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ABSTRACT

The famous excavations of Sir Arthur Evans at Knossos produced vast quantities of ceramic material. This thesis presents a new analysis of the most important Knossian deposits assigned by Evans to the Middle Minoan IA (MM IA) phase in his system of classification of the Minoan Bronze Age. These deposits have never been systematically studied and are largely unpublished or inadequately published.

The first, introductory chapter of the thesis is a short discussion of the previous studies and current definitions of Knossian MM IA pottery, of the sources of information, and of the problems involved in the study of Evans' material. Chapter 2 deals with the deposits located in the West Court, such as Houses A, B and C, etc. Chapter 3 deals with the deposits located in the area of the Palace, such as the Vat Room, the Upper East Well, etc. Chapter 4 deals with the North Quarter of the City, a deposit from outside the area of the Palace. Chapters 2-4 present a detailed analysis of the pottery, based upon a re-examination of the relevant documentary sources (excavation notebooks etc.) and a first-hand knowledge of the ceramic material. Chapter 5 presents a typology of Knossian MM IA pottery and briefly discusses its production and decoration. The picture of Knossian MM IA pottery presented in this study is remarkably different from that of Evans. Chapter 6 discusses vases of foreign origin (and/or local imitations) found in Knossian MM IA deposits, Knossian MM IA vases (and/or
local imitations) found outside the Knossos region, and the implications for relative chronology. Chapter 7 summarizes the main results obtained by this study. There is a Catalogue of the complete and restorable vases from the various deposits discussed in the text, and Appendix I lists various Knossian MM IA deposits, including those which could not be included in the present study.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.

This chapter will discuss the development of the definition of Knossian MM IA, the sources of information, and the problems involved in the study of the material from Evans' excavations.

The chronological subdivision of Bronze Age Crete devised by Evans is, essentially, based upon the development of the ceramic styles and stratigraphy found in his excavations at Knossos.

In Evans' system of classification the phase defined as MM IA represents the period which immediately preceded the construction of the Old Palace at Knossos. Evans (1921, 127-131; 1928, 665-666) devoted several pages to the various "wall-tests" and other tests he made in order to ascertain the date of the construction of what he called the First Palace (e.g. the tests under the Theatral Area or under the Corridor of the Procession: see Appendix I nos. 2, 6, 8-9, 13-16, 26): although he never illustrated the material found in these tests, he stated that the latest fragments were always "early MM I", i.e. MM IA. Thus, he concluded that:

"... the foundation of the Palace at Knossos dates from a time when the remains of the earlier phase (a) of the MM I style was already stratified, or to shortly after 2000 B.C., the date of the beginning of the XII Dynasty of Egypt. By the close of MM Ib the Knossian Palace as we know it seems to have been laid out, including its enceinte and entrances and
the general disposition of its several quarters round the Central Court" (Evans 1921, 203).

According to Evans, the MM IA phase ended with a destruction, perhaps caused by an earthquake although he suggested that some of the deposits which he assigned to MM IA could also represent the remains of a methodical demolition connected with the construction of the Old Palace (Evans 1921, 175; 1928, 320 n. 3; see also Mackenzie 1906, 253, who speaks of a general "catastrophe" which marked the end of this phase). Further stratigraphical evidence is provided by the Test Pits sunk in the West Court in 1904-1905, and by the excavations conducted in 1930 in that area where deposits assigned to MM IA were found stratified below deposits belonging to MM IIA.¹

The term MM IA was coined by Evans in the first volume of the Palace of Minos (1921, 172). In the original notebooks and daybooks of the excavations, the pottery later assigned to this phase was called variously: Kamares (cf. Mackenzie 1901 PN, 86 and 1902 DB vol. II, 46); Geometric (cf. Mackenzie 1903 PN, 5-10); Early Minoan (cf. Evans 1903 NB, 2; Mackenzie 1903 PN, 5); and MM I only after 1905, i.e. after the discovery of House C (see Evans 1905, 16 ff. and below; cf. Mackenzie

¹. According to recent studies of Old Palace deposits from Evans' excavations it appears that the MM IB phase, as defined by Evans, did not exist. However, deposits found in the Royal Road excavations and, possibly, House C (see below and Chapter 2) may, perhaps, be assigned to this phase.
1907 DB, 1-2). The term "Geometric" describes what Evans and Mackenzie thought to be one of the main characteristics of this ceramic phase: the prevailing rectilinear character of the decorative motifs (specially the polychrome ones), as opposed to the greater variety and elaboration shown in the later "Kamares" ware. In the ESA reports which preceded the discovery of House C, deposits later assigned to MM IA, such as the Upper East Well, the North Quarter of the City, the Vat Room, and the Monolithic Pillar Basement, were classified as Early Minoan (cf. Evans 1903, 18-19 and 1904, 20).

In 1904 and 1905, various Test Pits were sunk in the West Court in order to recover a complete pottery sequence for the early history of Knossos. After the first season of investigations, Evans published the famous section of the West Court (1904, 19, fig. 7; see FIG. 1) which showed a gap for the MM I period. The gap was filled in the following year, by the discovery of House C. After Mackenzie had studied the pottery from these tests, it was recognised that the deposits previously assigned to the Early Minoan period belonged to the same ceramic phase as House C, which was then called MM I. The results of this study were presented by Mackenzie in an important article (Mackenzie 1906) in which he listed six major deposits that he considered to be contemporary for both stratigraphic and stylistic reasons. The deposits are: the Monolithic Pillar Basement, the Upper East Well, the Vat Room, the North
Quarter of the City, House C and an unpublished pit repository in the NE region of the Palace (see Appendix 1, no. 27). This group of deposits constitutes the basis for Evans' definition of MM IA. Mackenzie believed that these six deposits belonged to the same ceramic phase because of their "constant occurrence immediately underneath deposits - often floor deposits - of the second Middle Minoan period and sometimes above deposits of the Early Minoan period in general" and because of the occurrence of typical forms, such as the footed and footless goblet, the bridge-spouted jars decorated in "dark on light and light on dark with characteristic geometrico-curvilinear polychrome tendencies", and the beaked jugs "of the type with butterfly motive and its polychrome variants". It is, perhaps, worth mentioning that the deposits from the Early Magazines, discovered in 1900 and 1901, and later assigned by Evans to MM IA, are not included in this list; nor is the last deposit mentioned by Mackenzie - the pit in the NE region of the Palace with polychrome sherds - taken into account by Evans in his discussion of MM IA in the *Palace of Minos*. 2

After Mackenzie's article of 1906 and Evans' *Essai de classification des époques de la civilisation Minoenne*

---

2. It seems very likely that Mackenzie did not include the deposits from the Early Magazines because he had already realized that they belonged to a later phase, while Evans did not take into account the deposit from the pit in the NE region of the Palace because it was never illustrated; it may also have become very difficult, if not impossible, to locate the material by the time he came to write the *Palace of Minos*. 
(Evans 1906) one has to turn to the first and fourth volumes of the *Palace of Minos* for the definition of the MM IA ceramic phase. The first volume deals, essentially, with the deposits already discussed by Mackenzie (1906) and, in addition, with the Early Magazines mentioned above, and with other deposits discovered after 1906, such as the Early Hypogaeum, the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace, etc. The fourth volume presents the important deposits from Houses A and B below the Kouloures, discovered in 1930 and published by the Pendleburys (1930). Their article was supposed to be a preliminary report but remains the most extensive account of the excavation and finds from the two houses.

It is not easy to summarize Evans' definition of MM IA. That Evans occasionally changed his mind when assigning pottery to one or the other phase in the various volumes of the *Palace of Minos*, and in the early ESA reports is well-known (see, e.g., Walberg 1976, 108). MM IA is no exception: e.g., vases from East Crete are assigned to this phase in the first volume (Evans 1921, figs. 133-134) and to MM IB in the fourth (Evans 1935, fig. 66 a-e); similarly, a fine cup with "crocus flowers" from Knossos was once assigned to MM IA and then to MM IB (cf. Evans 1928, fig. 205 and Evans 1935, colour plate XVIII: c 1-3); and a footed goblet or "egg-cup" from the Upper East Well was assigned to MM IB in the first volume (Evans 1921, 181 fig. 129a) and to MM IA in the fourth
(Evans 1935, 102 fig. 68). Such changes of opinion, however, are what one might expect in a work written over such a long span of time, and they may best be considered to show gradual evolution of Evans' system of classification. Major difficulties are created by the lack of any systematic discussion of the characteristics of the various pottery phases and by the small amount of pottery illustrated. Again, this is not surprising: as Boardman (1963,4) and Popham (1970, 11) have rightly pointed out, the Palace of Minos is not—and was not intended to be—a site publication. Moreover, it was Mackenzie who was supposed to undertake the study and definitive account or publication of the pottery, but he was never able to fulfil this onerous task. Thus, one has to rely essentially upon what illustrations there are and to glean, whenever possible, more detailed information from the text of the Palace of Minos.

According to Evans, amongst the general characteristics of MM IA pottery was the widespread use of Dark on Light decoration and—in a mature phase of MM IA—of polychrome decoration (meaning the contemporary use of both white and red paint on a dark ground) consisting of geometric motives derived from the Neolithic repertoire (Evans 1921, 164, 177). Evans

3. According to MacGillivray (1986, 4) less than 100 vases and a few groups of sherds were used to illustrate the characteristics of the pottery of the Old Palace. As to the MM IA phase, about 65 vases and a dozen sherds were illustrated. Many of these vases, however, are later than MM IA, as will be demonstrated in the following chapters.
(1921, 110-111, fig. 78; 1935, 99 n. 1) believed that polychromy had already begun in EM III. This statement, however, was based upon a single stray-find from Knossos, purchased before the excavations begun, which is more likely to be a MM I or MM II import from the Messara (cf. Andreou 1978, 44; Bonacasa 1968). Evans also considered barbotine decoration to be characteristic of a mature phase of MM IA, specially the so-called "rockwork" or "barnacle" barbotine (Evans 1935, 87).

Other characteristics of MM IA are the use of a "bright red" or "vermilion" pigment, as opposed to the "Indian" red used in EM III (Evans 1921, 111 and n. 4, 168); sometimes, however, the red of MM IA is described as a "madder-red", in contrast with the "bright vermilion hue" of MM IB (cf. Evans 1935, 99). Evans noted the use of a "new clear white" opposed to the "dingy cream" of EM III (Evans 1921, 111). But, elsewhere, he called the MM IA white "creamy" (Evans 1935, 87), and Mackenzie (1903, 170 and 1906, 244) described MM IA white as dull, lustreless cream, contrasting with later phases in which it tends to become a paler white. The pigments used in the Kamares and Pre-Kamares periods (for the terminology and correlation to Evans' phases see Walberg 1976, 12) have been submitted to various analyses: it appears that the white of the Pre-Kamares period (i.e. EM III-MM IA) is a calcium silicate, while the Early Kamares (MM IB-MM IIA) white used in palatial workshops was talc; the calcium
Silicate is usually yellowish, brownish or greyish in comparison with the pure white of the talc pigment (Walberg 1983, 70). According to Walberg this seems to agree with Evans' description of the "dingy white" of EM III pottery but, in fact, this is only partly so, because, according to the analyses, calcium silicate was used throughout the Pre-Kamares period which includes MM IA, whereas Evans remarked a difference between the white of EM III and of MM IA pottery.

Thus, it seems quite clear that there is no agreement as to how the pigments used in EM III, MM IA and MM IB may be used to distinguish different pottery phases. (For other contradictory descriptions of the pigments used to distinguish pottery phases, see also Branigan 1970a, 32).

As to other technological aspects of MM IA, Evans noted that most of the pottery was hand-made and often showed traces of paring, although pottery made on the "slow wheel" and "egg-shell ware" had already made their first appearance in this phase (Evans 1921, 168-169).

Some of the typical ceramic forms found in MM IA deposits were the tumbler; the footless and footed goblet (the latter present in two varieties, one reminiscent of modern "egg-cups", the other funnel-shaped like a "wine glass"); the rounded cup; the beaked jug; the saucers and the platters; the bridge-spouted and side-spouted jars;
and the two-handled jar (Evans 1935, 82 ff.). As to the well-known burnished and incised ware specimens found in the Vat Room and in the Houses below the Kouloures, Evans' opinion changed considerably: initially he seemed to believe that some of them were actual imports from the Cyclades, but he later regarded this ware as typical of Knossian MM IA (cf. Chapter 3, 106-107). This is perhaps why a one-handed cup produced in this ware was used by Walberg (1976, 179 fig. 34, form 42: type 194; cf. Chapter 2, 71: House B no. 61) to illustrate the typical cup of her Pre-Kamares phase, even though this cup is quite different in fabric and surface treatment from the more common Knossian wares and, moreover, seems to be unique, since no other example has yet been found either at Knossos or elsewhere in the island.

Evans' system of classification has been widely criticized and rejected by many scholars (see, e.g., Hazzidakis 1918, 56-57; 1934, 77-78; Aberg 1933; Levi 1960, 1976; Platon 1968; Walberg 1976, 1983), but more recent excavations at Knossos suggest that the pottery sequence devised by Evans and Mackenzie is fundamentally correct, although susceptible of improvement. Sinclair Hood's Royal Road excavations of the late '50s-early '60s (Hood 1962 and 1966; final publication in preparation) have been particularly important for a new definition of the Prepalatial ceramic phases relevant to the present study. In a preliminary report Hood (1962) wrote:
"Early Minoan III, as this was defined by Evans, does not seem to exist at Knossos. Evans himself never identified a pure EM III deposit and he defined the period in terms of stray finds from Knossos itself and from deposits from other sites in East Crete. It looks very much as if the material which Evans grouped as EM III is contemporary with his MM IA at Knossos and some of his EM III material may be even later, contemporary with Knossian MM IB or MM II. On the other hand, the MM IA material at Knossos is vast in quantity. It probably covers quite a long period of time and is capable of subdivisions. In the earliest phase there appears to be no trace of polychrome decoration. This pre-polychrome phase might, therefore, perhaps be called EM III and it may be this phase that Evans meant by EM III at Knossos itself. But it must be emphasised that EM III defined in this way has few of the characteristics of EM III as defined by Evans."

The subdivision of MM IA suggested by Hood in this important article can be summarised as follow:

a) Pre-polychrome MM IA, which is now called EM III.
b) Polychrome MM IA.
c) Polychrome MM IA with spiral decoration.

Evans' definition of EM III, based on stray finds and vases from East Crete, and his terminology, which combines chronological and stylistic phases for all Crete, thus obscuring regional variations (Andreou 1978, 8) lie at the root of a well-known controversy amongst Minoan archaeologists. Because EM III pottery, as defined by Evans, was only found in East Crete, many scholars have questioned the existence of this pottery phase elsewhere. Warren (1965), Zois (1968b) and Andreou (1978) have provided clear and detailed accounts of the controversy. In particular, Warren and Andreou have

4. Hood now believes that this phase could be called MM IB (personal communication)
shown the right approach to the problem by stressing that we need first to define the pottery sequence on a regional scale and then to establish chronological relationships. Andreou's work is most valuable, since it represents the first detailed attempt to illustrate the various regional styles and their complicated relative chronology for the EM III-MM III period.

Although Andreou's principal aim was the relative chronology of his pottery groups in the EM III-MM III period in all Crete, his work also represents the most up-to-date study of the EM III-MM IA ceramic phase at Knossos. An earlier study on palatial Kamares pottery by Walberg (1976) constitutes an important contribution to the artistic analysis of Middle Minoan pottery, but needs only a brief mention here: while her analysis of later (MM IB-IIIB) pottery deposits had wider implications, her analysis of the MM IA pottery from Knossos basically consists of a rearrangement, according to her stylistic criteria, of the pottery assigned by Evans to this phase and illustrated in the *Palace of Minos*. Her classification will not be taken into account in the present study because ceramics will be treated here essentially as archaeological finds not as "artistic entities" (cf. Walberg 1976, 11).

As mentioned above, Hood's excavations of the Royal Road provided new criteria for the definition of EM III and MM IA pottery. Thus, Andreou (1978, 12-16 and 26-
following Hood's suggestion that EM III at Knossos is represented by a pre-polychrome phase with characteristics usually assigned to MM IA, redated to EM III the following deposits which had been used by Evans to illustrate the MM IA phase: the Upper East Well, and, possibly, the North Quarter of the City and the "lower" floor of House B. As to MM IA, Andreou used the following deposits to represent this phase: House A, the "higher" floor of House B, House C and a "floor deposit" at 1.20m. found in Test Pit 14. Andreou considered the Vat Room and the Monolithic Pillar basement deposits to be too mixed to be of any use.

The presence of polychrome decoration in MM IA deposits and its absence in EM III is the fundamental and almost only criterion used to distinguish between the two phases. Indeed, Andreou (1978, 16, 24) remarked that the similarity between Knossian EM III and MM IA is such that it is, sometimes, very difficult, if not impossible, to assign single vases or even whole deposits to one or the other phase. In spite of these difficulties, the presence/absence of polychromy is generally accepted as the most useful indicator to distinguish between the two phases (see, e.g., Betancourt 1985, 71; Walberg 1987, 281). The presence of polychrome decorated pottery is

5. For other minor deposits assigned by Andreou to EM III see Chapter 3, 127-131.

6. The "floor deposit" from TP 14 is, in fact, House C and not a separate deposit, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 2.
also used to define the beginning of MM IA in East Crete (Betancourt 1984a, 6), while the first extensive use of wheel-made pottery helps to distinguish between MM IA and MM IB/IIA, as "MM IA is the last period in Crete to use only handmade pottery" (Betancourt 1985, 71).

After Andreou's study, A. MacGillivray's work on Kamares pottery from Evans' excavation at Knossos (MacGillivray 1986) has resulted in the most important implications for the definition of the MM IA phase: according to MacGillivray, certain deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA, such as the Early Magazines I and II and part of the Vat Room, actually belong to the MM IIA destruction levels.

To sum up, it would seem that the group of deposits assigned by Evans to a single ceramic phase, which he called MM IA, is not, in fact, a homogeneous group, but comprises deposits which various scholars have assigned to EM III, MM IA, MM IB = and MM IIA.

Andreou's (1978) and MacGillivray's research (1986) upon, respectively, EM III-MM IA (Pre-Kamares) and MM IB/IIA-IIIA (Kamares) pottery have greatly improved our understanding of the pottery sequence at Knossos.

7. At Knossos, however, a distinction between MM IA and MM IB is provided by the presence, in the latter phase, of spiraliform decoration (cf. above and n. 4).

8. Hood believes that House C should be dated to this phase (personal communication; see also Chapter 2, 88-90).
However, while MacGillivray's work is a very detailed and comprehensive study of the pottery used in the Old Palace period at Knossos, Andreou's work consists of a general survey of the EM III-MM III styles and their chronological relationships throughout the island: for this reason his definition of the EM III-MM IA Knossian phase is based upon a rather limited—although carefully selected—body of material. The promising results obtained by Macgillivray's new analysis of the MM IB-MM III material from Evans' excavations made it seem worthwhile to attempt a similar study of the Knossian deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA. Not only did it seem necessary to examine and illustrate a larger body of material than Evans, in order to produce a more detailed and comprehensive study, but it also seemed necessary to assess more carefully the context and the provenance of the pottery by means of an extensive use of all the available sources of information.

The sources of information can be broadly divided into two categories: the written sources; and the pottery itself, being that traditionally assigned to MM IA, which is kept in various museums both in Greece and Britain. The written sources may be further subdivided into primary and secondary sources. By primary written sources is meant the accounts written in the actual years

9. In particular, it seems that Andreou, for practical constraints, was not able to study most of the complete vases from the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA which are kept in the Knossos Stratigraphical Museum (KSM) and in the Herakleion Museum (HM).
of the excavation, such as Mackenzie's daybooks and Evans' annual reports, or the numbers and other details inscribed on the pottery itself by the excavators. With a few differences, the written sources used in the present study are those discussed at length by Palmer (1963, x-xiii, 4-7), Boardman (1963, 1-5) and -best- by Popham (1970, 11-15): Mackenzie's daybooks and pottery notebooks, his two articles in JHS (1903, 1906); a letter to Evans published by Palmer (1969, 149-151; see, also, Palmer 1963, xii); Evans' notebooks, his annual reports in BSA, the Palace of Minos, and his Photographic Archive kept in the Ashmolean Museum (AM); J. D. S. and H. W. Pendlebury's article on the Houses below the Kouloures discovered during the 1930 excavations; A Guide to the Stratigraphical Museum in the Palace at Knossos (Pendlebury et al. 1933-35); the wooden labels and the corresponding details inscribed on the boxes containing the pottery and other finds in the KSM (see Popham 1970, 12-13); numbers and other information inscribed on the pots and sherds; and the catalogues, inventories, and registers of the Museums which possess the pottery examined in the present work.

The primary written sources are invaluable for understanding the contexts and the nature of the deposits. Indeed, it is widely accepted that the primary sources in these matters are more reliable than secondary ones, such as the Palace of Minos (Palmer 1963, x-xiii; Boardman 1963, 4-5; Popham 1970, 15). It is regrettable
that the primary sources sometimes give inadequate information and that some of the daybooks and notebooks are now lost.

Daybooks, notebooks and Evans' Archive are also invaluable for reassembling the various deposits and checking the surviving archaeological material.

The surviving material from Evans' excavations usually consists only of a small part of what was actually found because, in the first place, it was subject to a preliminary selection made by Mackenzie; sometimes it is possible to have some idea of the quantity (measured in "baskets" or number of sherds) and of the nature of the pottery which was discarded.\textsuperscript{10} From Mackenzie's pottery notebooks it appears that the pottery which he rejected usually consisted of the coarse, plain wares or the decorated wares of which better examples had been kept. The surviving pottery was thought to comprise the best and most diagnostic pieces, but we cannot know how representative of the whole this sample is. It is, perhaps, fair to assume that the surviving pottery is representative of at least a class of ware, i.e. the fine painted ware, or more generally of the decorated wares. It seems very likely that nearly all of the polychrome

---

\textsuperscript{10}. For example, in the case of the Upper East Well at least 24 baskets and a considerable number (at least 427) of loose sherds were discarded (cf. Mackenzie 1901 PN, 86-91; 1902 PN, 1-8).
pottery was kept. It is obvious, however, that this material cannot be used for quantitative analysis.

The preliminary selection operated by Mackenzie is not the only limitation presented by Evans' material. For example, the pottery which is the subject of this study was excavated, in most cases, more than 80 years ago and, since then, has suffered many vicissitudes. The misfortunes of the material now kept in the KSM have been thoroughly described by Pendlebury (Pendlebury et al. 1933-35, 1-3) and Popham (1970, 12): missing, misplaced, illegible labels, rotting boxes, frequent rehousing with consequent loss or misplacement of material, and specially the fact that, in a large number of cases, the pottery from different levels was not kept separate (cf. Boardman 1963, 3; Popham 1970, 11; cf., also, Chapter 3, 141 and 146): these all constitute serious obstacles to a reassessment of the deposits. For example, it is sometimes not possible to establish whether material which appears to be later than one would expect has been misplaced, or has come from other levels and has not been kept separate, or does in fact belong to the original assemblage of finds and, therefore, requires that the date of the deposit be changed.

The material kept in other museums often presents similar limitations: in the case of unpublished pottery (or pottery unrecorded in some other way by the excavators) it is almost impossible to retrace the
provenance, since in most cases the inventory books give only the name of the site and the year in which the vase or sherd was given to or purchased by the museum. If on the one hand it is no longer possible to give a proper context to a considerable amount of material, on the other some of the pottery illustrated by Evans and Mackenzie can no longer be located. This often makes it impossible to reassemble completely the original deposits.

Indeed, one may wonder whether it is worth studying material which presents so many difficulties. In the first place, this material deserves to be studied because it is upon these deposits that Evans and Mackenzie devised the system of classification for Minoan Crete which is still widely accepted and used today. Second, in spite of preliminary selections and subsequent losses, the material from Evans' excavations is vast in quantity and only a small part of it has been published, studied and even, in some cases, properly washed. Although it is clear that this material has lost a large part of its potential information, its study is still rewarding: indeed, new analyses and fuller publications of deposits from Evans' excavations have already added considerably to our understanding not only of the pottery, but also of the history of the site in general (see, e.g., Popham 1970; Macgillivray 1986).
It has already been pointed out that Evans assigned a very large number of deposits to MM IA (cf. Appendix 1). In spite of the preliminary selection and rejection of pottery made at the time of the excavations, so great a quantity of this material still survives as to necessitate further selection.

First, only some of the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA have been chosen for re-examination here. The evidence of the written accounts, supported by personal observation, suggests that many are small and mixed deposits in which only some of the pottery found may be assigned to MM IA: in many cases, this comprises extremely fragmentary material. Such deposits did not seem likely to advance greatly our understanding of the basic characteristics of MM IA pottery (although they may, of course, be of great value for other purposes, such as dating certain structures). Moreover, Evans' definition of MM IA ultimately relies upon a small number of deposits, which will be discussed in the present study and are listed below in roughly chronological order of discovery:

- The deposits below Magazines 1 and 2, excavated respectively in 1901 and 1900.
- The Upper East Well (also known as the Well to the West of the Court of the Stone Spout), excavated in 1901-1902.
- The North Quarter of the City, the Vat Room deposit and the Monolithic Pillar Basement, all excavated in 1903 (a
test pit, however, had already been sunk in 1900 in the latter deposit).
- House C, excavated in 1904-1905.
- The large deposits from Houses A and B below the Kouloures (including the deposit from the Well to the North of House A), excavated in 1930.

A few more deposits, although they were not as important for the understanding of Evans' definition of MM IA, have also been included because, according to the written accounts, they seemed of particular interest for their stratigraphic position, for their ceramic contents, or as evidence of Prepalatial occupation. These deposits are:
- The Tholos or Early Hypogaeum below the South Porch, excavated from 1907-1910.
- The EM III-MM IA deposit from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace, excavated in 1908.
- The MM IA deposit below the Loom Weight Basement, excavated in 1920.
- The deposit from a Test Pit below the paving of the House of the Chancel Screen, excavated in 1926.

Although these deposits have been listed here in a chronological order of discovery, in the following chapters they have been arranged according to their location. Thus, Chapter 2 will discuss the deposits located in the West Court, Chapter 3 the deposits located
in the area of the Palace and Chapter 4 the deposits located outside the area of the Palace.

Second, after a thorough re-examination of all of the deposits listed above, only some of the material has actually been selected for description in this study. Even had time and financial resources allowed, it would probably not have been worth cataloguing and illustrating all of the material. However, all of the complete and restorable vases, which have a more or less reliable provenance, have been catalogued, drawn and/or photographed, and in some cases it seemed appropriate to include some of the fragments. Particular attention has been paid to complete, intact, or restorable vases for the following reasons. First, the written sources state quite clearly that most of the material traditionally assigned to MH IA came from "floor deposits". By this Mackenzie and Evans usually meant deposits in which complete or restorable pots were found resting on a floor. Thus, bearing in mind that material from different levels is often kept together in the KSM, I have assumed that the complete vases were more likely to belong to the original "floor deposits" than sherds and that they are therefore more representative of this

11. Each deposit has a separate catalogue and separate numeration. Only the Early Magazines and the MH IA deposit below the Loom Weight Basement have no catalogue; but two vases belonging to the former could be found; and one cannot be sure that the very fragmentary material in the KSM, which is labelled as belonging to the latter deposit, does actually belong to it (see Chapter 3, 109-113).
pottery phase. Second, the fragmentary material in most cases consists of sherds which belong to shapes and show decorative motifs already represented by complete examples. Although sherds were not used for typological purposes or to provide further illustrations of the deposits discussed in the present study, all relevant ceramic material has been taken into account in the reassessment of these deposits.

In order to avoid confusion, it is necessary to anticipate here some of the conclusions drawn from the new analyses of the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA, which have been listed above and will be discussed in the following chapters. This group of deposits is not homogeneous: some deposits clearly belong to the MM IIA phase as defined by MacGillivray (1986). Several deposits, however, do share a substantial number of ceramic types and a similar stratigraphy and, therefore, can be taken to represent a single pottery phase. Since these deposits were assigned by Evans to MM IA, it seemed convenient to retain his terminology. But it has to be stressed that MM IA thus defined is remarkably different from both Evans and Hood's definitions of MM IA. MM IA as defined in the present study appears to be more similar to Hood's pre-polychrome MM IA or EM III (cf. Hood 1962; Andreou 1978). The characteristics of Knossian MM IA and various problems concerning the choice of terminology will be discussed in Chapter 5.
Largely because of the obstacles and limitations discussed above, I have often had to work upon the basis of presumption and hypothesis and I am well aware that this may have vitiated some of my conclusions. But such presumptions and hypotheses will be clearly and explicitly indicated throughout the present work.
CHAPTER 2: DEPOSITS IN THE WEST COURT.

This chapter will discuss the main deposits in the West Court of the Palace which were assigned by Evans to MM IA: the deposits from Houses A, B and C, and the small deposit from the Well to the North of House A. In addition, I shall discuss the deposit from the Area encircling the Middle Kouloura, and a group of unpublished vases kept in the HM and inventoried as coming from a "MM IA Oikia" which, although they are later in date, are connected with the Houses below the Kouloures.

The deposits from Houses B and C are the most interesting in this group. That from House B is important for three reasons: first, it is the largest MM IA deposit yet found at Knossos and best illustrates the main fabrics, forms, and decorative motifs of this phase; second, it has yielded vases which attest to contacts not only with other regions of Crete but also with other parts of the Aegean; and, last but not least, the re-examination of the pottery assigned by the excavators and consequently by Evans and other scholars to Houses A and B best illustrates how a cursory stylistic analysis of the ceramic material, and of its stratigraphy, provenance, and context, have contributed to produce a distorted picture of Knossian MM IA pottery.
The deposit from House C is important for a very different reason: because it may be the only deposit from the old excavations at Knossos to represent the MM IB phase (Hood, personal communication; see, also, MacGillivray 1986, 19-20). Evans' definition of the MM IB phase at Knossos relied entirely upon the deposit from the Chamber below the West Court, discovered during the excavations of Test Pit 4 (Evans 1921, 186 ff. figs. 135-136). However, more recent studies by Walberg (1976, 119-121) and MacGillivray (1986, 12-23, 115-119) have shown that this deposit belongs to a stylistic and chronological phase represented by other deposits, such as the Royal Pottery Stores and the Room of the Olive Press: this phase is called Classical Kamares by Walberg, and MM IIA by MacGillivray. Thus, the MM IB phase at Knossos, as defined by Evans, does not seem to have existed. However, Hood has now proposed that the deposit from House C be dated to MM IB, and his new definition of this phase fills the gap in the traditional pottery sequence. Other deposits which have been taken to represent the MM IB phase at Knossos were found during Hood's excavation of the Royal Road (1962, where this phase was called MM IA with spiral decoration; cf. Chapter 1, 26), but they remain unpublished.

1. HOUSES A AND B

(Main Bibliography: Aberg 1933, 174-5 figs. 323-4; Andreou 1978, 26-28; Evans 1935, 66-95, figs. 50-55; Hood
Houses A and B were discovered during the excavations in the West Court conducted by H.W and J.D.S. Pendlebury in 1930 (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930). The deposits from the two houses constitute the largest assemblage yet found at Knossos of pottery traditionally assigned to MM IA. Given the importance of these deposits, which formed "practically a complete corpus of MM IA pottery" (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 61), they were immediately published by the excavators in a preliminary report which, nonetheless, remains the most extensive account of the excavations and of the finds.

House A lay below the Central Kouloura (or Kouloura II, see FIGS. 2-5). The complete house plan was not recovered because it was too dangerous to dig immediately behind the Kouloures walls and because, at least in the area to the North, the MM IA levels had been cut into by later houses. The area excavated revealed two communicating rooms with their floors at slightly different levels. The foundations of the walls, which were lined with rough masonry, were cut into the Neolithic layers. Both walls and floors were covered with red plaster, but the Southern and smaller room had subsequently been whitewashed. Five steps led down to the Northern room which had a circular depression in the middle of its floor, interpreted as a basin to catch
liquid offerings. The excavators attributed a religious function to the room, remarking that it had the character of a crypt, being partially below ground. According to the excavators, when the Central Kouloura was constructed (possibly in MM IIa or later; see MacGillivray 1986, 25 and below), the walls of House A were torn down and earth was thrown into the rooms to form a flat surface. For this reason, the levels sealed below this surface were considered to be uncontaminated. There are no boxes in the KSM with pottery or other material specifically assigned to this fill from either House A or House B, but it seems extremely unlikely that the earth thrown into the rooms could have been completely devoid of material.

House B lay directly above the Neolithic levels and below and outside the Western Kouloura (Kouloura III); some of its Northern rooms were cut by the Great West Enceinte Wall (see FIGS. 2-4, 6). In this case too the complete house plan was not recovered, for the reasons mentioned above. As shown in FIG. 6, two rooms (1 and 2) lay at the bottom of the Kouloura while further North, outside the Kouloura wall, other rooms, corridors, and magazines (2a and 3-8) were found, some at a higher level (5-8). Rooms 1-4 lay partly below ground but the stairs leading to them were not found. According to the excavators, evidence of an upper storey consisted of red plaster which they identified as the floor which had fallen to various levels in Room 4. As in the case of House A, the excavators maintained that the MM IA levels
were not contaminated by the levelling and other activities related to the construction of Kouloura III.

Two superimposed floors were found in rooms 1 and 2 of House B (FIG. 6). The Pendleburys (and Evans) believed that the pottery from both floors belonged to one single ceramic phase, but they remarked that the "lower" floor lacked the polychrome sherds so abundant on the "higher" one.

Many problems have emerged from my re-examination of the excavators' report and of the surviving material from the two houses. In the following pages, by means of a new analysis of the pottery, its context and provenance, it will be argued that a large proportion of the published (and unpublished) material assigned to the two houses and to the MM IA phase comes from mixed and later levels or, indeed, from areas and rooms which do not belong to Houses A and B.

The analysis of the pottery from the two houses, based on comparisons with other Knossian deposits, shows very clearly that the vases and fragments assigned by the Pendleburys to MM IA do not constitute a homogeneous assemblage. Indeed, as will demonstrated below, the quantity of later material probably surpasses the number of vases that, stylistically, can be assigned to the MM IA phase.
More than 70 complete vases (see House B nos. 86-125 and House A nos. 17-63) and many fragments, which are kept and inventoried in the KSM with the MM IA material from the two houses, are much later in date. Some examples are illustrated in FIG. 17 and PLS. 2, 13. They belong to MacGillivray's (1986, 186-194) MM II-III A types "thrown off the cone" which are so common in the levels above Houses A and B, i.e. in the MM III A deposit from the fill of the Kouloures (MacGillivray's group E). The Fendleburys believed this later material to be MM IA: first, one of these MM II-III types was published by them as belonging to the MM IA deposit from House B (House B no. 86, FIG. 17). Second, they remarked the presence of wheel-made vases, showing string-marks under their bases (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 69): the remark certainly refers to vases "thrown off the cone", which alone, amongst the material assigned to the houses, show clear string-marks. Third, the mention of saucers

1. Only a few specimens are kept in the HM.

2. Most of these vases are marked in ink "N 18" and "N II". This, as will be demonstrated below, indicates that they come, respectively, from the area of Kouloures II and III. As they belong to very standardised, mass-produced MM II-III A types and are most likely to come from a deposit thoroughly studied by MacGillivray (1986, group E), they have not been described in detail: they are listed in the catalogues of the pottery from Houses A and B but only museum numbers and bibliographical references (MacGillivray's types) are given. They will be properly published by MacGillivray with the rest of the deposit to which they are more likely to belong.

3. Concentric or horse-shoe shaped marks are usually left under the base of a pot when it is detached from the turning wheel with a string. MacGillivray (1986, 24), who had not seen these vases, suggested that this remark
(Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 59) must also refer to this kind of vessels, since there is no other material from Houses A and B which could fit this description. Finally, in their dating of the pottery in the KSH, the Pendleburys classified the whole assemblage of finds from Houses A and B, from the Well to the North of House A and from the Area encircling the Middle Kouloura as "MM IA; a few intrusive Neolithic" (Pendlebury et al. 1933-35). Unfortunately, it is not possible to establish in which of the two floor levels of House B the vases "thrown off the cone" were found, although it would make more sense to assume that they came from the "higher floor level" (FIG. 6; see below).4

Apart from the complete vases, a considerable quantity of later material can also be found in the KSH boxes containing fragments from the two houses. In the case of House A, the later fragmentary material does not occur in large amounts: it basically comprises a couple of sherds from MM II carinated cups (FIG. 12: A, B) and some fragments from MM II-IIIA pedestalled lamps (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 195-197 and Vat Room no. 49). However, the quantity of later fragments kept in the KSH boxes assigned to House B is quite remarkable and, refers to some MM IIA material to be related to the fill of the houses.

4. With the exception of four vases (nos. 27, 39, 61, 62) which, according to the excavators, come from the "lower" floor of House B, it is no longer possible to establish whether a complete vase came from the "lower" or "higher" floor of the house.
indeed, had already been noticed by Andreou (1978, 27-28). The vast majority of the later fragments from House B can be assigned to MM IIA and MM IIIA (see PL. 16: C, where a selection of MM II-III sherds is illustrated).

Later material can be found in all the boxes with the pottery from House B, but is particularly abundant in the boxes which contain the pottery from the "higher floor" and "upper storey" levels of the house (as well as in the boxes which contain the best sherds: see Table 1, FIG. 44). The excavators remarked that the "lower" floor lacked the polychrome sherds so abundant on the "higher" one. On the basis of this observation, Andreou (1978, 15) suggested that the pottery from the "lower" floor of House B should perhaps be assigned to the Knossian EM III phase, since it is generally accepted that the lack of polychrome decoration is the fundamental characteristic of the EM III phase at Knossos (cf. Chapter 1, 25-28). However, two facts stand against this interpretation: first, the KSM boxes which contain the pottery from the "lower" floor do have polychrome sherds (in this case, however, one may have recourse to later misplacement); second, and most important, even if the excavators reported the absence of polychrome sherds, they stated that a complete polychrome jug was found on the "lower" floor of House B (no. 39, PL. 6: Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 60 and pl.XIIa, 1). Thus, following the

5. There are also fragments which can be dated to LH II and even a fragment of Hellenistic pottery, clearly intrusive.
criterion of the presence/absence of polychrome decoration, it cannot be maintained that the "lower" floor of House B represents a EM III pre-polychrome phase, because at least one complete polychrome jug was found on it.

It is also interesting to note that the contrast between the two supposed floors created by the abundance of polychrome sherds in the "higher" one cannot be explained in terms of a MM IA floor, since much of the polychrome material, usually assigned to MM IA, does not belong to this phase. Many polychrome sherds published by the Pendleburys (1930, pl. XIV: 1-18; cf., also, Pendlebury 1939, 105, fig. 16) and traditionally considered typical of MM IA, are actually later: for example, both the shape and the decoration of the tumbler no. 122 (PL. 13; Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 3), which is adorned by a rosette composed of a large orange dot surrounded by tiny white dots, are typical of Knossian MM IIA (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 148: tumbler type 1, and pl. 25: 189 for decoration; for decoration, see also Walberg 1976, motifs 1. 6 and 1. 17, dated to her Classical Kamares phase). The motif of alternating orange and white three-leafed sprays present on some sherds from the Houses (see, e.g. Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 7) can be found on a fine spouted jar from the MM IIA Chamber below the West Court (MacGillivray 1986, fig. 41: 74). See, also, PL. 16: L, where a spouted jar fragment illustrated by Pendlebury
and Pendlebury (1930, pl. XIV: 1) was joined in 1986 to fragments decorated with three-leafed sprays. The motif consisting of rows of white dots, exemplified by a single fragment from the houses (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 10) is much more common in MM II A (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 70: 627 and pl. 74: 626: see, also, a similarly decorated cup from Archanes in Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1972, pl. F': 8, probably of slightly earlier date). A spouted jar body fragment (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 8) shows a rosette formed by a large orange dot and four smaller white dots, and encircled by an orange spiral: a nearly identical motif is found on a MM II A straight-sided cup rim fragment (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 19: 156). The largely restored polychrome "egg-cup" from House B (no. 121; Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 17) is much closer for shape and decoration to MM II A examples (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 146-147: conical goblet type 1 and pl. 72: 607-608): this particular specimen differs from the MM II A examples mentioned above in being decorated by horizontal instead of torsional polychrome bands, but various fragmentary "egg-cups" decorated by polychrome torsional bands, identical to MM II A specimens, can be found among the KSM material assigned to House B (see, e.g., Momigliano, in press, fig. IV: 4). Another fragment, from a spouted jar, is decorated by alternating white and red cross-hatched lozenges: a similar motif can be found on the inside of a polychrome bowl from a MM II-IIIA context (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 29: 251). A fragmentary
carinated cup from the houses (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 13) is decorated inside by a motif which resembles very closely the four dots rosettes connected by double S-curves which decorates a similar cup found in a MM II-IIIA context (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 30: 252); moreover, the supposed MM IA fragment belongs to a type of carinated cup, which is typical of MM IIA (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 162-163: short-rimmed angular cup type 1).

The presence of large quantities of material of the Old Palace period (MM II-IIIA), apparently found together with many complete or restorable vases which, on the basis of comparisons with other deposits, can be assigned to a Prepalatial phase (MM IA), clearly contradicts the report by the excavators of pure MM IA levels. Had the later vases and fragments not been illustrated by the Pendleburys in their publication, and had they constituted only a small and insignificant proportion of the deposits from Houses A and B, then they could be more easily dismissed as "intrusive". But the remarkable abundance of the later material makes it impossible to dismiss it in this manner: indeed, the number of comparisons between fragments assigned to MM IA found in the houses, particularly in House B, and material from later deposits could be greatly increased if the

6. The polychrome fragments discussed here can be found in boxes 405-406, which, according to their labels, contain the best fragments from House B. The material contained in these boxes is, indeed, very mixed and only useful for examples of fine pottery of various periods, mostly later than MM IA.
unpublished sherds were to be included. This, however, would be a rather tedious exercise, which would explain neither how the mixture of material of different dates may have occurred, nor the contradiction between the excavators' report and the evidence of the material itself. Instead, two general observations will be made, in an attempt to account for the presence of much later material in supposed pure MM IA levels.

The first observation concerns the fragmentary state of preservation of the polychrome material usually assigned to MM IA. While the vast majority of the complete vases were decorated in Dark on Light or Light on Dark, it has been possible to reconstruct the complete profile of only four vases (all from House B) decorated with polychrome motifs. Two are the beaked jugs nos. 39 and 43, which are more or less complete and may certainly be assigned on stylistic grounds to MM IA. The other two vases are the much-restored footed goblet and tumbler mentioned above (House B nos. 121-122), which have already been shown to be MM IIA types. The fragmentary nature of the polychrome material and the fact that it often finds precise comparisons with pottery found in deposits of the Old Palace period, is not confined to Houses A and B: also, in the case of the Monolithic Pillar Basement, the polychrome material, which is

7. The vases that I was able to restore myself were also decorated either in Light on Dark or in Dark on Light. I was also able to find a few new joins among the polychrome material, but nothing that would allow the reconstruction of a complete profile.
traditionally assigned to MM IA, is always fragmentary, and a closer analysis often shows that many of the sherds find precise comparisons with later deposits (see Chapter 3, 141-143; see also the discussion of the unpublished fragments from the North Quarter of the City in Chapter 4, 166-168). Now, the fragmentary state of preservation of the polychrome pottery contrasts strongly with that of the non-polychrome material, amongst which a comparatively high proportion of complete and restorable vases are found. Given that the polychrome sherds find precise comparisons with later deposits, it would seem to follow that there was originally one (or two — "higher" and "lower") MM IA "floor deposit"(s) with complete vases either in situ or fallen from shelves, to which the polychrome sherds do not belong. On the contrary, the polychrome sherds come from the later fill of the houses. If this is the case, then the excavators failed to distinguish between material from the "higher" MM IA floor and the overlying fill of the houses. Two facts support this hypothesis: first there are no boxes in the KSM with pottery from the fill, although it is likely to have contained material. Second, the polychrome and later material seems to be more abundant in what the excavators considered to be the "higher floor" deposit of House B.

The second general observation is that in House B there are many joins between sherds not only from different levels, but also from different rooms of the
house (see Figs. 15 and 15a, b). This seems to indicate that not just the "higher" but also the "lower" floor was somehow disturbed. It is, however, unlikely that part of the pottery from the fill of the house could have reached as deep as the "lower" floor. Thus, the previous hypothesis can only explain a contamination of the deposit from the "higher" MM 1A floor by the fill of the house. It cannot account for the presence of later material on the "lower" floor and for the joins between pottery from both floors nor, indeed for joins between pottery of different rooms. It is, therefore, necessary to suggest other hypotheses.

First, it may be that the excavators mistook the late fill of the house, which had become mixed with the MM 1A "floor deposit" below, for the "higher floor" deposit. Second, it could be suggested that there were two MM 1A "floor deposits" as reported by the excavators which were both much disturbed by the construction of the Kouloures (the fill of the houses, the trenches dug for the foundations of the Kouloures, etc.): something very similar happened in the case of House B, where the MM 1 deposit was cut through by later deposits and survived undisturbed only in a small area (see below). Third, if one assumed that all the vases "thrown off the cone" were found on the "higher" floor of House B, it could be suggested there were two floors, the "lower" belonging to MM 1A, the "higher" to MM II-III A. Fourth, it is even possible to argue that no pure MM IA level ever existed:
Houses A and B were cleared when they were abandoned and the deposits found by the Pendleburys are fills which contained pottery of various dates, but mostly MM IA and MM IIA-IIIA.

I am inclined to dismiss the latter hypothesis and, instead, to believe in the existence of MM IA "floor deposit"(s), although very much disturbed, for the following reasons: although it is not unusual to find complete vases in fills (as shown by the mass-produced MM II-IIII vases "thrown off the cone" found in the fill of Koulouris I-III, see MacGillivray 1986, nos. 444-528, pls. 54-59), the number of complete or restorable vases which can be assigned on stylistic grounds to MM IA is too large (by MM IA standards) to be explained thus. Although one may dispute the existence of two distinct "floor deposits", at least one floor must have existed as the walls of the house alone testify, and some vases were certainly found on what the excavators called the "lower" floor of House B (cf. Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 60 and this chapter, n. 4, above). Finally, the North Quarter of the City and House C are "floor deposits" which share a large number of forms and types with Houses A and B, and this seems to indicate that, using Mackenzie's words, there was a "general catastrophe", a destruction which caused the rooms in these houses to be abandoned with pots fallen or in situ on their floors. It therefore makes sense to interpret the majority of the MM IA pottery from Houses A and B as "floor deposits"
which belong to the same destruction. (It remains, of course, highly probable that the later fill also contained some sparse and scattered MM IA sherds). These appear to be the most plausible hypotheses which can account for the presence of such a large amount of pottery which finds comparisons with MM II and MM III material.

Incidentally, the latest pottery found in the fill levels could provide a precise terminus post quem for the construction of the Kouloures. As mentioned above, the majority of the later material found in the houses can be assigned to MM II-MM IIIA. If all of this later material could be assigned to the fill of the houses with absolute certainty, it could be argued that the Kouloures were built and destroyed in MM IIIA (see, also, MacGillivray 1986, 24-25). However, given the way the pottery has been excavated and stored in the KSM, it may well be that even some of the pottery from the fill of the Kouloures found its way into the boxes containing pottery from the lower levels, as the vases "thrown-off the cone" may suggest.

To sum up, it would seem that misinterpretation of the stratigraphy and a rather cursory analysis of the pottery caused the excavators to include later vases and fragments amongst material which they assigned to MM IA. It is, perhaps, more difficult to explain inconsistencies concerning the provenance of some of the published vases.
For many vases published as coming from House A were actually found in House B or even in areas outside the houses. It will also be argued that some rooms assigned to House B belonged to a later house, probably built in MM IIA and destroyed in MM IIIA.

The labels of the KSM boxes which contain the pottery from the Houses below the Kouloures, apart from the usual indications, present a number preceded by the letter "N", as illustrated in Table I (FIG. 44). It will be shown that the numbers preceded by "N" can be used to trace the provenance of the vases, since they represent the trench/area numbering system used during the excavations of 1930.

The complete vases (and very few fragments) from Houses A and B are marked in ink, usually on the base, with the same "N"-numbers which appear on the boxes (see PL. 28). These "N"-numbers not only appear on the boxes and vases relative to the Kouloures, but also on the boxes and vases from the adjacent areas, excavated in 1930. Although the "N"-numbers have been noticed before they have never been explained and have never been used to trace the provenance of the vases on which they are inscribed. Only the N"-numbers are to be found both on

B. MacGillivray (1986), in the catalogue compiled for his doctoral thesis, simply reports vases inscribed with "N"-numbers. Other KSM boxes with "N"-numbers are: B.III.1 = N 1; B.III.2 = N 2; B.III. 3 = N 3; B.III.4 = N 4; B. III.5 = N 5; B. III.6 = N 6 and 12; B. III.7 = N 7;
the labels and on the vases and sherds. The "N"-numbers are found both on the vases in the KSM and on those in the HM; since the latter were inventoried in 1930, the "N"-numbers must have been inscribed on the pots soon after the excavation: some vases from a "MH IA Oikia", inventoried in 1931 (see below), are not marked with "N"-numbers. The few sherds which are marked with the "N"-numbers are kept in the two boxes with the best sherds from House B (see Table I, FIG. 28): one published fragment marked "N 15" (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIV: 1, cf. above, 48-49 and PL. 16: D) joined another fragment from a box labelled "N 15" (see Table I, FIG. 44, box. no. 399 = B.II.11, N 15); and a fragment from a box labelled "N 11B" (box no. 394 = B.II.7, N 11B) joins the polychrome beaked jug (no. 43), which is, indeed, marked "N 11".

Thus, the correspondence between the numbers on the labels of the boxes and those on the pots strongly suggests that the "N"-numbers represent the room or trench/area numbering system used during the excavations in the West Court of 1930, and that they can therefore be used to establish the provenance of the vases on which they are marked.

B.III.8 = N 8; B.III.9 = N 13 and 14; B.III.10 = N 9; B.III.11 = N 10.

9. If one correlates the numbers given in Pendlebury's guide to the KSM (Pendlebury et al.1933-35) with the equivalent "N"-numbers, it will be found that they correspond to the fairly orderly fashion in which the 1930 excavations in the West Court proceeded.
Thus, it is possible to demonstrate that most of the pottery published as coming from House A (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, pl. XIIib), in fact, comes either from House B or from the Area encircling the Central Kouloura because the vases are marked either with "N 19" or with other "N"-numbers related to House B (see Table I, FIG. 44). All the vases illustrated in the upper row of pl. XIIib of Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930 come from House B; nos. 13, 14, 17 and 18-19 in the lower row of pl. XIIib come from the area encircling Kouloura II (N19): this area, which produced pottery very mixed in character, will be discussed separately below. (Pl. XIIib: 15-16 are marked "N 18" and pl. XIIib: 20 is not marked). Andreou (1976, 185 n. 14) had already remarked that some fragments attributed to House A (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, fig. 5) are now kept in boxes belonging to House B. Similarly, the polychrome fragments discussed above, which are assigned to both houses in Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930 (pl.XIV) can now be found in the two boxes containing the best sherds from House B (except for pl. XIV: 18 which is kept in the box with Pendlebury's MM IA study material). In the case of the fragments one could, perhaps, allow for misplacement. It seems, however, unlikely that such a considerable number of complete vases were erroneously marked. Perhaps a plausible explanation is that the vases were not arranged for the illustrations according to their provenance, as the captions seem to indicate, but as required by the exigencies of photographic composition, and in the
publication little attention was paid to the accuracy of the captions. It is, however, difficult to understand why vases from the Area encircling the Kouloura (see below) were included among the material from the two houses. It may either be that the Pendleburys believed that their context was pure MM IA (see, also, below) or, perhaps, that they could be added to those actually found in the houses because some were considered to be MM IA on stylistic grounds.

Finally, it is necessary to make some remarks on certain rooms that may have been wrongly assigned to House B. The rooms in question are nos. 5-8 (N 4a) (see FIG. 6). The excavators reported that their foundations were at a higher level than those of the other rooms of House B, and were actually on top of the walls of room 4. The walls of rooms 5-8 are still visible today, while corridors 2a-3 and room 4 have been backfilled. According to the excavators, the walls of rooms 2a-5 and 7 were cut by the West Enceinte Wall. Without thorough cleaning and some excavation it is very difficult to establish the stratigraphic relationship between the West Enceinte Wall and the walls of rooms 5 and 7 on the basis of what is still visible. Moreover, the South wall of room 5 has been largely destroyed by the roots of a pine tree (PL. 14). But, in any case, the vases and fragments found in rooms 5-8 cannot be assigned to MM IA: this material is a mixture of MM II and MM IIIA (see House B nos. 123-125). Some of this material (nos. 123 and 125)
was published in the preliminary report. Thus, it can be suggested that these rooms were not part of the MM IA House B: it is more likely that they belonged to a cluster of houses built in MM IIA and destroyed in MM IIIA, located to the North of the Kouloures (FIG. 4; cf. MacGillivray 1986, 32).

A MM IIA date for the construction of Rooms 5-8 may also have some bearing on the date of the West Enceinte Wall. Evans (1935, 49-56, 77 and fig. 30) assigned the wall to a late phase of MM IA, but other scholars, have recently proposed a later date. MacGillivray (1986, 27-28; see, also, Damiani Indelicato 1982, 60) considers the construction of the West Enceinte Wall to be part of a programme of re-organisation in the area of the West Court, which took place between MM IA and MM IIIA, i.e. probably early in MM IIA. Macgillivray used two arguments to support his hypothesis: first, the wall cuts the House B basements and must, therefore, be later than the house; second, the wall is intersected by a section of raised paving in the area to the South of the Theatral Area, which should be dated to MM IIIA. The observations made on the date of Rooms 5-8 could be used as further arguments in support of a date certainly later than MM IA for the Enceinte Wall, possibly even later than MM IIA.

Although it has been possible to establish a slightly more correct provenance for many vases, the level of accuracy is far from being very satisfactory:
because of the way the pottery has been stored, marked and inventoried it is now impossible to obtain important information. For example, a vase marked "N 18" could have come from either room 1 or room 2 of House A; and a vase marked "N 11" could have come from either the "higher" or the "lower" floor of rooms 1-2 of House B.10 More precise information on the exact provenance of the vases would have certainly helped our understanding of the chronology of the alleged two floors in House B, of the function of the rooms, etc.

2. THE POTTERY FROM THE "FLOOR DEPOSIT" OF HOUSE A

(FIGS. 11-12; PLS. 1-2)

The above analysis has reduced to only 16 the number of complete or restorable vases which can be assigned to the "floor deposit" of House A, while the Pendleburys (1930, pl. XIIb) assigned 20 vases to this house (22 if one includes a "sheep-bell" and a terracotta drain). Of these 16 vases, 13 are unpublished.11

The pottery from House A is all hand-made. A footed goblet (no. 6, FIG. 11 and PL. 1); cf. Chapter 5, 185-

10. The excavators stated that four vases (nos. 27, 39, 61 and 62) were found on the "lower" floor of House B, but because these are simply marked "N 11" it is no longer possible to establish whether they came from Room 1 or Room 2 (cf. also p. 46 n. 4). Vase marked "N 18" and "N 11" could even come, respectively, from the fills of Kouloura II and Kouloura III.

11. I mended three of these vases in 1985.
which shows grooves on the internal surface may attest to the use of some rotating device (cf. Chapter 5, 213). All vases are produced in the most common fabric, Fabric 1 (see Chapter 5, 181-182), with the exception of the shallow bowl no. 15 and the large spouted jar no. 16. They are decorated either in Dark on Light or in Light on Dark. Some specimens (e.g. the beaked jug no. 11; cf. also no. 13) show a combination of painted and simple relief decoration. The form which appears to be most common is the footed goblet (nos. 1-6, FIG. 11 and PL. 1), in a range of types which are also attested in other deposits such as House B, House C, The North Quarter of the City, the Well to the North of House A, the Upper East Well, and the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace. Other forms attested in House A are: the footless goblets (nos. 7 and 8, FIG. 11 and PL. 1); the one-handled cup (nos. 9 and 10, FIG. 11 and PL. 1); the beaked jug with cutaway neck (no. 11, FIG. 12 and PL. 2); the side-spouted jar (nos. 12 and 13, FIG. 12 and PL. 2); and the bridge-spouted jar (no. 14, PL. 2). With the exception of the side-spouted jars, the other forms attested in House A can be classified into types which are also attested in the other deposits mentioned above (cf. Chapter 5). Side and bridge-spouted jars appear to be rather uncommon in the MM IA deposits examined in the present study.

12. For this and other abbreviations of ceramic types see Chapter 5, 181 n. 8)
Forms produced in other -coarse- fabrics are the shallow bowl no. 15 (FIG. 12) and the large spouted jar no. 16, mentioned above. The latter vase is very close to no. 59 from House B.

Among the fragmentary material, it is worth noticing a rim fragment of spouted jar in typical East Cretan White on Dark ware (FIG. 12: D). Although it finds close comparisons with decorative motifs present in the North Trench deposit at Gournia, Andreou pointed out that the fragment may be later than East Cretan EM III (Andreou 1978, 69, fig. 3: 13; cf. Zois 1968b, pl. 1r: nos. 60, 62, 64, 66). Given the uncertainties as to the provenance of the material from the Houses below the Kouloures, specially of the fragments, its Knossian context cannot be proven: one can only say that it may be associated either with the original "floor deposit", or with fragments of MM IIA carinated cups and MM II-IIIA vessels "thrown off the cone".

As already remarked, the deposit from House A seems to be less mixed than that from House B. Thus, the fact that no complete vase from this deposit bears polychrome decoration, which occurs only on a single small and rather dull fragment (FIG. 12: C), assumes more significance and suggests that either polychromy was less common in MM IA than it is usually believed, or that the "floor deposit" from House A should be reassigned to EM III, since, according to current definitions, the absence of polychrome decoration is the basic (and, apparently,
only) criterion to distinguish between EM III and MM IA (cf. Chapter 1, 28). It will be shown in the following pages that a good number of deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA (and which cannot be re-dated to MM IB/IIA), do not present polychrome decoration.

3. THE POTTERY FROM THE "FLOOR DEPOSIT"(S) OF HOUSE B (FIGS. 13-16; PLS. 3-13)

The deposit from House B is by far the largest and most interesting among those discussed in the present study. Not only does it comprise of more than 80 vases, which widely illustrate the fabrics, forms and decorations typical of the MM IA phase, but also it contains vases which attest to contacts between Knossos and other regions of Crete and of the Aegean.

Most vases are made in Fabric 1 and are hand-made.13 Certain footed and footless goblets may have been made with the help of some rotating device, but it is unlikely that they were thrown on the wheel (nos. 7-10, 22-23, 63-65; cf. Chapter 5, 185-186, 189-190: I.FTG.4 and I.FTLG.2).14 The decoration is predominantly in Light on Dark or Dark on Light: only two vases, the beaked jugs nos. 39 (PL. 6) and 43 (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 13. For a discussion of Fabric 1 and other fabrics used in the MM IA deposits examined in the present study see Chapter 5.

14. See n. 12.
pl. XIII; Evans 1935, 84 fig. 53: 9) are polychrome decorated, with simple patterns: jug. no. 39 shows a horizontal red band bordered by white lines, while the main decoration of jug. no. 43 is a red cross encircled by a red band bordered by white dots (see FIG. 43: V; Zois 1968a, 191-192: "Kreise und Kreuz ornament"; Walberg 1976, fig. 40, motif 10.i.1). Furthermore, the jug. no. 39, which comes from the "lower" floor of House B, shows an interesting and unique incised pattern all over the shoulder, thus combining painted and incised decoration (for the incised pattern, see also Betancourt 1985, 82 fig. 57: A). The presence of these two polychrome vases suggests that the "floor deposit"(s) of House B should be placed in the MM IA phase, but it also confirms the impression that polychromy is much less common in MM IA deposits than previously thought, since the vast majority of the pottery from House B is decorated either in Light on Dark or in Dark on Light.

As in the case of House A, the typical forms made in the most common fabric, Fabric 1, are the footed (nos. 1-10, 63-64) and footless goblets (nos. 11-23, 25-26, 65, 67; FIGS. 13, 16 and PLS. 3, 4, 9). One-handled cups are also fairly common, with 11 specimens in the catalogue (nos. 28-35, 68-70; FIG. 14 and PLS. 4, 5, 10) and a wide variety of types attested (cf. Chapter 5, 191 ff. and Table II, FIG. 45). The beaked jug with cutaway neck is another very common form among the complete vases found in the house, with 17 specimens (nos. 36-49; 71-73; FIGS.
15, 16 and PLS. 5, 6, 7, 10) representing various types. No complete side-spouted jar seems to have survived from House B, but there are four examples of bridge-spouted jars (nos. 50-53; PL. 7). Most of the vases made in Fabric 1 from House B can be classified into types which are paralleled in House A, House C, The Well to the North of House A, the North Quarter of the City, the Upper East Well and the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (cf. Chapter 5, 171-176).

A form which seems to appear only in this deposit is the small amphoriskos (no. 74, PL. 11). Similar vases were found at Giophyrakia (cf. Marinatos 1935, figs. 2: 3 and 3: 5) and at Gournes in North central Crete (Zois 1969, pl. A: 7044, pl. 22: 6947, 6948, pl. 23: 6949, pl. 33: 7043). Amphoriskoi were also found in the Messara tombs (cf., e.g., Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. IX: 6860, from Platanos; Alexiou 1960, fig 19, from Lebena) and in other regions of Crete (cf., e.g., Pendlebury et al. 1936, 83, fig. 18: 704, 705 and pl. 13, from the Trapeza cave in Lassithi). The contexts of the specimens mentioned above range from early EM III to MM III. These parallels, therefore, are not particularly useful for chronological purposes: they simply show that this shape was common throughout Crete in Prepalatial times and, also, during the Old Palace period. Other vases from House B, which

15. All types of beaked jug with cutaway neck in Fabric 1 are attested in House B, with the exception of I.BJ.6, which, however, is attested by the single, polychrome decorated specimen from House C, which may be a later (MM IIA) type: see Chapter 5, 199-200.
do attest to contacts with other regions of Crete and of the Aegean and can be used more fruitfully for chronological correlations, will be discussed at the end.

Apart from the large number of vases made in Fabric 1, House B yielded four vases made in the less usual, soft and greenish Fabric 2 (see Chapter 5, 205-206): two one-handled cups (nos. 54 and 75) and two beaked jugs (nos. 55-56), all decorated in Dark on Light (see FIG. 15 and PL. 7). Morphologically, they are identical to vases commonly found in Fabric 1. The simple decoration is also paralleled in specimens made in the most common fabric. The only vase which shows a slightly more elaborate pattern is the beaked jug no. 55, with its arcs and pendent solid discs on the shoulder. Similar vases made in this fabric were also found in the North Quarter of the City.

Another group of 5 vases from House B (nos. 57-58, 76-78) was made in a reddish, crumbly and slightly micaceous fabric, Fabric 3 (see PLs. 8, 11). This group includes three wide-mouthed jugs with pinched-out spout—two with a tall, conical body (nos. 58 and 78) and one with a squat shape (no. 77)—and two footless goblets with flaring rims (nos. 57, 76). Of these five vases, only the squat jug. no. 77 is decorated, with groups of tiny knobs on the shoulder. Comparable vases made in Fabric 3 were also found in the Well to the North of
House A, The North Quarter of the City and House C (see Chapter 5, 208-209).

Another characteristic which distinguishes House B from the other Prepalatial deposits discussed, is the presence of a number of storage vessels made in various coarse fabrics, mostly found in room 4, i.e. in the "magazine" of the house (see FIG. 16; PLS. 12, 13). They are either left plain or they show a simple linear decoration in Dark on Light, as in no. 59; in some specimens the decoration consists of small knobs, as in no. 80, or of "rope" bands in relief, as in the pithos no. 84. This group of vases includes some large spouted jars of tall, conical shape, with two horizontal, round-section handles set on a high, rounded shoulder and tilted upwards; one specimen shows a tubular spout (no. 59)\(^1\), while the others are bridge-spouted (nos. 66, 79-80). No. 81 (FIG. 16) is a unique vessel, probably meant to fulfill some specialised domestic function. It is a sort of spouted vat with two horizontal handles; in the inside of the vessel, about 5cm. below the rim, there is a wide ledge with several small perforations, which leaves a circular opening in the middle. It has been suggested that this sort of vat was used to strain grape-juice, the grapes being crushed on the perforated ledge. Fragments of a vessel of comparable shape were found in the MM IA deposit from the Prepalatial Houses to the

---

16. Another vessel of this type was found in House A (no. 16).
South of the Palace (no. 19). Two narrow-necked jars (nos. 83-84) have a globular-conical, tall body, a slightly spreading neck, two round-section, horizontal handles set on the shoulder and tilted upwards; they are very similar to the necked jars found in the Vat Room deposit (see Chapter 3, 104-105). The necked jar is a simple and basic form and, therefore, has wide spatial and chronological distribution (cf. Walberg 1976, form 11, type 47; 1983, form 12, type 52). House B yielded the only known pithos of the MM IA phase at Knossos, no. 84. It has a tall, ovoid shape, a ledge rim, and four, round-section vertical handles set below the rim. The decoration consists of trickles of paint and of a horizontal "rope" band in relief which anticipates the common decoration of the later MM and LM pithoi. No. 60 (PL. 8) is a cooking ware tripod, very largely restored. The form is also attested in other EM III/MM IA deposits such as the Upper East Well by various fragmentary legs, but since it continues in MM and LM times with very slight variations, it may well be that no. 60 is not MM IA, but later.

The vases that will be discussed in the following pages are particularly interesting as they attest to contacts between Knossos and other regions of Crete and of the Aegean.

The Light on Dark decorated cup no. 27 (FIG. 13, PL. 4), found on the "lower" floor of House B is unique at
Knossos, but it represents one of the most typical forms of the so-called White on Dark Ware produced in East Crete (Betancourt 1984a, 41: shape 2D, figs. 2-4: E and 4-1: H, I). This form starts in East Crete in EM II B, is common in the EM III deposit from the North Trench at Gournia (cf. Andreou 1978, fig. 6: 3), and is also attested in Andreou's Mochlos House D-Vasiliki House B group (ibid., fig. 11: 2, 7), which corresponds to MM IA-MM IIA in Evans' terminology. The specimen from House B finds its closest comparisons—for the shape—with the material from the North Trench. Its decoration differs from the usual East Cretan examples, because the white lines are thinner. Its fabric—to the naked eye—seems to be that commonly used at Knossos (Fabric 1) but, obviously, only analyses of the clay could establish whether this vase should be considered to be an import from East Crete or a local imitation. In any case, this vase attests to some contacts between the two Cretan regions and can be used for chronological correlations.

Similarly, the goblet no. 24 (FIG. 13) is unique at Knossos for its shape and decoration—a trifurcated pattern in a "Light on Dark on Light technique". It has a medium-deep, conical body, which is close to the shape of certain Knossian footed goblets (cf. Chapter 5, 188: I.FTLG.1), but it also recalls, perhaps more closely, that of East Cretan goblets from the North Trench at Gournia (cf Andreou 1978, fig. 6: 1-3). A single identical specimen has been found in the South Houses at
Mallia, in a MM IA-II, context (Chapouthier et al. 1962, pl. XXXVIII, no. 9132; for the context see Andreou 1978, 133, who suggested a MM IA-MM IB context; it is clear, however, that some of the vases from the South Houses, e.g. the tumblers in Chapouthier et al. 1962, pl. VI, 8643 and 8641, can be as late as MM IIA in Knossian terms, as defined by MacGillivray 1986). Prepalatial pottery from Mallia seems to combine elements which are typical of both North central and Eastern Crete. This, also, seems to suggest that this vase is not a typical Knossian type but, rather, an import or imitation of an East Cretan prototype.

No. 61 (PL. 9) is a mug-shaped vase in an incised and dark burnished ware, found on the "lower" floor of House B. The fabric is not one of those commonly used at Knossos. This vase, although unique and decorated in a rather rare fashion, was used by Walberg (1976, type 194 and fig. 34) to illustrate the typical one-handled cup of the Pre-Kamares phase. Apart from its uniqueness in Crete, both the surface treatment and the shape of this vase find close comparisons among the Early Cycladic IIIB (Phylakopi I.ii) material (Barber 1981, 174-175; MacGillivray 1984, 73). Although clay analyses of other Knossian specimens in this ware seem to rule out a Cycladic provenance (MacGillivray et al. 1988), it can still be suggested that the mug from House B and the other incised and dark burnished vases found at Knossos
represent local products which imitate Cycladic prototypes. 17

No. 62 (PL. 9) is another peculiar vessel, found on the "lower" floor of House B, for which a Cycladic inspiration can be, at least tentatively, suggested. It is a squat-shaped, red-burnished askoid vase, with a handle joining the spout and the top centre of the body, also decorated by a relief band around the maximum expansion of the body. Many vases described as askoi have been found in Crete (see Walberg 1976, form 35; Walberg 1983, form 32), especially in Prepalatial contexts. As Evans remarked (1935, 79-82; see, also, Furumark 1941, 68), the askos is a vessel widely distributed throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. But in spite of the number of askoid vases found in Crete and elsewhere, there is no close comparison for the specimen from House B. The Pendleburys (1930, 60) suggested some Cycladic parallels, which are not particularly convincing: the Knossian example lacks some of the essential characteristics of the Cycladic askoid vessels, better known as "duck-vases", such as the body with pointed top and the string-hole handle which joins the base of the neck and the body (see Merrillees 1979, 10). However, a connection with the Cyclades should not perhaps be altogether dismissed: as Evans (1935, 80-81) pointed out, askoid vases, are well attested in this area

17. For further discussion of this ware and other Knossian specimens found in the Vat Room deposit, see Chapter 3, 106-107.
of the Agean from Early Cycladic onwards, specially those with a flat bottom, like that from House B. Indeed, in spite of the differences, the "duck-vases" seem the most logical source of inspiration for this Knossian vase. Evans also remarked that Cycladic askoi often present "a decorative reminiscence of the fact that the domed upper part had been moulded on in a separate piece". It is very likely that the relief band on the Knossian specimen served a similar purpose. Finally, it should be remembered that "duck-vases" imitating Cycladic prototypes were produced in Cyprus, where two specimens were found in the same tomb as a Cretan EM III-MM IA bridge-spouted jar (Grace 1940; Merrillees 1979, 14-19; Catling and MacGillivray 1983, 3). Thus, it should not come as a surprise that Cycladic "duck-vases" were also copied by Minoan potters although, admittedly, less faithfully than their Cypriot counterparts.

Two one-handled cups from House B (nos. 35 and 70, FIGS. 14, 16 and PL. 10) have a small foot and an incurving profile, unparalleled in other MM IA Knossian deposits. They show a vague similarity to specimens from Tylissos (Zois 1969, 32-33), Porti (Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XXXVII, no. 5143; Zois 1969, 32-33, pl. 47, no. 5143.) and from East Crete (cf. Zois 1969, 32-33, pl. 47, no. 4741 and Andreou 1978, 86, fig. 12, 5-6). Cups of similar shape were also found in MM IIA deposits from the Old Palace at Knossos (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 165-169: rounded cups types 2 and 3). Zois maintained that this
kind of cup, found in three different regions of Crete, attested to the absolute correspondence of the MM IA style throughout the island. However, the specimens from Tylissos, which have a very distinct off-set lip, are closer to the MM IIA examples from Knossos and, pace Zois (1969, 34), they come from a context which is at least as late as MM IIA in Knossian terms, because they were found together with various vases that find comparisons with deposits of that date: cf. the carinated and straight-sided cups from Tylissos (Hazzidakis 1934, pl. XVI: b-d, e-f, j-k and Hazzidakis 1921, fig. 34: 1-4) and those from the MM IIA Chamber below the West Court (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 3: 98; pl. 5: 94; pl. 10: 88). Also, the contexts of Porti and of East Crete can be as late as MM IIA in Knossian terms. On the basis of these observations, Zois' suggestion of a MM IA stylistic "koine" should, perhaps, be regarded with some scepticism.

As to the decoration of the two Knossian specimens from House B, the pattern on no. 70 - two standing dotted semicircles- is similar to decorative motifs found on sherds from the North Trench at Gournia (cf. Zois 1968b, pl. KA': 60-64 and Betancourt 1984a, fig. 2-5: C; fig. 3-4: 5 no. 1 = dot bands; and fig. 3-6: 9 nos. 6-7 = semicircles and crescent). As to the shape, quite surprisingly, the nearest parallel seems to be a vase found in the Kerameikos at Athens, apparently in a Middle Helladic I context, regarded as a MM IA import from Crete.
(Knigge et al. 1978, 64-65, no. 1, figs 36-37; Rutter and Zerner 1984, appendix II.B. no. 3). The decoration of the Athenian vase (lozenges filled with rosettes consisting of a large dot surrounded by smaller dots, in a white paint over a dark ground), however, is closer to MM IIA-IIIA examples (cf. Walberg 1976, 180, motif 1.6-7; MacGillivray 1986, fig. 60: 653; pl. 16: 144-145).

Perhaps, the closest parallel for the decoration of the Athenian vase can be found on a bridge-spouted jar from the Kamares Cave (Dawkins and Laistner 1913, pl. VII: d; cf. Walberg 1983, pl. 28: motif 1 (vii) 3). This bridge-spouted jar is similar in shape to one of MacGillivray’s MM IIA types (MacGillivray 1986, 176-180, fig. 35: type 5). According to Zerner (1978, 173), cups similar to nos. 35 and 70 were also found at Lerna Va (i.e. in a Middle Helladic I context). The cups found at Lerna, unfortunately, are not illustrated and it is therefore not possible to assess the degree of similarity. Without clay analyses it is not yet possible to establish whether these cups are imports from Crete or mainland imitations. Further study and publication of the large amount of Minoan and Minoanizing pottery found on mainland Greece (Rutter and Zerner 1984) will certainly improve our knowledge of the chronological correlations between these two areas.
4. THE AREA ENCIRCLING THE MIDDLE KOULOURA (N 19)

(Fig. 18; Pl. 18)

This area does not really 'encircle' the Middle Kouloura: it is simply situated to the North of this structure. In Pendlebury's plan (Pendlebury et al. 1933-1935, plan 4.B. and Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 55, fig. 2, see FIGS. 3, 5), this area is located between the central Kouloura and the long wall to the North of it, i.e. near the NE corner of the long wall. However, as it has been designated thus in the guide to the KSM (Pendlebury et al. 1933-35), the term has been retained to avoid confusion.

Some of the vases published by the Pendleburys as coming from House A were, in fact, found in the so-called Area encircling the Middle Kouloura (see above, 57-59). These include one example of a "butterfly jug" (no. 9), a kind of vase usually considered most typical of MM IA.

From the excavators' report (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 53 and 56) we know that the complete plan of Houses A and B was not recovered because, first, it was too dangerous to dig immediately behind the

---

18. The pottery from this area is kept in the KSM boxes 384-387: cf. Table I, FIG. 44. Box no. 387, however, contains a wooden label which reads "K.30, Kouloura 2, Eastern Unstratified, N 18". Thus, this box could contain some of the pottery from the fill of Kouloura II, and it has not been included in the present analysis of the pottery from N 19.
Kouloures walls and, second, the MM IA levels had been cut into by later houses. It was only thanks to the absence of some stones in the North side of the Kouloura II wall that it was possible to excavate the Well to the North of House A (see below, 80-81). This well was enclosed to the North by a wall, the foundations of which were at a higher level: this must be the long wall in Pendlebury's plan (cf. FIGS. 3 and 5). According to the excavators, the wall presented an opening, which, they suggested, probably led to a staircase serving the well, of which no trace had survived. If the area directly behind the Kouloures was not excavated down to the MM IA level(s) then, given that there is no positive evidence of the existence of a staircase between the wall and the MM IA well, it is not admissable to assign a MM IA date to the wall and to the context of the pottery found near it. As in the case of rooms 5-8 in House B, it seems more likely that the wall "encircling" the Middle Kouloura should be associated with the later structures built to the North of it and of Kouloura III. The analysis of the material assigned to this area also points to this conclusion. Although there are a few vases which may be assigned, on stylistic grounds, to MM IA (e.g. nos. 4 and 11), the majority of the complete and/or restorable vessels are later, mostly MM IIA (cf., e.g., the goblets nos. 1-3; the carinated cups nos. 6-8; the wheel-made goblet or "crude" cup no. 5: see FIG. 18 and PL. 18). Amongst the fragmentary material, there are straight-sided cups and polychrome tumblers which find
parallels in other deposits of the Old Palace period such as the Vat Room (cf. Chapter 3, 95-105) and the MM IB/IIA chamber below the West Court (MacGillivray 1986, 115-119). Moreover, it is very likely that the group of vases from the "MM IA Oikia" should be added to the material from this area.

5. THE "MM IA OIKIA"

(PLS. 19; 20)\textsuperscript{19}

An interesting group, now kept in the HM, of five vases and the head of a terracotta figurine was inventoried in 1931 under the provenance "Knossos, MM IA Oikia, anaskaphi Evans". This seems to refer to one of the two houses below the Kouloures discovered and excavated during the previous year. The fragmentary figurine (HM 9166), was published by the Pendleburys among the small objects found in House A, although they stated that it came from "inside the north-eastern angle of the wall north of the Kouloura", i.e. Kouloura II (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 70-71 fig. 9; cf., also, Evans 1935, 67-69, fig. 41). It seems very likely therefore that the provenance of this group of vases

\textsuperscript{19}. PL. 19 is a photograph from Evans' Archive, which illustrates some of the vases from the "MM IA Oikia" in the HM together with other vases, of MM II-III date. Although it is likely, one cannot be certain that the other vases in the picture also came from the "MM IA Oikia", because in Evans' Archive it is not unusual to find photographs of groups of pots of different provenances.
should be identified with B.II.3 = N 19, i.e. with the Area encircling Kouloura II. This alone would strongly suggest that the vases do not come from the original "floor deposit" of one of the MM IA houses, but confirmation may be had from their date: the straight-sided cup, the small tripod-bowl and the angular bridge-spouted jar (nos. 1, 2, 4) all find precise parallels in the material from the MM IIA Chamber below the West court (MacGillivray 1986, 21-23, 115-119). The "butterfly" jug (no. 3) has an awkward and apparently rare shape, paralleled only by a fragmentary vase from the Area encircling the Middle Kouloura (no. 10), but its decoration finds close comparison with the "butterfly" jugs from the Vat Room deposit (see Chapter 3, 105), with another specimen mentioned above, from the Area encircling the Middle Kouloura (no. 9), and with a fragmentary example from the Monolithic Pillar Basement (Mackenzie 1906, pl. IX: 2). The piriform jug from the "MM IA Oikia" (no. 5), which is made in a reddish coarse fabric, finds the closest comparisons with other specimens dated by MacGillivray (1986, nos. 567 and 589) to MM IIIA.

20. During the excavations conducted in 1987 at Knossos, fragments of butterfly jugs were found in a MM II deposits (personal observation and Hood, personal communication).
6. THE WELL TO THE NORTH OF HOUSE A
(Fig. 19; PL. 17)

(Main bibliography: Andreou 1978, 27; Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 56).

During the excavation of House A, it was possible to extend the investigation further North, thanks to the absence of a few stones in the North side of the wall of Kouloura 2 (cf. Evans 1935, fig. 39). This extension revealed a well which, according to the excavators (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 56), supplied House A with water; the pottery found to a depth of 2m. was "pure MM IA". The well, however, was not cleared completely because of the danger of the whole wall collapsing.

The pottery which belongs to this deposit is stored in one box in the KSM (B.II.4, box no. 388, cf. Table I, Fig. 44). The surviving material comprises just less than 50 sherds, in a very fragmentary state. It was possible to reconstruct the complete profile of only a couple of vessels. Apart from a few Neolithic sherds and one fragment of an EM II bowl or goblet with thickened inside rim, the material is homogeneous in character and finds close comparisons with MM IA deposits.

Although no specimen of footed goblet has been catalogued, the form is represented in this deposit by various fragments, typical of the MM IA phase, none of which, however, was large enough to reconstruct the
complete shape. Other typical forms attested in this deposit in the usual orange to buff fabric (Fabric I) are the conical footless goblet (no. 1) and the one-handed cup (nos. 2-3). All these vessels are decorated either in Dark on Light or in Light on Dark. There were also two plain vessels in the less common Fabric 3: a goblet and a fragmentary wide mouthed jug (nos. 7-8), which find comparisons in the pottery from Houses B and C and from the North Quarter of the City. As in House A, no vase bears polychrome decoration.

7. HOUSE C

(FIGS. 3-4, 20-21; PLS. 21-27)

(Main bibliography: Andreou 1978, 28-29, pl.III, 1-6; Evans 1905, 16-18, fig.9; 1921, 172, figs.122, 123a; 1935, 85; Hood and Taylor 1981, no.92; MacGillivray 1986, 12-23; Mackenzie 1904 DB vol. I, 30-45; 1906, 253 no.5; 1907 DB, 1-6; Walberg 1976, 119).

House C lay below the West Court, a few metres to the North of the Eastern Kouloura (Kouloura I). It was partly contiguous with the MM IIA deposit of the "Chamber below the West Court" (Evans 1921, 186 n. 3; Mackenzie 1906, 250), which should be associated with Test Pit 4

21. Some fragments appear to belong to I. FTG.4, others to I. FTG.3. For these and other abbreviations of ceramic types see Chapter 5, 181 n. 8.
According to Evans, the deposit from House C and from the MM IIA "Chamber below the West Court" both lay at a depth of about 1.50m. below the surface of the West Court. But, in fact, the MM IIA deposit must have cut through the MM I level, since it was found 1.75m. below the surface of the West Court (Mackenzie 1904 DB vol. I, 32; see, also, MacGillivray 1986, 17 fig. 4 and Andreou 1978, 28-29). House C was also, initially, called the "chamber" or the "room below the West Court". Only after the excavations of Houses A and B below the Kouloures did Evans regard this deposit as part of the same system of Prepalatial houses and, thus, named it House C (cf. Evans 1921, 172 and 1935, 85).

This deposit played an important role in Evans' and Mackenzie's reconstruction of the pottery phases at Knossos. In 1904 Evans published the famous section of the West Court, which showed a gap for the MM I period (FIG. 1; Evans 1904, 19 fig. 7). In 1905 this gap was filled by the discovery of the House C deposit (Evans 1905, 16 ff.). It is not necessary here to reassess the validity of Evans' stratigraphy and suggest a more accurate section and chronology for the relevant levels.

22. The section published in the BSA report for 1904 - which is copied from Mackenzie's daybook - is reported unchanged in Evans, 1921, 33 fig. 4, in spite of the subsequent discovery of House C.
since this has already been done by various scholars (see especially MacGillivray 1986, 12-23, fig.4; see also Andreou 1978, fig. 24; Wilson 1984, 35-36).

Mackenzie's daybooks (especially Mackenzie 1907 DB, 5) provide more information as to the circumstances of the discovery: in 1905 Mackenzie and Dawkins examined some pottery from Test Pit 9 (excavated in 1904)\(^{23}\), which was supposed to be MM III. Two baskets from the MM III level (i.e. from the first metre), upon closer examination, turned out to contain MM I pottery.

Mackenzie explained this by arguing that the MM I levels had been disturbed and largely removed during the construction of the MM III house excavated the previous year (cf. Mackenzie 1904 DB vol. I, 32; 1907 DB, 5-6 and 13; see, also, MacGillivray 1986, 15 ff.), but had survived in the area outside the house. In 1905, therefore, the excavation of Test Pit 9 was extended to the East, in the undisturbed area.

Andreou (1978, 28-9 and 178-9 n. 3) has studied the pottery from House C kept in the KSM, which he assigned, in agreement with Evans, to MM IA. According to him, the

\(^{23}\) Andreou (1978, 178-9 n.3) remarks that the position of Test Pit 9 (B.I.12) should be interchanged in Pendlebury's plan (Pendlebury 1935, plan no.4) with that of Test Pit 14 (B.I.17). The location of Test Pit 9 in Pendlebury's plan is certainly not correct, but should not be interchanged with B.I.17, as will be explained below.
pottery from the following Test Pits (and boxes) can be ascribed to House C:

**Test Pit 9 (B.I.12)**: box nos. 245-246, which, respectively, bear the labels "from under floor at 1.50" and "from floor-level at 1.50 to floor level at 2m."

**Test Pit 4 (B.I.7)**: box nos. 213-214, which, respectively, bear the labels "from house floor at 1.20, with vases in situ to house floor at 1.50" and "from house floor at 1.20 to floor at 1.50".

**Test Pit 15 (B.I.18)**: one box with pottery "from 1.05 to floor at 1.50".

All these boxes bear 1904 as the date of excavation, while one would expect to find at least some of them labelled 1905.

A study of the pottery from House C kept in the HM and a re-examination of the pottery from the relevant Test Pits has led me to different conclusions: while it is very likely that the MM I pottery from two of the test pits mentioned above (nos. 9 and 4) did originally belong to House C, all the vases published by Evans (1905, 16-18 fig.9; 1921, 172 figs.122, 123a) as coming from the "floor deposit" of the house (with a few exceptions) were found in Test Pit 14, which is an extension of Test Pit
This floor was found at about 1.20m. below the surface of the West Court.

All the pottery from House C illustrated by Evans (including the few fragments) is now kept in the HM. This pottery, with only two exceptions, is marked "K.05 WSK TP 14", plus a number which is clearly the number given to the vase by Mackenzie in his pottery notebook for 1905, which is unfortunately lost. Only two vases, nos. 6 and 26, are marked differently, as follows: "K.05 WSK TP 9, 19 TP 9 = TP 14" and "WS TP 9 K.04" (see PL. 28).

Moreover, two boxes in the KSM (nos. 294-5) from Test Pit 14 bear the label "K.05 W Square TP 14 adjacent to TP 9, from present surface (level of piazza) to .60 down where there is strosis".

In addition to the two boxes (nos. 245-6) assigned by Andreou to the MMIA level of Test Pit 9, I have

24. Obviously Andreou was not able to see the published pottery from House C in the HM and, therefore, discussed the pottery from the HM IA level of Test Pit 14 (KSM boxes nos. 296-301) as a separate deposit (Andreou, 1978, 29 and 180 n. 4).

25. I was unable to find one of the published vases, a large fragmentary shallow bowl (Evans 1921, fig. 122: 11).

26. K.05 stands for "Knossos 1905"; WSK probably stands for "West Square Kamares" and TP for "Test Pit". The numbers following this are probably like those of the Vat Room deposit (see Catalogue), where the numbers marked on some of the pots in the HM correspond exactly to the numbers and descriptions given by Mackenzie in his pottery notebook for 1903.
examined box no. 244, which contains the pottery from the first metre, i.e. the pottery examined by Dawkins and Mackenzie, which prompted the extension of the investigations. Not only are there joins between all three boxes of Test Pit 9, but also between all the three boxes of Test Pits 9 and the two boxes of Test Pit 4. In both Test Pits there are many fragments (and even a few complete or restorable vases) which can be assigned on stylistic grounds to MM IA, but there is also, as one would expect, a large proportion of material which is certainly later.

As to Test Pit 15: first, there are seven boxes (nos. 313-319) containing the pottery from "1.05 to floor at 1.50", and not one as stated by Andreou. Second, the contents of these boxes are not homogeneous and the general impression is that the greater part is much later than MM IA. There are no joins between these boxes from Test Pit 15 and those from Test Pits 9 and 4. There are, however, five complete vases which can be assigned on stylistic grounds to MM IA and are illustrated in PL. 27.

This suggests that the MM IA deposit from House C, with vases found in situ or fallen on the floor at about 1.50m. below the surface of the West Court (or 1.20m., 27. Pendlebury et al. (1933-35) reports only four boxes.

28. These five vases have not been included in the catalogue, because of the uncertainties concerning their provenance and context.
according to the labels on the KSM boxes), was found in 1905 in Test Pit 14, which is an extension towards East of Test Pit 9 (for the position of the relevant Test Pits see FIGS. 4, 7). Thus, it follows that the position of Test Pit 9 (= B.I.12) given by Pendlebury is not correct (cf. Pendlebury et al. 1935, plan 4.B = FIG. 3 and FIGS. 4, 7). Test Pit 9 (= B.I.12) should be beside Test Pit 14 (= B.I.17). The plan in Pendlebury et al. (1933-35, plan 4.B, i.e. FIG. 3) bears very little resemblance to Mackenzie's plan of the Test Pits (cf. FIG. 7).

Test Pits 9 and 4, excavated in 1904, contained some MM IA pottery. This pottery, although it is now mixed with later material, is most likely to have come, originally, from the "floor deposit" of House C. Given the amount of later building activity carried out in the area, this is not very surprising. It is, indeed, surprising and fortunate that a "floor deposit" with vases in situ was discovered in Test Pit 14, during the excavations conducted in 1905.29

House C is a fairly substantial deposit (for MM I standards), which yielded about thirty complete or restorable vases that can be assigned to MM I. Evans (1905, fig. 9) published only 15 complete vases and 5 fragments.

29. As one would expect, the material from the MM IA floor now stored in the KSM includes some later material, of which only a few examples have been included in the Catalogue (nos. 33-39).
Sinclair Hood (personal communication) believes that this deposit should be assigned to the MM IB phase, because of the presence of the very advanced polychrome jug with the double-axe motif and spiraliform decoration (no. 13, PL. 23). This vase, indeed, is unique in both shape and decoration. It is generally accepted that polychromy, intended as the contemporary use of red and white paint on a dark ground, started in MM IA and this is testified by the two polychrome jugs from House B. This vase, however, shows the contemporary use of three colours on a dark ground: red, white and yellow-orange, anticipating the polychromy of the best Kamares ware of the following MM IIA-IIIA phases. In addition to jug no. 13, the only other polychrome vase assigned to the house is the bridge-spouted jar no. 14 (PL. 23), which shows a very simple decoration of alternating orange and white lines. Apart from these two polychrome vases, the only other form which is unique to House C is the stemmed bowl no. 15 (Evans 1921, fig. 122: 12; cf. PL. 24). The rest —i.e. the vast majority— of the pottery from House C consists of "egg-cups", footed goblets, one-handled cups, beaked jugs with cutaway neck etc. (FIGS. 20, PLS. 22-26), which are identical in fabric and shape to the vessels found in other MM IA deposits such as Houses A and B, the Upper East Well, the North Quarter of the City etc. (cf. Chapter 5, 171-177).

The presence of the polychrome jug no. 13 has been taken as an indication that House C was, probably, later
than deposits such as Houses A and B (Hood, personal communication; cf. also MacGillivray 1986, 19-20).

However, this vase is so stylistically advanced and in such contrast with the rest of the pottery found in this deposit, that one is tempted to consider it to be the result of contamination by the overlying levels. Perhaps this vase belonged to the MM IIA deposit from the Chamber below the West Court (Test Pit 4) mentioned above, which had partly cut through the MM I level. An unpublished photograph from Evans' Archive (PL. 21) shows this and other vases resting on the floor of the house. (It is easy to recognize the shallow bowl no. 17, the polychrome bridge-spouted jar no. 14 and some of the beaked jugs with cutaway neck). However, while the other vases had not been lifted out of the ground, the polychrome jug appears to have been already washed, dried, mended and then put (back ?) on the floor of House C. This photograph, therefore, cannot be used to prove that the vase was found together with the others but, rather, causes suspicion. Thus, the doubts concerning the provenance of this vase combined with fact that the large majority of the vases from this deposit are identical in fabric, shape and decoration to those found in the Upper East Well, Houses A and B, the North Quarter of the City and in the Well to the North of House A, make it difficult to place House C in the pottery sequence at Knossos. Basically, there are three interpretations which at present may be equally sustained:
1) House C (as published by Evans and Mackenzie, i.e. with the polychrome jug no. 13) was destroyed or abandoned at the same time as other MM IA deposits but is stylistically more advanced.

2) House C (as published by Evans and Mackenzie) was destroyed later than Houses A and B etc. (i.e. after MM IA) and earlier than the MM IIA Chamber below the West Court, the Royal Pottery Stores etc. and should also be assigned to a different pottery phase, called MM IB.

3) The jug no. 13 with polychrome spiraliform and double-axe motif does not belong to the "floor deposit" of House C. The deposit, therefore, does not need to be dated to MM IB, and the traditional MM IA date may be retained without having recourse to the first hypothesis.

In the first hypothesis, the distinction between the deposits from House C and Houses A and B etc. is merely stylistic, while in the second it is also chronological.

Only a larger body of stratigraphic evidence, and the discovery and publication of similar deposits will enable us to understand the exact position of House C in the pottery sequence at Knossos.
SUMMARY

This chapter sought to present a new analysis of the deposits located in the West Court of the Palace, which have traditionally been assigned to MM IA.

The re-examination of the deposits from Houses A and B under the Kouloures produced a picture very much at variance with the excavators' report and with previous studies.

The stylistic analysis of the published and unpublished pottery assigned to the houses led to the conclusion that a large proportion of this material is much later in date than MM IA, as demonstrated by the numerous parallels with MM II-MM IIIA deposits. The analysis of the context showed that this later material must come either from mixed MM IA-MM IIIA levels or from a fill which overlay MM IA level(s), which was not recognized by the excavators. In the light of these observations, it is suggested that the abundance of polychrome material, specially in the "higher" floor levels of House B, is due to this material being later than MM IA and not, as proposed by other scholars, to the fact that the "lower" floor levels belonged to the EM III, pre-polychrome phase, while the "higher" levels belonged to the MM IA polychrome phase. Finally, the analysis of the provenance has shown that some of the vases assigned to House A in the excavators' publication came from House B or from the Area encircling the Middle
Koulora. This area produced vases very mixed in character, mostly MM II-III. It is very likely that a group of 5 vases, registered in the HM under the provenance "MM IA Oikia", of MM II-MM IIIA date, came from here. Moreover, it has been suggested that some of the rooms of House B (nos. 5-8) did not form part of the house, but belonged to the cluster of houses built in MM IIA and destroyed in MM IIIA, located to the North of the Kouloures. This, and other observations made by other scholars indicate MM IIA as the likely date for the construction of the West Enceinte Wall, and not late MM IA as suggested by Evans.

In spite of a drastic reduction in the number of vases assigned to the two houses, the two deposits, particularly that from House B, still offer the largest body of material that can be used to illustrate Knossian MM IA. The deposit from House B is particularly important for the variety of its ceramic assemblage, which also comprises vases that attest to contacts with other regions of Crete and of the Aegean. The Light on Dark cup no. 27 finds the closest comparisons with material from the North Trench at Gournia, thus confirming the partial overlap between East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA, suggested by many scholars. The mug no. 61 is closely reminiscent of Early Cycladic III material. Perhaps, a Cycladic influence may also be argued, although less strongly, for the askos no. 62. Finally, footed cups comparable to those found in House B
(nos. 35 and 70) were found in mainland Greece—Athens and, perhaps, Lerna—in Middle Helladic I contexts.

Polychrome decoration is completely absent from the deposits from House A and from the Well to the North of House A, which are less rich in finds than House B. Thus, since it is currently accepted that pre-polychrome MM IA should now be called EM III, they should be re-dated to this phase. As shown in the following chapters, the majority of the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA (and which cannot be redated to MM II) have no polychrome decoration. An EM III date for all of these deposits, however, is not without problems, and it will be better to discuss them once the new analysis of all these deposits has been completed.

As to House C, it has been shown that the pottery from the "floor deposit" published by Evans was all found in 1905 in Test Pit 14, which is an extension to the East of Test Pit 9. The stylistic analysis of the pottery has shown that the large majority of the ceramic types in this deposit find comparisons with the Upper East Well Houses A and B, the North Quarter of the City, etc. Only a few vases belong to forms and types which seem to be exclusively attested in House C. One vase in particular, the famous jug with double axe motifs no. 13, is so stylistically advanced that Hood suggested a MM IB date for the deposit. It is very difficult to establish the exact position of House C in the pottery sequence at
Knossos: at present, whether a MM IA or MM IB date is preferred ultimately depends on a very subjective interpretation of the evidence.
CHAPTER 3: DEPOSITS IN THE PALACE AREA.

This chapter will review the following deposits on the Kephala hill, in the area of the later Palace, which were assigned by Evans to MM IA: in the West wing of the Palace, (1) the Vat Room and (2) the Early Magazines; in the East wing, (3) the deposit below the Loom Weight Basement and (4) the deposit from the Upper East Well; and from just outside the South-East corner and along the South front of the Palace, (5) the Early Hypogaeum below the South Porch, (6) the sounding below the House of the Chancel screen, (7) the Monolithic Pillar Basement, and (8) the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace.

1. THE VAT ROOM

(FIG. 22, PLS. 29-30)

(Main bibliography: Aberg 1933, 170-171, figs. 312-317; Andreou 1978, 180 n. 6, 184 n. 13, 187 n. 23 and pl. III; Evans 1903, 94-99, figs. 65-66; 1903 NB, 2 ff.; 1921, 108, 165-175, figs. 117a-121; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 77; Mackenzie 1903 PN, 5-10; 1906, 252 no. 3; MacGillivray 1986, 47 ff.; Walberg 1976, 104, 121, 122).

The Vat Room deposit is, together with the Upper East Well, the most important in this group for the following reasons: first, it has been regarded as one of the deposits most representative of the MM IA phase
(Evans 1921, 165-175; Pendelbury and Pendlebury 1930, 59; Walberg 1976, 104; MacGillivray 1986, 47 ff.); second, it has been interpreted as the remains of the treasury of an early shrine (Evans 1921, 168, 170-171; Cadogan 1987, 72; cf., also, Branigan 1987, 248); and third, it has been regarded as the only deposit, to date, that represents a MM IA phase of occupation within the so-called West Central Insula (and within the area of the Palace: see MacGillivray 1986, 47 ff.).

The pottery from this deposit came from a small pit situated immediately under the pavement of the entrance of the Room of the Stone Vats. According to Evans (1921, 165), the pavement overlying the deposit "goes back to the earliest period of the existing Palace, and was laid directly on the Neolithic clay, an upper stratum of which had been levelled away for the new construction". The pit itself was about one metre deep and cut into the Neolithic levels. Evans (1903, 94) reports that some MM I vases were "superposed" on the earlier (i.e. EM) remains, which represented the bulk of the contents of the pit. However, Evans seems to have deduced the existence of earlier and later "levels" from the pottery alone, which he divided into two phases merely on stylistic grounds and/or according to the standard of

1. The other dimensions of the pit are not given in any published account.

2. Evans at first assigned to EM deposits that were later called MM IA, including the Vat Room deposit (cf. Evans 1904, 20; cf., also, Chapter 1, 18-19).
manufacture (e.g. according to the presence— or absence— of paring marks; cf. Evans 1903, 94-98). The scanty information that can be found in Evans' notebook (Evans 1903 NB, 2 ff.) throws no light on the problem, since there are only sketches and brief descriptions of the vases and other objects found in the pit. Mackenzie's pottery notebook (Mackenzie 1903 PN, 5-10) does not mention an early and a later deposit in this pit.

After Evans, many other distinguished scholars, such as Pendlebury (1939, 104) and Walberg (1976, 104, 121, 122), have used the pottery from the Vat Room deposit to illustrate the MM IA ceramic phase. Andreou (1978, 180 n. 6) first provided a more critical re-examination of the material and suggested that it is in fact a mixture of Neolithic, MM IA and Early Kamares (the MM IA being the material assigned to EM by Evans in the early BSA report; Early Kamares or MM IB/IIA, the material assigned to MM I). Andreou does not explain how this mixture of Neolithic, MM IA, and MM IB/IIA material may have occurred, but he seems to imply that during excavation the workmen failed to recognize a MM IIA level, and its material was mixed with that from the MM IA pit (together with that from the Neolithic levels into which the pit was dug).

A MM IIA date for much of the pottery from the Vat Room deposit has been confirmed by MacGillivray (1986, 47 ff.) in his important study of the Kamares pottery from
Knossos. Indeed, MacGillivray (1986, 49) has gone further, suggesting that "the Vat Room deposit was not an isolated pit, but probably a sounding into one part of a series of early floors that run underneath the whole area (scil. the middle of the West Central Insula)". In other words, he supposes a sequence of floors - MM IIA, MM IA, over Neolithic levels - through which the excavators cut a sounding.

This hypothesis was prompted by two factors: the first is that Evans reported some MM I material "superposed" on EM material. According to MacGillivray, this would imply a sort of stratigraphy. This supposed stratigraphy, however, is completely hypothetical, and it seems much more likely that the vases were assigned to MM I or to EM on stylistic grounds alone.

In fact, the state of preservation of the surviving material suggests very strongly that it came from a pit and not from a "floor deposit": a large number of vases are basically complete and intact; moreover, they were found in a very small area of probably about 1m$^3$. They are, therefore, likely to have come from a pit, where the vases were assembled together, and not from a "floor deposit", where the material would normally have been more dispersed and, probably, more fragmentary.

The second factor is the discovery of an early floor in the adjacent East Pillar Crypt during the cleaning and
restoration done by Platon and Hutchinson soon after the last World War.

Platon (1954, 433), reports the discovery of an early paved floor of the Old Palace period ("palaioanaktoriki phasi"). Hutchinson (1962, 165, 171; cf. Cook 1946, 117-118, fig. 7), however, dated this floor to MM IA.

Unfortunately the material recovered from this sounding has not yet been located and, therefore, one can only assess the contrasting dates suggested by Platon and Hutchinson on the basis of their brief descriptions of what was found, and of a photograph taken during the excavation.3

The material was found in a burnt level, which also contained many animal bones, and consisted of a stone lamp, some handleless cups and a jug with cutaway neck, decorated in Dark on Light by a single spiral rising from the base.

Two factors seem to suggest that the early floor of the East Pillar Crypt is more likely to belong to the Old Palace period, and, possibly, to the MM II A ceramic phase. First, the small handleless cups and the spiral

3. The material recovered from this test of the early 1940s is probably kept in the KSM together with the other material found by Platon, but none of the many boxes bears a label which seems relevant to the East Pillar Crypt or even to the year of excavation.
decoration of the jug seem to indicate a date later than MM IA. Second, it is very likely that the early floor in the East Pillar Crypt was dated by Hutchinson to MM IA through a comparison with the Vat Room deposit, which presents a large number of vases that should be dated to MM IIA.

Moreover, MacGillivray's theory of a series of Old Palace floors running underneath the entire West Central Insula does not seem to be supported by the results of recent excavations in the area.

In May-June 1987 a series of soundings in the Palace were directed by Sinclair Hood. One of these soundings was carried out partly to investigate the possible extent of the MM IIA destruction in this part of the Palace. Thus, a trench was opened in the room immediately to the West of the Vat Room. No MM IIA or earlier (EM or MM I) level was found: in this room the latest floor was laid directly above the Neolithic levels (personal observation; cf., also, Catling 1988, 69). Similarly, other soundings in the complex of the Throne Room Area gave no positive evidence for MM IIA or earlier occupation.

Given the large amount of levelling and building activity that took place in later phases, it may well be that the evidence of early occupation in the area has been removed. At present, however, it can also be
suggested that the MM IA-MM IIA occupation is much more limited than has previously been suggested. Only another series of soundings in the area could confirm one or the other hypothesis, and clarify the history of this part of the Palace.

However, on the basis of analysis of the pottery, a third working hypothesis can be suggested which, on the one hand, respects Evans' interpretation of the Vat Room deposit as a pit and, on the other, eliminates the evidence of MM IA occupation in this part of the Palace. In other words, it will be argued that the Vat Room deposit is a pit datable to the MM IIA phase because, while it contains a large number of vases that belong to this phase, it does not contain any pottery which must be assigned to MM IA.

The vases that undoubtedly belong to the MM IIA phase are:

1) the polychrome footed goblet (no. 4, PL. 29: cf. MacGillivray 1986, 146-147: conical goblet type 1).


3) The carinated cups (nos. 10-13, FIG. 22: cf. MacGillivray 1986, 162-163: short-rimmed angular cup type 1; these cups could also be intrusive, see below).

5) The straight-sided cup (no. 9, FIG. 22, PL. 29: cf. MacGillivray 1986, 151 ff.: straight-sided cup type 1).


7) The rounded cup (no. 8, FIG. 22, PL. 30) and the shallow bowl (no. 14, FIG. 22, PL. 30) are very close to MM IA types (cf. Chapter 5, I.OHC.2 and I.SHB.2) which, however, continued to be produced in MM IIA (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 165-167: rounded cup type 1, and 142: shallow bowl type 1).

Beside the vases listed above, which find exact parallels in MM IIA deposits, a MM IIA date has been suggested by Andreou (1978, 180 n. 6 and 187 n. 23) for the burnished jars (nos. 33-35, PLs. 29-30) and the amphorae with incised decoration (nos. 36-39, PL. 30):

4. A stone lamp very similar to these clay examples was found in a MM IA level during the excavation of the Royal Road (Warren 1969, 52 P 292). It is, therefore, possible that this type started earlier than MM IIA. To date, however, no clay specimens have been found in MM IA or earlier deposits, and Hood's MM IA deposits (except for his pre-polychrome deposits) appear to be later than MM IA as defined in the present study (cf. Chapter 1, 38 and Chapter 5, 172-173.

5. For these and other abbreviations of ceramic types see Chapter 5, 181 n. 8.
the burnished jars resemble a vase from the MM IIA
Chamber below the West Court (Evans 1921, 187 fig. 136: n
= MacGillivray 1986, no. 133), while the amphorae are
classified by Walberg (1976) under her type 69 which also
occurs in her Early, Classical, and even Post-Kamares
phases (the Pre-Kamares phase being illustrated by the
Vat Koom amphorae).

The miniature jugs (nos. 16, 27-30, FIG. 22, PL. 29)
find exact comparison with many specimens found in the
tombs at Gournes (Zois 1969, pl. A; pls. 1-3; pl. 19: nos.
7072-7073). Zois (1969, 4 and 24) dated most of the
material from Gournes to MM IA, and stated that nothing
could be assigned to a later date. However, there are
many vases that find comparisons with MM IIA and even MM
IIIA deposits at Knossos (for example, cf. Zois 1969 pl.
25: no. 7012; pl. 26: nos. 7013-7014 and MacGillivray
1986, 153-162: tall-rimmed angular cup type 6; cf. Zois
pl. 17 and MacGillivray 1986, 183-184: jug with horizontal
spout type 3; cf. Zois 1969, pl. 28: no. 7014α and
Thus, the comparison between the Vat Room juglets and
those from Gournes does not necessarily support a MM IA
date.

The miniature spouted jar (no. 31, PL. 29) is
similar to an example from the fill of Kouloura III
(MacGillivray 1986, no. 375: pl. 45). Both miniature
jars have a high foot, which is paralleled in another
Knossian example from the same deposit, dated to MM IIIA (MacGillivray 1986, 180: rounded bridge-spouted jar type 6 and pl. 47: no. 387; see also Walberg 1976, type 94, nos. 15-17, from Phaistos, assigned to her Classical Kamares phase).

The pithos rim fragment (no. 46) looks similar to MM II-III examples (cf. Evans 1921, 232, fig. 175) but also to LM profiles (cf. Evans 1935, 644, fig. 632: C8). This fragment may well be a later intrusion; so may the stone lids (cf. Warren 1967, 200 n. 35). Contamination of the deposit is also suggested by the fact that some of the carinated cup fragments (see above) joined with other fragments from an unprovenanced box which contains pottery from all periods.  

The small conical cup (no. 7) is again unparalleled in MM IA. It does not find precise comparisons with deposits belonging to later phases either, but somehow resembles more closely MM IIA-IIIA types (e.g., MacGillivray 1986, 198: crude goblet).

No useful comparisons were found as to the lids (nos. 47-48, PL. 29), the spouted bowl (no. 32) and the beaked jug decorated by arched bands (no. 26, PL. 30), although the latter has a shape very common in MM IA. The necked jars (nos. 40-44, PL. 30) find close comparisons with necked jars from House B (nos. 82-83),

6. The joins were found by A. MacGillivray.
but they are also very similar to a specimen which comes from the North West Pit and which, therefore, was found in a MM IIA-IIIA context (MacGillivray 1986, 10-12 and 122-124, pl. 24: no. 171).

Perhaps the vases that have always been considered most characteristic of the MM IA phase at Knossos are the so called butterfly jugs. Nine examples were found in the Vat Room deposit (nos. 17-25, PLS. 29-30). Apart from these specimens, only three more examples have been found and they all come from uncertain contexts, usually later than MM IA: 1) a fragmentary example from the Monolithic Pillar Basement, where it is doubtful that a MM IA level was actually found to correspond to the material assigned to MM IA by Evans and Mackenzie (see below, 137-143); 2) a complete example published as coming from the "floor deposit" of House A. However, this vase was actually found in the area to the North of Kouloura II (N 19; see Chapter 2, 76-78). The pottery from this area is rather mixed and, on the whole, later than MM IA; 3) an unpublished vase comparable in decoration to the examples mentioned above, comes from the "MM IA Oikia" (see Chapter 2, 78-79), which is probably to be identified again with N 19. All the other vases that come from the "MM IA Oikia" belong either to MM IIA or to MM IIIA.7

7. Fragments of a "butterfly" jug were also found during the 1987 excavations at Knossos by the British School in a deposit that should probably be assigned to MM IIA (personal observation, and Hood, personal communication).
Finally, the burnished and incised material will be discussed: a complete pyxis (no. 50, PL. 29) and other fragmentary examples (nos. 51-55, PL. 29; Brown 1983, 63 pl. 31) were found in the Vat Room deposit. Various opinions have been expressed upon this dark burnished and incised ware. Evans (1903, 97) initially suggested comparisons with Cycladic material, and even stated that in the case of certain pieces, such as the pixides, "we must recognize ... actual imports from the central Aegean..." (Evans 1921, 166). Later, however, Evans (1935, 89-91) remarked that the kind of incisions present in the Knossian finds was quite different from that found on Cycladic ware, and suggested that this kind of pottery belonged to the MM IA repertoire and represented a survival of Neolithic techniques, kept alive through materials other than pottery. Pendlebury's opinion seems to have varied as well (cf. Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 59 n. 1 and Pendlebury 1939, 104). Andreou (1978, 180 n. 6) suggested that this ware may be Neolithic and have come from the level through which the pit was dug (see above). This ware has been discussed most recently by MacGillivray (MacGillivray et al. 1988, where it is called "Dark Faced Incised Ware" or "DFIW"): samples have been submitted to various analyses in order to investigate the proposed Cycladic origin. The results suggest that these pieces are not imports from the Cyclades, but local products. However, a Cycladic connection should not be completely ruled out. A
burnished and incised mug from House B (no. 61, see Chapter 2, 71) finds a close parallel (in the shape) with Early Cycladic IIIIB material (see Barber 1981, 174-175). Thus, it could be suggested that the pottery in question, which is rather rare, represents a local production imitating Cycladic prototypes. In the context of the Vat Room, this material could be considered to be residual, like other vases which date from MM IA (see above and below). However, it cannot be ruled out that this ware, which appears to have started in MM IA (as suggested by the mug from the lower floor of House B), continued to be produced in later phases.

The results of my re-examination of the pottery from the Vat Room deposit can be summarised in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERAMIC_TYPES</th>
<th>SUGGESTED_DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) &quot;EGG-CUPS&quot;</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The evidence produced by MacGillivray for a MM IA date for this ware is not totally convincing. His major argument is the MM IA date for the "lower levels" in the Vat Room deposit; other fragments used to support a MM IA date come, in fact, from later contexts: for example, the Kouloures fragments, were found in the area of the wall to the North of Kouloura II, as clearly stated by the excavators (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 60), i.e. in the Area Encircling Kouloura II, discussed in the previous chapter. The mug from House B and, possibly, the fragments from the MM IA levels in the Royal Road may well support a MM IA date for the beginning of the production of this dark burnished and incised ware, although even in the case of this latter deposit the context is not as sure as stated by MacGillivray, since it contains various fragments which find comparisons with deposits of the Old Palace period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>TUMBLERS</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>ROUNDED CUP</td>
<td>MM IA-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>SMALL CONICAL CUP</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>STRAIGHT-SIDED CUP</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>CARINATED CUPS</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>SHALLOW BOWLS</td>
<td>MM IA-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>MINIATURE JUGS</td>
<td>Cf. Gournes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>BUTTERFLY JUGS</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>BEAKED JUG WITH ARCHED BANDS</td>
<td>MM IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>MINIATURE JUGLETS</td>
<td>Cf. Gournes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>MINIATURE SPOUTED JAR</td>
<td>MM IIA-IIIIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>SPOUTED BOWL/JAR</td>
<td>? (not located)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>BURNISHED JARS</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>AMPHORAE</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>NECKED JARS</td>
<td>MM IA-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>PITHOS</td>
<td>intrusion ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>LIDS</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>MM IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>PIXIDES</td>
<td>Neol ?/MM IA or later ? Hangover?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, it appears that only a very small number of ceramic types can be dated to MM IA, although there is no compelling evidence that they should be. The majority of the material is indisputably MM IIA. Moreover, the ceramic types which are most typical of the Knossian MM IA deposits (e.g. the footed and footless goblets described in Chapter 5, 182-191) are completely absent.
In conclusion, a re-examination of the evidence suggests that all previous interpretations of the Vat Room deposit (i.e. as a transitional EM III-MM IA pit; or as a mixed MM IIA/MM IA/Neolithic pit; or as a sounding through MM IIA and MM IA floors into Neolithic levels) should be discarded and that it should be considered a MM IIA pit which happened to contain a very small proportion of material which can be dated, on stylistic grounds, to earlier phases.

2. MAGAZINES I AND II

(Main Bibliography. Magazine I: Evans 1901, 48; 1921, 172; 1928, 664; 1935, 98 ff. 63; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 54; MacGillivray 1986, 36-37; Mackenzie 1901, 60. Magazine II: Brown 1983, 55, 68-69, fig. 36a, b, c; Evans 1900, 21; 1921, 172; 1928, 664; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 55; MacGillivray 1986, 36-37. In the early reports Magazines I and II were erroneously referred to as Magazines II and III: see Hood and Taylor, op. cit.).

In 1900 in Magazine II and in 1901 in Magazine I, early floors were discovered below the later Palace storerooms, cut into the Neolithic levels. These floors, with pottery on them, led Evans to conclude that these were storerooms belonging to an early phase, i.e.

9. In the early BSA reports Evans speaks of floors, but in the Palace of Minos (Evans, 1921, 172) small pits, instead of floors, are mentioned.
to MM IA. This date was justified by the similarity between the pottery from Magazine I and the Vat Room deposit.

The pottery from the two early Magazines was never published by Evans: only one vase, a tumbler, from Magazine I was illustrated (Evans, 1935, 98 fig. 63). However, he described these two deposits both in the early BSA reports and in the Palace of Minos. For Magazine I, Evans reported the discovery of a wide-mouthed Kamares jar, broken at the rim, which contained other vessels, including some tumblers of "exquisitely thin fabric", comparable to examples found in the Vat Room deposit (see above). In Magazine II, he reported the discovery of the following vases: a large polychrome jar, the upper part missing; a small spouted vase (a jug, see below) decorated with reddish-brown stripes; a clay brazier; a painted pedestalled cup; various other smaller cups and vessels, among which some that are described as "banded cups of the early MM I style" (rounded footed goblets, see below); clay nodules; and a core and flakes of obsidian. Some of the small cups contained fine earth and charcoal. Some of the vases from Magazine II are sketched in Evans' notebook of 1900, and illustrated in one photograph from the Evans Archive in the AM (see Brown 1983, 55, 68-69, fig. 36: a, b, c). With the help of the sketch and photograph it has been possible to locate two of the vases from Magazine II, now kept in the AM: a large fragmentary polychrome jar (AE 974) and a
small jug (AE 977). These two vases, and the rounded footed goblets which appear in the sketch and photograph, have been discussed by MacGillivray (1986, 36-38) who suggested convincing parallels with MM IIA deposits. The fine tumblers should also be assigned to this phase.

In conclusion, like the Vat Room deposit, the Early Magazines cannot be dated to MM IA; analysis of the pottery suggest that these two belong to the MM IIA ceramic phase.

3. THE SOUNDING BELOW THE LOOM WEIGHT BASEMENT

(Main bibliography: Aberg 1933, 142-143; Evans 1921, 251 n. 1, fig. 187b; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 209; MacGillivray 1986, 70-76, 131-132; Walberg 1976, 104, 120.

During the 1920 season, Mackenzie carried out supplementary excavations in the Loom Weight Basement. Beneath a floor with pottery assigned by Evans to MM IIB (see, however, MacGillivray 1986, 70-76, 131-132), another stratum was found. This overlay a floor of rough plaster and contained pottery which, according to Evans,
dated to the MM IA period; EM and -deeper down- Neolithic levels were discovered below the plaster floor. 10

According to the guide of the KSM (Fendlebury et al. 1933-35), the pottery from the MM IA level in the Loom Weight Basement is kept in one box (M.III.2a, box no. 1198). The contents of this box consist of just over two-hundred fragments, of which the vast majority is rather fragmentary and not particularly diagnostic; very few complete profiles could be restored, including a footed goblet which belongs to the roughly-made varieties produced in MM IIA; some egg-shell, polychrome fragments certainly belong to this phase. Very few and rather dull fragments can be dated, on stylistic grounds, to MM IA. The general impression is that the whole deposit is mixed in character and certainly later than MM IA, probably MM IIA.

Moreover, some sherds from box no. 1198 joined others in boxes L.III.1, nos. 996-8, which belong to the Royal Pottery Stores (MacGillivray 1986, 73). It would seem, therefore, that the pottery from box no. 1198 belongs to the latter deposit, while the material related to the MM IA level in the Loom Weight Basement has been misplaced or, perhaps, has not been kept. Thus, we are

10. The EM levels are not illustrated in the section of the Loom Weight Basement published by Evans (1921, fig. 187b).
unable to reassess the evidence for a MM IA level of occupation in this part of the Palace.

4. THE UPPER EAST WELL
(FIGS. 23-25; PL. 32-34)

(Main Bibliography: Andreou 1978, 13-14, 16-25; Evans 1901, 93; 1904, 20; 1921, 175; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 198; Mackenzie 1901 DB vol. II, 20, 39, 48; 1901 PN, 86-91; 1902 DB vol. II, 37, 39, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51; 1902 PN, 1-8; 1903, 167 fig. 1; 1907 DB, 10.)

The importance of the Upper East Well derives from the fact that this is the only published deposit from Knossos to date which has been thoroughly re-examined and which has been used to illustrate the EM III period (Andreou 1978, 13-14, 16-25). As explained in Chapter 1 (25-28), Hood's excavations of the Royal Road and other tests near the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (see below, 149-150) have discovered stratified deposits with pottery which is closely comparable with MM IA but which completely lacks polychrome decoration. These pre-polychrome deposits are stratified above EM II and, therefore, have been called EM III. Andreou re-examined some of the MM IA deposits from Evans' excavations and was able to reassign the Upper East Well and other deposits lacking polychrome decoration to the EM III phase.
The Upper East Well deposit comes from the fill of a well in the Eastern wing of the Palace, in the area just to the West of the Court of the Stone Spout, which was excavated in 1901 and 1902. The exact location of the well is not shown in any of the published plans, but with the help of Mackenzie's daybooks (1901 vol. II, 1902 vol. II and 1907) it has been possible to determine its position and to obtain some information upon the circumstances of its discovery and excavation.

The location of the Upper East Well is best shown in a sketch plan opposite p. 48 (28th of May) of the 1901 daybook (vol. II), but it is also shown, for the first time, in a sketch plan opposite p. 29 (16th of May): within the area of a pit full of "Kamares pot-sherds", the excavation of which had begun on the 10th of May (Mackenzie 1901 DB vol. II, 20), there is a circle with the date "22 May". In the page devoted to the work carried out on that day (Mackenzie 1901 DB vol. II, 39), the well is mentioned for the first time "... at a depth of 4.60 a circular hollow in the deposit just below where the large quantity of Kamares pot-sherds were found. This, which is full of pot-sherds, is now being excavated.". And, on the opposite page, a note reads: "East Well (to W of Court of Stone Spout) (Jan. 4, 1921)". This corresponds to Evans' BSA report (Evans 1901, 93) of the discovery in this area of the Palace, at a depth of about 4 metres, of a large deposit of vases "belonging to the earliest Palace period", some of which
had polychrome decoration, and of a nearby well which was partially excavated.\(^{11}\)

A subsidence in the area just to the west of the Court of the Stone Spout—which looks, indeed, like a filled well—appeared some years ago. The location of this subsidence matches the sketch plans in Mackenzie's daybook for 1901 (cf. above) and, therefore, I have assumed that this must be the site of the Upper East Well (see PL. 32).\(^{12}\)

The well was about 1.50m. wide at the surface, but narrowed as it descended. It was excavated to a depth of about 18.40m.\(^{13}\) The homogeneous character of both the pottery and the soil deposit throughout the well suggests that it was filled at one time.\(^{14}\)

\(^{11}\) I was not able to trace the deposit of "Kamares potsherds" above the Upper East Well deposit, but from the description of the pottery in the daybook and in the ESA report, I deduced that it must belong to MH IIa.

\(^{12}\) Sinclair Hood had already independently reached the same conclusion (personal communication).

\(^{13}\) Mackenzie (1902 DB vol. II, 39) reports that the bottom of the well was reached at a depth of 18.40m; the description of the pottery from the Upper East Well in his pottery notebooks for 1901 and 1902 stops at the 20th metre and the boxes in the KSM also contain the pottery found in the well down to the 20th metre. Only in a marginal note in the daybook for 1907, Mackenzie reports that the well was excavated to a depth of 22m. and then the work was abandoned, without reaching the bottom.

\(^{14}\) The soil which filled the well is described as having a "greenish olive tint" up to a depth of 19.25 m. From this depth downwards the soil assumed a "yellow tinged terracotta" colour, while "the foundation deposit and the vergin soil had a bright terracotta colour" (Mackenzie, 1902 DB vol. II, 39, 43-4, 46, 48, 49, 51). Mackenzie (1902 DB vol. II, 37, 39, 43-4) mentions a muddy yellowish layer found at the beginning of the excavations
The surviving pottery from the Upper East Well is kept in the KSM (L.I.4, boxes nos. 958-966 and SMP 2079); in the HM (2756; SMP 1636 = no. of receipt 1444, yet to be inventoried); and in the AM (AE 978, 1910.161, 1938.415). Various baskets full of sherds were rejected (at least 24 full baskets and 427 loose fragments; cf. Mackenzie 1901 PN, 86-91 and 1902 PN, 1-6).

The pottery from the Upper East Well has already been discussed by Andreou (1978, 16-25), who assigned it to the EM III period. Since Andreou's thorough account of the characteristic features of the EM III ceramic phase at Knossos is essentially based upon the material from the Upper East Well deposit kept in the KSM, here it will be sufficient to summarize his conclusions and combine them with my own study of the material conserved in the museums mentioned above.

Conducted in the 1902 season, i.e. at a depth of 15 m. The change of colour, however, was likely to be due to the wet conditions of the deposit at the beginning of the excavation or even to a deposit of soil created by the winter rain. Almost immediately below the yellowish layer, the deposit was of the same colour as in the previous year.

15. I was not able to trace the following published vases: a beaked jug (Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig 1: 4), and three "tea-pots" (ibid., fig 1: 6, 10 and 12). Most of the footed and footless goblets cannot be identified with only the aid of the old photographs, where they often appear piled in rows and look too similar to each other. Many catalogued and uncatalogued footed and footless goblets from Knossos, now kept in the HM, may well come from the Upper East Well, but it is no longer possible to ascertain their provenance.
The pottery from the Upper East Well is very similar, in many respects, to that found in MM IA deposits. Indeed, the similarity between the Upper East Well and most of the other major deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA will be further stressed in the present study.

All the material from the Upper East Well is hand-made. One fragmentary footed goblet (no. 7) shows some grooves on the internal surface, which are identical to those present on footed goblets found in other deposits assignable to MM IA and are similar to those found on MM IIA wheel-made specimens. It is possible that these grooves, which are usually more marked on MM IIA specimens, attest to the use of some sort of rotating device, which might have been a proper wheel, although not exploited to its full potential in the MM IA specimens. These grooves, however, may simply indicate that the vessel was turned around in some fashion during its manufacture (see Evely 1978, 371 and Chapter 5, 213).

In addition to the fragmentary example mentioned above, another complete "egg-cup" from this deposit (no. 6; Mackenzie, 1903, 167 fig. 1: 7) should be assigned, because of its shape, to the type of footed goblet with grooves (cf. Chapter 5, 185: 1.FTG.4). This type is

16. For this and other abbreviations of ceramic types see Chapter 5, 181 n. 8. Many of the footed goblets in the HH, which may come from the Upper East Well (see preceding n.), present these grooves on the internal surface.
also attested in Houses A, B, and C, in the Prepalatial House to the South of the Palace, and in the North Quarter of the City deposit.

The large majority of the surviving pottery belongs to the fine Fabric 1 (see Chapter 5, 181-182).

The decoration can be either in Dark on Light or in Light on Dark, and in relief. The lack of polychrome decoration is usually considered as the most distinctive feature of this deposit (and of EM III in general), in comparison with MM IA deposits.

The range of ceramic forms made in Fabric 1 that appear in the Upper East Well deposit is very similar to that of Houses A, B, C, the Well to the North of House A, the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace and the North Quarter of the City.

The footed goblet or "egg-cup" (nos. 1-9, FIG. 23 and PL. 34) is one of the most common forms. It is always decorated with a horizontal band below the rim, either in Light on Dark or in Dark on Light. Two exceptional specimens, however, are decorated with rockwork barbotine and added dark paint (Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig.1: 5-6; see also FIG. 23: 9 and PL. 33: 8-9). Footed goblets are present in a variety of types, usually shared by the other six deposits mentioned above (cf.
Chapter 5, 182 ff.: I.FTG.1-4). Only the Upper East Well footed goblet no. 9 represents a type (cf. Chapter 5, 186: I.FTG.5) which is not attested elsewhere. The shape of this "egg-cup" is reminiscent of EM II B specimens, with rounded body and wide foot (cf. Momigliano, in press). One can also remark the absence from the Upper East Well of footed goblets with straight-sided, conical body (cf. Chapter 5, 184: I.FTG.3), which appear in the other deposits.

Footless goblets (nos. 10-18, FIGS. 23, 24 and PL. 34) are present in two types: the first has a deep, usually straight-sided, conical body, and a flat base and is decorated in Light on Dark or in Dark on Light as are the footed goblets (see, also, Andreou 1978, fig 1: 5-7 and pl. 1: 5-8; cf. Chapter 5, 188-189: I. FTLG.1). The second is only attested in the Upper East Well (cf. Chapter 5, 190-191: I.FTLG.4). It has a rounded body, and a flat base, and can be simply decorated by a dark wash (inside and out) to which, on certain examples, a simple linear decoration is added (FIG. 24: 7; Andreou 1978, fig. 1: 4,8 and pl. I: 12, 14-15).

17. See n. 5.
18. Sometimes there can be a combination of the two techniques: one specimen from the Upper East Well has a white band painted over a wider brown band on the plain surface.
19. Rounded footless goblets were also found in the EM III levels discovered during the excavations of the Royal Road, and in the soundings near the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace.
The one-handed cups appear in three types, which find identical parallels in other MM IA deposits. One cup (no. 21, FIG. 24, PL. 34) has a rounded body, a loop handle with round section raised above the rim, and a flat base; this shape is very similar to EM II B examples (see, also Andreou 1978, pl. I, 9; cf. Evans 1921, 73 fig. 40, top right, for EM II B examples), but is also attested in the deposit from House B (cf. Chapter 5, 193: I.OHC.4); in the Upper East Well the decoration simply consists of a dark wash. The one-handed cups nos. 19 and 20 (FIG. 24, PL. 34; Andreou 1978, fig. I: 9 and pl. I: 10) both belong to types very common in most of the major deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA (cf. Chapter 5, 191-192: I.OHC.1-2).

Shallow bowls (nos. 22-26, FIGS. 24-25 and PL. 34) appear in three types. They all have flat bases, straight or slightly concave sides and simple or everted rims (cf. Chapter 5, 194-195; see, also, Andreou 1978, fig. I: 12 and pl. I: 17-18, 25-26). The external surface is usually left plain, while the decoration on the inside can be either in Light on Dark or in Dark on Light, and often consists of bands on and below the rim. Only two examples from the Upper East Well show slightly more elaborate patterns: one (no. 22) has diagonal crossing lines in brown paint on the rim, the other (no. 25) has black-brown solid semicircles pendent from the rim.
The beaked jug with cut-away neck seems to be the only kind of jug present in the Upper East Well deposit (nos. 27-35, FIG. 25 and PLS. 33, 34; cf. also no. 41, made in a different fabric, PL. 34). One specimen (no. 27; see, also, Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig. 1: 4) has a somewhat squat body and rather broad neck, which make it closer to EM II examples (cf. Evans 1921, fig 40; cf. also the specimens from Giophyrakia mentioned below). Apart from this single vase, the bodies of the other preserved jugs can be either globular-conical with a flat base (all the surviving base fragments are flat) or globular with a slightly raised base (cf. Chapter 5, 196-198: I.BJ.1-3). Necks are fairly tall and straight. Handles have a round section: they are slightly arched and go from the rim -or just below the rim- to the shoulder. Beaked jugs identical to those from the Upper East Well can be found in the six deposits mentioned above.

The decoration of the jugs is more varied than their shapes. A large specimen (no. 41), in a coarse orange fabric, showing a whitish slip and faint traces of decoration in brown paint, has relief decoration consisting of warts alternating with vertical ridges (PL. 34; Andreou 1978, pl. I: 28); this specimen is reminiscent of jugs from the Messara tombs (cf. Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XLI: lower row; pl. XXXV: 5075; pl. XLV: 5698-5699). Other fragmentary examples (made in the usual Fabric I) present relief decoration, often
combined with painted decoration, consisting of incised bands or plain ridges around and/or below the base of the neck (nos. 32, 34-35; Andreou 1978, pl. 1: 20-22). This sort of relief decoration also reminds one of material from the Messara (cf. Zois 1965, pls. 10, 17 and 18). A typical Dark on Light decoration is the so called "leaf-like" pattern, which consists, basically, of a slash of dark paint across each shoulder, often with the centre marked by a white line (cf. Chapter 5, 215 and, also, Andreou 1978, fig. 1: 11 and pl. 1: 19); this kind of decoration is also attested on jugs from other deposits such as the North Quarter of the City, House B, and House C. Other jugs may be simply decorated by dark bands, or have the body covered by a dark wash and the neck reserved. One complete example, now in the HM (no. 28, PLS. 33-34; Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig. 1:3), and a fragmentary one (no. 29, now kept in the KSM: see FIG. 25) are decorated in Light on Dark: the decoration consists of two horizontal rows of dots between pairs of horizontal lines around the maximum diameter of the body, on a red ground in the former, black in the latter.

The side-spouted jar with one vertical handle opposite the spout (or "tea-pot") is a form which seems to appear only in the Upper East Well deposit (nos. 36-39, PL. 33 and FIG. 25; cf. Chapter 5, 201-202: I. SSJ.3). It has a globular-conical body, a thickened inside collar
rim and a round-section handle. It seems that all the specimens from the Upper East Well are left plain.  

Bridge-spouted and side-spouted jars with two horizontal handles are only represented by fragments which are often difficult to assign to one or the other form (or even to the "tea-pot"). No complete profile could be restored. All base fragments, however, are flat. The body was probably either globular-conical or biconical, with a slightly carinated, high shoulder (cf. Chapter 5, 200-204). Rims are nearly always thickened inside. Handles, which are attached on the shoulder, have a round section and are slightly tilted upwards. Decoration is in Light on Dark, in Dark on Light, and in a combination of the two techniques, which has been called "reversible decoration" by Walberg (1976, 80). It seems that the more elaborate patterns are found on these spouted jars (cf. Andreou 1978, fig. 1: 14-18 and pl. II). One small fragment presents an incised pattern (Andreou 1978, fig. 1: 13 and pl. II: 23).

---

20. Apart from the four published "tea-pots", there are two other specimens from Knossos, conserved in the HM (nos. 2741 and 2742) which might come from the Upper East Well, although it is equally possible, for example, that they come from the North Quarter of the City or from some other deposits found in the first years of the excavations. One of them is decorated with bands in a brown-black paint. To my knowledge, this is the only complete specimen from Knossos which bears some decoration. It is impossible to tell whether some decorated fragments belonged to "tea-pots", to spouted jars with two horizontal handles or to bridge-spouted jars. One can only say that the majority of the surviving complete "tea-pots" from Prepalatial contexts at Knossos are not decorated.
Finally, it is worth mentioning the presence of a miniature pithos (no. 40, PL. 33; Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig. 1: 13) with three vertical handles, decorated by an incised relief band around the maximum diameter of the body, and by trickles of paint.

To date, the Upper East Well is apparently the only pure and homogeneous deposit from Evans’ excavations which is attributed to the EM III period without a shade of doubt (Andreou 1978; Cadogan and Hood, personal communication). If indeed the Upper East Well can represent the EM III phase at Knossos, it might seem rather odd that the significance of this deposit was not recognized by Evans and Mackenzie. This can, perhaps, be explained by two concomitant factors: first, the very close similarity between the material from the Upper East Well and that found in other deposits traditionally assigned by Evans to MM IA; second, the lack of good comparative material from the EM levels in the West Court Test Pits. Indeed, Mackenzie (1907 DB, 3; see also his letter to Evans in Palmer 1969, 149-151) remarked that Knossos, due to the scarcity of EM material, did not have a representative ceramic sequence for the period, for which one needed to look to other sites in Crete. This may also explain why Evans used East Cretan vases to illustrate the EM III period throughout the island. In

21. There are just a handful of fragments which are obviously later intrusions (and which were not described by Mackenzie in his pottery notebooks), amongst which it is worth mentioning the fragment of a LM alabastron. 
other words, although deposits such as the Upper East Well were initially assigned to the late phases of the EM period (Evans 1903, 18; 1904, 20; cf. Chapter 1, 18-19), after the discovery of House C in 1905 these deposits were firmly and consistently assigned to MM I (Mackenzie 1903; 1906) and, later, to MM IA by Evans (1921, 164-186; 1935, 82 ff., specially 85-87). Perhaps both Evans and Mackenzie expected the EM III pottery from Knossos to look different, i.e. more similar to its East Cretan counterpart and, therefore, did not realize that what they called MM I (MM IA) or, at least, a large part of it was indeed contemporary with East Cretan EM III and could therefore have represented the EM III phase at Knossos.

The similarity between the Upper East Well and other deposits usually assigned to MM IA (such as Houses A, B, C etc.) is clearly demonstrated by the large number of ceramic types which they have in common (for example, Chapter 5, 172-178 and 182-193: I.FTG.1, 2 and 4; I.FTLG.1.; I.OHC.1, 2 and 6; and I.BJ.1 and 3). It is also demonstrated by the presence of some common decorative motives, such as the raised incised bands and the "leaf-like" pattern on beaked jugs. Indeed, very few types seem to be typical of only the Upper East Well deposit: the footless goblet with rounded body (cf. above and Chapter 5, 190: I.FTLG.4); the footed goblet with rounded body which is exemplified by only a single specimen (see above and Chapter 5, 184: I.FTG.5); and, possibly, the "tea-pot" (cf. above and Chapter 5, 201:....
I.SSJ.3). The footless goblet with rounded body is represented in the Upper East Well only by fragmentary examples which were probably taken for one-handled cup or "egg-cup" fragments by Mackenzie: it is only with the British School's excavations of the Royal Road (Hood 1962: 1966), and in the area of the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace that material comparable to the Upper East Well has been provided, which has made possible a new analysis, and new dating of the Upper East Well. Indeed, if one had to judge from Evans' material alone, the Upper East Well would still be grouped together with the other deposits usually assigned to MM IA (with the obvious exception of those which clearly belong to MM IIA, such as the Vat Room and the Early Magazines).

Evans did not considered significant what is now accepted to be the fundamental (and, in practice, the only) criterion to distinguish between EM III and MM IA: the absence in the former and the presence in the latter phase of polychrome decoration. Evans believed that polychromy had already started in EM III (although his assumption was based upon a single vase, purchased before the excavations at Knossos had started; cf. Chapter 1, 23). Moreover, he assigned deposits to MM IA even if they lacked polychrome decoration (e.g. the Upper East Well itself; the North Quarter of the City; and the important deposits from the "wall tests": see Appendix 1 nos. 2, 8, 9, 26; see, also, Evans 1921, 104). As will
be explained in Chapter 5 (171-178) the criterion of the absence/presence of polychrome decoration to distinguish between Knossien EM III and MM IA deposits presents many shortcomings when applied to Evans' material.

In connection with the Upper East Well, it seems appropriate to discuss briefly the other deposits from Evans' excavations which have been tentatively assigned to EM III (Andreou 1978, 14-16; cf. Chapter 1, 27-28):

1) a "floor deposit" at 1.60 m. from Test Pit 14 (B.I.17, KSM boxes nos. 302-306);

2) a "floor deposit" at 1.70 m. from Test Pit 15 (B.I.18, KSM box. no. 320);

3) the "lower" floor deposit from House B below the Western Kouloura;

4) the deposit from the North Quarter of the City.

22. Andreou also mentions the EM III-MM IA deposit from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (see below); apart from this deposit and those found in more recent excavations by the British School, two other EM III deposits are reported: one is a Well excavated in 1931 (B.I.31) with mostly EM III material (Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 42), situated in the SW corner of the West Court; the other is another unpublished deposit from a test pit in the West Court excavated in 1937 (Warren 1965, 23). Evans (1935, 69) reports the find of an EM III vase in the Stavromyti cave, on the Road to Juktas. Some EM III fragments were found in the fill of the EM II House in the West Court excavated by John Evans (1972, 118 n. 2).
With the possible exception of North Quarter of the City, these deposits should not be used to illustrate the EM III phase, as it is currently defined at Knossos, for the reasons explained below.

According to Andreou the deposits from Test Pits 14 and 15 are stratified below MM IA. This may be the case for Test Pit 14, but certainly cannot be for Test Pit 15 where the level above the supposed EM III floor contains rather mixed pottery, mostly later than MM IA (see Chapter 2, 84-86). Nor can they be considered to be "floor deposits" such as those from Houses A, B, and C, since no "floor deposits" were found during the excavations of the Test Pits in the West Court. This was clearly stated by Mackenzie both in his daybooks (1904 DB vol. I, 45 and 1907 DB, I) and in a letter to Evans of September 1905 (in Palmer 1969, 149-151):

"The pit brought out for the first time at Knossos the fact of an EM stratum and, as I discovered afterwards by examination of the section, the fact of EM floor levels. But it yielded no EM floor deposits...... The floor levels were largely made out with the help of Hanolaki through actual examination of the sections left by the excavators, who themselves in several instances, here and elsewhere, had failed to identify these floors."

Thus, the mere fact that the labels on the KSM boxes report floors or floor levels (as in the case of Test Pits 14 and 15) does not necessarily imply that "floor deposits" were actually found. Moreover, the ceramic material itself from the supposed EM III "floor deposits"
in the two test pits is too fragmentary and mixed in character to be of any use. 23

As to House B, it has been suggested (Andreou 1978, 15) that the lower floor could belong to the EM III phase because the excavators (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 60) report that no polychrome sherds were found on it. However, even if the excavators did report the absence of polychrome sherds on the "lower" floor of House B, they also stated (ibid.) that a complete polychrome jug was found there (House B no. 39). Thus, if one follows the principle that EM III is characterized by the complete absence of polychrome decoration, the lower floor of House B cannot be assigned to this phase, but, rather to MM IA. Incidentally, the polychrome sherds assigned to the "higher" floor of House B are, in the majority of cases, much later in date (MM IIA-IIIA; cf. Chapter 2, 46-51).

The pottery from the North Quarter of the City, discussed in Chapter 4, presents no polychrome decoration, and could therefore be assigned to EM III. Following this criterion, other deposits usually assigned to MM IA, such as House A and the Well to the North of House A (discussed in the previous chapter), should also

23. The supposed EM III "floor deposit" is a mixture of EM II and MM IA. Moreover, the KSM box 307α, which should contain the pottery from the level below the "EM III floor deposit" of Test Pit 14, shows fragments of white spotted ware and cups as late as MM IIIA. In this case, however, one should probably allow for later misplacement.
be assigned to EM III, since polychromy is absent from their ceramic assemblages. In other words, only House B and, perhaps, House C could still be assigned to MM IA. In fact, the situation is much more complicated, and it would be better to consider the matter in greater detail after the re-examination of each deposit has been completed (see Chapter 5, 171-178).

Apart from the deposits discussed above, an EM III date has been suggested for another deposit in the Knossian region, found at Giophyrakia (Marinatos 1935, 49 ff.; Andreou 1978, 24-5; Walberg 1983, 105). According to Walberg, the deposit from Giophyrakia represents "an early stage of phase 1" (which includes EM III and MM IA in Evans' terminology), because of the shape of the "egg-cups". It could be suggested that the Giophyrakia deposit represents -stylistically- a transitional phase between EM II and EM III/MM IA in North Central Crete: not only the "egg-cup" types (Marinatos 1935, fig. 4: 1-8), but also some of the beaked jugs (Marinatos 1933-5, fig. 2: 1-2) are closely comparable to the EM II specimens from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (Evans 1921, fig. 40): the "egg-cups" from Giophyrakia have an interesting decoration, as yet unparalleled at Knossos, consisting of a single torsional band in Light on Dark. However, other jug types from Giophyrakia (Marinatos 1935, fig. 1: 1-4) are more closely related to MM IA examples (see Chapter 5, 196-197: I.BJ.1; see, in particular, North Quarter of the
City nos. 25, 27). The footless conical goblets from Giophyrakia (Marinatos 1935, fig. 4: 9-13), although shorter and with a heavier shape, are certainly connected with the MM IA types (cf. Chapter 5, 188-189: I.FTLG.1).

5. THE EARLY HYPOGAEUM BENEATH THE SOUTH PORCH
(FIGS. 8, 26; PL. 37)


The excavation of the Hypogaeum was "one of the most difficult tasks in the whole history of the excavation on the site of Knossos" (Evans 1921, 104 ff.). It started in 1907 and continued until 1910, but was never completed and only part of the floor of the building was explored (Mackenzie 1907 DB, 63-68; 1908 DB, 59; 1910 DB, 1, 9-13, 20-23). Evans (1921, 104 ff.) reports that the large "tholos", cut into the rock, was provided with a winding staircase, tunnelled into the rock, which was probably approached by a "passage way or sort of a tunnel like the doorway of a tomb" (FIG. 8). According to Hutchinson (1962, 163-164), however, there is no evidence for such an underground tunnel.24

24. Recent investigations conducted by the British School in 1987 to identify the exact location of this rather extraordinary structure have not been particularly
The date and function of this structure are not clearly understood. According to Mackenzie (1907 DB, 68; cf., also, 1908 DB, 59 and 61) the deposit found in the "tholos" represented rubbish thrown in to fill it. Since the latest pottery found in the deposit dated to MM I (i.e. to MM IA), the structure must have belonged to an earlier period, i.e., "at the latest to the end of the Early Minoan period". Mackenzie did not offer any functional interpretation of the structure:

"Thus the evidence we had got was so far negative, i.e. there was nothing whatever to throw light on the character or function of the great pit itself at the time when it was in use as a tomb or otherwise before it was finally filled up with the debris found in it". (Mackenzie 1908 DB, 61)

Evans (1921, 106), however, suggested that it was a sort of guarded entrance, which stood in relation to some EM predecessor of the Palace. Hutchinson (1962, 163-164) believed that the "tholos" was used as an underground granary, a view shared by Branigan (1988, 68), and he remarked that while Evans dated it to the EM III period Pendlebury (1939, 80) was inclined to assign it to MM IA (cf., however, Pendlebury 1935, 28, where he follows Evans' interpretation and dating).

The surviving pottery from this deposit is kept in one box in the KSM (H.I.3, no. 804). According to the label of the box, it comes from the cutting into the side successful. It is hoped that further research will provide more information.
of the Tholos, and from the excavations conducted in 1908. Thus, the material recovered during the other seasons (1907 and 1909-1910) may have not been kept or may not yet have been identified. This, obviously, imposes serious obstacles to the verification of Mackenzie and Evans' dating of the pottery or, in other words, to any sound reassessment of this deposit.

As mentioned above, according to Evans (and Mackenzie), the bulk of the pottery consisted of MM IA, with little EM and Neolithic, and nothing later. Evans (1921, 104 n. 1), in particular, mentioned the recovery of "pedestalled cups with bands either in matt white on a dark slip or in a dark glaze medium on the clay surface" (which are to be identified with the standard "egg-cups" or footed goblets) and of fragments belonging to "hole-mouthed pots with ridged decoration in the new barbotine style".

In box no. 804, which contains about a hundred sherds, there is a quantity of footed goblets, but no fragment with barbotine decoration. Some fragments of brownish burnished ware can be classified as Neolithic, but it is rather difficult to identify material which can only belong to the EM period. Contrary to Evans' (and Mackenzie's) account, there is also some later material. Some footed goblets are so fragmentary that it is impossible to date them precisely, but one should bear in mind that they could well be as late as MM IIA. No. 1 is
interesting for its polychrome decoration, which may also be related to MM IIA motifs (cf. MacGillivray 1986, pl. 6: 56-60). Similarly, the fragment of polychrome spouted jar (no. 9) could well be later, since the simple decoration of alternating orange and white bands continued in MM IIA (cf., e.g., MacGillivray 1986, fig. 41: nos. 55, 71-74 and pl. 103: no. 903). It is also worth noticing the presence of a few body sherds which are clearly wheel-made (in the sense that they are thrown on the wheel). In the case of vases nos. 11-12, which can be dated, respectively to MM III and LM IA, one should, perhaps, allow for later misplacement.

According to Evans, the Hypogaeum was filled to support the foundations of the South Porch which was built early in MM II (Evans 1921, 214-215), and the filling material was provided by the levelling activities carried out on the hill top above. This would explain the presence of fragments which may well be dated to MM IIA. On the other hand, one could either have recourse to later misplacement or maintain that these possibly later sherds are not in fact part of the fill of the Early Hypogaeum but come from later levels and were stored with the material from the fill. Pottery from different levels is often stored together in the KSM boxes (cf. Chapter 1, 33). Apart from these few possibly later pieces, the bulk of the pottery found in this box does find comparisons with MM IA pottery types (e.g., no.
2 can be classified as I.FTG.1; no. 3 as I.FTG.4; no. 6 as I.FTLG.3; no. 7 as I.BJ.3).  

It must be reiterated that because much of the pottery is missing, and because the investigation of the structure was rather limited, there can be no sound reinterpretation of this deposit.

6. THE SOUNDED BELOW THE HOUSE OF THE CHANCEL SCREEN

(FIG. 27; PL. 37)

(Main Bibliography: Evans 1926 NB, 17; 1928, 395 note 2; Hood and Taylor 1981 no. 284)

In 1926 supplementary excavations were carried out under the pavement of the House of the Chancel screen. According to the accounts of these testings (Evans 1926, 17) "pure" MM IA pottery was found under a slab in front of the opening of the balustrade; while this deposit was uncontaminated, the pottery found in another test pit made about 2m. away, in the NE corner, was extremely mixed (from MM I to LM II and, perhaps, later). The surviving pottery from the test in the House of the Chancel Screen is kept in three boxes in the KSM (R.II.2, nos. 1508-1510).  

---

25. Cf. n. 5.

26. Pendlebury et al. (1933-35) assigned only two boxes to the deposit in question.
The amount of material is fairly substantial, but it consists mainly of coarse and cooking ware, very fragmentary and not particularly diagnostic, from which no vase could be even partially restored, with the exception of a coarse bridge-spouted jar (no. 7), a shallow bowl, a few goblets and other shapes (nos. 1-6) made in Fabric 1.

Apart from a few earlier and later fragments (e.g. some Neolithic sherds, a "tea-pot" spout of EM II date, a MM II rim fragment from a large pithos), most of the fine ware finds comparison with MM IA. Among those vases which are more or less restorable there are the usual footed goblets and a fine small shallow bowl. As to the fragmentary material, which finds comparisons with MM IA deposits, fragments of jugs with nipple discs may be mentioned. Polychrome decoration is attested only by a single small sherd from a rounded cup belonging to a type that continues in MM IIA.

Although the majority of the diagnostic material can be assigned to MM IA on stylistic grounds, the general impression is that of a fill or rubbish deposit, in which by pure chance there is a concentration of material that can be dated to this phase. As mentioned above, however, the complete lack of further information on the discovery of structures or of a floor to which the MMIA pottery might be related, makes any re-evaluation of this deposit rather speculative.
7. THE MONOLITHIC PILLAR BASEMENT

(PL. 31)

(Main bibliography: Aberg 1933, 145-146, 165 fig. 297, 171 fig. 318, 173 figs. 320-321; Andreou 1978, 30; Catling and MacGillivray 1983; Evans 1900, 7; 1903, 17-19, fig. 7; 1921, 146 fig. 107, 172, 183 fig. 132: a; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 278; Hogarth and Welch 1901, 79 fig. 1; MacGillivray 1986, 94-96, 133; Mackenzie 1903 DB vol. I, 20; 1904 PN; 1906, 252 no. 1, pls. VII, IX).

This deposit comes from a deep basement - excavated between 1900 and 1903 - which lay outside the area of the existing Palace, by its South-East corner.

According to the early accounts of the excavations (Mackenzie 1903 DB vol. I, 20; Evans 1903, 17-19), the area presented a "triple stratification", which can be summarized as follows:

1. A stratum which contained Palace Style pottery, a pithos of the "latest Palace period" and the two cups with ink written inscriptions in Linear A. The walls were preserved to 1.30m. in height.

2. A stratum represented by walls preserved to 0.65m. in height (with no mention of the pottery associated with it).
3. The stratum within the basement chamber itself, with walls preserved to 2.02m. (or even to 2.20m. at one point), with pottery compared with that from the East Magazines (i.e. the Royal Pottery Stores), mixed with MM IA, as shown in the following passage:

"From its upper level downwards the pottery found in this chamber was of the early kind with polychrome decoration on a dark ground, together with some contemporary pottery with a light ground. ..... A certain proportion of the polychrome pottery was of the fine egg-shell class so well represented among the contents of the East Magazines, but there was here a larger proportion of coarser wares. It was also clear that some of these belonged to an earlier period than any of the vases in the East Magazines. A noteworthy feature here was the presence of polychrome fragments with plain angular decoration, such as chevrons and lozenges accompanied with dots, on a dark ground. These must be regarded as direct painted imitations of the more primitive hand-polished black ware with incised and punctuated patterns of the same character, filled in with pound and occasionally also with red ochre. This class of plain geometric painted decoration, whether on a dark or a light ground, precedes the curvilinear on the Cretan pottery, and it is best to assign this special class to the Early as opposed to the Middle Minoan Period when the decorative designs show a greater variety and complication." (Evans 1903, 17-19).

It is clear from this passage that the "geometric" MM IA polychrome pottery (which in this passage, written in 1903, is still called Early Minoan: cf. Chapter 1, 18-19) was found in the same stratigraphic context as the egg-shell ware of MM II date, and that it is assigned to an earlier phase merely on stylistic grounds, i.e. because it recalls the decoration of Knossian Neolithic ware and is less elaborate than the "Middle Minoan"
pottery. The observations on the relative simplicity of this kind of pottery and its similarity to Neolithic ware are undeniable, but it is difficult to see why it should follow that this pottery must be earlier than the other wares associated with it, unless there was supporting evidence from other well-stratified deposits, which was certainly not the case in 1903. 27

Incidentally, the remarkable "dove vase" (PL. 31: 9; Hogarth and Welch 1901, 79 fig. 1), together with other polychrome fragments, was found in 1900 during the excavation of a trial pit in this area, sunk to a depth of about 4.60m. from the surface. The vase itself was found at a depth of about 4m. (i.e. in the 3rd stratum). Since then, this sounding has been known as the "Dove Pit".

Thus, both in Mackenzie's daybook and in Evans' report it appears that the supposed "MM IA" pottery was found mixed with MM IIA in the same layer. Later, however, Mackenzie (1906, 244, 246, 252) seemed to maintain that there was a MM IA floor and another above it, dated to MM IIA.

It is not easy to decide which of the two versions should be accepted. That there is no mention of a MM IA

27. Note that the large proportion of coarse ware mentioned in the passage must have largely been discarded, because the vast majority of the surviving pottery is very fine.
(or Early Minoan) floor in Mackenzie's daybook and Evans' BSA report strongly suggests that this floor was hypothetically reconstructed after the excavation of the Monolithic Pillar Basement and after the study of the pottery carried out by Mackenzie, simply to justify the presence of pottery which appeared to Evans and Mackenzie— stylistically earlier than MM II.

The material that comes from this deposit, and has usually been assigned to MM IA, can be found in various museums. In the KSM, the boxes which are to be assigned to the Monolithic Pillar Basement deposit are the following: 0.11.3 boxes nos. 1385-1403; 0.11.7 box no. 1415; 0.11.7a box no. 1416; the vases and the fragments published by Mackenzie are kept in the HM (nos. 2687; 5195; 5197-5206); a few other fragments can be found in the AM (nos. AE 1095-1096); it is possible that some polychrome fragments preserved in the BM originally came from here (e.g. Forsdyke 1925, A 480, A 482 1-2).

28. It is obvious that the presence of pottery which stylistically appeared to be earlier, could be more conveniently explained by the existence of two distinct floor levels in the basement. If these floors did exist, it seems rather odd that their discovery was not reported either in Mackenzie's daybook (where all the measurements of the three "strata" are meticulously recorded) or in Evans' BSA report.

29. This include the boxes marked O.11.31, O.11.32 and O.11.3a. There are other boxes in the KSM which contain pottery from the Monolithic Pillar Basement, but from tests made in 1910 (O.11.7 box no. 1414; O.11.7 b-e boxes nos. 1417-1422: the material is very scrappy and mostly MM II.
The pottery from this deposit kept in the KSM does not allow a verification of the stratigraphical sequence, since not only the pottery from the supposed "MH IA" and MH IIA floors, but also that from the three "strata", is all kept together. It is a very large quantity of material, which also includes many complete vases. These, however, are nearly always later than MH IA, mostly MH IIA. Indeed, according to MacGillivray (1986, 95) the presence of a MH IIA "floor deposit" can be inferred by the number of complete or restorable vases assignable to this ceramic phase.

On the other hand, the material usually assigned to MH IA does not suggest the existence of a floor which can be dated to this phase. This material consists of a number of fragments, mostly polychrome decorated (see below), and some more or less complete vases. However, there are only nine complete or restorable vases, including the "dove vase". Three of them (nos. 1-2 and 4) are footed goblets which are in fact MH IIA types (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 144 ff.: rounded goblet types 1 and 2); while the one-handled cup (no. 6) belongs to a type that starts in MH IA and continues until MH IIA (cf. Chapter 5, 191-192: I.OHC.1).

There is a large number of polychrome fragments from the Monolithic Pillar Basement that could be assigned to MH IA, by means of parallels with the material published by Mackenzie (1906, pl. VII) and by the Pendleburys
(1930, pl. XIV). This is perhaps why, according to Catling and MacGillivray (1983, 5), the vast majority of the pottery from this deposit belongs to MM IA (see, also, below). But a closer examination will show that the decoration of some of these polychrome fragments can be paralleled in MM IIA or even in MM IIIA. For example, the fragment decorated with an interconnected C-pattern (or C-spiral: Mackenzie 1906, pl. VII: 20) finds parallels in MM IIA contexts (cf. Evans 1921, fig. 136; h = MacGillivray 1986: no.77 and, also, Walberg 1976, fig. 37, motif 4.4); this fragment, moreover, belongs to type of carinated cup which, again, belongs to the MM IIA phase (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 158-162: tall-rimmed angular cups). The two supposed MM IA fragments decorated by wavy lines (Mackenzie 1906, pl. VII: 6 and 19) are assigned, on stylistic grounds, to the Early Kamares phase by G. Walberg (1976, 72-73, fig. 50, motif 33. 13): the motif of the white wavy line bordered by orange bands can be found on a MM IIA cup from the Chamber below the West Court (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 8: no. 69). One fragment is decorated by diagonal bands pendent from the rim (Mackenzie 1906, pl. VII: 14), a motif quite common in later Kamares ware, specially on carinated and straight-sided cups (cf. MacGillivray 1986, pl. 29: no. 250, from a MM IIA-IIIA context and fig. 41: nos. 71-72 and pl. 19: no. 155, from a MM IIA context; the fragment from the Monolithic Pillar Basement is likely to belong to a straight-sided MM IIA cup). The rim fragment from a spouted jar decorated by vertical
white lines alternating with orange bands (Mackenzie 1906, pl. VII: 9) finds a close parallel in another MM IIA bridge-spouted jar (MacGillivray 1986, pl. 9: no. 76).

One of the most interesting finds from the Monolithic Pillar Basement was recently "rediscovered" and published by Catling and MacGillivray (1983). It is a fragmentary Red Polished III amphora, dated to Early Cypriot III/ Middle Cypriot I, which is the earliest Cypriot object yet recognized in Crete (Catling and MacGillivray 1983, 7). According to Catling and MacGillivray (1983, 5), the early date of the vase suggests that it is "most sensible to associate the amphora with the whole vases and majority of material from the basement" which they assign to late MM IA. As already mentioned, a MM IA date for the majority of the pottery, specially the complete vases, is very arguable: in a later study MacGillivray (1986, 94-95) dated the whole vases to MM IIA. In view of the mixed character of the deposit from the basement, it is perhaps safer not to put any fixed date on the Knossian context in which the amphora was found or, at least, to admit that the context may be as late as MM IIA.

In conclusion, both the written records and the re-examination of the surviving material from the Monolithic Pillar Basement show no evidence for the existence of a MM IA "floor deposit".
8. THE PREPALATIAL HOUSES TO THE SOUTH OF THE PALACE

(FIGS. 9, 28-29, PL. 35-36)

(Main bibliography: Andreou 1978, 12, 15; Evans 1921, 71, 73-75, 108, fig. 40; Mackenzie 1908 DB, 55-56; Wilson 1984, 166 ff.).

The excavations conducted in 1908 in the area to the South of the South Corridor revealed some house walls of Prepalatial date (FIG. 8; Mackenzie 1908 DB, 55-56 and sketch opposite). Mackenzie compared these walls with those of the Monolithic Pillar Basement, being of "primitive rubble construction", and dated the house and the pottery which belonged to it to the MM I period. 30 According to Mackenzie's Daybook, the greater part of the area was "covered" by MM I pottery and, in addition, a considerable quantity of EM pottery (later assigned to EM II) was found at a lower level, underneath the MM I walls. The EM pottery seems to have been associated with architectural remains, i.e. with two stretches of wall (one marked EM, the other EM II-III, in Mackenzie's sketch), which underlie the walls marked MM I and had a different orientation (FIG. 9). The MM I house, according to Mackenzie, was probably "pulled down on purpose and levelled away when the corridor (scil. the South Corridor) was built".

30. What was called MM I in 1908, Evans later called MM IA (cf. Chapter 1, 18-19).
The MM I pottery from this deposit is hardly mentioned by Evans in the *Palace of Minos*, where he refers to the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace only in connection with EM II and EM III deposits (cf. Evans 1921, 74-75, 108). Evans, however, does mention that the remains of the EM II house underlay MM I walls (Evans 1921, 71), and it is possible that what he called EM III pottery was in fact what Mackenzie had called MM I in his daybook.

Some of the EM II vases were illustrated by Evans (1921, 72 fig. 40), but neither the EM III nor the MM I deposit (unless they are the same, as suggested above) has ever been published. Evans (1921, 108), however, stated that the latest pottery from the Prepalatial Houses belonged to the EM III period, and showed close similarity to contemporary pottery from East Crete. This statement has been the cause of much debate among Minoan archaeologists (see Chapter 1, 26).

Andreou (1978, 12, 15) had a "look at"—but did not illustrate—the pottery from this deposit and remarked that the material from the EM III levels does not present the characteristics of EM III as defined by Evans but, on the contrary, has many features usually attributed to MM IA.

The pottery stored in the KSM which belongs to the Prepalatial Houses is kept in sixteen boxes (H.I.2, nos.
788-803; some of the EM II material illustrated by Evans is kept in the AM).

As in the case of the Monolithic Pillar Basement, the pottery which belonged to different levels is now mixed together, although the EM III/MM IA and the EM II materials are concentrated in different boxes.31

The EM II pottery comprises of a considerable number of complete vases, some of which were illustrated by Evans. Some other complete (or restorable) vases are to be found in the KSM. This strongly suggests the presence of an EM II "floor deposit". The EM II deposit is briefly discussed by Wilson (1984, 166 ff. and, in particular, 200), who assigned it to the EM IIB phase.

It is, more difficult to decide whether the pottery assignable to MM IA, and associated with the "MM I House" represents a "floor deposit". The MM IA material is present in a reasonable quantity, but there are very few complete or restorable vases in comparison with other "floor deposits", such as the North Quarter of the City or Houses A and B. In other words, the material is rather fragmentary and, although I was able to find a few

31. The EM III/MM IA material is mostly concentrated in the following boxes: nos. 789, 790, 797, 798, 800, 801. The EM II material is concentrated in the following boxes: nos. 788, 791-793. Boxes nos. 794-796, 799, 802-803 mostly contain coarse and other undiagnostic pottery. There is very little material which is obviously later, such as a LM III kylix stem, a couple of MM III conical cups and a red-figure vase fragment, which must be either intrusive or surface finds.
joins, I was unable to mend complete vases. Fortunately, in many instances the fragments are large enough to allow the reconstruction of the profile. Thus, the fragmentary state of preservation of the pottery from the Prepalatial Houses may be taken to suggest that the MM IA deposit is a fill rather than a "floor deposit". This interpretation may perhaps explain why Mackenzie (see above) did not mention a MM I floor, but simply wrote that the area was "covered" by MM I pottery.

The presence of several coarse, undiagnostic sherds among the boxes from the Prepalatial Houses may, perhaps, indicate that this deposit has not been subject to a preliminary selection. For this reason it seemed worthwhile in this case to present some quantitative information. The deposit contains: 75 footed goblet foot fragments; 21 footless goblet base fragments; 6 one-handed cup handle fragments; 25 beaked jug beak fragments; 4 bridge-spouted jar spout fragments; and 7 side-spouted jar spout fragments.

The figures listed above concern only the pottery made in the most common fabric, Fabric 1 (see Chapter 5, 181-182), and should be considered with great caution because only those fragments which were exclusively assignable to one shape were included in the count: a large number of rim and body fragments which may have belonged, for example, to either footed or footless goblets have not been counted. Thus, these figures do
not indicate the actual number of vases for each shape found in the deposit. Moreover, this is the only deposit among those examined in the present study which seems to have escaped a preliminary selection, and, therefore, it is impossible to establish by means of comparisons whether or not it is representative. Having made these cautionary remarks, however, it has to be said that the general impression (also based upon more recently excavated deposits) is that the footed and footless goblets are by far the most common forms in MM IA Knossian deposits, and must have occurred by the hundreds.

Apart from the forms mentioned above, and those which appear in the selected catalogue of the MM IA pottery from the Prepalatial Houses, other shapes made in Fabric 1 attested in the deposit by fragmentary material (less than 5 fragments) are the shallow bowls with slightly concave sides and simple or everted rims (I.SHB. 1 and 2) and, perhaps, the rounded footless goblets (I.FTLG. 4), although the attribution of small fragments to the latter shape is much less certain, since they could also belong to one-handled cups.  

Apart from the most common forms decorated in the usual Light on Dark or Dark on Light techniques, it is interesting to note the presence of a few fragments belonging to six polychrome vases (nos. 14-19), of which

32. Cf. n. 5.
only two were made in the usual fine buff to orange Fabric 1, while the others belong to rather coarser wares. With perhaps one exception, the strainer no. 19, all these fragments present a very simple decoration which, according to current definitions, is most typical of MM IA, but which can also occur in MM IB/IIA. On the other hand, both the shape and the decoration of the peculiar vessel no. 19 find closest comparisons with two vessels from House B (cf. House B no. 81, for shape, and no. 43, for decoration). In any case, the polychrome decorated pottery represent a very small proportion of the entire deposit (probably less than 2%).

The results of recent excavations in this area conducted by the British School raise some questions. They have revealed "successive floors, the latest ... dating from MM IA. Below were deposits that may be classifiable as Early Minoan, with Neolithic beneath them." (Hood 1961, 27). Hood and Cadogan kindly provided me with further information. The excavations revealed a EM III fill deposit, stratified above several EM II floors and below another deposit possibly to be dated to MM IA. Thus, while Mackenzie seems to have found only one MM I (or MM IA) deposit stratified above the EM II floor, in the recent excavations the EM II levels were stratified below EM III and this, in turn, was stratified below another level, probably of MM IA date. How can the results of the two excavations be reconciled? One could, perhaps, suggest that the EM III fill of the British School excavations and the MM IA pottery from the
Prepalatial Houses found by Mackenzie represent the same deposit; that it was only by chance that polychrome ware was not found in the more recent soundings; and that the alleged MM IA deposit found above the EM III fill may, in fact, be MM IB or MM IIA. Another equally possible alternative is that during the 1908 excavations the EM III and MM IA levels were undetected. These, however, are mere hypotheses.

SUMMARY

The discussion of the deposits located in the area of the later Palace and assigned by Evans (and Mackenzie) to MM IA, can be summarized as follows.

All the deposits located in the West wing of the Palace, i.e. the Vat Room deposit and the two deposits from the Early Magazines, are to be assigned to the MM IIA ceramic phase (as defined by MacGillivray 1986). The Vat Room deposit presents a very small quantity of material which may belong to an earlier phase, but the present evidence suggests that it was deposited together with the MM IIA material, and that it did not belong to a distinct earlier occupation level.

The Upper East Well is the only deposit from Evans' excavations which has been positively assigned to
EM III. Its ceramic assemblage, however, is very similar in character to the pottery found in Houses A, B, and C; in the Well to the North of House A; in the MM IA deposits from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace; and in the North Quarter of the City. Indeed, the majority of the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA do not show polychrome decoration (with the obvious exception of those deposits which have been redated to MM IIA). Thus, following commonly accepted practice, all of these deposits should be redated to EM III and grouped together (again, as Evans and Mackenzie had done) with the Upper East Well. However, this apparently easy and simple solution is not without problems, as I shall explain in Chapter 5 when the new analysis of the major deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA has been completed.

It is more difficult to summarize the evidence from the other deposits discussed in this chapter. Various constraints (that the supposed MM IA material from the Loom Weight basement has very likely been misplaced; that most of the material from the Early Hypogaeum cannot be located or has been discarded; the we lack information about the nature of the deposit and about the surviving ceramic material from the House of the Chancel Screen) all exclude any sound reassessment of the interpretations of Evans and Mackenzie.

In the case of the Early Hypogaeum, I am inclined to believe, with Evans, that this structure was filled when
the South Corridor and the South Porch were built, i.e. in MM IIA. Evans reports that the fill contained pottery no later than MM IA. But the MM IA date can, instead, be taken as a terminus post quem or can even be rejected, given the uncertainties which concern the surviving material from the Early Hypogaeum, and the possibility that some of the pottery may also be dated to later phases.

For the Monolithic Pillar Basement I am inclined to believe that, as for the Vat Room, this is a MM IIA deposit where a very small quantity of material can be assigned, merely on stylistic grounds, to MM IA.

The deposit from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace, found above the EM II deposit illustrated by Evans, also presents numerous problems of interpretation, particularly in connection with more recent excavations conducted in an adjacent area by the British School. These problems may find a solution when the material from the later soundings is completely published. Meanwhile, the surviving material seems to belong to a fill, rather than to a MM IA "floor deposit".

Positive evidence for MM IA deposits -and occupation- in the area of the Later Palace is therefore less substantial than has previously been thought, because a re-examination of the material has demonstrated
that at least four of the major deposits which Evans assigned to this phase in fact belong to the Old Palace period.
CHAPTER 4: THE NORTH QUARTER OF THE CITY, A DEPOSIT FROM OUTSIDE THE AREA OF THE PALACE.

In this chapter the deposits which were assigned by Evans to MM IA but which do not fall within the area of the Palace will be examined. Only one deposit from Evans' excavations, the North Quarter of the City, can be assigned to this phase. More recent investigations have discovered other deposits outside the area of the Palace which are probably contemporary: one, for example, is located about 1/4 of a mile to the West of the Palace, near the KSM (Warren 1987, 53 and n. 41; see also appendix 1, no. 29). Thus, the North Quarter of the City is important not only for its interesting ceramic assemblage but also because, together with other recently discovered (but still to be published) deposits, it attests to the wide extension of the settled area in the period immediately preceding the construction of the first Palace. Whether occupation covered the whole of this large area or consisted of rather small isolated compounds within it, is difficult to establish at present (see, however, Warren 1987, 53, who believes that

1. Evans assigned to MM IA a deposit found near Villa Ariadne (see Appendix 1, no. 30), which consisted of two amphorae identical to those found in the Vat Room deposit: but, because Evans' MM IA date relies upon the dating of the Vat Room deposit, which I believe to be later than MM IA (cf. Chapter 3, 95-109), the deposit near Villa Ariadne has not been included in the present chapter.

2. I would like to thank Professor Peter Warren for showing me the relevant pottery from his excavations.
occupation in MM IA times could have been continuous over at least 125,000m²). An answer may come from both further research in the field and study of the ceramic material already collected, but this lies beyond the scope of the present work.

THE NORTH QUARTER OF THE CITY
(FIGS. 30-31; PLs. 38-43)

(Main bibliography: Andreou 1978, 16; Evans 1903, 3; 1921, 175; 1928, 551-552 and plan opposite p. 547; Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 232; Mackenzie 1903 DB vol. I, 4-5; 1904 PN, 18, 28; 1906, 253 no. 4, pl. X; Zois 1965, pls. 17 (bottom), 18, 19).

The exact location of this deposit is not known. However, using various references by Evans (see below) and Mackenzie (1903 DB vol. I, 4-5; 1906, 253), it has been possible to establish that the deposit was found in 1903 in an area located about 0.5km. to the North of the modern village of Makrytheichos, on the Western cliff of the river Kairatos (FIG. 10; cf., also, Evans 1928, plan opposite p. 547 and Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 232). The deposit was found during investigations around the area of the Palace, which aimed at to locate tombs:

"In pursuit of the search of tombs a large area was methodically explored, extending over a quarter of a mile to the North of the Palace, but though a good many graves were found, they had all been rifled in antiquity, and none of them could have ever been of great importance."
One result of these explorations was that a large number of houses, going back to Early Minoan times, were traced over the whole of this area and to the East as far as the rocky steep that there overhangs the stream" (Evans 1903, 3).

The Early Minoan date is a reference to the North Quarter of the City deposit, since in the early years of the excavations at Knossos deposits later assigned to MM IA were called Early Minoan (cf. Evans 1904, 20 and Chapter 1, 18-19). In fact, in the general plan of the site which appears in the second volume of the Palace of Minos (Evans 1928, plan opposite p. 547), the houses are dated to MM I.

That the deposit was excavated in 1903 is also confirmed by the fact that one of the vases in the HM (no. 23) still contained in October 1986 a scrap of paper with a note, in Mackenzie's handwriting, which reads "K.03 N Suburb". "N Suburb" was the term used by Mackenzie to indicate the provenance of two vases sketched in his pottery notebook for 1904 (Mackenzie 1904 PN, 18 and 28), which do, indeed, come from the North Quarter of the City: one was illustrated (no. 21, PLS. 38, 42), while the other (no. 16, PL. 41) was only described in Mackenzie's publication of the deposit.

The majority of the vases published by Mackenzie (1906, pl. X) are kept in the HM (2738, 2739, 2744; 4336-4341; 4355-4359; 4364, 4365; 5207); two complete jugs

(nos. 10, 25) are kept in the AM (AE 928; 1909.402); and a fragment is kept in the BM (Mackenzie 1906, pl. X: 3; Forsdyke 1925, 82 no. A 479). In addition, I have been able for the first time to locate the material from the North Quarter of the City, which is kept in the KSM. Two boxes in the KSM (V. 1903, nos. 1756-7) bear the label "TP 4 K.03 N Kamares pits N of Makhryteichos". The year and the provenance seem to correspond with what is already known from the other sources mentioned above and -more significant- the boxes contain a good number of complete vases (mostly the usual footed and footless goblets) assignable to MM IA (cf. nos. 2, 3, 5-7, 18-20, 22, FIGS. 30-31, PLS. 39, 41). They also include a fragment which is identical in fabric, decoration etc. to a fragment from the North Quarter of the City published by Mackenzie (1906, pl.X,9), now in the HM (nos. 40 a,b: PL. 43). Although it is not certain that the two fragments join, it is most likely that they belong to the same vase and that they come from the same deposit. In addition, the boxes contain other fragments, mostly of MM date, some of which bear polychrome decoration and will be discussed below.

4. Most of the footed and footless goblets in most cases cannot be identified with the simple aid of the publication illustrations, since they are very similar to each other (cf. Chapter 3, 116 n. 15).

5. The Prepalatial pottery is concentrated in box no. 1757; box no. 1758 contains some fragments of MM date (see discussion below) and a good deal of MM III-LM IA.
The North Quarter of the City is a fairly substantial deposit, by Prepalatial standards. Twenty-seven complete vases have been included in the catalogue, but it is certain that the deposit originally comprised a larger number of vessels, particularly footless and footed goblets.

All the pottery is hand-made. Nos. 4-5, two footed goblets in Fabric 1 (cf. Chapter 5, 185: I.FTG.4) may have been made with the help of some rotating device, but they do not seem to have been thrown on the wheel (see Chapter 5, 213). Most vases are decorated either in Dark on Light or in Light on Dark. In addition, there are interesting examples of relief and incised decoration, sometimes combined with painted decoration. None of the complete vases bears polychrome decoration. Although most of the pottery in the catalogue finds precise parallels with the Upper East Well, Houses A, B, and C etc. there are a number of vases with unusual fabrics and shapes, some of which, if they are not actual imports from other regions of Crete, certainly show features indicating inter-regional contacts.

The majority of the pottery from the North Quarter of the City is made in the common orange to buff fabric

6. Mackenzie (1906, pl. X) illustrated 29 complete vases and two fragments. It is often impossible to identify many of the footless and footed goblets which may have belonged to this or to other deposits (cf. above, n. 4 and Chapter 3, n. 15). However, I believe the footed and footless goblets included in the catalogue to be a fairly representative sample of the original assemblage.
(Fabric 1). The most common forms made in Fabric 1 are: the footed and footless goblet and the beaked jug.

Footed goblets (nos. 1-5, FIG. 30, PL. 39) are present in the usual hand-made types with deep, straight-sided, conical body or with slightly curving walls (cf. Chapter 5, 182-185: I.FTG.1-3); in addition, there are specimens belonging to a type possibly made with the help of some rotating device, which show a medium-deep body, with curving walls (cf. above and Chapter 5, 185: I.FTG.4).

Footless goblets (nos. 6-7) are of the conical, straight-sided type (cf. Chapter 5, 188: I.FTLG.1): footless goblets identical in shape and decoration, but made in a different fabric (Fabric 2, cf. Chapter 5, 205-207), are also attested in this deposit (see below).

One-handled cups made in Fabric 1 are attested by a single specimen (no. 8, PL. 40), decorated by three solid discs between bands in a dark brown paint on a light ground, closely comparable with specimens from other deposits such as House B and the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (cf. Chapter 5, 191: I.OHC.2).

Beaked jugs with cutaway neck made in Fabric 1 are represented by six specimens (nos. 9-14, FIG. 30, PL. 38-40), showing a variety of types and many different decorative patterns. One (no. 9, PL. 40) is simply
coated by a red wash, with neck and handle reserved. Two specimens (nos. 13-14, PLS. 39-40) present the usual "leaf-like" pattern and another (no. 10, PL. 38), a variant of it. One jug decorated in Light on Dark (no. 11, PL. 40) shows a motif consisting of a row a small solid discs alternating with pairs of diagonal lines. Another example (no. 12, PLS. 38, 40) shows an interesting combination of painted (Light on Dark on Light), relief, and reversible decoration: the body, from the shoulder down to the base, is covered by a dark coat and, on this is simply decorated with a few white horizontal lines; the dark coat ends on the shoulder with large standing semicircles, the rest of the shoulder being reserved; two painted bands encircle the neck of the jug, one just above, the other just below the base of the neck, while between the two is a relief and incised ("rope") band. The decoration on the shoulder can be defined as reversible (for a definition of the term see Walberg 1976, 80-81), since it can be seen as either dark standing semicircles on a light ground, or as triangular patterns pendent from the neck base on a dark ground. (For other jugs in different fabrics see below).

Another form attested in Fabric 1, but represented only by two specimens (nos. 15-16), is the bridge-spouted jar. One (no. 15, PL. 40) is decorated in Light on Dark, showing some concentric arcs on its shoulder as the main motif. Peter Warren (1965, 25) considered it to be an import from East Crete, but its fabric, to the naked eye,
seems to be that used for most vases found at Knossos, and the form is well attested in other deposits by local specimens. The decorative motif does appear to be more common in East Crete (cf. Betancourt 1984a, 27 fig. 3-6), but this is not sufficient to classify this vase as an import. (A more likely import from East Crete is the jug no. 26, which will be discussed below).

The other bridge-spouted jar (no. 16, PL. 41) presents a large horizontal zone of veined barbotine with chevrons in a reddish paint over it as its main decoration. The vase has never been illustrated, although it appears in one of the negatives in Evans' Archive; however, it was mentioned in Mackenzie's article of 1906 (Mackenzie 1906, 248-249) and it was sketched in one of his pottery notebooks (Mackenzie 1904 PN, 18). This kind of barbotine is called "barbotine with fine ridges" by Evans (1935, 87); "veined barbotine with thin serrated ridges" by Andreou (1978, 47) and belongs to the "Plain Irregularly Spaced Ridges" type as defined by K. P. Foster in her comprehensive study of Minoan ceramic relief (Foster 1982, 25-27). According to the last study, this kind of barbotine seems to have been made only in a Knossian workshop (Foster 1982, 63 and 143). This fine bridge-spouted jar is the only complete vase from Prepalatial Knossos which is decorated with this kind of barbotine. (Footed goblets decorated with rockwork barbotine were found in the Upper East Well).
No. 17 (PLS. 38, 41) is a very peculiar vessel. The shape of its body and of its handle (now broken) reminds one rather vaguely of another Knossian vessel, found in the House of the Sacrificed Oxen (Evans 1928, 306 fig. 177; Walberg 1976, form 70, type 263, no. 6.). Evans called the latter a "bird's nest vessel" and his interpretation of its function is still considered to be the most plausible (see Georgiou 1986, 45). But the specimen from the North Quarter of the City must have served a different purpose, since it differs in having a fairly long and narrow spout, instead of a round, wide opening, and some sort of lateral handle. It cannot be excluded that it is a fragment of a composite vase like those found in the Messara tombs (e.g. Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XX: no. 4174) or at Giophyrakia and Gournes (Marinatos 1935, fig. 3: 4 and 6; Zois 1969, pl. 24: 7064; cf., also, Walberg 1983, 193, form 48).

Only three vases (nos. 18-20, FIG. 31, PL. 41) from the North Quarter of the City were made in the greenish soft Fabric 2: two are footless goblets and one is a one-handled cup. All are identical, in shape and decoration, to ceramic types made in the more common Fabric 1 (cf. Chapter 5, 205-208).

One vase was made in the reddish and slightly micaceous Fabric 3: it is the wide-mouthed jug no. 21 (PLS. 38, 42), decorated by a very worn red wash and an incised pattern, consisting of horizontal and zig-zag
cross-hatched bands. This jug is very close to other specimens found in House B (nos. 58, 77-78), and in the Well to the North of House A (no. 8), but differs from those in not having a pinched-out spout (cf. Chapter 5, 210-211: III.WHJ.1-3).

The remaining complete vases of the catalogue form a non-homogeneous group. They were all produced in different fabrics, which are often attested by single specimens.

No. 22 (FIG. 31, PL. 41) is a simple, straight-sided conical cup or goblet, in a reddish, medium-fine fabric. The only surviving decoration consists of a slightly lustrous red wash, very worn, on the external surface. The shape of the vessel reminds one of some goblets from East Crete (cf. Betancourt 1984a, figs. 2-4: E and 4-1: H:1); however, as this is a very simple and basic shape, it is not possible, without proper clay analyses, to provide a definitive opinion on this vessel. 7

Nos. 23 and 24 (PLS. 38-39, 42) are, respectively, a one-handled cup and a wide-mouthed jug in a reddish-orange, medium-coarse fabric. Both vases present a sagging body, having a very low maximum diameter. No. 23 is coated with a reddish wash, while no. 24 has no surviving decoration. No. 24 has a broad neck, a pinched

---
7. Some vessels from Palaikastro show a fabric of similar colour.
out spout and a lateral handle, features which recall the jugs produced in Fabric 3, mentioned above.

No. 25 (PL. 38) is a beaked jug with cutaway neck in a purple-reddish, medium-coarse fabric. This vessel shows a combination of painted and relief decoration, having a series of knobs around the maximum diameter of the body, from which trickles of dark paint run down to the base. Specimens identical in shape and decoration were found in the deposit at Giophyrakia (Marinatos 1935, 49 fig. 1: 1-2). This kind of relief decoration seems to be very common in the Messara (see the discussion of the jug no. 27, below).

The beaked jug with cutaway neck no. 26 (PL. 42) was made in a fairly fine fabric which shows a very dark grey colour, due to firing in a reducing atmosphere. Its shape is not particularly diagnostic, since jugs with cutaway neck, slightly globular body, handle with round section etc., are common throughout Crete in various periods; nonetheless its shape is not particularly common at Knossos in the MM IA period, when jugs usually have a globular-conical body, while it is very close to the shape of some smaller, Prepalatial jugs from Palaikastro, on display in the HM (nos. 3334-3335). Its decoration, also, suggests that this vase could come from East Crete, or that it could be a local imitation. The decorative pattern, in fact, consists of wide creamy white bands, which are very common in East Cretan White on Dark ware.
Although there are no precise comparisons for the decorative motif in East Crete, and the closest parallels come from the deposit of Gournes in North central Crete (Zois 1969, pl. 9: nos. 7017-7018), the jug has, in general, an East Cretan appearance.

The jug no. 27 (FLS. 38, 42) was made in a coarse, reddish-orange fabric. It shows relief decoration, consisting of four knobs regularly spaced around the maximum diameter of the body. This kind of decoration is common on jugs from the Messara tombs (cf., e.g., Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XLI: nos. 4957, 5675; see, also, Zois 1968a, 194, and K. Foster 1982, 27-38, 63, 68, who, however, does not seem to suggest a Messara workshop for this particular kind of ceramic relief decoration).

Unfortunately, these parallels with deposits found in other regions of Crete are not particularly useful for precise chronological correlations. First, because some of them are based merely on similarities in decoration (e.g. the relief decoration on Knossian and Messara jugs). And, second, because some of the parallels with East Cretan material are rather general, in the sense that they concern the overall appearance of the vessels, and they are made with ceramic types which in East Crete have a fairly long history. Nonetheless, in spite of these shortcomings, such parallels do attest to some kind of inter-regional contacts in Prepalatial Crete.
The KSM boxes which contain some of the pottery from the North Quarter of the City also include fragments of MM date (some could also be earlier). In the case of other deposits (e.g. Houses A and B, The Monolithic Pillar Basement), it did not seem necessary to present a catalogue of the sherd material, because previous publications and studies provide sufficient illustrations. However, since no fragments from the North Quarter of the City have ever been discussed or illustrated before, with the exception of no. 40a, it seemed appropriate to include them in the catalogue (nos. 28-40a, b) and to illustrate the most interesting.

Most of these fragments (nos. 28-38) are in the usual buff to orange-pink Fabric 1, and do not present remarkable features, except for nos. 35-38. Three fragments belong to different fabrics (nos. 39-40a, b), but only nos. 40a and b are noteworthy.

Nos. 35 and 36 (FIG. 31, PL. 43) are spouted jar fragments bearing a polychrome "geometric" decoration, which has traditionally been considered typical of MM IA: alternating white and orange zigzag lines and triangular patterns; but very simple, polychrome linear patterns are not unknown in deposits of the Old Palace (cf., e.g., MacGillivray 1986, fig. 41: 55, 71-72; pl. 9: 76). Also, no. 36 is a thickened and top flattened rim: this type of rim is typical of MM IIA angular bridge-spouted jars (cf.
MacGillivray 1986, 174 fig. 34, angular bridge-spouted jar type 2).

Nos. 37-38 (FIG. 31, PL. 43) are, respectively, a rim and a base fragment, which most likely belong to one-handed, straight sided cups of types common in MM IIA or even later.

Fragments nos. 40a and b (PLS. 38, 43) belong to a jug (7) made in a very dark reddish, coarse fabric. The surface is very abraded and, therefore, the painted decoration alternating with diagonal rows of knobs is extremely fugitive: one can just distinguish some sort of geometric pattern, possibly in white and orange paint.

Unfortunately, the written sources do not provide any further information as to the discovery and excavation of the North Quarter of the City, except that it is a "floor deposit", as stated by Mackenzie (1906, 253). This statement seems to be confirmed by the considerable number of complete vases. Much less certain, however, is the stratigraphical relationship between the fragments and the complete vases associated with the floor. Two of these sherds (nos. 35-36) bear a polychrome decoration which, according to the traditional

8. Although it seems rather unlikely, one could argue that the fragments (with the possible exception of nos. 40 a, b) were not found during the excavation which led to the discovery of the North Quarter of the City deposit, and that, in fact, they were found in another of the pits excavated in the area.
definition, is most typical of MM IA. However, the following observations suggest that the polychrome fragments should not be associated with the complete, non-polychrome vases. First, although there are fragments which can be assigned on stylistic grounds to MM IA, there are also a number of sherds which are certainly later (nos. 37-38). In other words, while the complete vases form a homogeneous group, the fragmentary material seems to belong to different periods. Second, the "MM IA" polychrome sherds – particularly no. 36 – show features which are found in later deposits. Third, the fragmentary condition of the polychrome material is in striking contrast with the good preservation of the non-polychrome material. These three characteristics of the supposed MM IA polychrome material are not peculiar to the North Quarter of the City: the same pattern occurs in the deposits from Houses A, B, and C and the Monolithic Pillar Basement.

An EM III (or very early MM IA) date has been suggested for this deposit by Andreou (1978, 16), on the grounds that none of the material illustrated by MacKenzie showed polychrome decoration (cf. Chapter 1, 28). The absence of polychrome decoration has been confirmed by the analysis presented above.
SUMMARY

This chapter presents the only MM IA deposit from Evans' excavations which is located outside the area of the Palace: the North Quarter of the City. Although the character and nature of the occupation are not satisfactorily understood, the North Quarter of the City, and other contemporary deposits discovered by more recent excavations attest to the wide extension of the area settled in the period preceding the construction of the Old Palace.

The North Quarter of the City is a fairly substantial deposit. Its ceramic assemblage shows types comparable with those found in the Upper East Well, Houses A, B, and C, in the Well to the North of House A, and in the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace.

Apart from the more common ceramic types occurring in other deposits, the North Quarter of the City yielded a number of noteworthy vases, such as the barbotine decorated bridge-spouted jar no. 16; the beaked jug with reversible decoration (no. 12); and the vases which show external elements, some of which might even be actual imports from other regions of Crete (nos. 22, 25-27).

Finally, the North Quarter of the City seems to confirm the impression, obtained from other deposits, that polychrome decorated pottery was, in fact, extremely
rare in the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA (and which do not belong to MM IIA), and that most of the "geometric" polychrome wares find better comparisons with deposits of the Old Palace period. In the following chapter, I shall discuss the implications of and the problems created by the new analysis of these deposits.
CHAPTER 5: CLASSIFICATION AND TYPOLOGY OF KNOSSIAN MM IA POTTERY.

Introduction.

This chapter presents a typology of Knossian MM IA pottery, and a short discussion of its decoration and forming techniques. But, first, it will be useful to explain what it is meant by Knossian MM IA, and how this pottery phase relates to Evans' MM IA and to MM IA as defined by more recent excavations at Knossos.

In the previous chapters it has been demonstrated that the group of deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA is not homogeneous: deposits such as the Vat Room, the Monolithic Pillar Basement and the Early Magazines lack the ceramic types which are common in the other deposits ascribed to MM IA by Evans, while their pottery finds close comparisons in other deposits which belong to the MM IIA phase as defined by MacGillivray (1986). Deposits such as the Early Hypogaeum and the House of the Chancel Screen cannot be dated to MM IA with certainty because of the scarcity of the surviving pottery and of the information to be gathered from the excavation daybooks and notebooks. (Indeed, there is some reason to believe that these deposits may be later than MM IA, but include a large proportion of material datable to that phase).
However, seven deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA do form a fairly uniform group, since they share a large number of ceramic types, as shown in Table II (FIG. 45), and share a similar stratigraphy (see, also, below). These deposits are: the Upper East Well, Houses A, B and C, the Well to the North of House A, the Prepalatial Houses, and the North Quarter of the City.

Evans assigned these deposits to the MM IA phase in his system of classification. Thus, in order to avoid confusion, his terminology has been retained. However, a new analysis of the pottery from these deposits produces a definition of MM IA which is very different from that of Evans. It is also very different from Hood's definition of "Polychrome MM IA" based upon the large rubbish deposit from the Royal Road excavations. The major difference concerns polychrome decoration, which has always been considered to be a fundamental characteristic of MM IA and is typical of Hood's deposit, but is scarcely attested in the seven deposits mentioned above. Indeed, MM IA defined in this way appears to be more similar to Hood's pre-polychrome MM IA, i.e. EM III (cf. Chapter 1, 26). It has to be admitted that comparisons with Hood's material are difficult because of the rather small quantity of pre-polychrome MM IA (or EM III) pottery yielded by his excavations, and because the large polychrome MM IA deposit from the Royal Road South appears to be contaminated by later levels. My impression, however, is that a very substantial part of
the material in Hood's polychrome MM IA deposit is later than the pottery from the seven deposits mentioned above and that, therefore, these are more likely to be contemporary with Hood's small EM III/pre-polychrome MM IA deposits.

It is rather tempting to reassign these seven deposits to EM III. Indeed, as will be shown in the following chapter, Knossian MM IA as defined in the present work appears to overlap with East Cretan EM III and seems to be earlier than deposits from other regions of Crete usually assigned to MM IA. It is interesting to note that Evans in the earliest BSA reports actually assigned some of these deposits to the Early Minoan period, and in the Palace of Minos called the deposit from the Prepalatial Houses EM III (cf. Chapter 1, 19 and Chapter 3, 145 ff.). However, there are three problems in reassigning these seven deposits to EM III. First, the current definition of EM III as a phase in which polychromy is not attested makes it impossible to assign the whole group to this phase, since in three deposits polychromy is attested, even if by a tiny number of vases. The problem could be tackled if one were to accept, as indeed Evans did (cf. Chapter 1, 22-23), that polychromy, although rarely attested, actually started in EM III. The second problem concerns terminology: Evans, in his final classification assigned these deposits to MM IA, and so they are called in all the archaeological publications which follow. To reassign them to EM III
would inevitably cause further confusion. Third, if one reassessing these deposits to EM III, there will be no deposits from Evans' excavations to illustrate the MM IA ceramic phase.

Another alternative would be to split this group into two (or three), by strict adherence to the current rule, which states that the absence of polychromy indicates EM III, and the presence of polychromy MM IA. The Upper East Well has already been detached from Evans' group of MM IA deposits and reassigned to EM III, upon this criterion (Andreou 1978; Hood and Cadogan, personal communications). Again, a MM IB date has been suggested for House C upon the presence of a single vase, the famous polychrome jug with spiral and double-axe motif (Hood, personal communication; see, also, MacGillivray 1986, 19). My new analysis, however, has shown that other deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA share the same lack of polychrome decoration with the Upper East Well: the North Quarter of the City, the Well to the North of House A, and House A.¹ Thus, these deposits could also be assigned to EM III, while House B, the Prepalatial Houses and, perhaps, House C could be assigned to MM IA.² This would seem to be the most convenient solution.

1. The Upper East Well was the only deposit to be assigned with certainty to EM III because it was the only deposit, amongst this group, to be thoroughly re-examined in recent times. Analyses of other deposits were obviously based essentially on published material.

because it would provide deposits to represent both the EM III and MM IA phases at Knossos. But this solution is not without problems.

Various elements suggest that the seven deposits mentioned above form a single and homogeneous group: they share a large number of ceramic types and a similar stratigraphy, i.e. they are stratified below deposits of the Old Palace period, usually of MM IIA date, as defined by MacGillivray. For example, Houses A and B are cut by the Kouloures and by the West Enciente wall, both probably constructed in MM IIA; House C was cut by the MM IIA Chamber below the West Court and was stratified "above EM in genere"; the Upper East Well lay below a deposit which, to judge from Mackenzie's description of the pottery, should also belong to MM IIA. The deposit from the Prepalatial Houses was clearly stratified above EM IIB (as defined by Wilson 1984). 3

The consistency of this group appears even more clearly when one compares it with the pottery from EM IIB and MM IIA deposits. There are, as one would expect, ceramic types which are only attested in certain deposits. However, these should not be used as "type-fossils" for EM III, MM IA, and MM IB because, in most

---

3. Only for the North Quarter of the City and the Prepalatial Houses is there no evidence of stratification below MM IIA. Further evidence of stratification below MM IIA could be provided by an unpublished deposit listed by Mackenzie (1906, 253 no. 6), from the pit in the NE region of the Palace, i.e. under the Royal Pottery Stores (cf. Chapter 1, 19-20 and Appendix 1, no. 27).
cases, they are represented by uncommon or unique vessels (and one may have legitimate doubts as to the context of the "HM IB" type from House C: see Chapter 2, 88-90). It would be rather unrealistic to expect all of these deposits to show an identical range of ceramic types, and to interpret the variations in their ceramic assemblages only in chronological terms. A glance at Table II (FIG. 45) will show that there are more ceramic types exclusive to House B than ceramic types exclusive to House C and the Upper East Well together: House B is the largest deposit within the "HM IA" group and this is sufficient to explain the wider variety in its ceramic assemblage.

In short, it seems better to base one's conclusions upon the general character of the pottery and, in particular, on the types which appear more frequently (such as the footed and footless goblets, or the beaked jugs with cutaway spout: see below), rather than to rely upon minor variations between these deposits, due to the presence of some exceptional or rare vessels.

In addition, four out of seven are "floor deposits" and it would make sense to interpret them as the product of a single destruction (as Evans and Mackenzie did: cf. Chapter 1, 18). This is particularly obvious in the case of Houses A and B. If one were to date these two deposits upon the criterion of the absence or presence of polychrome decoration, House A would be assigned to EM III, and House B to HM IA, despite the obvious contextual
relationship of the two deposits. Indeed, had the Pendleburys excavated only the Northern rooms of House B, the pottery would have been assigned to EM III, because the polychrome material was found only in the Southern rooms.

All these arguments strongly suggest that it is better to consider this group of deposits as belonging to a single pottery phase, which could be called either MM IA, after Evans, or EM III (allowing, though, for the beginning of polychromy in this phase, at least at Knossos). At present, however, in order to avoid confusion, it seems better to retain Evans' terminology and to call this group MM IA. But it has to be reiterated that MM IA pottery as defined here is very different from MM IA pottery as defined by Evans, and is most likely to be earlier than Hood's "polychrome MM IA" rubbish deposit.

One may think that whether one calls these deposits EM III MM IA is merely a question of terminology: that Evans' definition of the pottery phases needs to be slightly changed, but his chronological framework—all his chronological and pottery phases—remains unchallenged. But this is not the case, and I have chosen to leave these seven deposits in a single group, instead of dividing them between different phases. I do not believe that, on the basis of Evans' material, one can define three distinguished pottery and chronological
phases which satisfactorily correspond to EM III, MM IA and MM IB in his chronological system. At present, the scant stratigraphic evidence available, and the analysis of the pottery from Evans' excavations seem to indicate that the MM IA ceramic phase represented by these deposits followed EM IIB (as defined by Wilson 1984) and was, in turn, followed by MM IIA (as defined by MacGillivray 1986). In other words, it would seem that neither the EM III nor the MM IB phases of Evans' system are represented by any of the deposits from the old excavations.

Obviously, it is always easier to criticize Evans' system than formulate a new one, but it would be premature, if not presumptuous, to propose an entirely new system solely on the basis of my re-examination of these deposits. It may be that new studies of Evans' material, and of deposits excavated more recently will provide a new and clearer picture of the EM and MM pottery and chronological phases at Knossos.

The pottery from the seven deposits has been classified according to the following criteria: first, the pottery has been divided into large groups based on fabrics (i.e. according to the clay used); second, within each fabric, the material has been divided into forms (e.g. cups, jugs, spouted jars); and third, into types based on the shape of the vessel and/or technological factors (e.g., vessels of identical shape but
manufactured in different ways are classified into different types); finally, the examples within each type have been divided into smaller groups according to the surface treatment. The material has not been classified, as has often been the case in Minoan archaeology, simply according to its shape, because of the obvious limitations inherent in this approach, which disregards technological factors (see, for example, Rice 1976; 1982, 52; 1987, 286-288; Van As 1984). Also, the material has not been divided into "wares" based upon both fabric and surface treatment (another current system, which has proved to be useful, for example, in the analysis of Knossian EM II pottery: see Wilson 1984, 48-50 and 1985, 294) because this would have produced extremely small and rather insignificant groups.

Coarse vessels and vessels made in unusual fabrics were not included in the present typology for a number of reasons, largely due to the nature of the surviving material. To anyone who has excavated a Minoan site it appears quite obvious, examining one of these deposits, that the preliminary sorting has largely eliminated the coarse and plain wares. Thus, while one may assume that the surviving material is fairly representative of the fine decorated wares (see Chapter 1, 32-33), this seems very unlikely to be the case with the coarse wares. As

4. Some of the types are attested by single specimens. I have adopted Furumark's definition, which allows for types attested by single specimens: "A type means the sum of the specific characteristics of a specimen, or of a group of specimens." (Furumark 1941, 4).
to the vessels made in unusual fabrics, they could not be assembled into numerically significant groups. Coarse vessels and vessels made in unusual fabrics, however, are listed in the catalogues, illustrated, and briefly discussed in the relevant chapters. Thus, the following typology will only concern vessels made in the three distinct fabrics described below.

The body of material used to produce the following typology amounts to about 170 vases made in Fabric 1; 7 vases made in Fabric 2; and 10 vases made in Fabric 3. The "corpus" of MM IA pottery which the Pendleburys hoped to produce "as an aid to excavators" (Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 61 and n. 1) would have probably presented a much wider range of forms, types and decorative motifs. A body of just less than two-hundred vases may, perhaps, seem rather small to form a judgement on MM IA pottery, especially in comparison with the amount of material now available for the Old Palace period (MacGillivray 1986). On the other hand, Popham

5. The sorting of the fabrics has been carried out by simple observation with the naked eye, sometimes with the help of a x10 magnifying lens. Time and financial resources did not allow me to undertake petrographic or other analyses in order to provide a more scientific definition of the fabrics. But such analyses (unless used to solve very specific problems: see, e.g., MacGillivray et al. 1986) would only be useful as part of a larger programme of investigations on Knossian wares, similar to the White on Dark Ware project (Betancourt 1984a).

6. It would, however, have included vases which are in fact typical of MM IIA.

7. The largest MM IA deposit comes from House B, which shows about 80 complete vessels, including the coarse vessels, possible imports, and vessels made in unusual
in 1970 used only 72 complete or restorable vases to define the LM IIIA pottery phase (Popham 1970, 10).

**TYPOLOGY.**

1. **FABRIC 1 (I)**

Fabric 1 is the most common among the surviving material. It is usually hard, well-fired and fine. It is orange or pink at the break (Munsell 7.5 YR 7/6; 5 YR 6/6 or 7/4 are the most common values), and sometimes becomes lighter, almost whitish, near the surface (10 YR 8/3 is a frequent value), giving the false impression that the vessel was slipped. In some specimens this fabric assumes a yellowish or pale brown (buff) colour.

further fabrics. As to the Old Palace deposits, just to quote a few examples, more than 150 vases come from the MM IIIA chamber below the West Court; more than 80 from the early floor beneath the Room of the Olive press; and 347 vases were recovered from the West Polychrome deposit.

8. In the list of examples of each type, for the sake of brevity, the following abbreviations have been used:

- Upper East Well (UEW)
- North Quarter of the City (NQ)
- House A (HA)
- The Well to the North of House A (WN of HA)
- House B (HB)
- House C (HC)
- and the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace (PH)

The other abbreviations used in the typology are the following: I = Fabric 1; II = Fabric 2; III = Fabric 3. These are used in combination with the following abbreviations for ceramic types:

- BJ = beaked jug (with cutaway neck)
- BSJ = bridge-spouted jar
- FTG = footed goblet
- FTLG = footless goblet
- G = goblet
- OHC = one-handled cup
- SHB = shallow bowl
- SSJ = side-spouted jar
- WMJ = wide-mouthed jug

(e.g. I.FTG.1 = Fabric 1, Footed Goblet Type 1)

9. The amount of inclusions usually varies according to the size of the vessel, but is always in very small proportions. The examination of the fabrics has been carried out by simple observation with the naked eye, and more detailed studies in the future are most likely to show that the fabric here defined as Fabric 1 is, in fact, a group of similar fabrics.
(10 YR 6/3, 7/3 or 7/4). Some specimens present a whitish or yellowish-buff, self-slipped surface, an orange colour at the break, and a pinkish core. These colour variations, all visible on a single sherd, clearly indicate that they should be attributed to firing and not to the raw material. This fabric seems to be that most commonly used in EM and MM times for fine, painted wares (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 141-142, who describes it as "buff", and Wilson 1985, 307 and 319). MM IA vessels produced in this fabric are hand-made (only a couple of types may have been made with the help of a rotating device, see below) and usually present a painted decoration either in Dark on Light or Light on Dark. Very few specimens are monochrome (i.e. coated with a dark wash) or plain, or present a relief decoration. Even fewer specimens are polychrome decorated.

FORMS:

FOOTED GOBLETS (FIG. 32)

The footed goblet or "egg-cup" is a drinking vessel very common at Knossos and in North Central Crete in general. It has a relatively long history, in the course of which it underwent certain significant developments (Momigliano, in press). Its origin can be traced back to EM IIA (Walberg 1976, 17-18; Wilson 1985, 297-298), or even to EM I (Hood 1971a, 38 fig. 14). "Egg-cups" can be monochrome or decorated in Light on Dark, Dark on Light,
or in a combination of the two techniques. The most common decoration consists of a horizontal band below the rim. Barbotine decoration (combined with painted decoration) is attested by two specimens from the Upper East Well. Five types can be distinguished.

FOOTED GOBLET TYPE 1 (FTG.1)

Type 1 has a deep, conical body, with slightly curved walls and a low, conical foot. It appears in Light on Dark and Dark on Light varieties (or in a combination of the two techniques), and is usually decorated by a horizontal band below the rim. In the Light on Dark specimens the foot is reserved. The height in the catalogued examples ranges between 6.1 and 8.4 cm., with rim diameter between 6 and 7.6 cm., and foot diameter between 4 and 5.2 cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: UEW no. 5; NQ no. 1; HC nos. 22, 23; PH no. 3 (?).
Light on Dark variety: UEW no. 4; HC no. 1.
Rockwork barbotine variety: UEW no. 8.

10. Some footed goblets are decorated with a white band over a dark, larger band, on a light ground: since this is, basically, a Dark on Light decoration, they have been listed under this variety. This system has been adopted also for other forms and types.

11. House C no. 23 presents an interesting and slightly more elaborate pattern.
FOOTED GOBLET TYPE 2 (FTG.2)

Type 2 differs from FTG.1 in having a foot with flattened and/or upturned edges. The decoration is the same as in FTG.1, with the addition of a monochrome variety. Height in the catalogued examples ranges between 7.1 and 9cm., the rim diameter between 7.2 and 7.8cm., and the foot diameter between 3.9 and 5cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: HB no. 5; PH no. 3 (?).  
Light on Dark variety: UEW nos. 2, 3; HA nos. 1, 5;  
Monochrome variety: NQ no. 2.

FOOTED GOBLET TYPE 3 (FTG.3)

Type 3 has a deep, conical, straight-sided body; the foot is usually low, with flattened and/or upturned edges. Some specimens with only very slightly curving walls are very difficult to assign either to FTG.2 or FTG.3. But the marked difference in the shape of the body which can be seen in many specimens justifies the subdivision into two separate types. This type does not appear in the Upper East Well. It is very likely that some of the MM II A footed goblets evolved from this type (cf. Macgillivray 1986, 146-148: conical goblet types 1-3; MacGillivray, however, maintains that the MM II A conical goblet has no obvious predecessor). As in the case of FTG.1 and 2, the specimens decorated in Light on Dark have a reserved foot. Height ranges between 6.3

---

12. HC no. 2 presents a very fine and unusual decoration, consisting of four pairs of parallel, horizontal lines, spaced regularly along the body.
and 9.5cm., the rim diameter between 5.9 and 9.1cm., and the foot diameter between 3.5 and 4.6cm.

Examples:
Light on Dark variety: HA nos. 2-4; HB nos. 1, 2 (?), 3, 4; HC no. 2; PH nos. 1, 2.
Monochrome variety: NQ no. 3.

FOOTED GOBLET TYPE 4 (FTG.4)

Type 4 has a medium deep, conical body with curved wall and a low, conical foot; all the specimens are decorated in Light on Dark; the foot, in this type, is also covered by the dark wash. The most characteristic feature is that the body shows some large ridges on the internal wall, which suggest that the body may have been made with the help of some rotating device (see below, 213). Very similar ridges, but usually more marked, are found in the wheel-made MM IIA footed goblets, which are the successors of this type (MacGillivray 1986, 145: rounded goblet type 2; MacGillivray's rounded goblet type 1 is more likely to be a development of FTG.1 discussed above). Height ranges between 7.1 and 12.1cm., the rim diameter between 7.5 and 14cm., and the foot diameter between 4.3 and 6cm.

Examples:
Light on Dark variety: UEW nos. 6, 7; NQ nos. 4, 5; HA no. 6; HB nos. 7-10, 63, 64; HC nos. 3, 4, 24; PH no. 4.
FOOTED GOBLET TYPE 5 (FTG.5)

Type 5 is attested by a single specimen from the Upper East Well (no. 9), decorated with rockwork barbotine. The shape of this specimen is reminiscent of EM IIB examples, in having a rounded body and a low, conical foot, rather articulated (for EM IIB examples see Evans 1921, 73 fig. 40; Hood 1971a, fig. 14; Momigliano, in press). Height 5.9cm.; rim diameter 6cm.; foot diameter 4.6cm.

Polychrome decorated footed goblets are only attested in the deposit from House B. However, the fragmentary state and the high level of contamination of this deposit, and the fact that these fragments are basically identical, in shape and decoration to MM IIA types (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 146-147: conical goblet type 1) strongly suggest that the polychrome footed goblets from House B do not belong to the MM IA "floor deposit" but, rather, to the later MM II-III levels related to the construction or even to the filling of the Kouloures (see Chapter 2, 48-50). Thus, they should not be considered to be MM IA types. Apart from the polychrome decoration, another characteristic feature, seen on certain examples, is a rather short and thin stem that gives the vessel a sort of funneled-shape. In some cases the foot is very low, nearly disc-shaped (Momigliano, in press).
The footed goblet may be regarded as the most common form at Knossos in the seven deposits examined here. It is also one of the most characteristic forms of Knossian EM II and MM IIA, but seems to disappear rather suddenly from the repertoire of MM IIIA.

Footed goblets seem to be typical only of North Central Crete, although they can be found in other regions of the island; in this case, however, footed goblets can be taken as either imports or local imitations. Indeed, the footed goblets found in the sites listed below have been regarded as MM IA imports from North Central Crete and have been used for chronological correlations between East and Central Crete in the EM III-MM IA period:
Palaikastro, block Chi, 59 (EM III-MM IA context; Warren 1965, 26 no. 2; see, contra, Andreou 1978, 78-79);
Palaikastro, block Chi, 1 (MM IA-MM IIA context; Warren 1965, 26 no. 4; Andreou 1978, 79); Lebena, tomb II upper level (MM IA context; Alexiou 1960, fig. 19; Branigan 1970b, 58 fig 8 top right). For other Cretan sites see Walberg 1983, 183 (form 36, types 196-200); see, also, Demargne 1945, pl. III: 0681, for a specimen from the Premier Charnier at Mallia. In the Chania Museum, among the EM-MM vases on display from the Greek-Swedish excavations in plateia Ayia Aikaterini (Tzedakis 1965, 569), there is an egg-cup which finds exact parallels at Knossos: its fabric, however, looks different and, therefore, the vase might be of local manufacture. Egg-cups reached even mainland Greece, as indicated by a
published example from MH I Lerna (Caskey 1956, pl. 43; Rutter and Zerner 1984, appendix II.B. no. 6). A review of the chronological implications of these and other "cross-finds" will be presented in the next chapter.

FOOTLESS GOBLETs (FIG. 33)

This is another drinking vessel which was very common at Knossos in the Prepalatial deposits examined in the present typology. It appears in four types, which can be decorated either in Dark on Light or in Light on Dark or in a combination of the two techniques; some specimens belonging to FTLG.4 are monochrome. All types have a flat base. This form has no obvious EM predecessor.

FOOTLESS GOBLET TYPE 1 (FTLG.1)

Type 1 has a deep, straight-sided conical body. This type should, perhaps, be considered to be the precursor of MacGillivray's MM IIA tumblers of type 1 (cf. especially the specimen from the early floor beneath the Room of the Olive Press in MacGillivray 1986, pl. 102: no. 896. This later specimen differs in having a rather rough surface and in being less carefully made). Footless goblets of this type are usually decorated by a horizontal band below the rim in Dark on Light or Light on Dark, like the footed goblets. Indeed, in the case of
small rim or body fragments, it is often impossible to tell whether they belong to footed or to footless goblets. Footless goblets identical in shape and decoration to FTLG.1 were made in Fabric 2 (see below). Height ranges between about 4 and 7.9 cm., the rim diameter between about 4.5 and 8.2 cm., and the base diameter between 1.8 and 4.5. Very similar goblets were found in the Messara (see Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XXXVI b: 5099, e.g. Evans 1921, fig. 105: left; Fiandra 1973, pl. 21. These contexts can be as late as MM II); and Mallia (Chapouthier et al. 1962, pl. VI: 8638, 8639, 8642. Also in this case the context is as late as MM II in Knossian terms).

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: UEW nos. 10-12, 14-15; NQ nos. 6-7; HA no. 7; WN of HA no. 1; HB nos. 11-21; HC no. 25; PH nos. 5, 6.
Light on Dark variety: UEW no. 13; HB no. 67.

FOOTLESS GOBLET TYPE 2 (FTLG.2)

Type 2 is basically identical in shape to FTLG.1, but may have been made with the help of some rotating device (see below, 213). This type seems to be restricted to House B (nos. 22, 23, 65) and to the Prepalatial Houses (nos. 7, 8). Perhaps, it may be considered a predecessor of the later "crude cup type 1" (cf. MacGillivray 1986, pl. 56: nos. 474, 479). The examples in the catalogue are decorated in Dark on Light, with a band on the rim, instead of a horizontal band.
below the rim as in the preceding type. One specimen presents a line underneath the base (PH no. 7). Height ranges between 6.4 and 7.6cm.; the rim diameter between 7.8 and 8cm.; and the base diameter between 3.1 and 3.8cm.

FOOTLESS GOBLET TYPE 3 (FTLG.3)

Type 3 has a conical body, very irregular and asymmetric, made out of a single coil of clay, attached to a flat, irregularly shaped, base. The surviving specimens are not decorated. Their height ranges between 4.8 and 6.1cm., the rim diameter between 5 and 5.7cm., and base diameter between 3 and 3.8cm.

Examples:
Plain variety: HA no. 8; HB nos. 25, 26; PH nos. 9, 10.

FOOTLESS GOBLET TYPE 4 (FTLG.4)

Type 4 is only attested in the Upper East Well; it is a goblet with a rounded body and a flat base; two specimens are decorated in Light on Dark, one is monochrome. The latter is the only specimen which preserves a complete profile. It is 6.8cm. high, its rim diameter is 7.8cm. and the base diameter 4.2. Similar goblets have been found in a Prepalatial context at Mallia (Demargne 1945, pl. VI: 8677 and pl. XXIX: 8529; Andreou 1978, 25 and fig. 17: 6); one of the Mallia examples (no. 8529), though, is much closer to East Cretan rounded goblets, like those found in the North Trench at Gournia (cf., e.g., Andreou 1978, fig. 6: 5-6;
see, also, Fiandra 1973, pl. 19, for rounded goblets from
the foundation trench of the Palace at Phaistos).

**Examples:**
Light on Dark variety: UEW nos. 16-17.
Monochrome variety: UEW no. 18.

**ONE-HANDED CUPS (FIG. 34)**

One-handed cups, although not as common as the
footed and footless goblets, are well represented among
the surviving pottery from the deposits examined here, in
five types. One type can be traced back to EM IIA, but
the others appear to be new in the Knossian repertoire.

**ONE-HANDED CUP TYPE 1 (OHC. 1)**

Type 1 has a medium-deep, rounded body, a flat base
and a handle raised above the rim, attached to it and to
the side at middle height. The handle has a slightly
grooved section towards the upper attachment, and an oval
section towards the lower attachment. The few preserved
specimens are either monochrome or decorated in Dark on
Light. This type of cup continues almost unchanged in MH
IIA (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 166: rounded cup type 1a).
Height (to the rim) ranges between 4.9 and 6cm.; rim
diameter between 7 and 8.6cm. and base diameter between 4
and 6cm.

**Examples:**
Dark on Light variety: HA no. 9; HC no. 7.
Monochrome variety: UEW no. 19; HB no. 32.

ONE-HANDLED CUP TYPE 2 (OHC.2)

Type 2 differs from OHC.1 in having a moulded or a raised base. This type can be monochrome or decorated in Dark on Light, in Light on Dark, or in a combination of the two techniques. One-handed cups identical in shape to OHC.2 were also made in Fabric 2 (cf. below). As in the previous case, this kind of cup continues, with minor or no variations, into the MM IIA phase (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 166: rounded cup type 1b). Height (to the rim) ranges between 4.3 and 8cm.; rim diameter between 6.5 and 10.5cm. and the base diameter between 3.8 and 6.2cm.

Examples:

Dark on Light: UEW no. 20; NQ no. 8; HB nos. 28, 68; HC nos. 6, 8, 26, 30-31; PH no. 11.
Light on Dark: W N of HA nos. 2, 3(?).
Monochrome: HB no. 69; HC no. 5.

ONE-HANDLED CUP TYPE 3 (OHC.3)

Type 3 has a slightly angular profile: the upper wall is slightly curved; the lower wall is conical, straight-sided. The base can be flat or slightly concave. The handle is the same as in OHC.1 and 2. The examples in the catalogue are either monochrome or decorated in Dark on Light. A similar type occurs in Fabric 2 (cf. below). Height ranges between 6.2 and
8.1cm.; the rim diameter between 8.7 and 10.4cm. and the base diameter between 4.1 and 4.6.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: HB nos. 29-31.
Monochrome variety: HA no. 10.

ONE-HANDED CUP TYPE 4 (OHC.4)

Type 4 has a rounded body, a flat base and a loop handle, with round section, attached to the rim and raised above it. The decoration is monochrome or in Dark on Light. This type can be traced back to the EM II period (cf. Wilson 1985, fig. 12: 55 and fig. 18: 142-143, for EM IIA examples; Evans 1921, 73 fig 40, top right for an EM IIB example). Height ranges between 6.2 and 6.5cm.; rim diameter between 7.2 and 8cm. and base diameter between 3.8 and 4.7cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: HB no. 33.
Monochrome variety: UEW no. 21; HB no. 34.

ONE-HANDED CUP TYPE 5 (OHC.5)

Type 5 has a globular-conical body and a low, conical foot; the handle is as in OHC.1-3. It is represented by two specimens from House B (nos. 35, 70) both decorated in Light on Dark. Similar cups were found in mainland Greece where they are regarded as a MM IA imports from Crete (Zerner 1978, 173; Knigge et al. 1978, 64-65, no. 1, figs 36-37; Rutter and Zerner 1984,
appendix II.B. no. 3). This type of cup may, perhaps, be regarded as the predecessor of some MM II-III types widely attested in Crete (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 165-169: rounded cups types 2-6, and 169: rounded cups with sharply offset rim; Andreou 1978, 86, fig. 12: 5-6; Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XXXVII: 5143; Zois 1969, 32-33, pl. 47: 5143; see Chapter 2, 73-74). The height in the two specimens is 5.2 and 6.6cm.; the rim diameter 4.9 and 6.6cm.; the foot diameter 3.4 and 3.6cm.

SHALLOW BOWLS (FIG. 35)

Shallow bowls made in Fabric I with complete or restorable profiles are attested only in the Upper East Well. However, similar or identical shallow bowls made in different fabrics are represented in other deposits and it is, probably, purely fortuitous that no more complete examples in Fabric I have survived. Also, similar shallow bowls with flaring or everted rims can be found in the EM IIB period (cf. Evans 1921, 73 fig. 40) and continue into the Old Palace period, although MM IIA-III A shallow bowls made in the fine buff fabric do not seem to be particularly common (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 142-144).

Three basic types are represented in the material from the Upper East Well. All have a flat base and seem to be more or less 5cm. high, with rim diameters ranging
between 17 and 30cm. and base diameters between 5 and 12cm.

SHALLOW BOWL TYPE 1 (SHB.1)

Type 1 has slightly concave sides and a simple rim. It is represented by two specimens, one decorated in Dark on Light (UEW no. 22), the other in Light on Dark (UEW no. 23).

SHALLOW BOWL TYPE 2 (SHB.2)

Type 2 differs from the preceding type in having an everted rim. It is represented by two specimens, both decorated in Dark on Light (UEW nos. 24-25).

SHALLOW BOWL TYPE 3 (SHB.3)

Type 3 has straight sides and a simple, straight rim. It is represented by a single specimen decorated in Dark on Light (UEW no. 26).

STEMMED-BOWL (PL. 24: 12)

Only one vase belonging to this form is attested; it comes from House C (no. 15) and is decorated in Dark on Light. It is a two-handled, straight-sided, medium-deep bowl, with slightly flaring rim, on a high, conical, hollow pedestal. It is 21.7cm. high; the rim and base diameter are, respectively, 21.5 and 13cm.
This form may or may not be related to the EM I-II large pedestalled bowls (Wilson 1985, 301: P51-52 and 319: P178). For later examples see Walberg 1976, 153: form 59 and 1983, 196: form 54.

BEAKED JUGS WITH CUTAWAY NECK (FIGS. 36-37)

Beaked jugs with cutaway neck are a common shape in Minoan pottery since EM times (for Knossian EM IIA examples see Wilson 1985, 319 ff.; for EM IIB examples see Evans 1921, 73 fig. 40). This kind of jug is very common in the seven MM IA deposits. Indeed, it is the only kind of jug made in Fabric 1. Beaked jugs are attested in a variety of types, most of which share the general characteristic of a globular-conical body and differ in minor details, such as the shape of the base.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 1 (BJ.1)

Type 1 has a globular-conical body; a slender neck, usually straight; an arched handle, with round or oval section, attached to the neck and to the shoulder; and a flat base. The examples in the catalogue can be plain, monochrome, or decorated in Dark on Light (sometimes with the addition of white paint): a common motif is the so called "leaf-like" pattern, which

13. Specimens from the Upper East Well and from the Well to the North of House A which do not preserve a complete profile have been assigned to BJ.1, largely because all surviving base fragments are flat, and also because this type appears to be the most common.
basically consists of a slash of paint across each shoulder; this motif is also common on other types of beaked jugs (see below). Painted decoration is often combined with accessory relief decoration, usually in the form of a "rope" band around the base of the neck or in the form of nipped solid discs. Height varies between 11.5 and 22.1cm. and the base diameter between 4 and 8.3cm.

Examples:
Plain variety: HB no. 36.
Dark on Light variety: UEW nos. 30-32, 34-35; NQ no. 10; HA no. 11; WN of HA nos. 4-5; HB no. 38; PH no. 12 (?).
Monochrome variety: UEW no. 33; NQ no. 9; HB nos. 37, 73.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 2 (BJ.2)

Type 2 differs from BJ.1 in having a raised and, sometimes, moulded base. The examples in the catalogue are decorated in Dark on Light (sometimes with added white paint) or in Light on Dark; accessory relief decoration (relief bands around base of neck) is also attested. One specimen from House B is decorated with a "leaf-like pattern", while another bears polychrome decoration. The height of the catalogued specimens varies between about 10 and 17.7cm. and the base diameter between 3.5 and 5.6cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: HB nos. 40-42; HC nos. 9-11; PH nos. 13, 12 (?).
Light on Dark variety: NQ nos. 11-12.
Polychrome variety: HB no. 43.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 3 (BJ.3)

Type 3 differs from BJ.2 in having a globular or depressed-globular body. The surviving beaked jugs of this type are decorated either in Dark on Light (many with the "leaf-like" pattern and added white paint) or in Light on Dark; sometimes there is an accessory relief band. One specimen from House B is monochrome. As to dimensions, the height ranges between 10.2 and 14cm. and the base diameter between 4.2 and 6.5cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: NQ nos. 13-14; HB nos. 44-45; HC no. 12.
Light on Dark variety: UEW nos. 28-29.
Monochrome variety: HB no. 72.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 4 (BJ.4)

Type 4 is similar to BJ.1, but its neck is different: it has a globular-conical body, a flat base and a rather short and broad neck; the handle is arched, with a round section, and is attached to the neck and to the shoulder. All beaked jugs of this type were found in House B; they are either plain or decorated in Dark on Light; accessory relief decoration is also attested. Height ranges between 15 and 19.9cm. and base diameter between 5.6 and 8.5cm.

Examples:
Plain variety: HB nos. 48-49.
Dark on Light variety: HB nos. 46-47.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 5 (BJ.5)

Type 5 differs from BJ.1 in having a concave base; it is represented by a single specimen from the lower floor of House B (no. 39), which is also unique for its polychrome and incised decoration. This jug is 11.8 cm. high, and its base diameter is 3.4 cm.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 6 (BJ.6)

Type 6 is a beaked jug with cutaway neck with squat body and concave base. The neck is like in BJ.1-3, i.e. fairly straight and slender. The only specimen belonging to this type comes from House B (no. 71) and is decorated in Dark on Light with the usual "leaf-like" pattern. It is 10.5 cm. high and its base diameter is 6.6 cm.

BEAKED JUG WITH CUTAWAY NECK TYPE 7 (BJ.7)

Type 7 is also attested by a single specimen which is unique in both shape and decoration. It is the famous polychrome jug with the double-axe motif found in House C (no. 13). The body is rather broad and globular, the base flat; the handle has a round section and is very slightly arched; the neck is rather small, in proportion to the broad shoulder. The vessel is much larger than the other jug types: it is 27 cm. high and its base diameter is 10 cm. This jug is extremely advanced - stylistically- even for traditional MM IA standards, which allow for a widespread use of polychrome
decoration, intended as the use of both red and white paint on a dark ground. In this jug the colours employed against a dark background are three: white, red and orange on a reddish ground. Indeed, the decoration recalls the best polychromy of the Old Palace Period. This vase is so stylistically advanced and in contrast with the character of the other pottery found in House C and other MM IA deposits that one could be tempted to reject Evans and Mackenzie's accounts and, instead, consider this jug to be intrusive (see Chapter 2, 88-90).

SIDE-SPOUTED JARS (FIG. 38)

This form, to judge from the surviving material, was not particularly common in the Prepalatial phase represented by the seven deposits examined here. Side­spouted jars have a long history in Minoan pottery: the so-called "tea-pot" (see SSJ.3, below) may have begun in Southern Crete as early as EM I (Wilson 1985, 307 n. 33. For Knossian EM II predecessors of the spouted jars see Wilson 1985, 308 fig. 14 and Evans 1921, 73 fig. 40). The catalogued specimens can be divided into three types.

SIDE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 1 (SSJ.1)

Type 1 has a globular-conical body, a raised and slightly moulded base, a cut-away spout, and two horizontal handles with round section, set on the shoulder and tilted upwards. This type is represented by
a single specimen from House A (no. 12) decorated in Dark on Light. This vessel is 14cm. high and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 13 and 8.2cm.

SIDE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 2 (SSJ.2)

Type 2 has a very high and slightly carinated shoulder, which gives the vase a biconical shape, with a short upper part; as in the previous type, there are two horizontal handles with round section, set on the shoulder and tilted slightly upwards. This type has a moulded base. SSJ.2 is also represented by a single specimen from House A (no. 13), which shows a Light on Dark and accessory relief decoration. This vase is 10cm. high and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 9.4 and 5.2cm.

SIDE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 3 (SSJ.3)

Type 3 is the so called "tea-pot". The main difference between this type and the previous two is that it is provided with a vertical handle opposite to the spout, instead of two horizontal handles set on the shoulder. The "tea-pot" seems to be attested only in the Upper East Well (nos. 36-39), in plain varieties with globular-conical body, flat base, vertical handle with round section opposite to spout, attached just below the rim and at middle height on the body. It was possible to locate only one of the four "tea-pots" from this deposit (the three which were not located, UEW nos. 36-38, were illustrated in Mackenzie 1903, 167 fig. 1). This
specimen (UEW no. 39) is 7.6 cm. high and its rim and base diameter are, respectively 4.7 and 3.6 cm. *'

**BRIDGE-SPOUTED JARS (FIG. 39)**

To my knowledge, there are no published Knossian predecessors of this form, but bridge-spouted jars found in EM II contexts are known from, for example, Myrtos (Warren 1972, 203 fig. 87: F674; ibid. 204 fig. 88: F681, P687, P696; cf., also, Walberg 1976, 16). To judge from the surviving material, this form, as in the case of the side-spouted jar, was not particularly common in Prepalatial Knossos, but it seems to occur fairly frequently in the Old Palace period (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 173-180). The specimens found in the MH IA deposits here considered can be divided into five types. These types are closely related to each other, the differences consisting of minor details such as the shape of the base. The basic body shapes are also related to those of the side-spouted jars.

**BRIDGE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 1 (BSJ.1)**

Type 1 has a globular-conical body, a flat base, two horizontal handles with round section, set on the

---

14. Some "tea-pots" from Knossos are kept in the HM (2741, 2742) and in the AM (AE 978, AE 1178). They may come from the Upper East Well or from other Prepalatial deposits discovered in the very first years of the excavations at Knossos, such as the North Quarter of the City (cf. Chapter 3, 123 n. 20). Their dimensions are very close to those mentioned above.
shoulder and tilted upwards (cf. SSJ.1). This type is attested by one specimen from House B (no. 50), decorated in Dark on Light with splashes of brown-reddish paint. This vase is 10.6cm. high and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 11 and 5.4cm.

BRIDGE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 2 (BSJ.2)

Type 2 differs from BSJ.1 in having a carinated or slightly carinated shoulder, which gives the body a biconical shape (cf. SSJ.2). The surviving complete examples are monochrome, Light on Dark and Dark on Light decorated. Their height ranges between 11 and 16cm., the rim diameter between 9.8 and 15cm. and the base diameter between 5.5 and 6.4cm.

Examples:
Dark on Light variety: HB no. 51
Light on Dark variety: NQ no. 15; HB no. 52.

BRIDGE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 3 (BSJ.3)

Type 3 differs from BSJ.1 in having a moulded base. The only example in the catalogue, which comes from the North Quarter of the City (no. 16), is decorated with a dark wash and a central zone of veined barbotine and painted chevrons. It is 9.8cm. high and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 10.3-10.6 and 5.3cm.
BRIDGE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 4 (BSJ.4)

Type 4 differs from BSJ.2 in having a raised base. The only specimen of this type comes from House B (no. 53) and is decorated in Dark on Light. Its height is 8.3cm. and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 7.4 and 3.9cm.

BRIDGE-SPOUTED JAR TYPE 5 (BSJ.5)

Type 5 is represented by a single specimen from House C (no. 14). The vase has a very high, carinated shoulder, and a very short upper body; the lower body is nearly cylindrical; the handles, set above the carination, have a round section and are tilted upwards. It is one of the few complete vases bearing polychrome decoration. It is a miniature vase, being only 5cm. high (its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 3.7 and 4.3cm.).

AMPHORISKOS (PL. 11: 74)

This form is attested by a single specimen from House B (no. 74) decorated in Dark on Light. It has a globular-conical body, a splaying neck, two horizontal handles with round section, set on the shoulder and tilted upwards. The specimen is 6.8cm. high, its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 4.2 and 3.4cm. Apparently, there are no Knossian predecessors of this
form, although very similar vases are known from elsewhere in Crete from EM onwards (cf. Chapter 2, 66).

PITHARAKI (PL. 33: 40)

This form is attested by a single specimen, a miniature pithos, from the Upper East Well (no.40), showing a Dark on Light and relief decoration. The vessel has a biconical shape (the dividing line between upper and lower body is marked by the relief decoration) and a short, straight neck: three vertical handles are set below the rim. The vase is 5.9cm. high, its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 3.4 and 2.9cm.

2. FABRIC 2 (II)

Fabric 2 is very porous and soft; it has a yellowish-greenish colour (Munsell 10YR 8/4 or 8/3; 5Y 7/4 or 7/2; 2.5Y 7/4: very pale brown or pale yellow) and it resembles very closely one of the fabrics which appear in the LH II period (Popham 1984, 163; Popham, however, believes that the greenish colour and porous texture are simply the results of poor firing). Only seven complete or restorable vases produced in Fabric 2 have been catalogued; they were found in House B (nos. 54-56 and 75) and in the North Quarter of the City (nos. 18-20). Vases assignable to MM IA and made in this fabric have
also been found on louktas (Karetsou, personal communication). The seven Knossian vases, which are all hand-made, show that the following forms were produced in Fabric 2: the footed goblet; the one handled-cup; and the beaked jug. These forms can be classified into a number of types which are morphologically identical to types produced in the more common Fabric 1.

All the surviving examples appear to be decorated in Dark on Light, with the exception of a one-handled cup from House B, no. 75, which is decorated in Light on Dark (see also below). The painted decoration is always very fugitive (perhaps because of the poor quality of the clay): thus, it is possible that more vases had a Light on Dark decoration, of which no trace has survived.

FORMS:

FOOTLESS GOBLETS

Footless goblets produced in Fabric 2 can be assigned to a single type (II.FTLG.1). They have a deep, straight-sided conical body and are morphologically identical to I.FTLG.1. The two surviving examples come from the North Quarter of the City (nos. 18, 19) and are decorated in Dark on Light by a band below the rim. They are also similar in size to the specimens made in Fabric
1: they are both 7.3-7.4cm. high, with rim diameters measuring 7.4 and 8.4cm., and their bases 2.6cm.

ONE-HANDED CUPS

There are three one-handed cups made in Fabric 2, which can be classified into the following two types.

ONE-HANDED CUP TYPE 1 (OHC.1)

Type 1 has a slightly angular profile; its shape corresponds to that of I.OHC.3; it is exemplified by a single specimen from House B (no. 54) decorated in Dark on Light. It is 6.2-6.4cm. high, with rim and base diameter measuring, respectively, 9.4 and 4.7cm.

ONE-HANDED CUP TYPE 2 (OHC.2)

Type 2 has a medium-deep, rounded body, a raised base, a handle raised above the rim, attached to it and to the side at middle height, with a slightly grooved section towards the upper attachment, and an oval section towards the lower attachment (cf. I.OHC.2). There are two examples of this type: one comes from House B (no. 75), and is decorated in Light on Dark technique; the other comes from the North Quarter of the City (no. 20), and is decorated by a dark wash on the internal surface which goes over the rim, forming a band in dark paint against a light background. The first specimen is 5.6cm. high, its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 7.4
and 3.8cm. The second is 6cm. high, and its rim and base diameter are, respectively, 8.4 and 4.3cm.

BEAKED JUGS WITH CUTAWAY NECK

Beaked jugs also appear in two types, one with a flat base (II.BJ.1), the other with a raised base (II.BJ.2), which correspond, in shape, to I.BJ.1 and 2. The two types are represented by two specimens found in House B (nos. 55 and 56), which are both decorated in Dark on Light. The first is 20.4cm. high, with a base diameter measuring 6.1cm. The second is 12.7cm. high and its base diameter is 4.6cm.

3. FABRIC 3 (III)

Fabric 3 has a dark reddish colour (Munsell 2.5YR 5/6 or 5/8), a semi-coarse texture and is porous, soft and crumbly. It is very similar to the fabric commonly used for cooking pots, but differs in having fewer black and white grits and more very fine, shiny inclusions (probably golden mica; see, also, Andreou 1978, 53). Fabric 3, unlike Fabric 2, presents a very distinctive, although limited, range of forms and types. Among the surviving material, ten complete or restorable vases were made in this fabric. They come from the following
deposits: House B (nos. 57-58, 76-78), House C (nos. 16, 28), the Well to the North of House A (nos. 7-8) and the North Quarter of the City (no. 21). Only two basic forms are attested: the goblet and the wide-mouthed jug, in a variety of types. As to surface treatment, it seems that the majority of these vessels were left plain, but in a few cases, such as House B no. 57, there are traces of a dark coat which may have vanished completely on the other surviving vessels; they often show a mottled surface and signs of burning. Only two other specimens show some kind of decoration: one is the wide mouthed-jug from the North Quarter of the City no. 21, which preserves very faint traces of a red wash and an incised decoration; the other is the squat, wide-mouthed jug from House B no. 78, which shows a very simple relief decoration, consisting of groups of small applied knobs around the maximum expansion of the body.

FORMS:

GOBLETS (FIG. 40)

Goblets made in Fabric 3 can be assigned to a single type (III.G.1), which has a deep, conical body, with slightly flaring rim. Five goblets have been ascribed to this type: their height ranges between 4.6 and 8cm., and their rim diameter between 5.6 and 9.7cm.

Examples: WN of HA no. 7; HB nos. 57, 76; HC nos. 16, 28.
WIDE-MOUTHEd JUGS (FIGS. 40, 41)

Five jugs, among the surviving material, represent this form; they can be divided into three types.

WIDE-MOUTHEd JUG TYPE 1 (WMJ.1)

Type 1 is exemplified by a single specimen from the North Quarter of the City (no. 21); this type shows a globular-conical body; a tall, broad, splaying neck and a flaring rim; the vertical handle has a round section and goes from rim to shoulder. It is decorated with a red wash and an incised pattern. It is 16cm. high, and its rim and base diameter measure, respectively, 12 and 5-6.6cm.

WIDE-MOUTHEd JUG TYPE 2 (WMJ.2)

Type 2 differs from the preceding in having a pulled-out spout and a vertical, lateral handle. This type is exemplified by three specimens, which show a characteristic mottled surface and traces of burning, but, apparently, no decoration. Height ranges between 13.6 and 19.5cm., rim diameter between 9.7 and 12.5cm. and base diameter between 5.7 and 6.4.

Examples: HB nos. 58, 78; W N of HA no. 8.

WIDE-MOUTHEd JUG TYPE 3 (WMJ.3)

Type 3 has a pulled-out spout and a lateral handle as WMJ.2, but differs in having a squat, depressed body.
This type is exemplified by a single specimen from House B, no. 77, which shows a simple relief decoration. This vessel is about 11cm. high, its rim diameter is 13cm., and the base diameter 6.5cm.

Table II (FIG. 45) shows the occurrence in each deposit of the ceramic types discussed above. This table should not be used for statistical purposes. In particular, the absence of specific ceramic forms and types from the table must be seen in the context of the typology and the general accounts of the deposits presented in the previous chapters. The absence of a given form from the Table may hold no significance; for example, in Table II the occurrence of footed goblets in the Well to the N of House A is shown by a question mark. Footed goblets are, indeed, attested in this deposit, but their fragmentary state did not allow them to be assigned to a specific type. Similarly, no shallow bowls made in Fabric 1 are attested in the six deposits examined here, with the exception of the Upper East Well, but their absence is most likely to be merely fortuitous and, in any, case, would not be particularly significant. One should always remember: first, that the large preliminary selection of the material by the excavators may have considerably altered the surviving content of the deposits; and, second, that Table II and the typology are basically derived from complete or restorable vessels.
FORMING TECHNIQUES OF MM IA POTTERY

The ceramic types discussed in this chapter are all hand-made.

There are many ways to manufacture hand-made vessels, e.g. pinching, slab or coil building etc. (see, e.g., Rye 1983, 66-73) but it is not always easy to establish which technique was used with the unaided eye, particularly in the case of vessels in which smoothing and coating have obliterated all manufacturing marks. Often, only careful observation of the particle orientation, when the fabric is coarse enough, or very sophisticated analyses, such as xeroradiography (Johnston and Betancourt 1984), are required to establish the manufacturing processes. Nonetheless, the pottery examined here offers many clear examples of coil building, particularly fragments of closed vessels like the beaked jugs with cutaway neck, which could not be submitted to a final smoothing (see PL. 44); I.FTLG.3 shows very clearly the seams of the coil, built up in a continuous spiral (see, e.g., PL. 4: 25, 26). Traces of paring are very common, particularly on one-handled cups and footless goblets, and this is usually a good indication that a vessel was hand-made (see PL. 44).

15. Paring has often been considered a characteristic of MM IA pottery, but it also appears on pottery of the MM IIA period (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 148).
I.FTLG.2 and I.FTG.4 show certain marks on their body which do not appear on other ceramic types. The specimens assigned to I.FTLG.2 show very regular thin, horizontal ridges and lines left by the action of the potter's hand. This kind of goblet is only attested in House B and in the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace. I. FTG.4 is very well attested in all the MM IA deposits discussed here (with the possible exception of the Well to the North of House A). In particular, the ridges present on the internal surface (see PL. 44) remind one of the unmistakable wheel-marks found on the footed goblets of the MM IIA phase (cf. above). It is possible that the marks found on these two ceramic types simply attest to the fact that the pots have been turned around during the process of manufacture, but they could equally testify to the use of some sort of rotating device -if not a proper wheel- which was not exploited to its full potential. In any case, it seems that the vessels were not thrown on the wheel, i.e. that centrifugal force was not used to form them (Evely 1978, 371 ff.; Lewis 1983, 27).

All footed goblets, from EM IIA to MM IIA, both hand-made and wheel-made types, were manufactured in the following way. The body and the foot were made separately; the base of the body was fashioned into a blunt point and inserted into the top of the hollow stem or foot (cf. PL. 44). Clay was usually smoothed over to secure the join on the exterior. One specimen from House
B shows traces of the clay which was added to secure the join, but which the potter did not bother to smooth over (PL. 3: 5).

DECORATION

The surviving pottery from the six MM IA deposits examined here (including the vessels produced in coarse and unusual fabrics) is decorated in a variety of techniques. Vessels can be painted, incised, or provided with relief decoration. These techniques are often combined.

Painted decoration can be Dark on Light, Light on Dark and polychrome. Polychrome decoration, however, is extremely uncommon. As shown in the previous chapters, the idea that "geometric" polychrome decoration is typical of MM IA finds its origins in Evans' (and Mackenzie's) purely stylistic analysis of the pottery from the Monolithic Pillar Basement—an analysis which is not corroborated by stratigraphic evidence—and in the fact that he assigned to MM IA deposits such as the Vat Room and the Early Magazines, which actually belong to MM IIA (cf. Chapter 3, 108-111, 137-139).

The next few pages and FIGS. 42-43 are not intended to present and illustrate a "corpus" of the Light on Dark, Dark on Light, polychrome, incised, and
relief decorative motifs which appear on Knossian MM IA pottery, since this would necessarily require the use of the fragmentary material datable, on stylistic grounds, to that phase. What follows is simply a short discussion of the motifs which occur on the complete vases.

Starting with the Dark on Light and Light on Dark decoration, the motifs can be subdivided into two basic categories: rectilinear and curvilinear.

Common rectilinear motives are horizontal, vertical, and diagonal lines or bands, sometimes forming romboid or trifurcated patterns. Footed and footless goblets are nearly always decorated by a horizontal band below the rim.

Curvilinear motifs are the solid pendent discs and solid semicircles; standing solid semicircles; discs between horizontal or diagonal bands; discs between a horizontal and a wavy band; dotted semicircles; and pendent semicircles.

Perhaps, the so-called leaf-like pattern should be included in the last group (FIG. 43: S). This kind of Dark on Light decoration (or, sometimes, Light on Dark on Light) seems to be restricted to beaked jugs: it is a sort of torsional decoration, which consists of a leaf-like slash of paint across each shoulder.

16. Often the same motif can be found in both techniques.
Only four complete or restorable vases bear polychrome decoration. In this case, again, the decorative motifs can be subdivided into rectilinear and curvilinear.

Rectilinear motifs are represented by the horizontal bands on a jug from House B (no. 39; FIG. 43: T) and by the vertical and horizontal lines and bands on the miniature bridge-spouted jar from House C (no. 14; FIG. 43: U).

Curvilinear motifs are represented by the cross and circle pattern on a jug from House B (no. 43; FIG. 43: V) and by the complex double-axe and spiraliform pattern on a jug from House C (no. 13; see PL. 23: FIG. 21), which is stylistically extremely advanced and may not be MM IA. The double-axe motif, filled with white dots, finds a close comparison in a polychrome bridge-spouted jug found in the Kamáres Cave (Daukins and Lainster 1913, pl. V: top).

Incised decoration does not seem to be particularly common: only two of the vases included in the present typology bear this kind of decoration: the polychrome

17. A very similar polychrome motif appears on a coarse, fragmentary, vessel in the Prepalatial Houses deposit (no. 19).

18. See, also, above I.BJ.7 and Chapter 2, 89-90.
beaked jug from the lower floor of House B no. 39 and the wide mouthed jug from the North Quarter of the City no. 21. The former shows an interesting incised pattern on the shoulder, consisting of curving hatched bands. The incised pattern was covered by a dark coat, of which only very faint traces now remain. It is also possible that the incisions were filled with a white substance. The latter shows an incised decorative pattern consisting of horizontal and zig-zag cross-hatched bands.

Incised decoration also appears on the dark burnished pixides and mug from, respectively, the Vat Room deposit (no. 50-55) and the lower floor of House B (no. 61). (For a discussion of this ware see MacGillivray et al. 1988 and Chapter 3, 105-107)

Relief decoration is slightly more common than incised decoration, but usually constitutes only an accessory element. For example, beaked jugs often present as their main decoration a painted pattern and a relief incised ("rope") band or a simple ridge around the base of the neck (cf., e.g., UEW nos. 32, 34, 35; NQ of C no. 12); other accessory relief motifs which appear on jugs are: one rivet or a pointed knob on each side of the neck (cf. e.g. HB nos. 47, 49); nipples appearing at the centre of solid painted discs (cf., e.g., HA no. 11; HC no. 12); and warts combined with trickles of paint (NQ of C no. 25).
In a few instances, however, relief decoration constitute the most important, if not the only, element, as shown by the following examples. A coarse jug from the Upper East Well (no. 41) is decorated by ribs and rows of knobs all over the body. Two egg-cups from the same deposit (nos. 8-9) are decorated with rockwork barbotine (to avoid using Foster's terminology: "exaggerated irregular polygonal ridges"). Another vase which presents a barbotine pattern as its main decoration is the bridge-spouted jar from the North Quarter of the City (no. 16), with its large horizontal band of veined barbotine. Also, from the same deposit one may mention a coarse jug (no. 27) decorated with four knobs or protuberances regularly spaced around the maximum diameter of the body.

The similarity between some of the relief motifs occurring on both Knossian and Messara Tombs jugs has already been pointed out by other scholars (see Zois 1965, 70 and pls. 10-19; Andreou 1978, 25).
CHAPTER 6: INTER-REGIONAL CONTACTS AND RELATIVE
CHRONOLOGY.

The presence of vases which show external influences or which could actually be imports from other regions of Crete and of the Aegean has often been mentioned in the previous chapters. Here, the evidence for inter-regional contacts will be discussed in a more systematic fashion, together with the MM IA exports from Knossos and its region and their implications for the relative chronology.

The subject is certainly not new, since chronological problems are discussed in almost every work concerned with Minoan pottery (for the EM III-MM IA period see, in particular, Warren 1965; Zois 1966; Betancourt 1977; Andreou 1978; see, also: Warren 1980; Cadogan 1983; Walberg 1983). In the past, particular attention has been paid to the relationship between East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA, for the reasons referred to in Chapter 1, 26-28. The works of Warren (1965) and Andreou (1978) on the one hand, and of Zois (1966) on the other, best illustrate two different approaches to the problem.

The approach of Warren and Andreou is essentially based upon the identification of "cross-finds", i.e. of Knossian MM IA vases found in East Cretan EM III deposits and vice-versa, or as Warren (1965, 23) puts it "The
procedure ... must be twofold: to see what stratigraphy there is, and to see if any East Cretan EM III vases are found in central Cretan MM IA contexts and vice versa". What matters here is the correct attribution of the "imports" to a particular pottery/chronological phase in their region of origin and the correct dating of the context in which they were found. In the absence of "imports", close similarities in the shape and/or decoration of the vessels can be used (Andreou 1978, 10), but it is obvious that these correlations should have less bearing upon chronological issues and should only be used to corroborate more concrete evidence.

Zois' approach, on the contrary, is based upon the purely stylistic analysis of the decorative motifs typical of Knossian MM IA and of East Cretan EM III. This approach presents a serious methodological problem, since it assumes that the similarity of the decorative motifs found on pottery from different regions means contemporaneity, and that whatever looks stylistically more complex or more advanced must also be chronologically later. In other words, it assumes that the patterns of stylistic change were uniform all over the island or, at least, in the two regions in question. However, one cannot accept the validity of this assumption a priori: the approach of Warren and Andreou appears to be more correct. (Incidentally, many of the stylistic comparisons between East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA made by Zois concern the polychrome
fragments from Houses A and B published by the Pendleburys (1930, pl. XIV), which should be redated to MM IIA or even MM IIIA: see Chapter 2, 48-50).

The following discussion of "cross-finds" has some obvious limitations which stem from the fact that my first-hand knowledge of the pottery is limited to the Knossian material: for parallels with the pottery found in other regions of Crete or of the Aegean I have had to rely upon publications and upon similarity of shape and decoration. This, and the fact that the fabrics of the Knossian material were distinguished only visually, without the help of chemical, petrographic, or other analyses, has made it impossible, in most cases, to establish with absolute certainty whether a vase is an import or an imitation.

1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSSOS AND EAST CRETE

Warren (1965) provided a list of "cross-finds" to establish the chronological correlation (i.e. the substantial contemporaneity) between East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA. It seems, therefore, convenient to start with a review of this evidence. It will be shown below that, although Warren's general conclusions are still valid, there are several problems both with his identifications and attributions of the "imports" to
correct pottery phases, and with the dating of the contexts.

The site of Mallia is not strictly an East Cretan site, but, to judge from the published material, the pottery of its earliest phases shows a predominantly East Cretan character. It seems, therefore, convenient to include it in this section.

1.1. East Cretan EM III imports/imitations found in MM IA Knossian (and North Central) contexts.

Warren (1965, 25-26) listed six vases as East Cretan EM III "imports" found in MM IA Knossian contexts.

The first is the bridge-spouted jar from the North Quarter of the City no. 15, for which a parallels from Palaikastro and Gournia are quoted (Bosanquet and Dawkins 1923, pl. II: g; Boyd-Hawes et al. 1908, pl. XII: 34 and pl. XII: 30, for decoration; Hall 1905, pl. XXX: 4, for decoration). The parallels are unconvincing: the vase from Palaikastro is not a bridge-spouted jar but a "tea-pot", i.e. is provided with a vertical handle and a different type of spout; moreover, its decoration is very different from that on the Knossian specimen. The examples from Gournia are small rim fragments, with similar decoration. The bridge-spouted jar from the "Northern Suburb" has a fabric that, to the naked eye, looks typical of Knossos (Fabric 1: cf. Chapter 5, 181-
Moreover the shape, although apparently not very common, is certainly attested at Knossos by specimens which are undoubtedly local (cf., e.g., House B nos. 50-53; North Quarter of the City no. 18). The decorative pattern of the vessel, consisting of white concentric arcs on a dark ground, seems to be more common in East Crete. However, it seems unlikely that the vase should be regarded as an import, even if its decoration does show a strong East Cretan influence.

The second is the four-handled jar from the Vat Room deposit (no. 33), which is considered an import by Warren mostly on the basis of its decoration. The vessel, however, comes from a MM IIA context, and parallels for its shape and burnished surface can be found in other deposits of that date (cf. Chapter 3, 102-103, 107-109).

The third is a "carinated cup" from the Monolithic Pillar Basement (no. 7). In fact, the vase is not a cup, but a bowl with horizontal handle, and the context is, again, not MM IA but is more likely to be MM IIA (see Chapter 3, 137-143).

The fourth "import" is a rim fragment from the same MM IIA context. Note that this fragment finds its best comparisons with other unpublished fragments from Knossos (eg. AM 1910. 167f; sherds with identical patterns can also be found in the KSM boxes with the pottery from House B), rather than with East Cretan material. The
fabrics of these fragments confirm that they are not imports.

The fifth vessel is a spouted bowl from Giophyrakia decorated with a "White on Dark" and incised "criss-cross" decoration (Marinatos 1935, 49 fig. 1: 5). Although the parallels suggested by Warren are convincing (Seager 1912, fig. 49: 49 and fig. 50: 92), they do not come from well-stratified contexts (Seager 1912, 81). Moreover, other vases with similar decoration are known from Knossos and, to judge from the fabric, could be locally made (see, e.g. Betancourt 1985, pl. 6: D and F, both kept in the AM; a fragmentary vase with similar decoration can be found in KSM boxes with the material from the South House).¹ Since incised decoration is attested, although uncommon, both in East Crete and in the Knossos area, and since Light on Dark decoration is attested and common in both regions, it seems difficult to maintain that the vase from Giophyrakia is an East Cretan import.²

The sixth vessel is an amphoriskos from Gournes (Hazzidakis 1915, fig. 1 and 1918, pl. III: 12. Zois 1969, pl. 21: 7030). No precise parallel is suggested by Warren, who probably believed that this vase might be East Cretan EM III on the basis of its Light on Dark

¹ I would like to thank Dr. Penelope Mountjoy for showing me this fragment.

² Vases with incised decoration also appear in the Messara (cf., e.g., Bonacasa 1968, 44 fig. 33).
decoration. However, the mere fact that a vase is
decorated in Light on Dark cannot be taken as an
indication of East Cretan provenance. Indeed, as Wilson
(1984, 73-74; 1985, 312 and fig. 18: 146-149, pl. 33:
138, 145-147, 149, 150, 152)) has shown, Light on Dark
decoration is attested at Knossos from EM IIA. The shape
is common throughout Crete in Prepalatial times as well
as during the Old Palace period and thus offers no useful
chronological clues (cf. Chapter 2, 66).

Although, rather strangely, it has never been
noticed before, the handleless cup from the "lower" floor
of House B (no. 27) represents a "cross-find" or Knossian
imitation of East Cretan EM III ware which is more
convincing than those discussed above. The shape is
unique at Knossos, but is very common in East Crete (see
Chapter 2, 69-70).

The fragment of a spouted jar from House A (FIG. 12:
D: Andreou 1978, fig. 3: 13) also appears to be a typical
East Cretan product, but it may be later than East Cretan
EM III (cf. Andreou 1978, 69) and its context is not
secure. The context is safer of an unpublished spouted
jar found in a pre-polychrome MM IA, or EM III, deposit
in Hood's Royal Road excavations (Andreou 1978, 25 and
68).

Other vases mentioned in the present work, which
could be imports/imitations from East Crete are the
footless goblet and the beaked jug from the North Quarter of the City (nos. 22 and 26, cf. Chapter 4, 163-165); and the footless goblet with trifurcated pattern from House B (no. 24; cf. Chapter 2, 70-71) which is identical to one found at Mallia in the South Houses, in a MM IA-MM II context (Chapouthier et al. 1962, pl. XXXVIII: 9132; see also below). A "tea-pot" from Giophyrakia (Marinatos 1935, fig. 1: 6), with elongated spout, is also perhaps to be considered an import from East Crete, since this shape is more typical of that region (cf. Boyd-Hawes et al. 1908, pl. XII: 24; Seager 1912, fig. 49: 75; Betancourt 1984a, 46: shape 10). The decoration on the one-handled footed cup from House B (no. 70) presents some connections with East Crete (cf. Chapter 2, 74): the shape, however, seems to be Knossian, although rather uncommon. The evidence of these vases, however, is not very useful for precise chronological correlations, and needs further corroboration from analyses of the fabrics and further study and publication of both Knossian and East Cretan deposits.

1.2. Knossian (North_Central) MM IA imports/imitations found in East Cretan EM III contexts.

Warren (1965, 26) reports the following four Knossian "imports".
The first is a group of three "egg-cups" found in Ossuary III at Falaikastro (Dawkins 1905, 271). These three vessels are described (but not illustrated) by Dawkins as follows: "three handleless cups, pinched out to form a foot". This can hardly be the description of an "egg-cup" and, as Andreou has already pointed out (1978, 60), it would better suit the East Cretan handleless cups typical of this period (cf. House B no. 27). If these three vessels had found a parallel in Knossian deposits, this would presumably have been pointed out by Dawkins, as he did for the next group of "cross-finds" reported by Warren (see below). In any case, since the "egg-cup" is a shape with a long history at Knossos, the information given by Dawkins is not sufficient to date the three vessels to MM IA with any certainty.

The second group of "cross-finds" consists of an unspecified number of "egg-cup" fragments from the EM III deposit below Chi 59 at Falaikastro (Warren 1965, 26; Dawkins 1905, 271). Again the vessels were not illustrated, but Dawkins did draw a parallel with the "egg-cups" and footless goblets from the Upper East Well: the identification, therefore, is slightly more certain. However, given the presence of some polychrome material, albeit ascribed to EM III (Dawkins 1905, fig 5: d), the context cannot be considered to be pure EM III either in East Cretan or Knossian terms, according to current definitions (see, also, Andreou 1978, 78-79).
The third "cross-find" reported by Warren is a one-handled cup, decorated in Dark on Light by a band at the rim and around the base, with solid discs between, found in an EM III deposit at Kastri in 1963 (see, also, Andreou 1978, 58-9). The vase is unpublished, but it is obvious from the description that it is either a Knossian import or a local imitation of a Knossian prototype (for Knossian specimens cf. North Quarter of the City no. 8; House B no. 68; Prepalatial Houses no. 11; cf., also, Chapter 5, 191-192: I.OHC.1).

It is important to point out that the same deposit has also yielded a beaked jug decorated with torsional bands in Dark on Light (and added white paint), which would not be out of place in one of the seven MM IA Knossian deposits discussed in the present study: it may well be considered to be another import/imitation (Sackett et al. 1965, pl. 72: b; cf., also, Andreou 1978, 58).

The fourth "cross-find" in Warren's list is another "egg-cup" from an East Cretan deposit (Palaikastro, Block Chi, room 1) dated to MM IA by Warren, and to MM IA-MM IIA by Andreou (1978, 79), excavated in 1963. This vase is unpublished and, unlike the preceding case, one cannot be sure that it should be dated to Knossian MM IA, since this shape continues until MM IIA. Indeed, I suspect that this may be a MM IIA Knossian "egg-cup", or an
imitation, since a wheel-made tumbler from this deposit which has been illustrated (Sackett et al., 1965, 251 pl. 72: e; Andreou 1978, fig. 11: 12) may well be contemporary with Knossian MM IIA, and is certainly later than MM IA.

Some deposits at Mallia present shapes which find precise parallels with pottery very common at Knossos. For example, footed and footless goblets comparable to Knossian types were found in the South Houses (Chapouthier et al. 1962, pl. VI: 8639, 8642 and pl. XXVIII: 9136, 9134, 9225; Andreou 1978, fig. 18: 7). An "egg-cup" of MM IA Knossian type was also found in the Premier Charnier (Demargne 1945, pl. III: 8681). The same deposit yielded two vases which are similar in shape to the wide-mouthed jugs in Fabric 3 (see Chapter 5, 210; Demargne 1945, pl. IV: 8682 and pl. XXIX: 8509).

Unfortunately these two deposits from Mallia do not provide very precise chronological correlations, because the Premier Charnier and the South Houses span, respectively, the EM II-MM IA and MM IA-MM IIA periods in Knossian terms (Andreou 1978, 124, 133; see, also Chapter 2, 70-71). One can only say that the two deposits seem to have partly overlapped with Knossian MM IA as exemplified by Houses A, B, and C, etc.

Andreou reports that rounded footless goblets (cf. Chapter 5, 190-191: I.FTLG.4), similar to those found at Knossos in the Upper East Well and in the pre-polychrome
MM IA (or EM III) deposits excavated by Hood, were found in the Premier Charnier at Mallia (cf. Andreou 1978, 25, 123-4, and fig. 17: 5-6; Demargne 1945, pl. XXIX: 8529; pl. VI: 8677). Perhaps these goblets should not be considered to be Knossian imports: first, because this shape is not very common at Knossos and, second, because some of the specimens from Mallia are actually more similar to the East Cretan rounded goblets (cf., e.g., Betancourt 1985, fig. 39: D-E). Indeed, given the rarity of this shape at Knossos, one may wonder whether the Knossian specimens might be a local version of East Cretan prototypes.

In conclusion, the contemporaneity or, at least, the partial contemporaneity of East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA (as defined in the present study) can be supported on the basis of the following "cross-finds", which appear to be the most reliable.

1. The "East Cretan" goblet from the "lower" floor of House B no. 27.

2. The "East Cretan" spouted jar found in a Pre-polychrome MM IA Knossian deposit excavated by Hood (Andreou 1978, 25 and 68).

3. The "Knossian" cup found in the EM III deposit at Kastri (Palaikastro), during the 1963 excavations.
4. The "Knossian" beaked jug from the same deposit.

Other vases mentioned above, such as the bridge-spouted jar and the beaked jug from the North Quarter of the City nos. 15 and 26, and the one-handled footed cup from House B no. 70 have decoration which strongly reminds one of East Cretan Light on Dark Ware, but do not necessarily have to be imports/imitations. Although less useful for chronological correlations, they do attest to some kind of interrelation between the two regions.

2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSSOS AND THE MESSARA.

Precise chronological correlations between Knossos and the Messara are made difficult because most of the Prepalatial pottery from South Central Crete comes from tombs which were in use for a long time, usually from the Prepalatial to the Old Palace period. Moreover, the funerary character of large part of the Messara pottery makes it difficult to find parallels with the Knossian region, where nearly all the pottery comes from domestic contexts. ²

3. One possible exception is the deposit from Giophyrakia which, according to the excavator, may come from a religious context (cf. Marinatos 1935). However, there is very little evidence to support this hypothesis. A large funerary deposit found at Archanes between Tholos B and the Ossuary (Building 6) by J. and E. Sakellarakis (1972) has also been dated to MM IA. The deposit comprises several vases which can be dated, on stylistic grounds, to MM IA (particularly the beaked jugs). However, many other vessels such as the polychrome straight-sided cups (Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1972,
There are very few Messara non-funerary deposits which could be contemporary with Knossian MM IA: they consist of very fragmentary material, and are practically useless (cf. Betancourt 1984b, 89, where there is mention of 20 unpublished sherds assigned to EM III found at Kommos; cf., also, Levi 1958, figs. 351-356 and pls. XVIII-XX; Fiandra 1962, 117, pl. 10: fragments from the foundation trench of the first Palace at Festos). Some of these fragments, however, find close comparisons with the Patrikies deposit (cf. Bonacasa 1968, 13 n. 2), which seems to be later than MM IA as defined in the present study (see below; cf., also, Walberg 1976, 97 and 104, who, on other grounds, believes that these fragments should be later than Knossian MM IA).

2.1. Messara imports/imitations found in MM IA Knossian (and North Central) contexts.

It has been reported that a "tea-pot" of Patrikies type has been found in the polychrome MM IA levels from the Royal Road excavations (Bonacasa 1968, 15; Warren 1980, 491), but this deposit seems to be rather mixed and to represent a phase later than MM IA as defined in the present study (cf. Chapter 5, 172-173).

The deposit of Patrikies has been dated to the beginning of MM IA by Bonacasa (1968, 27: "Ci sembra ormai decisamente definita l'appartenenza di Patrikies al periodo iniziale del MM IA."). This date, however, is partly based upon parallels with vases and fragments from Knossos which are, in fact, later than MM IA, even as defined by Hood (cf., e.g., Bonacasa 1968, 14 and n. 4; ibid., 15 and ns. 3, 4; ibid., 24 where he draws parallels with the Vat Room and the North West Building deposits, which are MM IIA).

Thus, contrary to current opinion (cf., e.g., Andreou 1978, 172; Warren 1980, 490-491; Betancourt 1985, 71-73), Patrikies seems to represent a phase later than that represented by the MM IA deposits examined in the present work.

2.2. Knossian (North Central) MM IA imports/imitations found in Messara contexts.

A number of vases typical of Knossian MM IA were found outside Tholos A at Voros (Marinatos 1931, figs. 21-24; cf., also, Warren 1965, 28). These vases are: a one-handled cup with discs between bands in Dark on Light, identical to the specimens mentioned above from Knossos and Palaikastro (Marinatos 1931, fig. 24); an "egg-cup" (Marinatos 1931, fig. 22); and various "sheep-bells" ((Marinatos 1931, fig. 21; for a detailed
discussion of these peculiar objects see C. Morris and A. Peatfield, in press). Although a large part of the pottery from both outside and inside Tholos A does find comparisons with Knossian MM IA, the presence of some vases such as certain bridge-spouted jars; straight-sided cups; and wheel-made carinated cups (the latter, though, from inside the tholos) clearly suggests that the tomb was in use at least until MM IIA (cf. Marinatos 1931, figs. 22: top left, 24: top left and MacGillivray 1986, 178-180: rounded bridge-spouted jar types 3 and 4; cf. Marinatos 1931, fig. 24 and MacGillivray 1986, 151-158; cf. Marinatos 1931, fig. 18 and MacGillivray 1986, 158-164: tall-rimmed angular cup types 1 or 4 and short-rimmed angular cup type 2).

A "Knossian" "egg-cup" was found in the upper level of Tholos II excavated by Alexiou at Lebena (Alexiou 1960, fig. 19; Alexiou 1962; Branigan 1970b, 58, fig. 8: top right). The pottery of the upper level, which was stratified above an EM stratum, was dated to MM IA. Three scarabs, for which contrasting dates have been suggested by various scholars, were found associated with this pottery (Warren 1980, 495; Walberg 1983, 147-148, with references). Apart from the difficulties of dating the scarabs, the presence of a tumbler (Daux 1960, 844 fig. 7: 10; cf. Walberg 1983, 101 and type 203) among the "MM IA" pottery from the upper level suggests a date as late as MM IIA in Knossian terms, since this particular type of vessel does not seem to appear in Knossian.
Prepalatial contexts while it is very common in the first phases of the Old Palace (cf. MacGillivray 1986, 148-151).

Various vessels with "Knossian" shapes have been found in the Messara Tombs excavated by Xanthoudidis (1924). For example, a one-handed cup with a "Knossian" shape (cf. Chapter 5, 191-192: I.OHC.1) was found in Tholos B at Platanos (Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. LI: 6913); a footless goblet comparable to Knossian specimens (cf. Chapter 5, 188-189: I.FTLG.1) was found at Porti (Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XXXVI: 5099); and an "egg-cup" and a one-handed cup with loop handle (cf. Chapter 5, 193: I.OHC.4) were found at Drakones (Xanthoudidis 1924, pl. XLII: 5030, 5031; cf. Betancourt 1985, 72 fig. 47: c, d). Unfortunately, the finds from Platanos and Porti are not particularly useful for chronological correlations, since these burial contexts range from EM III to MM IIA. The tomb at Drakones, however, seems to have been used for a shorter span of time (EM III-MM I: cf. Warren 1969, 194; Walberg 1983, 102-103).

Parallels between the relief decoration of Messara and Knossian beaked jugs have already been noticed by various scholars (Andreou 1978, 25; Zois 1965, 70; Zois 1968a, 194). These parallels, however, do not provide very precise chronological indications because these are not "cross-finds", but merely similarities in decoration,
and also because the Messara contexts often comprise various phases.

In conclusion, the only deposit which appears to be contemporary with the Prepalatial deposits discussed in the present work is Drakones. A synchronism might also be established between Hood's MM IA deposit and Patrikies, but these may not be altogether Prepalatial deposits. Burial deposits such as Voros, Lebena and Porti seem to have been in use during MM IA as defined here, but they also overlapped with the Old Palace period at Knossos.

3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSSOS AND WEST CRETE

Very little is known of the pottery in vogue in West Crete at the time of Knossian MM IA. The very few fragments assigned to this period which have been published do not come from well-stratified contexts (see Tzedakis 1965, pl. 712: 6; Tzedakis 1969, pl. 435: 6). Some of these fragments present a peculiar kind of "wavy" barbotine decoration, rather different from — although possibly related to— the Knossian "rock-work" and "veined" barbotine (cf. Chapter 5, 217-218). In addition, among the pottery from the Greek-Swedish excavations in plateia Ayia Aikaterini (cf. Tzedakis 1965, 569) on display in the Chania Museum there are footed goblets and one-handled cups which are identical
to Knossian types (Chania Museum nos. 2355, 2358, 2416, 2476). 4

To judge from the specimens displayed in the Chania Museum, the fabrics look different from those used at Knossos. Thus, it is possible that these vases were locally made. It would seem, therefore, that the Prepalatial pottery of West Crete combined elements most typical of the Knossos area (such as the "egg-cups") with elements ("waved barbotine") peculiar of its own. The fact that the EM III-MM IA pottery from Kythira, a settlement which is thought to have been founded by Minoan colonists coming from West Crete (see below), presents a similar combination of "Knossian" and West Cretan elements, also points in this direction. However, more excavation and publication of Prepalatial deposits in West Crete are needed to establish more precisely the character of the EM III-MM IA pottery from this region.

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSSOS AND THE CYCLADES.

4.1. Cycladic pottery in Knossian MM IA contexts.

It has been suggested (Barber 1981, 174-175; Rutter 1983, 69 n. 2; MacGillivray 1984, 73) that a particular class of ware, characterised by a dark coated, burnished

4. These vases come also from mixed contexts. I am very grateful to Ms. Stavroula Markoulaki for this information.
and incised decoration and found in supposedly MM IA contexts is of Cycladic origin. Examples of this class of pottery are the pixides found in the Vat Room deposit (which, however, is not a MM IA context; see Chapter 3, 106-107) and the mug shaped cup from the "lower" floor of House B (no. 61). The results of physico-chemical and petrographic analyses of Knossian samples, however, suggest that the vessels were manufactured in Crete (MacGillivray et al. 1988). In spite of these results, it could still be maintained that the mug and also the askos from House B (nos. 61 and 62, respectively), may represent local products which imitate Cycladic prototypes (cf. Chapter 2, 71-73), of Early Cycladic IIIB date (cf. Barber 1981, 174-175). Thus, a correlation between MM IA as defined in the present study and Early Cycladic IIIB can be tentatively suggested. But it ought to be stressed that the subdivision of Early Cycladic III into A and B is by no means generally accepted (cf. Rutter 1983).

4.2. Knossian MM IA pottery in Cycladic contexts.

Apparently there is very little evidence for MM IA imports to the Cyclades: one MM IA fragment was found at Phylakopi, in an unknown context of the old excavations (Atkinson et al. 1904; Daukins and Droop 1911), now in the AM, AE 580, as reported by Rutter (1983, 73 and n. 25). AE 580 is probably a misprint for AE 550, since only two Minoan fragments from Phylakopi kept in the AM
could conceivably be assigned to MM IA, following traditional classifications. These fragments are AE 550c and AE 550e, and their fabric suggests that they may be Knossian. The former is a spout fragment from a bridge-spouted jar decorated in alternating white and orange lines and is more likely to be of MM IIA date (cf. MacGillivray 1986, pl. 103: 903). The latter is a body sherd, probably from a similar spouted-jar, with polychrome floral decoration closely comparable to one of the polychrome fragments from Houses A and B published by the Pendleburys (1930, pl. XIV: 1; see FL. 16: D). As argued in the previous chapters, this fragmentary polychrome material is stylistically, and probably stratigraphically later than the MM IA complete vases and often finds precise comparisons with MM IIA or even later material (the fragment illustrated by the Pendleburys, mentioned above, is no exception: cf. Chapter 2, 48-49).

Apart from the sherd(s) in the AM, there is also mention of MM IA pottery found at Phylakopi in a Middle Cycladic II context (Barber 1983, 77). Given the late date of the Cycladic context, it seems very likely that even in this case one is dealing with MM IIA material, wrongly assigned to MM IA. Cadogan (1983, 509) has also stated that he has personally observed EM III and MM IA pottery from the old excavations at Phylakopi, but, unfortunately, the material is unpublished and the Cycladic contexts are not specified.
5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSSOS AND MAINLAND GREECE

5.1. Mainland imports/imitations found in MM IA Knossian (and North-Central) contexts.

To date, only one mainland vase seems to have reached Knossos. It is a bowl dated to Early Helladic III by Hood and to Middle Helladic I by Zerner (cf. Hood 1971B; Zerner 1978, 178, 197; Rutter and Zerner 1984, 81) found in the MM IA deposit from the Royal Road excavations, which is later than the MM IA deposits examined here (cf. above and Chapter 5, 172-173).

5.2. Knossian (and North-Central) MM IA imports/imitations found in mainland contexts.

Rutter and Zerner (1984, 81-82) report that MM IA and Minoanizing pottery has been found at the following sites in contexts dated to Middle Helladic I (unless specified otherwise): Aegina (Colonna; from mixed contexts); Asine; Athens; Aghios Stephanos; Eutreusis; and Lerna. Finds seem particularly abundant only at Lerna, with over a hundred of Minoan and Minoanizing sherds. Most of this pottery seems to be produced in Kythera, but some fragments can be identified as coming from West and central Crete, and Minoanizing vessels suggest the presence of Minoan potters in mainland Greece at a very early stage (Zerner 1978, 163-178, especially 163, 166-167, 171; Rutter 1983, 72). Unfortunately, a
large part of the material from the mainland sites mentioned above is unpublished. Amongst the published pottery the material from Lerna VA offers a fairly good correlation: many of the Minoan imports and imitations can be matched with the pottery from the MM IA deposits examined here (Caskey 1956, pl. 43: c; Zerner 1978, 170-178). However, the Early Helladic III/Middle Helladic I import found in the MM IA rubbish deposit from the South side of the Royal Road at Knossos (see above), and the presence -amongst the Minoan imports at Lerna VA- of wheel-made fragments (Zerner 1978, 172), of oval-mouthed amphorae (Zerner 1978, 176-177), and of other vases for which parallels are drawn with Cretan deposits of a date later than Knossian MM IA (i.e. with Vasiliki and Tylissos; ibid.) all show that Lerna VA is partly later than the MM IA deposits examined here. Similarly, the fragments from Aghios Stephanos (Taylour 1972, 233 HS 31, 257, HS 96, figs. 16: 1-2, pls. 45: b and 49: d 1) do not find parallels in the MM IA deposits examined here, and are probably contemporary with Hood's MM IA or even later deposits. The two fragments from Asine (Frödin and Persson 1938, figs. 191: 1 and 192: 4) do not warrant such an early date: one fragment is simply decorated in Light on Dark, and could be dated, in Minoan terms, anywhere from EM II to MM III (or could it be a mainland fragment in Avia Marina style ?). The other fragment presents a barbotine decoration which could be as late as MM II. According to Frödin and Persson this barbotine fragment comes from a Middle Helladic II-III context.
The cup found in Athens (Knigge et al. 1978. 64-65 no. 1, figs. 36-37), although very close in shape to the specimens from House B nos. 35 and 70, has a decoration which in Crete can be found on pottery which is certainly later than MM IA (cf. Chapter 2, 74-75).

To sum up, I suspect that, as in the case of the Cyclades, some of the imports which have been assigned to MM IA, particularly the polychrome decorated material, should not be considered contemporary with the pottery from the seven MM IA deposits discussed here.

6. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KYTHERA AND KNOSSOS.

The settlement at Kastri on Kythera (Coldstream and Huxley 1972) deserves special mention since it appears to be the first Minoan "colony" which followed (and, possibly, displaced) an Helladic settlement, and must have played an important role in the relationship between Crete and the Greek mainland (Rutter 1983. 72; Zerner and Rutter 1984. 77).

The sequence of the pottery found at Kastri starts with a small Early Helladic I-II deposit (Coldstream and Huxley 1972, 272-308). Thereafter, there is a "sudden volte-face", i.e. the pottery becomes completely Minoan in character. Two small deposits from Kastri are
relevant to the present discussion. The first is deposit B, a fill of EM II-MM IA date. The second is deposit C, which has been dated to MM IA.

Deposit B has yielded various goblet fragments, some bearing "barbotine waves" decoration (Coldstream and Huxley 1972, pl. 18: 13-15), very close to fragments found at Chania (Tzedakis 1969, pl. 435: 5; cf. above). Indeed, on the basis of the similarity of the pottery from the two sites, it has been suggested that Kastri may have been a Chaniot colony (Tzedakis 1971, 509; Zerner 1978, 172; Coldstream and Huxley 1981). Both the barbotine decoration and the shape of certain foot fragments suggest a date no earlier than MM IA for some of the goblets in Knossian terms (Coldstream and Huxley 1972, fig. 36: 63; pl. 18: 13-15). The second deposit, C, is very small. It has been dated to MM IA, but the presence of wheel-made fragments, probably from carinated cups which, as the excavators already remarked, could be dated to MM IB (Coldstream and Huxley 1972, 92), may indicate that this deposit could partly overlap Knossian MM IB/IIA, i.e. that it was partly later than MM IA as defined in the present study. It is interesting to note that in neither deposit is polychrome decoration attested.

5. MM IA pottery was also found—together with later pottery—in burial contexts (cf. Coldstream and Huxley 1972, 258: L 1-2; Coldstream and Huxley 1984)
7. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSOS AND CYPRUS.

7.1. Cypriot imports/imitations found in MM IA Knossian (North Central) contexts.

To date, the only import from Cyprus found in a supposedly MM IA context is the Red Polished amphora dated to Early Cypriot III/Middle Cypriot I (Catling and MacGillivray 1983). As was argued in Chapter 3, 143, it seems best not to fix a date for the Knossian context, or at least, to allow for a date as late as MM IIA.

7.2. Knossian MM IA imports/imitations found in Cypriot contexts.

Apparently, the only MM IA import from Crete found in Cyprus is the bridge-spouted jar found in the Lapithos tomb 806 in a context dated to either Early Cypriot IIIb or Middle Cypriot I (Grace 1940; Merrillles 1979, 14-19; Catling and MacGillivray 1983, 3).

8. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOSOS AND EGYPT

To date, no MM IA pottery has been found in Egypt. The controversial vase from Qubbet el Hawa (Kemp and Merrillles 1980, 198-199, figs. 59-60 and colour pl. opposite p. 176) is dated to "probably" MM IA by Warren (1985, 148, n. 2) and by Walberg (1993, 112) to her phase III (i.e. to MM IIA-III A in Evans' terminology). Kemp and Merrillles (1985, 215) date the vase to MM IA-MM IB:
all of the Cretan parallels suggested by the authors belong to the Old Palace period. The earliest parallel quoted by Kemp and Merrillees is a large pedestal bowl from Palaikastro, which Evans dated to MM IA in the first volume of the Palace of Minos (Evans 1921, fig. 133: e). The same vase, however, was assigned to MM IB in the fourth volume (cf. Evans 1935, fig. 66: a) and, indeed, could be as late as MM IIA in Knossian terms. A MM IIA date for the Qubbet el Haua vase has been suggested by MacGillivray (1986, 210), who considers the vase to be of East Cretan origin (cf., also, Cadogan 1982, 516).

CONCLUSIONS

The new analysis of the pottery from the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA has allowed a new definition of this pottery phase at Knossos. This has wider implications for the relative chronology, as summarized in tables III, IV and V. in FIG. 46. But it must be stressed that these chronological correlations are based upon very little evidence; perhaps the best chronological correlation within Crete is that established between East Cretan EM III and Knossian MM IA, and this essentially relies upon four vases only. Although there are signs of contacts and reciprocal influences amongst the ceramic styles of the period, the general picture is one of pronounced ceramic regionalism, which persisted during the Old Palace period (cf. Andreou 1978, 166-171; MacGillivray 1986, 202-206; Cadogan 1988, 95-96). As to
contacts between other regions of the Aegean. Rutter and Zerner (1984, 77) claim that there was a "dramatic change in the nature and intensity of Hellado-Minoan relations" in the MM IA period: this, obviously, could be extremely significant in reducing the role of Palatial initiative and control over trade. But the volume of imports/exports or imitations is not impressive, and the supposed change is evident only at Lerna. Even there it may appear less "dramatic" if one considers that part of the material appears to be later than MM IA as defined in the present study, and that most of the pottery probably comes from Kythera (Zerner 1978, 166, 172; see, also, above). In short, although the pottery shows some evidence for inter-regional contacts between Crete and other Aegean regions (and the existence of Minoanizing pottery on mainland Greece suggests the presence of Minoan craftsmen), this evidence is slight and does not seem to indicate the existence of intensive trade in this Prepalatial phase.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

Recent studies of deposits of the Old Palace period (see, e.g. Walberg 1976, 108; MacGillivray 1986, 23, 26-27) seem to indicate that, in many instances, Evans assigned to a number of different phases pottery which, in fact, belonged to a single phase. In the case of the phase which he called MM IA, on the contrary, Evans seems to have conflated deposits which, according to some scholars (Hood, personal communication; Andreou 1978; MacGillivray 1986), should be assigned to four different phases of the traditional Knossian sequence: for example, the Upper East Well has been assigned to EM III; Houses A and B to MM IA; House C to MM IB; and the Vat Room deposit (or, at least, part of it) to MM IIA.

In this study I have argued that the major deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA can be divided into two groups: one group comprises Houses A, B, and C, the Well to the North of House A, the Upper East Well, the North Quarter of the City, and the deposit from the Prepalatial Houses to the South of the Palace, which overlay the EM II deposit illustrated by Evans (1921, fig. 40). As Evans assigned these seven deposits to the MM IA phase in his system of classification, his terminology has been retained, in order to avoid further confusion. But the MM IA pottery phase as defined in the present study is remarkably different from the MM IA pottery phase as defined by Evans. It is also different from MM IA as
defined by Hood on the basis of the rubbish deposit from the Royal Road excavations. The fundamental difference concerns polychromy, which was and still is generally considered to be the fundamental characteristic of MM IA, while it is a rather uncommon feature of these seven deposits.¹

The other group is formed by the Vat Room, the Monolithic Pillar Basement, the Early Magazines, rooms 5-8 in House B, the Area Encircling Kouloura II, the "MM IA Oikia", and –possibly– the deposit below the paving of the Loom Weight Basement.² This group can be assigned to the Old Palace Period, and in the majority of cases to the MM IIA phase, as defined by MacGillivray (1986).

Polychromy has been considered to be a characteristic feature of MM IA because many deposits and a great deal of material which clearly belong to the Old Palace period were assigned by Mackenzie, Evans, and the Pendleburys to this phase. Obviously, once the later material has been eliminated, a very different definition of Knossian MM IA pottery can emerge.

1. The rarity of polychrome decorated pottery, relative to Dark on Light or Light on Dark wares, would have been even more marked if the pottery had not been subject to preliminary selection, since it is fair to assume that Mackenzie, Evans and Pendlebury kept all of the polychrome material, while they discarded the coarse, plain wares or the decorated pottery of which they already had many examples, such as fragments of "egg-cups" and footless goblets.

2. If the pottery stored in the KSM does indeed come from this deposit.
Why was this later pottery assigned to MM IA? In Chapter 3 (138-139) I have pointed out a passage in one of the early EBA reports (Evans 1903, 17-19), which can provide an explanation. Here, it appears very clearly that the "MM IA" pottery found in the same stratigraphic context as pottery of the Old Palace period is assigned to an earlier ceramic and chronological phase simply upon the basis of Evans' and/or Mackenzie's stylistic judgment. In the case of the Vat Room deposit (Evans 1903, 94-99, especially 97; cf. Chapter 3, 96-97), Evans even seems to have had recourse to hypothetical "superposed" levels to fit his and/or Mackenzie's stylistic analysis of the pottery. Probably, Evans and Mackenzie did not believe that the hand-made "geometric" polychrome pottery or, for example, the "butterfly" jugs could be contemporary with the fine "egg-shell" ware, and therefore assigned it to a different pottery and chronological phase. However, when the Monolithic Pillar Basement and the Vat Room were excavated, in 1903, there was no stratigraphic evidence from other soundings in the Knossos area to support an earlier date for the pottery in question. It is interesting to note that a similar process of classification has been observed by

3. It is a matter of mere speculation whether this stylistic, and then chronological, classification of the material from the Monolithic Pillar Basement, which still influences definitions of Knossian MM IA, should be attributed to Evans or to Mackenzie or to a joint analysis by both. However, one should bear in mind that it was Mackenzie who, at the time, was supposed to study and, probably, publish the pottery of Knossos, as is indicated by his two JHS articles (Mackenzie 1903 and 1906) and, specially, by his pottery notebooks.
MacGillivray in the case of the pottery from the fill of the Kouloures. Evans (1935, 61-66) believed that the pottery belonged essentially to two periods, i.e. to MM II and MM IIIA. However, MacGillivray has now demonstrated that the majority of this material can be assigned to a single pottery phase, which he calls MM IIIA. MacGillivray suggests that Evans probably "found it difficult to accept that the two main styles of MM IIIA pottery, the fine polychrome and the dark monochrome and white spotted, could be contemporary and so suggested that they belonged to two separate phases" (MacGillivray 1986, 26-27, 99).

These examples offer a very useful insight into Evans' and Makenzie's approach to the construction of the pottery sequence at Knossos. These examples show -once again- the necessity of using all the documentary sources when dealing with Evans' material. They also show how critical analysis of these sources can throw some light upon the archaeological and historical problems of Knossos.

The seven MM IA deposits discussed in this study are likely to be the products of events and activities which were not exactly contemporary: four deposits (Houses A, B, and C and the North Quarter of the City) are "floor deposits" which are very likely to be the products of a single destruction; two come from the fill of wells (the Upper East Well and the Well to the North of House A),
which could date from either before or after the
destruction marked by the "floor deposits"; and one (the
Prepalatial Houses), could either be a rubbish deposit
which accumulated before and/or after the destruction or,
as suggested by Evans and Mackenzie, a fill which was the
result of methodical demolition connected with the
construction of the Old Palace, and thus followed the
destruction. But, in any case, analysis of the pottery
shows that these deposits belong to a single pottery
phase.* This pottery phase followed EM IIB—as defined
by Wilson (1984)—and was, in turn, followed by MM IIA—
In other words, the stratigraphical and stylistic
analysis of the pottery from Evans' deposits does not
support the existence of either the EM III or the MM IB
chronological and stylistic phases of his system.
Obviously, it is not to be excluded that future research
may alter this picture.

The aim of this study was simply to present a new
definition of Knossian MM IA pottery. In other words, it
tried partly to fulfill the promise, made by the
Pendleburys more than half a century ago, to produce a
"corpus" of MM IA pottery "as an aid to excavators"
(Pendlebury and Pendlebury 1930, 61 n. 1). However, the

4. One cannot assume a priori that historical or other
events must be reflected in ceramic development, and one
cannot assume that chronological, architectural, and
stratigraphical phases should be matched by pottery
phases (on the relationship between historical events and
pottery changes see, e.g., Adams 1979; Arnold 1985, 1-2).
reassessment of the deposits assigned by Evans to MM IA also has implications for the history of Knossos before and after the foundation of the Old Palace.

For example, the interpretation of the Vat Room deposit as a pit of MM IIA date removes all positive evidence for continuity of occupation and religious activity from Prepalatial times in this area of the later Palace (cf. Chapter 3, 95-96).

Similarly, it has been demonstrated that the West Enceinte Wall, which has been used as evidence for the existence of monumental structures at Knossos already in Prepalatial times (Warren 1987, 48-49), actually belongs to the Old Palace Period (cf. Chapter 2, 59-60).

A third example concerns the expansion of the area settled in Prepalatial times. A MM IA date has been confirmed for deposits such as the North Quarter of the City and that found by Warren in his Stratigraphical Museum excavations, which thus provide good evidence for Prepalatial occupation as far as 0.5km. from the Palace on the Kephala hill to the North and West (cf. Chapter 4, 154). It has been recently suggested that the MM IA occupation in the Knossos area "is likely to have been continuous over at least 125,000m²" (Warren 1987, 53): this calculation includes the two deposits just mentioned. But it also includes deposits and structures such as the Monolithic Pillar Basement and the West
Enceinte Wall which belong to the Old Palace Period (cf. Chapter 3, 137-143 and above). These, and, among others, the "MM IA" deposit from near the villa Ariadne (cf. Chapter 4, 154 n. 1 and Appendix 1, no. 30), and the Early Magazines (Chapter 3, 109-111) are good reminders that a considerable number of alleged MM IA deposits actually belong to the Old Palace period. It may therefore be necessary to revise downwards, at least for the present, our view of the extent of Prepalatial settlement at Knossos.

Finally, it is possible that the reassessment of Evans' MM IA deposits may have further implications as to the date of the foundation of the Old Palace at Knossos. Evans maintained that the Old Palace was founded when MM IA was already stratified, i.e. after MM IA, on the basis of various "wall tests" in which the latest pottery found was always MM IA (cf. Chapter 1, 17). But, as demonstrated in the previous chapters, Evans assigned to MM IA a good deal of material and even whole deposits which belong to the MM IIA pottery phase, and none of the material found in the "wall tests" has ever been illustrated. Thus, on the basis of the evidence now available -or lack of it- it cannot be excluded that the Old Palace was built when pottery of the MM IIA phase was already in vogue. Perhaps a re-examination of the tests

5. Some scholars have suggested that pottery of the MM IA phase was in vogue at the time of the foundation of the Palace (e.g. Pendlebury 1939, 96; Zois 1965, 86; Walberg 1976, 97 and 104).
conducted by Evans, together with new "wall tests" and new soundings underneath deposits of the MM IIA destruction may shed some light upon this problem.

In recent times many scholars have paid particular attention to the origins and early phases of the Minoan Palaces (see, e.g., Cherry 1983; Leithwaite 1983; Warren 1987; Branigan 1988; Cadogan 1988). In the debate on the genesis or origin of the Palaces attention has partly focussed upon the EM III-MM IA period. In this debate scholars are, ultimately, divided between "gradualists" or "evolutionists" who see the emergence of Palatial civilisation as the inevitable outcome of the developments which took place in the previous phases, and "revolutionists" who regard the emergence of Palatial civilisation as a "quantum leap" and prefer to consider developments in general as characterised by "punctuated equilibria", i.e. by moments of stasis and sudden appearance of new phenomena (Cherry 1980, 33 ff.). The "evolutionist" approach goes back to Evans who believed that, before the foundation of the Old Palace, "coming events had already cast their shadows before them" (1921, 127), and considered, for example, the Early Hypogaeum, and the West Enceinte Wall to be evidence for a predecessor of the Old Palace.

Obviously it is not possible yet to provide enough evidence to support either the "revolutionary" or the "evolutionary" model on the basis of my re-examination of
a number of selected deposits. However, my analysis has already shown that a critical reassessment of the archeological evidence can alter the traditional picture of Prepalatial Knossos and, therefore, provide a different set of data against which these models should be tested. Prepalatial monumental structures may or may not be considered to be precursors of the later Palaces, depending on the archaeologist's personal "evolutionary" or "revolutionary" interpretation of the function of these buildings. Similarly, the process of urbanization or expansion in the area settled in Prepalatial times, as attested by deposits such the North Quarter of the City, may or may not be considered to be crucial for the emergence of the Palaces (Warren 1987; see, also, Whitelaw 1983, 338-340). But the correct date of such structures and deposits is a prerequisite for both approaches.
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APPENDIX 1: LIST OF MM IA DEPOSITS AND OF OTHER DEPOSITS
IN WHICH MM IA POTTERY HAS ALSO BEEN FOUND

WEST COURT, THEATRAL AREA, ROYAL ROAD

1. HOUSES A, B, and C; THE WELL TO THE NORTH OF HOUSE A.
   (See Chapter 2).

2. THE "PROTO-PALATIAL FAÇADE".
   (Catling 1974, 34 and 1988, 69; Evans 1905, 20-21;
   1921, 127 ff.; 1928, 665-666; 1935, fig. 30 = FIG. 2;
   MacGillivray 1986, 31, 35, fig. 5).
   
   Evans believed that the West Façade of the New Palace had a predecessor of "proto-palatial" date. In its Northern section, the "proto-palatial" façade was built with small stones and ran underneath the Neopalatial façade. In its Southern section, the early façade stood a few meters to the West of the later

---

1. The main sources for the list are: Evans' Palace of Minos (1921-1935), Hood and Taylor (1981), Hood and Smyth (1981), Pendlebury et al. (1933-35).
   
   The following find-places of MM IA pottery which appear in the index of the Palace of Minos (compiled by Joan Evans) have not been included in this appendix: 1) the South Porch (Evans 1921, 104) because it is, in fact, the Early Hypogaeum; 2) the Wall above the N. Lustral Basin (Evans 1930, 13 n. 1) because this is a MM III deposit in which a single fragment of MM IA cup is reported. The index records also 3) the South House and 4) the SW Columnar Chamber as places where MM IA pottery was found, giving for both the reference Evans 1935, 87, where, indeed, a "House floor South of the Palace" is mentioned, but not as a place where MM IA pottery was found.
   
   Only the pottery from the deposits discussed in chapters 2-4 has been re-examined.
façade, and its remains consisted of large foundation slabs forming a rounded corner at the height of Magazine III (FIG. 2). The "proto-palatial" date of this structure was obtained by means of various "wall-tests" (at the back of Magazine XII and below the 2nd and 3rd slabs). The latest pottery found in these tests was dated to MM IA. Note that Hood's EM III wall corresponds to the North section of Evans' "proto-palatial" façade (Catling 1974, 34; 1988, 69).

3. WEST COURT, AREA OF THE EM II HOUSE
(Evans 1972, 118 n. 2)
Recent excavations conducted by John Evans in the West Court have brought to light the foundations of a wall associated with MM IA pottery.

4. WEST POLYCHROME DEPOSIT
Evans reported the existence of a MM IA stratum below a level with MM IB-MM II pottery (MM IIIA, according to MacGillivray 1986, 29-30).
5. EARLY HOUSE BY WELL
(Pendlebury et al. 1933-1935: B.I.23)

Pendlebury reports a deposit from a House in the SW corner of the West Court, excavated in 1930, with pottery mainly MM I and with a few intrusive later sherds from a nearby well.

6. BENEATH THE THEATRAL AREA
(Evans 1930, 247 ff.; Hood and Taylor 1981 no. 162; Platon 1955, 566; Pendlebury et al. 1933-35)

MM IA pottery has been reported from various points in this area:

1) Evans reports the discovery, in 1913, of a Kouloura "probably of 'proto-palatial' date, marked by MM IA pottery", and stated that the latest pottery found in the fill of the Kouloura dated from MM IIA. The pottery is kept in KSM A.I. 22 ("Kouloara NW of area, 1 box, 1908). Note that the date on the label of the box does not correspond to that given by Evans.

2) Evans reports that MM IA pottery was also found beneath the the 10th step of the Eastern Flight in the Theatral Area, during a test of 1929 which brought to light the following stratigraphical sequence: MM IIIA above MM IIA above MM IA. The ceramic material relative to this test is kept in the KSM (A.I.18: see below).
According to Fendlebury et al. 1933-35, MM IA pottery has been found in the following places beneath the Theatral Area:

A.I.1: Royal Road, under 8th slab W of fork in road; 3 boxes, 1925; MM IA, few neolithic.

A.I.3: W of area, test pit in centre of paving N of road below gap in paving 0-.40; 1 box, 1930; MM IA.

A.I.4: under missing slab in causeway of area; 8 boxes, 1930.
   0-.70 (paving): MM IA, about 1/5 MM II, intrusive Neolithic.
   .70-.90 (rough stones): MM IA; a few MM II.
   .90-1.35: MM IA; a few MM II; intrusive Neolithic.
   1.35-1.43: MM IA.
   1.43-1.65: MM IA.
   1.65-1.70: MM IA.
   1.70 -1.85 (virgin soil): MM IA; intrusive Neol.

A.I.5: W end, up against W wall; 2 boxes, 1930.
   0-.40: MM II-LM I.
   .40-.90 (paving): MM IA-MM III; intrusive LM I.

A.I.9: by S. steps; 2 boxes, 1930; 2 MM IA sherds, MM III LM I.

A.I.10: paving in small rectangle W of W wall, S of main
road: 1 box, 1930: MM I (in general).

A.I.11: paving between main road and W spur of W wall of
area: 1 box, 1930: MM IA; 1 LM IIIIB: 1 Mynian.

A.I.14: kalderim paving projecting W of area N of road.
Surface, 1 box, 1930: MM IA; MM II; MM III.

A.I.15: below paving of Theatral Area, 2 boxes, 1903:
MM IA-MM III mainly: intrusive Neolithic, LM IA-
LM'IB; Geometric.

A.I.18: E steps. Under 10th step, 6 boxes, 1929:
.75-1m. MM IA-MM II; intrusive Neolithic.
.75-1.30 (paving): MM IA-MM II; intrusive
Neolithic.
1.30-2.50 (bottom of pit) MM IA; intrusive
Neolithic.
(Cf. above)

A.I.22: Kouloura NW of area: 1 box, 1908: MM IA:
intrusive Neolithic; some MM II (?); 1 Roman; 1
Byzantine.
(cf. above)

Investigations by Platon in the early fifties have
also brought to light deposits assigned to MM IA. The
deposits were noticeable for the number of "sheep-bells"
that were found (cf., also, Catling 1988. 68).
7. ROYAL ROAD

(Hood 1962; Hood 1966; Hood and Smyth 1981, nos. 214-215)

EM III and MM IA deposits reported from this area
(respectively from the North and South sides of the road).

NORTH WING OF THE PALACE

8. NORTH WALL

(Evans 1921, 131)

Two tests made in the North wall showed MM IA
pottery mixed with EM and Neolithic material (date and
exact location of tests are not mentioned).

9. EARLY KEEP

(Evans 1921, 136; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 131)

Evans reported that the latest pottery found in the
inner crevices of the substructures of the Keep was MM IA
(test of 1913).

WEST WING OF THE PALACE

10. VAT ROOM

(See Chapter 3).

11. EAST PILLAR CRYPT

(See Chapter 3).
12. EARLY MAGAZINES
(See Chapter 3).

13. CORRIDOR BY WEST ENTRANCE
(Evans 1928, 669 n.1)

Evans reported the find of MM IA pottery mixed with EM and Neolithic in a test (no. 7a) made in 1925 beneath a gypsum slab in the Western wing of the corridor, about 1.85 m. from the entrance.

14. CORRIDOR OF THE PROCESSION
(Evans 1928, 683 n. 1; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 34)

In 1922 various test pits were sunk below the paving of the Corridor of the Procession. Various MM IA fragments came to light (mixed with earlier and later pottery), none showing polychrome decoration (tests A1, B1, B2).

SOUTH WING AND SOUTH FRONT

15. MINOAN WELL, AREA OF STEPPED PORTICO
(Evans 1928, 146, 153; id. 1930, 254; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 4; Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 282).

MM IA pottery was found in the upper part of the fill of a well located beneath the second terrace of the ascending ramp of the Stepped portico. Probably
excavated in 1905. KSM S.II.: no sherds identified as yet.

16. AREA OF STEPPED PORTICO

(Evans 1928, 146, 153; Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 282).

MM IA pottery was found below the foundation walls of the Portico. In particular, Evans reports the find of a deposit 1.45m. thick, with MM IA stratified above EMI-III, next to the first Pillar, between the Neolithic levels and the top of the pier. Probably excavated in 1905. KSM S.II.: no sherds identified as yet.

17. PREPALATIAL HOUSES TO THE SOUTH OF THE PALACE

(See Chapter 3).

18. EARLY HYPOGAEUM

(See Chapter 3).

19. SOUTH HOUSE

(Hood and Taylor 1981, no.1).

EM III and MM IA sherds reported from behind the retaining wall to the North.

20. HOUSE OF THE SACRIFICED OXEN

(Evans 1928, 300-301; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 287).

Evans reports the discovery of a jar or pitcher of MM IA date under a wall jutting out into the Southern
basement room of the house. The vase is described as having a "dark glaze" trickle decoration on a buff ground and alternating zones of vertical and horizontal handles. Within the jar various fragments of "egg-cups" and one intact specimen were found. The excavation was carried out in 1922. The pottery may be kept in KSM R.V. 1-8 (probably R.V.5 or 6 = SW and SE rooms).

21. DRAIN IN THE SE ANGLE


In 1926, Evans carried out excavations in the area NW of the House of the Frescoes. A large quantity of MH IA pottery came to light, but only one vase was illustrated: a cup with "crocus flowers" which was assigned to "the close of MH IA". The same cup, however, was later assigned to MM IB (see, however, MacGillivray 1986, 103, 136 for a MM IIA date).

22. MONOLITHIC PILLAR BASEMENT

(See Chapter 3).

23. BUILDINGS SOUTH OF THE MONOLITHIC PILLAR BASEMENT

(Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 279)

MM IA vases reported from this area.
EAST WING OF THE PALACE

24. UPPER EAST WELL
(See Chapter 3).

25. OLIVE PRESS ROOM
(Evans 1913 NB, 23-26; Mackenzie 1903, 169; Hood and Taylor 1981, no. 208)

Mackenzie reports the presence of six fragments of MM I pottery in the deposit immediately underlying the "Minoan floor".

26. EAST SLOPE
(Evans 1921, 131)

In 1910 some tests were made among the blocks of the massive wall line: MM IA pottery was found mixed with EM and Neolithic material. (One test was made in the area immediately to the East of the large pithoi; a second test was made half way between the Court of the Stone Spout and the East Bastion; and a third test was made a little to the East of the light-well of the Hall of the Double Axes).

27. AREA OF ROYAL POTTERY STORES
(Mackenzie 1906, 254 no. 6)

Mackenzie reports the discovery in 1905 of a pit containing MM IA vases and fragments immediately underlying the MM II floor, where "in 1902 were found the
fine polychrome vases JHS XXIII pl. V. 1,2,3; pl. VI. 1,2,3″. The polychrome vases belong to MacGillivray's (1986) group F, L.III.1 (MM IIA). (Fendlebury et al. 1933-35 reports a pit excavated in 1905 in L.III.1 as "above" the Kamares floor; other pits, excavated in 1905, are reported in the following areas: L.III.3, 4, 5, 8, 12.

DEPOSITS OUTSIDE THE AREA OF THE PALACE

28. THE NORTH QUARTER OF THE CITY
(See Chapter 4).

29. STRATIGRAPHICAL MUSEUM EXCAVATION
(Warren 1981, 19; Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 188)
MM IA pottery reported from this site (cf., also, Chapter 4, 154 n. 2).

30. WELL NEAR VILLA ARIADNE
(Evans 1928, 546-547; id. 1930, 254-255, fig. 174; Hood and Smyth 1981, no. 133; see, also, Chapter 4, 154 n. 1).

The well was located above the Little Palace, and to the NW of Villa Ariadne. Evans reports that a pair of two handled "pitchers" of MM IA date - both intact - were found at the bottom of the well. The vases (illustrated in Evans 1930, fig. 174) are dated to MM IA by comparison with the amphorae from the Vat Room deposit (cf. Evans...
1921, 167 fig. 118a, 4; see Walberg 1976, form 16, type 69).

31-42. MM IA pottery has also been reported from the following sites (the numbers refer to Hood and Smyth 1981: only sites where MM IA pottery was mentioned are included; sites where only MM I pottery in general was reported are not listed): 37, 139, 140, 190, 202, 208, 227, 269, 292, 295, 324.