 2001, 59, 63.}\]
\[\text{Coldstream 2001, 63.}\]
\[\text{Coldstream 2001, 63, RD: 0.30-0.35m.}\]
\[\text{TH.3, TH.5 and TH.6 carry traces of fire (the former contained a lamp, as well as particles of coal).}\]
similar shape occur in LM shrines (Knossos, Gazi), while a collection of earlier vases of broadly similar shape comes from Phaistos. Two types of thymiateria are identified in Eleutherna according to the articulation of body and foot.

A) THYMIATERIA WITH INTEGRATED FOOT: three vases (pl. 33).

Comments

The aforementioned Minoan examples from Gazi and Phaistos set the prototype for thymiateria with integrated foot. The foot of the latter became progressively lower and the recess on the bottom of the bowl shallower. Although the hollow foot of TH.3 is probably an influence from type B thymiateria, the overall form of the vase recalls a LM IIIC kalathos from Kavousi, which carries bosses on the lip and is affixed on a stepped, hollow, snake tube. Bosses are further found on the lip of LM IIIB-O kalathoi, which often come from shrines and occasionally carry traces of burning. Although Platon assumed that these bosses served to hold firebrands, recalling the Eleusinian kernoi, the finds from Kavousi suggest that they originally represented horns of consecration.

The yellow slip and groups of vertical strokes TH.1 carries favour a LG date. Although the other two vases are clearly later, their simple decoration and late

1760 Popham 1970, 93-94.
1761 Marinatos 1937, 283-284, fig. 7, upper right. Kanta 1980, 20, 316, fig. 9:4: Kanta argues that the vase imitates Levantine alabaster prototypes. An alabaster vase of similar shape from a Knossian LM II-LM IIIA1 context has recently been claimed as Cretan (Karetsou, Andeadaki-Vlazaki and Papadakis 2001, 243, number 243). Stampolidis prefers to trace the forerunners of the Eleuthernian thymiateria to the Minoan communion cups (Stampolidis 1990, 398, footnote 68).
1762 Mercando 1974-1975, 96-111.
1763 Although fairly deep, the thymiateria are classified among shallow open vessels due to the resemblance of the body of most examples to a basin.
1764 Gessel 2004, 141, fig. 7.9.
1766 Platon 1945-1947, 81-82, footnote 1.
1768 The pattern appears on the LG-(EPAR) type E cups (Section 5.4.4), as well as on Knossian PG, but mostly LG-EO pottery: Fortetsa, 168, 1a.
context perplex the issue of chronology. Judging by its added white colour bands, TH.2 may be PAR. On the other hand, the hollow foot and lack of decoration TH.3 displays, as well as its association with a lamp, favour a LAR or later date.

LG: TH.1
PAR or later: TH.2
LAR or later: TH.3

B) THYMIATERIA ON A PEDESTAL FOOT: three vases (pl. 33).

Comments
The predecessors of this type should be sought on the aforementioned, Minoan thymiateria from Knossos. The form of the bowl is, however, the body of a local lipless basin with vestigial reflex handles (type A). Although vestigial reflex handles occur on basins throughout the MG-EPAR period, the lack of suspension holes on the handles of the thymiateria and the drop of the horizontal segment on the handles of TH.4 favour an EPAR date (an EPAR-early date is suggested by the handles of TH.5 and TH.6). The white slip of all three vases and the rendering of the face on TH.6 confirm this date.

The style of TH.6, which has been regarded as a lid for a small larnax, has been discussed in several publications1769 and I only offer some fresh remarks. The closest parallels are provided by the Daedalic face that is applied on two slightly later vessels with cylindrical body and pedestal foot from Afrati (?)1770 and Archanes;1771 a mould was, however, used in these cases. The inspiration for the relief decoration, which accords with the Cretan fondness for anthropomorphic clay vessels that is

---

1771 Jenkins 1936, 46, 64: the Archanes vessel, however, carried a neck, like the bronze head-vase from the Idaean Cave mentioned below, as well as a clay Rhodian head-vase (Higgins 1959, 11, number 1601). The latter recalls TH.6 is carrying a row of circles on the forehead. The Idaean Cave vase is dated to the mid-7th century (Boardman 1961, 81. For a higher dating see: Archibald 2000, 31, note 2), while the other two are slightly later.
identified already in the 8th century, should be sought in metal vessels, like the bronze head-vase from the Idaean Cave, or in Oriental clay ‘thymiateria’ with relief decoration; a bronze, early 4th century, head-shaped thymiaterion from Motya, however, largely reconciles the two alternatives. Concerning the use of TH.6, I am sceptical about its identification as a larnax lid. Clay larnakes were common in LM III times, but only a few Iron Age examples are known. Furthermore, the lid of one small, Knossian larnax that probably carried the body of a child is almost double in size than the plinth of TH.6.

**EPAR-(early): TH.4, TH.5, TH.6**

*General Comments on the thymiateria*

Although the shape originates in the LM repertory, it is unattested in Iron Age Crete excluding Eleutherna. The local potters adopted the Minoan form (type A), which they later fused with the basin with reflex handles to produce type B. The hollow foot of TH.3 suggests, however, that type B exercised some influence upon type A. The shape proved popular only in the PAR period.

**5.5.4 Bowls**

The generic term bowl was employed for the simple form of BO.1 and BO.2 (pl. 34a, 83), which finds no close parallel in the rest of Crete.

---

1773 Boardman 1961, 80-81, number 378 (although the form of the ‘Cypriot’, 7th century parallel mentioned is closer to TH.6, its function is uncertain, see Mattusch 1988, 38-40).
1774 Amiran 1970, 302-303. For the uncertain function of these vessels see Mazar 1980, 95-96.
1775 Ciasca et al. 1989, 83-84.
1777 KNC 56.10.
Comments
The simple shape and decoration are not really illuminating in terms of dating. The overall impression (mostly the thin walls and the good quality paint) favours a MG-LG date.

MG-LG (?): BO.1, BO.2

5.5.5 Plates

The plate, which is defined as a narrow-based variant of the tray (see Section 5.5.6), is singly represented in Eleutherna (pl. 33). The shape is quite common in South Central Crete during the 7th century, but extremely rare in Knossos and the rest of Crete. The rarity of the plate throughout the Greek world has raised speculation on whether it was regularly made of perishable materials.

Comments
The reflex handles of PL.1 are paralleled on plates from South Central Crete, as well as Attica and the Cyclades. The row of dots is matched on an Attic tray that dates to the end of the 8th century, while dotted patterns are common on Eleuthernian PAR pottery. The cross pattern of the base is paralleled on two Knossian LG-EO lids and recalls the motif on the base of a Knossian tray and a Cycladic plate.

1778 KNC, 390.
1782 PL.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 1994, 89-90, number 35.
1784 Kübler 1954, pl. 101-104. Brann 1962, 44-45. GGP, 49, 87: The shape was introduced in Attica in the MG II period and became common in the LG.
1785 Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 68-69.
1786 Kübler 1954, 228, number 271.
1787 Fortetsa, 177, 9au.
1788 Coldstream 1992, 69, GB.33: LPG-PGB.
1789 Dugas et Rhomaios 1934, 69, number 8: (LG)-EO.
5.5.6 Trays

Trays are the shallowest open shapes of the Cretan Iron Age repertory (H/RD: 0.1-0.3). They are regarded suitable for eating, especially in funerary feasts, and often occur in pairs in Knossian tombs\(^{1790}\) (TR.1 and TR.2 also turned up as a pair). The eight trays\(^{1791}\) from Eleutherna have been divided in two types on the basis of the body profile.

A) TRAYS WITH BELLIED WALLS: two vases (a matching pair, pl. 33).

Comments

The shape of TR.1 and TR.2\(^{1792}\) is paralleled on Knossian G-EO trays.\(^{1793}\) White on dark decoration is, however, only found on Knossian EO examples,\(^{1794}\) while bands occur on Knossian LG-EO parallels.\(^{1795}\)

LG: TR.1, TR.2

B) TRAYS WITH STEEP SLOPING WALLS: six vases (pl. 85).

Comments

Erickson admitted difficulties in tracing the local development of the type.\(^{1796}\) The contexts of most examples discussed here favour a LPAR date; no vase is necessarily earlier, but most are possibly later.

\(^{1791}\) A ninth, fragmentary tray (TR.3), if correctly identified as such, should probably be assigned to type A.
\(^{1792}\) TR.1 and TR.2 are discussed respectively in Stampolidis 1996, 64-65, numbers 45-46 – Stampolidis 2004, 271, numbers 333-334.
\(^{1793}\) KNC, 392, type C. Add the EO KNC 76.5.
\(^{1794}\) Coldstream 1973, 40, H47. KNC 218.138.
The way the handles are attached sets apart two forms, which are represented already in the LH IIIC period. Trays with straight walls and three handles on the lip also occur in the LM IIIC and Subminoan period, as well as in PG contexts in Knossos, Kourtes and Phaistos. A G-O vase of similar shape comes from Agies Paraskies, two EO ones from Knossos and an O one from Gortyn. The early 6th century version is represented at Taucheira/Tocra. The reflex handles of TR.6 recall those of the PAR type Aii basins and are paralleled on a Knossian PGB-EG (?) tray.

On the other hand, the straight, very low walls of TR.8 and TR.9, as well as the squared lip of TR.8 recall some Knossian O trays. The dipping of TR.9 is paralleled on LPAR-LAR basins of variety Bii (Section 5.5.2) and is common on Knossian Archaic, domestic, open vessels.

(EPAR)-LPAR-LAR: TR.4, TR.5, TR.6, TR.7, TR.8, TR.9

General Comments on the trays

Although the tray appeared at Orthi Petra at a relatively late date, the number and variety of PAR-LAR examples is considerable. A similar peak in the number and variety of trays is traced in late 7th century Knossos, where, however, the shape occurs throughout the Iron Age.

1796 Erickson 2000, 212-213.
1797 Mounjoy 1986, 180, 193.
1798 Coldstream 2001, 59. The shape is also represented in contemporary (LC IIIB-CG I) Cyprus, as well as in a few regions of the PG Aegean (Demetriou 1989, 43-44).
1801 Rocchetti 1967-1968, 205, number 71.
1802 Platon 1945-1947, 60, 81, number 57.
1805 Boardman and Hayes 1966, 80, number 930.
1807 Cf. Coldstream 1973, 39-40, H44, H48 (H<0.04m.).
1809 TR.9 is discussed in Stampolidis 1996, 45, number 5.
5.6 COARSE AND COOKING POTTERY

The fabric of the local coarse and cooking pottery seems a crude, gritty version of the one employed for fine-ware vessels and displays no considerable improvement through time.

Some cooking vessels display provisions of technical character. The self-slipped surface that is occasionally identified contributed to the reduction of permeability,\(^{1812}\) while the nearly ubiquitous three legs provided stability over a source of heat. The traces of burning all cooking vessels (excluding the fragmentary BTR.7) display suggest that the vessels had served practical purposes, unlike their counterparts in Knossian tombs, which are regarded as symbolic offerings.\(^{1813}\) I return to this issue in Section 7.3.

5.6.1 Household Basins

The four local coarse basins (pl. 34) are distinguished from their fine-ware counterparts on account of their fabric, large size and flat lip. The origins of the shape are discussed in connection with the fine-ware examples (Section 5.5.2).

Comments

Although Cretan coarse basins normally carry a distinct lip (see the vases cited below), the Eleuthernian examples display a simple lip, in accordance with trends identified in the case of local fine-ware basins. Otherwise, all four examples discussed are individual. The shape and dimensions of CBA.1\(^{1814}\) find a close Knossian G parallel.\(^{1815}\) Two similar vases, which are closer to CBA.4, however, turned up in a G-O tomb in Agies Paraskies.\(^{1816}\) One of them\(^ {1817}\) carries a groove below the lip, like CBA.1. Although the thick, narrow lip of CBA.2 and CBA.3 is

---

\(^{1812}\) Moody et al. 2003, 80.
\(^{1813}\) KNC, 350-351, type F. Coldstream 2001, 63.
\(^{1814}\) CBA.1 is discussed in Stampolidis 2004, 263, number 308.
\(^{1817}\) Platon 1945-1947, 60, number 53.
paralleled on Knossian LG-late - O basins, their peculiar handles find no match. These handles perhaps conform to the variety in handle types that is identified on fine-ware basins during the EPAR period.

(PGB)-EG: CBA.1
LG-PAR: CBA.2
EPAR: CBA.3, CBA.4

5.6.2 Cooking Jugs

Although the cooking jug was introduced in LM IIIB-C Crete under Mycenaean influence, the criteria proposed for the identification of the Minoan or Mycenaean pedigree of the Cretan vessels have recently been claimed problematic. The Cretan Iron Age form is only loosely related to the handmade version of the shape that occurs in the rest of the Aegean during the PG period.

Although several cooking jugs have turned up in domestic and burial contexts at Knossos, the variety with three legs is less common than the flat-based one. A few parallels, most of which stand on three legs, come from burials contexts at Kourtes, Agies Paraskies, Archanes, Mastabas in Herakleion, Phaistos and Sitia. Concerning settlements, several vases have turned up at Phaistos, some at Kavousi, a few at Gria Vigla and just one at Khania.

1819 Kanta 2003, 173, 176.
1823 The parallels cited exclude flat-based coarse/cooking cups or vessels that resemble cauldrons.
1826 Platon 1945-1947, 58, number 49.
1827 Sakellarakis 1986, 44-45, П.24336.
1828 Lebessi 1970, 290, number 76.
1829 Rocchetti 1967-1968, 197, number 51.
The shape is quite common in the sanctuary of Kommos and is also represented on the potter’s workshop at Prinias. Eight examples come from Eleuthera (pl. 34, 86).

**Comments**

The local shape becomes shallower over time, while the height of the neck (H1) gradually decreases in relation to the overall (from base to rim) height (H2). Accordingly, the ratio H2/H1 rises from 4.9-5.1 (CJU.1, CJU.2), to 6-6.2 (CJU.3, CJU.4) and 6.5-6.9 (CJU.7) or even more (7.7: CJU.8). The LPG-PGB vases (CJU.1, CJU.2) are also distinguished by the form of their handle (rectangular in section) and legs (elliptical in section). During the G period, however, a handle that is elliptical in section and legs that are flattened elliptical in section are introduced. The G form persisted in the PAR period, but assumed a cut on the upper leg (CJU.7, CJU.8). Lastly, a self-slipped surface is only found on early examples.

**LPG-PGB:** CJU.1, CJU.2  
**G:** CJU.3, CJU.4  
**G-PAR:** CJU.5  
**EPAR:** CJU.6  
**PAR:** CJU.7, CJU.8

---

1832 Mook 1993, 188.  
1834 Hallager, Andreadaki-Vlasaki et al. 1997, 225, 70-P1380. This vase is also discussed in Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 237.  
1835 Kommos IV, 224, number 116; 229, number 169; 237, number 252; 248, numbers 379-381.  
1837 Two vases are illustrated in: Stampolidis 1990, 386, fig. 15. Stampolidis 1990b, 295, pl. 61α.  
1838 Note the H/RD (H: height of body and neck) of the following vases: CJU.1 (1.55), CJU.2 (1.33), CJU.3 and CJU.5 (1.25), CJU.7 (1.13). The RD of CJU.4, CJU.6, CJU.8 cannot be estimated.  
1839 In contrast, the neck of the Knossian jugs gradually grew taller: Coldstream 1992, 86.  
1840 Although the ratio of CJU.6 (5.7) does not conform to this scheme, this is perhaps due to the vessel’s very small size. Besides, the ratio of CJU.5 cannot be estimated.
5.6.3 Baking Trays

The Cretan Iron Age coarse tray, which is considered appropriate for 'toasting' and baking, follows a Minoan prototype. Leaving aside the eight examples from Eleutherna (pl. 34), the shape seems rare in Iron Age Crete and is only represented in settlement contexts in Subminoan-MPG Knossos and PG-G Kavousi. Likewise, the shape is uncommon in the rest of the PG Aegean.

Comments

The form of the lip provides the best indication for the development of the shape. Early examples (BTR.1, BTR.2, BTR.4) display a simple rim; the first step towards a distinct lip, which was probably introduced in the LG period, is apparently the addition of a groove below the rim (BTR.3, BTR.4). Also, finger impressions are missing from the legs of the early examples (BTR.1, BTR.2), but occur singly on EG-MG vases (BTR.3, BTR.4) and in pairs or groups of three on LG-PAR ones (BTR.5, BTR.8). The handles of BTR.7 lie within the spirit of the PAR period.

LPG-PGB: BTR.1, BTR.2
EG-MG: BTR.3, BTR.4
LG-PAR: BTR.5, BTR.6, BTR.7
EPAR: BTR.8

1841 Borgna 1997, 204-205.
1843 Two vases are illustrated in: Stampolidis 1990b, 295, pl. 61β. Stampolidis 1994a, 51. Add an example from the Nisi hill: Stampolidis 2004, 199, number 129, which I consider (LG)-EPAR.
1845 Mook 1993, 188-189, 210 (fragmentary examples).
1847 Add the example from Nisi cited in footnote 1843.
CHAPTER 6: IMPORTED POTTERY - ITS ORIGINS AND IMPACT ON ELEUTHERNIAN POTTERY

The identification of a vase from Eleutherna as an import is solely based on the examination of its fabric by non-scientific means and the study of its shape and style, since no fabric analysis has yet been conducted on Iron Age pottery from Orthi Petra. The eighty-seven vases considered imported are all fine ware examples and comprise nearly one tenth (~9.7%) of the total material discussed here. Although they are individually treated in Appendix III, this chapter provides an overall discussion of imported pottery found in Orthi Petra. The various sections of this chapter examine the total of imports from a particular region, focusing on the impact they exercised upon local pottery and assessing the distribution of vases of similar origins within Crete (for the location of the sites mentioned refer to Map 1). Two related aspects are addressed where evidence is available: other classes of artefacts that were imported in Eleutherna from the region in question and Cretan exports, whether pottery or other artefacts, to that region. Hence, the connections between Eleutherna and each region are set against the Cretan background and their quality is assessed. Lastly, the circulation of goods is occasionally discussed in association with the movement of people, including the proposed migration of individuals from the Cyclades and Phoenicia to Eleutherna, as well as the Cretan participation to the foundation of Gela.

I deliberately avoid pursuing general assumptions on trade on the basis of the clay imports from Orthi Petra, given their low absolute number and great variety in

---

1848 A project of fabric analysis has been planned in cooperation with the INSTAP.
1849 Jones 2000 provides useful catalogues of imported items (including pottery) in Iron Age Crete. Although, however, this book was published in 2000, the catalogues are not up-to-date: they exclude references to the publication of the Knossos North Cemetery (Coldstream and Catling 1996), the Kommos sanctuary (Shaw and Shaw 2000) and the Khania settlement (Hallager and Hallager 1997) and rely on preliminary reports. Hence, references to Jones 2000 are avoided where material from these publications is discussed. Further, since most references to Coldstream 1972 (in Jones 2000, 230) are erroneous and/or incomplete, the latter work is cited independently. Despite the problems pertinent to Jones 2000 (only some of which are discussed in: Johnston 2003, Sherratt 2003), I am frequently citing this work, which collects ample bibliographic references, to avoid repeating them (any omissions or errors are noted, however, and recent bibliography is added). Further, I avoid repeating the references to Attic and Cycladic imports in Crete that are collected in Kourou 1994, 275-279.
1850 Although some of these artefacts are discussed in more than one publication, I only cite the fullest reference.
1851 The particular origins of these exports are indeterminate.
terms of origins and types (for which see below). The number, variety and context of the imports suggest that they were largely acquired piecemeal and only the importation of PC aryballoi (7th century) and Laconian kraters (6th century) may eventually be claimed to conform to a model of directional trade. On the other hand, although one reasonably assumes that the Cretan imports reached Eleutherna in the hands of Cretans, the influx of vases from overseas should probably be attributed to foreign agents, the identity of whom is not elucidated by the material from Orthi Petra. The same material provides no evidence for the actual value of imported pottery, but offers important clues for the symbolic value accorded to imports through the mechanisms of consumption; the latter issue is, however, pursued in Sections 7.4-7.6.

---

This evidence confirms that imports were not intended to fill perceived gaps in the local ceramic repertoire. For the consumption of imported pottery see Section 7.4.

For the PC aryballoi see Section 6.2.1; for the Laconian kraters see: Erickson 2000, 167-171, particularly footnote 26; 246. Erickson 2004, 204-207.

For the possibility of 'directional, long-distance trade as early as the third quarter of the 8th century' see Osborne 1996a, 41. Another possible case for trade directed to Eleutherna is posed by the Knossian I-NDP.2 and I-NDP.3 that date around 700. Given that these two vases are among the earliest examples of a revived Knossian type, their exportation to Eleutherna, where the type in question remained popular throughout the 9th – 6th century (see below), is unlikely to have been unplanned.

I suppose that some Cretan imports, like the large and relatively thin-walled Knossian storage vessels, partly traveled by boat, given that their transfer on a cart would have been much more difficult and time-consuming.

Despite the fame of the Cretan pirates of the Hellenistic period, which recalls the tales of the Cretan Odysseus in the Odyssey (Willett 1965, 140-145. Brulé 1978), the Cretans of the Iron Age are generally considered no zealous seafarers (see for example: GGP, 382-383. Whitley 2001, 121) and the overseas connections of the island are usually attributed to foreign agents, as corroborated by the Kommos graffiti (Caspo, Johnston and Geagan 2000).

Discussions on whether pottery produced in a given region was distributed to another region by people from the former or the latter region (or a third agent) are extensive; references are collected in: Crielaard 1999, 61-62. Add: Arafat and Morgan 1994, particularly 113-114. Morris and Papadopoulos 1998. Although the latter publication claims that the production and distribution of PC pottery (which is amply represented in Eleutherna) 'were, to a large extent, determined and defined by Phoenicians' (Morris and Papadopoulos 1998, 252), I reckon that it fails to explain how the Phoenicians were actually involved in the manufacturing of ceramics that are entirely different from what they ever produced. Others, however, seem convinced, and further attribute to the Phoenicians of Corinth the production and circulation of 'spaghetti ware' aryballoi made of yellowish fabric (Grasso, Pappalardo e Romano 2004, 162).

Although centred upon Attic pottery of the Late Archaic and Classical periods, the issue of value is occasionally extended to earlier times; scholars debate whether painted pottery travelled as 'ballast' of limited value or as a profitable commodity (references collected in Stissi 1999, 90-91. Add: Foxhall 1998, 299. Johnston 1999. Salmon 2000). I reckon that the amount of vases that circulated throughout the Mediterranean in the Iron Age confirms that the endeavour was rewarding, regardless of the probability that ceramics regularly travelled alongside other goods (cf.: Foxhall 1998, 299. Sherratt 1999, 181).
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6.1 Pottery from Cretan sites

Although the quantity of Knossian Iron Age pottery that is meticulously studied and published makes its identification quite straightforward, this is not so for contemporary pottery from the rest of Crete. The study of most Cretan site-specific pottery sequences is limited and hardly ever accompanied by fabric analyses. Consequently, the identification of intra-island exports is uncommon and occasionally tentative, while our understanding of the circulation of Cretan Iron Age pottery within the island is poor and receives little scholarly attention.1860

Although most of the relatively few intra-island exports identified are Knossian LG-O vessels, the cases discussed below suggest that Cretan pottery was circulating in the island almost throughout the Iron Age. Knossian bird vases reached Kourtes already in the LPG-PGB period1861 and a possibly Knossian straight-sided pithos was imported to Prinias in the PGB-EG phase.1862 Individual Knossian LG-EO vases have tentatively been identified in Afrati (plate), Kourtes (hydria)1863 and the Psychro Cave (lekythos)1864 and more confidently in Gortyn (lid).1865 A few Knossian imports have turned up in East Crete, including the EO eponymous Praisos type lekythos,1866 a LG krater from Anavlochos,1867 two neckless pithoi (a LG-EO one from Kavousi1868 and a LG one from north-east of Neapolis),1869 as well as some LG-EO material from Itanos.1870 Additionally, two cups from Khania have been attributed to Central Crete and one of them is regarded Knossian.1871 Some vessels from Kommos, mostly kraters and skyphoi,1872 Kavousi,1873 and the Psychro Cave,1874

1860 Obscurities in the circulation of Iron Age pottery at a regional level are common: Crielaard 1999, 60.
1861 Coldstream 1989, 24-25.
1862 KNC, 316.
1863 GGP, 257.
1864 Watrous 1996, 43, number 129.
1865 Papadopoulos 1988, 167, number 39.
1866 Bosanquet 1901-1902, 242, pl. 9d. Payne first identified this vase as Knossian: Payne 1927-1928, 249, 276.
1867 Tsipopoulou 1987, 250-251, number 1.
1869 GGP, 257.
1870 Greco, Kalpaxis, Schnapp et Viviers 1999, 525.
1873 Gesell, Day and Coulson 1988, 283, V87.89; 298, pl. 83:a., left.
1874 Watrous 1996, 43, numbers 126-127 (LPG-PGB).
a PG krater from Sybrita and a fragmentary O vase from Phaistos are considered imports from Knossos or indeterminate Cretan sites. The recent attribution of some PG-EG coarse, ribbed juglets that occur mostly in Knossos, but also in Afrati, Kavousi, Kourtes, Eltyna, Prinias and Rhytion, to an East Cretan workshop, is, to my view, unlikely. On the other hand, although Eleuthernian pottery has been reported from Praisos and Itanos, I have serious doubts about the former case.

6.1.1 Knossian pottery

The Knossian imports include storage vessels (I-NDP.2 and I-NDP.3, I-NSP.1 with I-LI.5, as well as the domed lids I-LI.3, I-LI.6: pl. 36), lekythoi (I-LEK.6, I-LEK.7, I-LEK.8, pl. 39, 91) and I-AR.8 (pl. 39, 92). Most are distinguished by their fine or almost fine, pink (I-LEK.6, I-NDP.2, I-LEK.7, I-NSP.1, I-LI.5, I-LI.6) or buff (I-NDP.3) fabric.

The earliest Knossian import in Eleutherna (also the only one that is decorated in light ground) is the MG I-LI.3, which belongs to a type that is common in Knossos, but otherwise unattested in Orthi Petra. A pair of Knossian, Praisos type lekythoi were imported during the ensuing LG period, but their importation was probably not concurrent, judging by the slightly later date of I-LEK.7. As already mentioned, a similar, Knossian EO vase reached Praisos.

The neckless pithos was by the far the most popular type of urn in Knossos during the G-O period. The LG-late I-NSP.1, which was accompanied by I-LI.5, as well as the two aforementioned neckless pithoi from East Crete suggest the appeal these vases exercised throughout most of Crete. The late 8th and early 7th century

---

1875 Rocchetti e D'Agata 1999, 221, fig. 21 (attributed to Central Crete).
1876 Rocchetti 1974-1975, 277, St.24; 298.
1877 See Section 4.4.
1878 Tsipopoulou 1987, 264-265, number 8: LG-EO cup.
1880 Future research may prove that some of the vases classified as Knossian were actually produced in another site in North Central Crete, where the Knossian style was popular, such as Agies Paraskies (Platon 1945) and Eltyna (Englezou 2004, 429).
1884 See Section 5.1.3.
importation of neckless vases in Eleutherna has already been associated with the rise in the production of local versions, while the arrival of the aforementioned Knossian neckless pithoi in East Crete is contemporaneous with the introduction of the shape in the local repertory.\textsuperscript{1885}

Although the necked pithos remained popular throughout the 8th century in Eleutherna, South Central and East Crete, it disappeared in Knossos after the EG period and was revived during the LG/EO.\textsuperscript{1886} The discovery of I-NDP.2 and I-NDP.3, two of the earliest examples of the revived Knossian shape, in Orthi Petra suggests that it was probably Eleutherna (not South Central Crete, as Coldstream\textsuperscript{1887} suggested) that stimulated the revival of the Knossian series.

I-NDP.2 and I-NDP.3, as well as I-LI.6 and I-LEK.8 (all LG-EO) carry white on dark decoration, which proved popular on Cretan LG-EO pottery. Although this scheme was commonly applied on LPG-EG pottery from Eleutherna, it almost disappeared thereafter (excluding type A jugs). Its re-appearance in the EPAR period departs from the LPG-EG tradition,\textsuperscript{1888} since it involves applying slip to parts of the surface, rather than coating the entire exterior of the vase. Perhaps the stimulus for the renewed popularity of white on dark decoration in Eleutherna derives from Knossos.

The EO grey bucchero I-AR.8 is perhaps the latest Knossian import. Cretan grey bucchero vases are peculiar not only in terms of technique, but also because they carry two\textsuperscript{1889} of the very few known examples of Iron Age graffiti from the island written in the Cretan script.\textsuperscript{1890} Apparently, the grey bucchero lekythos from Kavousi, which has been regarded as non-Cretan\textsuperscript{1891} is an EO import from Central Crete.\textsuperscript{1892}

\textsuperscript{1885} See Section 5.1.3.  
\textsuperscript{1886} See Section 5.1.2.  
\textsuperscript{1887} GGP, 257.  
\textsuperscript{1888} The single exception being NDP.47.  
\textsuperscript{1889} A find from Gortyn (Johannowsky 2002, 66, number 411a) should be cited together with the well-known Knossian example (KNC 107.84. See Johnston’s comments in Moignard 1996, 463-464).  
\textsuperscript{1890} Cf. Whitley 1997, 649, 651.  
\textsuperscript{1891} Gesell, Day and Coulson 1985, 351, fig. 13. Tsipopoulou 1987, 257-258, number 6 (Tsipopoulou treats the same vase as local in page 125).  
\textsuperscript{1892} The shape is closer to an example from Gortyn (Johannowsky 2002, 66, number 411a), but the decoration points to Knossos (cf. Fortetsa 1247, KNC 40.10). Although the fabric analysis of the vase from Kavousi found no match in either Kavousi or Central Crete (comments by R. E. Jones in Tsipopoulou 1987, 314), this is hardly surprising, given that no Cretan bucchero vase had been analysed before; the recent analysis of samples from bucchero vases found in Knossos demonstrated
In conclusion, nearly all Knossian imports to Eleutherna date to the LG-EO period, adhering to a pattern that is also attested in the rest of Crete, excluding Kommos. Although Knossian pottery exercised no considerable impact on the ceramic production of Eleutherna, the increase in the popularity of the local neckless pithos and the white on dark technique are perhaps indebted to Knossian imports. On the other hand, an early 7th century pyxis from Knossos is a possible Eleuthemian import, while the stimulus for the revival of the Knossian necked pithos probably derived from Eleutherna.

MG: I-LI.3  
LG: I-LEK.6  
LG-late: I-NSP.1 with I-LI.5, I-LEK.7  
LG/EO: I-NDP.2, I-NDP.3  
LG-EO: I-LI.6, I-LEK.8  
EO: I-AR.8

6.1.2 Cretan pottery of indeterminate origins

Although future research or fabric analysis may prove that few of the twenty-five vases discussed in this section are actually local, I am confident that the vast majority come from Cretan workshops, which can only occasionally be identified. Some vases have been attributed to South Central Crete (I-NSP.2, I-AR.10; the former is tentatively assigned to Phaistos, while the latter to Afrati), while others further north, closer to Knossos (I-JU.3 could be from Agies Paraskies and I-PV.1 perhaps comes from Prinias). I-CUP.1 is considered to be Khaniote.

their local origins (Liddy 1996, 473, see particularly O128, which has been given a wrong catalogue number in page 493, repeating that of N125 in page 492).  
See the comments upon type Bii pyxides in Section 5.1.5.  
For possible cases of Eleuthemian influence upon vases from Knossos see the comments upon the neckless pithoi (Section 5.1.3) and type E cups (Section 5.4.4).  
For another Cretan import at Eleutherna, an O hydria, see Hartley 1930-1931, 110-111, fig. 10.  
See the comments for each vase in Appendix III.  
For reference to the plates see below.
I-LI.2 and I-JU.2 represent two different classes of vessels, the distribution of which in Central Crete has not been fully explored.\textsuperscript{1899} The class of I-LI.2 is amply represented in Knossos\textsuperscript{1900} and thinly in Kommos,\textsuperscript{1901} Kourtes\textsuperscript{1902} and Prinias,\textsuperscript{1903} as in Eleutherna. The fabric of some examples, however, and the lack of any suspension hole on the piece from Eleutherna suggest that their production was probably not limited to Knossos. Furthermore, although three of the four known parallels for I-JU.2 derive from North Central Crete (Archanes,\textsuperscript{1904} Kato Vathia,\textsuperscript{1905} Knossos\textsuperscript{1906}), their fabric, as well as the fabric of a fourth example in the Louvre\textsuperscript{1907} suggest that the class was probably produced in more than one site. These sites should probably be localised in North Central Crete.

Similarities in fabric and style occasionally allow for the attribution of some Cretan imports to a common source, which, however, cannot be localised. The PGB I-KR.2 and I-BV.1\textsuperscript{1908} are considered products of a single Cretan workshop, if not a single craftsman. Despite the discovery of a krater that is closely related to this pair in Knossos, the attribution of the group to that site is doubtful.\textsuperscript{1909} A light brown fabric and lustrous, white slip associate the PGB I-LEK.2 with the PGB-EG I-JU.1, while the PGB I-LEK.1 and I-AR.3 are linked by their light pink fabric and polished surface. Although the fabric and the polished surface of the EO I-JU.3, which is thought to originate from Agies Paraskies, recalls the characteristics of the latter pair, the attribution of all three vases to that site is insecure.

The preference for storage vessels (I-AM.8, I-NDP.1, I-NSP.2, pl. 35-36, 88), domed lids (I-LI.2 pl. 36, 89; I-LI.7) and lekythoi (I-LEK.1, I-LEK.2, I-LEK.9, pl. 38-39), which was also attested in the case of the Knossian imports, is complemented

\textsuperscript{1899} See the comments for I-LI.2 and I-JU.2 in Appendix III.
\textsuperscript{1901} Kommos IV, 233, number 200: although the authors are aware of the Knossian parallels, they date this vase to the 7th century; this is probably a mistake.
\textsuperscript{1903} Rizza 1969, 27, pl. XVIII.2.
\textsuperscript{1904} Alexiou 1950, 444, number 2, pl. ΛΑ’T.2, fig. 8, right - Sakellarakis 1987, 64, ΣΓ 382.
\textsuperscript{1905} Herakleion Museum MH 9180, Hall XI, Case 147.
\textsuperscript{1906} KNC 104.36. KNC, 349.
\textsuperscript{1907} Kauffmann-Samaras 1976, 31, pl. 31, number 1.
\textsuperscript{1908} The discovery of Knossian bird vases of roughly similar date in Kourtes (Coldstream 1989, 24-25) suggests that the shape seemed attractive enough to 9th century Cretans to stimulate intra-island exports.
\textsuperscript{1909} See the comments upon I-KR.2, I-BV.1 in Appendix III.
by a vogue for aryballoi (I-AR.3, I-AR.9, I-AR.10, pl. 39) and fast-pouring vessels (I-HYD.1, I-JU.1, I-JU.2, I-JU.3, I-OIN.1, I-OIN.7, pl. 37-38, 90). The varied repertory also includes a collection of mostly singly represented open vessels (I-KR.2, pl. 41; I-SK.7, pl. 42; I-CU.1, pl. 42, 94; I-CU.2, I-PL.1, I-TR.1: the latter three shapes and the jug are not found among imports from other regions), as well as I-BV.1 and I-PV.1 (pl. 40). Notably, storage and open vessels are largely limited to the LG-O period, while pouring vessels are evenly distributed through time.

The direct influence Cretan imports exercised upon local forms and decorative patterns is circumstantial and tentative (if at all). I-KR-2 may have served as a model for the fragmentary KR.5, I-NSP.2 could have contributed to the rise in the production of the local neckless pithoi, while I-LEK.1 and I-LEK.2 perhaps introduced the large lekythos to the Eleuthernian repertory. Concerning decoration, the dipped I-CU.1 should probably be associated with the few post-PG dipped cups from Eleutherna (type Aiv), while I-NSP.2 should be listed next to the aforementioned Knossian imports that are related to the re-emergence of added white colour decoration on EPAR pottery from Eleutherna. Nevertheless, several other decorative trends the Cretan imports display, including the Atticizing, dark ground scheme (I-JU.2; also cf. the aforementioned Knossian storage vessels), the figured repertory of the late 9th (I-KR.2, I-OIN.1) and 7th (I-HYD.1, I-TR.1) centuries and the Orientalizing imagery (I-LI.7, I-AR.10), were largely overlooked by the Eleuthernian potters. On the other hand, I would speculate that Cretan imports played an important role in the abandonment of the white on dark decoration that was popular on local LPG-EG vases, in favour of the island’s mainstream practice that involved the application of slip on large areas of the vase.

In conclusion, despite the LG-EO date of most Knossian imports, the vases that come from indeterminate Cretan workshops were already reaching Eleutherna in considerable numbers in the PGB period and carried on doing so until after the EO. The lull that is given to the MG period is partly due to the rarity of MG burials

1910 Although the large local lekythos (type A) is poorly represented, an example that is currently being restored dates to the PGB-EG period.
1911 Cretan vases with figured drawing were imported in Eleutherna even during the 6th century, when the island produced hardly any pottery of this kind (Erickson 2000, 184-185. Erickson 2004, 204).
1912 This excludes the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’, which have strong Cycladic connections (see Section 4.4).
identified outside the tomb and partly due to sumptuary attitudes explored in Chapter 7. In the late 8th - early 7th century, however, contacts between Eleutherna and other Cretan sites peak. It is during this period that ceramic interactions with the west (see the Khaniote I-CU.1) and east (see the Eleuthernian exports to Itanos) part of the island are identifiable, foreshadowing patterns of the Late Archaic and Classical periods. Apparently, pottery from several Cretan sites was imported to Iron Age Eleutherna and probably circulated widely within a rather dense, occasionally island-wide network, the legacy of which is traced in the ensuing periods.

PGB: I-LI.2, I-BV.1, I-OIN.1, I-LEK.1, I-LEK.2, I-AR.3, I-KR.2
PGB-EG: I-JU.1
EG: I-JU.2
LG-late: I-SK.7
LG-EO: I-NDP.1, I-LEK.9, I-CU.1, I-PL.1
EO: I-AM.8, I-NSP.2, I-HYD.1, I-OIN.7, I-JU.3
O: I-LI.7, I-AR.9, I-AR.10, I-CU.2, I-TR.1
LO: I-PV.1

6.2 Pottery from other Aegean (and perhaps Ionian) regions

6.2.1. Corinthian and related pottery

The considerable corpus of Corinthian imports identified in Eleutherna includes a LG pyxis (I-PY.2 with I-LI.4, pl. 36), two EG (I-AR.1, I-AR.2, pl. 39, 92) and nine PC (I-AR.11 to I-AR.19, pl. 40) aryballoi, three EC-MC alabastra (I-AL.1 to I-AL.3, pl. 40) and two LC exaleiptra (I-EX.1, pl. 42; I-EX.2). Two of the four remaining late 8th – early 7th century vases (I-AM.5, pl. 35; I-AR.5, pl. 39) are thought to originate from the north-eastern Peloponnese, while I-OIN.5 and I-AM.9 (pl. 35)

---

1913 Erickson 2000, 183-192, fig. 42.
1914 Erickson 2000, fig. 41-50.
1915 Seven PC aryballoi, which have not been cleaned, and at least three, probably LPC oinochoai, which are currently being restored, are excluded from this study.
1916 Although Corinthian pottery is fairly common in Crete (see below), Argive vases are only attested in Knossos (Jones 2000, 240, add the possible cases in pages 239, 250, the latter from Agios
are considered as Corinthian or Ithacan. Although the predominance of unguent vases is no surprise,\textsuperscript{1917} the Corinthian EG date of the earliest examples is notable. Further, the discovery of large storage vessels is extraordinary, given their rarity in the Corinthia.

The pair of Corinthian EG aryballoi from Eleutherna and the few Corinthian LPG imports from Knossos\textsuperscript{1918} suggest that the connection between Corinth and North Crete was established by the mid-9\textsuperscript{th} century and invite a revision of the opinion that Corinthian 9\textsuperscript{th} century pottery exhibits narrow geographical distribution.\textsuperscript{1919} Moreover, the aforementioned pair should probably also be credited with the introduction of the shape in the local repertory. Although I-AR.2 was not reproduced in Eleutherna (contrast, however, the prolific Knossian series and the attestation of the type in other Cretan sites),\textsuperscript{1920} the handmade, plain I-AR.1 was widely imitated during the PGB-PAR period (type D aryballoi), even though the Eleuthernians soon turned to wheel-made versions. The latter type was equally popular in Knossos (where Corinthian MG examples\textsuperscript{1921} have turned up) during the same period,\textsuperscript{1922} but rare in East Crete.\textsuperscript{1923} On the other hand, examples of the later, ‘Argive Monochrome’ class, have turned up in Eleutherna (I-AR.5) and Knossos,\textsuperscript{1924} but also in East Crete (Agios Georgios).\textsuperscript{1925} Clearly, the reception of the various

\textsuperscript{1917} See, for example, the distribution of PC aryballoi studied in Neeft 1987.
\textsuperscript{1918} KNC, 402.
\textsuperscript{1919} Although this impression relies on evidence available in the 1960’s (GGP, 91), it is still cited (Morris and Papadopoulos 1998, 253. Shanks 1999, 65) as if there are no recent finds (for example KNC, 402) that claim otherwise.
\textsuperscript{1920} Knossos: Fortetsa, 158, class C. KNC, 357-358, type C (Fortetsa 668 is a Corinthian MG import to Knossos). The type seems quite common in Archanes (Sakellarakis 1986, 94-96, Π.24334, Π.24330, Π.24333) and East Crete (Tsipopoulou 1987, 123-124, Hayden 2003, 73, number 203), but is perhaps uncommon in South Central Crete (Afrati: Levi 1927-1929, 273, fig. 340; 411, fig. 533; a PGB vase from Kourtes is wrongly associated with these aryballoi: Rocchetti 1988-1989, 210, number 100).
\textsuperscript{1921} KNC O3, 283.8.
\textsuperscript{1922} Fortetsa, 158, type Di. KNC, 357, type B. Coldstream 2001, 44.
\textsuperscript{1923} Tsipopoulou 1987, 125, group δ.
\textsuperscript{1924} Davaras 1968, 140, A67, A69.
\textsuperscript{1925} Jones 2000, 250.
types of Corinthian and related G aryballoi varied considerably in different Cretan sites and sub-regions.

Although the small Corinthian LPG pyxis from Knossos\(^{1926}\) probably served a different purpose than that of I-PY.2, both vessels, as well as an EPC example from Khania (of considerable size)\(^{1927}\) were accompanied by their lid.\(^{1928}\) Similar finds from Thera\(^{1929}\) suggest the appeal these imports exercised upon communities that practiced inurned cremation and used neckless storage vessels as urns.\(^{1930}\) They further outline a possible route for the supply of similar vases to Central Crete.\(^{1931}\) I-PY.2 and other imports of similar shape probably stimulated the local production of neckless pithoi. To the contrary, I-AM.5, which finds no close parallel, had no impact on local storage vessels.

The Corinthian or Ithacan origins of I-AM.9 and I-OIN.5 cannot be determined, since the reddish fabric\(^{1932}\) and decorative ornaments these vases display are attested on pottery from both regions. Further, the shape of the former vase is uncommon in both areas, while that of the latter occurs in both the Corinthian and Ithacan repertory. Although far-fetched, the Ithacan origin of the pair should not be dismissed, given the Cretan links identified on a few vessels and other items from that Ionian island.\(^{1933}\)

The remaining vessels (alabastra, aryballoi and exaleiptra)\(^{1934}\) that date to the 7\(^{th}\) – early 6\(^{th}\) century supplement the corpus of Corinthian, post-G material from Eleutherna discussed by Erickson.\(^{1935}\) PC and EC unguent vases are abundant in the cemetery of Afrati,\(^{1936}\) but relatively rare in Knossian tombs,\(^{1937}\) where Corinthian

\(^{1926}\) KNC 285.134. See KNC, 402.
\(^{1928}\) Add a PC pyxis lid from Phaistos (Rocchetti 1974-1975, 248, CC.41).
\(^{1929}\) Pfuhl 1903, 198-199, numbers 61-66. Perhaps also Dragendorff 1903, 71, fig. 239.
\(^{1930}\) GGP, 186.
\(^{1931}\) The Khania finds and two Corinthian LG pyxides from Messenia (Coulson 1988, 56, 58-59, 62-63, numbers 4-5) may be taken to represent an alternative route.
\(^{1934}\) Corinthian kotylai are not missing: Hartley 1930-1931, 111. Erickson 2000, 164.
\(^{1935}\) Erickson 2000, 162-166. Erickson 2004, 204. See also the material cited in footnotes 1915, 1934.
\(^{1936}\) Jones 2000, 253-257.
imports of similar date are mostly fast-pouring (oinochoai, olpai)\textsuperscript{1938} and open (kotylai)\textsuperscript{1939} vessels. Isolated finds come from other Central Cretan tombs\textsuperscript{1940} and a single West Cretan burial,\textsuperscript{1941} while East Cretan graves have produced mostly unguent vases.\textsuperscript{1942} Ritual contexts display a diverse picture: the Corinthian imports at Kommos vary in shape and even include coarse amphorae.\textsuperscript{1943} Syme,\textsuperscript{1944} Amnissos\textsuperscript{1945} and the Inatos Cave\textsuperscript{1946} have produced only a few examples, most of which are unguent vases, while the richer sample from the Psychro Cave displays an equally limited repertory.\textsuperscript{1947} An oinochoe and an aryballos turned up in the Acropolis sanctuary at Gortyn,\textsuperscript{1948} while two kotylai in the Idaean Cave.\textsuperscript{1949} Concerning domestic contexts, several sherds have turned up in Knossos (the kotylai predominate among a variety of shapes)\textsuperscript{1950} and Khania,\textsuperscript{1951} but only three sherds in Phaistos.\textsuperscript{1952}

Evidently, Corinth emerges as the prime supplier of imported unguent vases to Iron Age Eleutherna and probably to Iron Age Crete as a whole.\textsuperscript{1953} This tradition is, however, largely limited to the 7\textsuperscript{th} or early 6\textsuperscript{th} century and proves deeply-rooted

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1939} Moignard 1996, 457. Jones 2000, 220, 243.
\item \textsuperscript{1940} A kotyle turned up in Gouves (Jones 2000, 260) and a possibly Corinthian cup that dates to the end of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century in Lasea (Jones 2000, 283).
\item \textsuperscript{1941} Jones 2000, 289.
\item \textsuperscript{1942} Jones 2000, 252 (Anavlochos), 260-263 (Dreros, Itanos, Kavousi, Lasithi, Mochlos; the latter two examples were found out of context; the Kavousi example is PC not G; for the Dreros vase see also Tsipopoulou 1987, 253), 265-266 (Praisos; note that the fabric analysis produced no firm results concerning the origins of the exaleiptra from Praisos: Tsipopoulou 1987, 149, 310). A variety of Corinthian shapes is reported from domestic, burial and cult contexts at Itanos: Greco, Kalpaxis, Schnapp et Viviers 1999, 526.
\item \textsuperscript{1944} Erickson 2000, 279, 283.
\item \textsuperscript{1945} Jones 2000, 250.
\item \textsuperscript{1946} Papasavvas 2003, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{1947} Jones 2000, 259-260.
\item \textsuperscript{1948} Johannowsky 2002, 62, number 401 (oinochoe); 68, number 425 (aryballos). Besides, a fragmentary PC cup comes from the Odeion area: Erickson 2000, 122.
\item \textsuperscript{1949} Jones 2000, 278.
\item \textsuperscript{1951} Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 231-233, 235-236. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 27. For late 6\textsuperscript{th} century Corinthian aryballoi see Erickson 2000, 259, note 101. Besides, two vases come from further west: Jones 2000, 289.
\item \textsuperscript{1952} Jones 2000, 284-285.
\item \textsuperscript{1953} On the other hand, the identification of Cretan aryballoi in Corinth is doubtful (references collected in Jones 2000, 295).
\end{itemize}
only in the cases of Eleutherna and Knossos. These two sites have produced the earliest Corinthian imports and the widest variety in Corinthian shapes.

The response of the Cretan potters to the Corinthian imports varied considerably. In Eleutherna, the Corinthian plain aryballos had a long-lasting appeal, but otherwise influence was limited to occasional imitations of the shape of the PC aryballos\(^{1954}\) and the exaleiptron.\(^{1955}\) Concerning decoration, the Corinthianizing zone with vertical, wavy lines was introduced on EPAR vases. Corinthian influence was weak in East Crete,\(^{1956}\) but the numerous Corinthian imports in Khania had a considerable effect on the local LG II style.\(^{1957}\) The Knossian potters widely copied some Corinthian types, most notably the kotyle, the plain aryballos and the aryballos with cross-hatched triangles.\(^{1958}\) The PC aryballos was freely copied in Afrati,\(^{1959}\) a class of Corinthian alabastra was perhaps imitated in Gortyn,\(^{1960}\) while a few Corinthianizing aryballoi,\(^{1961}\) kotylai\(^{1962}\) and oinochoai\(^{1963}\) come from Kommos.

**EG:** I-AR.1, I-AR.2  
**LG:** I-PY.2 with I-LI.4  
**LG-EPC:** I-AM.5, I-AM.9, I-OIN.5, I-AR.5  
**PC:** I-AR.11, I-AR.12, I-AR.13, I-AR.14, I-AR.15, I-AR.16, I-AR.17, I-AR.18, I-AR.19  
**EC-(MC):** I-AL.1, I-AL.2, I-AL.3  
**LC I or II:** I-EX.1, I-EX.2

---

\(^{1954}\) See type B aryballoi and AR.36 (pl. 34a).  
\(^{1955}\) Erickson 2000, 164.  
\(^{1956}\) Tsipopoulou 1987a, 275-281 (I am not convinced about most cases discussed). Note, however, that copies of Corinthian kotylai are reported from Kavousi: Mook 2004, 173.  
\(^{1959}\) Levi 1945, 16, pl. XIX.4-6.  
\(^{1960}\) Johannowsky 2002, 64.  
\(^{1961}\) Kommos IV, 240, number 268.  
\(^{1963}\) Kommos IV, 247, number 373; 249, number 395.
6.2.2 Attic pottery

The Attic imports include an EG II globular pyxis with inset lip (I-PY.1 with I-LI.1, pl. 36, 89), the MG I belly-handled I-AM.1 (which is least likely to be Cycladic; pl. 35, 87), the MG I-late neck-handled I-AM.2 (pl. 35) and the MG I I-KR.2 (pl. 41). Apparently, the local interest in Attic vases was limited to the 9th century and focused on storage vessels.

Although numerous Attic MG pyxides come from Knossos, I-PY.1 is the only vase of its type to have been discovered in Crete and one of the relatively few Attic EG exports. Its shape was freely copied by the Eleuthemian potters (type Bi pyxides), as well as by their Knossian colleagues. Moreover, imports like I-AM.1 exercised considerable, direct influence upon the shape and the decoration of the local belly-handled amphorae. Several Attic LPG-MG II belly-handled amphorae come from Knossos and a single Attic/Cycladic MG example from Phaistos. Although the Attic neck-handled amphora (I-AM.2) displays a similar distribution within Crete, its influence on Eleuthemian pottery was probably meager (in contrast to what is attested in Knossos), judging by the poor representation of the shape in the local repertory. The latter case also applies to I-KR.1, which belongs to the rare, Attic, low-based type. Only one such vase has turned up in Crete, even though Attic kraters of other types are quite common in

1966 Coldstream 1996a, 135, 137, 139.
1967 See KNC 28.16, G105, G106.
1968 See type Di amphorae in Section 5.1.1.
1969 Note that the meander, the hallmark of Attic Geometric pottery, is popular on local belly-handled amphorae, but rare on the rest of the ceramic corpus from Eleutherna: NDP.20 (pl. 6), AM.23 (pl. 4), NDP.62 (pl. 9)- the latter two carry strong Cycladic influence. Varieties of the pattern also occur on NDP.44 (pl. 8) and HYD.14 (pl. 17).
1973 KNC, 331-335.
1974 The Attic MG II KNC 219.42.
Knossos (Attic LPG-MG II examples) and Khania (Attic MG II-LG examples).

A rich collection of Attic imports of various shapes, dating from the early 10th to the late 8th century is attested in Knossian, mostly funerary, but also domestic and cult contexts. Some Attic vases, mostly small, open shapes, have been identified in the sanctuary of Kommos and in the late 8th – early 7th century settlement at Khania, but only a single piece from the cemetery of Afrati may be Attic. Further, a few Attic vases have turned up in other Cretan sites, mostly in funerary contexts. In contrast, only a few Cretan vases have been identified in Attica.

Apparently, although the imported Attic EG II - MG I storage vessels exercised some influence on 9th century local pottery, both the imports and their influence disappeared after around 800. Attic imports re-appear in Eleutherna only in


1978 Jones 2000, 232-234, 236-237, 239 (note that several pieces mentioned in page 232 are wrongly classified as Attic EPG; they are actually Attic LPG sherds that turned up in a Knossian EPG context). Add: Coldstream 1972, 70, A30; 73, B41-43; 76, C42-43, C45-46; 84, D44; 97, G117-121. Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 289-291, B28-29, B31-35, C5 (perhaps Attic); 294, C36-38, D1; 301, S15.


1980 Johnston 1993, 357-358 (SOS amphorae, late 7th century ?). Kommos IV, 219, number 55 (10th century ? amphora); 223, numbers 101, 103 (respectively: 9th and late 10th century cups); 226-227, numbers 139 (perhaps Attic, late 9th century cup/skyphos), 144 (late 9th century cup); 235, number 229 (probably Attic krater: the 9th century date proposed is inconsistent with the assignment of the vase to the Attic MG II phase); 244-245, numbers 330, 335 (SOS amphorae, 7th century); 248-249, numbers 382-384, 393-394 (SOS amphorae, 7th century). Add the following Attic or Cycladic, mostly 10th - 9th century small open vessels: Kommos IV, 217, number 34; 219, numbers 46, 53; 221, number 70; 223-224, numbers 94 (jug or oinochoe), 112; 228, numbers 154 (amphora, early 8th century), 158-160; 233, number 212.


1985 Add the PGB broad-based OIN.33, which follows Attic prototypes.
the second quarter of the sixth century. On the other hand, the plentiful Attic 10th - 8th century pottery found in Knossos had a significant effect on local wares, which culminated in the Atticizing MG style and withdrew only in the end of the 8th century. Attic influence is scarcely attested in South Central (excluding a collection of 8th century kraters from Kommos) and East Crete, even though 8th century pottery from Dreros and Vrokastro displays Atticizing trends.

EG II: I-PY.1 with I-LI.1
MG I: I-AM.1, I-AM.2, I-KR.1

6.2.3 Cycladic pottery
Although most of the Cycladic vases from Eleutherna date to the late 8th - early 7th century, I-SK.1 (pl. 42, 93) is assigned to the late 9th century. These imports are either storage (I-AM.6, I-AM.7, I-NSP.3: the second case is uncertain; pl. 35-36) or small, open (I.SK.1 to I-SK.6, I-KO.1: pl. 41-42, 93-94) vessels. Despite the tentative identification of the skyphoi and the kotyle as Parian (or Naxian) imports, solely on the basis of fabric, the attribution of I-AM.6 and I-AM.7 to Paros and I-NSP.3 to Thera is based on both fabric and style.

1991 Note that the MG I I-AM.1 is perhaps Cycladic.
1992 Add a sherd from a small, open vessel of late 8th - early 7th century from Payne’s excavation: Hartley 1930-1931, 110, fig. 34.4. For the identification of this sherd as Cycladic see: Boardman 1961, 153. Hood and Boardman 1961, 77, footnote 8: the other sherd identified as Cycladic is probably local (see the comments upon NDP.33, NDP.37 in Section 5.1.2).
1993 A few more Parian vases have been securely identified in Crete: Jones 2000, 238 and 240 (Knossos), 261 (Inatos), 265 (Praisos). Add: Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 231 (Khania).
1994 Although Theran vases were rarely exported (Ström 1962, 222, footnote 4), a few Theran LG-Subgeometric amphora sherds have been identified in Knossos (Coldstream 1972, 98, G128-130), one possibly Theran krater sherd of similar date comes from Vrokastro (Hayden 2003, 71, number 192) and one possibly Theran 7th century plate from Kavousi (Tsipopoulou 1987, 258, number 7), while Theran influence has been traced on a few sherds from Aptera (Jones 2000, 119), Eleutherna (Hartley 1930-1931, 109-110) and Itanos (Deshayes 1951, 204-205).
I-SK.1 is associated with the corpus of Cycladic small open vessels that reached Crete during mostly the later part of the 9th century. If this fragmentary vase is really a skyphos, it should be related to the introduction of the local type C skyphoi in the EG period; if, however, it is a cup, it exercised no appeal upon the local potters. The decline in the importation of Cycladic small open vessels that is attested in Crete from the early 8th century was only temporarily halted in the later half of that century. The material from Eleutherna is most evocative of this trend, even though the concentration of most Cycladic late 8th – early 7th century skyphoi (I-SK.3 to I-SK.6) and I-KO.1 in a single trench may reflect no more than an individual choice. In any case, although the rise in the numbers of such imports in Eleutherna coincides with the peak in the production of local low-based skyphoi, the decoration of the latter seems unaffected by Cycladic examples.

I-NSP.3, I-AM.6 and I-AM.7 suggest an interest for Cycladic, large storage vessels, which seems unmatched in the rest of late 8th – early 7th century Crete. Nevertheless, a Parian LG-late – EO shoulder-handled amphora comes from Praisos and a sherd from a probably similar vase comes from Knossos. A few Cycladic storage vessels of types not represented in Eleutherna have turned up in Knossos and Kommos. The Cycladic storage vessels exercised some influence on Eleuthernian pottery: I-NSP.3 and other imports of similar shape are associated with the rise in the production of local neckless pithoi, while the shoulder-handled shape of I-AM.6 and I-AM.7 was adopted by the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’, which

---


1998 See Section 7.1.


2001 Most are LPG-MG or SubPG (Kourou 1994, 275-277. Jones 2000, 216-217 (the Cycladic pithos mentioned in page 218 is generally considered Attic, while the four amphorae from Naxos? cited in page 219 are considered works of a Naxian potter working in Knossos, see below). KNC, 404-405. Coldstream 2000, 271, D17-D18), except three Theran LG-Subgeometric amphorae (Coldstream 1972, 98, G128-130) and the Parian vase cited in footnote 2000. References to Attic/Cycladic amphorae are excluded here.

was probably established by one or more Parian potters that migrated to Eleutherna shortly after 700.\textsuperscript{2003} At the same time, a potter from Thera perhaps arrived at Eleutherna and founded the ‘saw pattern workshop’.\textsuperscript{2004} Interestingly, four LG amphorae from Knossos are attributed to an immigrant Naxian potter,\textsuperscript{2005} while Cycladic potters are thought to have been active in late 8\textsuperscript{th} - early 7\textsuperscript{th} century Athens.\textsuperscript{2006}

In conclusion, although the connection between Eleutherna and the Cyclades goes back to the late 9\textsuperscript{th} century, it only became strong in the late 8\textsuperscript{th} and early 7\textsuperscript{th} century. Interestingly, the latter period marks a decline in the numbers of Cycladic imports in Central and West Crete,\textsuperscript{2007} though not in East Crete,\textsuperscript{2008} where, however, Cycladic 8\textsuperscript{th} – 7\textsuperscript{th} century imports are few and sporadic. On the other hand, it is mostly during the late 8\textsuperscript{th} and early 7\textsuperscript{th} century that Cretan vases reached the Cyclades (including Andros, Delos, Melos, and mostly Thera),\textsuperscript{2009} while a story told by Herodotus places the relations between the king of Axos (the eastern neighbour of Eleutherna) and a Theran merchant in an early 7\textsuperscript{th} century context.\textsuperscript{2010}

**Cycladic MG I:** I-SK.1  
**Parian LG-late - EO:** I-AM.6, I-AM.7  
**Cycladic LG:** I-SK.2

\textsuperscript{2003} See the comments upon type C amphorae in Section 5.1.1. Hellenistic inscriptions record that Parian artists and craftsmen were active in Crete (Spyridakis 1992, 113).  
\textsuperscript{2004} See the comments upon AM.23 in Section 5.1.1.  
\textsuperscript{2005} Kourou 1994, 278-279 - Kourou 2004, 81 for amphorae Fortetsa 652, 673, 680, 681. Professor Coldstream has, however, convinced me that these amphorae are Knossian MG pieces to be attributed to KNC, 335, type E.  
\textsuperscript{2006} Papadopoulos and Smithson 2002, 191.  
\textsuperscript{2008} Jones 2000, 252 (Anavlochos) 261 (Itanos), 265 (Praisos), 268 (Vrokastro; for the krater, which is perhaps Attic, see footnote 1983). Add: Tsipopoulou 1987, 258, number 7 (Kavousi), 265-266 (Sklavoi).  
\textsuperscript{2009} Boardman 1961, 155-156. GGP, 382. The identifications of Boardman and Coldstream are more reliable than those in the original publications of the material. Also, Jones 2000, 295, 297, 300, 304, 306. Note that Cretan mid-7\textsuperscript{th} century limestone statuettes have turned up in Thera (Sigalas 2002).  
\textsuperscript{2010} Herodotus iv.151-154. See footnote 208.
6.2.4 East Greek pottery and the joint foundation of Gela

Diverse classes of artefacts from Orthi Petra suggest some connection between this site and the East Greek world, as well as Anatolia. Some bronze bowls find their best parallels in Phrygia,\textsuperscript{2011} some pillar-shaped grave markers from Orthi Petra are claimed to find close parallels in Lycia,\textsuperscript{2012} a portable Hittite object is assumed to have inspired the griffin composition of NDP.6,\textsuperscript{2013} while the ‘shield’ of Idaean Cave type discussed below displays an Urartian pedigree. Further, some ivory heads dating at around 600 find close parallels in Ephesus and have generated speculation on itinerant craftsmen.\textsuperscript{2014}

The aforementioned connection is supported by the discovery of East Greek vases in Eleutherna. These include two amphorae (I-AM.3, I-AM.4, pl. 35), two oinochoai (I-OIN.4, I-OIN.8, pl. 38), two aryballoi (I-AR.6, I-AR.7, pl. 39), two lekythoi (I-LEK.3, I-LEK.4, pl. 38) and I-PV.2. Although the particular origins of most vessels cannot be securely identified, I-AR.6 and I-AR.7 are considered Rhodian, while I-LEK.3 Coan. Furthermore, I-AM.3 and I-OIN.8 are assumed to have been produced in Cos and Miletus respectively. Interestingly, Coan exports are generally rare,\textsuperscript{2015} even though notable Coan influence has been traced on late 9th century pottery from Donousa.\textsuperscript{2016}

I-LEK.3 and I-LEK.4, which were associated with local EG urns, provide the earliest evidence for interactions between Eleutherna and East Greece. Although I-LEK.4 is considered East Greek (due to its micaceous fabric), its shape and decoration follow Cypriot prototypes. Imports of similar shape but different origins

\textsuperscript{2011} Stampolidis 1994, 30-31, 114-116, numbers 67-68.
\textsuperscript{2013} See the comments upon NDP.61 in Section 5.1.2.
\textsuperscript{2014} Stampolidis 1992. Also, Muss 2000, 150-152. Note that a family of sculptors migrated from Eleutherna to Rhodes in the Hellenistic period (see lately Papachristodoulou 2000).
\textsuperscript{2015} A few examples have turned up in the Cyclades, mostly in Thera (GGP, 269).
have turned up in Knossos (Cypriot Black on Red)\textsuperscript{2017} and Kommos (Phoenician),\textsuperscript{2018} while Cretan copies are known from Eleutherna (LEK.15), Knossos\textsuperscript{2019} and Ligortino.\textsuperscript{2020} The two-handled type of I-LEK.4 generally proved less popular than the single-handed class (for which see type C lekythia in Section 5.3.3). On the other hand, the meander of I-LEK.3, as well as the shape and the Atticizing decoration of I-AM.3 and I-AM.4 exercised no appeal upon the local potters. The latter two vases, however, suggest an interest in sizeable, East Greek LG storage vessels, which is in line with the contemporary importation of similar vases from Cretan sites, as well as the Cyclades.

Although East Greek in origin, I-OIN.4, I-AR.6 and I-AR.7 display a Cypriot and/or Phoenician pedigree, like the aforementioned I-LEK.4. The former, which is associated (by its micaceous fabric, shape and red slip) with two East Greek vases from Knossos,\textsuperscript{2021} recalls Phoenician Red Slip oinochoai from Cyprus and the Levantine coast.\textsuperscript{2022} The aryballoi belong to a well-known Rhodian class (‘Kreis- und Wellenbandstil’ aryballoi, aryballoi ‘rodio-cretesi’ or ‘spaghetti ware’ aryballoi), which derives from Cypriot examples.\textsuperscript{2023} They are widely distributed in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean, but poorly represented in the rest of Crete.\textsuperscript{2024}

Although Wild Goat oinochoai have turned up in Afrati,\textsuperscript{2025} Archanes,\textsuperscript{2026} Knossos,\textsuperscript{2027} Kommos\textsuperscript{2028} and Phaistos,\textsuperscript{2029} they are slightly later than I-OIN.8,\textsuperscript{2030} which belongs to the short-lived Early Wild Goat style that is scarcely represented

\textsuperscript{2017} Fortetsa 1411. Davaras 1968, 139, A56. KNC 104.8, H15, 292.244, 292.45 (discussed in: Coldstream 1984, 128-129. KNC, 407-408).
\textsuperscript{2019} KNC 292.202.
\textsuperscript{2020} Anatoliki Mesogeios 1998, 170, number 153.
\textsuperscript{2021} KNC 219.43, 219.97 (also: KNC, 405-406. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 155-156, numbers 115-116).
\textsuperscript{2022} See the comments upon I-LEK.4 in Appendix III.
\textsuperscript{2023} Johansen 1957, 155-161. GGP, 276. The long-held assumption that this class was produced in Rhodes is challenged by a recent study, which relies on scientific analyses and claims that the vases with yellowish or brownish fabric were produced in Corinth (Grasso, Pappalardo e Romano 2004, 162). I will uphold the traditional view until more examples are analysed, particularly since the class rarely occurs in the Corinthia.
\textsuperscript{2024} Only one example is known: Anatoliki Mesogeios, 186, number 197 (Knossos area).
\textsuperscript{2025} Levi 1927-1929, 125, fig. 107; 353-354, fig. 462.
\textsuperscript{2026} Kardara 1963, 92, number 1 - Sakellarakis and Sapouna-Sakellaraki 1997, 38-39.
\textsuperscript{2027} KNC 56.11. Add the Wild Goat dinos KNC 34.18.
\textsuperscript{2028} Johnston 1993, 351-352, numbers 54-55.
\textsuperscript{2029} Rocchetti 1974-1975, 248, CC.46 (small body sherd).
\textsuperscript{2030} The shape was only copied in Knossos, in the manner of the ‘Fortetsa painter’: Coldstream 1973, 44, K10.
outside East Greece. Hence, I-OIN.8 perhaps suggests a special connection between Eleutherna and East Greece, which survived into the early 6th century, provided that the identification of I-PV.2 as East Greek is correct.

The distribution of East Greek pottery in the rest of Crete displays notable differences. Only a few pre-LG vases have turned up in Knossos, but a considerable increase in numbers occurs from the LG period. A similar increase, during the 7th century, however, is identified in the sanctuary of Kommos, which has produced the most East Greek imports in Crete (including many coarse amphorae). Two skyphoi of PG style are among the few East Greek imports at Khania, which are otherwise LG, ceramic affinities have, however, been traced between East Greek and Khaniote pottery of the late 8th – early 7th century. Few other Cretan sites have produced one to three East Greek vases, almost all of which date to the late 8th - 7th century. On the other hand, a few Cretan vases (mostly of the late 8th or 7th century) have been identified in Kasos, Rhodes and Samos, while a few Cretan items of other materials have turned up in East Greece, mostly in Samos.

Apparently, the connections between Crete and East Greece were strong enough in the earliest 7th century to lead to the establishment of the colony of Gela in

---

2031 For an East Greek LG predecessor of the Wild Goat oinochoai that is alleged to come from Crete see Walter-Karydi 1968, 17-18, taf. 272.
2035 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 231.
2037 Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997, 237-239. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004a, 28. Note, however, that the affinities are largely attributed to similar, but independent responses to the SubPG style, as well as to Mainland influence. A amphora carrying strong East Greek influence was discovered further inland, at Gavalomouri (Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1985, 26, pl. 15 – Anatoliki Mesogeios, 140-141, number 86).
2038 Jones 2000, 255 (Afrati; the first of the three oinochoai is probably Cretan, not Rhodian), 260 (Dreros), 261 (Itanos), 269 (Gortyn), 284-285 (Phaistos). Johannowsky 2002, 54, numbers 348-349. Add the aforementioned Wild Goat oinochoe from Archanes.
689/688 by Cretans and Rhodians. Although several vases from Gela were originally considered Cretan or ascribed to a Cretan tradition, Lo Porto demonstrated that some of these identifications were unreliable. In the meantime, Coldstream argued that the vessels of Cretan origin or pedigree found in Gela are more closely connected to pottery from South Central Crete than to any other known Cretan sub-regional ceramic tradition. Accordingly, he proposed that that the Cretans involved in the venture originally came from South Central Crete. Although his observation holds well after almost forty years, one has to take into account our poor understanding of 7th century pottery from the west half of the island, as well as the lack of any systematic study of the relevant material from Gela. The close similarities in the shape and the decoration of a plate found in Gela and two trays from Eleutherna (TR.1, TR.2, pl. 33) only hint at the correspondences that might arise from comparisons of material from Gela and West Crete.

The view that perhaps more than one sub-region of Crete was involved in the colonisation of Gela finds support in the evidence for ceramic links between the various sub-regions of the island and East Greece. East Crete has, perhaps surprisingly, produced very few East Greek imports, while its pottery displays hardly any Dodecanesian influence. Besides, I have already noted that, although South Central Crete (mostly Kommos) has produced the richest record of East Greek imports, these mostly do not predate the foundation of Gela. On the other hand, Khania and other sites lying nearby have produced some East Greek pre-7th century imports, as well as evidence for East Greek influences on local pottery. Moreover, Eleutherna and Knossos have yielded quite a few East Greek imports, including

---

2044 Fiorentini e De Miro 1983, 94, fig. 91.
2045 Insights may also be provided by references to material from sites lying outside Crete or Sicily. For example, a sherd from Gela that bears a black figure eagle, which is though to recall Rhodian Orientalizing work, finds a close parallel on a possibly Cretan dinos from Ithaca (Fiorentini e De Miro 1983, 91, footnote 85, fig. 80), the shape of which is matched at Afrati (Robertson 1948, 101, number 599. Also, Boardman 1961, 157). Furthermore, there are strong, but unnoticed, similarities between a Cretan sherd from Taras (Lo Porto 1974, 181, pl. XX.6) and an earlier sherd from Prinias (Rizza 1973, pl. 768).
2046 For references see above.
2047 Tsipopoulou 1987, 232-233: the author speculates on whether this is due to an Eteocretan attitude towards the Dorian.
Rhodian, ‘spaghetti ware’ aryballoi (see above), which are otherwise unattested in Crete, but were widely exported to Gela.\textsuperscript{2048} Likewise, the Cypriot pouring vessels found in Gela\textsuperscript{2049} probably traveled along the north coast of Crete, judging by the distribution of Cypriot pottery within Crete (see below). Hence, if the joint foundation of Gela relied upon a network that linked East Greece and Crete, the network’s western end seems, on present evidence, to have lain on the north coast of Central and West Crete.

In conclusion, the particular origins of the Cretans that sailed to Gela may not have been really particular: the pottery from Gela, which displays strong affinities only with that from South Central Crete, offers positive hints to one direction, while the 8\textsuperscript{th} century connections between East Greece and the central and west part of North Crete point to another.

Coan MG-middle: I-LEK.3  
Local EG date: I-LEK.4  
Local LG date: I-OIN.4  
East Greek LG: I-AM.3 (early), I-AM.4  
Rhodian (LG)-Subgeometric: I-AR.6, I-AR.7  
Early Wild Goat Style: I-OIN.8  
Archaic: I-PV.2

\subsection*{6.3 Pottery from Cyprus and the Near East}

\subsection*{6.3.1 Cypriot pottery and the connections between Eleutherna and Cyprus}

The late 11\textsuperscript{th} – early 10\textsuperscript{th} century tomb at Pantanassa, some of the material from which (including a bronze and a clay vessel) displays Cypriot influence,\textsuperscript{2050} suggests that items and/or influence from Cyprus were already arriving in the hinterland of the Rethymnon nome (probably through harbours on the north coast, judging by the

\textsuperscript{2049} Fiorentini e De Miro 1983, 82, fig. 51.  
\textsuperscript{2050} Tegou 2001, mostly 147-148.
landscape) in the dawn of the Iron Age. This background accounts for the strong links that were forged between Eleutherna and Cyprus already in the late 9th century, as indicated by clay (see below) and bronze vessels, iron spits-firedogs and gold jewellery of Cypriot origins or pedigree from Orthi Petra. These links hardly withdrew in the 8th and 7th centuries, as iron spits-firedogs and a rich collection of bronze vessels, displaying Cypriot and/or Phoenician connections, testify.

The local copies of Cypriot pottery cover a similar time span (see below), in contrast to the few Cypriot imports, namely one Grey Polished I (III) (I-OIN.1a, pl. 37, 90) and two Black on Red I-II (III-IV) oinochoai (I-OIN.2, I-OIN.3, pl. 37), that date to the late 9th – early 8th century. The former belongs to a class that is otherwise not represented in Crete and is rare even within Cyprus. To the contrary, the Black on Red ware proved popular both inside and outside Cyprus. The latest scientific analysis, as well as a recent study have demonstrated that, although the original inspiration for the Black on Red decorative technique probably came from the Levantine coast, the ware was actually produced in Cyprus from the late 10th century and exported to the Levant, where it was occasionally imitated.

The Black on Red oinochoe appeared already in the late 10th century. Serious concerns have, however, been raised over Gjerstad’s criteria for the distinction between Black on Red I (III) and II (IV) examples. The shape of the pair of oinochoai from Eleutherna confirms Gjerstad’s impression for a development

---

2051 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 232-233, number 277; 235-236, number 282.
2052 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 258-259, number 323.
2054 Stampolidis 1994, 107, number 58.
2055 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 238, number 285; 240-246, numbers 292, 294-295, 297, 300-302, 304; 249, number 309; 251, number 313; 253-254, numbers 316-318.
2056 Schreiber incorrectly suggests that a Black on Red bowl has turned up in Eleutherna (Schreiber 2003, 33, map 7).
2057 All vases come from tomb A1K1; I-OIN.1a and I-OIN.2 turned up among local PGB pottery, while I-OIN.3 was found inside the MG NDP.28.
2058 Gjerstad 1948, 82-83. Perhaps similar (or Black Slip) vases stimulated the production of Cretan bucchero oinochoai (Knossos: KNC, 345, type Cii. Praisos: Bosanquet 1901-1902, 244).
2059 Brodie and Steel 1996. An earlier study had suggested that this ware was not an exclusively Cypriot product: Matthers et al. 1993.
2061 Gjerstad favoured a mid-9th century date for the introduction of the ware: Gjerstad 1948, 191, 423.
2062 Schreiber 2003, 252, table E. Also, Birmingham 1963, 34.
2064 Gjerstad 1948, fig. XXV:18, XXXIX:2. 4. Note that I am here referring to Gjerstad’s phases of the Black on Red pottery and not to the alternative system proposed in Schreiber 2003, which mainly regards the early history of the ware.
towards refinement, including the development of a cylindrical neck, but their late 9th and early 8th century context, which clearly pre-dates the absolute date for the beginning of the Black on Red II (IV) phase, corroborates the aforementioned concerns and suggests that the elegant version was produced already in the early 8th century.

Several Black on Red oinochoai have been discovered in Knossos, where Cypriot pottery has turned up in 8th - perhaps also in late 9th and early 7th - century contexts. Kommos has produced a few Cypriot, mostly coarse, storage vessels, which are no earlier than the mid-8th century, while single Cypriot vases of the late 8th - 7th century come from Anavlochos and Kavousi. On the other hand, only a single Cretan vase (a LG neckless pithos) has been identified in Cyprus (Amathous). The predominance of Black on Red pouring vessels among the Cypriot exports to Crete broadly mirrors the pattern that is attested for the Cypriot exports to the Levant, which has convincingly been associated with trade in perfumed oil. This issue is further connected with the widespread occurrence of Creto-Cypriot pottery in Eleutherna (already in the PGB period), Central and East - but not West - Crete during the 8th - 7th centuries, which is treated in Section 4.4.

To conclude, all three Cypriot vases from Eleutherna are oinochoai, even though Black on Red juglets must also have been imported, judging by the local copies that date back to the late 9th century. One of these oinochoai belongs to the

2065 Gjerstad 1948, 71.
2068 Johnston 1993, 370. Kommos IV, 298-299. It has been suggested that Jones's account of Cypriot imports in Kommos is problematic (comment by Johnston in Stampolidis 2003, 231).
2069 Johnston 2003, 247.
2070 Tsipopoulou 1987, 251, number 2.
2071 Jones 2000, 262. The identification of Cypriot vases at Vrokastro (Jones 2000, 268) is unreliable.
2072 Flourentzos 2004, 206, 213, number 124 (1a+1b). Although the decoration of this vase recalls LG storage vessels from Orthi Petra, its identification as Eleuthernian is discouraged by the description of its fabric that was kindly provided to me by Dr. Flourentzos and some details in the shape.
2073 See lately Schreiber 2003, 56-73, 298-299.
2074 Although Creto-Cypriot pottery is apparently unattested in the limited West Cretan Iron Age material that is published, the latter is not entirely untouched by Cypriot influence: Tzedakis 1979.
2075 See the comments upon type C oinochoai, type C lekythoi and type E aryballoi in Chapter 5, which include extensive references to related material from several Cretan sites. For Knossos see mostly Coldstream 1984 and for East Crete Tsipopoulou 1985.
rare Grey Polished ware, while two to the popular Black on Red class. These vases broaden the geographical and chronological horizon of the rather limited corpus of Cypriot pottery found in Crete, as well as the range of interactions between Eleutherna and Cyprus, especially during the late 9th and early 8th centuries.

Grey Polished I (III): I-OIN.1a (local PGB date)
Black on Red I-II (III-IV): I-OIN.2 (local PGB date), I-OIN.3 (local MG date)

6.3.2 Phoenician pottery and Phoenician interactions with Eleutherna
I-LEK.5 (pl. 39, 91), the only Phoenician clay vessel identified in Eleutherna, is a neck decorated/bichrome mushroom-lipped juglet. The type is very rare west of Cyprus2076 and the vase finds no close parallels in the Phoenician jugs and juglets that have turned up in Knossos,2077 Kommos2078 Eltyna2079 and Phaistos,2080 even though sherds from a lekythos that probably belongs to the type in question come from 8th century Komnos.2081 Other Phoenician shapes are poorly represented in Crete,2082 but Kommos has produced more than three hundred sherds, the vast majority of which belongs to storage jars.2083 Hence, all published Phoenician pottery from Crete2084 is clustered in the central part of the island,2085 but only the quantity and nature of the Phoenician ceramics in Kommos provide reliable evidence for systematic interactions, even though Bikai attributes several of these pieces to a single shipment.2086 Besides, the suggestion that Phoenicians from Cyprus

2076 Doumet-Serhal 1993-1994, 103: there is only one vase at Carthage.
2077 KNC 107.80, 283.50, 292.211, 56.10. See KNC, 408-409.
2079 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 124, 181, number 184; this publication is overlooked in Englezou 2004, 428, where the same vase is classified as an imitation.
2080 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 124, 181-182, numbers 185-186.
2081 Kommos IV, 308, number 18-19, see the reconstruction on pl. 4.63.
2082 Cf. the oinochoe KNC 292.80. See KNC, 408-409. Besides, an oinochoe, possibly of Oriental (Syrian?) provenance, has turned up in Kourtes (Rochetti 1988-1989, 199, fig. 66).
2084 Phoenician fragmentary material is, however, perhaps not being identified: Kommos IV, 310.
2085 Although the published Iron Age material from West Crete is too little to allow for any conclusions (note, however, the occurrence of a Phoenician letter on an amphora from Cavalomouri: Anatoliki Mesogeios: 140-141, number 86), the large corpus from East Crete suggests that the dearth of Phoenician vessels is not accidental (besides, the few Cypriot imports identified in East Crete come from the western part of the region: Tsipopoulou 1987, 267).
2086 Kommos IV, 310.
established an unguent factory in Knossos has repeatedly been challenged. Lastly, the influence of Phoenician wares upon Cretan pottery seems insignificant and the assumed Phoenician prototypes of OIN.34 (pl. 34a, 62) were probably metal vessels.

The single Phoenician clay vessel identified so far in Eleutherna would perhaps attract less attention if the site had not produced other types of artefacts that are commonly associated with the Phoenicians (including beads, vessels, a figurine, a scarab and a seal made of faience, glass vessels and beads, bronze vessels and a bronze ‘shield’ of Idaean Cave type). Firm evidence, however, for the presence of Phoenicians in Eleutherna is only provided by the discovery of three stone funerary monuments of Phoenician type (cippi). These monuments, as well as a fairly similar pair from Knossos establish that Phoenicians were living within some communities of Iron Age Crete and were integrated in the local societies to the extent that they were allowed to erect their grave markers next to typically Cretan tombs or burials. Although none of the

---

2087 See Section 4.4.
2089 See the comments upon OIN.34 in Section 5.2.3.
2090 This reference includes items related to North Syrians, but excludes artefacts of Cypriot origins or inspiration. For a review of the interactions between Crete and the Syropalestinian coast see Stampolidis and Kotsonas forthcoming.
2091 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 224, number 264.
2093 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 219, number 251.
2094 Karetsou, Andeakaki-Vlazaki and Papadakis 2001, 332, number 352.
2095 Jones 2000, 287.
2096 Stampolidis 1990b, 294.
2097 Stampolidis 1998, 177.
2098 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 249, number 309 (for Cypriot/Near Eastern bronze vessels see above). The vessel has been attributed to a Phoenician craftsman that migrated to Crete (Markoe 2003, 211-212).
2099 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 114-115, 255, number 319.
2100 Add the discovery of clay figurines of ‘Phoenician’ origins in the nearby hill of Nisi: Stampolidis 1990a, 104, footnote 48.
2102 Kourou and Karetsou 1998. Kourou and Grammatikaki 1998. I shall add my suggestion that a stone naiskos found in the acropolis sanctuary of Gortyn (Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 156, number 4) should be identified as an early Phoenician type stele (cf. Moscati 1988, especially the 6th–5th century examples from Mozia, illustrated in pages 314, 316, which display a fondness for the carving of human figures, hardly paralleled elsewhere at such an early date, as explained in page 312). Although such stelae are mostly found in cemeteries, they occasionally turn up in sanctuaries (Markoe 2000, 131. Cf., for example, the finds from Palaepaphos: Wilson 1974, 142-143).
aforementioned cippi was standing on its original position or was firmly associated with a single burial that could provide evidence (whether archaeological or physical anthropological) on the identity of the deceased, one of the Eleuthemian cippi comes from a stratified context (suggesting an 8th - 7th century date) and was found immediately south-west of a building that enclosed a jug with cremated bones.\textsuperscript{2103} At present evidence, one can only speculate on whether the individuals that are represented by the cippi are the ones that have long been assumed to have stimulated the production of some Orientalizing classes of artefacts in Crete, such as the Idaean Cave type ‘shields’,\textsuperscript{2104} the bronze bowls or the Idaean Cave ivories.\textsuperscript{2105} A piece of possibly related evidence is the (6th century ?) bronze weight in the form of a bull’s head, executed in Greek style, but carrying a Phoenician inscription, which was bought near Eleutherna and was said to come from the area of Sybrita.\textsuperscript{2106}

In conclusion, Phoenician pottery proved unappealing to the Cretans, despite their receptive attitude towards several other classes of Near Eastern artefacts.\textsuperscript{2107} The single Phoenician clay vase from Orthi Petra offers a meagre addition to the ample evidence for the relations between Eleutherna and the Phoenicians, as well as the establishment of a small Phoenician enclave within this Cretan community.

**Late 8th century (local LG date): I-LEK.5**

### 6.4 Pottery of indeterminate origins

The identification of I-OIN.6 (pl. 38) and I-AR.4 as imports relies on fabric; their shape and decoration are too simple to allow for an identification of their origins.

**8th - 7th century: I-OIN.6, I-AR.4**

\textsuperscript{2103} See Section 2.2.3.
\textsuperscript{2104} Stampolidis 2003, 226.
\textsuperscript{2105} These classes of artefacts are reviewed in Stampolidis and Kotsonas forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{2106} Brown 2001, 279, 474, number 404a.
\textsuperscript{2107} Stampolidis and Kotsonas forthcoming.
6.5 Review of the origins and impact of imported pottery in Eleutherna as opposed to the relevant evidence for other Cretan sites\(^{2108}\)

The preceding discussion suggested that, on present evidence, the dissemination of Eleuthemian ceramic vessels and their influence seems meager (the few cases identified regard material from Knossos). In contrast, the number of imported vessels and the impact of foreign wares on local pottery appears considerable enough to invite an inductive assessment of imported pottery and its impact on the Eleuthemian ceramic tradition. Both issues are first addressed in absolute terms and then in relation to evidence from other Cretan sites.

Eleutherna was importing pottery from a variety of regions, including Crete, the Aegean (and in the case of I-OIN.5 and I-AM.9 perhaps Ithaca), Cyprus and Phoenicia. Evidently, imports from the Saronic Gulf (Corinthia and Attica) were the first to arrive at the mid-9th century, but East Greek and Cypriot vases reached Eleutherna before the end of that century. During the second half of the 8th century, this geographic horizon was broadened by the arrival of imports from Phoenicia and perhaps the Argolid and Ithaca. On the other hand, only Cretan, Corinthian and East Greek imports persisted during the LPAR phase, which witnessed the importation of Laconian vessels.\(^{2109}\)

Although the vases from indeterminate Cretan sites comprise the richest class of imports in Eleutherna, Corinth is the most prolific source of imported pottery, while the roughly equal contributions of Knossos, the Cyclades and East Greece follow. Furthermore, only very few Attic, Cypriot and Phoenician vessels have been identified, while the origins of two vases remain indeterminate. Variety also governs the time-span covered by the imports from a given region: Attic pottery is limited to the last three quarters of the 9th century, the importation of Cypriot (late 9th – early 8th) and Knossian (8th – early 7th) vases is documented for a longer period, while the influx of Cycladic (late 9th – early 7th) and East Greek (roughly 800-600) vessels persisted for approximately two centuries. Lastly, Corinthian pottery first arrived

\(^{2108}\) This section focuses on sites that have produced abundant imported material, regardless of their function. A contextual approach on ceramic imports in Cretan cemeteries is, however, pursued in Section 7.4.

\(^{2109}\) For the Laconian vessels see: Erickson 2000, 166-171. Erickson 2004, 204-205.
during the early years after the cemetery’s establishment and persisted thereafter, excluding the early 8th century.

The ceramic imports identified in Eleutherna display a considerable geographical range, which is only surpassed by the range of imports found in Knossos. It is further rivaled by the relevant evidence from Kommos, but exceeds the range that is documented at Khania, let alone the remaining sites. This is perhaps one of the most conclusive pieces of evidence against the suggestion that the overseas contacts of Eleutherna ‘may be the result of interregional rather than international exchange’, regulated by ‘a site like Knossos’.

Concerning the quantity of imports from a given region, I stress that the amount of Cretan imports identified in Eleutherna is unrivalled. Although this phenomenon is to some extent a mirage produced by the limited scholarly interest in the circulation of Cretan pottery within Crete, the Knossian LG-EO imports identified in Orthi Petra suggest that there was a notable connection between Eleutherna and Knossos during that period. The Knossian potters were apparently more skilled than their Eleuthemian colleagues, but the relations between the two were proved to be two-sided.

Although the Attic imports from Eleutherna are few in comparison with the rich series that has turned up in Knossos and Kommos, they include rare types (I-PY.1, I-KR.1). Their disappearance at around 800 foreshadows the decrease in Attic imports that is attested in the mid-8th century throughout Crete, excluding Khania, which has even produced 7th century examples. Although this decrease is followed by a possible island-wide rise in Corinthian imports, the correlation of the two phenomena is superficial, given that the two regional wares are mostly represented by different shapes. In any case, Eleutherna and Knossos are the only sites that were importing Corinthian vessels before that date; concerning later Corinthian or related imports, Eleutherna is the only site that has produced sizable storage vessels (I-AM.5, I-AM.9, I-PY.2).

Knossos has produced examples of all regional wares represented in Eleutherna, as well as Argive, Euboean, Thessalian? (see mainly KNC, 402-404. Note, however, the possibly Argive origins of I-AM.5, I-AR.5) and Sardinian (Vagnetti 1989) imports.

Jones 2000, 117.
The Cycladic imports in Orthi Petra are neither as early nor as numerous as in Knossos and Kommos. They are, however, of particular importance since they mostly date to a period (late 8th – early 7th century) during which Cycladic imports in Crete display a decline. It is further mostly during that period that Cretan exports reach the Cyclades and Cycladic potters/painters arrive at Eleutherna. A different movement of people, namely the colonisation of Gela by Rhodians and Cretans, is perhaps illuminated by the East Greek imports in Eleutherna. These finds enhance the impression that the west and central part of Northern Crete had strong links with East Greece in the period that preceded the foundation of Gela, in contrast to South Central Crete, which only became deeply involved in this connection from the advanced 7th century. Hence, people from Northern Crete were perhaps among the Cretan colonists that sailed to Gela.

Although the Cypriot pottery from Orthi Petra is few compared to that from Knossos (but not the rest of Crete), Eleutherna appears to have received the earliest Cypriot imports. Accordingly, the local potters were faster than their colleagues elsewhere in the island in copying the Black on Red juglets. On the other hand, Phoenician pottery, excluding the Kommos storage vessels, occurs in (very) small quantities in a few Cretan sites, including Eleutherna, and proved unattractive to the Cretans.

Leaving aside the passion for Creto-Cypriot vases (which is discussed in Section 4.4) that is already identifiable in the late 9th century, the overall impact of imported vessels on Eleuthernian pottery is limited, particularly after the 9th century.\footnote{This is, however, no surprise, given that import substitution largely depends on the scale of the flow of actual imports (Sherratt 1999, 178).} The introduction or the appeal of a foreign shape is a relatively rare phenomenon, normally documented by a few examples, while external influence on decorative patterns or schemes is even more exceptional.\footnote{The rarity of external influence upon local pottery persisted during the Late Archaic and Classical periods (Erickson 2004, 201).} Despite the rarity of Attic imports, the belly-handled amphora (I-AM.1) and the globular pyxis (I-PY.1) proved appealing to the local potters. The latter were attracted much more by Corinthian aryballoi: the Corinthian plain aryballos (I-AR.1) stimulated the production of a long local series, while the shape (particularly the broad lip) of the...
PC examples was occasionally copied. Cycladic, East Greek and Phoenician pottery exercised no sizeable influence upon the local ceramic tradition, even though the 'Eleutherna bird workshop' and the 'saw pattern workshop' were probably established by Cycladic potters that migrated to Eleutherna.

The popularity of Creto-Cypriot vases in 8th–7th century Central and East Crete, as opposed to West Crete was underlined above. Since, however, the impact of other sources of influence varies from site to site, I will only discuss here the most notable cases. The unparalleled amount of Attic (and Cycladic Atticizing) imports that reached Knossos in the 10th–8th centuries is tied with the Atticizing influence that is identifiable on pottery from this site (and probably neighbouring sites as well) during the period in question. Although the Attic or Atticizing imports that reached Vrokastro were much fewer, the G pottery from this site displays notable Atticizing trends, which were probably produced by direct contacts with Attica and/or the Cyclades. Similar trends are only attested on some kraters from Kommos and the Mesariote production seems to have been largely unaffected by outside influence before the arrival of Corinthianizing elements in the 7th century. On the other hand, the late 8th–early 7th century pottery from Khania carries strong Corinthian and Argive influence, while ceramic links between the district of Kydonia and the Peloponnese are already traced in the 10th–early 9th century. Corinthian 9th–early 8th century models introduced two types of aryballoi in the Knossian repertory, but in the end of the 8th and the 7th century more Corinthian shapes like the kotyle were copied. During the latter period, Corinthian influence penetrated South Central Crete and made a limited impact on East Cretan wares. Significantly, all Cretan sites, the pottery of which displays notable outside influence in a given period of whatever duration, are located on or by the north coast of the island. Further, the influence derives from Attica and the Peloponnese (mostly its north-east part) and not the Cyclades or the Dodecanese, which lie closer to Crete.

---

2117 Desborough 1952, 250-259, GGP, 255-257.
2119 The various cases discussed by Coulson are collected in Jones 2000, 118, footnote 133.
In conclusion, wherever sufficient information is available, the amount of ceramic imports or influences attracted from a Cretan or overseas region to a single Cretan site finds no match in the relevant record for other sites in the island and occasionally defies the rationale of geographical proximity. This diversity warns against superficial generalisations and invites for in-depth studies on the mechanisms of production and consumption that operated within the structures of each community, as a background for the understanding of intra-island and wider interactions.
CHAPTER 7: CERAMIC CONSUMPTION AT ELEUTHERNA

Ceramic consumption explores both the physical and functional properties of a vessel and the cultural significance of its use. The first perspective involves assessments of morphology (for which see Chapter 5) and studies of the materials contained. Since, however, no residue analysis has yet been conducted on pottery from Eleutherna, the latter theme is not examined. The second perspective, which is pursued in Sections 7.2-7.6, explores the manipulation of ceramics within social life, particularly the funerary ritual held at Orthi Petra. It largely assumes a contextual approach, given that the formulation and interpretation of messages/intentions depends on a configuration of social strategies developed by conscious and unconscious choices and circumstantial factors, which often prove highly variable across cultural contexts. This variability is highlighted by comparative assessments of evidence from other Cretan cemeteries. Even, however, the meanings/intentions attached to a single artefact in a given context may face alternative and contested interpretations, as the discussion of figured imagery on vases from Orthi Petra suggests (see Sections 7.3-7.4).

Although studied in what is actually the final chapter of this thesis, consumption is not terminal; consumables do not actually vanish after consumption, but live on in the guise of the social personae and the social relations they produce, which may in turn reproduce the consumables in question. A clear case of the circularity of the process is examined in the following section.

7.1 A pottery outlet: linking production/circulation and consumption

This section is intended to emphasise that the processes of ceramic production and consumption are not separate from each other, despite their spatial detachment in the structure of this study. It also serves as a reminder that actual people and facilities were involved in processes that formed the archaeological record.

---

2120 Cf. van Wijngaarden 1999, 9-10. Also: Crielaard 1999a, 262-265.
2121 The issue of capacity is pursued, with reference to Knossian Iron Age pottery, in Tsatsaki 2004, 342-567. I am skeptical, however, about the line of argument and the deductive and to some extent rigid conclusions (page 566) that regard the functional properties of the vases discussed.
The loss of a member of the social group that used the Orthi Petra cemetery stimulated their kin to prepare for the funeral.\textsuperscript{2124} This regularly, but not always, involved the consumption of clay vessels. Although, however, the vessels attributed to a single burial or related ritual often shed no light on the mechanisms that brought them together, the occurrence of homogeneous sets in particular contexts suggests that a visit to a pottery outlet with an interest\textsuperscript{2125} in uniform vessels in mind had mediated.\textsuperscript{2126} In no case, however, can a single outlet be proved to have supplied the entire ceramic assemblage from a certain context.

The pyres in trench ΛΛ illustrate the point: the remains of the pair that were cremated in the LG-late pyre A were collected in two matching urns\textsuperscript{2127} that were found side by side.\textsuperscript{2128} The pyre also produced two identical trays (TR.1, TR.2) and three matching Creto-Cypriot aryballoi (AR.57, AR.58, AR.59).\textsuperscript{2129} Further, three pairs of local and imported vessels\textsuperscript{2130} were among the eleven vessels of the overlying EPAR pyre. Moreover, a group of Cycladic small open vessels turned up in trench 4Λ/3M (I-SK.3, I-SK.4, I-SK.5, I-SK.6, I-KO.1), while several PC aryballoi were found in trench AA (I-AR.14, I-AR.15, I-AR.16, I-AR.17, I-AR.18, I-AR.19). The most populous set, however, includes all twenty-three type E cups, which were found reversed over a LG-(EPAR) pyre in trench A and had clearly served in a ritual that followed the cremation of the deceased.\textsuperscript{2131} The interest in uniform sets is thinly attested in the 9th century, albeit in an occasionally loose manner: two pairs of matching PGB aryballoi were found in trench A (AR.3-AR.4 and AR.5-AR.6) and a pair of matching lids in trench K (LI.6, LI.7), while the sets of four cups and three bell skyphoi that were found inside KR.4 and I-KR.2 represent more than one workshop.\textsuperscript{2132}

\textsuperscript{2124} Cf. Stampolidis 1996, 93-148 (focusing on cremation funerals).
\textsuperscript{2125} This notion is indebted to Shanks 1999, 212.
\textsuperscript{2127} Note that urns are normally individual in Orthi Petra.
\textsuperscript{2128} Stampolidis 1996, 31, fig. 23.
\textsuperscript{2129} Looser correlations include four coated cups (CU.137, CU.138, CU.139, CU.149), two cups with straight neck (CU.197, CU.198), two pyxides (PY13, PY.16), two plain aryballoi (AR.53, I-AR.5) and two Creto-Cypriot unguent vases (AR.60, LEK.19).
\textsuperscript{2130} These include two PC (I-AR.12, I-AR.13), two 'spaghetti ware' (I-AR.6, I-AR.7) and two local aryballoi decorated in white on black (I-AR.20, I-AR.21).
\textsuperscript{2131} Stampolidis 1990b, 293.
\textsuperscript{2132} The workshop of variety Aib bell skyphoi contributed one or two (but not all three) bell skyphoi to the two sets.
Evidently, the consumer’s interest in homogeneous sets of vases covered a notable range of shapes and included imported pieces. Further, it was associated with various facets of the funeral, since few of the matching vessels served as urns, others as equipment for libations, while some perhaps carried foodstuff or oil for the anointment of the dead. Although this interest was perhaps limited in earlier times, or was undermined by chance factors such as availability, the potters and pottery entrepreneurs that dealt with the imported ceramics seemed keen in satisfying it during the LG-EPAR period. During this period, production/circulation and consumption were demonstrably closely interwoven in a manner that emphasises the circularity of the chaîne opératoire.

7.2 Ceramic consumption
Understanding the principles that govern the consumption of objects, such as the clay vessels from Orthi Petra, in a particular cultural context, like the burial ritual held at the necropolis,\textsuperscript{2133} relies on studying them from a range of perspectives.\textsuperscript{2134} This mostly involves a temporal, a spatial and a typological one (Sections 7.3-7.4).\textsuperscript{2135} Furthermore, the manipulation of figured drawing is explored and, in the case of imports, the parameter of origins is pursued. The overview of the patterns encountered that follows (Section 7.5) includes all evidence available for artefacts made of other materials and serves as a background for a study that conceptualises the dynamics of the strategies involved and assesses modes of social interaction (Section 7.6). Lastly, the date the cemetery was abandoned is reviewed (Section 7.7) with a consumption-oriented approach.

Throughout the analysis, I compare the sumptuary patterns identified in tomb A1K1\textsuperscript{2136} to those attested in the rest of the cemetery. Although I would like to refer to the group that was buried in the tomb and the group(s) that are represented outside it in social, rather than topographic terms, I understand that such a choice would be

\textsuperscript{2133} Consumption practiced in the burial ritual that preceded the advent of the dead body to Orthi Petra (Stampolidis 1996, 93-120) lies outside the scope of this study.
\textsuperscript{2135} The typological perspective is here with reference to the shape of the vessels.
\textsuperscript{2136} By mentioning the vases from tomb A1K1 in this chapter, I refer not only to those found in the chamber, but also to others (mostly LPAR urns) that were deposited over the tomb, in its dromos, or in monument A1K1. This choice of mine is based on the location and arrangement of these ‘outsiders’, which clearly suggests a strong interest in maintaining spatial and symbolic connections with the tomb after the latter’s chamber had been full.
totally unreliable. This is because primary evidence, such as the size of the cemetery or physical anthropological data, that are invaluable for social reconstructions, is currently unavailable. Moreover, I understand that the resonance that lies behind a comparison between a particular, fully-excavated context (the tomb) almost every vase from which has been included in this study, and a context that is loosely-defined and is still being excavated (the rest of the cemetery) is questionable. My intention is, however, to monitor relative frequencies, rather than absolute figures, and identify broad patterns, which could be calibrated in the future, as the body of relevant information will grow.\textsuperscript{2137} I see three principal reasons for adopting such an approach. Preliminary reports argue that while people of both sexes and varied age were buried according to a variety of burial customs at the rest of the cemetery, gender and age largely regulated who was to be buried (through secondary cremation) in tomb A1K1 (mostly male adults).\textsuperscript{2138} Furthermore, the layout of the necropolis of Afrati\textsuperscript{2139} suggests that the differentiation between collective and single burial was important in more than one site in Iron Age Crete. Lastly, the sumptuary patterns identified in the material from the tomb are fairly homogeneous and differ markedly to those identified in the rest of the cemetery, as demonstrated in the following sections.

7.3 Consumption of local pottery

The 753 local vases from Orthi Petra that are included in this study form the vast majority of the overall ceramic material in any period (always more than 85% and mostly more than 90%), even though their numbers display considerable fluctuations through time (Chart 1.1.1). Coarse wares are rare and, together with cooking wares, comprise 3% of the local material; plain wares (mostly basins and aryballoi; to a less extent necked pithoi and trays, as well as individual vases) form another 11%, while fine, painted pottery reaches 86%. Given that nearly one out of three local vases included in the latter figure is a cup, the high number of deep open vessels in Orthi

\textsuperscript{2137} Only, the growth of information would allow for a study that would do justice to the wide array of social personae represented outside tomb A1K1, which are here inevitably grouped together.

\textsuperscript{2138} See Section 2.2.3.

\textsuperscript{2139} Levi 1927-1929, pl. IV. Note that in Knossos, the only other site that has produced a substantial corpus of mortuary data, single burials are scarce.
Petra (Chart 1.1.2) is no surprise. Storage vessels are also ample, but slow-pouring, fast-pouring and shallow open vessels are considerably less common. Lids are rare.

Judging from the number of vases assigned to each period, in relation to the latter's length (Chart 1.1.1), the consumption of clay vessels apparently peaked in the LPG-PGB and the EPAR times, in contrast to the G and LPAR-(LAR) phases. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the LPG-PGB vases come from tomb A1K1 and crematorium A and is attributable to a fair number of burials, while EPAR pottery is most widely dispersed and probably derives from a maximum of burials.\textsuperscript{2140} In particular, nearly half of the local vases (45%)\textsuperscript{2141} discussed in this study are from tomb A1K1. Further, the vast majority of the vases included in this study come from primary or secondary cremations, while the remaining material, which accompanied pithos burial and inhumations hardly reaches 15%, in fact it probably represents less than 10%.\textsuperscript{2142}

Despite their validity, these general remarks conceal a complex and diverse picture, the elucidation of which is pursued in the following section, which is structured according to shape categories.\textsuperscript{2143}

The storage vessels\textsuperscript{2144} found at Orthi Petra normally contained cremated human bones.\textsuperscript{2145} Some pyxides, however, carried no bones, while the very small, narrow-necked type Biii pyxides are unsuitable for urns and one of them (PY.16)
probably contained olives. Only a few storage vessels are attested in the MPG-LPG period, but they belong to diverse shapes. Variety reaches a peak in the PGB period, when the numbers of storage vessels rise to standards that largely persist throughout the G period. Numbers and variety reach a nadir during the MG phase. This picture is, however, completely overturned in EPAR times. Lastly, although less populous and varied than their EPAR predecessors, the LPAR storage vessels form a rich body.

A comparison of the data from the tomb and the rest of the cemetery produces interesting patterns. After a timid start in the LPG period, the deposition of storage vessels in tomb A1K1 peaked in PGB times. The G period witnessed a gradual demise in their numbers and variety, but an amazing rise in both aspects occurred in the EPAR phase. Despite the rise in variety, the necked pithos outnumbered all other types. Variety shrank in LPAR times and numbers were halved. In contrast, the numbers of storage vessels from the rest of the cemetery remained low throughout its use, even though there was some rise in EG and LG-EPAR times. Considerable variety is only attested in the EPAR period and contrasts the predominance of the necked pithos in the ensuing phase. Hence, inurned cremation, which was the rule in tomb A1K1, was apparently not much practiced in the rest of the cemetery, even though it is attested throughout its use. The spatial distribution of storage vessels outside the tomb suggests that by the LPG-EG period, inurned cremation was practiced throughout most of the area of the built monuments, as well as north of it. The previously mentioned distribution re-emerges in the LG-PAR period, after the peculiar MG lacuna (only PY.9 from trench K is attested). Only a single, miniature storage vessel of late (although uncertain) date, PY.20, was found on the lower terrace, even though pyres are found in this area.

The detailed information available for the association between the storage vessels (mostly urns) from tomb A1K1 and other clay or bronze vessels reveals interesting patterns. Clay covers (lids, kalathoi, basins) occur throughout the PGB-LPAR period, even though they only become widespread in LPAR times.

\[2146\] Stampolidis 1996, 83.
\[2147\] There is only one earlier, MPG vessel, AM.14 from trench A.
\[2148\] Information derives from the comments upon the context of each type of large storage vessels (Appendix II).
Bronze covers are slightly more common in the PGB-LG period, become widespread in the EPAR, but dwindle thereafter. On the other hand, bronze vessels were rarely placed as an offering inside an urn. The deposition of clay vessels (mainly pouring examples, often imported, and occasionally deep, open vases) as offerings inside urns is slightly more common. It is mostly attested during the LPG-MG period, rarely in the LG-EPAR and never in the LPAR. These patterns, however, do not necessarily reflect trends attested throughout the rest of the necropolis.

Conical and domed lids (particularly the latter) are uncommon in Orthi Petra. Although the function of domed lids remains obscure, conical examples were normally covering storage vessels. Most lids date to the PGB-EG and were found in tomb A1K1. The remaining MG-LG/EPAR examples are conical and also come from the tomb.

The persistent unpopularity of lids outside the tomb is related to the rarity of storage vessels in this context, while the general unpopularity of the conical lid, particularly after the EG period, is related to the employment of lipless basins or bronze vessels as covers (see above).

The modest amount of LPG fast-pouring vessels attested in Orthi Petra is succeeded by a considerable rise in numbers during the PGB period. Numbers drop gently in the EG and sharply in the MG period. Only a slight rise is attested in LG-EPAR times and LPAR-LAR examples are extremely rare. This general trend requires qualification. First, the demise is largely a reflection of the drop in the numbers of oinochoai, which is loosely paralleled in 8th century Knossian tombs and does not apply to hydriae and jugs. Second, fast-pouring vessels are abundant in tomb A1K1 during the PGB-EG period, but hardly at all thereafter (MG-LPAR). Their numbers in the rest of the cemetery display notable stability from the 9th to the early 7th century, excluding the MG phase. Also, the spatial distribution of fast-pouring vessels outside the tomb gradually broadened: LPG examples are limited to

---

2149 The following account is based on Chapter 5, Appendix II and Chart 1.1.2.
2150 Several lids were, however, represented in building A: Stampolidis 2003, 224.
2151 The following account is based on Chapter 5, Appendix II and Charts 1.3.1-1.3.3.
2152 Fortetsa, 156-157. KNC, 342-347.
trench A, PGB-EG examples occur in the entire area of the built monuments, while LG-PAR examples also turn up further north. During the MG period, however, fast-pouring vessels are only attested in trenches K and perhaps A. Notably, there were no fast-pouring vessels on the lower terrace. Interestingly, the hydria proved popular outside the tomb, but only scarcely occurred inside the latter. The reserving of the latter context mostly for adult males may explain the contrast, since hydriai and related vessels are already connected with females in the Homeric epics. 2153

Slow-pouring vessels2154 are already found in the LPG period, albeit in small numbers and in shapes which mostly have no future. By the PGB phase, however, and until the abandonment of the cemetery, nearly all slow-pouring vessels are lekythoi and aryballoi. The distribution of these classes through the PGB-EPAR period suggests considerable stability; later, however, they almost disappear. The picture of stability largely reflects sumptuary patterns attested outside tomb A1K1 and contrasts the gradual demise (which becomes sharper in the late 8th century) in the deposition of slow-pouring vessels in the tomb. Besides, the spatial distribution of such vessels outside tomb A1K1 gradually broadened: LPG examples are limited to trench A, while PGB examples also occur in trenches K and 3K; the latter two trenches have produced most of the EG-MG vessels and only during the LG period do slow-pouring vessels spread further north and south. In the EPAR phase, the distribution reaches all ends of the excavated area, including the lower terrace (AR.36).

The discovery of a matching pair2155 of EPAR lekythoi (LEK.1, LEK.2) in a single context deserves particular attention since it conforms to a possible, but previously unnoticed pattern that is paralleled in late 8th – early 7th century Afrati2156 and Knossos. 2157 Nevertheless, the pairs/groups of lekythoi from Afrati and Knossos cannot be attributed to specific burials with any certainty. This also applies to the

2153 Manakidou 2004, 711.
2154 The following account is based on Chapter 5, Appendix II and Charts 1.4.1-1.4.3.
2155 For matching pairs/groups of vases in LG-EPAR Eleutherna see Section 7.1.
2156 Levi 1927-1929, 282, fig. 358; 284, fig. 363. GGP, 256-257.
2157 Out of the eighteen Praisos type lekythoi that were found in the Knossos North Cemetery (KNC, 355, type D. Moignard 1996, 442, type D), eight occurred in pairs (there was also a set of six). This pattern finds further support in Fortetsa (Fortetsa, 155, type Eii-iii) and the Tekke tholos (Hutchinson and Boardman 1954, 225, numbers 27-28), while three examples come from a tomb at Gypsadhes (Coldstream, Callaghan and Musgrave 1981, 160, numbers 10, 75, 114).
matching Knossian I-LEK.6 and I-LEK.7 that turned up in tomb A1K1. The slight chronological discrepancy between the latter two vases emphasises that confirmation of the previously mentioned pattern relies on contextual evidence.

The numbers of deep open vessels\(^{2158}\) (mostly dipped cups and bell-skyphoi) peak in the LPG-PGB, but drop significantly immediately afterwards. They remain fairly stable during the EG-EPAR period, but dwindle thereafter. This picture, however, largely reflects patterns attested outside tomb A1K1. The latter has produced a long series of LPG-PGB deep open vessels, but hardly any later examples. Deep open vessels are found only in trench A during both the LPG and the PGB periods, in contrast to other shape categories that are represented in the neighbouring trench K or elsewhere by the PGB. EG-MG deep open vessels only occur in trenches K and B, but LG-EPAR examples have turned up in most of the excavated area, including the lower terrace. Lastly, despite their small quantity, the LPAR examples display a maximum spatial distribution.

The deposition of high numbers of deep open vessels at Orthi Petra (occasionally in sets) raises the question whether they were being discarded after serving in ceremonies that bid farewell to the deceased\(^{2159}\) (henceforth called feasts)\(^{2160}\) for the consumption of drink and/or food. Tomb A1K1 provides the most promising evidence: The occurrence of few MG-LPAR deep open vessels by themselves confirms that if such feasts were practiced (as the discovery of animal bones suggests),\(^{2161}\) the crockery employed did not follow the urn. Nevertheless, the discovery of sets of four cups and three bell skyphoi inside the late 9\(^{th}\) century KR.4 and I-KR.2,\(^{2162}\) which is best paralleled in late 10\(^{th}\) - early 9\(^{th}\) century Knossos,\(^{2163}\) and the deposition of high numbers of deep open vessels during the 9\(^{th}\) century

\(^{2158}\) The following account is based on Chapter 5, Appendix II and Charts 1.5.1-1.5.3.


\(^{2160}\) By feast, I refer to the communal consumption of drink and perhaps food within the funerary ritual. On feasts see Dietler and Hayden 2001.

\(^{2161}\) Agelarakis 2004.

\(^{2162}\) If not coincidental, the correspondence in the number of vases could support a ritual regulation and/or the scale of the social group attending the feast (cf. Sherratt 2004, 321-322, footnote 80). The latter case is reinforced, as Stamolidis pointed out to me, by the occurrence of seven-couch dining rooms in Archaic and Classical Greece (Bergquist 1990, 37-38).

\(^{2163}\) See, for example, the bell kraters: KNC 285.82, Fortetsa 168, Fortetsa 207, Fortetsa 221, Fortetsa 428, Fortetsa 1467, Fortetsa 1484.
suggest the occurrence of feasts.²¹⁶⁴ It is likely that some of the bell skyphoi and dipped or coated cups that formed a dense layer overlying the LPG NDP.¹⁰⁴, which was probably the first urn that was deposited in tomb AIK1, had served a feast that celebrated the construction and the inauguration of the tomb.²¹⁶⁵ This inaugural custom is best paralleled in the ⁹ᵗʰ century tholos tomb of Gortyn.²¹⁶⁶ In both cases, however, no krater was accompanying the small open vessels.²¹⁶⁷ Besides, although mostly small groups²¹⁶⁸ of cups and skyphoi occur in MG-PAR contexts outside tomb AIK1, they are never associated with a krater.²¹⁶⁹ Kraters were, however, identified among the numerous LPG-PGB deep open vessels from trench A (KR.3),²¹⁷⁰ as well as among the fewer EG-MG cups from trench K (KR.5, I-KR.1).

In conclusion, feasts are currently only documented in tomb AIK1 during the LPG-EG period,²¹⁷¹ but probably persisted throughout the LPG-EPAR period in the rest of the cemetery. Nevertheless, the post-⁹ᵗʰ century feasts were rarely centred on a krater²¹⁷² and were normally more rare and less elaborate than before. Interestingly, the number of kraters deposited in Knossian tombs also drops after the EG period²¹⁷³ and comparable, although less consistent, evidence comes from the settlement of Knossos and the sanctuary of Kommos.²¹⁷⁴ Furthermore, although the cemetery of

²¹⁶⁴ It is highly unlikely that the inconspicuous open vessels in question were chosen as funerary offerings per se. There is further nothing to suggest that they served as containers of gifts to the deceased.
²¹⁶⁶ Alexiou 1966, 190-191: stratigraphy suggests that many cups and bell skyphoi, were deposited in the tomb before any urns were inserted. Also note the piles of similar vases in a corner of a ¹⁰ᵗʰ century tomb at Phaistos: Hadji-Vallianou 1979, pl. 193-left.
²¹⁶⁷ Tomb AIK1, however, produced the fragmentary, LPG-PGB KR.1.
²¹⁶⁸ The only considerable concentrations of small open vessels of MG-LAR cups occur in trenches A (twenty-three LG-(EPAR) type E cups), K (eleven (LG)-EPAR type Bv cups) and N-3 (eight EPAR, type Bii cups).
²¹⁶⁹ The few, barely decorated kraters of ⁸ᵗʰ - ⁶ᵗʰ century date included in this study were not associated with cups or skyphoi: KR.6 was closing the mouth of a pithos burial that contained no other vases, while KR.7 was found in a pyre that produced no other open vessel (Stampolidis 1996, 46-51).
²¹⁷⁰ Given Stampolidis’s suggestion that the ‘interments’ of tomb AIK1 were cremated in crematorium A (see Section 2.2.3) and the possibility that (a part of) the group of open vessels from trench A formed a set, I wonder whether the krater and the set had served the feasting that celebrated one of the earliest cremations, perhaps (again) the one represented by NDP.¹⁰⁴.
²¹⁷¹ The date of the context of the aforementioned animal bones is unknown to me.
²¹⁷² One cannot exclude the possibility that this vessel was used, but not deposited (cf. a ⁵ᵗʰ century inscription from Keos, which regulates that the vases that serve the funeral should be taken back: Sokolowski 1969, 188, number 97, line 10).
²¹⁷⁴ Whitley has demonstrated that although the numbers of 'drinking vessels' (small, deep, open vessel here) remain fairly stable in the sanctuary of Kommos and the settlement of Knossos throughout the Iron Age, the numbers of kraters drop, from the ⁸ᵗʰ century in the first case and from
Afrati, which was established in the 9th century, but only flourished in the late 8th – 7th, has produced quite a few kraters or dinoi, these normally served as urns or urn covers. Also, cups and skyphoi were rare at the site.\textsuperscript{2175} Although the krater served as a metonym for the drinking feast in Archaic-Classical poetry,\textsuperscript{2176} the disappearance of the vessel does not necessarily reflect the demise of the feast. Luke has demonstrated that the krater is treated as a kernel of power in Homeric and Archaic poetry and has persuasively, albeit rigidly, argued that its demise reflects wider socio-political developments towards more egalitarian structures.\textsuperscript{2177} Accordingly, evidence from Eleuthera is taken to corroborate the connection between the disappearance of the krater and social negotiations resulting in the sharing of particular privileges by larger groups, as explained in Section 7.6.

The gradual enlargement of the coated cup, which has received hardly any attention other than typological, further suggests that consuming habits underwent notable alterations through time.\textsuperscript{2178} In LPG-PGB times, most Eleuthemian – dipped – cups weighed 130-140gr.\textsuperscript{2179} and could carry 0.310-0.320lt. (variety Ai-Aii cups), even though several lighter (100gr.) and less capacious (0.230-0.240lt.) examples (variety Aiii) were also circulating. Interestingly, the weight and capacity of the latter group is closely paralleled on most bell skyphoi (variety Aia-Aib; weight: 80-100gr., capacity: 0.210-0.230lt.), which are contemporaneous. On the contrary, even the cups of the smaller (variety Bii) of the two varieties of coated cups (Bii-Biii) that were popular in the early 8th century were considerably heavier (190gr.) than their LPG-PGB – dipped – predecessors and could hold almost 50% (0.440-0.450lt.) more than their most capacious predecessors. These trends culminated in the late 8th – early 7th century: type Biv-Bv cups weigh 450-470gr. and hold 1.150-1.450lt.\textsuperscript{2180} Hence, after a period of relative uniformity in the LPG-PGB period, the cups's

\textsuperscript{2175} Levi 1927-1929 (roughly a dozen cups and skyphoi discussed in pages 421-422 have no context).
\textsuperscript{2178} For the importance of changes in the size of ceramic types cf.: Woodard and Blinkhorn 1997. Mills 1999.
\textsuperscript{2179} All figures cited in this paragraph are approximate. Capacity is based on experiments made by filling the vases with water.
\textsuperscript{2180} No figures are provided for the late 7th – early 6th century variety Bvi cups, all of which are fragmentary.
weight grew by roughly three and a half times\textsuperscript{2181} and its capacity multiplied by four within the span of three generations. I maintain that these fairly consistent developments, which are identifiable through most of Crete, cannot be convincingly attributed to changes in ceramic fashions and should be related to an alteration of drinking habits, particularly of the custom of diluting the wine. I actually assume that the cup was enlarged to serve the mixing of wine and water, particularly since Nestor's capacious 'depas' cup served as a mixing bowl\textsuperscript{2182}, while small and inconspicuous mixing vessels are recorded in the Odyssey.\textsuperscript{2183} This explanation would also account for the demise of the krater. In any case, some of the social implications of the change are illuminated by the discovery of most of the 'unorthodoxly' small, G-PAR cups of variety Bvii in child burials. Evidently, the enlarged cup became a stereotype of adulthood. One could further assume that it emphasised manhood, particularly since a cup (among other things) was offered by an adult male to a boy after the latter's initiation to adulthood, according to a Cretan custom.\textsuperscript{2184} The rare attestation of the shape, however, within tomb A1K1, which was mostly reserved for adult males, suggests that this last assumption is precarious. Besides, as already mentioned, the cemetery of Afrati only produced a few cups.

Despite their potential for holding solid and liquid materials, several shallow open vessels\textsuperscript{2185} (particularly the kalathoi and the basins) were used as urn lids. This potential was more systematically exploited from the LG period, when basins became more widespread and trays were introduced. At this time, the thymiaterion, a ritual vessel for burning incense, appears (only) outside tomb A1K1. Before that date, the repertory of shallow open vessels was poor (LPG-EG kalathoi and EG-MG basins) and their numbers are almost negligible both inside and outside tomb A1K1. The considerable rise in variety and quantity that emerged in the LG period culminated in EPAR times and withdrew only gradually thereafter. Actually, the

\textsuperscript{2181} Note that the enlarged, Knossian late 8\textsuperscript{th} century cups remained light due to refinements in fabric and technique (KNC, 387).

\textsuperscript{2182} Iliad XI.628-641.

\textsuperscript{2183} klpνν: Liddell and Scott 1996, 958. Also, Sherratt 2004, 328-330.

\textsuperscript{2184} Strabo X.4.21. Lebessi 1985a, 189-190. For 'manliness' and the consumption of wine in the Homeric epics see Sherratt 2004, 323-324. For a fragmentary, 6\textsuperscript{th} century law from Eleutherna, which forbids excessive drinking of adult males, excluding the case of communal drinking on a particular occasion see Appendix 1.2.1.

\textsuperscript{2185} The following account is based on Chapter 5, Appendix II and Charts 1.6.1-1.6.3.
persistence of considerable numbers of shallow open vessels after the EPAR period is only paralleled in the case of storage vessels. The distribution of open vessels displays one more peculiarity, which is unparalleled in other shape categories: the numbers of vases deposited through time inside the tomb match those attested for the rest of the cemetery.

The LPG-EG kalathoi are only found in tomb A1K1 and trenches A and K. Other shallow open vessels are missing from the latter two trenches, but display an increasingly broader spatial distribution. In the EG-EPAR period, basins and, from the LG period, other shallow open vessels occur in the tomb and the area of the built monuments and gradually further north. By the LPAR-LAR times, they also appear in the lower terrace, as well as the fringes of the excavated area.

Orthi Petra has produced only a few coarse ware vases (excluding the pithoi that served as containers for inhumations, which are not discussed here), all of which are basins. Most of the diverse examples turned up in tomb A1K1 and date to the LG-PAR period. Evidently, coarse pottery was not considered appropriate for the dead.

Cooking wares are slightly more common and include jugs and trays. Although their distribution through time is even, they all turned up outside tomb A1K1. The earliest, LPG-PGB jugs and trays come from trench A, later examples turned up in trenches immediately north – north-east (K, 3K, A), while LG-PAR vases reach the north and west fringes of the excavated area. CJU.8 in particular was found considerably lower than any other vase as the slope descends.

The discovery of a number of cooking vessels, all of which (except BTR.7) carry traces of fire, in Orthi Petra\textsuperscript{2186} raises the question of whether they had been used on the spot for the preparation of funerary meals (and/or other rituals), they had been used elsewhere for the preparation of funerary meals and then carried to the cemetery or are domestic chattels that were eventually deposited in the cemetery.\textsuperscript{2187} It is hard to determine, particularly for every single case, but all evidence available favours the third alternative.\textsuperscript{2188} This does not imply, however, that food preparation

\textsuperscript{2186} This discussion excludes CJU.7, which comes from a domestic context.
\textsuperscript{2187} Contrast the cooking vessels from the Knossos North Cemetery, which are considered as symbolic offerings (KNC, 350-351, type F. Coldstream 2001, 63).
\textsuperscript{2188} For the reuse of domestic vessels in funerals see Roberts 2002.
and consumption did not take place. The narrow mouth of the Eleuthernian jugs is more suitable for an ‘indoor-kitchen’ than for an open-air ritual, while the tray, which is connected with toasting and baking, could not have fed a sizeable group of people. On the other hand, the cooking cauldron, a shape that carried ritual connotations in Minoan times and is regarded ideal for ceremonial, open-air use (its morphology is suited for heating and rapid boiling and provides direct access to its contents), is missing. Furthermore, some cooking vessels from Eleutherna were clearly not accompanied by eating/drinking crockery and the worn base of some trays suggests their long and hard domestic use. Lastly, CJU.8, which displays traces of burning, contained the dry bones of a child.

The secondary use of at least some clay cooking vessels deposited at Orthi Petra does not necessarily imply that they served those who could not afford to employ new or unused crockery, particularly since CJU.6 was found in a rather rich burial. This evidence, as well as the association of some examples with infant/child inhumations (CJU.6, CJU.8, BTR.8) and the lack of clay cooking vessels in tomb A1K1 (which was principally reserved for cremations of mostly adult males) suggest that the deposition of the ware was to some extent governed by age (and/or sex) distinctions. Clay cooking vessels (like the small G-PAR cups of type Bvii) were considered appropriate for infant/child inhumations, at least during the PAR period. Interestingly, the remains of fetuses, infants and children are often found inside, or are furnished with, cooking vessels in Iron Age Attica and Torone.

2189 Recall the occurrence of bronze cauldrons (Stampolidis 1994, 108-111, numbers 59-62), as well as spits/obeloi at Orthi Petra (Stampolidis 1994, 107, number 58. Anatoliki Mesogeios, 258-259, number 323) and note that the Homeric feast was centred upon spits/obeloi, unlike its Late Bronze Age counterpart, which largely relied on sizeable cooking vessels (Sherratt 2004, 312-315).

2190 Borgna 1997, 204.

2191 Borgna 1997, 204-205.


The last comments upon local pottery regard figured decoration. All twelve local vases that carry such decoration are fairly large, necked, storage vessels and were found inside or above tomb A1K1. They represent 1.6% of the local material and 1.4% of the entire material included in this study. All apart from two (NDP.37, NDP.61), however, are attributed to two workshops that were established by immigrant potters originating in the Cyclades (AM.6 to AM.13 are assigned to the 'Eleutherna bird workshop', while AM.23, NDP.62 and NDP.76 to the 'saw pattern workshop').\textsuperscript{2195} Most vases date to the first half of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, but NDP.47 is slightly earlier (LG) and NDP.76 slightly later (EPAR-late). Figured drawing is limited to faunal motifs\textsuperscript{2196} (including the mythical griffins of NDP.61) and mostly involves the depiction of four birds on the shoulder of the vase (two on each side). AM.23, however, is also adorned with other animals, a lion, a goat and three horses, which are set paratactically in a belly frieze (this is the only definite case where the animals are depicted in motion), while the shoulder of NDP.61 carries no birds, but two winged griffins, which only adorn one side of the vessel. The figures on the shoulder, which are separated by linear or geometric patterns (excluding AM.23), are confronted/heraldic (AM.11, AM.12, AM.13, AM.23, NDP.62, NDP.76 NDP.37, NDP.61) or face right (AM.7, AM.8, AM.9, AM.10). Summarising, vases carrying figured imagery were apparently produced in Eleutherna only during the late 8\textsuperscript{th} and most of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, even though most examples date to 700-650; their record is dominated by homogeneity in the shape of the vessel, the choice of figures and their position within the decorative syntax.

The attribution of most vases carrying figured decoration to workshops established by immigrants from the Cyclades invites some reflection on whether the adoption of the figured ornaments entailed acceptance of any associated 'cultural baggage'.\textsuperscript{2197} I assume that the borrowing of imagery did not involve any explicit transfer of ideas, since birds are commonly attested on Greek pottery of the late 8\textsuperscript{th}

\textsuperscript{2195} See Section 4.4.
\textsuperscript{2196} Human figures are solely attested on a few sherds: Stampolidis 1990, 388, footnote 30. Stampolidis 1996, 117, fig. 165.
\textsuperscript{2197} Cf. Morgan 1999a, 239-243.
and early 7th century. This is further corroborated by the uncommonness of this imagery on Cycladic storage vessels, as well as the relatively short life of the workshops and the imagery in question in Eleutherna and the lack of Eleuthernian interest in imports with similar imagery (excluding I-HYD.1). Lastly, the employment of all local vases carrying figured imagery as urns in tomb A1K1, which served as the burying place of a particular segment of the population (mostly adult males), suggests that this imagery assumed a role of local character, discussed in Section 7.6.

The vases in question were occasionally accompanied by clay and/or metal vessels. According to the limited information available for their contents, AM.7 contained a gold band depicting war chariots, while AM.23 two LM I sealstones incised with fish and hay-stacks. Hence, the taste for figured imagery that is attested on the decoration of the vase is extended to the offerings placed in it. The discovery of Minoan artefacts in AM.23, which carries heavy Orientalizing imagery, recall’s Morris’s model on the manipulation of connections with the past and the east by Iron Age elites. As it stands the model is not applicable to Crete (which has wisely been excluded from it), since it involves sharp, temporal and spatial dichotomies that are missing from the island’s material record, but the related agenda is of interest. I am deliberately avoiding speculating on the significance of the Minoan past in Iron Age Eleutherna before evidence on the context of other Bronze Age artefacts from Orthi Petra is published. Suffice it to say that the

2198 Benson 1970, 60-76. This evidence discourages any speculation on possible symbolic/eschatological connotations conveyed by the birds on Eleuthernian pottery (for interpretations of birds in 7th century Cretan art see: Lebessi 1976, 91, 98. Shaw 1983, 447-448).
2199 The belly frieze of AM.23, however, recalls Cycladic storage vessels.
2200 This is unclear for AM.10, which was found smashed. The ‘Rethymnon amphora’, which is attributed to the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’, has no provenance (see the comments upon type C amphorae in Section 5.1.1). Its state of preservation suggests a funerary context.
2201 A metal (AM.7, AM.11, AM.12, NDP.37), a clay (AM.23) or a metal and a clay (NDP.76) vessel covered half of these urns, while the rest carried no cover (Section II.1.1).
2203 Stampolidis 2004, 293, numbers 392-393. For the occurrence of Minoan or Mycenaean seals in later Greek contexts see Sakellarakis 1976.
2204 Morris 2000, 195-312. For the manipulation of Orientalizing ceramic imagery see also Whitley 1994.
2205 This subject is lately discussed in: Sjögren 2001 (abstract). Prent 2003. Wallace 2003. Although I am skeptical about the model advanced in the latter publication (as well as about matters of detail, most relevant of which here is the lack of any reference to the LM IIIC and PG-A sanctuaries of Eleutherna in figures 1-2), this is not the place to review it.
2206 Stampolidis 2004b, 118. Stampolidis 2004, 234, number 249; 238, number 256; 294, number 396.
palatial periods are poorly represented in the entire site\textsuperscript{2207} and Iron Age ceramic manifestations of any local interest in Minoan material culture are largely missing, unlike, for example, in PGB Knossos.\textsuperscript{2208} Besides, the Eleuthernian vases with figured, Orientalizing imagery reveal a major shortcoming of the aforementioned model, namely the implicit assumption that ideas and material traits from the East reached the Aegean Iron Age sites that ventured in Orientalizing experiments as identifiably Eastern products. By lying in the Cyclades, and not the Eastern Mediterranean, the direct source of the Eleuthernian imagery challenges the long-held assumption that by Orientalizing, a community is necessarily (let alone consciously) adopting ideas and material traits directly from the East and demonstrates the complexities in the dissemination of such imagery. The manipulation of Cycladic material traits of Oriental descent by some high status Eleuthernians of the early 7\textsuperscript{th} century evidently probably did not involve any participation in debates about the social role of the east. It seems that the 'cultural baggage' of these traits was largely emptied from its Cycladic, let alone its Oriental, load.

\textbf{7.4 Consumption of imported pottery}

In theory, the amount of fine ware pottery that circulated in the Mediterranean during the Iron Age (but also in earlier and later periods) is somewhat surprising, given that, in contrast to other classes of artefacts, the raw material for ceramics is neither rare nor restrictable and the manufacture process requires no complex infrastructure or specialised technology and skills. Also, in several cases, the export of the finished product was hardly intended to offer any narrowly defined functional advantage against the alternatives produced in the consuming area, or prove appealing though the great labour input or technical virtuosity it displayed.\textsuperscript{2209} Moreover, accounts that assume that imports satisfied a shortage of local alternatives have often been proved inadequate.\textsuperscript{2210} Hence, production-driven interpretations cannot fully account for the circulation of such an amount of pottery; even in cases where pottery was produced

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{2207} Kalpaxis 2004, 106.
\textsuperscript{2208} See Section 4.2 and the comments upon AM.16 in Chapter 5.
\end{footnotesize}
mainly for export, it evidently corresponded to a certain demand. On these grounds, interpretations that regard exported vessels as ‘objects d’art, xenia gifts, personal belongings of traders, seafarers, mercenaries or settlers, marriage gifts’ have lately been criticised. Accordingly, scholarly comprehension of the impetus for and the patterns of the circulation of fine ware pottery increasingly relies on understanding the consumer’s choices and aspirations through contextual approaches.

7.4.1 Consumption of imported pottery at Eleutherna

The discussion in Chapter 6 remarked that all eighty-seven vases considered imported are fine ware examples and comprise nearly one tenth (9.7%) of the total material. It further demonstrated that their deposition in the cemetery of Eleutherna commenced during its earliest phases and persisted until the 6th century. Charts 2.4.2-2.4.3 however, establish that the influx of imports in the cemetery of Eleutherna was susceptible to notable fluctuations through time. The most eminent drop in the number of imported vessels is in the first half of the 8th century and contrasts the rich and varied record of the 9th century. The demise was initiated just after 800. Imports nearly vanished in the second quarter of the 8th century and recovery started after 750. By the last decades of the century, however, a flood of imports, which did not withdraw until the mid-7th century, was reaching Orthi Petra. Although numbers

---

2214 After realising that accommodating dozens of vases (the absolute date of which depends on diverse regional sequences and is not always narrow) in a single chart involved inexorable shortcomings, I decided to produce two charts with similar aims, but slightly different structure. The ‘main’ pillars (this refer to the first four pillars of each chart; the pillars that follow merely demonstrate how much material and of what date could not fit in the ‘main’ pillars and are called ‘secondary’) of Chart 2.4.2 were built to incorporate as much of the material as possible, even though this involved the attribution of this material to periods of unequal length. In contrast, Chart 2.4.3 is structured upon roughly even periods (seventy/eighty years long) and proves more sensitive to the fluctuation of the number of imports through time, necessarily excluding a larger part of the material from the ‘main’ pillars. Hence, although the first and fourth pillars of the two charts are identical, the second and third ‘main’ pillars and some of the ‘secondary’ ones display some discrepancies.
2215 A comparable lull in imports is attested in Eleutherna during the mid/late-5th century (Erickson 2000, 162. Erickson 2004, 209-211).
dwindled in the second half of the 7th and the early 6th century, the Archaic imports treated by Erickson\textsuperscript{2216} suggest that the trend was not as sharp as my charts suggest.

The spatial distribution of the imported material largely conforms to the patterns identified in the discussion of local pottery. Precisely half of the imported vessels identified in Orthi Petra are from tomb A1K1.\textsuperscript{2217} Several vessels turned up in primary cremations, while the remaining material, which accompanied pithos burials and inhumations hardly reaches 10-15\%.\textsuperscript{2218} The evidence for cremations, however, deserves some qualification. Despite their quantity, the imports that were associated with the secondary cremations of tomb A1K1 occurred mostly singly.\textsuperscript{2219} On the contrary, pairs/groups of imports\textsuperscript{2220} are commonly attested in late 8th – 7th century primary cremations. Only few imports turned up among the burned material that was enclosed by (or associated with) structures A and K. Hence, if Stampolidis is right in identifying structure A as the crematorium for the deceased that were eventually buried in tomb A1K1 (see Section 2.2.3), one is entitled to assume that imports were not ‘discarded’ in the flames of the funerary pyre to embellish the deposition of the collected human remains in the tomb. In conclusion, although the vast majority of the imported material was associated with cremations, the depositional patterns encountered in primary and secondary cremations are markedly different.

Differences also arise over the temporal distribution of the material. The date of the imports from the tomb ranges from the second quarter of the 9th century to just after the mid-7th century. On the contrary, I-AM.1 and I-KR.2, which are assigned to the late 9th century and come from trench K, are the only imports found outside the tomb that pre-date the late 8th century. During the late 8th and early 7th century, however, imports spread south (trench A), south-east (trench AA) and east (trench

\textsuperscript{2216} Erickson 2000, 161-192.
\textsuperscript{2217} This includes the only import that was (probably) found over the tomb, I-OIN.8.
\textsuperscript{2218} See Chart 2.1.2: Although the lack of detailed context information for a group of vases found outside tomb A1K1 obstructs precision, I reckon that the vessels from trenches A, AA, K, 4A/3M and the two pyres in trench ΛΛ (as well as those from tomb A1K1) were accompanying cremations. Inhumations or pithos burials produced I-PV.1, I-PV.2, I-AL.1, I-AL.3, I-AM.9. A few vases, like I-AL.1, were not associated with any burial.
\textsuperscript{2219} The only urn that was firmly associated with two imports (I-AR.3, I-OIN.1) is the PGB NDP.107.
\textsuperscript{2220} See footnote 2218 and cf. mostly the collections from trenches 4A/3M, AA, as well as the groups found in the two pyres of trench ΛΛ (Chart 2.1.2). Only a detailed study of stratigraphy would confirm whether these groups belong to single or neighbouring/superimposed burials.
3K), but mostly north-east (trenches Λ, ΛΛ, 4Λ/3Μ), even though they rarely appear far from the area of the built monuments (excluding I-AR.11 and I-LI.7). Lastly, imports only appear occasionally on the lower terrace from the end of the 7th century.

Chart 2.3 suggests that slow-pouring vessels are the most popular class of imports. Storage, fast-pouring and deep open vessels are less popular, while shallow open vessels are rare. Given that at least two fifths of the corpus are non-container vessels, a significant part of the material was imported in its own right. Besides, whenever information is available (mostly for the vases from tomb A1K1), the imported storage vessels of large size were employed as urns, even though there are notable exceptions like I-AM.1 and I-AM.4. The former, Attic (or Cycladic Atticizing) MG I amphora was found together with the contemporary Attic I-KR.1 in trench K. The pair could have formed the core of a libation set that was supplemented by some of the numerous local EG-MG coated cups (varieties Bii-Biiii) found nearby. Most of the remaining imports probably contained (perfumed) oil. Hence, the funerals held at Orthi Petra seldom involved the offering of imported vases carrying foreign commodities other than oils to the deceased.

Given that the vases attributed to every exporting region are relatively few and occasionally amply represented only in a single context, chance factors and individual preferences largely account for ‘overall’ attitudes towards particular wares. In any case, storage vessels were only imported from Cretan and Aegean sites. Leaving aside the lids, storage vessels, all originating from Attica, were first deposited at Orthi Petra during the 9th century. After an interruption in the first half of the 8th century, imported storage vessels make an impressive reappearance during

---

2221 The figure includes all open and fast-pouring vessels, cf. Sherratt 1999, 170-172.
2222 No reliable information is available for I-AM.6, I-AM.7, I-AM.8 and I-AM.9 that were found smashed.
2223 The Attic amphorae from the Knossos North Cemetery, which are mostly belly-handled (KNC, 394), like I-AM.1, also did not contain bones (Coldstream 1990, 30. Coldstream 1996a, 135. Coldstream and Catling 1996, 716, footnote 1623). On the other hand, the Attic MG I belly-handled I-AM.2 had served as an urn.
2224 This has also been suggested for some Attic vases found in Knossos: Coldstream and Catling 1996, 716. Coldstream 1996a, 135, 137.
2225 Only the earliest local EG is, however, concurrent with Attic MG I.
2226 No mention to the importation of goods is identifiable in the fragmentary Archaic inscriptions from Eleutherna that regard economic affairs (Perlman 2004, 100-118, 124-128).
the late 8th – early 7th century, particularly in tomb A1K1. The examples of late 8th – early 7th century date originate from the north-east Peloponnese, East Greece and the Cyclades.\textsuperscript{2227} Fast-pouring vessels from Crete and Cyprus were deposited in the tomb during the late 9th – early 8th century, while fewer, Cretan and Corinthian examples occur thereafter in the entire cemetery. On the other hand, slow-pouring vessels from diverse regions were placed in the tomb during the 9th century. After a possible (if only short) gap in the early 8th century, Cretan and Corinthian imports dominate the record of the entire cemetery during the late 8th – early 6th century, even though the Cretan examples mostly occur in tomb A1K1, while the Corinthian ones only in the rest of the cemetery.\textsuperscript{2228} Although the Cyclades is the only region that did not export pouring vessels to Eleutherna, most imported open vessels identified at Orthi Petra originate from this area (probably from a single island); they date to the late 8th – early 7th century and were found outside the tomb. This excludes, however, the Cycladic I-SK.1, which dates to the late 9th century and turned up inside the tomb. The spatial and temporal distribution of the slightly fewer open vessels that come from various Cretan sites is similar. The late 9th century I-KR.2, however, turned up in the tomb. The earliest and latest imported open vessels originate from Attica and Corinth respectively. To sum up, vases from all major shape classes were imported during the 9th century (even though open shapes are thinly represented), their numbers dwindled significantly in the first half of the 8th century, while the late 8th – early 7th century recovery was marked by diversity. Open vessels only occur outside the tomb, storage vessels and Cretan slow-pouring vessels are mostly attested in it, while burials outside the tomb show a preference for Corinthian slow-pouring vessels. Only slow-pouring and open, mostly Corinthian vessels persisted in the late 7th and early 6th, when the importation of Laconian kraters\textsuperscript{2229} commenced.

\textsuperscript{2227} The imported storage vessels that were mostly employed as urns in tomb A1K1 were rarely furnished with other vessels, whether an imported, matching lid (1-NSP.1, I-PY.2), a local clay vase (I-AM.2, I-NSP.2) or a bronze vessel (I-AM.2, I-NSP.3 and perhaps I-AM.5, I-NDP.2).

\textsuperscript{2228} The non-appearance of PC-EC unguent vases in tomb A1K1 is no surprise, given the rarity of late 8th – early 6th pouring vessels found in it. Such imports turned up in both collective and individual tombs at Afrati (Jones 2000, 253-257) and East Crete (Tsipopoulou 1987a, 263; 268-271. Jones 2000, 265-266), a few examples occurred in collective Knossian tombs (Moignard 1996, 447. Jones 2000, 220, 242), while the single vase that is known from West Crete comes from an individual burial (Jones 2000, 289).

\textsuperscript{2229} Erickson 2000, 166-171. Erickson 2004, 204-205. For some thoughts on the context and use of these see Section 7.7.
These patterns invite for a brief review of the relevant evidence from the
cemeteries of Knossos and Afrati, which is of significant quantity and
chronological range. In all three sites, imports mostly occur singly, but a few
Knossian tombs have produced small or large sets of contemporary vases
originating from a single region. All imported pottery from Afrati, however, dates
from the beginning of the 7th to the early 6th century and includes approximately
thirty Corinthian pouring vessels (mostly aryballoi and alabastra, but also oinochoai),
two East Greek oinochoai and a Knossian LG-EO plate. The evidence from
Knossian tombs is markedly different, excluding the rarity of Cretan imports
identified. Pottery was imported in Knossos throughout the 10th - 7th centuries.
Imports from a variety of regions have been identified, as in the case of Eleutherna,
but Knossian tombs have also produced Argive, Euboean, Sardinian and perhaps
Thessalian pottery. Attica is by far the most prolific source of imported vessels
(Attic imports dwindle after the early 8th century, later than in Eleutherna, and
disappear in the 7th), Cyprus and the Cyclades follow, while in all other cases the
imports from a given region hardly exceed a dozen. Further, although the variety
of Corinthian shapes is notable, the Corinthian post-G unguent vases seem unpopular,
in contrast to what is attested for both Eleutherna and Afrati. The late 8th century
demise in the number of Cycladic imports to Knossos contrasts the concurrent peak
in Cycladic imports to Eleutherna and Cretan exports to the Cyclades (see Section

2230 The comparable, systematically excavated cemetery of Prinias remains unpublished.
2231 Although the cemetery of Afrati (which is fully excavated and published) recalls Orthi Petra in
covering a specific locale and dating from the mid/late 9th to the early 6th century, the Knossian tombs
cover a vast area and date from the 11th to the late 7th century. I am primarily concerned here with the
time span that is represented in Orthi Petra.
2232 The only probable exceptions at Afrati are the pairs of PC aryballoi in Levi 1927-1929, 346, fig.
451-452; 355, fig. 463-464.
2233 Pairs are not uncommon, but homogeneous sets of three (EPC vases from KNC tombs 34, 292:
Moignard 1996, 437, 457) or more (Cycladic MG I skyphoi from tomb 219: KNC, 404; Cypriot Black
on Red II lekythoi from tombs KNC 285, 292: KNC, 407) imports from a single tomb are rare.
2234 Attic LPG, mostly open vessels from tomb J (KNC, 396, 400-401) and Attic MG I amphorae,
oinochoai and cups from tomb G (KNC, 394-396, 401).
2235 These sets perhaps accompanied more than one burial.
2236 Jones 2000, 253-257: note that the Attic MG amphora Jones includes, is only treated as a possible
import in the scholarship he cites. Further, his references to Cycladic pottery and a third East Greek
oinochoe are probably erroneous.
2237 GGP, 257.
2238 For a class of juglets that are considered East Cretan see Section 4.4.
2239 Vagnetti 1989. KNC, 402-404. Argive imports are perhaps also represented in Eleutherna.
2240 Although the figures of imported vases given in Coldstream 1990, 25 only concern the material
from the Knossos North Cemetery, they provide a reliable order of magnitude.
6.2.3). East Greek pottery, particularly of the 8th century, is better represented in Orthi Petra than in the cemeteries of Knossos and Afrati, but Knossos displays a collection of Cypriot and Phoenician vessels that exceeds the Eleuthemian one (see Sections 6.2.4-6.3). Nevertheless, the late 9th century Cypriot imports and imitations from Orthi Petra suggest a notable, as well as early, interest in Cypriot wares.

The last comments on the consumption of imported pottery regard figured decoration. Nine vases produced outside Eleutherna, which represent 9.7% of the total of imports and 1.1% of all vases included in this study, carry figured (always faunal) imagery. Some of these vases come from Cretan sites and date to the late 9th (I-KR.2, I-OIN.1) and mature or late 7th century (I-HYD.1, I-TR.1),2241 but the group also includes Corinthian unguent vases of the mid- and late-7th century (I-AR.18, I-AR.19, I-AL.1), as well as East Greek vases of the late 8th (I-AM.3) and mid-7th (I-OIN.8) century. The mature 7th century not only marks a rise in their numbers, but also witnesses their distribution outside tomb A1K1 (albeit only in the area of the built monuments). Significantly, most vessels carry birds (I-KR.2, I-AM.3, I-HYD.1, I-AL.1), but dogs (I-AR.18, I-AR.19), goats (I-OIN.8) and marine creatures (I-OIN.1, I-TR.1) are also represented. Concerning syntax, the fauna of the earliest examples mostly (I-KR.2, I-AM.3) hold no prominent place among non-figurative patterns, but a paratactic composition with figures facing right dominates the body of I-OIN.1. The latter case is also attested on examples (I-AR.18, I-AR.19) that date to the mid-7th century, roughly when heraldic compositions make an appearance (I-HYD.1 I-OIN.8). Other 7th century vases, however, carry single, dominant figures surrounded by repetitive ornaments (I-TR.1, I-AL.1). In conclusion, small numbers of imported vases carrying figured imagery were deposited in Orthi Petra during most of the period the cemetery was in use (the early-8th century gap fits in the contemporary demise of imported pottery that was mentioned above). Their record is dominated by variety and particularity regarding the vessel’s shape, the choice of figures and their position within the decorative syntax. The only consistent trend is represented by the rise in their numbers after the beginning of the 7th century, in connection with their broader spatial distribution. This picture sharply contrasts the

2241 Cretan vases with figured drawing were imported in Eleutherna even during the 6th century, when the island produced hardly any pottery of this kind (Erickson 2000, 184-185. Erickson 2004, 207).
uniform one conveyed by local pottery with figured drawing (see Section 7.3) and suggests that different concerns regulated the consumption of local and imported figured imagery. The issue is further discussed in the following section.

### 7.5 Diachronic overview of consumption in ceramics and other materials

This section offers a comprehensive account of sumptuary patterns of local and imported pottery, supplemented by evidence for other classes of materials. Although this evidence is limited and sporadic, I maintain that any contextual study of ceramics should explore their dynamics against a multiclass artefactual system. An analytical study of the overall picture is offered Section 7.6.

One of the most consistent patterns identified in the preceding analysis regards the derivation of the vast majority of the local and imported ceramic material included in this study from primary or secondary cremations; the remaining percentage, which accompanied pithos burial and inhumations hardly reaches 15% and probably represents less than 10%. Given that cremation at Orthi Petra was largely reserved for adult males (see Section 2.2.3), ceramic consumption largely served aspects of burial ritual associated with this social group. Interestingly, other social groups were regularly offered vessels that rarely occur in cremations of adult males. For example, the ceramic 'prescription' that pertained to inhumations of infants and children included cooking vessels (which had served domestic, rather than ritual purposes prior to their deposition) and (in the G-PAR period) small, coated cups. Coarse pithoi, which served as containers for the inhumation of children (but also aged adults), are a further component of this 'prescription'.

Despite these general patterns and the fairly stable ratio between local (more than 85 to 90%) and imported (~10%) pottery, ceramic consumption at Orthi Petra displays notable fluctuations through time. Hence, the study of consumption presented in this section departs from the thematic approach adopted above and is arranged in four broad phases (LPG-EG, MG-LG, LG/EPAR, LPAR-(LAR)) of unequal duration (60-100 years). The utility of this division in addressing long-term

---

2243 Although Sections 7.5-7.6 discuss aspects of burial customs, they are not intended to offer comprehensive accounts of the issue.
2244 The later part of the EG, LG and EPAR periods are considered transitional time-spans.
continuities and abrupt changes in material expressions surpasses the one offered by an arrangement that relies solely on individual ceramic phases. It further allows for easily accommodating artefacts other than pottery, the precise dating of which is often hard, as well as for direct comparisons with roughly contemporaneous developments in other sites.

**LPG-EG**

The LPG-EG phase\(^\text{2245}\) represents a crest in the quantity and variety of local ceramic vessels deposited at Orthi Petra. The aptitude of the local workshops to satisfy the notable demands for ceramic consumption at the cemetery during the first century of the latter’s use portray a community that was deeply rooted in the area and was served by productive potters. The dynamics of this community are also manifested by imported ceramics, which although limited in absolute terms, display a notable diversity in origins (from the Saronic Gulf to Cyprus).

Although the LPG period is only represented in tomb A1K1 and crematorium A, PGB-EG vases are also represented around the latter structure. If crematorium A served for the cremation of those who were eventually buried in tomb A1K1 (see Section 2.2.3), the surviving ceramics suggest that this probably occurred within this phase and only for a few cases.

During the LPG-EG phase, the consumption of fast-pouring and deep open vessels reached unparalleled numbers and variety. This evidence, as well as contextual information, confirms that funerary feasts were held at Orthi Petra. Storage and slow-pouring vessels are amply represented, but the repertory of shallow open vessels is poor and the few vases identified often served as lids. Imports are not uncommon. The twenty vases identified include a few storage and deep open vessels from Attica and the Cyclades, some fast-pouring vessels from Crete and Cyprus and slow-pouring examples from quite a few Cretan and Aegean sites.

Despite the roughly even representation of most shape categories of local ceramics inside and outside tomb A1K1,\(^\text{2246}\) all but two imports (perhaps a set) come from tomb A1K1. Deducing that the distribution of imports was largely regulated by

---

\(^{2245}\) AM.14 is the only securely identified MPG vase.

\(^{2246}\) This excludes storage vessels, the low representation of which outside tomb A1K1 is probably due to the unpopularity of inurned cremation outside the tomb.
the social group that was buried in the tomb is, however, precarious, since not many LPG-EG burials are known from outside the tomb, while the lack of imported vessels within the rich, 9th century material from crematorium A suggests a determination to avoid discarding imported vessels within the flames of a pyre. Evidently, the actual destruction of imports was prevented in favour of their deposition in a secondary context. Although in both cases the vase was withdrawn from circulation, only the former involved the vase vanishing. On the contrary, the deposition of an imported vessel in a tomb, the entrance of which was regularly opened, made possible its re-identification (especially due to the often peculiar shape and decoration) and could regenerate stories about the past (see Section 7.6).

The same spirit is perhaps expressed more eloquently in the deposition of metal artefacts, the vast majority of which turned up in the tomb. These artefacts include bronze vessels, which mostly served as covers (their clay counterparts are few), a ‘shield’ of Idaean Cave type (of late 9th - early 8th century date), iron weapons, tools and cooking utensils (including spits and firedogs), gold and other ornaments.

MG-LG

The MG-LG phase is less homogeneous than the previous one. Some of its principal characteristics are identifiable already in the late part of the EG period and several are largely overturned in the late part of the LG. The beginning of the phase (the MG period) witnessed a series of discontinuities: a) the unparalleled white on dark style was almost entirely abandoned in favour of the widespread dark on light alternative, b) the amount of local pottery, its variety and spatial distribution was drastically reduced, c) drinking sets became rare: local kraters and oinochoai largely disappeared (never to reappear), while the numbers of cups and related shapes declined; d) imports nearly vanished. Nevertheless, the second and the fourth trend

---

2247 Note, however, that the narrow dromos hindered access to the tomb.
2248 Most imported (and local) vessels were deposited outside other vessels.
2249 Anatoliki Mesogeios, 233-233, number 277; 265-266, numbers 332-333. Stampolidis 2004, 274-292, numbers 340-343, 355, 360-368, 377, 383-384, 389. Only the latest reference to each item is mentioned in this and the relevant references that follow. All items are classified according to the date of their deposition, which is occasionally later than the date of manufacture.
2250 Sufficient quantities of MG pottery have only turned up in tomb A1K1 and trench K. This under-representation may partly be due to chance, but I assume it reflects the reality of a relatively low level of activity outside the tomb.
were gradually challenged in the second half (mostly the last third) of the 8th century. The numbers of local vases rose and their spatial distribution increased to cover most of the excavated area. Accordingly, the numbers of imported vases and their occurrence outside tomb A1K1 was augmented (their origins range from the Saronic Gulf to Phoenicia).

Although the overall numbers and variety of all shape classes of local ceramics declined, the shallow open vessels depart from this trend during the LG period. The trend deserves some further qualification: the reduction in the numbers of fast-pouring vessels actually stems from the near disappearance of the oinochoe, while the deposition of slow-pouring vessels withdraws only inside tomb A1K1 and the deposition of storage vessels outside the tomb first diminishes and then revives. Vessels of the later class are, however, larger than ever during this phase. Lastly, the deposition of deep open vessels decreases in the rest of the cemetery and nearly stops in the tomb. Although the numbers and variety of imports recall 9th century standards, most examples date to the late part of the phase in question. A few slow- and fast-pouring imports (from Crete, the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean) occur both inside and outside the tomb. Open vessels, mostly deep, from Crete and the Cyclades (of late 8th – early 7th century date), as well as Cretan and Aegean storage vessels (mostly dating to the last third of the 8th century) are better represented. Nevertheless, the former only originate from outside tomb A1K1, while the latter are only amply attested inside the tomb.

Pairs/groups of matching local and imported vessels often accompanied LG burials outside tomb A1K1, while the deposition of local and imported vessels inside urns stored in tomb A1K1 decreased. Besides, clay urn covers remained less common than bronze ones. Diverse, occasionally imported artifacts, including bronze vessels and dressing ornaments, iron weapons, tools and spits, glazed lekythia, jewellery and a faience figurine were deposited during mostly the last third of the century.2251 Although most (still) originate from the tomb, their appearance in the

rest of the cemetery rises. Lastly, individual burials are occasionally marked by a stone pillar.2252

**EPAR**

Several of the trends identified in the last third or quarter of the 8th century culminate in the EPAR phase. The quantity and variety of local ceramic vessels consumed at Orthi Petra increases considerably and so did the quantity of imports, which now derive only from Cretan and Aegean sites. The spatial distribution of local vases largely adheres to LG standards, but imports spread north of the central area.

In tomb A1K1, the numbers and variety of local storage vessels increase sharply, but pouring and open vessels become rare. On the contrary, the representation of the latter two classes in the rest of the cemetery adheres to LG standards. The numbers of storage vessels also remain stable, but variety is (for the first and only time) introduced. Interestingly, the amount of imported vessels deposited in the tomb is now surpassed by those recovered from the rest of the cemetery. The deposition of imported storage vessels (originating largely from Crete and the Cyclades) almost exclusively in tomb A1K1 persists. Fast-pouring vessels remain rare in the entire cemetery, but slow-pouring examples (mostly Corinthian aryballoi) are regularly accompanying burials lying outside the tomb. Lastly, open vessels (including individual shallow examples) from Crete and the Cyclades are thinly represented outside the tomb.

During the EPAR phase, the Eleuthernians invest in decoration more than ever.2253 Not only do local vases regularly carry different patterns on the two sides, but also figured imagery gains in popularity, even though it only occurs on urns placed inside tomb A1K1 and mostly date to 700-650. Notable homogeneity is attested in the shape of the vessels that display such imagery, as well as in the choice of figures and their arrangement. On the contrary, variety and particularity rule over the occurrence of such imagery on imported vases (originating from Cretan and Aegean sites). These were largely discovered outside tomb A1K1 and date mostly around the mid-7th century. Similarly, artefacts (other than ceramics) with figured

2252 Stampolidis 2004c, 133-135.
2253 This phenomenon is paralleled in several Greek regions (Cook 1997, 41-138. Boardman 1998, 83-140).
decoration are amply attested in tomb A1K1 by the early 7th century,2254 but spread to the rest of the cemetery from the late 7th century.2255

The occurrence of pairs/groups of local and imported vessels outside tomb A1K1 and the decrease in the deposition of such vessels inside urns stored in tomb A1K1 persists. Although clay vessels occasionally serve as lids, the employment of bronze covers gained unparalleled popularity. Bronze vessels and glazed lekythia (occasionally imported), dressing ornaments, clay figurines, gold jewellery, an Egyptian scarab and two Minoan sealstones accompanied burials of the period in question.2256 Although the occurrence of such artefacts at Orthi Petra rises, the majority still comes from the tomb. Further, the erection of stone grave markers (occasionally carrying incised decoration)2257 over some individual burials persists and stone sculpture is introduced.2258 At the same time, impressive stone structures are erected: monument A1K1 was built over the tomb2259 while monument 4A and the great pillar that marked the entire site were erected further east.2260

LPAR

The sumptuary feast of the EPAR phase largely terminated in the LPAR. Beside the demise of painted pottery, the latter phase witnessed a decline in the numbers and mostly the variety of the local and imported vases: necked pithoi with minimal decoration, coated cups and unpainted or dipped shallow open vessels dominate the local repertory, while Corinthian pouring (mostly unguent) vases and Laconian kraters2261 overshadow the remaining few imports. The distribution of late 7th – early 6th century vases, however, reaches all ends of the excavated area.

2254 Stampolidis 2004, 280, numbers 356-357; 290, numbers 385-387; 293, numbers 392-394.
2259 Stampolidis 2004c, 124-125: although Stampolidis dates monument A1K1 to the first quarter of the 7th century, the second quarter seems to me a preferable alternative.
2261 For some reservations on whether all Laconian kraters should be assigned to the context of the necropolis see Section 7.7.
The representation of local storage vessels in the rest of the cemetery remains stable, but numbers drop by half over tomb A1K1. The overall amount remains considerable, however, even if variety in shape forms shrinks. Pouring vessels become a rarity and the numbers of deep open vessels drop. Shallow open vessels are still amply represented. On the other hand, slow-pouring and open Corinthian vessels, Laconian kraters, as well as a few, mostly open Cretan vessels and individual pouring vessels from East Greece comprise the repertory of imported pottery, which now entirely comes from individual burials.\(^{2262}\)

The deposition of clay vessels inside urns is unattested and the use of bronze covers demises. On the contrary, the use of clay covers (shallow open vessels) peaks. Most bronze vessels covered the urns placed above tomb A1K1, while the known gold and ivory ornaments\(^ {2263}\) come from the rest of the cemetery. The erection of stone pillars and sculpture\(^ {2264}\) persists. During this phase, a row of three rectangular monuments (including pieces of sculpture that perhaps belonged to the superstructure of these monuments) was erected east of structure K.\(^ {2265}\)

7.6 Consumption and social interaction at Orthi Petra
Consumption was embedded as a social practice throughout the use of the cemetery, even though it declined in the LPAR period. Although its study served so far as a means to monitor the fluctuating sumptuary attitudes of two broad social groups (those buried in tomb A1K1 and those laid in the rest of the cemetery), it henceforth seeks to assess the modes of social interaction between the two groups.

During the first century of the cemetery's use (LPG-EG phase), sumptuary expressions remained fairly homogeneous (but much different) inside and outside the tomb. It is debatable whether structures A and K served the group that was buried in the tomb, but I assume that the LPG-EG material from (at least) the former structure had probably accompanied the cremation of a few people, the remains of whom were eventually placed inside the tomb. Only a few burials of this date are identifiable in the vicinity of crematorium A. They were furnished with some pottery, but hardly

\(^ {2262}\) I-OIN 8, which is associated with the tomb, is assigned to the EPAR/LPAR transition.
\(^ {2265}\) Stampolidis 2004c, 134.
any imports or metal objects. On the contrary, the group that was buried in the tomb invested heavily on consumption through a variety of means: drinking equipment, imports ranging from the Saronic Gulf to Cyprus, weapons, tools and cooking utensils and, to a less extent, metal vessels and gold jewellery.\textsuperscript{2266} The conspicuous rituals orchestrated occasionally emphasised manhood, as the deposition of weapons, tools and drinking equipment suggests, but were probably mostly serving as mnemonic devices aimed at shaping or structuring social identities within a milieu of intense competition.\textsuperscript{2267} Accordingly, the deposition of most offerings (regardless of their size) outside urns advertised expenditure, even if it perhaps adhered to the notion of appropriateness. The memory of this expenditure would have been regenerated at times, given my estimation that the entrance of the tomb was opened for the deposition of a new urn roughly every three years during the period in question.\textsuperscript{2268} By disposing central tokens of value in a recurring ritual, during which status and memory were negotiated, the individuals buried in the tomb were actually joining what anthropologists describe as ‘tournaments of value’.\textsuperscript{2269} In conclusion, during the LPG-EG period, adult males largely controlled the manipulation of imported pottery and metal objects in funerary ritual (and perhaps their distribution within the Eleuthemian society as well, through sumptuary exclusivity),\textsuperscript{2270} on which they heavily invested to endorse their socio-political aspirations.\textsuperscript{2271}

Sumptuary attitudes underwent, however, serious change in the MG-LG phase. The lull in MG pottery from outside the tomb contrasts sharply (but also hinders an assessment of) what is attested for the LG period, when burials spread to every direction, but mostly north. The astonishing rise in their numbers, as well as the notable variety of rites performed, suggest that a negotiation concerning access to formal burial at Orthi Petra had mediated. Whatever their gains in several respects, the ‘newcomers’ were denied burial in the chamber tomb, as the stable number of

\textsuperscript{2266} Competitive display through a variety of means is also attested in 9th century Knossos, where, however, an exuberant ceramic style was also introduced (Whitley 1986, 307-324). On the contrary, relatively few large, lavishly adorned urns are known from Orthi Petra, where plain alternatives are equally common and fairly small, austerely decorated examples are popular.
\textsuperscript{2268} See Section 2.2.3.
\textsuperscript{2269} Appadurai 1986, 21.
\textsuperscript{2271} One recalls here the Saxe/Goldstein hypothesis (reviewed in Morris 1991; contra Papadopoulos 1993, 182, 188-189), according to which the legitimisation of a group’s rights over crucial but restricted resources is often associated with the disposal of their dead in a specialised area.
urns deposited per year suggests. On the other hand, no restrictions upon sumptuary attitudes are identifiable (even though the number of offerings attested in burials ranges from none to a few dozen): the deposition of clay vessels, weapons and tools, as well as metal dressing ornaments increased considerably. Further, during the last third of the 8th century, imports appear in some quantity. Stone pillars of local and (scarcely) Phoenician type are erected over some burials and extraordinary rites, like ritual execution, are performed. Lastly, pottery is henceforth employed to register social identities, for example, small, coated cups and cooking vessels are recurrently accompanying child burials. Hence, despite the apparent heterogeneity of the social group that was buried outside the tomb (local and foreigners, males and females, adults and children), a trend for increased expenditure is noted.

The group that was buried in tomb A1K1 refrained from any sumptuary feast, in defiance of the contemporaneous vogues identified in the rest of the cemetery, as well as of the LPG-EG trends identified within the tomb. It was probably, however, the perilous tensions embedded in those earlier trends (rather than any social pressures) that engendered an attitude of ‘conspicuous parsimony’, which involved conscious self-restraint as a means to avoid the potentially divisive implications of differentiation. Accordingly, selectivity governs the patterns of deposition in the tomb, which is henceforth (from the MG period) largely an urn repository. Basins serving as lids are also amply represented. The deposition of imported pottery, metal vessels and various artefacts declines. Deep open vessels, kraters and oinochoai largely vanish, while other pouring vessels gradually disappear. I doubt that the ‘prescription’ of the ceramic repertory stem from any need to save space within a chamber that was gradually being filled up, particularly since the MG-LG urns are generally considerably larger than the LPG-EG and PAR ones. My impression is that self-display among the group that was buried in the tomb had largely been regulated. Although the increased deposition of imports made of various materials in tomb A1K1 during the last third of the 8th century seems to contrast this interpretation, it was probably an arrogant response to the contemporaneous spread of small-sized imported vases and metal artefacts of Cretan manufacture to the rest of

2272 See Section 2.2.3.
the cemetery,\textsuperscript{2274} as well as an ingenious tactic to circumvent (though not challenge) the principles of restraint that pervaded artefactual deposition in the tomb.\textsuperscript{2275} The individuals that sponsored these attitudes invested in the quality of the urn\textsuperscript{2276} and/or the urn cover, but refrained from depositing other vessels as offerings. They further denounced the manipulation of artefacts like weapons and tools that were quite popular in the LPG-EG phase, but occasionally embraced largely unexploited alternatives, like glazed or faience objects. In conclusion, the group that was buried in tomb A1K1 chose to eschew material display from the onset of the MG period and throughout the phase in question.\textsuperscript{2277} The choice was not recalled even in the last third of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century, when a decentralised distribution of imported clay vessels and metal artefacts emerged. During the latter time-span, however, some individuals were tempted to blur the rigid lines of the aforementioned choice by investing in the quality of the urn and/or its cover (or even in new, but often small-scale forms of material expression) rather than in quantity and variety, unlike what is attested in most conspicuous burials identified outside the tomb.\textsuperscript{2278}

During the EPAR period, more of those buried in tomb A1K1 (the number of which had now doubled)\textsuperscript{2279} took on circumventing the principles of restraint. Although imported storage vessel largely disappeared, several new, though subtle sumptuary tactics were advanced. The variety in the shape of the urns rose significantly; the decoration on the two sides of these vases was regularly differentiated (this trend is unparalleled in earlier or later periods); a bronze vessel commonly served as the cover of the urn; a few ‘exotica’ (two Minoan sealstones, an Egyptian scarab, two glazed vases) – all very small in size - were deposited.

\textsuperscript{2274} I understand this interplay as a dynamic process of emulation, which facilitated change in material forms, but exercised no radical effect upon social structure (cf. the ingenious model in Miller 1985, 185-187).
\textsuperscript{2275} Most clay imports are storage vessels employed as urns (they differ markedly from the typical local LG urn: a necked pithos with circle panel), while other imports are largely trinkets.
\textsuperscript{2276} This investment is perhaps anticipated by the increased size of the MG urns.
\textsuperscript{2277} Some broadly similar phenomena, including a decrease in display and a rise of homogeneity, as well as the introduction of a new decorative style, are attested in early 8\textsuperscript{th} century Knossian tombs (Whitley 1986, 325-337).
\textsuperscript{2278} Diverse, but non-comparable depositional attitudes are attested in Knossian late 8\textsuperscript{th} century tombs (Whitley 1986, 337-349).
\textsuperscript{2279} See Section 2.2.3. The interpretation of the increase relies on physical anthropology and is perhaps related to the rise in the numbers of burials that occurs in the rest of the cemetery during the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century. Interestingly, a comparable increase is attested in some Knossian tombs (Fortetsa tombs II, P. KNC tombs 75, 107, 285) during the early 7\textsuperscript{th} century.
Moreover, storage vessels carrying figured imagery became popular. Although at least three and probably more (local and immigrant) painters were involved in the production of such vessels, the correspondences that recur in their work suggest a uniform demand or a demand for uniformity. In any case, although the production of the figured imagery relied on new forms of investment and partly involved the mobilisation of potters/painters from overseas, it was manipulated to amplify, rather than challenge, group membership.\footnote{2280}

The taste for figured imagery spread outside tomb A1K1 by the second quarter of the 7th century.\footnote{2281} Local vessels with such decoration were, however, apparently largely unavailable to those buried outside the tomb\footnote{2282} and their demands were satisfied by imports. Judging by the varied repertory of the shape and the decoration of these imports, the spread of figured imagery outside the tomb did not adhere to any sumptuary tactic and was largely stimulated by capricious choices. Leaving aside figure imagery, the sumptuary patterns manifested outside tomb A1K1 during the EPAR period largely capitalise on those introduced in the late 8th century. The variety in funerary rites persists and burials spread further, while the consumption of local and imported pottery, as well as metal artefacts\footnote{2283} rise gently. Stone pillars persist and are now occasionally decorated, while stone sculpture is introduced.

The latter two developments suggest that display manifested outside the tomb was no longer largely directed towards those attending the funeral, but also appealed to those who would later visit the site.\footnote{2284} Pillars and low earth mounds were attested already from the LG period (at the latest), but only from the EPAR did the grave monument increasingly articulate aspects of the social persona of the deceased. Moreover, large structures, mostly not associated with single burials, are erected in

\footnote{2280}Cf.: Whitley 1986, 347-349. Morgan 1999a, 242-243. Note that local vases with elaborate figured imagery are amply attested in single burials and in tomb L at Afrati, but the grandiose tomb R has only furnished a few unimpressive examples (the remaining collective tombs produced little pottery): Levi 1927-1929.

\footnote{2281}Cf. the spread of metal artefacts carrying figured imagery from tomb A1K1 (8th - early 7th century) to the rest of the cemetery (late 7th century).

\footnote{2282}For the rationing of the figured imagery of the largely contemporaneous, Protoattic pottery by particular social groups see Whitley 1994.

\footnote{2283}Weapons and tools are henceforth hardly attested throughout the site.

\footnote{2284}Cf. Morris 1992, 128.
this and the ensuing period (monuments A1K1 and 4A and the great pillar in the EPAR, the buildings north of 4A in the LPAR).

In the LPAR period, the restraint that transcended all sumptuary attitudes manifested in tomb A1K1 was replaced by the most rigid version of austerity. Urns (mostly necked pithoi) with minimal decoration and plain basins serving as covers form the vast majority of the late 7th–early 6th century artefacts deposited over the tomb, among which there are no imported vases. Ceramic consumption also declined in the rest of the cemetery, despite the increased spatial distribution of burials and the persisting variety of funerary rites. Investment in other classes of materials, most notably sculpture, survived, even though it probably decreased. Evidently, material statements of individualism withdrew and the cemetery gradually ceased to serve as a major arena for competitive display. I have elsewhere explored the spread of this phenomenon (which I identify as the triumph of ‘conspicuous parsimony’) throughout most of Crete and attributed it to socio-political and economic transformations, rather than to any decline in prosperity or the unavailability of goods. Although Orthi Petra was sooner or later abandoned as a burial site, it persisted attracting resources from the living; it is to this aspect I shall now turn.

7.7 Consumption and the abandonment of the necropolis of Orthi Petra

The premises of consumption and the background of sumptuary patterns at Orthi Petra, particularly during the LPAR phase, oblige me to return to Erickson’s views on the date of the abandonment of the cemetery. Concerning local pottery, the demise of all shapes classes excluding shallow open vessels and the near disappearance of pouring vessels (especially slow-pouring vessels, which are connected particularly with funerary ritual) within the LPAR phase suggest that activity at Orthi Petra was shrinking. Significantly, the local 6th century material

---

2285 The evidence available for these monuments (Section 2.2.3) hinders any assessment drawing from Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 108-298.
2286 Funerary sculpture survived in other Eleuthernian loci until at least the early 5th century: Lebessi 1973, 7-9.
2287 Kotsonas 2002. Stampolidis and Kotsonas forthcoming. The view that attributes the disappearance of Near Eastern commodities from Crete to the collapse of Assyria and the siege of Tyre (Morris 1995, 170-172. Contrast Guralnick 2003, where the same events are considered stimuli for the export of Near Eastern artefacts to the Aegean) takes the Cretan demand for granted and contradicts anthropological claims (Appadurai 1986, 13-16) for the fluctuating status of commodities.
2288 The issue is tackled from a topographic perspective in Section 2.2.3.
discussed by Erickson only includes open vessels. On these grounds, I consider that the demise lasted for approximately seventy years (rather than a century or more) and the cemetery largely stopped serving in such a capacity after 570, when Corinthian unguent vases disappeared. Besides, Erickson admits that most of the Laconian kraters he identified were produced within 590-560, even though he argues that their influx at Orthi Petra persisted in the late 6th century on the basis of the discovery of some sherds from these vessels in contexts of such date. Nevertheless, the date of the aforementioned contexts, which are largely not sealed, heavily relies on the evidence of imports like the Laconian kraters, given that 6th century Cretan ceramics were (and partly remain) notoriously hard to date. Hence, I doubt that Laconian kraters were deposited considerably later than they were produced.

I further question the attribution of the Laconian kraters to sympotic sets accompanying the dead, particularly since the krater is rarely found at Orthi Petra during the preceding two centuries. Also, the context of the few known 8th – 7th examples argues against their inclusion in such sets. Moreover, at least one of the few clusters of sherds from Laconian kraters was not accompanied by sherds from cups. On these grounds, I offer alternative interpretations. Some of the sherds of the Laconian kraters could originate from the overlying settlement or even a sanctuary deposit, like the Late Archaic–Hellenistic one that has been reported from an area that lies south-east (a few meters up the slope) of the nucleus of the cemetery. Further, the Laconian kraters that were originally deposited at the cemetery could have served as markers or in feasts venerating the ancestors,
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2289 Erickson 2000, 192-216 (the study excludes utilitarian, coarse and cooking wares: Erickson 2000, 32). As explained sporadically in Chapter 5, I maintain a few doubts for the (low) date Erickson proposed for some vases and types of local pottery.
2290 Erickson 2000, 162-166. Erickson 2004, 204. Also see Section 6.2.1.
2291 Erickson 2000, 167. Erickson 2004, 204-207. Although Erickson lists twenty-three sherds from Laconian kraters (Erickson 2000, 169-171), which he attributes to a minimum of twelve vases (page 166), he also refers to 'a large quantity of body fragments ... from various deposits' (pages 166-167, footnote 26).
2293 See footnote 2169.
2294 For the cluster from trench A1 see Erickson 2000, 160-171, numbers 10-14, 22; for the cups see pages 192-209.
2296 Stampolidis 1994a, 37-38. Stampolidis 2004b, 94.
particularly since clusters of sherds were located over places, where collective burial was practiced over long periods of time: tomb/monument A1K1 and the tumulus that occupies the north-east part of the excavated area. These monuments would undoubtedly have been visible throughout the 6th century.

In conclusion, I am reluctant to accept Erickson's arguments on when Orthi Petra was largely abandoned as a cemetery, although I hold that his suggestion should not be dismissed. I personally, however, identify demise already during the last third of the 7th century and believe that this demise culminated in the early 6th century. Although the identification of a few later burials (which currently remain elusive) at the site remains a possibility, emphasis should be laid upon the probability that the site ceased to be a/the major burial ground for the community in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

2299 Cf Antonaccio 1995, 200-203.
2299 See respectively: Erickson 2000, 169-171, numbers 1-5 (tumulus) and 10-14, 22 (tomb). There is a third cluster (numbers 16-18, 24) from the area immediately south of structure A and its courtyard.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

The central argument of this thesis is that ceramic analyses should examine the entirety of the ceramic chaîne opératoire in a local and regional context. Its various aspects are summarised in the present chapter, which draws together some of the major issues treated and the main arguments raised in the previous detailed discussion of the evidence. The chapter is divided in two parts with different concerns. The first part, which largely corresponds to the first to fourth aims outlined in Section 1.4, reviews the implications of this study for works on Aegean ceramic formal analysis, as well as the generation and dissemination of pottery styles. The second part, which pertains to the fifth and sixth aims defined in Section 1.4, focuses upon Eleutherna and summarises the contribution of the ceramic chaîne opératoire to the understanding of developments in the necropolis of Orthi Petra and the Eleuthernian society in general.

8.1 Implications for ceramic formal analysis

This section appraises issues of ceramic chronology and typology, as well as the production and dispersion of pottery styles, against both a Cretan and a wider background.

8.1.1 Advantages of a new format of ceramic analysis

Although archaeologists regularly disagree on the interpretation of their evidence and treat theory as subjective, they seldom take much notice of the subjectivity that is embedded in the primary interpretative steps involved in the building of stylistic typologies. On the other hand, some critiques of empiricism, such as those of Hodder and Shanks, have exaggerated in nearly equating it with mere intuition. The present study of the style of Iron Age pottery from Eleutherna consciously adheres to the empirical tradition that pertains to Aegean and Classical Archaeology, but takes advantage of the criticism the latter has attracted. Accordingly, it aims to diminish the notion of the ‘esoteric expertise of the

---

2300 Hodder 1990.
connoisseur\textsuperscript{2302} that is often inherent in relevant studies by providing detailed, as well as summarising descriptions, comprehensive explanations of identifications, recurring overviews, rich bibliography and parallels from most of Crete. The catalogue entries in Appendices II-III are designed to provide exhaustive information and correspond to a range of questions, including some that are perhaps not addressed here. The review of the shape and decoration that accompanies each type of local pottery in Appendix II facilitates the reader’s understanding and enhances his/her aptitude to check the reliability of the stylistic development that is proposed in Chapter 5.\textsuperscript{2303} This aim is also served by overviews that recapitulate the development of different types and varieties presented in the latter chapter. In the case of imports, detailed discussions included in Appendix III cite the arguments for the identification and the date of each vase. A regional, pan-Cretan perspective is, however, persistently pursued for a series of questions, concerning mostly the origins and distribution of particular types of local and imported vessels, as well as of morphological characteristics and decorative motifs (see mostly Chapters 5, 6).\textsuperscript{2304}

Another major aim of the format advertised is the assessment of the entire ceramic chaîne opératoire. The discussion of the production of local pottery (Chapter 4) draws from ceramic technology and ethnography, as well as anthropology and art history to overcome the scarcity of important information (such as the one provided by fabric analysis and the discovery of a kiln) for the reconstruction of modes of production. My interpretation of stylistic development does not side with the art historical impression that emphasises the role of the artist and does not share any notion of teleology.\textsuperscript{2305} Although innovative craftsmen are indeed identifiable in the Eleuthemian ceramic corpus, the generation of local style is regarded as inconceivable without the consumer’s interest and outside the interplay between ceramic production and consumption (see Section 7.1). The manipulation of style in general is assessed through a contextual analysis\textsuperscript{2306} of the strategies that

\textsuperscript{2302} Shanks 1996, 34. The publication of the Cretan Iron Age pottery in Kommos IV is a clear case for the occurrence of this notion.
\textsuperscript{2303} The reviews owe much to Catling and Lemos 1990, but in general the analysis is mostly influenced by Coldstream’s work (mostly: KNC, 311-393. Coldstream 2001).
\textsuperscript{2304} Selective citation is occasionally limited to parallels that accord with preconceived assumptions.
\textsuperscript{2305} Cf. Whitley 1991, 13-23.
\textsuperscript{2306} Whitley’s work (particularly Whitley 1986) was influential in this respect. For a critique see Papadopoulos 1993.
governed the deposition of local and imported pottery and other classes of materials in the cemetery of Orthi Petra. As a result, aspects of the social life of an Iron Age community, particularly its manipulation of ceramics in funerary ritual, are elucidated and the mostly unpopulated milieu of ceramic formal analysis is fleshed out.

8.1.2 Knosso-centrism and the need for sub-regional and site-specific ceramic studies

The amount of Iron Age pottery (and other artefacts) from Knossos that has been published and the merit of the study it has received, as well as of the diachronic prominence of the site (or the nearby Herakleion) in Cretan history, have gradually built notions of Knosso-centrism for the period in question. These treat Knossos as the island’s principal nexus in generating stylistic change\(^{2307}\) or as representative\(^{2308}\) of Iron Age Crete, despite the contradiction that is inherent in these two concepts.\(^{2309}\) This attitude, however, masks the dissimilar responses of the island’s communities and hinders their interpretation, denies the particularities of sub-regional or site-specific relative chronologies and blurs the understanding of the modes of stylistic emulation within Crete. Knosso-centrism, however, cannot be suppressed by critiques. Only publications of Cretan material that address questions of chronology and typology will reveal the complexities of the island’s cultural landscape and stimulate an awareness of the variety of local preferences and sub-regional responses. It is only against such a background that historical and cultural developments in Iron Age Crete can properly be assessed. These objectives were persistently pursued here for the case of Eleutherna and advertised repeatedly for the rest of Crete.

Although their style conforms to the Cretan idiom, the Eleuthemian ceramics are considerably different to those from Knossos or any other Cretan site, the pottery of which has been published. Stylistic dissimilarity, however, involves departures in

\(^{2307}\) See for example: Desborough 1952, 236. GGP, 234.
\(^{2309}\) My view is that Knossos was one of the few major sites of Iron Age Crete and played a leading role in generating changes in the style of ceramics and other artefacts in North Central Crete. Knossian influence is also identifiable outside this area, but seems much weaker.
relative and occasionally in absolute chronology, as well as in chronology-related terminology, and urges against the entire island’s dependence on the Knossian sequence.\textsuperscript{2310} The large quantity of the material from Eleutherna and the high quality of the system adopted for recording information on the field has allowed for building a reliable, relative and absolute chronology for the local pottery of the 9\textsuperscript{th} – 6\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{2311} This development offers an alternative yardstick for the chronology of Iron Age Crete, but its importance can fully be assessed against a wider, Aegean background. A recent account on Aegean Iron Age chronology concludes that ‘fairly detailed relative sequences have now been built up [only] for Athens, Knossos, Argos, Euboea and Corinth’;\textsuperscript{2312} Eleutherna should now be added next to these sites.

8.1.3 Circulation of pots and people – generation and dissemination of ceramic style

A considerable collection of imported pottery was identified in the necropolis of Orthi Petra and the flow of imported ceramics was proved to have persisted throughout - and outlasted - the use of the cemetery. Vases from Cretan, mostly indeterminate sites, form the most populous group and Corinthian vases follow. A fair amount of vessels are identified as Knossian, Cycladic or East Greek, while only a few pieces are attributed to Phoenicia, Cyprus, Attica, the northeast Peloponnese and perhaps Ithaca.\textsuperscript{2313} Vessels from most regions (excluding the latter two) exercised some, albeit mostly limited, influence on local wares.\textsuperscript{2314} Imported shapes were evidently scarcely copied in Eleutherna, particularly after the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, and external decorative trends were systematically overlooked. Only the Creto-Cypriot pottery had an enduring appeal. On the other hand, some cases of possible Eleuthernian influence on Knossian ceramics were noted and a possible Eleuthernian export to Knossos was traced.\textsuperscript{2315} Lastly, a Cretan, probably Knossian vessel was identified in Pontecagnano.\textsuperscript{2316}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[2310] See Chapter 3.
\item[2311] See Chapter 3.
\item[2312] Whitley 2001, 63.
\item[2313] See Chapter 6 and Appendix III.
\item[2314] See Chapter 6.
\item[2315] See Section 6.1.1.
\item[2316] D’Agostino 2001, 18, T. 7738.3; 34, number 3. See Section 4.4.
\end{footnotes}
The discovery of imported pottery in Orathi Petra and the identification of external influences on Eleutherian ceramics further fueled discussions on the complexities in the dissemination of style and the interpretation of stylistic emulation. These discussions, however, proved most fruitful only when set against a regional, island-wide background. The regional perspective, which was also advertised in the previous section, is adopted here in response of calls for a change of focus from the long distance circulation of fine wares to the regional or sub-regional dispersion of all classes of ceramics. At the same time, however, this perspective avoids the particularity of some empirical discussions of imports from a specific site, as well as the 'reductionist, simplistic and misleading' character of some overarching theories.

Two points raised in the study of the influx of ceramic imports and influence in Eleutherna and the rest of Crete, which is pursued in Chapter 6, illustrate the significance of the regional perspective and the pitfalls of generalising. The first regards the considerable, but hitherto largely overlooked amount of Cretan ceramics that was proved to have been circulating within the island during the Iron Age. Although this amount includes vases of exceptional shape or decoration, standard examples were evidently also circulating at a considerable scale. Accordingly, I call for extra attention on peculiarities in the fabric and style of ceramics and urge for a reexamination of material from publications that have inadequately pursued these lines of inquiry. The second conclusion regards the high diversity of the responses of Cretan communities towards ceramic imports or influences. The variety and the fluctuations that are identified in the origin and flow, the nature and impact of imports in all known Cretan sites defy the rationale of geographical proximity, challenge any impression of consistent patterns of diffusion or trade routes and warn against superficial generalisations. The only broad pattern traced regards the wider occurrence of external influences on pottery from sites that lie on or by the island's north coast.

Such discussions were regularly tied with the treatment of modes of stylistic dissemination in Chapters 4 and 6, as in the case of the Creto-Cypriot pottery. The production of this ware, especially of the early, fairly close, Cretan copies of Cypriot
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2317 Crielaard 1999, 60.
2318 Foxhall 1999, 298.
(Black Slip and Black on Red) prototypes, has regularly been attributed to the advent of Cypriot/Phoenician potters or entrepreneurs in Knossos and East Crete. I emphasised, however, that the manufacture of close copies, which was contemporaneous with the production of freer examples, should be assessed not only in the light of the imitator’s interests, but also the potter’s skills. I further demonstrated that the relatively wide diffusion of Creto-Cypriot vases within the central part of the island favours a model of decentralised production, fueled mostly by the circulation of Creto-Cypriot pottery within Crete, rather than the importation of Cypriot originals, which currently seems an isolated phenomenon. Lastly, I noted that, after the beginning of the 8th century, the Cretans rarely produced any lekythia outside the Cypriot Black on Red tradition (and offered a fresh hint for the distinction between Cypriot originals and Cretan close imitations; the shape was henceforth assimilated with the ware.

The mobility of potters/painters proved an essential interpretative tool in other cases. The vases attributed to the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’ were considered the work of craftsmen that migrated from the Cyclades to Eleutherna. The first case is more straightforward. The largely uniform shape and decoration of the vases from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ is alien to the local ceramic tradition, but find close parallels in the Cyclades, mostly on vessels attributed to Paros. The identification of two different solutions for a problem that arose in the drawing of a belly frieze generated some speculation on the involvement of at least two painters in the production of these vessels, while the apparently different fabric and unaccomplished form of two vases from the workshop raised assumptions on the additional employment of ‘inexperienced personnel’. Given that its products display high standardisation, great efficiency and exalted skill, the workshop was regarded specialised. On these grounds, the vases from the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ offer an unparalleled insight in the structure of an early 7th century ceramic workshop and a reliable case for the dissemination of style through the dislocation of craftsmen.

2319 Section 4.4.
2320 Section 5.3.3, type Cii.
2321 Section 5.3.3.
My attribution of the three vases from the ‘saw pattern workshop’ to a Theran potter/painter was tentative. Although their style recalls Theran pottery, I could trace no close Theran parallels. Furthermore, only the fabric of the latest vase is typically local, while the fabrics of the other two vessels, which carry the eponymous saw pattern, are dissimilar. The occurrence of different fabrics on vases from both workshops mentioned above perhaps suggests that that immigrant potters were unsatisfied with the relatively gritty fabric that widely occurs on pottery from Eleutherna and were experimenting with other clay sources.

Stylistic emulation was achieved not only through the circulation of people, but also of particular tools that served the potter/painter’s work. The aforementioned workshops introduced (but did not share out) the use of the multiple brush for the drawing of linear motifs in Eleutherna during the early 7th century. On the other hand, the circulation of moulds within Crete at approximately the same period was confirmed by the identification of the same mould-made motif on vases from Knossos and Gortyn, which are otherwise of different shape and decoration. On the other hand, the introduction of moulds in Crete, which is now placed in the beginning of the 8th century on the basis of the context of BA.1 (pl. 84), is an example for the role of the movement of small or large groups of people, in this case the Phoenicians, in the dissemination of style. Interestingly, close parallels for the mould-made motif of BA.1 come from the Punic world of the 6th – 4th centuries and the same case can be made for a naïskos from Gortyn, the Phoenician type of which was first identified here.

The issue of the links between human mobility and the generation of ceramic style was also raised in the discussion of the origins of the Cretans that joined the Rhodians in colonising Gela. The small amount of Cretan imports and local imitations that has been published from Gela generated convincing assumptions on the origins of the Cretan colonists from South Central Crete. I emphasised, however, that the publication of more material from both Gela and West Crete may point otherwise. I further discussed the origin of the Cretan colonists in connection with the evidence for the affiliation between Rhodes and the various sub-regions of
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2322 See Section 4.2.
2323 Rizza e Scrinari 1968, 156, number 4.
Crete during the period that preceded the joint foundation. The evidence reviewed suggested that the central and west part of North Crete was associated with Rhodes and the Dodecanese before the foundation of Gela, while South Central Crete scarcely participated in this network before the 7th century. On these grounds, I suggested that the Cretan settlers perhaps originated from more than one of the island’s sub-regions.

In summary, the response of the various Cretan sites to foreign ceramic traditions varied considerably. Moreover, the dissemination of ceramic style was served or facilitated by a range of modes, including the circulation of pottery, craftsmen and/or the tools for their work, as well as the dislocation of wider groups of people.

8.1.4 Cretan Orientalizing pottery: a case of stylistic emulation and scholarly misconception

Oriental influence is identified on Cretan Iron Age pottery during mostly the late 9th and the 7th century. On these grounds, the 7th century of Crete, as of other places, has widely been called the Orientalizing period, while the late 9th century has mostly recently been occasionally baptised the Proto-Orientalizing period. Both the application of the former term to the whole of Crete and the validity of the latter term, however, were questioned in Chapter 3.

Scholars that favour the term Proto-Orientalizing for the period that is conventionally, and perhaps not fully satisfactory, called PGB fail to realise that an Orientalizing current is identifiable on a considerable part of the material from only a few sites (mostly Knossos and Prinias). Furthermore, they underestimate the persistence of the local PG tradition and the introduction of Atticizing trends that are also identifiable in the period in question. On these grounds, I asserted that the term might be used to describe the style of particular vessels or workshops, but not name the period.

I further argued that only if a considerable percentage of the 7th century material from a Cretan site displays Orientalizing trends, should the term Orientalizing be applied to that material. It was therefore claimed that the term is applicable to the 7th century ceramics of Knossos and Afrati for example, but not to
the pottery of much of West and East Crete, including Eleutherna. Although the term Subgeometric may fit the 7th century pottery of some sites, I consider that the term PAR suits better the ceramic developments at Eleutherna, if not most of Crete.

The aforementioned discussion has raised once more the need for attention to sub-regional and site-specific developments, which is also emphasised in the following treatment of the introduction of figured imagery on ceramics from Eleutherna.2325 The emerging perplexities of this phenomenon, which is commonly considered a clear case of Orientalizing, challenge some theories that regard its generation and social role. Figured imagery is found on a few late 9th and late 8th century imported vases, but mostly on 7th century examples from Orthi Petra. Such imagery is introduced on local ceramics only in the late 8th century and is more widely represented in the 7th, if only mostly on the products of the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’. By originating in the Cyclades, however, the style of these workshops and the people that run them question the notion that by Orientalizing, a community is necessarily (let alone consciously) embracing ideas and material traits directly from the Eastern Mediterranean or negotiating the role of the East, as well as highlight the complexities that pertain to stylistic emulation. In my opinion, the adoption of figured imagery on locally produced ceramics did not involve any explicit transfer of ideas from the Cyclades or the Orient, but served a locally determined role. This relies on the striking homogeneity that pervades the shape and the decoration of these vessels (which were produced by different workshops), as well as on the employment of all examples as urns in tomb A1K1, which was mostly reserved for adult males. In contrast, the style of the imported vases with figured imagery is individual and their spatial distribution within the cemetery is wide.

To conclude, although Cretan Iron Age pottery displays a notable, as well as enduring interest in Near Eastern style, the assessment of the Orientalizing influence on the island’s ceramics has largely, but unwarrantably, relied on Knossian material.

2325 See Sections 7.3-7.4.1.
8.2 Implications for Iron Age Eleutherna

The growing body of evidence for the physical and archaeological landscape of Eleutherna and the surrounding region, from the Prehistoric to Modern times, is collected in Chapter 2 and Appendix I. Emphasis was laid upon the Iron Age. The recording and description of quite a few largely unpublished sites of this date in the Mylopotamos district and adjacent areas and the assessment of their relations with Eleutherna set the latter site in a sub-regional context for the first time. The Iron Age remains from the site itself, also largely unpublished, were reviewed with particular reference to geography. The latter choice emphasised overlooked aspects, such as the role of the visibility and acoustics of the site of Orthi Petra in the transformation of any funeral held there to an ubiquitous spectacle for most Eleuthernians of the Iron Age.

8.2.1 The establishment and abandonment of the Orthi Petra necropolis: structures and dates

Orthi Petra is probably named after a great stone pillar, of which only the base survives today. I argued that this pillar was still visible in the late 19th century and should be identified with Joubin’s ‘colonne quadrangulaire en tuf, haute de 2m,50 et profondément enfoncée dans le sol’.

Stampolidis has repeatedly suggested on the basis of the evidence available that the necropolis of Orthi Petra was used from 870 to 570 approximately. The former date is consolidated by this study, particularly by the identification of an Attic EG II pyxis (I-PY.1, pl. 36, 89) in what is probably the earliest, LPG urn that was deposited in tomb A1K1 (NDP.104). Some of the LPG material from crematorium A seems slightly earlier than the LPG pottery from tomb A1K1, but only AM.14 is identified as MPG. I therefore argue that the necropolis was inaugurated in the second quarter of the 9th century, when activity was limited to crematorium A and

---

2326 See Section 2.2.3. For later times see Appendix I.2.
2327 The interpretation of the function of these structures does not rely entirely on pottery and is avoided here. Stampolidis’s views are outlined in Section 2.2.3.
2328 Stampolidis 2004c, 137.
2329 Joubin 1893, 10.
2330 See Section 2.2.3.
tomb A1K1. Interestingly, an inaugural feast was identified in the tomb and parallels were tentatively drawn from other Cretan Iron Age tombs.2331

The date of the abandonment of the necropolis is less secure. The latest undisturbed burials date to around 570, but fragmentary pottery of later date has been identified.2332 Erickson demonstrated that the amount of LAR and Classical material was considerable and argued that the use of the necropolis persisted throughout the 6th century.2333 Although I have raised doubts about the date of a few of Erickson’s types and have demonstrated that he has occasionally misunderstood the context of some vases and the development of the funerary customs at the site,2334 I feel convinced that activity persisted in Orthi Petra after 570 and that the 6th century or later use of the site as a cemetery should not be dismissed. My interpretation of this activity, which lays emphasis on sumptuary attitudes and contextual information, claims, however, otherwise. I underlined that the deposition of local and imported pouring vessels decreased in the late 7th century and ceased at around 570, as well as that the LAR material discussed by Erickson is limited to open vessels. On these grounds, I argued that the 6th century material, including the Laconian kraters, was perhaps employed in customs venerating the ancestors, rather than placed in burials that currently remain elusive. The argument for the dislocation of the burial ground is further corroborated by the assumed expansion of the city’s domestic quarters, the discovery of an elaborate grave monument of the beginning of the 5th century just north of the Prines hill and the localisation of the later necropolises further north.2335

The present study clarified the date of some structures of the necropolis. A minimum of three 9th – early 8th century ceramic sub-phases, the earliest of which dates to 870-850, is probably represented by the material from crematorium A. The structure was less frequently used in the early 8th century and was probably full when a late 8th – (early 7th) century pyre was lighted on the spot. The neighbouring structure K was inaugurated in the late 9th century and its use persisted throughout the 8th century. Tomb A1K1, as already mentioned, was first used in the second

2331 Section 7.3.
2332 See Section 2.2.3.
2333 Erickson 2000, 156-236.
2334 See Sections 2.2.3, 7.7.
2335 See Section 2.2.3.
quarter of the 9th century. The chamber of the tomb accommodated several dozens of urns, the latest of which date just before the mid-7th century. Urns of later (late 7th and perhaps early 6th century date) date were deposited in the dromos of the tomb and above it. At approximately the same time with the final use of the tomb’s chamber, monument A1K1 was erected over the eastern part of the tomb.\(^{2336}\)

Given that the excavation of other structures has not been completed and the restoration of some material is pending, I refrain from proposing any dates and refer the reader to the excavator’s provisional suggestions, which are cited in Section 2.2.3. I further avoid speculating on the function of these structures, since this does not rely entirely on pottery (Stampolidis’s views are outlined in Section 2.2.3). I provide, however, rough estimates on the number of burials deposited in tomb A1K1 per year and per period, as a means to monitor the scale of the social group that was buried in the tomb. This provides important hints for social reconstruction and contributes to the discussion of the nature of the relations between the occupants of each single Cretan Iron Age tomb.\(^{2337}\)

### 8.2.2 Ceramic styles and social interaction in Eleutherna

This section is a summarising interpretation of the evidence for social interaction in Iron Age Eleutherna, as manifested in the preceding analysis of production, dissemination and consumption of local and imported ceramic styles.\(^{2338}\) The focus on pottery is largely dictated by the limitations outlined in Section 1.3 and does not involve any assumption on its leading social role. On balance, recurring references to other classes of unpublished material delineate the diverse means through which individual and group identity was manifested in Orthi Petra.

Already in the LPG-EG phase, ceramic production in Eleutherna was probably run by families - leaded by semi-specialist members - that potted for profit, but also engaged in other economic activities for subsistence. Although the phase represents a crest in the quantity and variety of local ceramic vessels found at Orthi Petra, their production is assigned to a limited number of workshops on the basis of

\(^{2336}\) Although the EPAR AM.1 cannot be dated with further precision, I believe that a date in the first decades of the 7th century is unlikely.

\(^{2337}\) Section 2.2.3.

\(^{2338}\) See mostly Chapters 3, 6 and 7.
the occurrence of particular potter’s marks on a considerable portion of the oinochoai and the bell skyphoi. Potter’s marks are not uncommon on pottery of this phase, but scarcely occur thereafter, leaving no ground for a diachronic assessment of the development of the local ceramic industry, even in relative terms. This industry proved fairly dynamic during the LPG-EG period. The pale fabric that was widely used until just after the mid-9th century disappeared in favour of an orange one, which persisted thereafter. The change is perhaps due to the exhaustion of the sources for the former fabric, but it may also be related to the establishment of the white on dark decorative technique. This technique is scarcely represented in other Aegean Early Iron Age sites and its popularity in Eleutherna is unparalleled. The EM III-MM I white on dark ware is a likely source of inspiration, even though Minoan influence is uncommon on Eleuthernian pottery. Proto-Orientalizing (including Cypriot) and Atticizing influence are occasionally identified on PGB-EG vases and ‘bilingual’ decoration is represented by a single case (NDP.20, pl. 6). Mould-made (BA.1, pl. 84) and appliqué (SLI.3, pl. 16, 57) decoration are also singly documented.

A considerable amount of imported pottery of diverse types reached the site in the 9th century. Although most imports originate from Cretan sites, a range of regions including Corinth, Attica, the Cyclades, Cyprus and, from the end of the period, East Greece, is also represented. Other classes of artefacts, mostly metal objects, are also quite common and demonstrate overseas connections. Imported pottery and metal items, however, only scarcely accompanied the burials found outside the tomb. On the contrary, the group that was buried in the latter (largely adult males) invested heavily on consumption. Expenditure, feasting and manhood were emphasised in a milieu of intense competition. Feasting deserves particular attention. The inauguration of the tomb was probably followed by a conspicuous feast, which is perhaps paralleled on Iron Age tombs at other Cretan sites. If not coincidental, the discovery of sets of seven small open vessels inside two kraters perhaps suggest the scale of the group attending these feasts, as corroborated by the seven-couch dining halls of Archaic-Classical times.2339 The sharp contrast between the sumptuary attitudes manifested inside and outside the tomb perhaps reflects that
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2339 On feasts see Section 7.3.
access to particular wealth resources was exclusive to specific social groups within the Eleuthemian society.

Although the modes of ceramic production witnessed no major transformation in the MG-LG period, three notable changes are identified. The abandonment of the peculiar white on dark technique in favour of a scheme that involved the application of dark paint on a layer of thick yellow slip finds no straightforward interpretation. The latter scheme is certainly commonly found on Aegean Iron Age pottery, but outside influence is scarcely identifiable on Eleuthemian ceramics of the 8th century.2340 The second change regards the occurrence of homogeneous sets of vases in contexts of the LG (and EPAR) period. The sets, which suggest increased standardisation, confirm the potter/painter’s response to particular consumer requirements, which were evidently also directed towards imports. In one case (type E cups), a homogeneous set of vases may have been commissioned. The last of the aforementioned changes is the considerable increase in the size of the coated cup, which is identifiable throughout Crete, but had hitherto received no attention. I proposed that the cup was perhaps enlarged to serve the mixing of wine and water, particularly since the numbers of kraters clearly declined in some Cretan sites, including Eletherna, during the 8th century. I further argued that the enlarged cup was henceforth a stereotype of adulthood, as confirmed by the recurrent discovery of ‘unorthodoxly’ small cups of G-PAR date in child burials. The analogous association between child burial and cooking vessels that occurs during the same period further confirms that some types of vessels served to amplify social identities. Despite the traces of fire the Eleuthemian cooking vessels of this date carry, they are unlikely to have served the preparation of meals on the spot.2341

During the phase in question, the sumptuary attitudes underwent radical, as well as diverse transformations. Drinking sets became a rarity and kraters and oinochoai largely disappeared, never to reappear. Further, imports nearly vanished in the MG period (a Knossian and a Cypriot import are only known), but their number
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2340 On the other hand, an Eleuthemian stimulus probably revived the production of the Knossian necked pithos just before 700.
2341 For the enlargement of the cup and the cooking vessels see Section 7.3.
and variety increased in the LG, particularly in the last decades of the 8th century. During the latter time span, vases from Cretan sites, including Knossos, but also Corinth, the Cyclades, East Greece and even Phoenicia arrived.

The group that was buried in tomb A1K1 seems to have largely reacted from the sumptuary exaggeration of the preceding phase. The tomb was hereafter largely an urn repository. I argued that this attitude of self-restraint was conscious. ‘Conspicuous parsimony’ was introduced to regulate self-display and prevent the disruptive consequences of culminating material statements. In the last third of the 8th century, this attitude was challenged by the rise of sumptuary manifestations outside the tomb (see below). Under these circumstances, a particular tactic designed to circumvent, but not contest the principles of restraint, emerged among those buried in tomb A1K1. It largely overlooked some of the means of conspicuous consumption employed in the preceding phase and mostly involved investment in the quality of the urn and the urn cover and manipulation of mainly small-scale artefacts (like glazed or faience objects) that had only scarcely, if at all, been used as funerary offerings before.

The MG period is insufficiently documented outside the tomb and a low level of activity is assumed. From the LG period, however, burials multiply and spread to every direction. Evidently, access to formal burial at Orthi Petra, but significantly not tomb A1K1, had now been granted to a larger group. The ‘newcomers’ displayed varied sumptuary attitudes, but the deposition of vases and other offerings generally increased. Investment in quantity and variety, rather than in quality, is manifested in the most conspicuous burials. Increased expenditure is further confirmed by the employment of stone pillars as grave markers. The Phoenician type of a few of these pillars suggests that Phoenicians were living in Eleutherna and were fairly integrated with the locals. The pillars further delineate an interest in the preservation of memory. Only from the EPAR period, however, do the grave monuments increasingly articulate aspects of the social persona of the deceased.

Slip was a major concern for the Eleuthernian potters/painters of the EPAR period. The thick bright yellow slip of the MG-LG phase is found on small vessels, but large examples mostly carry a thinner and duller version that flakes easily and
may partly be unslipped. Furthermore, a whitish or white-brown slip is introduced.\textsuperscript{2342} Perhaps there were constraints affecting the availability or accessibility of the raw material that produced the yellow slip from around 700. Throughout the period that is conventionally called Orientalizing, the Eleuthernian painters proved reluctant to produce figured and Orientalizing imagery, even though they did accept some influence from other Cretan and overseas (mostly Corinth) sites and were living in a community that imported vessels with such imagery.

Local ceramics with figured imagery were mostly produced by two EPAR workshops, the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ and the ‘saw pattern workshop’. Both workshops were, to my view, established by immigrant potters/painters, who probably originated in the Cyclades, in Paros and Thera respectively. Both produced vessels in more than one fabric, perhaps while experimenting with local clays, and both used a simple multiple brush (a device that was not uncommon elsewhere in the Aegean at the time), the potentials of which they did not share with their Eleuthernian colleagues. As time passed, their work was assimilated to local products. More information can be deduced for the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’. This employed at least two painters and perhaps also ‘inexperienced personnel’. Judging by the high standardisation, great efficiency and considerable skill of its products, the workshop is considered specialised. The Cycladic connections of these workshops date to a period (late 8\textsuperscript{th} – early 7\textsuperscript{th} century), during which the influx of Cycladic imports to Eleutherna rises and Cretan exports reach the Cyclades. Interestingly, Cycladic imports to other Cretan sites decline during the same period.

The interpretation of the near doubling of the scale of the group that was buried in tomb A1K1 during the EPAR period relies on physical anthropology. Ceramics, however, suggest that the subtle undermining of the principles of restraint culminated in the tomb, despite the decline of imported storage vessels. A bronze vessel commonly covers an urn and a few ‘exotic’, but small artefacts occur. Moreover, the shape of the urns varies and the decoration on the two sides of these vases is regularly differentiated. In addition, storage vessels with figured imagery are not uncommon. The uniformity that governs the occurrence of such imagery, which was produced by different painters, suggests that it served to amplify rather than

\textsuperscript{2342} These trends are only scarcely identified on MG-LG vases.
undermine group membership. This is further confirmed by its rationing. Local vessels with figured decoration were largely unavailable to those buried outside the tomb, the relevant demand of whom was satisfied by imports of varied, individual style. In other respects, the sumptuary attitudes manifested outside tomb A1K1 during the EPAR period largely adhere to or elaborate on those of the LG. Moreover, large structures, mostly not associated with single burials, are now erected.

The variety of modes of production, which was attested from the 9th to the early 7th century, largely withdrew after 650. Simplification, low labour investment and standardisation dominate the ceramic repertory of the LPAR times. The application of slip and motifs largely disappears and painted pottery demises. This demise is, however, fairly gradual and can be identified already on some local EPAR-late vases. Hence, the Eleuthernian sequence challenges the impression of a fairly sharp break between an elaborate, early and mature 7th century style and a restrained, late 7th - 6th century one, which largely relies on assessments of the material from sites like Knossos and Afrati.

Evidence from Orthi Petra further confirms that the demise of painted pottery is not an isolated art-historical phenomenon. Ceramic consumption declined in the entire cemetery during the period in question and investment in other classes of materials decreased, despite the rise in the spatial distribution of burials and the persistence of variety in funerary rites. Rigid austerity pervaded the deposition of urns over tomb A1K1, which was full by now. These urns, mostly necked pithoi with plain basins as covers, were not furnished with clay offerings and bronze vessels were rare. To my view, this triumph of 'conspicuous parsimony' should not be attributed to any decline in prosperity or the unavailability of goods, but to the culmination of socio-political and economic transformations I have reviewed elsewhere.2343 Personal display and conspicuous funerals were no longer regarded desirable and the necropolis of Orthi Petra was sooner or later abandoned as a burial site, even though it did attract some investment in rituals venerating the ancestors. The cemeteries of Eleutherna were henceforth located mostly north of the Prines hill.

To conclude, the necropolis of Orthi Petra proved a major, physical and social frame for the deposition of artefacts as much as corpses. Although investment in ceramics emerged as a fairly reliable barometer for the fluctuating attitudes that governed the deposition of other artefacts, the present study dissociated the scale of material investment in the funerary ritual held at Orthi Petra from the degree of the community’s overall prosperity and pursued the identification and interpretation of the versatile and occasionally contesting aspirations of particular social groups. I emphasised that pottery did play a role, albeit probably not a leading one, in shaping and structuring individual and group identity, which can fully be assessed only in the light of forthcoming studies on other classes of artefacts and physical anthropological evidence.
APPENDIX I: LATE TESTIMONIES FOR ELEUTHERNA AND THE SURROUNDING REGION

Appendix I collects all literary and archaeological information for Eleutherna and the surrounding region from the Hellenistic to the Medieval and Modern times. Although a significant part of the rapidly growing body of evidence has been treated in several publications, no diachronic account citing full references has yet been produced and important testimonies have occasionally been neglected. The Appendix is divided in two sections: the first focuses upon Eleutherna, while the second treats the surrounding region.

I.1 Evidence for Eleutherna in the Hellenistic-Modern times

I.1.1 Historical documents for Eleutherna

The infrequent references to Eleutherna in the ancient literature and the increasing corpus of inscriptions from the site provide important evidence for its history, particularly during the Hellenistic period.

Concerning inter-island politics, Eleutherna seems to have managed to avoid any large-scale involvement in the wars that affected other Cretan cities. An early 3rd century inscription mentions a treaty between Eleutherna and Raukos, while another inscription of similar date records a treaty between Eleutherna and a city, the name of which is not preserved (Knossos ?). Slightly later, probably in the third quarter of the 3rd century, Eleutherna forged a treaty with Phaistos, while in the early 2nd century defensive treaties with Lato and Aptera were established.

The overseas relations of the city are best documented during the 3rd century. In 292, Eleutherna and several other Cretan cities joined a treaty with Miletus. The city dedicated a statue to Ptolemy II, the Euergetes, some time between 247-221.
while in 227-224, Eleuthema and Ierapetra entered the alliance of Antigonos Doson and the Achaian League against the Spartans. According to Polybius, the Achaian League and the new king of Macedon, Phillip V, forced the Eleuthernians and other Cretans to abandon their alliance with Knossos against Lyktos in 220. At the same time, the Eleuthernians decided to fight the Rhodians, allies of Knossos. Later, the Eleuthernians joined other Cretans in guaranteeing the safety of the land of Teos (201), as well as in forming a treaty with Eumenes II of Pergamon (183).

Although the most famous Eleuthernian is perhaps the 5th century philosopher Diogenes Apolloniates, the name of several individuals, mostly proxenoi, is recorded in Hellenistic inscriptions found in a number of places. The list includes some artists, most notably a family of sculptors (Timochares, Pythokritos, Simias) that migrated to Rhodes at around 200 and is well known from inscribed statue bases and literary sources.

Inscriptions testify that Eleutherna honoured a series of Roman emperors, following its conquest, which was achieved through treachery, by the Roman general Metellus in 67. Although the city was ruined by a great earthquake just after the mid-fourth century A.D., it soon revived and became the seat of a bishopric in the early 5th century A.D. Euphratas, the first bishop of Eleutherna, attended the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), while bishop Epiphaneios, known as the 'unworthy' one,

---

2359 See lately Papachristodouloou 2000, 145-149.
participated in the Council of Nikaia (787 A.D.). A mosaic inscription on a basilica that occupies a central place on the heart of the Roman-Early Christian city records that Euphratas erected it in honour of Archangel Michael. In the reign of Constans II (641-648 A.D.) or Constantine IV (668-685 A.D.), the city, including the basilica, was destroyed by a new earthquake; it never truly recovered and was gradually abandoned. This demise adheres to an island-wide pattern of change in settlement patterns and is related to the rising Arabic threat. Nevertheless, the reference to bishop Epiphaneios, as well as two Byzantine churches and a few inscriptions suggest that the site was not totally deserted. Indeed the city remained the seat of a bishopric perhaps as late as the 10th century A.D. and Tsougarakis assumes that Eleutherna was the only Cretan city to withstand the Arab invasion of the 9th century A.D. Much later, during the revolution of the Kallergeis, Eleutherna resisted the Venetians for two years (1364-1366/1367 A.D.). When the Venetians re-gained control of the area, they ordered the abandonment of this well-defended site, demolished the settlement and forbade anyone to live there, as Buondelmonti, an early 15th century A.D. visitor, reports. It is assumed that the site was re-inhabited at 1700 A.D.

1.1.2 The modern discovery of the site

Eleutherna and its ruined antiquities are noted in a Venetian 16th century document, which refers to a Greek monastery on the site. Later, in the early 18th

---

2367 Tsougarakis 1988, 323-324.
2368 Tsougarakis 1987, 402-403. Themelis, however, believes that the town fell in serious decadence from the last quarter of the 8th century: Themelis 2002, 24-25. Themelis 2004a, 43.
2369 Tsougarakis 1987, 373. The original text (Genesius, 2.10.32-33) claims that the Arabs conquered twenty-nine Cretan cities, but one remained free.
2370 Xanthoudidis 1939, 106, 108.
2373 The subject is discussed in Stampolidis 2004a, 23-25: more than half of the references cited are, however, missing from the bibliography.
century, Pockocke visited Eleutherna and saw the tower on the Prines hill, a monument I shall discuss below. In the 19th century, the site was visited by Spratt, Thenon, Mariani and Gerola. Pashley heard about it but was advised not to visit it on account of snow. In the end of the 19th century, the torso of a late 6th century female statue and two inscriptions of similar date were found at Eleutherna. More inscriptions and a steatite scarab were published in the early 20th century. Notably, in 1908, Eleutherios Venizelos, the later Prime Minister of Greece, proposed to the Council of the then Cretan state to appoint an archaeologist who would supervise the restoration of a Hellenistic bridge that lies north of the Prines hill. The approval and funding of the project by the Council is the first act of a Greek authority for the preservation of the cultural heritage of Eleutherna.

In the meantime, in 1899, the Italian School had asked for permission to excavate at Eleutherna, but did not proceed with this plan. Evans visited the site in the same year, but it was only thirty years later, in 1929, that the British School at Athens decided to explore its ‘potentials’. After twenty days of excavation, Payne concluded that there was ‘little if any possibility of the site justifying a second campaign’. Nevertheless, when referring to the western slopes of the Prines hill, he noted that ‘the place was probably a necropolis, though we found no certain evidence for this’. He had unearthed some PG, many G and a few Archaic vases.

2375 Pockocke 1745, 258, footnote a; 259. For Pockocke see Platakis 1972, 7-11.
2376 Spratt 1865, 89-98. For Spratt see Platakis 1972, 11-14.
2377 Thenon 1868. Slightly later, Bursian (Bursian 1868-1872, 554-555) drew from Spratt and Thenon.
2378 Mariani 1895, 211-215.
2379 Gerola 1908, 56-57.
2380 Pashley 1837, 145-146. For Pashley see also Platakis 1971, 262-264.
2381 Joubin 1893, 10 (publication of the torso). Brown 2001, 33, footnote 41: collection of early references to the torso which was unearthed by villagers on the west slope of the Prines hill.
2382 Fabricius 1890, 92-94. Also found in Guarducci 1939, 150-151, numbers 8-9. For their date see Jeffery 1990, 316.
2384 Xanthoudidis 1907, 164-165.
2385 Add two fragmentary, relief pithoi: Courby 1922, 52-52, pl. 2.
2386 Petroulakis 1914, 230. The bridge is discussed below.
2389 Macmillan 1928-1930, 268. This is basically repeated in Woodward 1929, 226.
Since then, the site attracted only minimal attention on account of chance finds reported by the Greek Archaeological Service, mainly by N. Platon. In the 1950's, this land, which belonged to the nearby Arcadi monastery, was sold to farmers, who constructed terraces in order to achieve a maximum of arable land and augment productivity. Although some ancient terrace walls were incorporated in the modern terrace system, damage was caused to ancient remains and the landscape was re-shaped. On the other hand, the terraces prevented soil erosion, leaving the undisturbed antiquities safely buried in the earth.

In 1984, the 25th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities gave permission to the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Crete to undertake an excavation project on the Prines hill and the surrounding area; work began in September 1985. The site was divided in three sectors: sector I, the eastern slopes of the Prines hill, was assigned to P. Themelis; sector II, the top of the hill, was allocated to A. Kalpaxis; sector III, the western slopes, was assigned to N. Stampolidis.

I.1.3 The archaeology of Eleutherna from the Hellenistic to the Medieval period

This section supplements the review of the archaeology of Eleutherna that was laid out in Section 2.1 by focusing on the Hellenistic to the Medieval period.

Although public buildings and houses, as well as inscriptions of Hellenistic date have been unearthed on the top of the Prines hill, the formation of a proper urban landscape, which was achieved during the period in question, probably involved the relocation of the public centre from the top of the Prines hill to the eastern slopes, which witnessed intense building activity: massive terrace walls were

---


erected to support domestic units, a monumental, probably public building and an impressive bath (these buildings survived in the Roman period after some repairs). Another important structure is only identifiable from the decorated spolia that were found incorporated in a Roman villa. Furthermore, two successive Hellenistic temples were built in the area of the much later Euphratas Basilica. The later temple was probably destroyed during the Roman conquest and was replaced by a considerably larger, third one (for which see below). The temples were probably dedicated to Hermes and Aphrodite. Hellenistic terraces and houses are also found on the western slopes of the Prines hill, while houses and cisterns occupy Nisi, west of which tombs are located. Small ceramic kilns were integrated in some houses at Nisi and Kalpaxis assumes there was a concentration of workshops (albeit not an industrial quarter) on this hill. Parts of defensive walls have been unearthed at Orthi Petra, the eastern slopes of the Prines hill and the eastern slopes of Nisi.

This is the period when the bridge that stands just north of the point where the three streams running along the foot of the Prines and Nisi hills meet was erected (this bridge was restored after the proposal of Venizelos).

It has been estimated that the urban space of Hellenistic Eleutherna covered 1-1.5km² (100-200 hectares), which is equivalent to or greater than the urban space of Knossos and Gortyn. Wide paved roads unified this space. The increased

---

2405 Kalpaxis 1996, 45.
2407 Nacassis 2000, 356-360, 365 (although both a Classical and a Hellenistic date have been suggested, Nacassis favours the later date). Also: Stampolidis 1993, 27.
2408 Kalpaxis, Furtwängler, Schnapp et al. 1994, 17.
needs in stone were probably served by the limestone quarries identified at Peristeres and Kantonades,\textsuperscript{2410} which were, however, perhaps used already in the Archaic period.\textsuperscript{2411}

The Hellenistic period offers considerable evidence for the cults of the Eleuthernians:\textsuperscript{2412} inscriptions and coins suggest that Apollo and Artemis were the main deities worshipped, while the cults of the Mothers and the Kouretes underline the connection between Eleutherna and the Idaean Cave sanctuary.

During the seizing of Eleutherna by the Romans in 67, parts of the city might have been destroyed.\textsuperscript{2413} The Roman period witnessed the elevation of the plateau on the eastern slopes to a prosperous city quarter. The Hellenistic bath was refurbished, while a smaller one, as well as a sizeable temple and large, luxurious domestic complexes were erected.\textsuperscript{2414} Modest, disturbed remains are preserved on the top of the Prines hill,\textsuperscript{2415} while a habitation quarter partly overlies the southern edge of the Orthi Petra necropolis.\textsuperscript{2416} Impressive works of engineering aimed to improve the city's water supply: a short aqueduct brought water from the Pigadaki spring to two cisterns located on the upper part of the western slopes,\textsuperscript{2417} while a vaulted aqueduct carried the water from these cisterns down to the city terraces on the eastern

\textsuperscript{2410} Stampolidis 1990a, 98, footnote 2. Stampolidis 1993, 23 (LM sherds have been identified at Peristeres). Kalpaxis, Furtwängler, Schnapp et al. 1994, 19. Stampolidis 1994-1996, 287. Stampolidis 2004b, 85-88. For Peristeres see also Faure 1965, 48, footnote 4. Stone was also available on the rocky shelf of Mount Ida and could be extracted from the calcareous beds that make up the hills to the north; indeed, all three spurs (Prines, Nisi, Tripodo) display marks of quarrying (Gouin et Vogt 2002, 202), while nowadays, a rock quarry is located further north, near Alpha (Stampolidis 1990, 399, footnote 70. Stampolidis 2004b, 86).


\textsuperscript{2412} See the latest discussion in Sporn 2002, 235-241. For coins see Stampolidis 2004, 161-162, numbers 21-27.


slopes. \(^{2418}\) A group of four vaulted cisterns on the latter area was part of the large bath. \(^{2419}\) Roman and later, rock-cut, mostly looted tombs are located north, north-east and north-west of the Prines hill \(^{2420}\) and along the route that leads north, to the sea. \(^{2421}\)

Shortly after the beginning of the Early Christian period, an earthquake caused damage and casualties in Eleutherna \((360-370\ \text{A.D.})\). \(^{2422}\) Pottery of this period has been identified on the top of the Prines hill, \(^{2423}\) but more substantial vestiges come from the eastern slopes: the small Roman bath was repaired and houses were built, \(^{2424}\) while the erection of the Early Christian basilica of Euphratas, the courtyard of which overlies the Hellenistic and Roman temples, \(^{2425}\) confirms that the area served as the public centre of the period in question. The basilica had three aisles and was lavishly decorated with mosaics, *opus sectile* and limestone sculpture.

One of the mosaics bears an inscription, according to which the church was dedicated to Archangel Michael by bishop Euphratas. The latter is known to have attended the Council of Chalcedon \((451\ \text{A.D.})\), as stated above. Already within the 5\(^{th}\) century A.D., a baptisterion was erected by the basilica, \(^{2426}\) but both buildings were destroyed by the aforementioned earthquake of the 7\(^{th}\) century. Three (perhaps

---

\(^{2418}\) The cisterns were constructed as rock was quarried from their inside. Their approximate dimensions are: 40m. long, 25m. wide and 5-6m. high. They are divided into three aisles by pillars almost square in plan (each side measuring 2m., 3m., or 3.5m.). The vaulted aqueduct is 150m. long, 1.5m. wide and 2m. high: Spanaklis 1991, 263. Sanders 1982, 162. Myres, Myres and Cadogan 1992, 92. Sanders believed that the water supply system of the eastern slopes dates to the Hellenistic period and suggested that the cisterns may be contemporary with it. His reference to two groups of three cisterns probably corresponds to our two three-aisled cisterns (Sanders 1982, 162).

\(^{2419}\) Themelis 2002a, 285.


\(^{2426}\) Themelis 2004b, 64-65.
four) more Early Christian basilicas have been located.\textsuperscript{2427} One of them stands on the
top of the Prines hill, by the church of Agia Eirene, while a tetra-conch building of
probably cultic function lies nearby.\textsuperscript{2428} Tombs of similar date were found in the
vicinity of this building,\textsuperscript{2429} as well as on the eastern\textsuperscript{2430} and perhaps the western\textsuperscript{2431}
slopes, and on various sites north, north-east and north-west of the Prines hill.\textsuperscript{2432}

As stated above, the city fell into demise after the 7\textsuperscript{th} century A.D., but was
not totally deserted, even though it may have been largely abandoned for some time.
Habitation was now concentrated on the top of the Prines hill, as shown by the
substantial medieval tower (about 8m. tall) that guards the narrow ledge leading to
this area,\textsuperscript{2433} as well as two Byzantine churches, a kiln, an 11\textsuperscript{th} – 13\textsuperscript{th}
century house and a few coins.\textsuperscript{2434}

I.2 The territory of Eleutherna from the Hellenistic to Modern times\textsuperscript{2435}

The following account is intended to map the territory of Eleutherna in a sketchy
manner, given the paucity of relevant literary, epigraphic and archaeological
evidence, which greatly hampers any study of territorial expansion or contraction.
There is actually no indisputable evidence that Eleutherna ever came to dominate the
territory outlined below, even though geography and archaeology provide important
hints. I personally assume, however, that the city had perhaps absorbed much of the
territory in question already in the Archaic period.

\textsuperscript{2428} Sanders 1982, 120, 162 (basilica). Building: Kalpaxis 1988, 302. Effenterre, Kalpaxis,
403-409. Stampolidis 2004c, 142-143.
\textsuperscript{2430} For the archaeology of the graves see Yangaki 2004 (also: Themelis 2002a, 279, 281. Stampolidis
2004, 300-302, numbers 410-419. Stampolidis 2004c, 142-143); for the evidence of physical
\textsuperscript{2431} Stampolidis 1994a, 36-38. Stampolidis 2004c, 143: the tombs are perhaps later.
\textsuperscript{2432} See footnotes 2420-2421.
\textsuperscript{2433} Evans thought that the tower was Late Roman or Byzantine (Brown 2001, 285), while Sanders
(Sanders 1982, 162) favoured a late Roman or Early Medieval period. The latter date is lately
preferred (Stampolidis 1993, 24. Myres, Myres and Cadogan 1996, 92). For the partial restoration of
the monument see Tzedakis 1970, 478: he is the only one to consider the tower Hellenistic. Reference
can also be found in Davaras 1967, 501.
196, number 115; 199, number 128; 216, number 184.
\textsuperscript{2435} See Map 2 throughout.
1.2.1 The Harbour(s)

Imported artefacts or items that display influence from overseas are documented in Eleutherna from the Prehistoric period, but become quite common from the Iron Age. During the latter, particularly in the late 8th – early 7th century, people from the Cyclades and Phoenicia resided in Eleutherna. On these grounds, it is highly probable that Eleutherna communicated with overseas entrepreneurs through one or more dependent coastal sites, rather than through a coastal centre of equal or greater status in terms of settlement hierarchy.

The geography of the three sites (Stavromenos, Panormos and Bali) that could have served as harbours for Eleutherna on the grounds of geography, as well as their scanty Prehistoric and Iron Age remains were reviewed in Section 2.3. Although richer, the archaeological and literary evidence for later periods complexes the issue. The following account first discusses the relation between ancient names and sites and later reviews the evidence for relations between the three aforementioned sites and Eleutherna.

Literary testimonies are obtained from the Natural History of Pliny the Elder (1st century A.D.), the Geography of Claudius Ptolemaeus (2nd century A.D.) and the Stadiasmus (second half of the 3rd century A.D.). The Geography, which is generally regarded as highly reliable, lists the ports of North Crete from east to west. Pliny does the reverse, but his list is slightly confused, while the relevant passage of the Stadiasmus is corrupted and confused.

2437 See Chapter 6.
2438 See Sections 6.2.3 and 6.3.2 respectively.
2439 Platon 1948, 349-350 (Platon collects all relevant references). Also, Kirsten 1949, 831-832. The relevant passages of Ptolemy’s Geography and the Stadiasmus can also be found in Müller 1883, 566-567. The latter is further cited in: Pendlebury 1939, 28-29. Guarducci 1939, 142.
2440 For the dates see respectively: Hornblower and Spawforth 1996, 1197-1198, 1273-1274.
2441 Faure 1959, 187.
2442 Ptolemy, Γεωγραφική Υφήγησις, III.15.5: ... Heracleum-Panormus-Apollonia-Cytaeum-Dium promontory-Pantomatrium-Rithymna-Aphimales sinus-Drepanum promontory-Minoia-Pyeri fluvii ostia-Kydonia ...
2443 Pliny, Naturalis Historia IV.12.59: ... Kydonia-Minoium-Apteront-Pantomatrium-Amphomala-Rithymna-Panhormum-Cytaeum-Apollonia, Matium-Heraclea ...
2444 Stadiasmus maris magni, paragraphs 346-347: ... Minoa-Amfimatrion-Hydramon-corrupted-land distance from Amfimatrion to Eleutherna-Amfimatrion to Astale-land distance from Astale to Eleutherna ... The text is usually reconstructed as follows: ... Minoa-Amfimalion(Themomala)-Hydramon-Rithymna-Pantomatrium-land distance from Pantomatrium to Eleutherna-Pantomatrium to Astale-land distance from Astale to Eleutherna ... (Guarducci 1939, 142).
According to these testimonies, the harbour sites associated with Eleutherna are *Astale*, *Panormus/Panormum*, *Pantomatrion* and *Amfimatrion*.\(^\text{2445}\)

*Astale* can be securely identified with modern Bali on the basis of some Venetian maps that refer to this site as Atali.\(^\text{2446}\) On the other hand, the name of modern Panormo was established only in the beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century (the village was previously called Roumeli Kasteli),\(^\text{2447}\) because of a misidentification of the site with ancient Panormo (*Panormus/Panormum*).\(^\text{2448}\) Ancient Panormo is now generally thought to be located further east, between modern Agia Pelagia and Herakleion.\(^\text{2449}\)

As far as *Pantomatrion* is concerned, modern scholarship does not follow Pliny, who locates it west of Rethymnon, but Ptolemy, who places it between Rethymnon and the Dion promontory (*Δίον Άκρων*).\(^\text{2450}\) Nevertheless, three different sites between Rethymnon and Herakleion have been identified with *Pantomatrion*; the identification that favours modern Panormo is solely based on geography.\(^\text{2451}\)

Stavromenos, however, emerges as an equal candidate in geographic terms. This site has further produced a particular numismatic type, which closely resembles an Eleuthernian type, but carries the letters Π and A. According to Faure, this type suggests that *Pantomatrion* was located at Stavromenos, as well as that the site achieved autonomy from Eleutherna during the intra-island struggles of the 2\(^{nd}\) century.\(^\text{2452}\) Nevertheless, these coins were not necessarily struck by

---

\(^{2445}\) Ancient toponyms are henceforth italicised in the main text.


\(^{2447}\) Spanakis 1993, 609.

\(^{2448}\) The misunderstanding, which stemmed from the work of Andrea Cornaro at around 1600, was backed by Platon, who associated the ancient name (Panormo) with the local cult of St. George Panarmitis (Platon 1948, 360-362). Alexiou, however, challenged this identification by demonstrating that Panormo has different meaning than Panormo (Alexiou 1979, 5-9. Alexiou 1984. Alexiou 2002, 201-202. Alexiou forthcoming. Also, Georgakas 1988-1989, 195-196).


\(^{2450}\) Dion promontory is discussed below.

\(^{2451}\) Alexiou 1979, 13.

\(^{2452}\) Faure 1993, 72. Le Rider was sceptical about both the attribution of these coins to Pantomation and the identification of this town with Stavromenos (Le Rider 1966, 248-250); he preferred to attribute the coins to Eleutherna (Le Rider 1966, 255). Chaniotis considers Pantomation as a port of Eleutherna, which was perhaps independent in earlier times, and tentatively locates it at Stavromenos (Chaniotis 1987, Appendix with map and tables of Cretan poleis and dependent communities); he lately concerns it as a port of Eleutherna, without favouring any identification (Chaniotis 1996, 121, footnote 744; 162, footnote 1037; 277, footnote 1502).
Pantomatrion. 2453 The third view locates Pantomatrion near modern Phodele, where Platon claimed to have located a river called Pantomatria. 2454 Faraklas went even further to argue that beside Pantomatrion, which was located at Phodele, there was Amfimatrion, the harbour of Eleutherna at modern Panormo. According to his view, it was the similarity of the toponyms that led to the confusion of the ancient sources. 2455

A few more toponyms have been introduced in relevant discussions. Stavromenos has occasionally been identified with the ancient town A(g)ron, 2456 on the basis of 17th century maps that locate river Arius in the area. 2457 Faure, however, has rightly noted that the name appears only in the 9th century A.D., after the Arab conquest, and is attributed to the seat of a Bishopric at Viran Episkopi, 3km. south-east of Stavromenos. 2458 He further suggested that the town on the ridge was called

---

2454 Platon 1948, 358, 363-365. This identification was followed by Alexiou (Alexiou 1972, 241, footnote 14), Faraklas (Faraklas et al. 1998, 197) and Stefanakis (Stefanakis 1998, 99); although it was originally also accepted by Faure (Faure 1959, 176, 196), the latter later rejected it since he could trace no ancient ruins in the area (Faure 1963, 19; the ruins at the site of Elleniko need not be pre-medieval: Sanders 1982, 154) and find anybody to confirm the tradition about the name of the river (comment in Le Rider 1966, 249). Interestingly, Buondelmonti (early 15th century) was also locating Pantomatrion close to Herakleion, near Rogdhia (Van Spitael 1981, 147, 252, note 119, line 600 in the original text).
2455 Faraklas explains (Faraklas et al. 1998, 79-82) that the problem stems from the occurrence of three similar toponyms on the north coast of Crete, at a relatively short distance (an interpretation originally found in Kirsten 1949, 830-831): Amfimall, mentioned by Ptolemy and Pliny - thought to be located at the bay of modern Georgioupoli (Pendlebury 1939, 13. Kirsten 1949, 830-831. Faure 1960, 206. Faraklas et al. 1998, 79-82), Amfimathron, mentioned only in the Stadiasmus and identified with Panormo by Faraklas (Faraklas et al. 1998, 79-82), Pantomatrion, mentioned by Ptolemy and Pliny, located at Stavromenos, Panormo, or Phodele (see above). Although a late 2nd century inscription from Eleutherna that regulates religious affairs preserves the ending -ματρίων, it probably refers to the name of goddess Demeter, not to Pantomatrion or Amfimatrion (Effenterre, Kalpaxis, Petropoulou, Stayrianopoulou 1991, 34).
2456 Pockocke 1745, 258, footnote a. Xanthoudidis 1920-1921, 164. Tsougarakis 1988, 230. 231, 324. Troulis 1992, 37-38 (he collects earlier opinions and concludes that this ancient town was located near the Arsani Monastery). Ekkekakis 1993. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1995, 368. Platon believed that the town of A(g)ron was inhabited by the Ariaioi (Platon 1948, 363-365: with references to earlier scholars). Faraklas (Faraklas et al. 1998, 71, 186) locates the Ariaioi on this site and suggests that their town was perhaps called Osmida. Nevertheless, the limited numismatic and epigraphic evidence available for the Ariaioi suggests that they were located in the south-east edge of the modern Herakleion prefecture (Kitchell 1983: Kitchell assumes - on the basis of linguistic criteria - that their town was called Aria). This identification, which had earlier been proposed by Faure (Faure 1960, 197, 199. Faure 1967, 51), has been accepted by the Barrington Atlas (Talbert 2000, 465-478). In conclusion, the Ariaioi were probably located in the south-east Mesara, while A(g)ron at Stavromenos (Talbert 2000, 920, 921, 926).
2457 Faure 1960, 204. Faure 1962, 41.
Allaria and the coastal site of Palaiokastro Pantomatia.\textsuperscript{2459} Nevertheless, the identification of two different towns is supported neither by the short distance separating them (500m.),\textsuperscript{2460} nor by archaeology, which, as we shall see, has produced finds stretching from the ridge to the coast.\textsuperscript{2461} Moreover, inscriptions and coins of unknown provenance, produced in Allaria, suggest some connections to Eleutherna, Aptera, Polyrhena and mostly Kydonia.\textsuperscript{2462} Thus, Allaria should perhaps be located west of Rethymnon.\textsuperscript{2463}

Lastly, a possible coastal site that is mentioned in a 6\textsuperscript{th} century law from Eleutherna that regulates excessive drinking deserves some attention.\textsuperscript{2464} The site is called \textit{Διός Ακρων} (the latter term usually denotes a cape)\textsuperscript{2465} and is related to \textit{Διος Ακρων} mentioned by Ptolemy\textsuperscript{2466} and generally identified with the great promontory

\textsuperscript{2459}Faure’s various suggestions: Faure 1959, 176, 194: Allaria ? for the town on the ridge (at the time, he was accepting that Pantomatia was located at Phodele, see footnote 2454). Faure 1960, 202: Allaria ?. Faure 1962, 42: Allaria, Stelai, or another name. Faure 1963, 16, 19-20: there is no evidence for the identification of Allaria with Chamalevi/Stavromenos; Pantomatia is situated at Stavromenos. Faure’s latest view (that the town on the ridge was called Allaria, while the port Pantomatia) is found in: Faure 1988, 85. Faure 1993, 72. Faure 1997, 106. Faure’s latest identification has been accepted by Perlman (Perlman 1996, 282-283), The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical sites (Stillwell 1976, 452: for Allaria only) and the Barrington Atlas (Talbert 2000, 920, 921, 926). As far as I know, Pockocke was the first to assume the identification of Pantomatia with Stavromenos (Pockocke 1745, 258, footnote a) and his view was later adopted by Kirsten (Kirsten 1949). Le Rider was sceptical (Le Rider 1966, 240, footnote 6; 248-250).

\textsuperscript{2460}Faure 1960, 204.

\textsuperscript{2461}Sanders 1982, 162. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1987, 63.

\textsuperscript{2462}Guarducci 1939, 1-3: some numismatic types resemble Kydonian ones and a treaty inscription bears similarities to others known from Eleutherna, Kydonia and Polyrhena. Furthermore, linguistic elements suggest connections with Kydonia and Aptera. Guarducci concluded that this city was located somewhere between Aptera and Eleutherna. For inscriptions from Allaria as documents for its history see Spyridakis 1992. For coins from Allaria see: Svoronos 1890, 1-4. Zervogiannis 1976, 219-220.


\textsuperscript{2465}The name is unlikely to refer to an oronyme, even though it appears as such in East Crete (Effenterre, Kalpaxis, Petropoulou, Stayrianopoulou 1991, 19). The Archai sanctuary of Zeus (?), located by the peak of Mount Ida (Kritzas forthcoming), should perhaps not be identified with \textit{Διός Ακρων}, even though the Eleutherian inscription in question mentions a priest and a sacrifice (modern pilgrims from Eleutherna visit the nearby church after a six to eight hours walk).

\textsuperscript{2466}Ptolemy, \textit{Γεωγραφική Έννοια}, III.15.5.
of Stavros/Agios Sozon, near Agia Pelagia.\textsuperscript{2467} The discovery of this inscription, however, led to the assumption that the site was probably located on the coastal front of the Eleuthemian territory, perhaps on the frontier with the Axians (on capes Lianos Kavos, Chondros Kavos, Korakias, or even Bali).\textsuperscript{2468} Moreover, Stefanakis' independent localisation of Kytaion on the bay of Sisses\textsuperscript{2469} brings the Axpo\v{e} very close to - if not within - Eleuthemian territory, according to Ptolemy's description. This line of argument gains further support by some 15\textsuperscript{th} century maps that were accompanying an edition of Ptolemy's Geography.\textsuperscript{2470} Although their depiction of the island's outline is imprecise, they clearly show that Dion promontory is just east of Rethymnon, far from Herakleion. The maps are eloquent in depicting capes Dion and Drepanon as embracing the area of Rethymnon. On these grounds, Dion promontory should probably be identified with cape Lianos or Chondros Cavos, which mark the east end of the important recess of land that extends from this point to cape Drepanon, west of Rethymnon.

In conclusion, the identification of the ancient names of the sites that perhaps served as harbours for Eleutherna is problematic. Only Bali can be securely identified with Astale, while Viran Episcopi is most likely the Medieval A(g)rian.

The second question addressed concerns the relations between Eleutherna and the harbours of modern Stavromenos, Panormo and Bali. If the identification of modern Panormo or Stavromenos with Pantomatrition (or Amfimatrition, according to Faraklas), is accepted, one of these sites should be recognised as the main harbour of Eleutherna, at least in Late Antiquity, since the text of the Stadismus explicitly refers to the ascent of people from Amfimatrition to Eleutherna. Modern Panormo has


\textsuperscript{2470} Van Spitael 1981, pl. XVI, XVII, XVIII. One could argue that these maps merely follow Ptolemy's description; Ptolemy, however, has Pantomatrition lying west of Dion promontory, while the maps clearly locate Pantomatrition just east of the same promontory.
been accepted as a harbour of Eleutherna in modern scholarship, which also attributes Stavromenos, or, perhaps, both of them to this city.

The few Hellenistic and Roman remains from Panormo hinder any assessment of the site’s significance and suggest no particular connection to Eleutherna. Nevertheless, Pendlebury’s assumption on its size in Roman times and the impressive basilica of the 6th century A.D. that has been unearthed suggest the potentials of a systematic excavation in the area. On the other hand, the predominance of Eleuthernian coins of Hellenistic date around Stavromenos suggests a special connection between the two sites, which has already been postulated for the Iron Age (Section 2.3). Judging by the paucity of public inscriptions, especially of Hellenistic date, in the area of Chamalevri-Stavromenos, I assume that the site was dependent from Eleutherna. Accordingly, the ancient wall, the breadth of which was 2m., that was revealed for more than 100m. in a 19th century excavation along the bank of river Arsaniotis (west of Stavromenos) perhaps set the northern border between Eleutherna and the neighbouring Rithymna in the Hellenistic period. In any case, the Late Classical-Roman tombs that cover the coastal zone from Palaiokastro/Stavromenos to Sfakaki suggest that this fertile area was well-populated in antiquity, as it is today.

---

2471 Svoronos 1890, 128. Chaniotis 1987, Appendix with tables of Cretan poleis and dependent communities. Faraklas et al. 1998, 81. Le Rider cites only one coin that was said to come from Panormo; it is Axian (Le Rider 1966, 254).
2476 Pendeley 1939, 370.
2477 Sanders 1982, 117-118, 162.
2479 Public inscriptions are commonly attested in independent Cretan cities.
2480 Stones from this wall were later incorporated in the church of the Arsani Monastery (Troulis 1992, 37. Stratidakis 1994, 115).
Although Bali/Astali is often connected to Eleutherna, as suggested above, some scholars prefer to associate it with Axos. The few, mostly Roman remains do not support any case, but the Stadiasmus links Bali/Astali to Eleutherna by providing the distance between them. This text, however, does not mention Axos, as if it had no harbour, which is highly unlikely. The main harbour of Axos was, however, probably lying on the bay of Sises, which is the closest coast for the Axians. The connection between Axos and the bay of Sises is traced back to the Archaic period, as discussed in Section 2.3. Given that both Eleutherna and Axos were mainly served by some other harbour, the geographical isolation that Mount Kouloukonas imposes to Bali/Astali, as well as the scarcity of pre-Roman remains from the site and its neglect by Ptolemy and Pliny, I assume that Bali/Astali did not serve as a harbour of any regional significance before Late Antiquity.

In conclusion, there is no concrete evidence to suggest that any of the three sites discussed served as a harbour Eleutherna in Hellenistic and later periods. In contrast to Stavromenos and Bali/Astali, Panormo undoubtedly fell within the territory of Eleutherna in the Hellenistic times. Stavromenos is, however, the closest shore for the Eleuthernians and the only coastal site that has produced evidence for connections with Eleutherna.


2482 Naval Intelligence Division 1945, 205-206, 252.
2484 Early scholars cited in Platon 1948, 360, footnote 41. Kirsten 1949, 831. Guarducci treats Bali in connection with both Axos and Eleutherna (see Guarducci 1939, 43, 142 respectively).
2486 The route is less than 20km. long: Stefanakis 1998, 99. Stefanakis locates ancient Kytaion, which was probably dependent from Axos, on this bay.
2487 For an Axian, Bali is accessible through a mountain path that heads off the village of Agia, in the central Mylopotamos (the path is noted both on Map 2b and on the map of the Geographical Service of the Greek army), or through a much longer (around 30km. according to Stefanakis 1998, 99), but less demanding route that circumvents Kouloukonas and passes through Melidoni (Pendlebury 1939, 12). An Eleuthernian would also approach Bali through Melidoni.
1.2.2 *The limits of the territory of Eleutherna*

The discussion on the harbour(s) of Eleutherna has identified the north limit of the Eleuthernian territory with the coastal front that extends from the area of Stavromenos to west of Panormo. The southern limit is marked by Mount Ida (Psiloritis), a no man’s land, poor in drinkable water$^{2488}$ for most part. It is hardly coincidental that no modern village lies south of Eleutherna.

The south-west border of the ancient city should probably be located in the vicinity of the Arcadi monastery; the area lies less than one hour’s walk to the south-west of Eleutherna, but almost two hours to the north of Eleutherna’s important southern neighbour, ancient Sybrita.$^{2489}$ Traditionally, this area was traversed by a path that followed the western edge of the Mavrou Korifi peak (944m.), on which a Minoan peak sanctuary has been traced,$^{2490}$ and linked the south and the north part of the Rethymnon nome.$^{2491}$ Nevertheless, the path diverged at this point, either towards Eleutherna or towards the modern village of Amnatos.

The area of Amnatos is connected to Arcadi by a gorge, the north entrance of which is guarded by a Classical and later hilltop site.$^{2492}$ Faure suggested$^{2493}$ that Amnatos was not lying in the territory of Eleutherna, the western territorial limit of which probably ranged from the peak called Mavrou Korifi (944m.) to the south, to Stavromenos to the north, largely coinciding with the border of the modern districts of Rethymnon and Mylopotamos. The Gipofarango gorge and the Stamata river, whose northern end is called Arcadiotis river, mark the axis and form a natural border significant enough to be commented by the Naval Intelligence Division.$^{2494}$

Interestingly, a fort has been identified on each bank of the river, recalling the

$^{2488}$ Naval Intelligence Division 1945, 206-207 (Psiloritis is poor in springs).

$^{2489}$ For the testimony of Scylax’s and other references to the geography of Sybrita see Guarducci 1939, 289. For the distance between Sybrita and Eleutherna see: Pashley 1837, 308-309, 311. Kanta 1994, 67. This route is documented by the Tabula Peutingeriana: Bosio 1983, 143, pl. 44. In recent times, it was followed by Evans and Halbherr in 1894 (references cited in Rocchetti 1994, 231-233. See above for Pashley). For a discussion of this route see: Kanta 1994, 67-68, 72. Scafa 1994 (particularly pages 179, 182). For the few archaeological traces between the Arcadi Monastery and Sybrita see Belgiojoro 1994, 222, 225.

$^{2490}$ Hood, Warren and Cadogan 1964, 67-69: the hill is called Perisakia; its antiquities were fully destroyed by deep ploughing in 1974 (Stratidakis 1994, 110). The walk from the village of Amnatos to Arcadi takes forty-five minutes (Pashley 1837, 313. Kanta 1994, 67).

$^{2491}$ Kanta 1994, 67.

$^{2492}$ Faure 1960, 205.

$^{2493}$ Naval Intelligence Division 1948, 233.
reference to forts in two Hellenistic treaties of Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{2495} On the east bank, to the side of Eleutherna, Pendlebury identified a Roman fort on the hill Tsidhos/Tsidhais, less than 2km. south of modern Roupes and Skouloufia.\textsuperscript{2496} In this area, a Hellenistic settlement of considerable size, which commands an excellent view to the sea, is currently being excavated.\textsuperscript{2497} Interestingly, finds include parts of Archaic pithoi. On the west bank, in mid-distance between Chamalevri and Amnatos, just north-west of the previous site, a Hellenistic fort was located.\textsuperscript{2498} Thus, both landscape features and survey evidence, support Faure’s hypothesis for the west limit of the territory of Eleutherna. I would only note that river Arsaniotis (not Arcadiotis) probably set the north-west border of the Eleuthernian territory.\textsuperscript{2499}

On the other hand, there is no significant evidence for the eastern limit of the territory in question, which would divide the Mylopotamos plain into a western part, controlled by Eleutherna, and an eastern part, dominated by Axos. As the crow flies, the midpoint of the distance between these two sites falls between two streams, which run in ravines that extend from south to north and meet river Geropotamos/Oaxos, the latter flowing from east to west in this area. Thus, it is possible that one of these streams, though not necessarily the same throughout antiquity, was serving as the border of these two ancient cities.

The north-south axis marked by the western stream is reinforced by the east end of Mount Kouloukonas. Besides, the area of modern Choumeri has produced archaeological evidence on both banks: a pair of LM III tombs and a Roman settlement have been located on the eastern bank, while a Venetian fort on the western one.\textsuperscript{2500} Further south, near the village of Keramota, which lies directly west of Eleutherna, two 4\textsuperscript{th} century graves have been discovered.\textsuperscript{2501} On the other hand, no ancient remains have yet been located along the eastern stream, even though this is largely due to the state of research in the area. This stream runs in a steeper ravine

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{2495} Chaniotis 1996, 276-280, number 37, line 15; number 38, line 16. Such references are, however, typically attested in treaties between Cretan cities.
\item \textsuperscript{2496} Pendlebury 1939, 366 (map 23), 371. Pendlebury calls the site Tsidhais/Tzidhais. Map 2a calls this site Tsdhos.
\item \textsuperscript{2497} Andreadaki-Vlasaki forthcoming. Andreadaki-Vlasaki 2004, 38-39.
\item \textsuperscript{2498} Faure 1962, 41: on a site called Kastrokefala.
\item \textsuperscript{2499} See Section I.2.1.
\item \textsuperscript{2501} Platon 1953, 490. Sanders 1982, 163.
\end{itemize}
and carries more water than the previous one. The north-south axis is further strengthened by geography. The stream springs from a point where the slopes of Mount Ida advance north (Kopidha peak),\textsuperscript{2502} while the village of Agia, through which the path that connects Axos and Bali/Astali runs, is located further north.

In conclusion, the picture is unclear, particularly due to the scarcity of archaeological finds. Geomorphology favours the eastern stream, but in that case, Axos is left with almost no lowland fields in the Mylopotamos plain. The fertile area between the two streams is more easily accessible for the Axians, who were otherwise surrounded by mountains and would probably invest much effort in occupying it. On these grounds, I assume that the western stream served as the limit between the territories of Eleutherna and Axos.

Despite the uncertainties presented above, I assume that in the Hellenistic period, the territory of Eleutherna covered no more, but probably less, than $2/5$ of the modern district of Mylopotamos, that is no more than circa 200 km.\textsuperscript{2}. Consequently, the territory of Eleutherna was roughly as large as that of Lato and Kydonia, but smaller than that of Knossos, Gortyn and Lyktos.\textsuperscript{2503}

\subsection*{1.2.3 Routes within the territory of Eleutherna}

Archaeological evidence supplements geography in outlining some routes that crossed the Eleuthernian territory.

The valley of Alpha was probably the main gateway to Eleutherna, at least in Late Antiquity, judging by the numerous Roman and Early Christian rock-cut tombs that cover the hilly terrain,\textsuperscript{2504} as well as the two Roman baths that have been unearthed in the vicinity of Alpha.\textsuperscript{2505} Two routes coming from Alpha, one heading north-west and the other north-east, were crossing the plain of Mylopotamos and led to coastal sites.

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{2502} Faraklas favours this boundary: Faraklas et al. 1998, 77.
\item \textsuperscript{2503} Benett 1990, 202, table 3 (for the size of the territories of Lato, Kydonia, Knossos, Gortyn and Lyktos); 206, table 4 (for the size of the Mylopotamos district).
\end{footnotes}
The former route linked Eleutherna and Stavromenos (for the connection of these two sites in the Iron Age see Section 2.3). Roman finds illuminate the course of this route: a paved road was discovered near the village of Nea Magnesia, while further south, at Viran Episkopi, by which a Roman settlement has been located, a Roman inscription referring to the construction of roads with money provided by the sanctuary of Diktynna in north-west Crete has been found. This evidence suggests that the route that linked Eleutherna and Stavromenos was incorporated in the major artery that ran between Gortyn and the sanctuary of Diktynna during Roman times.

The route leading northeast of Alpha, to eastern Mylopotamos, as well as to Panormo and Bali, was rivalled by the path that passed through Margarites. In both cases, however, the traveller had to cross river Geropotamos/Oaxos, the main ford of which was probably located close to the Minoan - Iron Age site of Grivila, which was discussed in Section 2.3, and modern Perama (=ford). The walk from Eleutherna to Grivila would take two or three hours. Roman remains have been located both at Grivila and on a site on the opposite, west bank. Given that Geropotamos/Oaxos was called Aulopotamos in Medieval times, Platon suggested that Grivila was called Αὐλόδον (=channel). Nevertheless, this ancient toponym is commonly identified with the village of Agioi Deka, near Gortyn, while Faraklas locates it on the north part of the Amari valley. In any case, the

---

2510 Although Perama was destroyed during the Turkish conquest of the island, the site continued to serve as a ford, albeit controlled by Turkish outlaws (Spanakis 1993, 626).
2511 Pendlebury 1939, 12.
2512 Faure 1964, 136.
2513 Pendlebury 1939, 370. Hood, Warren and Cadogan 1964, 56. For earlier finds see Section 2.3.
2514 Pendlebury 1939, 370. The reliability of this information is questioned in Hood, Warren and Cadogan 1964, 56.
2515 Platon 1948, 362.
2517 Faraklas et al. 1998, 70.
ford would have prospered by facilitating the movement of people and goods within
the plain of Mypomotamos and serving the movement of pilgrims from the area on
the west bank of the river to the sanctuary in the cave of Melidoni. After all, Perama
was transformed from Pashley’s ‘wretched village’\textsuperscript{2518} to the prosperous town of
today mainly thanks to the now old highway that was constructed to pass through
it.\textsuperscript{2519}

Although cult persisted in the cave of Melidoni, it only flourished in Roman
times.\textsuperscript{2520} It was addressed to Hermes Talaios, according to a 3\textsuperscript{rd} century
inscription.\textsuperscript{2521} Melidoni is generally assumed to have fallen within the territory of
Eleutherna\textsuperscript{2522} and Faraklas suggests that the area was the home of the community of
the \textit{Artemitai}, which is mentioned in a late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century inscription from
Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{2523}

Another pilgrimage route, which largely crossed non-Eleuthernian territory,
however, connected Eleutherna to the sanctuary of Zeus in the Idaean Cave through
mountain paths.\textsuperscript{2524} Although drinkable water is rarely found in the itinerary through
Ida (Psiloritis),\textsuperscript{2525} the perennial spring of modest production that lies two-three hours
south - south-east of Eleutherna, at Aravanes,\textsuperscript{2526} is a common stop for modern hikers
from Eleutherna.\textsuperscript{2527} South-east of Aravanes, the hiker meets the foot of the highest
peak of Mount Ida, Timios Stavros (2456m.), by which an Archaic sanctuary,
probably dedicated to Zeus, has been identified.\textsuperscript{2528} The path turns east – south-east
and after circumventing the Kochri peak from the south, through the ravine that
separates it from Timios Stavros, it continues eastwards, following the lower parts of

\textsuperscript{2518} Pashley 1837, 125. 
\textsuperscript{2519} Spanakis 1993, 626. 
\textsuperscript{2520} For bibliography on Melidoni see Section 2.3. 
\textsuperscript{2521} Guarducci 1939, 302-304, number 2. 
Melidoni with Axos (Sporn 2002, 231-232). 
\textsuperscript{2523} Faraklas et al. 1998, 78. For the relation of this community to Eleutherna see: Guarducci 1939,
\textsuperscript{2524} The Cave is discussed in Section 2.3. 
\textsuperscript{2525} Naval Intelligence Division 1945, 206-207: subterranean channels direct water to lowland areas.
Consequently, no modern village is located south of Eleutherna. 
\textsuperscript{2526} For Neolithic to modern (including Iron Age) sherd s from Aravanes see Stampolidis 2000-2001, 
311. 
\textsuperscript{2527} The time estimates rely on information provided by modern Eleuthernians and the leaflet
produced by the local Cultural Society. For the path through Aravanes see Kalomenopoulos 1894, 
188. 
\textsuperscript{2528} Kritzas forthcoming.
the Kourouna peak (1850m.). At this point, the path meets the route that connects Axos to the Idaean Cave at approximately the 3/5 of the distance.\textsuperscript{2529} The latter path continues southwards, following the foot of the Kousaka peak (2209m.) and finally reaches the Idaean Cave.

Modern Eleuthemians proudly assert they have climbed on Timios Stavros, but I have not met anybody claiming to have walked to the Idaean Cave. Based on various reports, I have realised that an average modern person needs eight hours to walk to the root of Timios Stavros, while a group of young men to whom the paths were familiar managed to reach it in five hours (non-stop). I estimate that at least five more hours are demanded for the Cave itself. Hence, the Eleuthemian pilgrims’ itinerant demanded more than ten hours of walking on rough terrain, poor in water resources. Evidently, the ascent to the cave was easier for travellers from some other sites, particularly Axos.

To conclude, the limited and often problematic literary evidence for the Mylopotamos district and the limited archaeological research carried out in the area hinder any attempt for the mapping of the archaeological landscape of the Eleuthemian territory. Nevertheless, the information available for the Hellenistic and Roman times allows for a reliable reconstruction of much of the transportation network, including the harbours and land routes, as well as on the limits of the territory in question.

\textsuperscript{2529} The Idaean Cave is five hours away from Axos (Faure 1988, 84).