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ABSTRACT

Incised Marks on Late Helladic and Late Minoan III Pottery. (December 1990)

Nicolle Elise Hirschefeld, B.A., Bryn Mawr College

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. George F. Bass

A careful look at Late Helladic/ Late Minoan III pottery marked with incised signs leads to two observations. First, the incised signs are related in form and method of application, as well as the types of vessels to which they are applied and the chronological range and distribution of those vessels. These common features suggest systematic use of incised marks. Second, this system is directly related to potmarking practices of contemporary Cyprus.

Cypriot signs on Mycenaean vessels found on Cyprus or in the Near East can be explained as having been marked in Cyprus, but the incised Mycenaean vases found in the Aegean are more difficult to understand. The increasing number of incised vessels found in the Argolid and the fact that they are fine-ware vases makes it difficult to think of them as "returnables." In view of other evidence of highly-organized trade between the Argolid and Cyprus, it is proposed that the vessels bearing incised marks were designated for export to Cyprus while still on the mainland and there marked according to the practices appropriate to their destination. There is no precedent or logical reason to suggest that Mycenaeans employed such marks; more likely, Cypriots themselves incised the signs.

No pattern can be discerned which might indicate the function of the marks. No particular sign or combination of signs is peculiar to a certain shape, decorative motif, geographical region, or context. In fact, this lack of patterning in the appearance of the marks must itself provide some clue to the meaning of the signs. In default of other possible explanations, it is proposed that the diversity of signs is best explained as reflecting personal marks of those (Cypriots) handling the merchandise: traders, shippers or warehouse.
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</tbody>
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INTRODUCTION

Although Aegean pottery was a significant export commodity during the Late Helladic/Late Minoan IIIA-B (ca.1400-1200 BCE) period, little is known of the actual process of exchange. Written records surviving in Aegean and Near Eastern archives directly document the transfer of goods, but uneven preservation and difficulties in interpretation limit the usefulness of these documents for explaining the processes by which Aegean pottery reached the Near East.

Research has, necessarily, first concentrated on establishing the simple facts of exchange based on archaeological evidence: what and how much was being sent where. The publication of Mycenaean goods found at various sites in the eastern Mediterranean and Near Eastern goods found in the Aegean constitutes the primary stage of documenting Mycenaean pottery exchange mechanisms.1

Subsequent analysis of these "facts of exchange"—comparing them by site or region, types, and quantities—addresses questions such as who was transporting the pottery and for what specific purpose (why). With respect to the Mycenaean vases found outside of the Aegean, one approach has been to examine closely the vessel types themselves. For example, A. Leonard's detailed study of the particular Mycenaean ceramic forms which reached Syro-Palestine suggests that specific market demands were being met by the Mycenaean imports.2 B. Gittlen hypothesizes a similar organized market orientation for the Cypro-Palestinian trade.3 In contrast, V. Hankey's analysis of the Mycenaean pottery at Amman postulates religious or political motivations for the appearance of Mycenaean wares at this site.4 Studies such as these have concentrated on examination of features such as decoration, shape, and fabric of the exchanged ceramics.

The American Journal of Archaeology is used as the model for style and format of this thesis.

1 Bibliography of Mycenaean pottery found outside of the Aegean is listed infra. Geographical Distribution. For Near Eastern goods found in the Aegean, see E. Chine, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, forthcoming.


This thesis focuses on another feature of Aegean pottery which potentially offers direct evidence of the exchange process, namely the various types of marks incised on pottery. Not all marks applied to pottery are necessarily connected with facilitating exchange or marketing; however, this is one common reason for marking ceramic wares and thus the signs which are found on Aegean pottery should be examined as possible evidence for the mechanisms of pottery export during LH/LM III. In this period, three different means of marking Minoan and Mycenaean ceramic pottery are preserved:

(1) Linear B painted inscriptions are most often found on coarse-ware stirrup jars and are almost always painted before firing. The precise function of these inscriptions is debated, but it seems clear that their limited appearance is connected with a very specific aspect of LH/LM IIIIB exchange between the mainland and Crete.5

(2) Painted single marks are a very different phenomenon from the Linear B inscriptions. They appear on a wide variety of open and closed shapes throughout the Aegean, Crete, Cyprus, and the Near East; and they seem to be applied both before and after firing. The meaning of these marks and any connection they might have with other marking systems have not been fully studied.6

(3) Finally, a limited number of vessels carry incised signs7, engraved either before or after firing. The particular stage when marks were made is of fundamental importance, for pre-firing marks are directly related to the manufacturing process so that, whatever the significance of such marks, we at least know that they were intentionally placed on the vessels as part of the production of the vase, whereas marks incised after firing may have been applied at any stage of production, exchange, use or reuse of the vessel. Both pre- and post-fired signs may be associated with a wide range of meanings: identification of contents, origin, destination, owner, or distributor, for example. In the Aegean, although pre-firing incised marks were routinely used during the Middle Bronze


6See, however, Raison, VIP, 213-16 and Stubbings, MPL, 45-52 for some discussion of these painted single marks.

7J. Rutter informed me that LH III Mycenaean cooking pots sometimes carry impressed marks; these merit study, but because of (a) their (apparent) lack of direct relevance to the problems of Mycenaean exported wares, (b) the scanty publication of these impressed pieces, (c) time limitations on my part, I have not considered them within the context of this paper. I thank J. Rutter for bringing them to my attention.
and early Mycenaean periods, incised marks (either before or after firing) are very rarely found on LH/LM III Aegean pottery, and then—with few exceptions—only in the Argolid.

The situation on Cyprus, however, contrasts sharply with that in the Aegean, for on this island the practice of marking pottery with incised signs was by no means exceptional. In fact, it is commonplace. On local Cypriot pottery from Late Bronze Age contexts on Cyprus, there exist at least five hundred incised vessels or sherds of all sorts of wares, but especially local (Plain White Wheelmade) domestic jugs and jars. Signs were incised both before and after firing, though marks incised after firing are far more common. Cypro-Minoan (CM) inscriptions (i.e., actual sequences of two or more CM signs) are not uncommon on these domestic vessels, and single marks are often assumed to be CM characters. And it is also on Cyprus that most Aegean wares with incised signs appear.

It is reasonable to surmise, given both the relative quantity of marked Mycenaean wares in Cyprus in contrast to their rarity within the contemporary Aegean and the style of marking, that the practice of incising signs on Aegean wares is somehow intimately connected with Cyprus. We then must ask how the Argolid, the single other area with a significant number of these distinctively marked vessels, fits into a Cyprus-oriented picture.

The following thesis concentrates on three points:
(1) Establishing a catalogue of all known Aegean vessels carrying incised marks.
(2) Analyzing this information with respect to the following questions:
(a) Does the complete collection of vessels marked with incised signs confirm the immediate impression that these incised marks are in some way connected with Cyprus? If so, how can the presence of vessels with incised marks outside of Cyprus be explained?

For example, at Tiryns [H. Döhl, "Bronzezeitliche Graffiti aus Tilyn I: Vor dem Brand eingeritzte Zeichen," Kadmos 17 (1978) 115-20], Kea [A. Bikakí, Keos IV, Ayia Irini: The Potters' Marks (Mainz 1984), Phylakopi [C. Edgar, A. Evans, "The Pottery Marks," Excavations at Phylakopi in Melos (JHS Suppl. 4, 1904) 177-85], and Lerna [C. Zerner, Ware and Biegen] numerous finds attest to well-developed marking systems consisting of combinations of short slashes and punches incised or impressed before firing.

Unpublished catalogue; assembled during my year of research in the museums of Cyprus, 1988-1989.
(b) Can the function(s) of the incised signs be determined? How does this fit into explanations developed for (2a)? Do the marks directly document exchange processes?
THE SAMPLE

This study encompasses all marks *incised* on all kinds of ceramics—coarse and fine fabrics, common domestic as well as special-purpose vessels—manufactured on the Mycenaean mainland or Crete during the LH/LM III period.

Because of general inattention paid to coarse and utilitarian wares, it is certain that published reports of marks on such fabrics only partially represent the extent of the practice of marking domestic vessels.\(^{10}\) Those listed in Appendix II are all that are known to me through publications. The most notable—and only common—characteristic of the marked vases listed is their scarcity relative to the total amount of pottery excavated. To what degree this scarcity is a function of biased observation and publication as opposed to a real absence of marked domestic ceramics can only be ascertained by further direct contact with excavators and re-examination of (unsorted) pottery assemblages. Thus, the marked domestic vessels listed in this report are to be regarded only as a provisional indication of the marking practices associated with domestic wares. The only statement which *can* be made with some degree of confidence is that there is no indication of *widespread* use of marks of any sort, such as is attested in the Middle Bronze and early Mycenaean Aegean or in Late Bronze II Cyprus.

The one shape to which the above bias in observation and publication probably does *not* apply is the large coarse stirrup jar, FS 164. The function of the vessel itself, as well as the amount of research associated with this particular shape, set it aside from other coarse vessels. It differs in function in that, although certainly suitable for domestic storage, it is also characteristically used for long-distance transport. In terms of documentation, this particular vessel has been and continues to be a focus of several research projects,\(^{11}\) and so its occurrences have become reasonably well documented. Consequently, it is fair to conclude that the marked coarse stirrup jars listed in this report represent all presently known examples.

In contrast to the coarse wares, marks on fine fabrics are much more likely to have been noted; thus the reported sample has a greater chance of accurately reflecting

---

\(^{10}\)For example, supra n.7.

\(^{11}\)(Supra n.5). Research currently being conducted by H. Haskell (Southwestern University, Georgetown, TX), R. Jones (Fitch Laboratory, British School at Athens) and H. Catling aims at comprehensive scientific and typological analyses of these jars.
ancient patterns of use. All fine wares which were certainly or probably manufactured in the Aegean during the LH/LM III period and were marked by incised signs are included in this analysis (Appendix I); pottery definitely made in Cyprus (for example, Mycenaean IIIC:1b ware) or the Near East is not.

Thus, the appendices list all known examples of LH/LM III wares with incised marks, but can be considered comprehensive only with respect to the marked fine-ware vessels and large coarse stirrup jars. This report concentrates on the latter two categories.
CHRONOLOGICAL RANGE

With only a handful of exceptions, the Aegean vessels with incised marks that can be closely dated by either ceramic typology or stratigraphical context fall within the LH IIIA-B range; of those which can be dated more specifically within this range, most are LH/LM IIIB (ca.1300-1200 BCE) in date (Table 1).

There does not seem to be any overlap between the widespread use of potters' marks (incised before firing) during the Middle and early Late Bronze Age and the later LH/LM III use of inscribed marks.12

The marking system discussed in this paper does not appear at all outside the general bounds of LH/LM III13.

Three vessels seem to indicate the use of such marks already in early LH IIIA. A Pictorial style amphoroid krater from a tomb at Enkomi14 is dated primarily by stylistic criteria. A large coarse-ware stirrup jar handle found at Kourion Bamboula15 is dated stratigraphically. According to published information, this piece comes from a context contemporary with LH IIIA1.16 It is not clear to me whether the third piece—a fragment from a large coarse-ware stirrup jar17 found at Minet el Beidha—is dated by style or stratigraphy, but it is regularly published as LM IIIA1.

---

12 According to J. Rutter, the potters' marking system continued to be used up until LH IB at Tsoungiza (Argolid). The earliest dated use of the post-fired marking system is LH IIIA1. Thus, at present, there seems to be no chronological overlap between the earlier and later methods of marking, but the interval was very short.

13 Based on published descriptions or photos, those vases marked "No Date (ND)" on my chart probably also can be assigned to a LH/LM III, but the separate category is maintained until this assumption can be justified in detail.

14 Enk.T.7/11.

15 Kourion B1137.

16 Found in Area A stratum A:3, which is dated to LC IIA [Bamboula, 118; also, J. Benson, "Bamboula at Kourion, The Stratification of the Settlement," RDAC (1970) 40]. Contra this date is the stylistic date assigned by P. Åström in SCE IV:1C, 336. The only way to resolve this discrepancy would be to check the context again (i.e. study the finds and the notebooks describing the excavation process and observations). Until this is done, I accept the excavator's dating rather than the typological criteria which assigns most such large coarse stirrup jars date to IIIB.

17 MeB Dep.213.
Table 1. Vessels with Incised Marks: Chronological Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IIIA1</th>
<th>IIIA2</th>
<th>IIIA-B</th>
<th>IIIA2-B</th>
<th>IIIIB</th>
<th>IIIIB?</th>
<th>pre-HIC</th>
<th>No date</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peariform jars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large coarse SJs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large fine SJs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SJs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphoroid krater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell krater/deep bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

(1) If both stratigraphic and typological dates are available, object is listed according to typological date.

It is not clear whether the dates given to the objects published by Döhl are based on stylistic criteria or on contextual data. However, since in a few cases he offers dates for objects which have no specific provenience (ex: T1 Neg. 639), it is clear that at least sometimes the date is based on ceramic typology. For the purposes of this paper, all dates given by Döhl are assumed to be typological dates.

(2) Minoan/Mycenaean designation is listed according to published (excavators’) classifications. This distinction, especially in the case of coarse stirrup jars, is liable to revision [H. Haskell, (fc.)]. However, although place of manufacture may change, relative chronological dates will probably remain the same. Thus, for example, an LM IIIB jar may be reassigned to LH IIIB or vice-versa, but the IIIB date remains constant.

(3) Certain major deposits or ceramic designations together provide the bulk of chronological data:

*Sjöqvist’s designation “Levanto-Helladic.”* Vases described as “Levanto-Helladic” in Sjöqvist’s publications are here designated as LH IIIB [B. Kling, *Western Cyprus: Connections*, 120-25].

*FS 36 piriform jars.* FS 36 piriform jars are dated to LH IIIB as per Furumark’s definition [MP, 590].

*Epichosis deposit, Tiryns.* Vases from the "Epichosis" deposit at Tiryns are dated to LH IIIB by context. However, it does remain to be verified to what extent the pieces with incised marks themselves provided dating criteria for the deposit.

*Enkomi T.18*, side-chamber and lower burial.
Table 1 (continued)

Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios. All finds from settlement strata are dated to LC IIC. There are tombs which predate the settlement [A. South Todd, "The Late Bronze Age in the Vasilikos Valley," Praktika tou Deuterou Dieithnous Kyprologikou Synedriou (Nicosia 1982) 118], an Archaic well [A. K. South, "Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios 1983," RDAC (1984) 227], and a limited scatter of Roman objects on the surface [A. K. South, "Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios 1983" RDAC (1984) p.15 no.4] but in all other respects the Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios settlement is a one-period site, dated to LC IIC by the excavator [A. K. South, "Contacts and Contrasts in Late Bronze Age Cyprus: The Vasilikos Valley and the West," in D. W. Rupp, ed., Western Cyprus: Connections (SIMA 87, Göteborg 1987) 85]. Thus, a LC IIC date may be accepted as almost certain even for objects from very shallow, surface, or disturbed contexts.

Ugarit Récent 3, especially MeB T.VI. Equivalencies for the Ugarit levels are as follows:

Ugarit Recent 2 = 1450-1365 = LC II A = LH/LM III A1
Ugarit Recent 3 = 1365-1185 = LC III B-III A1 = LH IIIA2- LH IIIC1 early

= LM IIIA2 - LMIIIC

J.-C. Courtois, "Ugarit grid, strata, and find-localizations: a reassessment," Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palastina-Vereins 90 (1974) 97-114; J.-C. Courtois, Alasia III, 8; H. Catling in Greek and Cypriot Pottery, p. 596 table 7.13. I am told that the absolute dates given above for Ugarit Récent 3 may now be considered almost wholly synonymous with LH IIIB, according to the chronology advocated by V. Hankey and P. Warren, but I have not had an opportunity to check this. If this is indeed so, then the number of inscribed vessels assigned to IIIB would increase.
The frequency with which inscribed marks were used may increase slightly during IIIA2; eight finds are attributed specifically to this period. However, the sample is too small to determine whether this slightly larger number is indicative of a gradual increase in the use of this method of marking, or whether it is indicative only of continued, low-level use of incised marks.

[One handle fragment (Kommos I5), possibly from a large coarse stirrup jar, is assigned to an LM IIIA context by the excavators; I have (inadvertently) incorporated it into the specifically IIIA2 category on Table 1].

The practice of incising marks on Aegean wares occurs primarily during LH/LM IIIB. 125 of the 197 marked vases can be dated specifically to this period. Another 20 are probably LH IIIIB in date. And, given the preponderance of vessels with a specifically IIIIB date, it can be hypothesized that most vases falling into the general "IIIA-B" or "IIIA2-B" categories probably date to the later period. Thus 64% of marked vessels can be fairly dated to IIIIB, another 10% are probably IIIIB, and a further 8% are likely to be (= 82% total!)

The use of incised marks ends suddenly, coterminous with the end of IIIIB. On Cyprus, only one possible Aegean vessel with an incised mark can be dated to IIIC: the base of a bowl (B438) found in a LC IIC-IIIA context at Kourion-Bamboula. Two

---

There are marked Aegean vessels found in Cypriot contexts which are post-LH IIIIB in date. In all cases, the inscribed vessels themselves, however, date to LH/LM IIIA-B. There are two possible explanations: (1) the inscribed IIIIB vases were inscribed sometime in the IIIIB period, but not deposited until much later, or (2) the IIIIB vases could have been inscribed close to the time of deposition, which would have been some time after their arrival on the island. Since most inscribed Aegean IIIIB vases are found in contemporary (LC IIC) contexts, I believe that inscribed Aegean IIIIB vessels in later contexts were probably inscribed during IIIIB.

Two other Mycenaean IIIC.1b vessels with incised marks are known to me: (1) MaaPk 234, a fragmentary FS 284 skyphos found in a disturbed LC IIIA context [Maa Palaeokastro: 170, 318 (ceramic typology); 261 (stratigraphic context)] and (2) Enk 5837(20), a handle fragment from a Mycenaean IIIC.1b bowl, found in a LC IIIA context [Enkomi: 757 (ceramic typology), 204 (stratigraphic context)]. Both are similarly marked: three parallel slashes incised at the base of a handle. I have recorded one set as having been inscribed before firing and the other after firing, but given the other similarities between the marks (form of marks, their location on vessel, and type of vessel), these vases need to be re-examined in order to determine if this discrepancy really does exist.

The marks on these two vessels bear no specific resemblances to the Cypro-Minoan signs of earlier Aegean wares: a series of parallel lines is found only on the coarse stirrup jar from Akanthou-Moulos (Akanthou-Moulos CS 997 no.30). Such parallel lines, however, are often found on local wares [for example, the many Plain
signs, one certainly CM 108, are engraved on the base. The fragment is published by its excavators (Daniel and Benson) as "LC III Decorated ware", a designation based primarily on fabric and shape. There has been—and continues to be—a great deal of confusion concerning the definition of this ware (including its place of manufacture) and the date of its appearance. B. Kling, who has begun to sort through this problem, cautions that Benson, like many others, was not certain of how to differentiate between Mycenaean and LC III (i.e. local Cypriot) wares. Thus, the designation of this bowl as a Mycenaean IIIIC vessel (rather than a late LH IIIB) must be held in question until it has been examined by an expert. Its stratigraphical context is not of much help, since although basically LC IIIC (LH IIIB) in date, some pieces characteristic of LC IIIA (Mycenaean IIIIC:1b) begin to appear in the same level. In summary, the excavator's classification of this bowl as Mycenaean IIIIC:1b (rather than LH IIIB) is not at all certain and cannot be resolved on the basis of published evidence. Its stratigraphical context leans toward an earlier date, but this is by no means firm. If the bowl is indeed

White Wheelmade jar handles from Kouklia; Mitford, Kadmos 10 (1971) 87-96] and their appearance on these two locally-produced (Kling, Mycenaean IIIIC:1b, 91-94) Mycenaean IIIIC:1b vessels may well be related to a marking system used internally on Cyprus (which may not have had any direct relation to the marking system used on Aegean wares). This impression is reinforced by two other oddities of these marks in terms of the features of marks which appear on Aegean wares. First, the location of the marks is unusual. The few earlier marked open shapes with horizontal loop handles carry signs prominently at mid-handle or under the base, but not at the base of the handle. [See Enk. 1848/11 for a mark at mid-handle; Enk.T.82, CM 1943/II-20/1, Kourion B1063, Kit. T.4+5/108, Kit.T.4+5/116 with signs under base. The mark on the deep bowl from Midea (Dendra), dated to Mycenaean IIIIB2, may be a close parallel to the Mycenaean IIIIC:1b examples from Cyprus, although it is difficult to judge on the basis of the published photo and description. At this point, it is impossible to tell if this similarity is coincidental, or evidence of a specific mark used with open bowls/skyphoi, or a chronological development (end IIIIB-IIIIC) in the marking system.] Second, smaller open shapes are rarely marked even at the flour of inscribed signs on the Aegean wares. Thus these two vessels bear no real resemblance to the marking practices on LH/L.M IIIA-B vessels. Indeed, their idiosyncrasies—scarcity, the unusual form and location of the mark, and their appearance on small open vessels—suggest an entirely unrelated origin and function for these particular marks.

20 "Prolegomena," 275 no. 9; Bamboula, 81.

21 Kling, Western Cyprus: Connections, 99-100.

Mycenaean III C:1b, it would be the only such example known to me which carries a CM sign.
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Introduction

The 197 incised vases were found mostly on Cyprus, but substantial numbers have also been reported in the Near East and on the Greek mainland (Table 2). Thus, the marks are distributed over a wide area of the Mediterranean, though by no means in all areas where Mycenaean pottery is found; noticeable lacunae are the Troad and the Black Sea region, Rhodes and the Dodecanese, the Cyclades, and the mainland outside of the Argolid. In Egypt and Crete, too, marked Aegean vessels are extremely rare.

In order to discuss the distribution patterns of marked Aegean wares, a necessary first step is to try to determine to what extent the known marks constitute a representative sample of ancient patterns of usage: do the distribution patterns of marked Aegean wares known at present accurately reflect their use in antiquity? Of course, many factors, natural and human, affect this correlation, but two seem especially pertinent to this general regional survey of the potmark distribution:

(1) Thoroughness of publication: are potmarks (of all kinds) consistently noticed and published?

(2) Extent of excavation and survey: does the recovered material adequately represent the geographical, chronological, and functional parameters?

With respect to publication, one bias which immediately springs to mind is the scrupulous attention paid to Late Bronze Age potmarks by excavators on Cyprus almost from the earliest organized excavations on the island onward. This focus contrasts sharply with the attention awarded to this subject elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. On Cyprus, already the earliest excavators—the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, S. Casson and M. Markides—collected and noted potmarks; as a consequence, there survive drawings of incised and painted marks and inscriptions known to them from contemporary finds as well as antiquities collections. Interest in potmarks was further fanned by the meticulous publications of J.F. Daniel of the finds from Kourion

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Piriform Jars</th>
<th>Large fine SJ's</th>
<th>Large coarse SJ's</th>
<th>Other SJ's</th>
<th>Jars</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Open/ Frgs.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afanasso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afanasso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afanasso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaties</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More recently, the work of O. Masson, P. Aström, P. Dikaios and especially the continuing studies by E. Masson have kept the CM script and potmarking systems matters of high visibility among Cypriot excavators. As a consequence of this early and continuing scholarly interest, Cypriot site publications and survey reports have generally documented finds of inscribed objects, including marked fine- and coarse-ware pottery. Thus it can be assumed that a large number of potmarks found on Cyprus have been noted in publications.

Elsewhere in the Mediterranean, no such general interest in Late Bronze Age potmarks has been expressed; documentation is sporadic, limited to a few particular sites. Actually, this does not seem to be much of a problem in the Near East, at least with respect to specifically Aegean wares. Because Mycenaean/Minoan finds are exotic items and important chronological indicators, they are almost always mentioned in publications and any unusual features are detailed. It seems unlikely that any incised marks have been neglected. What is difficult to judge, however, is the kinds of marking systems on local wares, and their possible associations with the marks on Aegean vessels.

Within the Aegean itself, little attention has been paid to potmarks. For example, although an extensive system of potters’ marks existed during Middle and early Late Bronze Age, until recently only one article documented it. For the Late Bronze


29C. Edgar, A. Evans, "The Pottery Marks," Excavations at Phylakopi in Melos, UHS Suppl. 4, 1904) 177-85; for more recent work, see articles on the material from Kea [A. Bikaki, Keos IV, Ayia Irini: The Potters’ Marks (Mainz 1984)], Tiryns [H. Döhl,
Aegean archaeology, in spite of the interest in Linear B and Linear B-related topics, only in the past few years have the many potmarks (some claimed to be Linear B characters) excavated at Tiryns been published.\(^{30}\) Similarly, J. Bennet's contribution to the Kommos publication is the first thorough analysis of potmarks in use at a Cretan site.\(^{31}\)

Thus, the early and persistent interest of Cypriot excavators in potmarks contrasts with the situation elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. It may be that this interest has resulted in attributing too great an emphasis to the number and range of potmarks found in Cyprus.

Even more difficult to assess is a second potential skew in the data: the degree to which excavations have provided a representative sample of material. Do the excavated finds provide an accurate basis from which to construct distribution patterns? To what extent are they the result of varying degrees of archaeological activity in different areas? The Argolid, for example, has yielded a comparatively greater proportion of Mycenaean material than many other areas of the mainland; is the concentration of marks here a function of a greater pool of data, or is there a real qualitative difference?

Not only are the relative quantities of material excavated important in assessing the validity of a claim, but also the types of material must be considered. Incised marks occur on particular shapes, particularly large closed storage vessels. In looking at material from various regions and types of sites, does the variety in the kinds of samples found allow fair comparisons?

A fair evaluation of the significance of patterns in distribution of marked Aegean wares would involve, then, a discussion of the overall distribution (quantities and types) of Aegean wares throughout the Mediterranean. But such a study is clearly beyond the scope of this thesis. What follows, instead, is a very basic discussion of the Mycenaean finds from various areas of the Mediterranean specifically in relation to the question of

---


\(^{31}\)J. Bennet, *Kommos I*. 

whether the distribution of potmarks known at present accurately reflects ancient distribution patterns.

Cyprus

The number of Aegean vessels with incised marks found on Cyprus (123) is much greater than the number found anywhere else. The range of marked shapes contrasts sharply with the limited repertories found everywhere else except at Ugarit. Note especially the number of open and Pictorial vases found on Cyprus.

The high proportion of marks reported from Cyprus is in part the product of thorough publication (supra pp.14-17). Extensive excavation is also a factor in the size and quality of the sample, for the number of LC IIC (=LH IIIB) excavated sites is substantial.

The sites are spread throughout the island (though concentrated on the southern coast; Figure 1), and functional contexts include religious and public centers, industrial areas, domestic quarters of varying luxury, and many burials. Mycenaean pottery has been found at most sites, though the amount and types vary a great deal. With very few exceptions, every site with Mycenaean wares includes some vessels with incised marks. (Almost every Late Bronze Age site on the island also includes local pottery with incised marks or inscriptions). Not surprisingly, those sites more cosmopolitan in tone, with greater amounts and varieties of imports, yield larger numbers of marked Aegean wares: Enkomi, Hala Sultan Tekke, and Kition. The greatest variety of marked shapes is found at these sites.

Near East

Outside of Ugarit, very few marked vessels have been reported from the Near East (Figure 2).

The number of marked Aegean vessels (27) found in the region of Ugarit is comparable to the quantity found at Hala Sultan Tekke on Cyprus. This is more than from any other site outside of Cyprus. Tiryns runs a close second to Ugarit, but the latter again distinguishes itself by the wide range of marked shapes found. In contrast to sites elsewhere in the Mediterranean, the shapes on which marks occur at Ugarit are almost as wide-ranging as those on Cyprus. These comparisons of the marked vessels
Figure 2. Distribution of Vessels with Incised Marks: Near East
found in the region of Ugarit and on Cyprus add to the picture of close ties between the two areas formed on other grounds.\textsuperscript{32}

Elsewhere in the Near East, finds of marked Mycenaean wares are few and far between: only twelve vases, eight of which come from Tell Abu Hawam. As discussed above, given the attention with which Aegean pottery found in the Near East is treated, there seems little reason to suspect that published records have failed to mention potmarks. On the other hand unpublished potmarks may be lurking within storerooms, as J. Balensi informed me is the case with material from Tell Abu Hawam. It is difficult to ascertain if other such situations exist, but V. Hankey (whose specialty is Mycenaean pottery in the southeastern Mediterranean) knows of no other unpublished marks,\textsuperscript{33} and thus it is a reasonable assumption that, with the exception of Tell Abu Hawam, known potmarks on Aegean wares found in the Near East have been published.

The total number of Mycenaean ware fragments in the Near East exceeds 1,100\textsuperscript{34} pieces, and so the reported thirteen incised marks are indeed a meager lot. It should be noted, however, that most of the Mycenaean ceramic finds in Syro-Palestinian contexts are extremely fragmentary—often only scraps of body sherds. Handles—the favored place to incise marks—are hardly preserved at all. Thus, the ratio of ca. 1:100 is probably not indicative of the actual situation. Nevertheless, the very few marks relative to the total number of finds makes a convincing contrast to the situation in Cyprus.

Also, although closed shapes (especially stirrup jars) predominate among Mycenaean LH IIIA-B imports to Near Eastern sites, relatively few are of the specific types (FS 164, FS 36, Pictorial style)\textsuperscript{35} most often marked with incised signs. Thus the nature of the sample itself would not lead one to expect the presence of many marked vases. But the lack of marks on the closed vases found in the Near East does emphasize

\textsuperscript{32}For example, formal CM inscriptions have been discovered at Ras Shamra. They are found nowhere else outside of Cyprus.

\textsuperscript{33}I am grateful to both scholars—J. Balensi and V. Hankey—for generously offering information.

\textsuperscript{34}Most Mycenaean ceramics found in the Near East are listed in an excerpt from A. Leonard, “An Index to the Mycenaean Pottery from the Southeastern Mediterranean Littoral,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1976.

\textsuperscript{35}Leonard lists only 19 FS 36 piriform jars (85 piriform jars total) and 3 FS 164 stirrup jars (303 stirrup jars total).
the close association between specific shapes and wares and marks: only certain types of large closed storage vessels exported from the Aegean were apt to be marked.

All of the incised Aegean vessels are found at sites where there is also evidence of Cypriot contact. There is nothing unusual about this, since in fact all sites with Mycenaean finds evince a far greater number of Cypriot wares. This observation is the basis of V. Hankey’s theory that Mycenaean objects arrived in the Near East via Cyprus:

“Except for Tell el Amarna, all sites in the south-eastern Mediterranean seem to have imported far more Cypriote Base Ring II and White Slip II than Mycenaean pottery. The explanation for this seems to be that the best and the bulk of the Mycenaean exports went to Cyprus. The empty cargo space was then loaded with Cypriote goods for onward trading . . .”36

Thus, the marked Aegean vessels found in the Near East can be explained as having come via Cyprus, and they do not detract from the hypothesis that the practice of marking Aegean wares was specifically associated with Cyprus.

One word of caution should be added. Almost half of the finds from the Ugarit area come from a single tomb, Minet el Beidha T.VI, and most of the Syro-Palestinian finds come from a single site, Tell Abu Hawam. These two contexts substantially alter the picture of distribution, and serve as a reminder that the data base for these marked vessels is still small enough to be significantly skewed by fairly small-scale finds.

Egypt

One stirrup jar with an incised mark was reportedly found at Hawara.37 I have not included it in the catalogue or discussions because of lack of further information. Also missing from this report is a discussion of the general nature of Mycenaean pottery found in Egypt.

Turkey

With the exception of the material from Troy and substantial deposits at Miletus, Iasos, and Mysgebi, Mycenaean finds in Turkey are relatively scarce. They are sporadically published: Troy, Mysgebi, and the scattered tomb groups are well-


37I thank V. Hankey for bringing this piece to my attention.
documented,38 but the large numbers of vessels from Miletus and Iasos are still only briefly mentioned in preliminary reports.

By far the largest number of imported Mycenaean vessels is found at Troy (Levels VI f-h); approximately 750 imported sherds have been found in the course of excavations preceding the current project. They date primarily to LH IIIA2-B. Closed and open shapes appear in roughly equal proportions; among closed shapes, especially characteristic are jars, piliform jars (FS 45), alabastra, large and small stirrup jars (FS 164 and 171) and various other jars. None of the Mycenaean vessels is reported to be marked.

Excavations have recently been resumed at Troy and begun at nearby Beşiktepe. The director, M. Korfmann, was kind enough to answer my queries; he reports that no potmarks—on Mycenaean or other wares—have been discovered thus far during the current excavations.

Outside Troy, Mycenaean finds are scattered lightly along much of the west coast, penetrating inland only along river drainages and even then not very far. The finds range in date from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC (though these latest are mostly, if not all, local imitations), and consist almost entirely of fine-ware closed vessels from tomb contexts. None are marked.

In addition, three coastal sites have been interpreted as possible Mycenaean settlements, based primarily on the presence of large amounts of Mycenaean pottery: Miletus, Iasos, and Mı̇şgebi.

The final report for the Miletus material is forthcoming; publication of the (apparently) large numbers of Mycenaean sherds in the preliminary reports is extremely brief. Aegean-type ceramic fragments are found in both settlement and tomb contexts, and date from MM III through the end of LH IIIC. The range of shapes cannot be determined from the existing reports. Recent clay analyses may indicate that the bulk of the “Mycenaean” vessels found at Miletus were locally-produced.39 No marks have

---

38Two reviews of the Mycenaean finds in Turkey provide the relevant bibliography for each site/find: C. Özgüney, “Bati Anadolu ve İçerlerinde Miken Etkinlikleri” Belleten XLVII (1984) 697-743; C. Mee “Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millenium BC” Anatolian Studies 26 (1978) 121-55. These two sources, and the primary material referenced within them, provide the bibliography for the following section of this paper.

been reported specifically on imported Mycenaean vessels, but apparently they do occur on some “local Mycenaean” vessels:

“The engraved signs on some of the Miletus made containers for trade goods suggest the knowledge and use of linear scripts.”

At Iasos, too, evidence of contact with the Aegean extends from Middle Minoan through Late Mycenaean periods. Aegean wares occur in both settlement and burial contexts. Because this site, too, is thus far published only as a series of preliminary reports, few details are given and it is difficult to ascertain whether any vases were marked. Mee states that unlike Miletus, most of the Mycenaean wares are imports from the Argolid rather than local imitations.

The third possible Mycenaean settlement site is in the vicinity of MÜsgebi, where 48 tombs containing circa 200 intact Mycenaean vases were found. These are fully published. Closed shapes (piriform jars, stirrup jars, jars, pyxides/alabaster) are predominant, but open shapes are also present. The bulk of the finds are LH IIIA2-B, though both earlier and later specimens occur. Many are imports from the Argolid, others are reported to be “Dodecanesian” or “Rhodian.” None is marked.

The incomplete publication of the substantial Mycenaean finds from Miletus and Iasos makes it difficult to state certainly that incised marks on imported Mycenaean wares are not found in Turkey. But at Troy, MÜsgebi, and all other scattered sites, no Mycenaean ceramic imports are marked, although many are appropriate candidates by virtue of their date (IIIB) and basic shapes (storage vessels, some large). The fairly large deposits at some sites contrast with scanty finds known in general and serve as a

author’s conclusions have been published, acceptance of her hypothesis should be reserved, especially since it runs counter to the analytical results of a study concerning a similar situation on Rhodes [R.Jones, C. Mee, “Spectrographic Analyses of Mycenaean Pottery from Ialysos on Rhodes: Results and Implications,” JFA 5 (1978) 461-74, esp. 468-69.]

40 K. Gödecken (supra n. 39) 314.
41 R. Jones, C. Mee (supra n.39) 130.
43 Ö zg ü nel (supra n. 38) 733.
reminder that the extent and nature of Mycenaean presence in coastal Asia Minor is hardly known.

The Mycenaean ceramics found in Turkey indicate that connections with the Argolid were predominant and ties with Rhodes and the Dodecanese were also significant.44 However, Cypriot finds in Turkey are few during the LC IIC (=LH IIIB) period, though the ship wrecked at Ulu Burun does show that the sea routes in use certainly provided potential trading connections between Cyprus and coastal Asia Minor.

Rhodes and the Dodecanese

No Aegean wares with incised marks have been reported from Rhodes or the Dodecanese.

Mycenaean pottery—both open and closed shapes—is plentiful in this region during the Late Bronze III, mainly found in large cemeteries on Rhodes and Cos and in scattered tomb groups on Kalymnos, Karpathos, and Astypalaia.

Mycenaean finds on Rhodes are especially numerous and well-published, but the region as a whole has also been the subject of fairly detailed surveys,45 and several areas have been the focus of specific studies.46 Thus, the corpus of Mycenaean and Minoan wares has been extensively documented and the publication record should not be considered a factor in the lack of potmarks reported. Confirmation of this came from the response of two scholars (M. Benzi, C. Mee) interested especially in the Mycenaean pottery of this region, neither of whom was able to recall having seen any LH IIIA-B marks heretofore unpublished.47

But two features of the archaeological record do stand out in connection with the subject of potmarks. First, Mycenaean ceramics in the Dodecanese are most numerous

44Özgül nel (supra no. 38) 721-22 states that mainland Mycenaean contact with eastern Anatolia (as far north as Pithane) during the LH IIIB-C was routed via the Dodecanese.

45R. Hope Simpson, J. Lazenby, “Notes from the Dodecanese” BSA 57 (1962) 154-75; “Notes from the Dodecanese II” BSA 65 (1970) 47-78; “Notes from the Dodecanese III” BSA 68 (1973) 127-180.

46For example, E. Melas, The Islands of Karpathos, Saros and Kasos in the Neolithic and Bronze Age (SIMA 68, Göteborg 1985).

47M. Benzi knew of one unpublished sign from a LH IIIC vessel, however, which I have not yet been able to examine.
in the III A2 period. By III B, at least on the island of Rhodes, a dramatic decrease in the number of tombs, and consequently in grave goods, including Mycenaean wares, is observed. Interpretations of the reasons for this change vary widely. Mee sees this decrease in quantity, as well as a corresponding stylistic stagnation in the ceramic corpus, as evidence of decreasing trade/contact between Rhodes and the Argolid. He further supports his assessment of the situation on Rhodes with evidence of instability in other parts of the eastern Aegean during the III B period. Benzi, on the other hand, argues that although the decreased number of finds indicates depopulation for some reason, the quality of the finds gives no evidence for a cut-off of contact with the Argolid, nor for any other economic crisis. The arguments are ultimately based on ceramic analyses and regional site distribution studies which are difficult for someone not intimately familiar with the material to judge. However, neither side denies a substantial decrease in the quantity of III B wares; this may be a (partial) explanation for the lack of potmarks (which are primarily a III B phenomenon) found in the region.

A second factor is the ceramic assemblage itself. The types of Mycenaean vessels found on Rhodes and elsewhere in the Dodecanese range widely in form, though certain types, distinct in shape and decoration, are particularly characteristic of this region. Because of their specific distribution, they are labelled “Rhodo-Mycenaean” wares. Their situation is comparable to the category of Mycenaean vessels found in Cyprus and Syro-Palestine, referred to as “Levanto-Helladico” or “Levanto-Mycenaean” types. Rhodo- and Levanto-Mycenaean wares are stylistically distinct and geographically mutually exclusive, though the kinds of shapes found in the Dodecanese are often similar in basic form to those marked shapes found on Cyprus. The number of large closed


49 C. Mee (supra n. 48) 88.


51 M. Benzi (supra n. 48) 62-67.

52 Stubbings, MPL, 11-20; MP, 540-41.

53 For example, the large piriform jar shape is found throughout the eastern Mediterranean. However, certain variants of the basic shape are characteristically found in specific areas: FS 36 on Cyprus and in the Levant, FS 34-35 on Rhodes.
storage vessels offered seemingly comparable material for marking. But, in fact, none is, and like the situation in the Near East, this emphasizes the close ties between the use of marks and their association with very particular vessels. It is precisely the difference in ceramic repertoires which may account for the lack of potmarks found on Rhodes. C. Mee very kindly offered the following observations:

"I suspect that the reason for the lack of marks on the Rhodian pottery is that it is quite different from the Levante-Helladic material which you saw in Cyprus. It is striking that the pottery found in the Eastern Aegean does not have much in common with the Mycenaean pottery from Cyprus. The lack of chariot kraters on Rhodes illustrates this well. On the other hand, analysis has demonstrated that much of the LHIII A2-B pottery from Ialysos is imported from the Argolid and the same is of course true of the chariot kraters. . . . This being so, I am inclined to interpret the differences between Rhodian and Cypriot pottery in terms of a fairly sophisticated approach to trade, the manufacturing centers in the Argolid producing different shapes for different markets despite the fact that the route to Cyprus was presumably via Rhodes."55

The paucity of Cypriot finds on Rhodes—only six or seven pieces dating to LCII—also points to the absence of large-scale commercial connections between Cyprus and Rhodes during the time marks were being incised on LH III B vessels.56

Thus, the lack of inscribed marks on Aegean wares in the Dodecanese does not seem to be due to either insubstantial publication or excavation. Rather, two historical factors may be more pertinent: (1) a possible decrease in (commercial) ties with the mainland during LH II B, and (2) the presence of a different Mycenaean ceramic assemblage which does not include the shapes which elsewhere are specifically associated with incised marks.

54 Or, as J. Rutter suggested to me, perhaps different Argive centers supplied different eastern regions with Mycenaean exports.

55 Personal communication: 8 November 1989.

56 P. Åström, "Relations between Cyprus and the Dodecanese in the Bronze Age" Archaeology and Dodecanese (1988) 76-79. The author emphasizes that the Cypriot finds on Rhodes are indicative of constant contact throughout this period; much more striking, to my mind, is the evidently small scale of those contacts.
Cyclades

In spite of the extensive use of potter’s marks (before firing) during Middle Cycladic and early Late Cycladic, local wares in Late Cycladic III contexts are rarely marked. No imported LH III or LM III vessels with marks have been reported from the Cyclades, but whether this is an accurate picture of the situation is unclear, for relatively few Cycladic sites post-dating LM IB have been excavated or published.

Ayia Irini is the one well published site. One section of the final report includes an extensive discussion of the potters’ (i.e. pre-firing) marks found there.57 Although in preceding periods the practice of marking pottery is copiously attested, only five pieces from Period VIII (=LH III) levels are marked, the marks on all of which fit into the tradition of the immediately preceding stratum (=LMIB) which suggests that many if not all may be earlier cast-ups. This statistic, however, may be misleading since the amount of Period VIII stratified material recovered at Ayia Irini is far less than for earlier periods. Bikaki notes that:

“Relatively little pottery of Period VIII had been found. Therefore the paucity of marked pieces cannot be used as evidence either that the practice of marking pots continued or that it came to an end.”58

At Phylakopi, like Ayia Irini, potters’ marks are abundantly attested in Middle and early Late Cycladic, but later evidence peters out. The final publication of the LH IIIC shrine area lists only one coarse-ware cooking tripod, its leg incised with an “X”.59 Mycenaean material from this locale is mostly deep bowls and kylikes, none of which are marked. Publication of the LH IIIA megaron is still forthcoming, but there is no mention of potmarks in preliminary reports of this area or any other. Because most of the IIIIB remains have yet to be published and because those IIIIB vessels which have been published are not of the types which are characteristically marked, it is difficult to ascertain whether the apparent lack of incised marks at this site is meaningful.


58Bikaki (supra no. 57) 40.

Other sites whose preliminary reports indicate significant LH IIIB-period remains are Koukounaries (Paros) and Ayios Andreas (Siphnos), but preliminary publications do not mention any potmarks on local or imported LH III wares.

Mainland Greece

Twenty-eight marks incised onto Mycenaean fine-ware vessels have been reported from the mainland. All come from the Argolid, primarily from Tiryns. With respect to plain and coarse wares, marks incised either before or after firing are extremely rare; none are found on coarse stirrup jars.

In order to evaluate the significance of these statements, two questions must be addressed:

(1) Is the published record an accurate reflection of the finds? Have incised marks on local plain and coarse wares consistently been noticed and reported with the same attention given to fine wares?

(2) To what extent has the concentration of archaeological activity in the Argolid skewed the sample?

In answering the first question, it should be noted that although Linear B and Linear B-related objects (the coarse stirrup jars with painted inscriptions, for example) have been a focus of attention among Mycenaean archaeologists, potmarks have never been treated with the zeal accorded them in Cyprus by those interested in CM. Potmarks in the Mycenaean world have not been completely ignored, but only recently have they been given much attention in site reports. A primary concern in addressing the question of potmarks in the LH III Aegean, then, is to find out whether this lack of discussion is due to a lack of material or rather a lack of interest.

Three hints suggest that perhaps the absence of potmarks in site reports might be due to oversight. First, recent publications of finds from Tiryns include reports on LH III potmarks found there. Almost all post-firing marks are incised onto fine-ware vessels (especially stirrup jars), but there are also a very few local plain ware pots with pre-firing marks. Second, E. French has kindly informed me that there are unpublished potmarks—perhaps in substantial numbers—among material excavated at Mycenae.

---


61 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979); Olivier, AA (1988).
Third, two sherds with incised signs were recently found in Thessaly, and their
discovery there serves as a reminder negative evidence is tenuous.\textsuperscript{62} It also emphasizes
that plain wares, and not just the fine, decorated Mycenaean luxury wares, must be
carefully scrutinized for evidence of marking systems. These three notes show that the
practice of incising marks on both fine and plain wares was known, and hint that more
potmarks exist than have been acknowledged in print.

On the other hand, there is no reason to think that a widespread marking
system(s) on the mainland has gone unnoticed. If published evidence and the memory of
an expert (P. Mountjoy)\textsuperscript{63} can serve as guides, incised signs on plain wares are few in
number and mostly pre-firing (potters') marks. If one concentrates specifically on the
shapes and wares which characteristically bear post-firing marks elsewhere—that is,
fine, decorated Mycenaean wares and coarse stirrup jars—it seems clear that the number
of incised marks omitted from standard preliminary and final publications is low. Since
fine wares are usually considered an important indication of chronology and contact, they
are often published in great detail.\textsuperscript{64} It seems a fair assumption that potmarks would
have been noticed and mentioned. None have. Furthermore, at a recent meeting of
archaeologists interested specifically in Mycenaean pottery, I was able to address
directly the question of whether incised potmarks have been found but not published.
With the exception of E. French's mention of the unpublished finds from Mycenae, no
other examples of incised marks on Mycenaean fine wares in LH III contexts were

\textsuperscript{62}K. Gallis, "Ενδειξεις για την εξάπλωση μέχρι της θεσσαλίας, ενώς οργανωμένου
συστήματος συμβόλων επί εγγείων κατά την εποχή του Χαλκού," Archaelogia

\textsuperscript{63}I thank P. Mountjoy for taking time to discuss with me the question of incised marks
on mainland wares.

\textsuperscript{64}For example, A. Papadopoulos' study of Mycenaean finds in Achaia [Mycenaean
Achaia (SIMA 55, Göteborg 1979)], Bryan Feuer's discussion of Thessaly [The
Northern Mycenaean Border in Thessaly (BAR International Series 176, Oxford 1983)],
Symeonoglou's work on the Thebes material [Kadmeia I (SIMA 35, Göteborg 1973)],
P. Mountjoy's study of the ceramics from Orchomenos [Orchomenos V. Mycenaean
Pottery from Orchomenos, Eutresis and other Boeotian Sites (Munich 1983)] and Athens
[Four Early Mycenaean Wells from the South Slope of the Acropolis at Athens
(Miscellanea Graeca 4, Gent 1981)] ceramics, and C. Schimerdine's thesis on the
Niochria pottery ["Late Helladic IIIA2-IIIB Pottery from Nichoria and the Bronze Age

\textsuperscript{65}Athens, December 1989: Wace and Blegen.
brought to my attention. Also, with regard to coarse stirrup jars, H. Haskell—who is currently conducting an intensive study of these vessels with R. Jones of the Fitch Laboratory, British School of Archaeology in Athens—confirms that no large coarse stirrup jar with incised signs and a mainland provenience is known to him. Thus, I conclude that the impression that incised marks are hardly found on local pottery—fine or plain—in the LH III Mycenaean mainland is a fair assessment of the artifactual record.

The second, and much more difficult question to assess, is whether the artifacts excavated thus far reflect ancient practices and patterns of use. For example, is the observation that all incised marks found thus far come from the Argolid related to the fact that it is precisely this area that has been the focus of excavation and study of Mycenaean material? Certainly, less is known of Mycenaean and Mycenaean-period sites elsewhere on the mainland. For this reason, my argument that incised marks appear exclusively in the Argolid must be accepted as provisional, and in need of constant re-evaluation as more Mycenaean material from outside the Argolid is published.

Still, there is enough evidence from other areas to justify setting forth this observation as a hypothesis. It is not based entirely on negative argument, since, for example, substantial finds of comparable Mycenaean pottery have been found at sites such as Athens, Pylos, Gla, Thebes, and Orchomenos as well as collected in various regional surveys. It is not within my expertise to enumerate or evaluate the quantities and types of Mycenaean wares found throughout the mainland; a glance at the (forthcoming) published proceedings of the *Wace and Blegen* conference does, however, give a fair summation of our knowledge. While it is clear that far less is known of the Mycenaean world outside of the Argolid, it also seems fair to say that the sample is large

---


67 *Wace and Blegen*: see also E. French, K. Wardle, eds., *Problems in Greek Prehistory* (BSA 1986), esp. Klaus Kilian “Mycenaens Up To Date, Trends and Changes in Recent Research” 127-33; and *Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*. 
and diverse enough to give a reasonable basis for the following hypotheses: (1) the practice of incising marks on any pottery at all was highly unusual, and (2) the concentration of post-firing signs in the Argolid is a significant observation.

Crete

As in the rest of the Aegean, the reported number of local (LM III) vessels with incised marks is almost negligible. I have not had the opportunity as extensive a contact with Minoan specialists as I have had with Mycenaean experts, and so I cannot verify with the same assurance for Crete as for the mainland that the lack of published marks reflects a corresponding dearth of material evidence. However, three scholars (S. Hood, P. Warren, and P. Betancourt) who concentrate on Minoan Crete have kindly taken time to discuss this question with me, and agreed with the conclusions drawn from the published record: evidence of a local practice of marking pottery is limited to a handful of signs. The lack of marks apparent in the written record is in accord with the excavated evidence. But a note of caution must be interjected. Recent publication of the finds from Kommos does indicate that perhaps marking of local wares during LM III was not quite as limited as might have been concluded from earlier literature. The number of marked LM III vessels at this site is still meager (possibly five from the entire site), but the range of vessel types extends beyond the coarse stirrup jugs exclusively noted elsewhere on Crete. This study of the Kommos material serves as a warning that careful re-examination of stored finds may reveal more extensive evidence of marking.


From Knossos three (maybe four) coarse stirrup jar fragments [M. Popham, The Destruction of the Palace at Knossos (SIMA 12, Göteborg 1970) 74, pl 28g and possibly 28e]. Also from Knossos, at Makritikos, another stirrup jar [S. Hood, P. de Jong, “A Late Minoan III “Kitchen” at Makritikos (Knossos),” BSA 53-54 (1958-59) 193 no. 35, fig. 8, pl 47c]. I thank S. Hood for bringing this piece to my attention.

From Amnioss: a stirrup jar, said to have incised marks (AD 23 (1968) Chr. B’2 pp. 402-03, pl 36) =Herakleion 18213.

69I am very grateful for the time taken to answer my questions.

70(Supra n. 68).
on LM III pottery. However, there is no reason to think that marked vessels would surface in any substantial quantity. So, as in the rest of the Aegean, local vases bearing incised marks stand out as exceptional on Crete in relation to the huge quantities of unmarked pottery excavated on the island.

Whether the excavated material provides an adequate indication of ancient patterns of distribution is, as usual, questionable. As we have seen, incised marks are found primarily in LH IIIB contexts. But in Crete, archaeological attention has generally focused on earlier Minoan history; Mycenaean Crete is still something of a mystery. Recent work has, however, begun to tackle the subject; Kanta’s survey of LM III sites summarizes the state-of-knowledge as of 1979,71 and excavations at Khania (Kastelli),72 Palaikastro (Kastri), and Kommos73 have provided substantial new evidence. Yet the evidence is still very spotty, and our understanding of activities on Crete during LM III is very tentative. Any hypothesis concerning phenomena of this period must be constantly renewed in light of new evidence.

Still, in spite of the limited material available for study, the evidence from Khania, Palaikastro, and Kommos convinces me that it is reasonable to begin to evaluate the extent of potmarking systems in LM III Crete. At each of these three sites fairly large-scale excavation projects have recently unearthed an extensive range, quality, and quantity of material: purposefully marked pots, moreover, were objects of note. Surely this is adequate basis for preliminary hypothesis, especially since in this case the question concerns an evaluation of presence or absence of specific material, rather than more refined observations. At all of these sites there is very little, if any, evidence for the use of potmarks. So, although the archaeological evidence for this period is beset with serious lacunae, there are some indications that marking pots with incised signs was rare in LM III Crete.

With only two exceptions,74 those local LM III vessels which bear incised marks are large coarse stirrup jars (eight, possibly nine, total). Of these, four (five?) were

71 Kanta, LM III.


73 Supra n. 68 for most recent publication; further references therein.

74 Bennet, Kommos I: no. 6 (conical cup) and no. 11 (large coarse ware vessel).
incised before firing and also differ in other respects from the signs incised after firing on Cyprus: the signs are incised upon the false-spout discs rather than on the handles, and at least one sign is certainly Linear B.\textsuperscript{75} These characteristics seem to associate the pre-firing signs more closely with the tradition of painted Linear B inscriptions or painted single signs rather than with the conventions of post-firing signs and thus they are not considered in the general discussion of post-firing marks.

The signs on the other four jars,\textsuperscript{76} as far as I have information,\textsuperscript{77} conform to the characteristics of incised marks on stirrup jars found on Cyprus and in the Near East: post-firing, single signs cut boldly, one per handle. These four, then, are included in the catalogue, and must be considered in any discussion of distribution patterns of post-firing marks. Because they are so unusual within their context, it is tempting to see them as possible imports, thus explaining their uniqueness on Crete. But there are two arguments against this: (1) their geographical distribution over the island (i.e., not confined to coastal or major redistribution sites), and (2) even more significantly, the description of the Kommos jar as of local fabric. Thus, it is difficult to argue that these jars—or the marks inscribed upon them—are anything but local products.

\textbf{Italy, Sicily, Sardinia}

No Mycenaean fine wares imported to these regions are marked with incised signs. I have not yet studied the range of Mycenaean ceramics found in these areas.

\textbf{Geographical Distribution: Summary}

A brief summary of the quantities and types of Mycenaean wares distributed throughout the eastern Mediterranean indicates that there often is sufficient relevant material to allow regional comparison of the number of imported Aegean vases bearing incised signs. Cyprus contains by far the greatest number and widest range of such marked vessels, and, as such, serves as the “yardstick” by which other areas are evaluated.

\textsuperscript{75}KHZ 16 (supra n. 68) is incised with a \textit{wa}.

\textsuperscript{76}Those found at Makritikos, Amnisos, Kommos and Tripti.

\textsuperscript{77}For the Amnisos stirrup jar, I have very little information about the marks themselves. I don’t know exactly the form of the signs, nor how they are arranged upon the vessel.
Variation in the amount of imported Aegean vessels found (and published) in the different regions is tremendous. But only the Cyclades, Egypt, and perhaps Turkey beyond the Troad\(^78\) have insufficient quantities of published Mycenaean vases to allow comparison with other areas. The lack of potmarks in these areas is not a significant observation because the sample of Mycenaean pottery is so small.

A second criterion for valid comparison is the quality of the sample itself. The shapes which are most commonly marked in Cyprus are specific types of large closed storage vessels: large fine and coarse stirrup jars (FS 164), “Levanto-Mycenaean” piriform jars (FS 36), as well as various smaller stirrup jars and jugs. It seems most likely—though it does not necessarily follow—that these shapes, or at least their equivalents, would be incised in other regions. If this assumption is valid, then these shapes should be present in the regions being compared. In fact, because it is most often closed shapes which are Mycenaean exports, comparison on a general level among regions is not seriously hindered by this criterion.

But one point which becomes quite clear in comparing the occurrences of shapes and marks regionally is that potmarks are associated only with very specific forms. For example, although basically similar piriform jars are found throughout the eastern Mediterranean, it is apparently only a single variation (FS 36) that is marked.\(^79\) Thus, in this case, geographical distribution of marks is coincident with geographical distribution of a certain shape. The situation is not quite so clear for FS 164 jars, for the distribution of the shape is much wider than the distribution of marked examples of this shape. Perhaps this is partially a function of the loose definition of FS 164; if variations of this category were sorted out, then perhaps here too there would be a coincidence of marks and particular variation in vessel types.

In any case, there is sufficient comparable material from the various regions to allow the following observations and hypotheses:

---

\(^78\)The last by virtue of the large number of unpublished—rather than undiscovered—artifacts.

\(^79\)This is true in almost every case where sufficient fragments of a vessel are preserved to determine its specific shape. There are, however, exceptions: two handles from FS 35 jars (TAH 47-1616, Enk 20.230), and a further two possibly from FS 35 (TI acrop? TI Neg. 562, though both are also listed as possible FS 36). Many of the marked piriform fragments are too small to determine specific classification, though most are provisionally attributed to FS 36 independently by their various excavators.
(1) Potmarks on Mycenaean wares are far more common on Cyprus than anywhere else in the eastern Mediterranean. They appear on a far wider range of shapes here than elsewhere, and they are distributed to sites of all kinds throughout the island. Finally, only on Cyprus (and *perhap* in the Near East\(^{80}\)) does there appear to exist a pervasive and well-documented system of marking local wares.

(2) The lack of potmarks on Mycenaean wares in the following areas is probably significant: Rhodes and the Dodecanese, the mainland outside of the Argolid, and maybe Crete.

(3) Ugarit is the only area outside of Cyprus with both a significant quantity and a wide range of shapes of marked vessels.

(4) The Argolid is the only area in the Aegean with a large number of incised vessels. Most are found at Tiryns, though there are indications that Mycenae may also have yielded a substantial number. In contrast to Ugarit, however, the marks are almost entirely confined to stirrup jars.

(5) Marks on Mycenaean ware found outside of Cyprus, Ugarit and the Argolid are very rare and sporadic. Two possible exceptions are Miletus and Tell Abu Hawam.

(6) No particular mark or combination of marks correlates significantly with any particular region, or any site within a region.

(7) The geographical distribution of Mycenaean potmarks outside of Cyprus seems to correspond with areas of substantial contact with Cyprus—especially the Argolid and Ugarit, less so the Near East. The lack of marks on Rhodes and in the Dodecanese, generally assumed to have been in frequent contact with Cyprus at this time, must be explained.

Finally, having tried to defend a valid basis for the statements listed above, I now end on a note of caution. The fragile basis of this data base is emphasized by the great difference which single deposits have made on its configuration. The marked vases from T.VI at Minet el Beidha comprise almost half of the finds from the Ugarit area; the incised stirrup jars found in the Epichosis deposit at Tiryns make up one-third of the recorded sample from the Argolid. Excavations at Mycenae and Tell Abu Hawam hint that substantial amounts of data may be unpublished. Thus, the hypotheses presented

\(^{80}\) If the marked "Canaanite" jars are an indication of a local (Syro-Palestinian) marking system(s).
above are intended as an evaluation of present evidence and in need of constant re-
evaluation in light of new finds.
SHAPES

Incised marks are found on a limited range of shapes, mostly large stirrup jars or piriform jars. Moreover, as became apparent in the survey of geographical distribution, only specific forms of these shapes carried incised marks. This is most readily apparent among piriform jars, where marks occur almost exclusively on FS 36 types. With regard to stirrup jars, almost only the large ones (FS 164) are incised. Marks occur on other shapes sporadically.

The following section of this paper examines those specific shapes which are characteristically marked with the following question in mind: Are there any particular features of these vessel-types which give clues to the reason(s) for their association with this particular marking system?

FS 36: Three-Handled Piriform Jar

Seventy-eight piriform jars are marked with incised signs. Twenty-eight are well enough preserved to be identified as coming from the specific type of piriform jar designated as FS 36; another eleven are probably FS 36. Only three are identifiable as other variants of piriform jars: one FS 44 or 45, 81 three (?) FS 35 82 and one undefined smaller piriform jar.83 The other fragments are too small to be specifically identified, though the high proportion of FS 36 shapes among the marked piriform jars suggests that most of these probably come from the same shape.

FS 36 is a large (average H.: 35 cm) three-handled piriform jar. The physical feature which sets it apart from other contemporary piriform jar shapes (FS 35, 37, 39, 40, and 48)84 is its high, narrow neck which is concave in profile and often splays outward toward the top.85 Furumark classified it as a specifically LH IIIB shape,86

81 Kourion B1112; Kourion B1113, B1114, B1115 are also identified as FS 44-45 by Benson (Bamboula, 115-116), but as FS 36 in SCE IV:1C, 295.

82 Enk.20.230, TAH 47-1616, also possibly T Neg.562.

83 HST 694.

84 Mycenaean Decorated Pottery, 96.

85 Nouveaux Documents, 219.

86 MP, 590.
and recent finds support that dating. Whether this particular shape typically contained a specific product is unknown.

FS 36 is one of about a dozen distinct forms which are characteristically found in Cyprus and the Near East, but are only rarely found elsewhere in the Mediterranean.\(^{87}\) This class of pottery, which is commonly referred to as Levanto-Mycenaean, has been the subject of extensive discussion especially by archaeologists working on Cyprus and in the Levant. The fundamental issue is whether these particular vessels were manufactured on the Mycenaean mainland,\(^{88}\) or whether they were the product of regional workshop(s) on Cyprus and perhaps in the Levant.\(^ {89}\) This question is relevant to the study of incised marks in that the place of origin, trade route, and destination all have bearing upon deciding when, where, and for what purpose the marks were incised.

Discussion of the origin of Levanto-Mycenaean vessels is based on three aspects of the pottery: (1) geographical distribution, (2) stylistic features, and (3) technical features. None of these has yet been shown to provide conclusive evidence for either mainland or regional production. The first argument revolves around the concentration of Levanto-Mycenaean shapes on Cyprus and in the Levant. One interpretation is that this distribution reflects a clustering of products around regional manufacturing centers. On the other hand, the same distribution pattern can be viewed as a consequence of specialized export from a production center to specific markets.\(^ {90}\) The second and third arguments are based upon the pottery itself. Certain stylistic features and some shapes of the Levanto-Mycenaean repertory are thought to be derived from either Near Eastern

---

\(^{87}\)The shapes which are defined as Levanto-Mycenaean are most thoroughly discussed in Stubbings, MPL: FS 36, 95, 116, 139, 191, 210, 223, 228-29, 232, 243-44, 296, 310; and Nouveaux Documents, 201-30.


\(^{89}\)Myres, Cesnola, 46-50; Casson, Ancient Cyprus, 42-53; Sjöqvist, Problems, 65-73, 92-97, 121; MP, 540; Stubbings, MPL (supra n.87); Nouveaux Documents, 201-30; S. Sherratt, "Regional Variation in the Pottery of Late Helladic IIIB," BSA 75 (1980) 175-202, esp.195-96.

\(^{90}\)Greek and Cypriot Pottery, 602-03 lists several comparable examples in the context of Archaic and Classical Athenian pottery trade.
prototypes or native Cypriot wares. The incorporation of such elements undoubtedly reflects regional influences on pottery production, but whether the Oriental elements were innovations necessarily developed in provincial centers or whether they could also have been a product of mainland workshops is difficult to judge. Argument for either alternative becomes essentially a subjective evaluation of the flexibility of the Mycenaean potting process: Were foreign elements absorbed by mainland potters, or is their presence necessarily indicative of regional manufacture? Can Levanto-Mycenaean innovations in shape and decoration be attributed to Mycenaean potters working either at home or abroad, or are they more likely to be the work of foreign potters producing their own version of mainland Mycenaean ware? Finally, with respect to technical features, Levanto-Mycenaean vessels are virtually indistinguishable from vases produced on the mainland. No difference in paint or fabric or firing methods can be discerned visually. Proponents for Argive manufacture argue that the quality of clay, paint, and firing are evidence of mainland production; those who advocate regional manufacture explain similarities in fabric and paint as a result of similar technical processes. Unfortunately, no systematic clay analysis of specifically Levanto-Mycenaen pottery has been undertaken to determine the origin of clay used in Levanto-Mycenaean vases. In sum, neither distribution patterns, stylistic features, nor fabric analyses provide conclusive evidence for the place of production of Levanto-Mycenaean vases.

However, although the Levanto-Mycenaean vases themselves do not provide certain evidence of their place of manufacture, there is indirect evidence which suggests that these vases most likely were manufactured on the mainland. A close analogy to the Levanto-Mycenaean pottery is provided by the Mycenaean pottery found on Rhodes. The Rhodo-Mycenaean pottery, like the Levanto-Mycenaean, is distinctive in its particular

91 Nouveaux Documents, 201-30; Sherratt (supra n.89) p.196 no.77.
92 Gjerstad, Studies, 220.
93 Nouveaux Documents, 208-09; Casson, Ancient Cyprus, 52; Sjöqvist, Problems, 93.
94 The only specific reference in the literature is the analysis of a single FS 36 three-handled piriform jar from Deir el-Balah, which concludes that the jar is of Cypriot origin [I. Perlman, F. Asaro, T. Dothan, "Provenance of the Deir el-Balah Coffins," IEJ 23 (1973) 151]. The authors are quick to point out that a Cypriot origin for all such jars should not be generalized from the evidence of a single sample. Given the lack of adequate control groups for Cypriot sites (Greek and Cypriot Pottery, 574), I wonder how certain the claim of Cypriot origin can be.
shapes and its restricted distribution. Fabric analyses of Rhodo-Mycenaean vessels indicate that these distinctive shapes were exported from the Argolid rather than made on the island of Rhodes where they are almost exclusively found.\textsuperscript{95}

In summary, the piriform jars which carry incised signs are, when adequately preserved, almost always identifiable as FS 36, a Levanto-Helladic shape. The fact that incised marks occur specifically on a class of pottery known to have strong associations with the island of Cyprus adds support to the hypothesis that incised marks on Aegean vases are closely connected with Cypriot marking practices.

**FS 164: Large Stirrup Jar**

This class of stirrup jars is well-known for the painted Linear B inscriptions which occur on vessels found on the Greek mainland and Crete. Marked vessels have also been found on Cyprus, but these "inscriptions" are very different from the Aegean inscribed examples: the Cypriot examples were incised after firing rather than painted before firing, they consist of only one or two isolated signs, and their signs are derived from the CM syllabary rather than Linear B.

FS 164 is Furumark's "catch-all" category for stirrup jars whose height exceeds 30cm. He also described the type as "domestic," but no further specifications are given, and the examples listed in *Mycenaean Pottery* include a variety of shapes, fabric, and decorative schemes.\textsuperscript{96} Consequently, a great range of stirrup jar types have since been designated as "FS 164". Heights can range up to 60cm and the shapes vary from distinctly piriform to almost globular ovoid. Both fine and coarse fabrics are included and decoration encompasses a variety of techniques (dark-on-light and light-on-dark), syntaxes (banded and patterned), and motives (wavy line, octopus, etc.).

The different types of large stirrup jars must be significant in some respect; perhaps a specific type reflects a certain manufacturing center, or maybe the jars' intended contents. It is postulated, for example, that the coarse FS 164 jars decorated with octopus motifs are specifically Cretan products. But no systematic study of the FS 164 category as a whole has been published, although some specific types within this

\textsuperscript{95}C. Mee, R. Jones, "Spectrographic Analyses of Mycenaean Pottery from Ialysos on Rhodes: Results and Implications," *JFA* 5 (1978) 461-74, esp.468-69; *Greek and Cypriot Pottery*, 510.

\textsuperscript{96}MP, 610.
category have been discussed at length (for example: octopus stirrup jars, “oatmeal” ware jars). Fortunately, an intensive investigation of at least the coarse stirrup jars is currently underway, and a specific classification is in preparation.\footnote{Already begun in H. Haskell, “Coarse-ware Stirrup Jars at Mycenae,” BSA 76 (1981) 225-38 in conjunction with J.A. Riley, “Petrological Examination of Coarse-Ware Stirrup Jars from Mycenae,” BSA 76 (1981) 335-39. A much grander project is now well under way, under the auspices of the Fitch laboratory (British School of Archaeology, Athens) and organized by H. Haskell, H. Catling and R. Jones.} I know of no comparable work being done with the large fine-ware stirrup jars. Until such studies are completed, it is extremely difficult to evaluate possible associations between incised marks and specific types of large stirrup jars.

Still, as a first step in a discussion of incised marks on large stirrup jars, the following section of this paper lists and discusses the basic types upon which incised marks appear. Few interpretations can be made on the basis of present information, but it is hoped that the discussion below will provide a useful basis for further evaluation in light of new data.

Seventy-two large stirrup jars with incised marks have been preserved: thirty-five coarse-ware, thirty-seven fine-ware, and one of uncertain fabric.

\textit{FS 164: Coarse}

The coarse stirrup jars vary in fabric, shape, and decoration. With one exception\footnote{Which is approximately one-third of the total number of coarse stirrup jars with incised marks: Kourion BM C501 (octopus); Enk.Fr.T.12/36 (single deep wavy line); San Antonio (octopus); Dhenia 1937/IV-13/1 (single? wavy line); CM A 1580 (?)(octopus); Amnisos (single deep wavy line); MeB T.V. (single deep wavy line); MeB T.III (single deep wavy line); Athienou 2156/3112 (single deep wavy line); Kourion B1129 (two deep wavy lines); Dhenia 1938/3-10/2 (single deep wavy line). The jar in Erlangen is too fragmentary to determine certainly whether the two bands preserved at the shoulder border are octopus design, or whether they are themselves the only decoration.} incised marks are only found on coarse stirrup jars decorated in the dark-on-light scheme.

Eleven of the coarse stirrup jars are decorated with some variation of the octopus motif.\footnote{MeB Dep. 213, decorated with white running spirals on a dark ground.} In a widely-cited article published in 1960, V. Karageorghis and H. Catling determined that certain octopus stirrup jars were of Minoan origin, based on their distinctive fabric, certain stylistic commonalities of the octopus motifs, and the consistent
combination of octopus motif and large stirrup jar shape. Their conclusions seem to have been accepted to a large extent, and current Cypriot excavation reports often cite their criteria as basis for assigning a “LM IIIB” designation to coarse stirrup jar fragments. However, I believe this to be somewhat misleading. The criteria expressed in the Karageorghis and Catling article are vague, both with respect to the description of the fabric and in terms of which features of the motif can be considered Minoan. If one reads carefully through the catalogue of Minoan stirrup jars presented by Karageorghis and Catling, no specific feature consistently appears in all examples. Only very general characteristics can be extrapolated from these descriptions as indicating Minoan origin, namely: octopus decoration (in various styles), fabric characterized by a heavy grit temper, and (usually) a matt slip.

Excavation reports which classify coarse stirrup jar fragments as Minoan with reference to this article usually do not justify their comparisons explicitly. But I believe that until more specific criteria have been established, the automatic classification of sherds as “Minoan” merely because they evince some fragment of octopus design and/or a rather coarse, heavy-tempered fabric should be questioned. First, the octopus motif varies a great deal, ranging from elaborate representations to schematic abstractions of wavy lines. In view of the great differences in representation, certainly there is no reason to assume common origin on the basis of the appearance of the same general motif. Second, the fabrics described as Minoan by Karageorghis and Catling encompass a broad range of hardness, temper, and surface finish. Their general description corresponds to the kind of fabric generally referred to as “oatmeal” ware, although this specific term is not used in the BSA (1960) article. The origin(s) of this fabric has long been debated. The term was coined in the Troy publications (1953) and was considered to be indicative of Cretan manufacture. However, Benson, in his 103


101 For example, fabric description varies a great deal: It can be hard (nos. 23, 24, 25, 27), medium-hard (nos. 28, 29) or rather soft (nos. 30, 31). Its temper is characterized by heavy grits, but more specific description is given only twice—no. 27 has mica and brown grits, no. 29 has red, brown, and black grits. Nor is clay color consistent.

102 The octopus motif when it appears specifically on coarse stirrup jars is usually assumed to be Cretan, but not always. See M. Popham, The Last Days of the Palace at Knossos (SIMA 5, Göteborg 1964) 18; Kanta, LM III, 294, 296.

103 C. Blegen, J. Caskey, M. Rawson, Troy III (Princeton 1953) 305: “The biscuit in all instances is firm but very rough, containing many minute pebbles; the exterior is coated
study of coarse stirrup jars (1961), emphasized the great variety in fabrics subsequently classified as "oatmeal," and argued that at least some were made in mainland Greece. The term "oatmeal" is still somewhat haphazardly applied, and argument as to its place(s) of production has continued to waver back and forth. The early stylistic and visual observations are being re-evaluated by scientific analyses, but no definitive conclusions have been reached. Rather, the complexity of establishing typologies and origins has been emphasized. Recent discussions reiterate the caution promulgated by Benson in his pioneering study of coarse ware stirrup jars: "We are not only free, but actually obliged to treat each particular vase or group of vases on its own merits in an attempt to decide on provenance." Finally, the particular shapes upon which octopus designs occur vary a great deal. Even among those few which carry incised marks and are well-enough preserved for shape to be ascertained, forms are quite different. Whether any (or all) particular variants are specifically Minoan is not clearly stated in the literature.

A single coarse stirrup jar with simple banded decoration carries an incised mark. The twenty-one other coarse stirrup jar fragments do not preserve traces of the main body decoration. Sometimes the disc and handle fragments do preserve various patterns of ornament and perhaps when stylistic typologies are developed for coarse stirrup jars, these secondary decorations will provide clues to the main decorative schemes.

In summary, incised marks on coarse stirrup jars seem to be particularly associated with octopus decoration. Note, however, that there are many differences

with a semi-lustrous slip which partially conceals the coarse texture. All were probably imported from the same locality."

104 Benson, Berytus XIV (1961) 40-42.

105 See R. Jones, "Linear B inscribed and other coarse ware stirrup jars," in Greek and Cypriot Pottery, 477-93, esp. 489-93 for a review of various scientific analyses of these jars.

106 Benson, Berytus XIV (1961) 41.

107 Tripiti; but see also (supra n.99) re: Erlangen fragment.

108 Discs are generally decorated with concentric circles or outlined; handles are solidly painted (with a reserved triangle at disc junction) or decorated with a single (sometimes wavy) vertical line or with two vertical lines outlining the edges of the handle.
among these vases with regard to the specific form of this motif, as well as fabric and shape differences. Their origin in Crete is possible, but not by any means certain.

*FS 164: Fine*

Large stirrup jars are also made of fine fabric, often indistinguishable in texture from the clay used for smaller finely-decorated Mycenaean pottery. There exists no specific discussion of fine-ware FS 164 jars as far as I know.

Eight\(^{109}\) of the thirty-seven fine FS 164 stirrup jars with incised signs are (almost) completely preserved, and all of these carry banded decoration only. The arrangement of the bands, the shapes of the jars, and the fabrics vary, although three jars from Enkomi T.18 (nos. 53, 54, 55) and one from Athienou (2134 and 3042/1) are close parallels.

The remaining examples are too fragmentary to determine their main decoration, but certain patterns are characteristic of the subsidiary ornamentation: discs are decorated with concentric circles of varying elaboration, and handle ornamentation can be solid, or outlined along both edges, or with a single straight or wavy vertical line.

---

\(^{109}\) Enk.Br.T.48/967; Enk.Sw.T.18/53, 54, 55; KAD 40; Athienou 2134 and 3042/1; Larnaca Museum 53; Cesnola 775; also possibly Enk.1957.SS.
CATALOGUE OF SIGNS

Classification Method

This catalogue of incised marks on Aegean wares includes all published examples as well as most of the unpublished pieces known to me—in total, at least 55 different signs on 197 vases. A few signs (usually simpler types) are frequently repeated, but many are either unique or occur only two or three times.

Optimally, the catalogue should be organized so that its categories reflect differences which were significant to those who inscribed or “read” the marks. And, at first glance, it seems an obvious process to distinguish sign-types. But closer examination reveals the problem so often encountered in constructing typologies: types cannot be easily separated into distinct categories. While some marks—especially simple forms—are obviously the same and others obviously idiosyncratic, there are those which bear recognizable general similarities but whose individual features may vary greatly. The greatest difficulty in organizing this corpus of potmarks lies in deciding whether forms with slight variations were intended to represent different signs or deliberate modifications of a particular sign, or if the idiosyncrasies are irrelevant to the value of a sign.

One suggested method of organization is to arrange the signs according to the classification established for signs of the formal Cypro-Minoan inscriptions. This

110 There are reportedly a number of unpublished marks from the excavations at Mycenae and Tell Abu Hawam, as well as a single sign from Hawara, which I have not been able to include in this study. (This information given by kindness of Drs. E. French, J. Balensi, and V. Hankey).


112 Idiosyncrasies which don’t change the value of a sign may be, for example, simple mistakes of oversight or sloppiness, or the result of an inexperienced or uninformed hand cutting the mark. Such mistakes are interesting in relation to understanding the marking process itself—who cut the sign, what he understood of its meaning—but not in respect to understanding the intended value of a sign. For discussion of such problems with respect to the Linear B syllabary, see T. Palaima, Scribes of Pylos (Incunabula Graeca 87, Rome 1988) chapter 1.

113 Such an approach is implicit in publications which classify potmarks according to Cypro-Minoan designations. A “formal” inscription consists of two or more signs in sequence (L. Godart, J.-P. Olivier, Recueil des inscriptions en Linéaire A Vol. I (Études
makes some sense because the potmarking system is clearly derived from, or heavily influenced by, the CM system (infra, CM Signs). However, theoretical and practical considerations render such an approach undesirable.

From a theoretical point of view, automatic identification of potmarks with CM signs assumes (or at least encourages the assumption) that the potmarks are specifically CM signs and that those who inscribed the potmarks had the formal signs clearly in mind. In fact, although the potmarking system and the CM system are clearly related somehow, the specific nature and extent of the ties are not certain. Ordering the potmarks specifically in accordance with the formal writing system precludes independent assessment of the relation between these systems.

Practical difficulties also mitigate against a catalogue based on CM signs. First, the potmarks include a large number of signs which are not listed in the formal repertory. While some of the potmarks seem to be CM signs which simply have not yet appeared in the limited number of formal inscriptions found to date, this cannot be assumed for all of the potmarks unattested in the CM repertory. Until a sign is attested as CM by its inclusion in the context of a formal CM inscription it should nor be automatically added to the CM sign-list. Thus, many potmarks could not be incorporated into a catalogue of specifically CM signs.

Second, the published CM sign-list does not provide enough information to allow a careful comparison with the potmarks. The immediate shortcoming of the standard lists is that only a few examples of each sign are illustrated, rather than the whole range of examples known from formal inscriptions. Thus, one gets only a limited sense of the features which distinguish one sign from another. Close examination of the sign lists in the course of trying to “fit in” the potmarks leads to great confusion: Signs extremely close or exactly the same in form are sometimes categorized separately (CM #38 and 113; 95 and 96). Conversely, signs which seem quite different


115 Contrast the limited illustration of CM signs with the full corpus of signs published for Linear B archives: J.-P. Olivier, Les scribes de Cnosos (Incunabula Graeca 17, Rome 1967); T. Palaima, (supra n.112); L. Godart, J.-P. Olivier (supra n. 113).
in appearance are catalogued together (CM #73; 74; 97; 108; 110; 114). Sometimes changes in orientation differentiate signs (CM # 8 and 9; 16 and 82; 19 and 20; 29 and 57; 44 and 45; 50 and 81; 104 and 106) but elsewhere this is not considered significant (CM #31; 116 34). The addition of a short slash (“flag”), generally to an extremity of a sign, is usually (CM #9 and 10; 11 and 12; 30 and 31; 53, 54 and 55; 65 and 66; 69 and 70 and 71; 82, 83 and 84; 87 and 88; 91 and 92; 99 and 100) but not always (CM #19; 37; 41; 113) a feature which differentiates between signs. In short, the distinction between CM signs as catalogued in the published repertoire is not always inherently obvious, nor do these CM lists provide consistent guidelines as to what sorts of criteria distinguish forms. Because only select examples are listed, it is difficult to comprehend the magnitude or frequency of variation characteristic of any particular sign. It becomes a problem, then, to fit potmarks into these often fuzzily defined categories.

Another difficulty in using the CM sign-lists is the lack of readily accessible information concerning the context of each sign. This is vital information because, unfortunately, the published repertoire of CM signs is based not only on formal texts and inscriptions but also on isolated signs occurring on seals, bronze objects, and pottery. In cases where a particular sign is also represented in true CM inscriptions, the inclusion of single signs from other media does not violate the basis of the repertoire. But in other cases (CM #31, 98, 108 for example) it seems that the sign in the formal repertoire is defined only on the basis of isolated (i.e. not in the context of an inscription) occurrences. Thus, assigning a potmark to a particular CM category might be a circular argument, since indeed it might have been this same mark which established a category or the inclusion of a particular variant within a category in the first place. Admittedly, instances of such circumstances are few, but the point is that the CM repertoire to which it is proposed that the potmarks be compared is not a reliable listing of signs which certainly occur in formal CM inscriptions but rather a hodge-podge of marks from different media. Adding more potmarks to the system would only further confuse attempts to differentiate between true CM signs, signs possibly derived from or influenced by CM, and non-CM signs.

In fact, the inclusion of signs from different media may explain some of the odd groupings in the formal lists (ex: CM #108; 110). Perhaps the variations apparent within

these categories are the result of different ductus. That the medium into which a sign is inscribed may have a significant effect on the form of signs is well illustrated by the contrast in forms of Linear B signs which are scratched onto wet clay tablets and those which are painted onto the shoulders of coarse SIs.\textsuperscript{117} The corpus of Linear B inscriptions is large enough that the vital features of each sign have been distinguished, and variants due to ductus or individual hand can be fairly securely identified. But the extent to which ductus is an explanation for variations in the listed CM signs cannot be judged without more information.

Thus, the formal repertoire of CM-signs is an inadequate basis for organizing a catalogue of potmarks. It does not provide clearly defined categories, nor does it include all the marks attested on pottery. Also, using the formal signary to order the potmarks lessens the possibility of fairly addressing the nature of the relationship between these two notational systems.

The catalogue presented below, then, is devised independently of any direct reference to other notational systems and is based solely upon the features of the inscribed marks themselves. (Similarities with the symbols of specific script systems—Linear B and CM—are, however, noted where appropriate). This method eliminates the problems of trying to fit the potmarks into a pre-determined, rigid system, although difficulties remain: how narrowly should categories be defined? What sorts of variations should be considered significant, which intentional and which without meaning?

Because the corpus is so diverse and there are no predictable patterns of sign formation, there are no inherently “logical” ways to group similar signs. Also, in most instances there is not enough repetition of a particular sign to indicate clearly which features are “standard” and so serve as bases by which variations can be evaluated. Even in cases where several examples of each variation exist—which increases the possibility that these “variants” do indeed represent separate values rather than haphazard idiosyncrasies—there are no independent criteria which confirm their identification as separate types.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{117}See A. Sacconi, \textit{Corpus delle Iserizioni Vascolari in Lineare B (Incunabula Graeca LVII, Rome 1974)} 193-203.

\textsuperscript{118}For example, in the cases of \(\frac{a}{b}\) and \(\frac{c}{d}\), or \(\frac{m}{n}\) and \(\frac{p}{q}\), no distinct patterns of one variation peculiar to a certain shape, decoration, or findspot exist to reinforce a hypothesis that the variations are intentional and specifically differ in function or application.
Two kinds of variations in particular are repeatedly attested among the potmarks, and a decision of whether or not to consider them as features which indicate distinct signs significantly alters the structure of this catalogue.

The first is changes in orientation—i.e., appearances of the same sign reversed or inverted. In part, such changes in direction might well be explained as a consequence of their appearance on pot handles and bases, whose surfaces present several possible directions of orientation. There are, for example, inscriptions on plain ware Cypriot pottery which run horizontally and others which run vertically along the length of a handle (Figure 3). Differences in the orientation of potmarks perhaps reflect varying vantage points of the inscriber rather than indicating qualitative differences in the marks themselves. It is possible also that the different directions of some potmarks were due to "illiterate" inscribers, copying symbols without understanding clearly what features gave them their meaning and thus prone to making errors. And indeed this explanation probably does explain some instances of inversion or reversal. But it is also true that an examination of these marks which appear on handles, at least, show a great degree of regularity: in those cases where the "correct" orientation of a sign\(^{119}\) is known, almost always they are placed with their vertical axes parallel to the length of the handle, and with the top of the sign pointing up towards the top of the handle. The consistent orientation of these signs suggests standardization of the marking process in this respect and raises the possibility that differences in orientation were deliberate rather than haphazard occurrences.

It is noteworthy, then, that the formal CM corpus includes—and differentiates between—signs which are the same in every respect except orientation. Not always (CM #31) but usually (CM 8 and 9; 16 and 82; 19 and 20; 29 and 57; 44 and 45; 50 and 81; 104 and 106) a change in direction is taken to represent a different value for a sign. Though the conventions of the formal script cannot be assumed to hold true for potmarks, the CM repertoire seems to indicate that changes in orientation were considered significant in a notational system which clearly influenced the potmark

---

\(^{119}\)The assessment of "correct" orientation is based upon two different criteria (1) Potmarks which are clearly derived from the CM syllabary and whose correct positioning is thus clearly understood from formal inscriptions, and (2) potmarks such as \(\mathcal{A}\), which occur so frequently and regularly in a particular position on a vase that this may be assumed to reflect their standard orientation.
Figure 3. CM Inscriptions on Pottery: Various Orientations
repertoire. Likewise, it is plausible that variations in the orientation of potmarks were deliberate.

In organizing this catalogue, I have adopted a compromise stance: signs of fairly similar form are classified together as one type, but then separated into subgroups within a type according to their orientation.\textsuperscript{120}

A second frequent feature of variation among the potmarks is the occasional addition of a short slash ("flag"), generally to the extremity of a sign. The only clue as to whether this feature might be an important one is again the formal Cypro-Minoan system. As with changes in orientation, the "flag" is usually (CM #9 and 10; 11 and 12; 30 and 31; 53, 54 and 55; 65 and 66; 69, 70 and 71; 82, 83, and 84; 87 and 88; 91 and 92; 99 and 100) but not always (CM #19; 37; 41; 113) the differentiating feature between signs. Again, although I have argued that the published CM repertoire is an unreliable basis for detailed potmark studies, it is the one contemporary—and certainly on some level, related—indication of features considered significant within a notational system. Thus, provisionally, signs with "flags" are separated into different subcategories within a type.

Other variations among signs are idiosyncratic, none occur consistently. Deciding whether or not to include certain variations within a sign-type is admittedly subjective. The one general rule which I have followed is to create separate categories for doubtful cases. This may result in an overly-refined catalogue, but it seems the wiser approach for the following reasons:

(1) The CM repertory—though it refers mostly to a formal script rather than specifically to the potmarking system—does indicate that there is no logical way to predict which sorts of features separate signs; at this point in the study of the syllabary, there is no sense of what magnitude of variation is permissible within a sign-group. In some cases a short slash tacked to an extremity is reason enough to establish separate categories; in other instances signs quite different in appearance are assigned to the same category. In light of this uncertain guide, it seems wiser to err on the side of caution and to separate possible distinctions at first.

(2) Additional finds of CM inscriptions and potmarks as well as careful re-study of known texts will undoubtedly refine present classification. In applying new criteria to

\textsuperscript{120}A similar procedure was adopted in the early stages of Linear A studies: J. Raison and M. Pope, \textit{Index du Linéaire A} (Roma 1971), and now L. Godart, J.-P. Olivier (supra n. 113).
long familiar data, it will be easier to combine overly separated groups than to re-sort excessively general categories.

The catalogue is organized so that signs which are basically similar are grouped together under a single type, but variations are noted by separate subcategories. In this way, both general similarities and possible significant differences are noted. The signs/groups are arranged in order of increasing complexity.

Cypro-Minoan Signs

Signs incised on Aegean wares are often simple in form and these—depending upon one’s approach—may be interpreted as CM, Linear B or simply abstract marks which are not directly related to any script. Examination of the complex marks, however, provides more substantial indication as to the basis of this marking system. Seventeen\(^\text{121}\) of the complex marks are certainly identical to signs attested in formal CM inscriptions (Figure 4, Table 3). In contrast, none of the complex potmarks show certain connections with the Linear B script, nor with any other contemporary scripts or making systems known to me. These observations suggest to me that the incised signs appearing on Aegean vessels are evidence of a marking system based upon the CM script.

Two notes must be appended to this statement:

(1) Not *all* the marks are necessarily specific CM characters, but certainly the proportion of signs which must be or can be CM is great enough to suggest that the formal script was the inspiration for the incised marks. Although I list only seventeen certain matches, there are probably more.

Many of the simpler marks can be matched with CM signs; their simple form prevents the assumption that they *necessarily* were derived from this script, but certainly does not lessen the possibility that they were. In fact, in light of the attested CM signs among the complex marks, it is reasonable to postulate these simpler signs which correlate with CM characters as also having been influenced by the formal writing system.

---

\(^{121}\)Seventeen if grouped according to the criteria set forth supra, Classification Method; fourteen if grouped according to the standard CM repertoire (thus published in my article in *Wace and Blegen*)
Figure 4. Inscribed Marks: CM Signs

CM: Designations according to CyproMinoica
#: Designations according to Appendix III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potmark*</th>
<th>Cypro-Minoan**</th>
<th>Linear B</th>
<th>Potmark</th>
<th>Cypro-Minoan</th>
<th>Linear B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;1&quot;</td>
<td>24B</td>
<td>24C</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;10&quot;</td>
<td>25A</td>
<td>25B</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>25C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25D</td>
<td>25E</td>
<td>25E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26A</td>
<td>26B</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26C</td>
<td>26D</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td>33A</td>
<td>33B</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>11B</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>11C</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>11D</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11E</td>
<td>33E</td>
<td>33E</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11F</td>
<td>11F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11G</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35A</td>
<td>35B</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35C</td>
<td>36A</td>
<td>36B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36A</td>
<td>36B</td>
<td>36B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38/113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16E</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16F</td>
<td>42A-D</td>
<td>42A-D</td>
<td>42A-D</td>
<td>42A-D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44A</td>
<td>44A</td>
<td>44A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44B</td>
<td>44B</td>
<td>44B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44C</td>
<td>44C</td>
<td>44C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbered according to Appendix III: "Catalogue of Incised Marks on LH/LM III Vases."

**Numbered as in Cyprominoica, pp.13-15, figs.2-4.
In addition, there are signs among the marks inscribed on Aegean wares which, although as yet unattested in the formal CM repertoire, nevertheless are likely to represent specifically CM signs. It must be kept in mind that the CM script is barely known—comparatively few formal texts exist, and they include only some 2450 signs total (or less than a page and a half of running text);\textsuperscript{122} moreover, the entire repertoire of signs has not been identified.\textsuperscript{123} Thus it is likely that several complex signs which cannot be identified with characters in the formal CM repertoires but are paralleled by signs incised on local Cypriot pottery may well represent CM signs so far unattested in the formal inscriptions.

For example, the $\beta$ sign, which occurs several times on Aegean wares, is also found as an isolated sign on a Canaanite jar handle found at Kiton-Bamboula\textsuperscript{124} and as part of an “inscription” consisting of two signs on a Canaanite jar handle from Pyla-Verghi (Figure 5).\textsuperscript{125} The appearance of this complex sign on different wares from widely-separated contexts within the island of Cyprus suggests that it reflects a commonly known sign or symbol. Its appearance in an “inscription” suggests that it is, indeed, a CM character that heretofore has not been attested in the limited formal CM repertoire. The brevity of the inscription and the simple nature of its second sign prevent a certain identification of these signs as specifically CM, but given the frequent

\textsuperscript{122}T.G. Palaima (supra n.114) 123-25.

\textsuperscript{123}\textit{Contra} E. Masson, ["Les syllabaires chypre-minoens: mises au point, compléments et définitions à la lumière des documents nouveaux," \textit{RDAC} (1985) 149] who bases her statement on the relatively few new signs which are identified with each new discovery of a CM text. Yet, though the bulk of signs seems to be known, new finds do reveal new characters [Ex: E. Masson, "Premiers documents chypre-minoens du site Kalavassos—Ayios Dhimitrios" \textit{RDAC} (1983) 135]. And, though the range of items in the CM corpus is gradually expanding, the bulk of formal CM writing is attested on a few tablets, six cylinders, and many “boules”. The cylinders and “boules”, by their shape, seem to have had specialized functions; some of the tablets, on the internal evidence, may have used a specialized vocabulary. These few, restricted texts may contain a large proportion of the CM characters, but certainly not all.

\textsuperscript{124}Kiton-Bamboula, p. 179 no. 342, fig. 80:342.

Figure 5. A CM? Mark
appearance of similar short CM inscriptions on Cypriot wares, the probability that this, too, is CM is very high.

Similarly, the sign $\text{_sy}$, found on two Mycenaean vessels, is closely paralleled by a sign on a coarse ware jug from Dromolaxia T.1/51 (Figure 6).\textsuperscript{126} A Canaanite (?) handle found at Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios also carries a similar sign.\textsuperscript{127} Since these signs occur as isolated marks rather than in the context of an inscription, they cannot be argued to be specifically CM. But their appearance on local Cypriot wares attests the use of the signs by Cypriots. Thus, they support the hypothesis that these marks are to be considered a Cypriot practice, even though they do not point specifically to the use of the CM script.

There are also signs on Mycenaean wares which are unattested in the formal CM repertory but are found in inscriptions or in isolation on local pottery (Figure 7). Signs within the context of an inscription are evidence of specifically CM characters; isolated signs on local pottery reaffirm the Cypriot practice of marking pottery with the same sorts of signs as those found on imported Aegean wares.

Finally, the local marked wares sometimes exhibit variations of a basic sign type in combination with CM characters (Figure 8). These inscriptions are too short and nonspecific to prove that all the variations are intended to represent the same sign, but they do certainly point out that the range of signs incorporated into CM inscriptions is much greater than that reflected in the published repertory. Many of the categories in this corpus which have not yet been assigned CM parallels may indeed be variations of signs represented in the formal inscriptions.

Further examination of inscribed signs—both potmarks and inscriptions—on pottery found on Cyprus will undoubtedly reveal other parallels for the signs on Aegean wares. Continued study especially of the CM inscriptions found on pottery should reveal a much clearer picture of the range of CM signs, as well as the variation found within a specific sign-type.

(2) The second matter which must be addressed is the identification of certain of the marks incised on Aegean wares as Linear B signs. Just as marks incised on vases found in Cyprus have been compared to—and often just assumed to be—CM signs, marks incised on vases found on the mainland and Crete have often been compared with

\textsuperscript{126}S. Admiraaal, “Late Bronze Age Tombs from Dromolaxia,” \textit{RDAC} (1982) 45.

\textsuperscript{127}KAD 799.
This same sign found on:
- MeB T.VI/1k (piriform jar)
- MeB T.VI (mug)

RAD 790
Canaanite jar?
LC IIC

Figure 6. Another CM? Mark
Enkomi I 306/1 Plain White Wheelmade Jug (local) #26A, 238

Katydida 7.05
Plain White ware (local) #38

KitSam KEF-302
Canaanite Jar #16f

Enkomi 1761
Plain ware Jug #49

HST F1639 rm 31 layer 3b
Canaanite? #22

Enkomi (unpublished) #50

# Designates incised mark on Aegean vessel (Appendix III)

Figure 7. More Possible CM Marks
Figure 8. Variations within a Sign Type?
Linear B signs. Specifically, incised signs on vases from Tiryns,\textsuperscript{128} Asine,\textsuperscript{129} and Kommos\textsuperscript{130} have been identified as Linear B characters.

The marks on the vases from the Argolid which have been claimed as Linear B are either too simple in form to make the identification compelling, and often can just as convincingly be compared to CM signs. In fact, the publication of the Tiryns marks lists possible CM values alongside most marks for which a Linear B correction has been proposed.\textsuperscript{131}

The only other mark for which a Linear B identification has been suggested is the coarse stirrup jar handle from Kommos, whose sign J. Bennet identifies as Linear B \textit{je}. Although at first glance this identification is tempting, in the perspective of inscribed marks as a whole the identification is not convincing. The sign is fairly simple—an X with a flag at the two upper ends. X’s and variations of X’s are found in both Linear B and CM systems, although this particular form is only known in Linear B. However, it is quite clear that one characteristic feature of CM is the addition of “flags” to the extremities of signs and thus this particular form would certainly not be out of place among CM signs. I do not claim this sign as CM—only that it is too simple to be definitely Linear B, and its features are not uncharacteristic of features associated with the formal script.\textsuperscript{132} This argument would not be a serious objection on its own, but the number of attested CM potmarks on Aegean wares and the lack of any other convincing Linear B identifications the burden of proof lies in demonstrating that this mark is positively a Linear B sign. The simple nature of the sign itself and the coarse incision technique make this difficult to do.

Thus, in the face of the CM signs certainly attested among the potmarks on Aegean wares, the few, simple signs proposed as proof of the use or influence of Linear


\textsuperscript{129} B. Frizell “A Late Helladic Graffito from Asine,” \textit{Kadmos} 16 (1977) 176-78.

\textsuperscript{130} Bennet, \textit{Kommos} I, no. 12.

\textsuperscript{131} Olivier, \textit{AA} (1988) nos. 16, 21, 24, 25.

\textsuperscript{132} The other characteristic of the Linear B \textit{je}, the curves of its lines (X rather than \textit{X}), may simply be a result of the wet clay in which it is incised and cannot be judged in this sign scratched into hard clay.
B within the marking system are not sufficient. If one accepts the proposition of a CM-basis for the potmarks, a great number of the simpler signs can be included as examples of the extensive influence of the formal script upon this potmarking system.

**Timing of Marking**

In formulating any general interpretations, it is important to determine whether these CM-related signs on Aegean wares were incised before or after firing. When this distinction has been noted in publication, the incised signs are almost always classified as post-firing marks, but only exceptionally are the particular observations which would support such a classification specifically discussed. Until recently, only J.F. Daniel treated the matter in any detail;\(^{133}\) S. Casson mentioned in an off-hand way that the incisions cut through paint,\(^{134}\) and other publications generally limit any comment to a categorical comment without any explanation at all.\(^{135}\) Most recent publications of these marks either assume post-firing—presumably based on "common sense" or the weight of analogy to the other marks published as post-firing—or do not even bother to mention this aspect of the marks.\(^{136}\) Thus, the common perception of these incised marks as post-firing phenomena is an implicit point of view, treated in detail only in J.F. Daniel's single footnote.

However, two recent publications have challenged this widespread assumption of incised marks on Aegean wares as a post-firing practice. The publication of Late Bronze Age material from Kition-Bamboula includes seven fine-ware Mycenaean sherds with incised marks, all described as having been incised *before* firing.\(^{137}\) The authors very

---

\(^{133}\) "Prolegomena," p. 273 no. 56.

\(^{134}\) Casson, *Ancient Cyprus*, 77.

\(^{135}\) So, for example, Persson in *SCE III*, App. 1, 601: "The majority of these consist of one or a couple of signs which—as regards the vases—usually have, after the baking, been scratched on the handles with some pointed tool, or in some instances on the bottom of the vases." Or Stubbings, *MPL*, 45: "Signs of the Cypro-Mycenaean script are also found incised (almost always after firing) on the handle (or occasionally the base) of pots of both Mycenaean and other wares found in Cyprus."


conscientiously include a specific explanation for this assessment in their catalogue.  

The other article focuses on a single CM mark inscribed into the handle of a coarse stirrup jar made on Crete but found on Cyprus.  

Again, included in the analysis is a careful record of the observations which led these authors to conclude that this particular mark was incised before firing. These two thoughtfully-argued proposals demand a reassessment of previously-published material, especially those pieces where the pre-/post-firing criteria have not been explicitly considered.

In the course of my work on Cyprus, I was able to examine approximately 500 marks incised into pottery, including one-quarter of the marks incised into fine and coarse Aegean vessels. Signs incised into wet clay are easy to identify, but it is not so easy to differentiate between signs incised into clay at the leather-hard stage and those cut into fired clay. In his early study of inscribed signs, J.F. Daniel suggested some criteria: "Inscriptions made after firing often have many successive strokes of the knife within the incision. Inscriptions cut while leather-hard are cleaner, and the surface coloration of the

---

138 "Quant à la céramique "mycénienne" (Myc. III B), sa qualité technique permet de constater indubitablement que les marques ont été incisées avant cuisson, dans l'atelier de fabrication. Chaque trait de l'incision, bien net, a été tracé tout droit, sans réprise avec une lame fine qui a fendu plus ou moins profondément la pâte encore humide (mais déjà recouverte de peinture): on voit bien comment le retrait de la surface un peu élastique a écarté les lèvres de l'incision." Kiton-Bamboula, 175.


140 "The extreme left portion of the sign and the bottom of the central staff cut clearly into the painted decoration. This in itself indicates that the sign was incised after the decoration was applied, that is when the clay surface had hardened sufficiently to receive the decorative slip. Moreover, the linear strokes and the dot lack the characteristics observable when made by a stylus into moist clay, namely curvature, puncture, extruding ridges at the sides of strokes (particularly where strokes cross), a uniform depth of incision, and often a pushing of clay at the start or finish of a bold stroke.

On B1129 the sign appears to have been incised with a blade or hard straight-edged cutting tool. The vertical strokes show traces at their bottoms of several passes of such an instrument, and the depth of the vertical strokes varies with the contour of the handle. The horizontal was incised much shallower, but again completely straight, as with a blade. Most diagnostic is the dot. It is not impressed into moist clay or even drilled into leather-hard or fired clay, but rather it has been irregularly picked into the hardened clay surface as if by the point of a blade....[Cites Daniel's note and, based on observations above and Daniel's criteria, concludes that...] The sign of B1129 lacks the definitive features of inscription after firing and possesses those of inscription while leather-hard." Palaima et al, Kadmos 23 (1984) 71-72.
vase often continues into the incision."[141] In addition to Daniel's expressed criteria, I would add some characteristics:

— In coarse wares, the inclusions provide clues. If a mark is made before firing, even at the leather hard stage, the grit will be disturbed by the incising tool. The inclusions are either dragged along the line of incision or pushed into the clay, and no longer project into the incised groove. After firing, on the other hand, the grit resists incising; often the particles show cut or scratch marks, and sometimes they have been "popped" out of place, leaving empty holes.

— On fine wares, and often on coarse wares, when a line is made in clay before firing, a very characteristic ridge is raised on either side of the incised groove, a result of the clay being pushed aside by the incising tool. Clay which has been hardened by fire does not, of course, yield and the result is a line without any sort of a ridge whatsoever. Other indications of post-firing incisions are paint which has been flaked away from the edges of an incised groove by the pressure of the incising tool or the appearance of scratch marks alongside the primary groove where the hardness of the clay has forced the inscriber to make several starts or to slip off-track before achieving a satisfactory line.

It should be noted, however, that signs incised after firing are not necessarily "scratchy;" indeed, very sharp, clean grooves can be observed on some marks on the Mycenaean vessels. It seems difficult to imagine that such sharp, deep lines could have been incised into the curved surfaces of very hard-fired clay vessels with any sort of tool, and it is particularly this feature which is M. Yon's main objection to classifying these marks as after-firing. But two reasons convince me that this argument is not a strong one. First, a piriform jar handle found at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios carries a mark whose grooves are very sharp and clean with no signs of scratchiness, but where it can be clearly seen that the groove cuts through the oxidized surface of the clay into the darker core—i.e., the groove cut into clay which had not been exposed at the time of firing, and thus the incision was made after the firing process was complete. So, KAD 525 is an example of a very neat, deep incision made after firing. Second, experiments in incising lines on hard-fired Mycenaean and other wares kindly provided by V. Karageorghis and S. Swiny demonstrated that indeed sharp lines with intricate junctures can be relatively easily incised by means of a sharp point or an edge of local flint flakes. Only a few sherds were available and thus the experimenter had little practice and the

marks achieved are not up to par with the ancient ones. However, even this cursory attempt makes it clear that it was not only possible, but relatively easy and quick to incise deep, clean grooves into painted, hard-fired clay.142 Thus, a lack of “scratchy” grooves cannot be taken as a secure indication of incision before firing.

The criteria listed above—which are specific and can be seen clearly—are observable on most incised marks. Thus, it is usually possible to differentiate between marks incised before and after firing. With reference to specifically Mycenaean and Minoan wares, I believe that all examples which I was able to examine were incised after firing. This includes those signs on Mycenaean wares found at Kiton-Bamboula which M. Yon and A. Coubet classified as pre-firing marks. For the reasons outlined above, I do not think their arguments are strong even for certain exceptionally “clean” incisions. I have not yet examined the coarse stirrup jar examined by T.G. Palaima et al.143 But I have carefully studied the marks on thirteen other coarse stirrup jars of which twelve appear to have been incised after-firing; this causes me to question the designation of the Kourion-Bamboula mark as pre-firing.

All of us—T.G. Palaima, M. Yon and A. Coubet, and myself—have carefully examined certain marks and specifically set forth our reasons for classifying them as pre- or post-firing. Explicit methods of classification narrow the degree of subjectivity but do not eliminate it altogether. M. Yon kindly consented to look again at the Kition-Bamboula material together with me, but even after much looking and discussion we were not able to agree on the timing of the Kiton-Bamboula potmarks. On the other hand, although we were not able to look at the stirrup jar which was the centerpiece of his article, T.G. Palaima agreed with my interpretation of features characteristic of post-firing marks on other coarse wares. Possibly high magnification would improve the objective means by which to determine post- vs. pre-firing marks. But until such a method has been applied, classification depends on experienced observation. When I originally began this research project, I was inclined to consider the marks on Aegean wares as incised before firing; now, pursuant to year of studying this question, I believe that the signs on Aegean wares were incised after firing. This was also the opinion of

142These experiments at inscribing marks into fired ceramics are filed in the survey collection of the Cyprus-American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI). I thank both S. Swiny and V. Karageorghis for the opportunity to test my ideas.

143Kourion B1129, discussed in Palaima et al., Kadmos 23 (1984).
J.F. Daniel, the first to look closely at this question. And though common opinion is not necessarily correct, it seems clear that most others who have published marks incised upon Aegean wares explicitly or implicitly agree with such an interpretation.
A Cypriot Marking System

By definition, signs in this corpus share two characteristics: they are incised, and they appear on Aegean (LH/LM III) wares. Such a loose definition potentially encompasses a great diversity of both marks and items marked. But, in fact, most\(^{144}\) incised marks on Aegean wares share a specific set of features:

—They are incised after firing, at least in all cases which I have been able to examine personally.

—Most are incised into the handles, and thus the marks are prominently visible.

—Those which can be certainly identified with any attested notational system are Cypro-Minoan characters; many others may be Cypro-Minoan. None is exclusively Linear B.

—The great majority of incised Aegean vessels are found on Cyprus and the closely-affiliated sites of Ras Shamra/Minet el Beidha. Other substantial deposits of marked vessels occur in the Argolid. Elsewhere, finds are scarce or completely absent.

—Incised marks consistently occur only on large transport/storage vases: large coarse and fine stirrup jars, and a particular variation (FS 36) of large piriform jars. The consistently restricted appearance of incised marks points to some specific and directed use, and thus one can speak of a marking system.

That this marking system was specifically associated with Cyprus is clear from the form of its marks as well as their application. First, the distribution of Aegean vessels with incised marks points toward Cyprus, for it is here that the largest number have been found. Incised marks found outside of Cyprus are from sites or areas where other finds attest significant contact with Cyprus: coastal Syro-Palestine (especially Ras Shamra/Minet el Beidha), the Argolid, and (perhaps on a smaller scale) Crete. Argument from distribution patterns is, of course, highly subject to new discoveries, especially when the data base is small. Thus, the quantities of incised marks appearing in various regions may well change, and marks may appear in regions where they are as yet unattested. But it hardly seems likely that the relative proportion found on Cyprus will

---

\(^{144}\)Appendix II lists the few vases whose marks do not conform to the patterns described below.
lose significance. Furthermore, it should be noted that in addition to the great quantity of Aegean vessels with incised marks, Cyprus and the closely-associated site of Ras Shamra/Minet el Beidha are also the findspots of the greatest variety of these marked vases. While the examples from the Aegean are almost exclusively large stirrup jars, on Cyprus and at Ras Shamra/Minet el Beidha several different closed and open shapes marked with incised signs are preserved, including piriform jars, jugs, Pictorial-decorated (amphoroid and bell-shaped) kraters, deep bowls, a kylix, a cup, and a mug.

Second, the kinds of vessels marked are themselves indications of intimate connections between Cyprus and the incised marking system. For example, although piriform jars are found in abundance throughout the Mediterranean, only one particular variant specifically associated with Cyprus (PS 36, a "Levanto-Helladic" shape) is ever marked with incised signs. Similarly, Pictorial vases have special Cypriot connections and they, too, sometimes carry incised signs.

Third, the method of marking seems a Cypriot feature; while signs incised after firing are unusual within the Mycenaean Aegean, they are abundantly preserved on both local and imported ceramics on Cyprus.

Finally, the fact that some marks on the Aegean wares are certainly to be identified as specific signs of the formal Cypro-Minoan syllabary adds great weight to the hypothesis of Cypriot connections. Many of the simpler signs, though not sufficiently distinctive to be labelled exclusively "Cypro-Minoan" do match Cypro-Minoan characters. In light of the certain identifications of complex signs, the tentative correlations of simpler signs seem valid. Thus, the Cypro-Minoan signary was the source of a large proportion of the incised marks on Aegean wares.

In sum, the distribution of the marked vessels and the particular shapes which are marked point to some sort of connection with Cyprus as the reason for the incised marks. Marking by means of incision and the use of the Cypro-Minoan signary as a basis for the forms of the marks suggest that the practice of marking Aegean pottery with incised signs was specifically Cypriot.

Cypriots in the Argolid

The identification of incised signs as a particularly Cypriot feature implies that vessels with these signs on them either have been routed via Cyprus at some stage, or that they have been handled by people familiar with the Cypriot marking system. The signs on Aegean wares in Cyprus can simply be explained as having been incised upon arrival for redistribution purposes, and the marked vessels in the Near East as having
been routed via Cyprus or the Cypriot depot at Ras Shamra. But the marked vessels found in the Argolid and on Crete warn that the situation was more complex.

There are two possible explanations for the presence of CM-inscribed pottery in the Aegean. First, the incised closed transport and storage vessels found on Crete and in the Argolid may be re-used vessels, having been exported to Cyprus, inscribed in accordance with redistributive or handling practices there, but eventually emptied and the containers reused. Some may have eventually been shipped back to the Argolid in the process of secondary trading. The incised closed transport and storage vessels found on Crete and the Argolid may be examples of such “returnables”. The Mycenaean vessels found on the Ulu Burun shipwreck are examples of fine and coarse Aegean wares which survived one or more trips to the Near East and were being shipped back towards the Aegean; the Canaanite amphoras found on the same shipwreck may provide evidence for secondary re-use of storage vessels. But as the number of vessels with incised marks found in the Argolid increases, the suggestion that these jars coincidentally arrived via secondary trade appears less plausible. Also, it should be kept in mind that all the vessels found in the Argolid are fine ware and thus less likely to have been frequently shipped.

The other possibility is that the marks were incised outside of Cyprus, by people knowledgeable in the Cypriot marking system. In this case we might imagine a Cypriot or Mycenaean individual in the Argolid specifically concerned with exports to Cyprus incising the appropriate marks on outgoing vessels.

---

145 There is a third possibility, namely that the inscribed vessels in the Argolid are examples of Mycenaean wares made on Cyprus, marked according to practice there, and then shipped to the Argolid. This seems to me to be untenable for two reasons: (1) in light of the scientific evidence for manufacture of Rhodo-Mycenaean wares in the Argolid, it seems most sensible to also attribute the production of Levanto-Helladic wares to the Argolid, at least until further scientific investigation proves otherwise (supra n. 94 and 95), and (2) in any case, none of the incised vessels from the Argolid belong to Levanto-Helladic shapes (insofar as they can be attributed), but instead to shapes (stirrup jar) for which the possibility of local Cypriot production has not been raised.

The suggestion that CM marks were being incised in the Aegean assumes highly organized and directed trade contacts between the Argolid and Cyprus. (And perhaps between Crete and Cyprus, if the incised stirrup jars there are indication of a similar situation). There are indeed indications that such a situation existed, at least with respect to the Argolid and Cyprus. The most compelling evidence is the distribution of Levanto-Helladic and Rhodo-Mycenaean wares. Each of these "wares" is defined as pottery which is indistinguishable from (fine) mainland vessels in terms of fabric and technique, but is distinguished by certain distinctive shapes which have a limited geographical distribution. Rhodo-Mycenaean types are found only in Rhodes and the Dodecanese, a few in the Argolid and possibly Achaea. Levanto-Helladic types are found in Cyprus and the Near East, as well as some in the Argolid. Both types are rarely found outside their area of concentration. So, one traditional explanation for the specific geographical distribution and design features of these types has been to view them as provincial imitations of mainland products. The difficulty with such an interpretation has always been then to account for the remarkable similarities in fabric and technique of mainland and the so-called "provincial" products. This objection is supported by clay analyses of a substantial number of Rhodo-Mycenaean shapes which indicate that these were manufactured from Argive clay\textsuperscript{147} and thus discount the theory of provincial imitation. Rhodo-Mycenaean pottery, then, is best explained as a specifically designed export product, manufactured on the mainland specifically for shipment to a particular region/market. Levanto-Helladic wares are likely to represent a similar situation of specialized trade, though systematic clay analyses have yet to be undertaken to confirm this. The mutual exclusiveness of the types of Mycenaean ceramics found on Rhodes and those found on Cyprus emphasizes the separate nature of trade contacts between the Argolid and various regions. In spite of the fact that Rhodes is presumably a way-station between the mainland and Cyprus, no Levanto-Helladic nor any vessels bearing incised marks have been found in the Dodecanese. This is a compelling indication of specifically directed trade contacts, with certain wares made for and sent only to certain markets and not subject to peripheral trade en route.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{147}C. Mee, R. Jones, "Spectrographic Analyses of Mycenaean Pottery from Ialyssos on Rhodes: Results and Implications," JPA 5 (1978) 461-74, esp. 468-69. Of course, the possibility remains that Argive clay was exported, and then fashioned at regional centers. I don't think this is a strong hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{148}The situation \textit{vis à vis} Cyprus and Crete is not so clear, although increasing evidence of contact [For example, see J. Shaw, "Excavations at Kommos (Crete) during 1982-
Thus, the appearance of CM-marked pottery in the Argolid makes sense in the context of a highly organized export trade, in which already at their origin certain goods were designated for specific destinations. Some of the vases bound for Cyprus were even marked with notations appropriate to that region. But who in the Argolid was inscribing such marks? Two possibilities can be suggested. Either local Mycenaean pottery-dealers, much experienced in handling Cypriot trade, may have adopted the foreign notation system from, and for the benefit of, their customers. Or Cypriot traders may have come to the Argolid and marked their purchases by means familiar to them.

Neither suggestion can be "proven" by the existing evidence, though the latter seems more probable. Many different signs are found on the pottery in the Argolid, and thus the inscribers seem to have had a fairly intimate knowledge of the Cypriot marks. Although it is quite possible that a Mycenaean may have acquired such knowledge, there is no evidence of knowledge of foreign languages/scripts in the Linear B texts. Also, the practice of marking pottery was in general alien to Mycenaean administrative methods. None of the Rhodo-Mycenaean pottery, for example, carries incised signs. This seems a practice peculiarly necessary to the Cypriot methods of handling pottery.

Handlers' Marks

Because the marks themselves cannot be "read", their meaning(s) must be deduced from the circumstances in which they occur: the patterns of marks appearing on certain vessels, in certain regions or in certain contexts. The fact that the signs were incised after firing leaves open a wide range of applications, for there is no way to determine—from the marks themselves—at which point after firing the mark was scratched into the clay.

There are no immediately obvious patterns to suggest the specific reason for incising the marks; listed below are some possible reasons for marking vessels and a discussion of how the vessels with inscribed signs may or may not fit into each suggested interpretation.

_Potters'/Workshop Mark._ There are no significant correlations between a particular mark and any particular fabric, shape or decoration. _If_ it is fair to say that the

1983, _Hesperia_ 53 (1984) 249-87 (with references to earlier seasons); E. L. Bennett, Jr., _et al._, "436 Raccords et quasi-raccords de fragments inédits dans KT 5," _Minos_ 24 (1990) 202-05, 216-17] strengthens the possibility that the four incised coarse stirrup jars from Crete may be evidence of circumstances similar to those postulated for the Argolid.
products of a particular ceramic workshop or potter can be identified by consistency in fabric, shape, or decoration, then the incised marks do not identify either workshop or potter.

The nature of the marks themselves argues against their application during the manufacturing process. For although it is possible that potters’ or workshop marks could have been incised after firing, potters traditionally take advantage of the greater ease of incising unfired clay. Also, potters/workshop marks are generally (though not always) used for internal production purposes, and the signs are characteristically pre-firing, small, simple, and inobstrusively placed (under or near the vessel base, for example). The potters’ marking system in use in the Aegean during MH - LH II is a good example.149 But the large, complex, and prominent signs incised into Mycenaean vases are a strong contrast to such a system.

Marks Indicating Place of Origin. Even if one assumed that Mycenaean place-names might have been transliterated into the Cypro-Minoan script, the many examples of vessels with single signs or a single sign repeated do not conform to the known pattern of Mycenaean place-names (Table 4). Also, at Mycenaean sites where more than one marked vessel has been found (i.e., possible points of origin), there is no clustering of any particular marks/combinations of marks which would be expected if the marks corresponded to places of origin.

Marks Indicating Place of Destination. Sites in Cyprus and the Near East where marked vessels have been found are not characterized by the presence of particular, unique marks; the same marks may be found at several different sites.

Ownership. One would expect vessels with a tomb-group (and possibly pieces found within a room or individual residence) to bear the same mark. While there are some tombs in Cyprus where more than one vessel carries the same combination of marks, each of these tombs also contains vessels bearing other marks. The situation is not straightforward, for the tombs contain multiple burials, and often it is not possible to determine which vases are associated with a particular burial. It is also quite feasible that more than one vessel may have been brought from a single lot, and thus an individual might coincidentally possess several pots with similar markings. This is even more plausible in the case of (Swedish) T.18 at Enkomi where several of the pots with the same marks are nearly identical and thus may well have been produced at the same workshop, shipped and sold together. But because no tomb-group or residence thus far

149(Supra n. 29).
### Table 4. Vessels with Multiple Preserved Handles or Signs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three-handled piriform jars</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/31</td>
<td>１</td>
<td>ー</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>1, 3B, 9A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/57</td>
<td>।</td>
<td>।</td>
<td>Ｘ－</td>
<td>20A, 20a, 35A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.18/58</td>
<td>ト</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>3A, 9A, －</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Br.T.45</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>6A, 27, －</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Br.T.68</td>
<td>ト</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>3A, 9A, －</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA 1650b</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>Ｘ－</td>
<td>6A, 20A, 35B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KitBam KEF-334+ KEF-372</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>42B, 42C, －</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST C434</td>
<td>末</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>34, 45, NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 98 12-1.310</td>
<td>末</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>34, 47, NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 1971.3-25</td>
<td>山</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>11B, 33C, NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST T.1/52</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>寸</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>9A, 19B, －</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAD 535</td>
<td>μ</td>
<td>－</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>11A, －, NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NP denotes "Not preserved"; － denotes unmarked; # according to Appendix III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piriform Jar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhera T.1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA 1650a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS T.VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS exc.1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 27.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB T.VIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAH 34-717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deir el Balah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Neg.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Fine Stirrup Jars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Br.T.48/967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athienou 2134+3042/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Painted sign on this handle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAD 40</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Disc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18A, 18A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAD 600</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapithos T.502/98c</td>
<td>Іі</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14/15?, —</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laracca 53</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesnola</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>6A+44C, 27</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelidonya</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Г. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 27.428</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>9A, ?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI 27.429</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7B, ?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI LXI 43/9 XV</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>45, 45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY Anm.57nr.1</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>6A, 42D</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midea</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44B, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Coarse Stirrup Jars</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>Handle</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Disc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Fr.T.12/36</td>
<td>Іі</td>
<td>Іі</td>
<td>16F, 25E</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion C501</td>
<td>rop</td>
<td>rop</td>
<td>3A, 3A</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourion B1129</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33E, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM A 1580</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15, 15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhenia 1937/IV-13/1</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Disc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>17, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhenia 1938/X-10/2</td>
<td>(\wedge)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthou CS997no.31</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>19452C?</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanthou CS997no.30</td>
<td>≃</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>39, 39</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlangen</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>(\wedge)</td>
<td>25A/B, 35C</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB T.III</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB T.V</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>17?, 25D</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeB Dep.213</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6A, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW 1977</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>⌈</td>
<td>6A, 7A</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnisos</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7A?+28?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripiti</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44B, —</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous

Kit.T.9/74 (stirrup jar)  ⌈  44A, — (handles)
CM A1581 (stirrup jar)  ⌊  3B, — (handles)
Enk.T.18/5 (jug)  ⌈ ⌈  7A+9A (handle)
Enk.T.18/74 (jug)  ⌊ ⌊  7 B + 9 A (handle)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Code</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kit.T.4+5/110 (jug)</td>
<td>23A+25A/B(base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit.T.4+5/207 (jug)</td>
<td>23+25A/D (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.T.7/11 (amph. krater, Pictorial)</td>
<td>7A+9A (body); handles NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.T.18/6 (amph. krater, Pictorial)</td>
<td>3A/B+9A (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.T.18/47 (bell krater, Pictorial)</td>
<td>3A, 9A (handles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A+3B+24C; 7A/B (base-ring)</td>
<td>23B (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—, — (handles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.T.82 (bell krater, Pictorial)</td>
<td>21, — (handles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 1943/11-20/1 (bell krater, Pictorial)</td>
<td>16D+55 (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—, — (handles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkom T.18/48 (bell krater)</td>
<td>5, 9A (handles?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enk.T.4+5/108 (deep bowl)</td>
<td>23A+25A (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierides 235 (kylix)</td>
<td>11E+55, — (handles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyla Verghi (frg.)</td>
<td>5, ? (handle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit.II/3438? (bowl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
excavated contains consistently marked pottery, I do not think that the case for marks indicating ownership is very strong.

One unexplored direction for research is to compare marked Mycenaean vessels with marked Cypriot (local) jars when both occur in the same context. If local and Mycenaean wares both carried the same set of marks, it would seem to me to strengthen the case that the marks were signs of the owner. But it is not quite so simple. Mechanisms of domestic pottery exchange on Cyprus have not been studied, but it is possible that Mycenaean and local wares traded in quantity were handled through the same channels and thus would have been similarly marked in the process of handling.

A second argument against the hypothesis that marks referred to owners is the many marked vessels appearing in the Argolid. The number and variety of marks would imply the presence of a large number of Cypriots, but there is absolutely no other evidence for such a resident population.

Marks Indicating Capacity. Enough jars are sufficiently well preserved to indicate that no particular sign is consistently associated with vessels of similar capacity.

Marks Describing Contents. It is reasonable to assume that highly specialized and distinctive shapes such as the large stirrup jars or piriform jars were designed to carry specific contents. A great variety of marks are, however, incised into each shape, and so one would have to postulate a great range of descriptive labels for each product. That such a range of terms existed for a basic and pervasive commodity such as the oil carried in stirrup jars is possible; however, (a) there is nothing in the Mycenaean archival texts which suggests such detailed categories of any products,150 (b) one would have to assume that these very numerous and different labels were well recognized as often only a single sign appears on the jar as a shorthand description, and (c) the appearance of the same sign on different shapes, including open vessels, would have to be explained. The use of the same signs on both open and closed shapes is the strongest argument that these marks do not refer to contents.

150For example, C. Shelmerdine, in her study of the oils listed on the Pylian Linear B tablets [The Perfume Industry of Mycenaean Pylos (Göteborg 1985) 11-41, esp.35], identifies only about a dozen adjectives which serve to describe the oils regulated by the palace. The information provided by these tablets is certainly not exhaustive, but the surviving evidence doesn’t fit the pattern of variation which the marks on the coarse stirrup jars or PS 36 containers display.
Marks Inscribed by Handlers (Shippers, Warehousemen, or Merchants). This seems to be the most likely suggestion, as it accounts for the wide variety of marks, the number of signs incised per vessel, and the absence of any consistent distribution pattern of a particular mark by shape, decoration, or provenance. If the signs are marks of various handlers involved in the transport and merchandising of the vases, the lack of patterns in the marks can be explained by the vicissitudes of various trading contacts and routes. But it is not possible to say whether the marks refer particularly to shippers, warehousemen, or merchants.

The only actual shipments including Aegean wares with incised signs are the ships’ cargoes at Gelidonya and Ulu Burun. Most of their vases, Aegean and otherwise, are not marked. In fact, only one large coarse stirrup jar from each ship is marked (out of a total of five or six such jars found on the Ulu Burun shipwreck thus far, and two on the Gelidonya shipwreck). These cargoes, however, may not be good indicators of normal trading practice in Mycenaean wares: the Gelidonya ship is interpreted to be the ship of an itinerant bronze-smith and the Mycenaean pottery odds and ends rather than cargo shipment; the Ulu Burun ship was returning to the Aegean from the Near East and thus carried a returning cargo of empty, re-used, or unsold containers.\footnote{151} Also, some pottery on both ships may have been designated for shipboard use rather than as cargo items. The only conclusion which can be drawn from these two shipwrecks is that not all exported pottery was marked, as is also clear from Mycenaean ceramic assemblages found on land sites. These shipments neither confirm nor discourage the hypothesis that incised marks were the signs of handlers.

If, in default of other viable explanations, it is accepted that the incised signs refer to handlers, certain observations can be made:

—First, the variety of signs may indicate that a large number of people were involved in the pottery trade.\footnote{152} Furthermore, \textit{if} the same mark(s) is to be consistently

\footnote{151} Just as this thesis was in its last proof, I received information (G. Bass, personal communication, 6 October 1990) that at least one of the "Mycenaean" vessels (the pitcher with painted decoration) found on the Ulu Burun shipwreck is not of Greek mainland nor Cretan manufacture. Whether or not this is also true of the storage vessels found on shipboard has not yet been ascertained. Clay analysis has also shown that one of the coarse stirrup jars from the Gelidonya shipwreck is made of clay from somewhere other than known Greek mainland or Cretan clay sources.

\footnote{152} At this point, it cannot be determined exactly how marks and individuals correlate: Does a particular mark always correspond to a single individual? Is there only one mark per individual? Does the form of the mark vary according to the individual's capacity?
identified with a certain merchant/group of merchants, then individual trade was not restricted to particular shapes or destinations, for the same mark may appear on several different shapes at several different places.

—Second, if the incised signs are indeed marks of the handlers, this implies that Cypriots were organizing at least some of the trade in Mycenaean vessels, for Mycenaean merchants presumably would have used a Linear B-based or perhaps an abstract marking system rather than the foreign Cypriot one. There is no evidence within Mycenaean administrative records of a knowledge or use of any foreign script and so it seems unlikely that the marked vessels were connected with Mycenaean administrative practices. The marks in the Argolid become doubly interesting, then, for they are evidence that foreign (Cypriot) traders came to the Argolid and organized vases for export to Cyprus.

The Cypro-Minoan marks are found at both inland and coastal sites within the Argolid. The presence of marked vessels at inland centers precludes the hypothesis that such signs were engraved during the ship-loading process. It seems most feasible to hypothesize merchants travelling about the region, marking their consignments so as to keep track of them during subsequent handling. Perhaps it was sufficient to mark only one or two pots per lot. Maybe some merchants had single marks as a signature while others had multiple ones. Perhaps multiple marks indicate that different handlers added their marks en route, even after reaching Cyprus itself. This would explain the variable numbers of marks found on vases.

Such a scenario—Cypriot/Cyprus-dealers on the mainland and possible additional marks added by subsequent handlers—would best account for the features associated with marked Mycenaean wares. Thus, incised marks on Aegean wares not only are evidence of trade in ceramics targeted for a specific market, but also suggest active participation of Cypriots in organizing shipments from the mainland to Cyprus.

Questions for Further Research

Several questions raised but not yet answered in the course of this research are listed below as suggestions for further study:

Percentage of Marked Vessels. The number of vessels marked with incised signs as compared to the number left unmarked is difficult to assess, due in most part to the

Remember, too, that the LH IIIB spans approximately one century, and so the marks may span several generations.
fragmentary state of the ceramic evidence. Also, because ceramic finds are not or cannot be adequately presented in most publications, unless the excavator himself has set forth an estimation, it is difficult to reconstruct how many vessels of a particular shape were found in any particular context. This is especially true for coarse sturrup jars, whose fragments are far less distinctive than fine-ware sherds and are thus less apt to be noted. It is extremely difficult to determine—based on excavation reports—the proportion of wares of any particular type which were marked.

The Gelidonya and Ulu Burun shipwrecks may indicate that the majority of ceramics in a shipment were unmarked. In a very general sense, this seems to be corroborated by land sites from which substantial amounts of unmarked ceramics have been recovered. Sites whose material has been carefully saved and recorded should be re-examined with this question in mind.

**Literacy.** The incised marks on Mycenaean vessels sometimes consist of one sign, sometimes two, and occasionally three (Table 4). Because of the placement of the signs on the vases (most commonly, a single sign per handle), it is not clear whether the multiple signs are meant to be “read” as a combination (i.e. taken together to form a word) or whether they each stand individually, possibly incised at different stages of handling, and thus are not directly associated with one another.

Cypro-Minoan is a syllabic script, and therefore it seems that even if the marks incised on separate handles are to be “read” in combination, they might spell out a single word, or at the most, two. One study which remains to be completed is to compare the sign-groups on the vases with words attested on the formal texts, to see if any of the inscribed groups of signs might indeed be correlated with formal vocabulary. At first glance, none does, though this may be a function of the poverty of preserved texts. In some cases, a single sign is repeated on the handles of the jar; repetition of a sign within a word is not a feature of the formal texts. It seems, in preliminary study, that the signs incised on the Mycenaean vessels do not appear to spell out words: the isolation of the signs (each placed separately on a handle), the maximum of three signs per jar, and the lack of parallels with formal vocabulary argue against these signs functioning as formal inscriptions similarly to the Linear B inscriptions on large coarse sturrup jars. Rather, the CM marks seem to stand as independent signs—initials or abbreviations or perhaps even abstract symbols derived from the script.

If the incised marks represent independent signs rather than words or inscriptions, then it is difficult to assess whether the use of CM signs reflects any degree of literacy on the part of the inscriber, or whether individuals merely copied a few
learned symbols. Whether the signs were copied as symbols only without conscious knowledge of their formal syllabic value cannot now be ascertained, especially since it is not clear how closely the potmarks mirrored the actual script. This last point, however, bears hope of fruitful inquiry: new textual discoveries add to the corpus of formally attested CM signs, restudy of the known texts yields information as to sign formation, and examination of multi-sign inscriptions on local Cypriot wares provides clues to the literary capabilities of those handling pottery.

**Function.** Further ideas concerning the purpose of the potmarks might be gained by studying the marks found on all types of wares *within* Cyprus. Does local use of potmarks confirm the function (handlers’ marks) ascribed to the incised marks on Aegean wares?

The distribution and contexts of marked wares in the Argolid and on Crete should be closely studied: Where are marked wares found in relation to known export-production centers? in relation to redistribution centers? Do incised vessels at Midea, Asine, and Tripiti make sense as evidence of Cypriot merchants’ visits?

**Comparison with other Marking Systems.** The CM marking system should be placed in perspective with other contemporary ceramic marking systems (Table 5). Within the Aegean, this would require intensive re-examination of the painted marks and how they were used. Careful study of the Linear B inscribed and CM marked pottery indicate particular and limited applications of each system: Linear B inscribed stirrup jars were associated with (oil) trade between western Crete and the mainland; CM marks were used particularly on vessels brought to Cyprus from the Argolid. In both cases, the implication is of a highly ordered and specialized trade. Did similar circumstances generate the need for the painted marks?

Marking systems used on Aegean wares should be compared also to systems in use in the Near East. Potmarks were extensively used on Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age. How did potmarks function within and between various regions?
### Table 5. Late Bronze Age
Methods of Marking Aegean Export Ceramics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear B Inscriptions</th>
<th>Cypro-Minoan Marks</th>
<th>Painted Single Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before firing</td>
<td>After firing</td>
<td>Before firing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear B</td>
<td>based on CM</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse stirrup jars</td>
<td>Coarse stirrup jars</td>
<td>Variety of shapes open closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine large stirrup jars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS 36 (3-handled piriform jars)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pictorial kraters misc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent position (shoulder)</th>
<th>Prominent position (handles); also a few under base</th>
<th>Prominent position (body); many on base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars manufactured in (west) Crete</td>
<td>Argolid (?)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed to Crete Greek mainland</td>
<td>Cyprus &amp; Near East: Argolid</td>
<td>Cyprus &amp; Near East ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handlers’ marks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, a look at how marking systems developed and were used in other cultural contexts\(^\text{153}\) may provide suggestions relevant to the study of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean potmarks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Åström, P. *Excavations at Kalopsisdha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus* (SIMA 2, Göteborg 1966).


Courtois, J.-C. *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi* (forthcoming) [J.-C. Courtois, Centre de Recherches Archéologiques, Maison l'Orient Méditerranéen, Université Lyon 2].


Crouwel, J. "Pot-Marks on Grey Minyan Ware," *Kadmos* 12 (1973) 101-08.


Dikaios, P. *Guide to the Cyprus Museum*2 (Nicosia n.d.).

Dothan, T. *Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el Balah* (Qadem 10, Jerusalem 1978).


Frizell, B. "A Late Helladic Graffito from Asine," *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 176-78.


Gjerstad, E. *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus* (Uppsala 1926).


Kanta, A. *The Late Minoan III Period in Crete* (SIMA 58, Göteborg 1980).


Karageorghis, V. *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Cyprus 1, Cyprus Museum I* (Nicosia 1963).

Karageorghis, V. *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Cyprus 2, Private Collections I* (Nicosia 1965).


Karageorghis, V. *Mycenaean Art from Cyprus* (Picture Book 3, Cyprus 1968).


Karageorghis, V. "Notes on a Late Cypriote Settlement and Necropolis Site near the Larnaca Salt Lake," *RDAC* (1968) 1-11.


Kling, B. *Mycenaean IIC:1b and Related Pottery in Cyprus (SIMA 87, Göteborg 1989).*


Melas, E. *The Islands of Karpathos, Saros and Kasos in the Neolithic and Bronze Age* (SIMA 68, Göteborg 1985).


Mountjoy, P. *Four Early Mycenaean Wells from the South Slope of the Acropolis at Athens* (Miscellanea Graeca 4, Gent 1981).


Mountjoy, P. *Orchomenos V: Mycenaean Pottery from Orchomenos, Eutresis and other Boeotian Sites* (Munich 1983).

Myres, J. Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus (New York 1914).


Papadopoulos, A. Mycenaeans Achaea (SIMA 55, Göteborg 1979).


Raison, J. Les vases à inscriptions peintes de l'âge mycénien (Rome 1968).
Renfrew, C. The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi (BSA Suppl. 18, 1985).


Sacconi, A. Corpus delle Iscrizioni Vascolari in Lineare B (Incunabula Graeca LVII, Rome 1974).

Salles, J. La necropole "K" de Byblos (Paris 1980).


Schaeffer, C. Ugaritica II (Paris 1949).


Shelmerdine, C. The Perfume Industry of Mycenaean Pylos (Göteborg 1985).


Sjöqvist, E. Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age (Stockholm 1940).


South Todd, A. *Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios II* (SIMA, Göteborg forthcoming).


Stubbings, F. "Some Mycenaean Artists," *BSA* 46 (1951) 168-76.


Vermeule, E. *Greece in the Bronze Age* (Chicago 1964).


APPENDIX I
CATALOGUE OF LH/LM III VASES WITH INCISED MARKS

Format for each entry:

(1) Vase provenience and identification number or label. (*Denotes that vase was examined firsthand by NH, 1989-1990). Also, abbreviated reference to vase used in this paper.
(2) Museum and museum inventory number.
(3) Excavator/expedition: date object was found.
(4) Inscribed sign(s): number of signs, proposed identification [#] according to catalogue of potmarks [Appendix III], part of vase which carries mark (handle, base, etc.). Incised before or after firing.¹
(5) Brief description of vase: state of preservation, shape², main decorative scheme.
(6) Date according to ceramic criteria ("ware").
(7) Date according to stratigraphy ("context").
(8) Find context: settlement (domestic, public, religious, etc.), tomb, surface.³
(9) Primary (or most complete) reference(s).⁴

¹NH indicates that I have been able to examine the vase firsthand, and the evaluation of before/after firing is my own judgement. Other references are also noted.
²Annotated only if a particular FS is specified, if there is any confusion in published identifications of the shape, or if the identification is proposed by NH.
³Annotated only if information varies from that given for "context."
⁴Full bibliography, arranged chronologically, is given in the footnotes.
Three-Handled Piriform Jars

ENKOMI SWEDISH T.11/24
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two different signs [#25B, #44C] depicted in SCE III, p.603 n.17; but SCE I p.516 mentions, "Incised, graphical signs on each of the handles." Since piriform jars have three handles, either one sign is repeated on two handles, or (more probably) only two handles are preserved and carry a single sign each.

Complete? (H:34.3). FS 36.\textsuperscript{5} Pendant scale pattern fills shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Levanto-Mycenaean (Furumark).\textsuperscript{6}
Context: End LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{7}

Tomb.

SCE I, p.516 no.24, pl.LXXXIII row 5:6; SCE III, p.603 no.17, p.613 no.17, p.616 fig.3:22\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{5}MP, 590 FS 36:7; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (d).

\textsuperscript{6}SCE I, 516; MP, 590 FS 36; Chronology, 69.

\textsuperscript{7}Third burial period: SCE I, 513, 525.

\textsuperscript{8}MP, p.523 no.II:A4, p.528, no.IV:d1, p.590 FS 36:7; Chronology, 69; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:10b, p.281 II:16a; Minos V, p.21 no.233; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (d).
ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/31
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Three signs [#1, #3B, #9A] depicted in SCE III, p.602 no.4; presumably one sign per handle.

Intact except chipped base, worn paint (H:35.1). FS 36. Scale pattern fills shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Levanto-Mycenaean (Furmark). Context: After mid-LCII.

Tomb.

SCE I, p.555 no.31, pl.XC row 3:5; SCE III, p.602 no.4, p.613 no.4.

---

ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/57
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Three signs [#20A, #20A, #35A] depicted in SCE III, p.603 no.14; presumably one per handle.

Rim missing; painted decoration obliterated (H:34.2). FS 36.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Levanto-Mycenaean (Furmark). Context: After mid-LC II.

Tomb.


---

9MP, p.590 FS 36:8; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (e).
10SCE I, 555; MP, p.590 FS 36; Chronology, 69.
11Tomb 18, lower burial: SCE I, 557; see note appended to Table 1.
12Enkomi-Alasia, p.324 fig.98; MP, p.523 II:A4, p.527 IV:c1, p.590 FS 36:8; Chronology, 68, 134; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:2,5; Minos V, p.21 no.220; SCE IV:IC p.294 type 36 (e).
13No marks are mentioned, however, in SCE I, p.556 no.57.
14MP, p.590 FS 36:10; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (g).
15SCE I, 556; MP, p.590 FS 36; Chronology, 68.
16Tomb 18, side-chamber: SCE I, 557; see note appended to Table 1.
Piriform Jars

ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/58
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two handles carry a single incised sign each [#3A, #9A].

Apparently complete (H:32.8). FS 36.18 Vertical zigzags fill shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Levanto-Mycenaean (Furumark).19
Context: After mid-LCII.20

Tomb.

SCE 1, p.556 no.58, pl.XC row 2:9; SCE III, p.602 no.7; p.613 no.7.21

---

17 Enkomi-Alasia. p.324 fig.98; MP, p.523 II:A4, p.528 IV:d1, p.590 FS 36:10; Chronology, 68, 134; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:11, p.281 II:18; Minos V, p.21 no.230; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (g).

18MP, p.590 FS 36:11; SCE IV:IC p.294 type (h).

19SCE I, 556; MP, p.590 FS 36; Chronology, 68, 134.

20 Tomb 1B, side-chamber: SCE I, p.557; see note appended to Table 1.

21 Enkomi-Alasia. p.324 fig.98; MP, p.523 II:A4, p.528 IV:d2, p.590 FS 36:11; Chronology, 68, 134; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:2.5; Minos V, p.21 no.223; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (h).
Piriform Jars

ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/77
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

SCE I, p.557 mentions signs on one handle; SCE III, p.602 no.2 depicts only one sign, though its commentary seems to imply two handles inscribed. Until the jar itself can be re-examined, the most plausible interpretation of these confusing descriptions is that the two preserved handles of this jar were both inscribed, apparently each with the same sign [#9A].

Complete profile; one handle missing (H:28.5). FS 36. Dotted circles in shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Levanto-Mycenaean (Furumark).
Context: After mid-1CII.

Tomb.

SCE I, p.557 no.77, pl.XC row 3:8; SCE III, p.602 no.2, p.613 no.2.

22"Incised, graphical signs on one of the handles."

23"One handle is missing; probably this had another sign in accordance with other three-handled vases with inscriptions."

24MP, p.590 FS 36:12; SCE IV:1C p.294 type 36 (i).

25SCE 1, 557; MP, p.590 FS 36; Chronology, 68.

26Tomb 18, side-chamber; SCE 1, 557; see note appended to Table 1.

27Enkomi-Alasia p.324 fig.98; MP, p.523 II:A4; p.527 IV:c1; p.590 FS 36:12; Chronology, 68, 134; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:5; Minos V, p.21 no.218; SCE IV:1C, p.294 type 36 (i).
Piriform Jars

*ENKOMI BRITISH T.45
British Museum: C430 (= 97 4-1 432).
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1896.

Two handles carry a single incised sign each [#6A, #27]; third handle unmarked.

Complete (H:36.7). FS 36.28 Double row of joining semicircles framing top and bottom of shoulder panels; horizontal row of dotted circles across the center.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean (Furumark).29
Context: LC II.30

Tomb.

BMCV, p.89 no.C430.31

*ENKOMI BRITISH T.68
Cyprus Museum: A 1650.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1896.

Two handles carry an incised sign each [#3A #9A]. After firing.32

Complete (H:34.5). FS 36.33 Pendant scale pattern fills shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean (Karageorghis).34
Context: No date.

Tomb.

CVA Cyprus 1, p.23, pl.19:6, fig.3:20.35

29MP, 590 FS 36; BMCV lists this vase as "Mycenaean fabric."
30Courtois and Lagarce, Enkomi, 45.
31Casson, Ancient Cyprus, p.98 no.1; MP, p.523 II:A4, p.527 IV:c1, p.590 FS 36:13; Stubbings, MPL, p.41, pl.XIII:8, fig.8i; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:3, p.281 II:22; Minor V, p.20 no.201; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (j).
32NH; CVA Cyprus I, p. 23.
33CVA Cyprus 1, 23; Nouveaux Documents, 219; SCE IV:IC, 294.
34CVA Cyprus 1, 23; Nouveaux Documents, 219.
35Nouveaux Documents, p.219, pl.XIX:3; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (m).
*CM A 1650b (from Enkomi British T.68\textsuperscript{36})
Cyprus Museum: CM A 1650b.

Each of the three handles incised with a single sign [\#6A, \#20A, \#35B]. After firing.\textsuperscript{37}

Complete (H:36.5). FS 36.\textsuperscript{38} Horizontal wavy lines in shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean (Karageorghis).\textsuperscript{39}
No context.

Tomb?

CVA Cyprus 1, p.22, pl.19:4, fig.3:18.\textsuperscript{40}

---

*ENKOMI 1420
Cyprus Museum: 1420.

Single sign [\#7A] inscribed into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{41}

Fragmentary handle.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{42}
Context: LC IIIB.\textsuperscript{43}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{44}


---

\textsuperscript{36}CVA Cyprus 1, 23 lists this vase as unprovenienced, but *Nouveaux Documents*, 219 and *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (abis) list it as from Enkomi British T.68.

\textsuperscript{37}NH: CVA Cyprus 1, 22.

\textsuperscript{38}CVA Cyprus 1, 22; *Nouveaux Documents*, 219: *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (abis).

\textsuperscript{39}CVA Cyprus 1, 22; *Nouveaux Documents*, 219.

\textsuperscript{40}Nouveaux Documents*, p.219, pl.XIX:2; *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (abis).

\textsuperscript{41}NH.

\textsuperscript{42}Dikaios, *Enkomi*, 767.

\textsuperscript{43}End Level IIIIC: Area III, room 39 L-M 50-52 east, in layer overlying [i.e. not in situ] Floor 1: Dikaios, *Enkomi*, 767.

\textsuperscript{44}Dikaios, *Enkomi*, 148: no particular function indicated for this room.
*ENKOMI 20.230 (Tomb 1907)

Single sign [#11A] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{45}

Single handle and attached shoulder fragment. Probably FS 35.\textsuperscript{46}

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC I- LC IIIA, disturbed.\textsuperscript{47}

Tomb.

Alasia IV, p.134 & 136 no.238, p.135 fig.41:h.

---

*ENKOMI 1949 no.5113
Cyprus Museum: 1949.5113.

Part of a single sign [Fragment, possibly #6A?] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{48}

Handle fragment. Three-handed piriform jar.\textsuperscript{49}

Ware: Museum label says IIIB.
Specific context unknown.

MINOS V, p.22 no.247.

\textsuperscript{45}NH; Alasia IV, 134. Note: FS 35 is a shape which occurs LH IIIA-B.

\textsuperscript{46}Alasia IV, 136.

\textsuperscript{47}Enkomi Tomb 1907 was robbed, i.e. disturbed (Alasia IV, 60-61). Mycenaean ware dating LH IIIA2-
IIIIC:1 was found (Alasia IV, 151-52), but the incised handle itself is not specifically dated. Several
phases of tomb use were detected (Alasia IV, 156-57), but the incised sherd was found at the top of fill
(Alasia IV, 156), and therefore not in dated stratigraphical context.

\textsuperscript{48}NH.

\textsuperscript{49}NH.
ENKOMI 1960 no.183
Cyprus Museum: 1960 no.183.

Single sign [#6A] incised into handle. After firing.50

Handle and shoulder fragment.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2.51
Context: LC II.52

Settlement.

Courtois, Corpus céramique d'Enkomi, no.1915, fig.137:8.

---------------------------------------------------------------

KITION T.4+5/107

One sign [#24A] incised into the single preserved handle. After firing.53

Complete profile (H:35.2), but only one handle preserved. FS 36.54 Shoulder panels with double rows of joining semicircles framing top and bottom, and a horizontal quirk chain across the middle.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.55
Context: LC IIIC.56

Settlement.

Kiton 1, p.21, p.145 no.A5, p.147 fig.1e, pls.XV, XXXVII.

---------------------------------------------------------------

50 Courtois, Corpus céramique d'Enkomi, no.1915.
51 Courtois, Corpus céramique d'Enkomi, no.1915.
52 Quartier 3E, topo.pt.384: Courtois, Corpus céramique d'Enkomi, no.1915.
53 Kiton 1, 21.
54 Kiton 1, 36 refers to this jar as "characteristic of the so-called Levanto-Mycenaean pottery...", which presumably refers to FS 36.
55 Kiton 1, 21, 36.
56 Kiton 1, 41.
*KITION I/687/1
Cyprus Museum: I/687/1.
Cyprus Department of Antiquities (V.Karageorghis): 1963 or 1976.
Part of a single sign [Frg.] incised into handle. After firing.57
Handle fragment.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.58
Context: CG I59 [i.e. not in situ].
Settlement (domestic?).60

Kition V2, p.68, p.284, pl.F, pls.XXXIV, LVI.

57NH; Kition V2, 68.
58Kition V2, 68.
59Area I, floor I, room 4A enclosed courtyard: Kition V2, 68; Kition V1, 21 re: floor I.
60Kition V1, 21-22 indicates that this findspot (Area I, floor I, room 4A enclosed courtyard) had a domestic function, but whether this has direct relevance to the use of the jar with the incised mark is doubtful since the jar's date of manufacture substantially predates this depositional context.
*KITION II/5375
Larnaca Museum: II/5375.

Part of a single sign [#44C?] incised into handle. After firing. 61

Handle fragment, probably from a three-handled piriform jar (?). 62

Ware: Mycenaean III B. 63
Context: LC IIIA fill. 64

Settlement: religious precinct, workshop area (weaving?). 65

Kiton V2 p.126, p.284, pl.F, pls.CXIV, CXIII.

---

61 NH; Kition V2, 126.
62 Kition V2, 126.
63 Kition V2, 126.
64 Area II, floor III- IIIA, room 126: Kition V2, 126.
65 Kition V1, 78.
Piriform Jars

*KITION-BAMBOULA KEF-322
La Mama Museum: KEF-322 + KEF-287 + K77-570.

Single sign (#46) incised into the one preserved handle. After firing.\(^{66}\)

Incomplete: upper body profile preserved (pres.H:17), but two handles missing. FS 36.\(^{67}\) Shoulder panels with tricurved arches pointing up and dotted lozenges in center; one panel with arches of doubled lines.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.\(^{68}\)
Context: LC IIIA.\(^{69}\)
Tomb?\(^{70}\)


---

\(^{66}\)NH; Note that M. Yon and A. Caubet believe that all the Mycenaean incised pieces found at Kition-Bamboula were marked before firing. My counter-arguments are presented in the text supra: Timing of Marking.

\(^{67}\)M. Yon follows V. Karageorghis in designating this shape as "Levanto-Mycenaean," though it is not absolutely clear whether by this term she also implies local manufacture of this ware on Cyprus, as does V. Karageorghis. Kition-Bamboula, 130-31 emphasizes the Mycenaean IIIB nature of these vessels but it is not clear whether Mycenaean IIIB traits are considered as necessarily indicative of mainland manufacture. One piriform jar is signaled as quite different from the rest, but I am not certain whether the distinction setting this vessel apart from the other pithoid jars is its date (IIIC.1) or its place of manufacture (local).

\(^{68}\)Supra n.67.

\(^{69}\)LBA locus 314: Kition-Bamboula,, 43.

\(^{70}\)Kition-Bamboula, 42-43.
Piriform Jars

*KITION-BAMBOULA K76-4992
Larnaca Museum: K76-4992.

Single sign [#4] incised into the one preserved handle. After firing.\(^{71}\)

Single handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36.\(^{72}\) Shoulder panels framed above and below with double row of joining semicircles; in center, a horizontal chain of "N" motifs.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.\(^{73}\)
Context: LC IIIA.\(^{74}\)

Tomb?\(^{75}\)


\(^{71}\)(Supra n.66).

\(^{72}\)(Supra n.67).

\(^{73}\)(Supra n.67).

\(^{74}\)(Supra n.69).

\(^{75}\)*Kition-Bamboula* (supra n.70).
Piriform Jars

*KITION-BAMBOLA KEF-370
Larnaca Museum: KEF-370.

Single sign [#4] incised into the one preserved handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{76}

Single handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36,\textsuperscript{77} No decoration preserved within shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.\textsuperscript{78}
Context: LC IIIA.\textsuperscript{79}

Tomb?\textsuperscript{80}


\textsuperscript{76}(Supra n.66).
\textsuperscript{77}(Supra n.67).
\textsuperscript{78}(Supra n.67).
\textsuperscript{79}(Supra n.69).
\textsuperscript{80}Kiton-Bamboula (supra n.70).
*KITION-BAMBOULA K76-5592
Larnaca Museum: K76-5592.

Single sign [#40] incised into the one preserved handle. After firing,81

Handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36.82 Standing scale pattern fills shoulder panels.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.83
Context: LC IIIA.84

Tomb?85


81(Supra, n.66).
82(Supra n.67).
83(Supra, n.67).
84(Supra n.69).
85Kition-Bamboula (supra n.70).
Piriform Jars

*KITION-BAMBOULA KEF-334 + KEF-372  KitBam KEF-334 + KEF-372
Larnaca Museum: KEF-334 + KEF-372 + K76-5585 + K77-744.

Two of the three handles incised with a single sign each [#42B, #42C]. After firing.\textsuperscript{86}

Almost complete (H: 34); all three handles preserved. FS 36.\textsuperscript{87} Pendant scale pattern fills shoulder panels.

Ware: Levanto-Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{88}
Context: LC IIIA.\textsuperscript{89}

Tomb?\textsuperscript{90}

\textcite{Kition-Bamboula, p.132 no.282, figs.61:282, 63:282, p.180 nos.357-58, figs. 82:357-58, 84:357-58.}

\textsuperscript{86} (Supra n.66).
\textsuperscript{87} (Supra n.67).
\textsuperscript{88} (Supra n.67).
\textsuperscript{89} (Supra n.69).
\textsuperscript{90} Kition-Bamboula (supra n.70).
Piriform Jars

*HALA SULTAN TEKKE BM C434
British Museum: C434 (=98 12-1 223),
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1897-1898.

Each of the two preserved handles with an incised sign [#34, #45]. After firing.\(^91\)

Almost complete (H:37.4), but one handle missing. FS 36.\(^92\) **Pictorial** style
decoration: "The three shoulder panels, in the handle zone, are each decorated with two
birds facing each other, and various arrangements of dotted circles."\(^93\)

**Ware:** IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.\(^94\)
**Context:** LC IIIB\(^95\)
**Tomb**\(^96\)

*HST* I, p.12, p.14, p.131 no.4, fig.125:4a-b, pls.Ib, IX; *CVA Great Britain* 20 (British
Museum 1), pl. 8-8; *BMCV*, pp.89-90 C434,\(^97\)

---

\(^91\) NH; *HST* I, 12.

\(^92\) *MP*, p.590 FS 36:14; *Nouveaux Documents*, 219; *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (k).

\(^93\) *HST* I, 12.

\(^94\) *MP*, p.431-C, p.590 FS 36; *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (k), following Furumark's definition of FS
36; *Nouveaux Documents*, 219; *Kition-Bamboulia*, p.130 no.6. Ripe 1 (=LH IIIB1) according to
*Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*, V.69, p.3.

\(^95\) *HST* I, 14, if indeed from Walters' Tomb IV (infra n.96).

\(^96\) Possibly from Walters' Tomb IV: O. Masson, *BCH* 81 (1957) 28; *Minos V*, p.17 no.180; *HST* I, 12,
14; *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (k).

\(^97\) *SCE III*, 607; Casson, *Ancient Cyprus*, p.78 no.4, p.100 no.12, p.105 no.48; *MP*, p.253 fig.30:28,
F. Shniberg, "Some Mycenaean Artists," *BSA* 46 (1951) p.176 fig.4; S. Immerwahr, "The Protome
p.29 figs.19-21; *Minos V*, p.17 no.180; V. Karageorghis, "Supplementary Notes on the Mycenaean
Handle Stamped with the Cartouche of Seti I from Hala Sultan Tekke," *OpAth* V (1965) p.116 no.7;
*Nouveaux Documents*, p.219 no.8; *SCE IV:IC*, p.294 type 36 (k); *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*,
V.69, p.204; Olivier, *AA* (1988) 266.
**HALA SULTAN TEKKE, BM C379**

British Museum: C379 (=98 12-1 309).
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1897-1898.

Single sign [226A] incised into the one preserved handle. After firing.\(^98\)

Shoulder fragment, including one handle. Three-handled piriform jar.\(^99\) Shoulder zone ornamentation barely preserved; possibly three narrow wavy bands.\(^100\)

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2 or B.\(^101\)

*HST* I, p.20, pls.I.Ia, XXI; *BMCV*, p.25 C379.\(^102\)

---

\(^98\)NH; *HST* I, 20.

\(^99\)Fragments from two separate vessels are stored and catalogued under the same number in museum storage. The other fragments are from an amphoroid krater, but the incised shoulder piece is certainly from a pithoid jar, possibly FS 36. (See *HST* I, 20).

\(^100\)41*HST* I, 20.

\(^101\)*HST* I, 20; specifically Levanto-Mycenaean IIIB in *Kition-Bamboola*, p.130 no.6.

\(^102\)Mistakenly identified as from Maroni in *BMCV*, which mistake is repeated in all the references cited except *HST* I. *SCE* III p.607, p.609 no.36; Casson, *Ancient Cyprus*, p.78 no.2, p.101 no.22; *Prolegomena*, p.281 II:15; *Minos* V, p.15, no.160.
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HALA SULTAN TEKKE 98 12-1 310a-b
British Museum: 98 12-1 310a-b.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1897-1898.

Two handles, each with a single incised sign [#34, #47]. After firing.\(^{103}\)

Two handles with similar decoration; probably from the same jar. FS 36.\(^{104}\) Shoulder panels filled with cross-hatching.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA or B.\(^{105}\)
Context: LC IIB (?).\(^{106}\)

Tomb?\(^{107}\)

\(^{103}\)NH; \textit{HST} I, 13.

\(^{104}\)SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (p).

\(^{105}\)\textit{HST} I, 13; specifically Levanto-Mycenaean IIIB in \textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (p), following Furumark's definition of FS 36, and in \textit{Kiton-Bamboula}, p.130 no.6. IIIB date accepted for the purposes of this paper.

\(^{106}\)If indeed from Walters' Tomb IV (infra no.107): \textit{HST} I, 14.

\(^{107}\)Possibly from Walters' Tomb IV: \textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (p); \textit{HST} I, 12, 14.

\(^{108}\)Casson, \textit{Ancient Cyprus}, p.105 nos.49-50; "Prolegomena," p.281 II:19b (=C11091), II:19c (=C11094); O.Masson, \textit{BCH} 81 (1957) p.28, p.30 fig.21 (=C1109-1), fig.22 (=C1109.1b); \textit{Minos} V, pp.17-18 no.181 (=C1109:1a-b); \textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.294 (p); \textit{Kiton-Bamboula} III, p.130 no.6.
Piriform Jars

HALA SULTAN TEKKE 98 12-1 311
British Museum: 98 12-1 311.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1897-1898.

Single sign [#14] incised into handle. After firing.109

Single handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36.110 Shoulder panels filled with small, closely-spaced trefoils.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA or B.111
Context: LC IIIB (?).112

Tomb?113

HST I, p.13, p.132 no.8, p.134 fig.125:8, pl.I:8, pl.XI:c.114

109 NH; HST I, 13.

110 SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (q).

111 HST I, 13; although specifically Levanto-Mycenaean IIIB, according to Åström (SCE IV:IC, 294, following Furumark's definition of FS 36) and M. Yon and A. Caubet (Kition-Bamboula, p.130 no.6). IIIB date accepted for purposes of this text.

112 If indeed from Walters' Tomb IV (infra n.113): HST I, 14.

113 Possibly from Walters' Tomb IV: O. Masson, BCH 81 (1957) 28; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (q); HST I, 12, 14

114 Ancient Cyprus, p.105 no.51; "Prolegomena," p.281 II:17; O. Masson, BCH 81 (1957) p.28, p.30 fig.23 (=C1109.2); Minos V, p.18 no.182 (=C1109.2); SCE IV:IC, p.294 (q) (=C1109.2); Kition-Bamboula, p.131 no.6.
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*HALA SULTAN TEKKE 1971 3-25 1.2*\(^{115}\)
British Museum: 1971 3-25 1.2,
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1897-1898.

Single sign incised on each of two preserved handles [#11B, #33C]. After firing.\(^{116}\)

Upper body fragment including one handle and a separate handle fragment from the same three-handled jar. FS 36.\(^{117}\) Shoulder panels bordered above and below by single row of small joining semicircles; horizontal row of widely spaced rosettes across center of panels.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2 or B.\(^{118}\)
No context (surface find).\(^{119}\)

\(HST\) I, p.20, p.132 no.7, p.134 fig.125:7, pls.Ij-j, XXI:b-c\(^{120}\)


\(^{116}\)NH; \textit{HST} I, 20.

\(^{117}\)\textit{SC} E IV:IC, p.294 (s) (=C1109.3); the second fragment is not classified as FS 36 by Åström (p.306 (=C1109.3), though he does mention the possibility that these two pieces join, p.294 (s)). Both must be included as FS 36 since \textit{HST} I, 20 confirms that both C1109.3 and C1106.3 belong to the same jar.

\(^{118}\)\textit{HST} I, 20; but specifically Levant-Mycenaean IIIIB in \textit{SC} E IV:IC, p.294 (s), following Funmark's definition of FS 36, and in \textit{Kition-Bamboula}, p.130 no.6.

\(^{119}\)Attribution of C1109.3 to Tomb IV (in O.Masson, \textit{BCH} 81 (1957) 28) is incorrect: see \textit{HST} I, 20.

Listed as surface find in \textit{SC} E IV:IC, p.294 (s).

\(^{120}\)"Prolegomena," p.281 II:21b (=C11003), II:25 (=C11093); O.Masson, \textit{BCH} 81 (1957), p.28 (=C1109:3, mistakenly attributed to Tomb IV) p.32 fig.26 (=C1100.3); \textit{Kalopsidha}, p.159 no.Vg III (14) (refers only to C1109.3 and incorrectly identifies it as a stirrup jar handle); \textit{SC} E IV:IC, p.294 (s) (=C1109.3), p.306 (=C1109.3).
Piriform Jars

HALA SULTAN TEKKE T.1/52
Larnaca Museum: T.1/52.
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (V. Karageorghis): 1968.

Two of the handles with a single incised sign each [#9A, #19B]. After firing.¹²¹

Complete profile above base, which is missing (pres.H:29.5); all three handles preserved. FS 36.¹²² Shoulder panels are decorated with a horizontal row of small cross motifs across the middle.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Mycenaean.¹²³
Context: End LC IIIB- end LC IIIC.¹²⁴

Tomb.

HST I, p.74 no.52, p.76, p.132 no.13a-b, p.134 fig.125:13a-b, pls.51, 54, 68; V.Karageorghis, "Notes on a Late Cypriote Settlement and Necropolis Site near the Larnaca Salt Lake," RDAC (1968) pl.II:7-8.

¹²¹HST I, 74, 131.

¹²²HST I, 76 states that this jar is an example of the Levantine type which, following the definition established in Nouveaux Documents, 219 by the same author, refers specifically to FS 36.

¹²³(Supra n.122).

¹²⁴Tomb 1: HST I, 89.
Piriform Jars

HALA SULTAN TEKKE 1948/III-4/3
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities, Rescue excavation, "House of the Pithos" (G.Anastasiou):
1948.

Single sign [#16C] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{125}\)

Handle only.

Ware: Mycenae IIIB.\(^{126}\)
Context: Probably LC III, though earlier sherds present.\(^{127}\)

Setlement.

HST I, p.36 fig.13, p.37.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

HALA SULTAN TEKKE F6031/596
Larnaca Museum?

Single sign [#9A] incised into handle. Probably made before firing.\(^{128}\)

Shoulder fragment with complete handle (Hdle.W:3.2). Probably FS 36.\(^{129}\) Lower
border of preserved shoulder panel fringed by double row of joining semicircles; further
possible decoration not preserved.

Ware: Mycenae IIIB.\(^{130}\)
Context: LC IIIB-IIIC1, mainly IIIC1.\(^{131}\)

Redeposited tomb contents?\(^{132}\)

HST VI, p.3 no.596, p.74 fig.7, p.85 fig.74 (published upside down).

\(^{125}\)HST I, 37.

\(^{126}\)Supra n.125.

\(^{127}\)Layer III: HST I, 37.

\(^{128}\)HST VI, 3.

\(^{129}\)Supra n.128.

\(^{130}\)HST VI, 3, 21.

\(^{131}\)Area 22 Deposit F6031: HST VI, 16.

\(^{132}\)HST VI, 29.
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HALA SULTAN TEKKE F6139/6056  
Larnaca Museum?  

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #52B?] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{133}

Fragment of the upper part of a flat vertical handle (Hdle.W:3.2), probably from a three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.  
Context: LC IIB-IIIC1, mostly IIIC1.\textsuperscript{134}

Redeposited tomb contents?

*HST* V, p.41, p.45 no.6056, p.86 fig.235, p.89 fig.279.

---

HALA SULTAN TEKKE F6031/648  
Larnaca Museum?  

Part of a single sign [#52B] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{135}

Fragment of the upper part of flat vertical handle (Hdle.W:2.2) from a piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.  
Context: LC IIC.\textsuperscript{136}

Redeposited tomb contents?\textsuperscript{137}

*HST* VI, p.6 no.648, p.76 fig.27a, p.85 fig.76.

---

\textsuperscript{133}HST* V, 45.  
\textsuperscript{134}Area 22 Deposit F6139 GCh 452: HST* V, 43.  
\textsuperscript{135}HST* VI, 6.  
\textsuperscript{136}Area 22 Deposit F6031: HST* VI, 16.  
\textsuperscript{137}HST* VI, 29.
HALA SULTAN TEKKE F6031/644
Larnaca Museum.

Single sign [#26A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{138}\)

Complete flat vertical handle (Hdle,W:1.4). Probably from a small piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC IIIB-IIIC1, mostly IIIC1.\(^{139}\)

Redeposited tomb contents?\(^{140}\)

*HST VI*, p.6 no.644, p.76 fig.27b, p.85 fig.75.

-------------------------

HALA SULTAN TEKKE chamber tomb 20 (A)
Larnaca Museum?

Single sign [#16A] incised into handle.

Handle fragment. Three-handed piriform or stirrup jar.\(^{141}\)

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA-B.\(^{142}\)
Context: No date.

 Looted tomb.\(^{143}\)

*HST VIII*, p.146, p.158 fig.387.

-------------------------

\(^{138}\) *HST VI*, 6.

\(^{139}\) Area 22 Deposit F6031: *HST VI*, 16.

\(^{140}\) *HST VI*, 29.

\(^{141}\) *HST VIII*, 146; this fragment assumed to be from a piriform jar for the purposes of this text.

\(^{142}\) *HST VIII*, 147.

\(^{143}\) *HST VIII*, 145.
HALA SULTAN TEKKE chamber tomb 20 (B)  
Larnaca Museum?  

Single vertical incision [#1] into handle.

Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform or stirrup jar.\(^{144}\)

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA-B.\(^{145}\)
Context: No date.

Looted tomb.\(^{146}\)

*HALA SULTAN TEKKE F1548/layer 4*  
Larnaca Museum?  

Single sign [Frg., possibly #39?] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{147}\)

Handle fragment, probably from a three-handled piriform jar.\(^{148}\)

Ware: Mycenaean.
Publication forthcoming.

---

\(^{144}\) *HST* VIII, 146; this fragment assumed to be from a piriform jar for the purposes of this text.

\(^{145}\) *HST* VIII, 147.

\(^{146}\) *HST* VIII, 145.

\(^{147}\) *NH*.

\(^{148}\) *NH*. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piriform Jars</th>
<th>HST ch. T.20B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Piriform Jars

*HALA SULTAN TEKKE F2003/2036
Larnaca Museum?

Part of a single sign [#14] incised into handle. After firing.149

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.0). Three-handled piriform jar.150

Ware: Mycenaean III B.151
Context: No date.152

Settlement.

HST VIII, p.60, p.69, p.89 fig.234.

HALA SULTAN TEKKE F2003/2026
Larnaca Museum?

Single sign [#4] incised into handle.

Shoulder fragment and complete vertical handle (Hdle.W:2.6). FS 36.153 Shoulder panels filled with scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean III B.154
Context: No date.155

Settlement.

HST VIII p.60, p.69, p.89 fig.234.

---

149NH.
150HST VIII, 69.
151(Supra n.150).
152Area 6, Trench ECD-e 395-9, layer 4 F2003 = disturbed (Roman sherd!), HST VIII, 60.
153HST VIII, 69.
154(Supra n.153).
155(Supra n.153).
Piriform Jars

*HALA SULTAN TEKKE 1953 no.391

Single sign [#52A] incised into handle. After firing. 156

Vertical handle and shoulder fragment. Three-handled piriform jar. 157 Shoulder panel motif indeterminable.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2. 158
Surface find (No date).

HST I, p.67 no.152, pl.XLV no.152.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALA SULTAN TEKKE 51.330 \ HST 51.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single sign [#33B] incised into handle. After firing. 159

Fragment of shoulder and handle (Hdle.W:2.8). Three-handled piriform or stirrup jar.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB (?). 160
Surface find.

HST I, p.61, p.132 no.9, p.134 fig.125:9.

156 NH.
157 NH.
158 HST I, 65.
159 HST I, 61.
160 (Supra n.159); this fragment assumed to be from a piriform jar for the purposes of this text.
*KALAVASOS-AYIOS DHIMITRIOS 535
Lamaca Museum.
Vasilikos Valley Project (A. South Todd).

One handle with a single incised sign [#11A]. After firing.\textsuperscript{161}

Almost complete (H: ca. 33.5); one handle missing. FS 36 (?). Shoulder panels filled
with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.
Context: LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{162}

Settlement: room possibly with official/administrative function.\textsuperscript{163}

\textit{KAD} II, \textit{fc}.

\textsuperscript{161}NH.

\textsuperscript{162}See note appended to Table 1.

KOURION-BAMBOULA B1112
Episkopi Museum\textsuperscript{164}

Part of a single sign incised on handle [Frg.]. After firing.\textsuperscript{165}

Vertical strap handle. Probably from a three-handled piriform jar,\textsuperscript{166} possibly FS 45.\textsuperscript{167}

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{168}
Context: LC IIC.\textsuperscript{169}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{170}

"Prolegomena," p.276 no.71, p.277 fig.15:71, p.280 II:6; Bamboula, 111, 116.\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{164}Unfortunately, I have been unable to locate any of the material excavated from Kourion-Bamboula except those objects stored at the University Museum, Philadelphia. As far as can be found out from records and memories, the Kourion-Bamboula objects left on Cyprus should be in the Episkopi storerooms, but the curator and I were unable to find them.

\textsuperscript{165}"Prolegomena," p.276 no.71.

\textsuperscript{166}"Prolegomena," p.276 no.71 ("three-handled jar"); Bamboula, 116 ("three-handled (?) jar").

\textsuperscript{167}SCE IV:IC, 306; Bamboula, 115-16, identified as possibly FS 44-45.

\textsuperscript{168}Bamboula, 111.


\textsuperscript{170}Bamboula, Kourion," AJA 64 (1960) 149.

\textsuperscript{171}Bamboula, Kourion," AJA 64 (1960) p.149, pl.38; SCE IV:IC, 306.
Piriform Jars

Kourion B1113

*KOURION-BAMBOLIA B1113
University Museum, Philadelphia: B1113.

Single sign [#11A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{172}\)

Vertical strap handle and fragment of shoulder. FS 36.\(^{173}\) Shoulder panels filled with scale pattern.

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{174}\)
Context: LC IIIC.\(^{175}\)
Settlement.\(^{176}\)

"Prolegomena," p.276 no.72, p.277 fig.15:72, p.280 II:8; *Bamboula*, 111, 116.\(^ {177}\)
Piriform Jars
Kourion B1114

KOURION-BAMBOULA B1114
Episkopi Museum\textsuperscript{178}

Single sign \#24A incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{179}

Vertical strap handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36.\textsuperscript{180}

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{181}
Context: LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{182}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{183}

"Prolegomena," p.276 no.73, p.277 fig.15:73, p.280 II:9; \textit{Bamboula}, 111, 116.\textsuperscript{184}

\textsuperscript{178}(Supra n.164).
\textsuperscript{179}"Prolegomena," p.276 no.73.
\textsuperscript{180}\textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.295 type 36 (w); although more generally identified as a "three-handled jar" by Daniel ("Prolegomena," p.276 no.73) and as a "3-handled (?) jar," possibly FS 44-45, by Benson (\textit{Bamboula}, 115-166).
\textsuperscript{181}(Supra n.174).
\textsuperscript{182}(Supra n.175).
\textsuperscript{183}(Supra n.176).
\textsuperscript{184}"Bamboula, Kourion," \textit{AIA} 64 (1960) p.148, p.149, pl.38; \textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.295 type 36 (w).
KOURION-BAMBOULA B1115
Episkopi Museum\textsuperscript{185} University of Pennsylvania (J.F. Daniel): 1938-1948.

Single horizontal line [#2] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{186}

Upper part of handle and fragment of shoulder. FS 36.\textsuperscript{187}

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIIB.\textsuperscript{188}

Context: LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{189}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{190}

"Prolegomena," p.276 no.75, p.277 fig.15:75, p.280 II:24; \textit{Bamoula}, 116-17.\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{185}(Supra n.164).

\textsuperscript{186}"Prolegomena," p.276 no.75.

\textsuperscript{187}\textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.295 type 36 (x); although more generally identified as a "three-handled jar" by Daniel ("Prolegomena, p.276 no.75) and as a "3-handled (?) jar," possibly FS 44-45, by Benson (\textit{Bamoula}, 115-166).

\textsuperscript{188}\textit{SCE} IV:IC follows Fumark's chronology and definition of FS 36; but note that Benson does not include B1115 with the other three-handled jar fragments (B1112-B1114) which he dates to Mycenaean IIIIB (\textit{Bamoula}, 111).

\textsuperscript{189}(Supra n.175).

\textsuperscript{190}(Supra n.176).

\textsuperscript{191}"Bamoula, Kourion," \textit{AJA} 64 (1960) p.148, p.149, pl.38; \textit{Kalopsisha}, p.162 no.Hgl (13); \textit{SCE} IV:IC, p.295 type 36 (x).
*KOUKLIA KC 402
Kouklia Museum: KC 402.
T. Mitford: 1951.

Single sign [#29] incised into handle. After firing.192

Handle and shoulder fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.193

Ware: Mycenaean III.194
Context: No date.195

Mitford, Kadmos X (1951) p.92 no.34, p.91 fig.2 no.34, pl.II no.16.

*KOUKLIA KC 665
Kouklia Museum: KC 665.
T. Mitford: 1952.

Single sign [#6A] incised into handle. After firing.196

Handle and shoulder fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.197

Ware: Mycenaean.

Unpublished.

---

192NH; Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) p.92 no.34.

193NH; misidentified as a stirrup jar fragment in Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) p.92 no.34.

194Mitford, Kadmos X (1951) p.92 no.34.

195From fill under Mosaic Surround: Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) p.92 no.34.

196NH.

197NH.
MAA-PALAEOKASTRO 1954/2
Cyprus Museum?
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (P.Dikaios): 1954.

Part of a single sign [Frg.] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{198}

Handle fragment. Three handled jar (?).\textsuperscript{199}

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{200}
Context: No date.

Settlement.\textsuperscript{201}


\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Maa Palaeokastro}, p.214 no.2.
\textsuperscript{199}(Supra n.198).
\textsuperscript{200}(Supra n.198).
\textsuperscript{201} Although no specific proveniences are given for individual pieces found by Dikaios, the general area where this piece was found is known (Area I: \textit{Maa Palaeokastro}, 214). There is no reason to suspect anything but settlement debris from this area.
Two handles incised with a single sign each [#11A, #11E]. After firing.  
Almost complete, but missing one handle. FS 36. Shoulder panels with antithetic spirals framing triglyph panel of vertical scallops.

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIB. Context: No date.

Looted tomb.


---

202NH.

203 *Nouveaux Documents*, 219, 221; *SCE IV*:C, p.295 type 36 (a2).

204 *Nouveaux Documents*, 219.

205 Karageorghis, *BCH* 84 (1960) 245.

206 *Nouveaux Documents*, p.219, p.221 fig.51:1; *SCE IV*:C, p.295 type 36 (a2).
Piriform Jars

*APLIKI
Cyprus Museum.
J. du Plat Taylour: 1939.

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #6A?] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{207}\)
Handle fragment,\(^{208}\) FS 36,\(^{209}\)
Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIIB,\(^{210}\)
Context: LC IIIC,\(^{211}\)
Settlement.

J. du Plat Taylour, "A Late Bronze Age Settlement at Apliki, Cyprus,"AJ 32 (1952) p.142, p.166, pl.XXVIII a:2.\(^{212}\)

---

\(^{207}\)NH.

\(^{208}\)Only half of the sherd as depicted in AJ 32 (1952) pl.XXVIII a:2 could be found in the museum storage.

\(^{209}\)SCE IV:IC, p.295 type 36 (y), which follows Furumark's chronology and definition of FS 36.

\(^{210}\)Supra no.209; identified as Mycenaean IIIIB in the original publication [AJ 32 (1952) 166].

\(^{211}\)Under A1 floor [AJ 32 (1952) 166], but pp: locus is dated by this particular piece [AJ 32 (1952) 142-44], and thus the context cannot be used as independent dating criteria for this object. But for general dating of the overall ceramic repertoire from this site as LC IIIC, see Kling, Western Cyprus: Connections, 105.

\(^{212}\)Minos V, p.13 nos.39-43; SCE IV:IC, p.295 (y).
Two of the handles each bear the same sign [#6C], incised after firing.213

Complete (H:33.3). FS 36.214 "The three panels are bordered above and below with joining semicircles; in their middle a horizontal row of three sea anemone motives (FM 27:16)."215

Ware: Levanto-Mycenaean IIIB.216
Provenience unknown.

CVA Cyprus 1, pp.22-23, pl.19:5, fig.3:19.217

RS T.1

Single sign [#24A] incised into handle. After firing.218

Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar: FS 36?219

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.220

Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p.160 no.4; fig.62:4.

213NH; CVA Cyprus 1, 22-23.
214CVA Cyprus 1, 22; Nouveaux Documents, 219; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (i).
215CVA Cyprus 1, 23.
216CVA Cyprus 1, 23; Nouveaux Documents, 219; SCE IV:IC, p.294.
217Gjerstad, Studies, pl.216/1; Nouveaux Documents, p.219, pl.XIX:1; SCE IV:IC, p.294 type 36 (i).
218Ugaritica II, 160.
219Designated a hydrie in description; see Ugaritica II, 154 where this term is illustrated by an FS 36 jar (fig.60 no.20).
220Ugaritica II, 160; see note appended to Table 1.
RAS SHAMRA T.VII

All three handles inscribed with a single sign each [#6A, #6A, #11A? or C?].

Before firing. 222

Handle and shoulder fragments (only two handles depicted). Three-handled piriform jar: FS 36? 223 Shoulder panels filled with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récents 3. 224

Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p.190 no.9, fig.77:9.

---

221 The drawing looks as if it may have been published upside down; if the orientation of this mark is in fact with the three “prongs” facing up, then the sign conforms with the attested orientation of the majority of signs (#11A) in the #11 category.

222 Ugaritica II, 190.

223 (Supra n. 219).

224 “Grande Tombe VII, BE, installé dans l’ancien rempart, au nord de la rue dite du Rempart.”: Ugaritica II, 190; see note appended to Table 1.
Piriform Jars

**RAS SHAMRA exc: 1936**

"Gravée sir les trois anses," but only one handle and shoulder fragment illustrated. Assume other handles with the same sign [33D]? **Before firing.**

One handle and shoulder fragment illustrated. **FS 36?** Shoulder panels filled with pendant scale pattern.

*Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.*

*Context: End Ugarit Récent 2 or early Ugarit Récent 3.*

No specific provenience given.

**Ugaritica** II, p.228 no.26, fig.96:20.

---

**RAS SHAMRA pt. 4466**

Single sign [12?] incised on handle. After having been painted.

Handle and shoulder fragment. Three-handled piriform jar. Shoulder filled with dotted circles?

*Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.*

*Context: ?*

**Ugaritica** VII, p.306 no.7, fig.36:7.

---

225 **Ugaritica** II, p.228 no.26.

226 **Ugaritica** II, 228.

227 Leonard, p.6 no.13.

228 (Supra n.226).

229 **Ugaritica** II, 228; see note appended to Table 1.

230 Leonard, p.6 no.13.

231 **Ugaritica** VII, p.306 no.7.

232 **Ugaritica** VII, 306.

233 Sud Acropole, topo.pt.4466.
RAS SHAMRA 27.402

Two handles each inscribed with a single sign [#5, #11A]. After firing.\(^{234}\)

Complete profile above shoulder; apparently all three handles preserved. FS 36.\(^{235}\)
Shoulder panels filled with pendant scales.

Ware: Levanto-Mycenaean III B.\(^{236}\)
Context: Very end Ugarit Récent 3.\(^{237}\)

Tomb.\(^{238}\)

\textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.318 no.3, fig.41:3.\(^{239}\)

RAS SHAMRA "est du Grand Palais"

Single sign [#27]?\(^{240}\) incised into handle. After firing or at leather-hard stage.\(^{241}\)

Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean III B.\(^{242}\)
Context: ?\(^{243}\)

\textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.306 no.5, fig.36:5.

\(^{234}\)\textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.318 no.3.

\(^{235}\)\textit{Kiton-Bamboula}, p.130 no.6.

\(^{236}\)Implied by the FS 36 designation assigned in \textit{Kiton-Bamboula}, p.130 no.6.

\(^{237}\)\textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.318 no.3.

\(^{238}\)Sud Acropole, maison, tombe de Patila-wa(?), topo.pt.4498: \textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.318 no.3.

\(^{239}\)\textit{Kiton-Bamboula}, p.130 no.6.

\(^{240}\)Mark not discernible in published drawing; described as "signe triangulaire," \textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.306 no.5.

\(^{241}\)\textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.306 no.5.

\(^{242}\)\textit{Ugaritica} VII, 306.

\(^{243}\)Région à l’est du grand Palais*: \textit{Ugaritica} VII, p.306 no.5.
RAS SHAMRA T.IV pt.14
Mission de Ras Shamra (C.F. Schaeffer).

Single sign [#11A] incised into handle. **Before firing.**

Handle and shoulder fragment. **FS 36**
Shoulder panels filled with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: End Ugarit Récent 2 or early Ugarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

**Ugaritica II**, p.228 no.27, fig.96:27.

---

**MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1b**

One handle incised with single sign [#26A]. **After firing.**

Almost complete above the shoulder; all three handles preserved. **FS 36**
Shoulder panels filled with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean III.B.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

**Ugaritica II**, p.156 no.20, fig.60:20, which is presumably the same as the marked vessel mentioned on p.154 no.1b, fig.59:1b, also fig.125:6.

---

244 **Ugaritica II**, 228.
245 **Leonard**, p.6 no.19.
246 **Ugaritica II**, 228.
247 **Leonard**, p.6 no.19.
248 **Ugaritica II**, 156.
249 **Leonard**, p.6 no.12.
250 **Leonard**, p.6 no.12.
251 **Ugaritica II**, 156.
252 **Leonard**, p.6 no.12.
MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1a

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #5? or #6A?] incised into a handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handed piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1a, fig.59:1a.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1c

Single sign [#56] incised into handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handed piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1c; fig.59:1c.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1d

Single sign [#31] incised into handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handed piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1d, fig.59:1d.

253 All information (after firing, shape, ware, context) for the following marked three-handed piriform jars from Minet el Beidha T.VI comes strictly from Ugaritica II, p.154: nos.1a, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, k, l (i.e. excluding 1b and 1j).

254 (Supra n.253).

255 (Supra n.253).
MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1e 256
Single sign [Frg., possibly #13?] incised into handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.
Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1e, fig.59:1e.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1f 257
Single sign [#9B] incised into handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.
Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1f, fig.59:1f.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1g 258
Single sign [#6B] incised into handle. After firing.
Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.
Tomb.
Ugaritica II, p.154 no.1g, fig.59:1g.

256 (Supra n.253).
257 (Supra n.253).
258 (Supra n.253).

Single sign [#28] incised into handle. After firing.

Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p. 154 no.1h, fig.59:1h.


Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p. 154 no.1i, fig.59:1i.


Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

Ugaritica II, p. 154 no.1k, fig.59:1k.

---

259 (Supra n.253).
260 (Supra n.253).
261 (Supra n.253).
MINET EL BEIDHA T.VII/1\(^{262}\)

Single sign [#22] incised into handle. After firing.

Handle fragment. Three-handled piriform jar.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: ʿUgarit Récent 3.

Tomb.

_Ugaritica_ II, p.154 no.1L, fig.59:1L.

---

MINET EL BEIDHA près de T.VII
Mission de Ras Shamra (C.F.Schaeffer).

Single sign [#3B] incised into handle. **Before firing.**\(^{263}\)

Handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36?\(^{264}\) Shoulder panels decorated with three(?) horizontal quirk chains (FM 48:15) framing field and as fill.

Ware: Mycenae IIIB.\(^{265}\)
Context: End ʿUgarit Récent 2 or early ʿUgarit Récent 3.\(^{266}\)

_Ugaritica_ II, p.228 no.25, fig.96:25.\(^{267}\)

---

\(^{262}\) (Supra n.253).

\(^{263}\) _Ugaritica_ II, 228.

\(^{264}\) Leonard, p.5 no.9.

\(^{265}\) Leonard, p.5 no.9.

\(^{266}\) _Ugaritica_ II, 228. The only description of the findspot is vague: "...près de T.VII, sur sol voisin...."

\(^{267}\) Leonard, p.5 no.9.
Piriform Jars

ALALAKH ATP/38/209 A
L.Woolley.

Single mark [#45] incised into handle.

Handle and shoulder fragment. FS 36.268 Shoulder panels framed above and below by double row of joining semicircles; horizontal row of U-pattern in center.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.269
Context: ?270


TELL ABU HAWAM 37-341
PAM.

Hamiton.

Single sign [#7B] incised into handle. After firing.272

Shoulder, body, and handle fragments. FS 36.273 Shoulder panels: joining semicircles frame field, quirk as fill.

Ware: (Levanto-)Mycenaean IIIB.274
Context275

Hamilton, *QDAP* 4 (1935) p.50 no.306w, p.53 no.31Aa, pl.XIX no.306w; Balensi, pp.133, 135, 429, 460, 555; catal. p.86, pls.32:4, 75, 137:7.276

268Leonard, p.5 no.7.
269Leonard, p.5 no.7.
271Leonard, p.5 no.7.
272Balensi, 555.
273Balensi, catal. p.86; more tenuously attributed to FS 36 by Leonard (p.5 no.10).
275Well in Building 52 and room 64v of citadel = stratum V1, Balensi, 133, 555. This stratum is dated by the Mycenaean wares found therein (Mycenaean IIIB), Balensi, 497-98.
276Leonard, p.5 no.10.
TELL ABU HAWAM 34-717

PAM.

Hamilton.

Single sign [#36B] incised into one handle. After firing. 277

Shoulder area; all three handles preserved. FS 36. 278 Each shoulder panel contains a cuttlefish and isolated semicircles.

Ware: (Levanto-)Mycenaean III B. 279

Context 280

Settlement? 281


277 Balensi, 555.

278 Balensi, catal. p.70; more tentatively attributed to FS 36 by Leonard, p.6 no.11.

279 MP, p.590 FS 36:3; Balensi, 10, 555; Leonard, p.6 no.11.

280 Stratum V (Balensi, 555), which is dated by Mycenaean III B pottery (Balensi, 497-98).

281 Associated with the "ciut del"; "...found in small fragments within a small area directly below and outside the north wall of 43 (Stratum IV)..." along with other Mycenaean, Cypriot, and local vessels, Hamilton, QDAP 4 (1935) 12.

282 MP, p.590 FS 36:3; Leonard, p.6 no.11.
TELL ARU HAWAM 37-418(?)

PAM.
Hamilton.

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #3A? or 3B?] incised into bottom of base. After firing. 283

Base fragment. FS 36? 284

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA. 285
Context 286

Settlement? 287

QDAP 4 (1935), p.53 no.310f; Balensi, pp.211, 429, 555; catal. p.108; pl.32:12,
75, 288

283 Balensi, 555, catal. p.108.

284 Balensi, p.555, catal. p.108; Leonard classifies this fragment as a piriform jar, FS 44-47, but not FS 36 (Leonard, p.10 no.88b).

285 Balensi, 555; Leonard assigns a broader chronological range, Mycenaean IIIA-B (Leonard, p.10 no.88b).

286 Stratum V 17, which is dated by Mycenaean IIIA-B pottery (Balensi, 211, 555).

287 G4, at a low level inside the city wall: Balensi, 211.

288 Leonard, p.10 no.88b.
TELL ABU HAWAM 47-1615/1
PAM.
Hamilton: 1932-1933.

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #5?] incised into handle. After firing. 289

Handle fragment. FS 36 or FS 164. 290

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIB. 291
Context: LC II A2 - Mycenaean IIIB. 292

Settlement?


TELL ABU HAWAM 47-1616
PAM.
Hamilton: 1932-1933.

Part of a single sign [Frg.] incised into handle. After firing. 293

Handle fragment. FS 35. 294

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean III A2-B. 295
Context: Mycenaean III A2 late - IIIB. 296

Settlement?


289Balensi, 555.

290Balensi, 555; FS 36 designation accepted for purposes of this text.

291Balensi, 226, 555.

292Under maison 41, below level IV =stratum V1 (Balensi, 56). Note that most Late Bronze Age strata at Tell Abu Hawam are dated by the Mycenaean sherds.

293Balensi, 555.

294Balensi, 555.

295Balensi, 226, 555.

296Stratum V1: Balensi, 162-64. Note that this stratum is dated by the Mycenaean sherds.
DEIR EL BALAH T.114
PAM?

Single sign [#25C] incised into one handle.

Apparently complete; all three handles preserved. FS 36.\(^{297}\) Shoulder panels filled with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: (Levanto-) Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{298}\)
Context: Late 13th century.\(^{299}\)

Tomb.


---

TIRYNS 27.427
Nauplion Museum.
1957.

Single sign [#11B] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{300}\)
Handle fragment.
Mycenaean IIIB by ware and context.\(^{301}\)

Dump.

Chadwick, *Mycena Tablet III* (1963) p.74 no.3; Döhl, *Kadmos* 18 (1979) pp.52-53 no.89, fig.7:89, pl.7:89.

---

\(^{297}\) *Deir el Balah*, 12.

\(^{298}\) *Deir el Balah*, 12.

\(^{299}\) *Deir el Balah*, 98.

\(^{300}\) Chadwick, *Mycena Tablets III*, 74.

\(^{301}\) From the "Epichosis," level K1-1 (second from top). See Table 1 (continued), supra. Also, Döhl, *Kadmos* 18 (1979) 53.
TIRYNS Neg. 562
1905.

Single sign [#11G] incised into one handle. After firing. 302

Two handles and shoulder fragment. (One handle with painted sign, one with incised sign, one missing). FS 35-36. 303 Shoulder panels with standing scale pattern with small circle in each scale.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA 304 or Mycenaean IIIIB. 305
Context: 7 306

Settlement?

Åkerström, Kadmos 13 (1974) p.43, p.44 pl.1:1, 3-4, p.45 fig.1:1,2,4, pp.46-47; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no. 88, fig. 7:88; Olivier, AA (1988) p.255 nos.9-10, p.257 fig.1:9-10, fig.4:9-10.

TIRYNS Acropolis?
Nauplion Museum?

Single sign [#42C] incised into handle. After firing. 307

Handle and shoulder fragment (Hdle.W: ca.2.0-2.5). Three-handed piriform jar. Shoulder panels with pendant scale pattern.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIIB. 308
Context not certain. 309


303 Åkerström, Kadmos 13 (1974) 46 no.4.
304 Olivier, AA (1988) p.255 no.9
309 From Mycenae or more probably from Tiryns (Åkerström, Kadmos 13 (1974) 43), certainly from the Argolid (Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 54). Olivier specifies the Tiryns acropolis (AA (1988) p.256 no.15).
FS 164: Large Fine-Ware Stirrup Jars

ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/52
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.
Single sign [#5,#9A] incised into each handle.
Almost complete (H:30.6). FS 164, DOL, banded.
Ware: IIIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Mycenaean (Furumark).
Context: After mid-LC II (LC IIIC).
Tomb.

SCE I, p.556 no.53, pl.XC row 2:2; SCE III, p.602 no.6, p.613 no.6.

310 Not all stirrup jars listed within this section are certainly identifiable as FS 164, and a few have been identified as other FS forms of large stirrup jars. Until clearer criteria than those provided by Furumark have been set forth with regard to classification of large stirrup jars, it seems most sensible to examine the marks on large stirrup jars together as a group. Handles included here, but without specific reference to shape, should be understood to fall generally within the class of fine-ware large stirrup jars by reason of the shape and size of the handle itself.

311 Listed as a coarse-ware vessel in Benson, Beryus 14 (1961) p.45 no.60; but photographs of a vase (Enk.Sw.T.18/55, infra) which closely parallels T.18/53 with respect to size, decoration and marking, and which was found in the same tomb depict a fine-ware vessel. Enk.T.18/53 is also listed as a parallel to Athienou 2134 + 3042/1 (infra), which is certainly a fine-ware stirrup jar. Therefore, until a fabric description can be obtained, T.18/53 is catalogued as a fine-ware stirrup jar, contra Benson, Beryus 14 (1961) p.45 no.60.

312 MP, p.610 FS 164:12; SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (a).

313 SCE I, 556; Chronology, 68; SCE IV:IC, 336.

314 SCE I, 557. See Table 1 (continued)

315 Enkomi-Alasia, p.324 fig.98; MP, p.610 FS 164:12; Chronology, 68; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:2,5; Minos V, p.21 no.222; Benson, Beryus 14 (1961) p.45 no.60; Raison, VIP, p.130 no.7; SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (a).
ENKOMI SWEDISH T.18/54\textsuperscript{316}
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Single sign [#7A, #9A] incised into each handle.

Almost complete (H:32). FS 164,\textsuperscript{317} DOL, banded.

Ware: IIIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Mycenaean (Furumark),\textsuperscript{318}
Context: After mid-LC II (LC IIC).\textsuperscript{319}

Tomb.

SCE I, p.556 no.54, pl.XC row 2:8; SCE III, p.602 no.9, p.613 no.9.\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{316}As with Enk.Sw.T.18/53 (supra no.311)—i.e. in comparison to Enk.Sw.T.18/55 and Athienou 2134 + 3042/1, this vase is here listed as fine-ware, contra Benson, Berytus 14 (1961) p.46 no.61.

\textsuperscript{317}MP, p.610 FS 164:13; SCE IV:1C, p.335 type 164 (b).

\textsuperscript{318}SCE I, 556; Chronology, 68; SCE IV:1C, 336.

\textsuperscript{319}SCE I, 557. See Table 1 (continued).

\textsuperscript{320}Enkomi-Alasia, p.324 fig.98, p.328 fig.100 no.13; MP, p.610 FS 164:13; Chronology, 68; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:4a, 5; Minos V, p.21 no.225; Benson, Berytus 14 (1961) p.46 no.61; Raison, VIP, p.130 no.7; SCE IV:1C, p.335 type 164 (b).
ENKOMISWEDISH T.18/55
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Single sign incised into each handle [#7B, #9A].

Complete (H:32.2). FS 164, Ware: MMIB, Levanto-Helladic (Sjöqvist) or Mycenaean (Furumark),
Context: After mid-LC II (LC IIIC), Tomb.

SCE I, p.556 no.55, pl.CXIX:6; SCE III, p.602 no.10, p.611 figs.316-17, p.613
no.10.

---

321 Classified as a coarse-ware stirrup jar in Benson, Berytus 14 (1961), but see SCE III, p.611 figs.316-
17 where the fabric seems almost certainly to be fine-ware. Also, listed as a parallel to Athienou 2134 +
3042/1 (infra), which is positively a fine-ware stirrup jar.

322 MP, p.610 FS 164:14; SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (c).

323 SCE I, 556; Chronology, 68; SCE IV:IC, 33.

324 SCE I, 557. See Table 1 (continued).

325 MP, p.610 FS 164:14; Chronology, 68; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:4a, 5; Minos V, p.21 no.226;
Berytus 14 (1961) p.46 no.62; Raison, VIP, p.130 no.7; SCE IV:IC p.335 type 164 (c).
Large fine-ware SJ

*ENKOMI BRITISH T.48/967
British Museum: C523.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1896.

Single sign [#3A, #25A? or B?] incised into each handle. Probably after firing.326

Complete (H:29.2). FS 167.327 DOL, banded.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.
Context: LC IIB-C.328

Tomb.

Excavations in Cyprus, p.48 fig.73 no.967; BMCV, p.103 C523.329

*ENKOMI 1957 SS
Cyprus Museum: 1957 SS.

Single sign [#10, Frg.] incised into each handle (one sign only partially preserved). After firing.330

Upper body fragment: fragments of both handles, false spout and shoulder.331 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.332
Provenience not specific: from a tomb excavated in 1957.333


326NH: note the very clean, sharp incisions.
327SCE IV:1C, p.338 type 167 (c), though Aström notes that it is hardly different from vases assigned to FS 164: “This is not unlike Type 164a-c [Enk.Sw.T.18/53-55], but owing to its size (29.2cm) it belongs to Type 167 according to Furumark’s system.” (FS 164, according to Furumark, is defined as having a height of at least 30 cm). Dated to IIIB (SCE IV:1C, 339).
328Courtois and Lagarde, Enkomi, 45.
329“Prolegomena,” p.280 II:2,10a; Minos V, p.20 no.202.
330NH.
331No FS shape specified, although Courtois (Alasia II, 289) does comment: “Le fragment de jarre mycénienne à évier (Mycénien IIIB) no. 15 relève d’un type relativement courant à Chypre et dans les pays du Levant durant le Chypriote Récent II.”
332Alasia II, p.285 no.15.
333Alasia II, p.285 no.15.
Large fine-ware SJ

*ATHIENOU 2134 + 3042/1
Cyprus Museum: 2134 + 3042/1.

Same sign [#6C, #6C] incised once each handle. After firing.334

Complete profile; both handles preserved, though one is damaged. FS 164.335 DOL, banded.336

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.337
Context: 14th-13th centuries BCE.338

Two adjacent pits, purposefully and simultaneously filled with luxury (i.e. many imported) items. In a settlement area in which there is evidence of much metalworking and cult activity.339


334NH; Athienou, 49.
337Athienou, 49.
339Athienou, 20, 22, 140. Same findspot as Athienou 2156 + 3112 (infra).
Large fine-ware SJ

*KITION II/5120
Larnaca Museum: II/5120.
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (V. Karageorghis): 1977.

Single sign [#30] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{340}\)
Handle fragment (Hdle. W:2.7).

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{341}\)
Context: LC IIIA.\(^{342}\)

Settlement (religious precinct): temple storeroom.
*Kition V1, 71; *Kition V2, p.103, p.284, p.286 pl.F, pls.CX, CXCII.

---

*KITION-BAMBOULA KEF-186
Larnaca Museum: KEF-186.

Part of a single incised sign [Frg., possibly #6C7]. After firing.\(^{343}\)
Fragmentary false spout disc and strap handle. DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{344}\)
Context: LC IIIA.\(^{345}\)
Tomb?

---

\(^{340}\)NH; *Kition V2, 103.

\(^{341}\)Kition V2, 103.

\(^{342}\)Area II, floor IIIA, Temple 4 room 38C: *Kition V2, 103; *Kition V1, 71, 277-78.

\(^{343}\)NH (contra M. Yon, A. Cauvet); see comments in text, Timing of Marking.

\(^{344}\)Kition-Bamboula, p.139 no.317.

\(^{345}\)LBA locus 314: *Kition-Bamboula, 42-43.
Large fine-ware SJs

*KALAVASOS-AIYOS DHIMITRIOS 40
Larnaca Museum: 40.

Same mark [#18A, #18A] incised into both handles. After firing.\textsuperscript{346}

Complete (H:27.5). Possibly FS 176.\textsuperscript{347} DOL, banded.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{348}
Context: LC IIC.\textsuperscript{349}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{350}


\textsuperscript{346}NH.

\textsuperscript{347}So classified by S. Heuck (RDAC (1981) p.74 no.21), though not, I believe, in KAD II).

\textsuperscript{348}KAD II: if this jar is indeed FS 176, then the Mycenaean IIIB date should be revised to extend into Mycenaean IIIC, as stated in Heuck, RDAC (1981) 68, 74.

\textsuperscript{349}See Table 1 (continued).

\textsuperscript{350}In area, building II A28 4.2 pit. The excavator informed me that, contrary to preliminary report (A.K. South, "Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios 1979: A Summary Report," RDAC (1980) 37), this context is no longer interpreted as a possible pit tomb.
Large fine-ware SJs

*KALAVASOS-AYIOS DHIMITRIOS 234*\(^\text{351}\)
Larnaca Museum: 40.
Vasilikos Valley Project (A. South Todd): 1980.

Part of a sign [Frg., possibly #397 or #427] incised into handle. After firing.\(^\text{352}\)
Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.25). *Probably* from a large stirrup jar (certainly from a closed vessel). DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC IIC.\(^\text{353}\)

Settlement: yard area (large depression filled with rubble).\(^\text{354}\)

*KAD II.*

---

*KALAVASOS-AYIOS DHIMITRIOS 600*  
KAD 600
Larnaca Museum: 600.
Vasilikos Valley Project (A. South Todd): 1983.

Single sign [§5] incised into one handle. After firing.\(^\text{355}\)
Two handles and disc of large stirrup jar. *Probably FS 164.*\(^\text{356}\) DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC IIC.\(^\text{357}\)

Settlement.\(^\text{358}\)

*KAD II.*

---

\(^{351}\)Possibly from same jar as KAD 619.

\(^{352}\)NH.

\(^{353}\)See Table 1 (continued).

\(^{354}\)SE Area, A43 3.2 (= immediately north of Building IX): "...a large depression filled with stone rubble. Among this rubble were many sherds, a high proportion of which are of interesting and varied types..." A.K. South, "Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios," *RDAC* (1982) 63.

\(^{355}\)NH.

\(^{356}\)NH.

\(^{357}\)See Table 1 (continued).

\(^{358}\)A.202 4.1 (Building III).
*KALAVASOS-AYIOS DHIMITRIOS 619*\(^{359}\)
Larnaca Museum: 619.
Vasilikos Valley Project (A.South Todd): 1983.

Single sign [#42A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{360}\)

Handle fragment. Probably from a stirrup jar (certainly from a closed vessel). DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC IIC,\(^{361}\)

Settlement: yard.\(^{362}\)

**KAD II.**

---

**LAPITHOS T.502/98c**\(^{363}\)
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (M.Markides): 1915.

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #147 or #157] incised into one (broken) handle.

Neck fragment with two handles. FS 164, possibly FS 167.\(^{364}\)

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{365}\)
Context: LC II-III A.\(^{366}\)

Tomb.

A.Pieridou, "A Tomb-Group from Lapithos 'Ayia Anastasia'," *RDAC* (1966) p.9 no.98c, pl.I:2.\(^{367}\)

---

\(^{359}\)Possibly from same jar as KAD 234.

\(^{360}\)Note that the incised grooves expose the buff core fabric, i.e. the core visible in these grooves was not exposed to firing. Thus, this mark was cut after firing and demonstrates that tools were available to cut clean, deep incisions into hard-fired Mycenaean ware. See supra, Timing of Marks.

\(^{361}\)See Table 1 (continued).

\(^{362}\)SE Area, A43W 3.4: north of Building IX.

\(^{363}\)Same as Ayia Anastasia T.2/98c.

\(^{364}\)SCE IV:1C, p.336 type 164 (Q), but *nb* also mentioned here as possibly FS 167(?).

\(^{365}\)RDAC (1966) p.9 no.98c.

\(^{366}\)RDAC (1966) 1-2, 11.

\(^{367}\)SCE IV:1C, p.336 type 164 (Q).
LARNACA MUSEUM 53
Larnaca Museum: 53.

Single sign [#34] incised into top of the disc.

Almost complete (H:31.5). FS 164 or FS 167.368 DOL, banded.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.369
Provenience unknown.

CVA Cyprus 1, p.46, p.48 fig.3:24, pl.40:1.370

CESNOLA 775
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Cesnola Collection: 775 (=74.51.736).
Cesnola: ca.1870.

Two signs [#6A, #44C] inscribed into one handle, one sign incised on the other handle
[#27].371 After firing.372

Apparently complete (H:38.2). FS 164.373 DOL, banded.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.374

No specific context known; said to be from Alambra (=Dhali).375

Cesnola, Atlas II, pl.XC no.775; Cesnola, Atlas III, Suppl. after pl.CXLI no.11;
Myres, Cesnola, pp.48-49 no.438, p.301, p.525.376

368FS 164 according to Åström [SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (n2)]; FS 167 according to Karageorghis
(CVA Cyprus 1, 46).
369CVA Cyprus 1, 46.
370SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (n2).
371These sign identifications are very tenuous as they are made on the basis of a very rough, small
sketch in Myres, Cesnola, 49.
372Cesnola, Atlas III, Suppl. after pl.CXLI no.11.
373SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (m).
374SCE IV:IC, 336.
375Cesnola, Atlas II, no.775; Cesnola, Atlas III, Suppl. after pl.CXLI no.11; Minos V, p.16 no.1.
376Minos V, p.16 no.166; SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (m).
GELIDONYA P23

Single sign [#5?]\(^{377}\) incised into disc.

Stirrup jar handle and fragmentary disc. FS 164?\(^{378}\)

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: ca.1200 BC.\(^{379}\)

Ship’s cargo.

*Gelidonya*, p.124 P23, fig.133:23.

\-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

BETH SHAN 34.1237
PAM: 34.1237. 1933.

Single sign [#11D] incised into handle. After firing\(^{380}\)

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.5) and fragmentary disc. (est.H of jar:40). DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\(^{381}\)

Settlement.\(^{382}\)


\-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

\(^{377}\)The description and drawing do not make clear whether the sign consists of a cross only, or a cross in the center of a circle.

\(^{378}\)The handle section and the shape of both handle and disc depicted in the illustration do not seem characteristic of FS 164; the parallels cited in the publication, however, are Enk.Sw.T.18/55 and Kourion C501, both certainly FS 164.

\(^{379}\)*Gelidonya*, 164-65.


\(^{381}\)Hankey, *BSA* 62 (1967) 127.

Tell Abu Hawam 37-417

PAM: 37-417.

Hamilton: 1934.

Part of a single sign [Frg., possibly #3A?] incised into handle. After firing. 383

Handle fragment. FS 164? 384 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean III B 385

Context: Mycenaean IIIA late-III B 386

Settlement: Public building, possible military function. 387


383 Balensi, 178, 555.


386 Stratum V, dated by the Mycenaean pottery therein: Balensi, 555.

Large fine-ware SJ

BYBLOS K11/T.3

Single sign [#36A] incised into handle. Before firing. 388

Handle (Hdle.W: ca.3.5) fragment and attached body sherd. FS 164? 389 DOL.

Ware: Dated to Mycenaean IIIC by Salles, based entirely on the dating of motifs on other sherds thought by him to come from the same type of vessel. 390 However, these other fragments are not stirrup jar fragments, and in the absence of close contextual association, there is no reason that the date assigned to these other fragments should be applied to the stirrup jar handle.
Context: Very disturbed (LBA-Roman). 391

Tomb.


TIRYNS LXII 44/13 II

Single sign [#33B] incised into handle. After firing. 392

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.1). Stirrup jar? DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Out of context. 393


388 J.F. Salles, La necropole "K" de Byblos (ADPF 1980) 34.

389 Identified as a krater handle by Salles, but illustration (pl.XII:4) does not support this identification. S. Sheratt and P. Mountjoy kindly took the time to look at the published drawing and both agree that the illustrated fragment is a stirrup jar handle rather than a krater handle. P. Mountjoy thought that it was probably an FS 164 stirrup jar, to judge by the width and shape of the handle.

390 Salles, La necropole "K" de Byblos, p.34, 81 pl.13:5-8.

391 Salles, La necropole "K" de Byblos, 13, 15.


393 Found in lower citadel, S area, in level dating to 420/360 CE: Olivier, AA (1988) 255.
Large fine-ware SJs

TIRYNS LXIV 44/85 IIb
Nauplion Museum.
1979.

Single sign [#44B] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{394}\)

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3,2). Stirrup jar.\(^{395}\) DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LH IIIB2.\(^{396}\)

Settlement.


\(^{395}\)The publications of the marked stirrup jars found at Tiryans do not assign specific FS designations, probably because the material is extremely fragmentary. Most marked handles, however, can be identified as coming from stirrup jars (by preserved fragments of the attached disc), and the widths of those handles indicates that the stirrup jars were large. These large, but not certainly FS 164, stirrup jar handles from Tiryans are here included with the FS 164 jars since (1) given their date and size, most are probably from specifically FS 164 jars, and (2) since the typologies for larger varieties of stirrup jars have not yet been worked out clearly and no specific origins or functions are associated with certain varieties, at this point even if one were able to identify the specific shape from which a marked handle fragment came, that information would provide little further understanding of how the marks functioned. The marked vessels assigned to this section of the catalogue all have the following significant characteristics in common: they are large (ca.30cm and over), fine-ware, stirrup jars and it is these features which are considered significant in discussing possible reasons for the marks.

\(^{396}\)Lower citadel, south (open) area: Olivier, AA (1988) 256.
Large fine-ware SJs

TIRYS L XIII 44/61 III
Nauplion Museum.
1979.

Single sign [#31] incised into handle. After firing?
Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.4). Stirrup jar.
Ware: Mycenaean, pre-LH IIIC.
Context: LH IIIC fill.
Fill: settlement debris?


398 (Supra n. 395).
400 Olivier, AA (1988) 256.
Large fine-ware SJ

TIRYN S LXII 40/36 II
Nauplion Museum.
1976.

Single sign [#35C] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{402}

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.2). Stirrup jar.\textsuperscript{403} DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean, pre-LH IIIC.\textsuperscript{404}
Context: LH IIIC fill.\textsuperscript{405}

Fill: settlement debris?\textsuperscript{406}


\textsuperscript{402}Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.17.

\textsuperscript{403}(Supra n.395).

\textsuperscript{404}Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.17.

\textsuperscript{405}Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.17.

\textsuperscript{406}Above Building VI, North: Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.17.
TIRYNS LXI 367 IV/G
Nauplion Museum.
1981.

Single sign [Frg., possibly #23?] incised into handle. After firing.407

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.1). Stirrup jar.408 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean, possibly pre-LH IIIC.409
Context: LH IIIC.410

Settlement?411


---

TIRYNS Neg.639
Nauplion Museum? TI Neg.639

Single sign [#35A] incised into handle. After firing.412

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:ca.2.5). Stirrup or piriform jar.413 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.414
No specific context.

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1970) p.52 no.87, fig.7:87.

---


408 (Supra n.395).


412 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.

413 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no.87. Designated as a stirrup jar for purposes of this text.

414 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no.87.
TIRYNIS IAI 183
Nauplion Museum.
1968.

Single sign [#5] incised into handle. After firing.415
Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.4). Stirrup jar.416 DOL.
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Probably LH IIIB.417

Settlement.

TIRYNIS LXI 42/70 XII
Nauplion Museum.
1981.

Single sign [#7B] incised into handle. After firing.418
Handle fragment (Hdle.W:2.8). Stirrup jar.419 DOL.
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: (LH IIIB1 end) or LH IIIB2.420

Settlement.

---

416(Supra n.395).
417Lower citadel, in area of Bâtiment II: Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.16.
419(Supra n.395).
Large fine-ware SJs

TIRYNS 27.428
Nauplion Museum: 27.428.

Two handles [Frg., #9A] each with a single sign (one only partially preserved) [#9, Frg.]. After firing. 421

Disc and two handle fragments (Hdle.W:2.5; disc dia.:6.4). Stirrup jar. 422 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean III B. 423
Context: LH III B2. 424

Dump: settlement debris?

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.50 no.81, fig.6:81, pl.VII:81.

TIRYNS 27.429
Nauplia Museum: 27.429.

Two handles, each with a single sign (one only partially preserved) [#7B, Frg.]. After firing. 425

Disc and handle (Hdle.W:2.6, disc dia.:6.2). Stirrup jar. 426 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean III B. 427
Context: LH III B2. 428

Dump: settlement debris?

Chadwick, Mycenae Tablets III, p.73:1, p.74 no.1; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) pp.50-51 no.82, fig.6:82, pl.VII:82.

421 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.
422 (Supra n.395).
423 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.50 no.81.
424 Epichosis: Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.50 no.81. See Table 1 (continued).
425 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.
426 (Supra n.395).
427 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.50 no.82.
428 Epichosis, level K1-2 (lowest): Chadwick, Mycenae Tablets III, p.74 no.1; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979), p.50 no.82. See Table 1 (continued).
Large fine-ware SJs

TIRYNS 27.430
Nauplion Museum: 27.430.

Single sign [#45] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{429}

Fragmentary disc and handle (Hdle.W:3.3, disc dia.:5.6). Stirrup jar.\textsuperscript{430} DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{431}
Context: LH IIIB2.\textsuperscript{432}

Dump: settlement debris?

Chadwick, \textit{Mycenae Tablets} III, p.73:5, p.74 no.5; Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.83, fig.6:83, pl.VII:83.

\hline
TIRYNS 27.431
Nauplion Museum: 27.431.

Single sign [#9A] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{433}

Handle and disc fragment (Hdle.W:3.2). Stirrup jar.\textsuperscript{434} DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{435}
Context: LH IIIB2.\textsuperscript{436}

Dump: settlement debris?

Chadwick, \textit{Mycenae Tablets} III, p.73:2, p.74 no.2; Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.84, fig.6:84, pl.VII:4.

\hline
\textsuperscript{429}Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) 50.

\textsuperscript{430}(Supra n.395).

\textsuperscript{431}Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.83.

\textsuperscript{432}Epichosis (unstratified): Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.83; Chadwick, \textit{Mycenae Tablets} III, p.74 no.5. See Table 1 (continued).

\textsuperscript{433}Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) 50.

\textsuperscript{434}(Supra n.395).

\textsuperscript{435}Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.84.

\textsuperscript{436}Epichosis (unstratified): Chadwick, \textit{Mycenaean Tablets} III, p.74 no.2; Döhl, \textit{Kadmos} 18 (1979) p.51 no.84. See Table 1 (continued).
Large fine-ware SJs

TIRYNS 27.432
Nauplion Museum: 27.432.


Complete handle and disc fragment (Hdle.W:3.5). Stirrup jar.438 DOL.

Ware: Late Mycenaean IIIIB.439
Context: LH IIIB2.440

Dump: settlement debris?

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.51 no.85, fig.6:85, pl.VII:85.

TIRYNS 27.433
Nauplion Museum: 27.433.

Sign [#50] incised into handle. After firing.441

Handle and disc fragment (Hdle.W:3.1). Stirrup jar.442 DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIIB.443
Context: LH IIIB2.444

Dump: settlement debris?

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no.86, fig.6:86, pl.VII:86.

---

437Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.

438(Supra n.395).

439Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.51 no.85.

440Epichosis: Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.51 no.85. See Table 1 (continued).

441Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.

442(Supra n.395).

443Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no.86.

444Epichosis: Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.52 no.86. See Table 1 (continued).
TIRYNS LXi43/9 XV
Nauplion Museum.
1983.

Same sign [#45, #45] incised into each handle. After firing.445

Upper fragment of stirrup jar: two handles, false spout, disc, and some shoulder fragments (Hdle.W: 2.9, disc dia.: ca. 6.0). Stirrup jar.446 DOL.

Ware: Mycenae.
Context: LH III B1 (late).447

Fill: settlement debris.

Olivier, AA (1988) p. 255 no. 12, p. 257 fig. 1: 12, p. 264 fig. 4: 12.

MYCENAE Anm.57 nr.1

Single sign [#6A, #42D] incised into each handle.

Disc and two handle fragments (Hdle.W: ca. 3.5, disc dia.: ca. 5.8). Stirrup jar.448 DOL.

Ware: Mycenae.

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p. 51 no. 82, fig. 6.


446 (Supra n. 395).


448 (Supra n. 395).
Large fine-ware SJs

**ASINE**


Part of a single sign [#38] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{449}\)

Handle fragment (Hdle.W: 3.2). Probably stirrup jar.\(^{450}\)

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LH IIIA-IIIB.\(^{451}\)

Settlement.\(^{452}\)

B. Frizell, "A Late Helladic Graffito from Asine," *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 176-78.

\(^{449}\) Frizell, *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 176.

\(^{450}\) Frizell, *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 176.


\(^{452}\) East of the acropolis: Frizell, *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 176.

\(^{453}\) AD 19 (1964) Chr.134.

\(^{454}\) Remarks re: Tiryns stirrup jar fragments (supra no.395) apply here also.

\(^{455}\) Ash deposit: AD 19 (1964) Chr.134.

**MIDEA**

Incised sign [#44B] on one handle. After firing.\(^ {453}\)

False spout and disc, two handles and attached shoulder fragments (Hdle.W: ca.3.2, disc dia.: ca.7.0). Stirrup jar.\(^ {454}\) DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LH IIIB (end).\(^ {455}\)

Settlement?

FS 164: Large coarse-ware stirrup jars

ENKOMI FRENCH T.12/36

Single sign [#16F, #25E] incised into each handle.

Complete profile, except missing spout-rim (H:43). FS 164.457 DOL, single deep wavy line fills body panel.

Ware: IIIIB.458
Tomb.

_Missions en Chypre_, p.91 fig.37, p.141 no.36.459

---

456 To my knowledge, coarse stirrup jars are only found in large size, and thus all the marked coarse stirrup jars in this catalogue are classified together as FS 164: coarse. Handles included in this section, but without specific reference to shape should be understood to fall generally within the class of large coarse-ware stirrup jars by reason of the fabric, shape, and size of the fragment. All stirrup jar fragments identified as "Late Minoan" in publication are assumed to be so identified particularly with reference to a coarse fabric unless illustration or description provides other criteria (See, for example, Kitson T.97/4, infra, Other Stirrup Jars). Fragments are here labelled "Minoan" and "Helladic" in accordance with the designation published by the excavator, although these identifications should be understood to be provisional. The provenience(s) of this class of transport/storage jar is currently being investigated by R. Jones (Fitch Laboratory, British School of Archaeology, Athens) and H. Haskell (Southwestern University, Georgetown, TX).

457 SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (g).


ENKOMI 1962 no.8

Single sign [#49] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{460}\)

One complete handle and disc; fragmentary second handle and false disc (Hdle.W:3.2, disc dia.:6.7). DOL.

Ware: LM III B.\(^{461}\)
Context: LC II C.\(^{462}\)

Settlement?

Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1931, fig.138:10.

---

ENKOMI 1960 no.366
Cyprus Museum: 1960 no.366.

Part of a single sign [Frg.] incised into handle.

False spout, disc, and handle fragment (disc dia.:6.8). DOL.

Ware: LM III B.\(^{463}\)
Context: LC II C.\(^{464}\)

Settlement?


---

\(^{460}\) Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1931.

\(^{461}\) Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1931.

\(^{462}\) Quartier SW, topo.pt.737 2.30m depth: Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1931.

\(^{463}\) Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1920.

\(^{464}\) Quartier SE, topo.pt.522 1.50m depth: Courtois, *Corpus céramique d'Enkomi*, no.1920.
ENKOMI 1848/12
Larnaca Museum: 1848/12.

Single sign [Frg., #24B] incised into handle. According to Dikaios, "...traces of sign on
the second handle which is largely wanting."465 After firing.466

One complete handle and disc, stub of second handle.467 DOL.

Ware: LM IIIIB.468
Context: Early-middle LC IIC.469

Fill: settlement debris?470


465 Dikaios, Enkomi, 650.
466 NH.
467 Note: Only handle fragment with sign seen in museum; disc missing.
468 Dikaios, Enkomi, 650, 889.
469 Dikaios, Enkomi, 650, 889.
Large coarse-ware SJ

*ENKOMI 5903/4  
Cyprus Museum: 5903/4,  

Single sign [Frg., possibly #25B? or C?] incised into handle. After firing.  
Handle fragment, broken just below disc. DOL.

Ware: LM III B.  
Context: End LC IIC.  
Settlement: fill.


---

ENKOMI 4551/2  
Cyprus Museum?  

Single sign [#53] incised into handle.

Handle fragment.

Ware: LM III B.  
Context: LC IIC.

Slag dump.


---

471NH.  
Large coarse-ware SJ\textsuperscript{s}  

\textbf{ENKOMI 6009/5}  
Cyprus Museum?  

Part of a single sign [#217] incised into handle.  

Handle fragment.  

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ware: LM IIIB.}\textsuperscript{478}
\item \textit{Context: LC IIIC.}\textsuperscript{479}
\item \textit{Settlement.}\textsuperscript{480}
\end{itemize}


\textbf{*ENKOMI 5791/1}  
Cyprus Museum: 5791/1.  

Single sign [#45] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{481}  

Handle fragment. DOL.  

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ware: LM IIIB.}\textsuperscript{482}
\item \textit{Context: LC IIIC-III A.}\textsuperscript{483}
\item \textit{Settlement.}\textsuperscript{484}
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{478}Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 671, 889.  

\textsuperscript{479}Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 671, 889.  

\textsuperscript{480}Area I, O-P 0-2 north, under floor VI of Level IIIA room 46 (-13.76-13.10): Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 671.  

\textsuperscript{481}NH.  

\textsuperscript{482}Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 890.  

\textsuperscript{483}Level III B-III A: Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 711, 890.  

\textsuperscript{484}Area I, room 39 A level -13.68: Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 711; no particular function indicated for this room: Dikaios, \textit{Enkomi}, 186-87.
Large coarse-ware SJs

*ATHIENOU 2156+3112
Larnaca Museum: 2156 + 3112.

Single sign [#18B] incised into handle. After firing. 485
Almost complete: neck and spout broken off, one extant handle (est.H:42). FS 164.
DOL. Pair of suspended antithetic spirals on shoulder opposite spout; deep continuous
wavy line fills belly zone.

Ware: LM III-B. 486
Context: 14th-13th centuries BCE. 487

Two adjacent pits, purposefully and simultaneously filled with luxury (i.e. many
imported) items. In a settlement area where there is evidence of much metalworking and
cult activity. 488

Athienou, p.51 fig.15:2, pp.52-53, p.122 fig.55:6, p.123, pl.17:2-3, pl.40:1. 489

---

485NH; Athienou, 52.
486Athienou, 52. (Identification as FS 164 by NH).
487Stratum III loci 552 and 637: Athienou, 22, 23, 52, 139.
488Athienou, 20, 22, 140. Same findspot as Athienou 2134+3042/1.
489T.Dohan, "Minoan Elements and Influence at Athienou, Cyprus," in Acts Cyprus/Crete, pp.174-75,
pl.XX:2.
*PYLA-KOKKINOKRELOS 27
Cyprus Museum: 27.

Single sign [#26B] incised into handle. After firing. 490

Fragment of false spout disc, and complete handle (Hdle.W:3.6). DOL? (Possible traces of painted decoration).

Ware: LM III B. 491
Context: LC IIIC. 492

Settlement.

Pyla-Kokkinokremos, p.35, p.50, p.76 no.6, p.78 fig.6, pls.XXIII, XLIII.

*KITION II/3681A
Lamaca Museum: II/3681A.
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (V.Karageorghis): 1974.

Single sign [#87] incised into handle. After firing. 493

Handle fragment which includes partial disc. DOL.

Ware: LM III B(?). 494
Context: LC IIIA-B. 495

Well. 496


---

490NH; Pyla-Kokkinokremos, 35.
491Pyla-Kokkinokremos, 35, 50.
492Pyla-Kokkinokremos, 66-67.
493NH; Kition V2, 235.
494Kition V2, 235.
495Based on finds listed in: Kition V2, 241-42; also, Plans IV-VI.
496Well 6, Temple 4 (Room 38): Kition V2, 235.
Large coarse-ware SJs

Kourion B1129

University Museum, Philadelphia: 54-12-99.

Single sign [#33E] incised into one handle. Before or after firing?497

Base missing, but most of upper body complete (est.H:33). FS 164,498 DOL. Double deep wavy lines fill belly zone.

Ware: LM IIIb.499
Context: LC IIC.500

Settlement.

"Prolegomena," p.267 fig.11, p.277 no.82, p.277 fig.16:82, p.281 IV:4.501


498SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (t).


KOURION-BAMBOULA B1137

Episkopi Museum.\(^{502}\)


Part of a single sign [Frg.] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{503}\)

Handle fragment, broken off at top, near disc. FS 164.\(^{504}\)

Ware: LH IIIB?\(^{505}\)

Context: LC IIA.\(^{506}\)

Settlement.

"Prolegomena," p.268 no.6, p.277 fig.16:83, p.278 no.83, p.281 IV:6.\(^{507}\)

---

\(^{502}\) (Subr n.164).

\(^{503}\) "Prolegomena," p.277 class IV.

\(^{504}\) SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (v).

\(^{505}\) Kourion, Bamboula," AJA 64 (1960) 149; Benson, Berytus 14 (1961) 42; IIIB according to SCE IV:IC, 336, but this does not correspond with stratigraphic date.


*KOURION-RAMBOMA B1138
University Museum, Philadelphia.

Single sign [#6A] incised into disc.\(^{508}\) After firing.\(^{509}\)
An almost complete disc and stump of one handle (disc dia.:6.4). \textbf{FS 164}.\(^{510}\) DOL.

Ware: LH IIIb.\(^{511}\)
Stray.\(^{512}\)

Settlement?

"Prolegomena," pp.267-68, p.277 no.79, p.277 fig.16:79, p.281 IV:3.\(^{513}\)

\(^{508}\)"Prolegomena," p.277 no.79.

\(^{509}\)NH; "Prolegomena," 277.

\(^{510}\)SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (v).

\(^{511}\)Kourion, Bamboula," AJA 64 (1960) 149; Benson, Berytus 14 (1961) 42; SCE IV:IC, 336.

\(^{512}\)Area B, well, in an Iron Age deposit: Bamboula, 118.

KOURION-BAMBOULA B1139
Episkopi Museum?314

Single sign [#87] incised into handle. After firing.515
Neck, disc, and one handle with connecting fragment of shoulder (disc dia.:6.3). FS
164.516 DOL.

Ware: LH III B.517
Context: Stray.518

Settlement?

"Prolegomena," p.267 no.5, p.277 no.80, p.277 fig.16:80, p.281 IV:5.519

514( Supra n.164).
515"Prolegomena," 277.
516SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (v).
518"Prolegomena," p.277 no.80.
Large coarse-ware SJs

Kourion B1140

*KOURION-BAMBOULA B1140*
University Museum, Philadelphia.

Single sign [Frg.] incised on handle. After firing.\(^{520}\)

Fragment of disc and handle stump. FS 164.\(^{521}\) DOL.

Ware: LH IIIIB.\(^{522}\)
Context: LC IIIC.\(^{523}\)

Settlement.

"Prolegomena," p.267-68 no.1, p.277 no.81, p.277 fig.16:81, p.281 IV:1.\(^{524}\)

\(^{520}\)NH; "Prolegomena," 277.

\(^{521}\)SCE IV:3C, p.336 type 164 (v).


Large coarse-ware SJ

*KOURION C501*
British Museum: C501.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1895.

Each handle incised with the same sign [#3A, #3A]. After firing?

Complete profile; some body fragments missing (H:45). FS 164. DOL. Shoulder decorated with some sort of animal (bird?) motif drawn in outline; each side of body decorated with an elaborate octopus.

Ware: LH/LM IIIA2-IIIB.
Context: LC IIIB, or possibly earlier.

Tomb.


---

525NH: This piece was very puzzling to me. Grits were sliced and cut through by the incising tool, and in places doubled lines indicate retracing—these features are indicative of post-firing marking. On the other hand, the grooves themselves were generally very clear, sharp and deep—can this be done so neatly on such coarse ware after firing?

526MP, p.610 FS 164:16; *SCE* IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (6).

527Much debate about the place where this vase was made. Benson [*Beryus* 14 (1961) 42] argues for mainland Greece, while A.S.Murray, A.H.Smith, and H.B.Walters [*Excavations in Cyprus*, 74; *BMCV*, 99-100], Catling and V.Karageorgis [*"Minoika in Cyprus,"* BSA 55 (1960) 119] postulate a Minoan origin. IIIA2-B date cited by Benson [*Beryus* 14 (1961) 40] based on context (infra n.528) as well as style, *pace* MP, p.610 FS 164:16 (=IIIA2). Haskell (fc.) agrees with this date.

528Old Tomb 50 = New Tomb 26. This tomb not excavated stratigraphically, and the finds were barely recorded or published. Benson dates the tomb to LC IIIB based on the finds within it, as well as by comparison to a general pattern of luxurious tombs during LC IIIB at Kourion-Bamboulou. Tomb dated to late fourteenth/early thirteenth century BCE in *"Minoika in Cyprus,"* BSA 55 (1960) p.119 no.23.

*CM A1580 (KATYDHATA? STYLOP?)*

Cyprus Museum: A1580.

Each handle incised with the same sign [#15, #15]. After firing.

Nearly complete (H:43). FS 164. DOL, two elaborate octopi fill belly zone.

Ware: LM (IIIA2?) IIIB.

Markides, *ARCA* 1916, p.22; *CVA Cyprus* 1, pp.43-44, pl.38:1-3, fig.3:21.

---

530 Presented to the Cyprus Museum by G.C. Gunther. Provenience unclear. O. Masson [Minos V, p.14 no.1] believes this vase probably came from Katydhata, as Gunther was president of the Cyprus Mines Corporation at Skouriotissa. But *ARCA* 1916, p.22 states: "...it is said to have come from the village of Stylopi, near Famagusta."

531 NH; *CVA Cyprus* 1, 44.

532 MP, FS 164:17; *CVA Cyprus* 1, p.43; *SCE IV:IC*, p.335 type 164 (f).

533 IIIA2: MP, p.610 FS 164:17; IIIIB: *SCE IV:IC*, p.336; Minoan: *CVA Cyprus* 1, p.44.

*Dhenia-Kafkalla 1937/IV-13/1
Cyprus Museum: 1937/IV-13/1.

Single sign [17, #48] incised into each handle. After firing. 535

Upper body fragment: handles and disc complete, spout rim missing, sections of shoulder preserved. FS 164. 536 DOL. Single? wavy line fills belly zone.

Ware: LM IIIB. 537

Probably from a tomb.


---

*Dhenia-Kafkalla 1938/X-10/2
Cyprus Museum: 1938/X-10/2.

Single sign [#21] incised into handle. After firing. 539

Upper body fragment: complete handles and false spout, spout broken, most of shoulder preserved. FS 164. 540 DOL, octopus design in belly zone. 541

Ware: LM IIIB. 542

From a looted tomb.


---


536SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (n).

537Raison, VIP, p.25 no.116: dated to IIIB on the basis of the octopus motif.

538Raison, VIP, p.23 no.110, p.25 no.116, p.34 no.125; SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (n); Haskell (fc.) DHE 02.

539NH.

540SCE IV:IC, pp.335-36 type 164 (p).

541"Minoika in Cyprus," BSA 55 (1960) p.119 no.27.

AKANTHOU-MOULOS 1961/VIII-12/1
Cyprus Museum?

Single sign [Frq., possibly #6A?] incised into handle. After firing.544

Handle fragment. FS 164.545

Ware: LM IIIB.546

Surface find; probably from a tomb.547


543 "Minoika in Cyprus," BSA 55 (1960) p.119 no.27, pl.29d; Raison, VIP, p.23 no.110, p.25 no.116, p.34 no.125; SCE IV:IC, pp.335-36 type 164 (p).


548 SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (l).
Large coarse-ware SJs

*AKANTHOU-MOULOS CS 997 no.31
Archaeological Survey of Cyprus Collections: CS 997.549

Single sign [#19A, #52C7] incised into each handle.550 After firing.551

Two handle fragments. FS 164.552

Ware: LM IIIB.553

Surface find; probably from a tomb.554


549 The sherd itself is labelled CS 997, contra the number CS 990 reported in "Minoika in Cyprus," BSA 55 (1960) p.120 no.140.

550 I was able to find and examine only one handle/sign [#19A] from this vase in the museum storerooms.


552 SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (k).


555 SCE IV:IC, p.335 type 164 (k); Haskell (fc.) AKM O3.
Large coarse-ware SIs

*AKANTHOU-MOULOS CS 997 no.30
Archaeological Survey of Cyprus Collections: CS 997. 556

Three parallel lines [2] incised into handle. After firing. 557

Upper body fragment: false neck, both handles, and part of shoulder preserved. FS 164. 558

Ware: LM III B. 559

Surface find; probably from a tomb. 560

"Minoika in Cyprus," BSA 55 (1960) p.120-21 no.30. 561

SAN ANTONIO 86-1-34 G(7) 562
San Antonio: 86-1-34 G(17).

Same sign [8R] incised into each handle.

Complete. FS 164. 563 DOL. Elaborate octopus decoration fills belly zone.

Probably from Cyprus.

H. Haskell (fc.).

556 (Supra n.549).


558 SCE IV:1C, p.335 type 164 (j).

559 "Minoika in Cyprus," BSA 55 (1960) 121; SCE IV:1C, p.335 type 164 (j).


561 Kalopitésia, 166; SCE IV:1C, p.335 type 164 (j); Haskell (fc.) AKM O2.

562 This vase brought to my attention kindness of H. Haskell.

563 NH.
ERLANGEN I/335
Kunstsammlung der Universität Erlangen: Inv. Nr. I 335.

Single sign [ #25A? or B?, #35C] incised into each handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{564}

Upper body fragment, includes both handles, false spout, and spout (est.H:30+). FS 164,\textsuperscript{565} DOL. Not likely to be an octopus jar.\textsuperscript{566}

Ware: IIIB.\textsuperscript{567}

From Cyprus.


\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{564}Buchholz, AA (1963) col.35.
\textsuperscript{565}Buchholz, AA (1963) col.34; SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (v2).
\textsuperscript{566}H.Haskell, personal communication, 6. June. 89.
\textsuperscript{567}Buchholz, AA (1963) col.34; SCE IV:IC,336.
\textsuperscript{568}SCE IV:IC, p.336 type 164 (v2).
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
MINET EL BEIDHA T.III
Louvre.

Single sign [#31] incised into one handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{569}

Complete (H:26.5), FS 164.\textsuperscript{570} DOL. Triple wavy band on shoulder; single deep wavy line filling belly zone.

Ware: LM III-B.\textsuperscript{571}
Context: Ugarit Récent 2-3.\textsuperscript{572}

Tomb.\textsuperscript{573}

\textit{Ugaritica} II, p.144 no.15, fig.54:15; \textit{Ugaritica} III, p.234, p.235 fig.205:1.\textsuperscript{574}

\textsuperscript{569}\textit{Ugaritica} II, 144; Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.13.

\textsuperscript{570}NH.

\textsuperscript{571}Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.13.

\textsuperscript{572}\textit{Ugaritica} II, 144. See note appended to Table 1.

\textsuperscript{573}Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, 151: "From Tomb 3 (1929), an imposing ashlar construction. The contents include Myc. III-B early and mature pottery and figurines, BR II, WS II, a calcite jar, and the fine ivory Mistress of the Animals, wearing a skirt in Minoan style and flanked by goats. A stone anchor was at the top of the stepped dromos."

\textsuperscript{574}V. Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.13.
MINET EL REIDHA T.V
Louvre: AO 16093.

Single sign [#17, #25D] incised into each handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{575}

Almost complete (base missing) (pres.H:34,5). FS 164.\textsuperscript{576} DOL. Squiggled lines casually distributed in shoulder area; single deep wavy line fills belly zone.

Ware: LM IIIB.\textsuperscript{577}
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.\textsuperscript{578}
Tomb.\textsuperscript{579}

\textit{Ugaritica} II, p.152 no.15, fig.58:15; \textit{Ugaritica} III, p.234, p.235 fig.205:3-4.\textsuperscript{580}

---

\textsuperscript{575}\textit{Ugaritica} II, p.152; Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.12.

\textsuperscript{576}NH.

\textsuperscript{577}Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.12.

\textsuperscript{578}\textit{Ugaritica} II, 152; see note Table 1 (continued).

\textsuperscript{579}Hankey, \textit{Acts Cyprus/Crete}, p.151 no.12: "From Tomb 5 (1932), built of ashlar masonry with stepped dromos, with a wide range of Myc. IIIB early and mature pottery."

Large coarse-ware SJs

MeB Dep.213

MINET EL BEIDHA Dep.213 Tr.8.1V
Louvre: AO 14932.

Single sign [#6A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{581}\)

Complete profile (H:60). FS 164.\(^{582}\) LOD. Running spiral fills belly zone.

Ware: LM IIIA1.\(^{583}\)

Settlement.\(^{584}\)

Schaeffer, *Syria* 13 (1932) pl.7:1; *Ugaritica* I, p.72, p.77, fig.68; *Ugaritica* II, pl.XXVII.\(^{585}\)

\-----------------------

MINET EL BEIDHA Tr.aux lampes
Louvre 83 AO 559.

Single sign [#54] incised into handle. **Before firing.**\(^{586}\)

False neck and handle fragment. DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 2.\(^{587}\)

Settlement.\(^{588}\)

*Ugaritica* II, pp.228-29, fig.96:19.\(^{589}\)


\(^{584}\)Hankey, *Acts Cyprus/Crete*, p.149 no.10. "From the rebuilding, following a fire, of a complex of small rooms and covered pits. The deposit, no.213, contained animal bones, more than a thousand pots, many of them BR II juglets, Egyptian stone vases, ivory boxes, but apparently no Mycenaean."

\(^{585}\)MP, p.610 FS 164:11; Benson, *Berytos* 14 (1961) p.48 no.70; Leonard p.29 no.272; Haskell (fc.) MIN 02.

\(^{586}\)Ugaritica II, 228.

\(^{587}\)See Table 1 (continued).

\(^{588}\)Ugaritica II, 228: "Tr. aux lampes, à côté d'un entonnoir à libation."
TELL ABU HAWAM 47-1615
PAM.
Hamilton: 1934.

Part of a single sign [#24A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{590}\)

Fragmentary disc and handle. FS 164.\(^{591}\) DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB\(^{592}\)
Context not certain.\(^{593}\)


ULLURU KW 1977
Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology; KW 1977.

Single sign [#6A, #7A] incised into each handle. After firing.\(^{594}\)

False spout, disc, and one handle completely preserved; second handle fragmentary; fragments of attached shoulder.

Ware: Mycenaean or Minoan?
Context: LH IIIA2 late.\(^{595}\)

Ship's cargo.

Publication forthcoming.

---

\(^{589}\) Leonard, p.43 no.502; Haskell (fc.) MIN 03.

\(^{590}\) Balensi, 555.

\(^{591}\) Balensi, p.555; catal. p.226.

\(^{592}\) Balensi, 555.

\(^{593}\) Stratum V1, locus 597: Balensi, 555.

\(^{594}\) NH.

\(^{595}\) C.Pulak, personal communication.
MAKRITIKHOS (Knossos)\textsuperscript{596} 
British School of Archaeology (S.Hood, P.de Jong): 1951.

Single sign [#16B] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{597}

Entire handle, fragmentary disc (Hdle. W: ca.3.5). DOL.

Ware: Minoan.
Context: LM IIIA2.\textsuperscript{598}

Settlement: domestic (kitchen?).\textsuperscript{599}

S. Hood and P. de Jong, "A Late Minoan III 'Kitchen' at Makritikhos (Knossos)," \textit{BSA} 53-54 (1958-1959) p.193 no.35, p.191 fig.8:35, pl.47c.

\hline
AMNISOS\textsuperscript{600}

Herakleion Museum: 18213.

Two signs [#7A?, #287] incised, apparently both into one handle.

Almost complete (H:39.3). DOL. Single deep wavy line (?) fills belly zone.

Ware: Minoan.
Context: LM IIIA2.\textsuperscript{601}

Settlement, possibly in a shrine.\textsuperscript{602}

Σ. Αλεξίου, "Αρχαιότητες και Μνημεία Κεντρικῆς και Ανατολ. Κρήτης," \textit{AD} 23 (1968) B'2 Chr. pp.402-3, pl.363b.\textsuperscript{603}

\hline

\textsuperscript{596}I thank S.Hood for bringing this piece to my attention.

\textsuperscript{597}Hood, \textit{BSA} 53-54 (1958-1959) p.193 no.35.

\textsuperscript{598}Hood, \textit{BSA} 53-54 (1958-1959) 182, 185.

\textsuperscript{599}Hood, \textit{BSA} 53-54 (1958-1959) 182.

\textsuperscript{600}I thank H.Haskell for this reference.

\textsuperscript{601}AD 23 (1968) B'2 Chr. p.403.

\textsuperscript{602}AD 23 (1968) B'2 Chr. pp.402-3.

\textsuperscript{603}Haskell (fc.) AM 01.
TRIPITI
Herakleion Museum: 9246.
Chance find: 1933.

Single sign [844B] incised into one handle.

Apparently complete. FS 164. DOL, banded.

Ware: LM IIIIB. No context.

Kanta, LM III, p.249, fig.9:5; Raison, VIP, p.20 no.108, fig.16 no.21.

KOMMOS IS

Single sign [844C] incised into handle. After firing, "or just possibly at bone dry stage before firing." Handle fragment. Stirrup jar(?) DOL.

Ware: Minoan, probably local (Mesara). Context: LM IIIA. Settlement: rubble.


---

604 Again, I thank H.Haskell for this reference.
605 Raison, VIP, fig.16.
606 Kanta, LM III, 249.
607 Bennet, Kommos I.
608 Identification as from a stirrup jar bolstered by the appearance of an incised mark, which extremely rarely occurs on any other coarse-ware shape.
609 Bennet, Kommos I.
611 Rubble included Cypriote sherds!
Other Stirrup Jars

*KITION T.9/74

Larnaca Museum: T.9/74, Cyrus Dept. of Antiquities (V.Karageorghis).

Single sign [#44A] incised into one handle. After firing. 612

Almost complete (missing base) (pres.H:16). DOL. Groups of concentric semi-circles on upper shoulder; rest of body banded.

Ware: LM III B. 613
Context: LC II C. 614

Tomb.

Kition I, p.50, p.145 no.A7, p.147 fig.1g. pls.XLIV, XCIII.

-----------------------

KOUKLIA KA 200

Kouklia Museum?

Single sign [#40] incised near top of handle.

Handle and shoulder fragment from an unspecified type of stirrup jar. 615

Ware: Mycenaean III. 616
Context: No date. 617


-----------------------

612NH; Kition I, 150.

613Kition I, 50.


615Possibly from an FS 164 jar, but description and drawing not clear enough to confirm this.

616Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) 93.

617From top-soil near siege-mound: Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) 93.
CM A1581
Cyprus Museum: A1581.
Provenience unknown.

Single sign [#3B] incised into one handle. After firing.618

Almost complete (upper part of spout missing) (H:21.5). FS 170.619 DOL. U-pattern fills upper shoulder area; banded body.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2.620

*CVA Cyprus 1, pp.24-25, fig.3:22.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI/1j

Single sign [#13] incised into handle. After firing.621

Handle and shoulder fragment. FS 173-174.622

Ware: Probably Mycenaean IIIB.623
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.624

Tomb.

*Ugaritic II, p.154 no.1j, fig.59:1j.

-----

618*CVA Cyprus 1, 25.
619*CVA Cyprus 1, 24.
620*CVA Cyprus 1, 25.
621*Ugaritic II, 154.

622This identification based on drawing of a stirrup jar which is said to be similar to the type of jar from which sherd 1j originates (*Ugaritic II, 154, compares 1j to fig.60:10). These FS shapes span both IIIB and early IIIIC but, as all other material from this tomb seems to be IIIB, this stirrup jar fragment probably dates also to IIIB rather than later. I thank S.Sherratt for taking time to discuss this with me.
623(Supra n.622).
624*Ugaritic II, 154; see Table 1 (continued).
RAS SHAMRA fig.96/13
Mission de Ras Shamra (C.F. Schaeffer).

Single sign [5] incised into handle. Before firing.\(^{625}\)

Stirrup jar handle, false disc, and shoulder fragment. FS 167.\(^{626}\) DOL.

Ware: Mycenaean III B.\(^{627}\)
Context: Ugarit Récént 3.\(^{628}\)

Ugaritica II, p.228 no.13, fig.96:13.\(^{629}\)

---

TELL ABU HAWAM 310Ab
Hamilton.

Single sign [6A] incised into handle. After firing.\(^{630}\)

Publications do not specify how much of this vase is preserved. FS 185A.\(^{631}\) DOL.

Ware: LM IIIB.\(^{632}\)
Context: LB II.\(^{533}\)

Hamilton, QDAP 4 (1935) p.53 no.310Ab (=306a); Balensi, pp.46, 501, 556; catal.p.77, pl.131:18.\(^{634}\)

---

\(^{625}\)This identification tentatively suggested by P. Mountjoy.

\(^{626}\)Both S. Sherratt and P. Mountjoy agree on assigning this date to this fragment.

\(^{627}\)Leonard, p.44 no.518.

\(^{630}\)Balensi, 555.

\(^{631}\)Balensi, p.555, catal. p.77.

\(^{632}\)Balensi, 46, FS 185 is, by definition, a Minoan shape; 306a has, according to Hankey (Acts Cyprus/Crete, 150) a non-Argolid composition.

\(^{633}\)E5, below foundation level of Stratum IV walls at 37.

\(^{634}\)Hankey, Acts Cyprus/Crete, 150.
Jugs and Jars

ENKOMLT.18/5
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet.
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two signs [#7A, #9A] incised into the handle.

Complete (H:24.4). FS 110. Enk.T.18/5
Pictorial style decoration: a bull on shoulder opposite the handle.

Ware: LH IIIB2.635
Context: LC IIC.637

Tomb.

SCE I, pp.554-55, pl.XC third row from top, furthest left; SCE III, p.602 no.8, p.613.638

---


636 Ripe Pictorial II: *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*, V.100, p.3. (MP, 602 lists this vase as IIIB).

637 T.18, side chamber: SCE I, 557; see Table 1 (continued).

Two signs [#7B, #9A] incised into handle. Also, possibly two signs [#20B? or 217, #44A] incised into base.639

Complete (H:22.5). FS 110.640 Pictorial style decoration: two grazing bulls on shoulder.

Ware: LH III B.641
Context: LC II C.642

Tomb.

SCE I, p.557 no.74, pl.XC third row from top, far right; SCE III, p.602 no.11, p.603 no.13, p.613, p.615 fig.320.643

639 The two signs on the base are listed in SCE III, p.603 no.13 (though note that the handle and base marks are not discussed in conjunction on p.613), but not mentioned in the excavator's original catalogue entry, SCE I, p.557 no.74. There is no way to determine which publication is in error without looking at the vases themselves. Until that has been done, I assume that Enk.T.18/74 carries marks on both handle and base.


641 Ripe Pictorial II: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.99.

642 Enkomi T.18, side-chamber: SCE I, p.557; Kalopsidha p.175; see Table 1 (continued).

643 MP, p.602 FS 110:19; Chronology, 68; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:1.11; Minos V, p.21 no.229; Kalopsidha, p.175 no.X(18); Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.99, p.205.
*KITION T.4+5/110
Two signs [#23A, #25A? or B?] incised into base. After firing. 644
Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2-B. 645
Context: LC IIC. 646
Tomb.
Kition I, p.21, p.145 no. A3, p.147 fig. 1c, pls.XXII, XXXVII, CXXVIII.

*KITION T.4+5/207
Two signs [#23, #25A? or D?] incised into base. After firing. 647
Fragment from the lower part of a jug? Banded decoration.
Ware: Mycenaean IIIB. 648
Context: LC IIC. 649
Tomb.
Kition I, p.32, p.145 no. A2, p.147 fig. 1b, pls.XXXVII, CXXVIII.

644 NH; Kition I, 145.
645 Kition I, 21.
646 Kition I, 41.
647 NH; Kition I, 32.
648 Kition I, 32.
649 Kition I, 41.
*KITION T.9/51
Cyrus Dept. of Antiquities (V.Karageorghis).

Jugs and Jars
Kit.T.9/51

Single sign [#19A] incised into handle. After firing. 650


Ware: Mycenaean IIIB. 652
Context: LC IIC. 653

Tomb.

Kition I, pp.47-48, p.145 no.A6, p.147 fig.1f, pls.XLVI, XCIII, CXL.

--------------------

KOUKLIJA KC 637
Kouklija Museum?

Single sign [#6A] incised near top of handle.

Jug or amphora(?) handle.

Ware: Mycenaean III. 654

Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) p.91 fig.2:37, p.92 no.37.

--------------------

650 NH; Kition I, 48, 145.
651 NH.
652 Kittyon I, 47.
654 Mitford, Kadmos X (1971) p.92 no.37.
KOUKLIKA KC 535
Koukla Museum?

Part of a single sign [#6A] incised into handle. 656
Jug or amphora (?) handle.

Ware: Mycenaean III. 657
Context:
Settlement. 658


---

656 "The left side of the sign is worn away." Mitford, *Kadmos* X (1971) p.92 no.38.


Closed Shapes

*ENKOMI 3595/1
Cyprus Museum: 3595/1.

Single sign [#18A] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{659}

Handle fragment. Small fine-ware stirrup jar?

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{660}
Context: LC IIIB.\textsuperscript{661}

Settlement.\textsuperscript{662}

Dikaios, Enkomi, p.750, p.891; pls.175/7, 319/101.

*HALA SULTAN TEKKE F1508 lyr.5
Larnaca, Kastro: HST F1508 lyr.5.
P.Åström.

Two horizontal strokes [#2?] incised at top of handle. Very worn: not able to discern if before or after firing.

Handle fragment: small, fine-ware stirrup jar? jug?

Ware: Mycenaean.

Settlement.

HST (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{659}NH.

\textsuperscript{660}Dikaios, Enkomi, 750, 891.

\textsuperscript{661}End Level IIIB, Area III, Th-I 8-10 east, in layer overlying floor II, -13.50-13.23: Dikaios, Enkomi, 891.

\textsuperscript{662}Room 23: no indication of a specific function: Dikaios, Enkomi, 142.
Closed Shapes

TIRYNS LXIV 44/85 VI
Nauplion Museum.
1982.

Single sign [#16E] incised into handle. After firing.663
Handle fragment. Amphora? hydria? jug?

Ware: LH IIIB2.664
Surface find.


TIRYNS 27.421
Nauplion Museum: 27.421.

Single sign [#25A] incised into handle. After firing.665
Handle and rim fragment. Hydria or amphora (FS 697).

Ware: LH IIIB (-C1?).666
Context:667

Dump: settlement debris?

Tiryns VIII, p.84 no.195 fig.47, pl.57; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.53 no.91, fig.7:91, pl.VII:91.

665Tiryns VIII, 84; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.
666Tiryns VIII, 84; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.53 no.91.
667Obere Schutzone von Bau 3 (Unterburg): Tiryns VIII, 84.
TI 27.246

TIRYNES 27.246

Nauplion Museum: 27.426.

Single sign [#25A] incised near top of handle. After firing.668

Handle fragment. Amphora or jug.

Ware: LH III B.669
Context: LH IIIB2.670

Dump: settlement debris?

Chadwick, Mycenae Tablets III, p.73:4, p.74 no.4; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) pp.53-54 no.92, fig.7:92, pl.VII:92.

TI LXI 36/67 VIII A


Single sign [#6A] incised into handle. After firing.671

Handle fragment. Amphora? hydria? jug?

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LH III B2.672

Settlement.


668 Chadwick, Mycenae Tablets III, p.74; Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.50.

669 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.54 no.92.

670 Epichosis (unstratified): Chadwick, Mycenae Tablets III, p.74 no.5; also, Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.53 no.92; see Table I (continued).


TIRYNS LXII 41/82 Xb
Nauplion Museum.

Single sign [#5] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{673}

Handle fragment. Amphora? hydria? jug?

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LH IIIB2.\textsuperscript{674}

Settlement.


\hline
TIRYNS LXII 43/56-58 IX
Nauplion Museum.
1979.

Single sign [#12] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{675}

Handle fragment. Amphora? hydria? jug?

Ware: Mycenaean, pre-LH IIIIC.\textsuperscript{676}
Context: LH IIIB2.\textsuperscript{677}

Settlement: fill.

Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.19, p.261 fig.3:19, pl.265 fig.5:19.

\hline

\textsuperscript{673}Olivier, AA (1988) p.259 no.25.

\textsuperscript{674}Maison 6, long corridor: Olivier, AA (1988) p.259 no.25.

\textsuperscript{675}Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.19.

\textsuperscript{676}Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.19.

\textsuperscript{677}Open passage south of Bâtiment 127, in LH IIIB2 fill: Olivier, AA (1988) p.256 no.19.
Closed Shapes

NAUPLION 27.418
Nauplion Museum: 27.418.

Part of a single sign [#43] near top of handle. After firing. 678

Handle with fragments of rim and shoulder attached. Amphora or large hydria.

Ware: LH IIIB. 679
Provenience known only to be Argolid, perhaps Tiryns.

Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.53 no.90, fig.7:90, pl. VII:90.

Hala Sultan Tekke 51.330 (Sydney)
Sydney, Nicholson Museum.

Possibly three signs incised after firing into a body fragment from a closed vessel. 680

Ware: "...described as Levanto-Helladic in the inventory, but it may be a later fabric (Black-on-Red?)." 681
Unstratified.

NOTE: Due to the uncertain nature of all elements of this object (signs which are difficult to discern, uncertain shape, fabric, and provenience) this piece is mentioned here in the catalogue for the sake of completeness, but is not considered in any analyses in the text above.

HST I, 61; HST III, p.6 fig.4, p.7.

678 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) 50.
679 Döhl, Kadmos 18 (1979) p.53 no.90.
680 "There are signs incised after firing resembling a V (fragmentary), an A with oblique transverse line and a V (fragmentary)." HST I, 61.
681 HST I, 61.
Open Shapes

Pictorial Vases

HALA SULTAN TEKKE C434
Supra: FS 36 three-handled piriform jars.

ENKOMI T.18/5
Supra: Jugs and Jars.

ENKOMI T.18/74
Supra: Jugs and Jars.

ENKOMI T.3/272
Stockholm.
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Single sign [H35A] incised into base.

Complete profile; apparently both handles preserved (H:46.5). Amorphoid krater FS 54.682 Pictorial style decoration: chariot scene.

Ware: (LH IIIA2 late-) LH IIIB1.683
Context: LC II.684

Tomb.

SCE I, p.484 no.272; SCE III, p.603 no.15, p.613 no.15, p.615 fig.321.685

682MP, p.593 FS 54:16.

683MP, p.593 FS 54; Ripe Pictorial I: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.11, p.3.

684SCE I, 476-77. Note: incorrectly recorded as coming from T.18, side-chamber in SCE III.

ENKOMLT.7/11
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet.
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two signs [#7A, #9A] into the lower part of the body near torus foot. After firing.

Lower part of a large amphoroid krater. Pictorial style decoration: bull fight?

Ware: LH IIIA1 early.686
Context: mid-LCII.687

Tomb.


ENKOMLT.18/6
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet.
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two signs [#3A? or B?, #9A] incised on base; single sign [#3A, #9A] incised into each handle.

Complete (H:52.5). Amphoroid krater FS 55.689 Pictorial style decoration: large and small bulls in meadow filled with birds.

Ware: LH IIIIB1.690
Context: LC IIIC.691

Tomb.

SCE I, p.555 no.6, pl.120:2; SCE III, p.602 no.3a-b, p.613 no.3, p.614 fig.319.692

686Early Pictorial I: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, III.3, p.3.
687SCE I, 55; nb chronology based on a limited number of finds.
689MP, p.593 FS 55:5.
690Ripe Pictorial I: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.40, p.3; IIIIB, according to MP, p.593 FS 55.
691T.18, side-chamber, see Table 1 (continued).
ENKOMIT.18/47
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.


Ware: LH IIIB1.694
Context: LC IIC.695

Tomb.

SCE I, p.556, pl.118:4; SCE III, p.602 no.12, p.613 no.12, p.614 fig.318.696

ENKOMIT.82
Cyprus Museum: A1546.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1896.

Single sign [#21] incised on the top of one handle.697


Ware: LH IIIB1.699

Tomb.

CVA Cyprus 1, p.10, fig.3:16, pl.10:1-3.700


694Ripe Pictorial I: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.67, p.3; IIIB, according to MP, p.633 FS 281.

695Enkomi T.18, side-chamber; see Table I (continued).

696MP, p.633 FS 281:18; Chronology, 68; "Prolegomena," pp.280-81 II:2,4a,5,9,21a; Minos V, p.21
no.228; Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.67, p.204; Courtois and Lagarce, Enkomi, 47-48.

697Note that there is also a painted sign (CVA Cyprus 1, fig.3:2) on the base.

698CVA Cyprus 1, 10.

699Ripe Pictorial I: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.55, p.3; IIIB, according to F.Stubbings,
MPL, p.37, pl.X.

700F.Stubbings, "Some Mycenaean Artists," BSA 46 (1951) pp.173-74, pl.19:f; F.Stubbings, MPL,
pl.X;1; V.Karageorghis, Mycenaean Art from Cyprus, Picture Book 3 (Dept. of Antiquities, Cyprus
1968) pl.94; H.-G. Buchholz and V.Karageorghis, Altdis und Altikypros (Tübingen 1971) no.1627;
H.-G. Buchholz, G.Johrens, I.Maull, "Jagd und Fischfang," in Archaeologia Homerica I (Göttingen
CM 1943/II-20/1
Cyprus Museum: 1943/II-20/1.

Two signs [#16D, #55] on base. After firing.701

Almost complete (H:26.1). Bell krater FS 281.702 Pictorial style decoration: bull and bull protome, by Protome Painter A.

Ware: LH IIIB2.703

CVA Cyprus 1, pp.11-12, pl.11:1-3, fig.3:17.704

1973) p.49 fig.9; Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.55, p.49, p.203; Courtois and Lagarde, Enkomi; 48.

701 CVA Cyprus 1, 12.

702 CVA Cyprus 1, 11.

703 Ripe Pictorial II: Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting, V.80, p.3.

Non-Pictorial Open Shapes

ENKOMIT.18/48
Stockholm?
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Two signs [#5, #9A], but it is not clear how they are disposed. *SCE I*, p.556 states that "On one handle is [sic] a graphical signs," which implies both signs on the same handle. The presence of a mark of separation supports this reconstruction. On the other hand, *SCE III*, p.602 describes the signs as "...inscribed on handles," which seems to indicate the more usual pattern of one sign per handle.

Complete profile; both handles preserved. Bell krater *FS 281*;"Panel pattern of squares, filled with U-shaped ornaments framed by vertical fringed lines; below the handle are conventionalized designs of small horses or bulls." *705*

Ware: LH III B. *707*
Context: LC II C. *708*

Tomb.

*SCE I*, p.556 no.48, pl.XC second row fourth from left; *SCE III*, p.602 no.5, p.613 no.5. *709*

---


*706 SCE I*, 556.

*707 MP*, p.633 *FS 281*; Levanto-Helladic according to Sjöqvist, *SCE I*, 556.

*708 Enkomi Tomb 18, lower burial; see note appended to Table 1.

*709 MP*, p.633 *FS 281*:19; "Prolegomena," p.280 II:2,5; *Minos V*, p.21 no.221.
ENKOMI T.78
Cyprus Museum: A1548.
British Museum Expedition (Turner Bequest): 1896.

[Frg]: "There are traces indicating that, on top of one of the handles at least, there was a sign of the CM syllabary, engraved after firing, of which only a stroke now survives." 710

Both handles missing; otherwise, complete profile (H:29). Deep krater FS 8. 711 Panel between handles decorated with frieze of stemmed spirals 712 and circle motives.

Ware: LH IIIA2 (-IIIB). 713

Tomb.

CVA Cyprus 1, pp.17-18, pl.16:1-2.

---------------------------------------------

ENKOMI 1848/11
Cyprus Museum?

Single sign [#3A] incised at mid-handle.

Fragmentary horizontal handle, from a deep bowl or krater.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB. 714
Context: early LC IIIC. 715

Fill: settlement debris?


710 CVA Cyprus 1, pp.17-18, pl.16:1-2.

711 Catalogued as FS 7 in CVA Cyprus 1, p.17, but shape looks closer to FS 8, according to criteria defined by P.Mountjoy in Mycenaean Decorated Pottery, 83-84.

712 A motif usually associated with FS 9, rather than FS 8: Mycenaean Decorated Pottery, 83, 110.

713 Defined as Mycenaean IIIA2 (ripe Mycenaean IIIA) in CVA Cyprus 1, pp.17-18. This date accords with the shape (FS 8 =III A2), though the stemmed spiral motif tends to be more characteristic of IIIB: Mycenaean Decorated Pottery, 83, 110.

714 Dikaios, Enkomi, p.650, 889.

ENKOMI-AYIOS IAKOVOS
Cyprus Survey Collections.

Single sign [#16C, though possibly #3A instead] incised on handle.716 After firing.717

Fragmentary krater handle.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2-B.718
Surface find.

H.Catling, "Unpublished Finds from Cyprus: I) Graffiti in the Late Cypriot Linear Script
II) Imported Greek Pottery at Chyтроi," RDAC (1988) p.326 no.5, p.327 fig.1:5,
pl.XLIV:5.

*ENKOMI 20.229
Cyprus Museum: 20.229.

Single sign [Frg., possibly #11 or #33] incised into handle. After firing.719

Handle fragment (Hdle.W:3.6). Probably from an amphoroid krater: FS 53, 54, or 55.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Disturbed, ranges LC I- LC IIIA.720
Tomb.

Alasia IV, p.135 fig.41:g, p.136.

716This handle also carries a dipinto: RDAC (1988) 326.
717RDAC (1988) 326.
718RDAC (1988) 326.
719NH; Alasia IV, 135 suggests also the possibility that the mark was incised while the fabric was
leather-hard.
720Tomb 1907, east chamber northern half: Alasia IV, 60-61, 156-57.
Two signs [#23A, #25A] inscribed into base. After firing.\textsuperscript{721}

Fragmentary deep bowl; complete profile (H:16.8). FS 279\textsuperscript{722} “The two shoulder zones between handles are decorated with oblique and horizontal rows of parallel chevrons and vertical parallel strokes.”\textsuperscript{723}

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2 or Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{724}

Context: LC IIC.\textsuperscript{725}

Tomb.

\textit{Kiton I, p.21, p.145 no.A1, p.147 fig.1a, pls.XXVIII, XXXVIII, CXXVII.}

---

\textsuperscript{721}NH; \textit{Kiton I, 145.}

\textsuperscript{722}This identification is a result of discussions with P.Mountjoy, whose help I acknowledge with thanks. \textit{Based on the published illustration, the roundness of the belly, the very short flaring lip and the overall size of this vessel suggest its identification as FS 279 rather than 281 or 284. S.Sherratt suggests that this bowl \textit{may} be Cretan.}

\textsuperscript{723}\textit{Kiton I, 21.}

\textsuperscript{724}IIIIB, according to the published report (\textit{Kiton I, p.21}), but IIIA2 if the identification as FS 281 is correct (supra n.722).

\textsuperscript{725}\textit{Kiton I, 41.}
*KITION T.4+5/116

Single sign [#25A] incised into base. After firing.\textsuperscript{726}

Fragmentary deep bowl; complete profile (H:14.4). FS 284.\textsuperscript{727} The whole surface of
the vase, inside and outside, except for the base, is covered with orange to dark brown
glossy paint.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2 or Mycenaeann IIIB.\textsuperscript{728}
Context: LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{729}

Tomb.

\textit{Kition} I, p.22, p.145 no.A4 fig.1d, pls.XXXVII, CXXVII.

*KITION II/3438
Larnaca Museum: II/3438.
Cyprus Dept. of Antiquities (V.Karageorghis): 1970.

One or two signs [Frg.] incised at exterior, below rim. After firing.\textsuperscript{730}

Fragmentary bowl (est.dia.:16.0). Horizontal bands around body, interior and exterior.

Ware: "Late Mycenaean IIIB." \textsuperscript{731}
Context: LC IIIA-IIIIB.\textsuperscript{732}

Settlement: religious precinct (main hall of temple).

\textit{Kition} V2, p.137, p.283 pl.C, pl.CXCIX.

\textsuperscript{726}NH; \textit{Kition} I, 145.

\textsuperscript{727}NH, P.Mountjoy, and S.Sherratt in separate discussions.

\textsuperscript{728}IIIB according to \textit{Kition} I, p.22; but both P.Mountjoy and S.Sherratt agree that this vase dates to
IIIA2 (late) by the standards of the Argolid. S.Sherratt points out, however, that this type was produced
in IIIB at Lefkandi.

\textsuperscript{729}\textit{Kition} I, 41.

\textsuperscript{730}NH.

\textsuperscript{731}\textit{Kition} V2, 137.

\textsuperscript{732}Floor III, Temple 2 room 24: \textit{Kition} V2, 105.
Single sign [Frg., possibly #45?] incised into base. After firing.\textsuperscript{733}

Bowl? Interior with concentric circles/spiral at base; band(s) below mid-body.

Ware: Mycenaean.

Publication forthcoming.

\underline{KOURION-BAMBOULA B1063}

Philadelphia: 49-12-100.


Single sign [#28] incised into base. After firing.\textsuperscript{734}

Nearly complete (H: 29.3). Deep bowl FS 281.\textsuperscript{735} Area between handles set off into panels by horizontal bands and vertical chain patterns and narrow bands. Bird in each panel.

Ware: Mycenaean IIIB.\textsuperscript{736}

Context: LC IIIB.\textsuperscript{737}

Tomb.

"Prolegomena," p.276 no.74, p.277 fig.15:74, p.281 II:23; \textit{Bamboula}, p.113, pl.32.\textsuperscript{738}

---

\textsuperscript{733}NH.

\textsuperscript{734}"Prolegomena," p.276 no.74.

\textsuperscript{735}NH.

\textsuperscript{736}\textit{Bamboula}, 110; specifically LH IIIB2 in "Prolegomena," p.276 no.74.

\textsuperscript{737}Tomb 6: "Prolegomena," p.276 no.274; \textit{Bamboula}, 113.

PIERIDES 235
Pierides Collection, Larnaca.

Two signs [#11E, #55] incised into one handle. After firing. 739

Complete (H:23.4). Kylix FS 255 or 256. 740 "The shoulder zone between the handles is decorated with a horizontal frieze of running spirals, and vertical groups of parallel chevrons above and below the spirals." 741

Ware: Mycenaean IIIA (IIIA2 early). 742

No context.

CVA Cyprus 2, pp.4-5, fig.7:1, pl.9:3-4.

CESNOLA 434
Cesnola Collection, New York Metropolitan Museum of Art: 434.
J.L. Myres.

Single sign [#41] incised on body below handle.

Fragments of a cup, including one handle. FS 220. 743 Body zone with angular multiple stem motif.

Ware: LH IIIA2. 744

No context.

Myres, Cesnola, p.47 no.434, p.525 no.434. 745

739 CVA Cyprus 2, 5.

740 P.S 255 according to CVA Cyprus 2, 4; FS 256 in my (NH) judgment, based on published illustrations.

741 CVA Cyprus 2, 5.

742 IIIA according to CVA Cyprus 2, 5; IIIA2 early if one accepts the FS 256 identification (Mycenaean Decorated Pottery, p.88). The decorative motif is characteristic of IIIA2, also.

743 P. Mountjoy kindly helped in making this identification.

744 Based on motif (P. Mountjoy, personal communication); identified generally as Cypro-Mycenaean by Myres, Cesnola, 47.

MINET EL BEIDHA T.VI
Single sign [#32] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{746}
Complete (H:17). Mug FS 226.\textsuperscript{747} Upper and lower zones divided into panels by columns of (dotted) triangles bordered by fine lines.
Ware: Mycenaean IIIA2-B1; panel decoration more characteristic of IIIB1.\textsuperscript{748}
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.\textsuperscript{749}
Tomb.
*Ugaritica* II, p.156 no.16, fig.60 no.16, fig.128 no.2.

\textbf{RAS SHAMRA pt.4574}
Single sign [#37] incised into body.\textsuperscript{750} After firing.\textsuperscript{751}
Body sherd. Krater?
Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: Ugarit Récent 3.\textsuperscript{752}
Settlement.

\textsuperscript{746}Ugaritica II, 156.
\textsuperscript{747}NH.
\textsuperscript{748}Mountjoy, *Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*, 112.
\textsuperscript{749}Tomb VI: *Ugaritica* II, 156; see note appended to Table 1.
\textsuperscript{750}Ugaritica VII, 336 speaks of two signs, but only one is shown in published illustration.
\textsuperscript{751}Ugaritica VII, 336.
\textsuperscript{752}Topo.pt.4574: *Ugaritica* VII, 336.
MIDEA (DENDRA)

Two parallel horizontal lines [#2] on one handle. Before firing.\textsuperscript{753}

Fragmentary deep bowl FS 284.\textsuperscript{754} Deep band at rim; handle zone decorated with columns of chevrons and zigzags.

Ware: LH IIIB2.\textsuperscript{755}
Context: End LH III B.\textsuperscript{756}

Settlement?


\textsuperscript{753}AD 19 (1964) 134.

\textsuperscript{754}NH.

\textsuperscript{755}Mounjoy, \textit{Mycenaean Decorated Pottery}, p.130 fig.161 Group B (deep bowls with deep rim band).

\textsuperscript{756}Ash deposit: \textit{AD} 19 (1964) 134.
Fragments

ENKOMI T.3
Swedish Cyprus Expedition: 1927-1931.

Single sign [#33A] incised into handle.

Handle fragment.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC II (disturbed).\textsuperscript{757}

Tomb.

\textit{SCE III, p.603 no.16, p.613 no.16}.\textsuperscript{758}

\hline

*KALAVASOS-AIYOS DHIMITRIOS 427

Larnaca Museum: 427.

Vasilikos Valley Project (A.South Todd):

Single sign [Frg., possibly #6A?] incised into handle. After firing.\textsuperscript{759}

Handle fragment.

Ware: Mycenaean.
Context: LC IIIC.\textsuperscript{760}

Settlement.

\textit{KAD II (fc.)}.  

\hline

\textsuperscript{757}\textit{SCE I, 476-77, 485}.

\textsuperscript{758}\textit{Minos V, p.21 no.232}.

\textsuperscript{759}NH.

\textsuperscript{760}\textit{See Table 1 (continued)}.   

"Incised cross on one handle, Cypriote Bronze Age sign on the other."\(^\text{762}\) [#5]

Handle fragment.

Ware: Mycenaean.

Tomb.\(^\text{763}\)

*Kalopsisida*, p.178 no.+(26).\(^\text{764}\)

---

*Hala Sultan Tekke* F1523A

Larnaca Kastro.

P. Aström.

Single sign [#23B?]. After firing.\(^\text{765}\)

Handle fragment.

Ware: Worn Mycenaean? Possibly Plain White Wheelmade (i.e. local fabric).

Settlement.

Publication forthcoming.

---

\(^{761}\) Same as Pyla-Asprolakkos T.1/112.

\(^{762}\) Kalopsisida p.178 no.+(26).

\(^{763}\) ARDA 1952, p.14 no.19.

\(^{764}\) Minos V, p.18 no.192.

\(^{765}\) NH.
APPENDIX II
INCISED MARKS ON LH/LM III COARSE WARES
(With the exception of large stirrup jars)

Tiryns

TI LXI 42/20 Xa R123b
Before firing: 2 short parallel (?) strokes on body near base.
Large closed vessel.
LH III B2 context.
Olivier, AA (1988) p.254 no.4, p.257 fig.1 no.4, p.264 fig.4 no.4.

TI LXII 43/95 X1a
Before firing: 3 short vertical strokes above a horizontal stroke; body.
Body sherd from a stirrup jar.
LH III B context.
Olivier, AA (1988) p.254 no.5, p.257 fig.1 no.5, p.264 fig.4 no.5.

TI LXIII 361
Before firing: 3 short parallel horizontal strokes.
Handle, jug or amphora.
LH III B context.
Olivier, AA (1988) p.254 no.6, p.257 fig.1 no.6, p.264 fig.4 no.6.

Thessaly

Kyparissos 3
After firing: 2 parallel horizontal lines, 4 parallel vertical lines, rectangle; on rim.
Pithos rim.
Surface find. "Mycenaean."

Gonnoi
Before firing: LB g; body.
Shape?
Surface find. "Mycenaean."

Ayia Irini

K.4270
Before firing: on underside of base, set in from one edge, a single stroke; set in from opposite edge, two strokes oblique to each other.
Base of jar.
LH III context "Local ware."
Ayia Irini:

K.4421  
Before firing: on underside of base, three short radiating lines.  
Base.  
LH III context. Possibly imported.  
Bikaki, Ayia Irini, p.40, pls. 15, 28.

K.1735  
Before firing: row of punched dashes, two on underside of base, one on body.  
Fragment of closed vessel.  
LH IIIA context. Imported.  
Bikaki, Ayia Irini, p.40, pls.15, 28.

K.4467  
Before firing: on underside of base, set in from edge, three parallel punched dashes, and a fourth in a second row.  
Fragment of closed vessel.  
LH IIIA 2? context. Imported.  
Bikaki, Ayia Irini, p.40, pls.15, 28.

K.2636  
Before firing: low on body, applied plastic crescent.  
Fragment of closed vessel.  
LH IIIA-B context. Imported?  
Bikaki, Ayia Irini, pp.40-41, pl.28.

Phylakopi

No.378  
Tripod leg.  
Possibly III C.  

Kommos

I50  
Before firing: simple sign similar to CM 28, on handle.  
Large coarse vessel.  
LM IIIA2 context. Possibly Cypriot?  

I21  
Before firing: single cross mark on underside of base.  
Conical cup.  
LM IIIB context.  
J. Bennet, Kommos I, no.6.
Kommos:

I

Before firing: LB j (=AB 28) or possibly re (=AB 27), on rim.
Large open vessel.
Surface find.
J. Bennet, Kommos I, no.8.

II

Before firing: fragmentary, on body.
Large open vessel.
Surface find.
J. Bennet, Kommos I, no.9.

I51

After firing: cross-sign, on handle.
Large coarse ware vessel.
LM IIIA1 context.
J. Bennet, Kommos I, no.11.

Coarse wares
APPENDIX III
CATALOGUE OF INCISED MARKS
ON LH/LM III VASES

#1
(a) HST ch.T.20B
(b) Enk.Sw.T.18/31

piriform jar? stirrup jar?
piriform jar: FS 36

#2
(a) Akanthou CS 997no.30
(b) Kourion B1115
(c) ?HST F1508 lyr.5

large SI, coarse: FS 164
piriform jar: FS 36
closed

Not pictured:
Midea

deep bowl: FS 284
Incised Marks

#1

(a)  (b)

#2

(a)*  (b)  (c)*
Incised Marks

#3A
(a) Kourion BM C501  large SJ, coarse: FS 164
(b) Enk.Br.T.48/967   large SJ, fine: FS 167
(c) Enk.Br.T.68       piriform jar: FS 36
(d) Enk.1848/11       krater or bowl
(e) Enk.Sw.T.18/58    piriform jar: FS 36

(f) ?Enk.Ay.Iak.      krater

Not pictured:
Enkomi 18/6

#3A or B?
(g) Enk.Sw.T.18/6    krater: FS 55 (pictorial) base
(h) TAH 34-418 (?)  piriform jar base

#3B
(a) Enk.Sw.T.18/31   piriform jar: FS 36
(b) Enk.Sw.T.18/47   krater: FS 281 (pictorial) base-ring
(c) MεB près T.VII  piriform jar: FS 36?
(d) CM A1581         stirrup jar

(e) ?TAH 37-417      large SJ, fine: FS 164?

#4
(a) KitBam KEF-370   piriform jar: FS 36
(b) KitBam K76-4992  piriform jar: FS 36
(c) HST F2003/2026   piriform jar: FS 36
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#5</th>
<th>Incised Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) RS 27.402</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) KAD 600</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Enk.Sw.T.18/53</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) TI LXII 41/82 Xb</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) RS fig.96/13</td>
<td>stirrup jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) TI A1 183</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Enk.Sw.T.18/48</td>
<td>krater: FS 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) ?Gelidonya P23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) ?MeB T.VI/1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) ?TAH 47-1615/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not pictured:  
Pyla-Verghi T.1/112  

Fragment
#6A
(a) Enk.Br.T.45
(b) CM A1650b
(c) Enk.1960 no.183
(d) RS T.VII
(e) Kouklia KC 665
(f) Cesnola 775
(g) MY Amm.57 nr.1
(h) Kourion B1138
(i) MeB Dep.213
(j) KW 1977
(k) TAH 310Ab
(l) Kouklia KC 637
(m) Kouklia KC 535
(n) TI LXI 36/67 VIIIa
(o) ?Enk.1949no.5113
(p) ?Apliki
(q) ?KAD 427
(r) ?Akanthou 1961/VIII-12/1
(s) ?MeB T.VI/1a

Incised Marks

piriform jar: FS 36
piriform jar: FS 36
piriform jar
piriform jar
piriform jar: FS 36?
piriform jar
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
large SJ, fine
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
disc
large SJ, coarse: FS 164 (LOD)
large SJ, coarse
large SJ, coarse
SJ
jar
jar
closed
piriform jar
piriform jar: FS 36
fragment
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
piriform jar
Incised Marks

(a)* (b)* (c) (d) (e)*

(f) (g) (h)* (i) (j)*

(k) (l) (m)* (n)

(o)* (p)* (q)* (r)* (s)
Incised Marks

#6B
McB T.VI/1g
piriform jar

#6C
(a) Athienou 2134+3042/1
large SJ, fine: FS 164
piriform jar: FS 36
(b) CM A1650a
large SJ, fine
(c) ?KitBam KEF-186
Incised Marks

#68

#6C

(a)*

(b)*

(c)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7A</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Incised Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Enk.Sw.T.18/54</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Enk.Sw.T.18/5</td>
<td>jar: FS 110 (pictorial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Enk.Sw.T.7/11</td>
<td>krater (pictorial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Enk.1420</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) KW 1977</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pictured: ?Amnisos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7A or B?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Incised Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7B</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Incised Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Enk.Sw.T.18/55</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) TAH 37-341</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) TI LXI 42/70 XII</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) TI 27.429</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Enk.Sw.T.18/74</td>
<td>jar: FS 110 (pictorial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#8</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Incised Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) ?Kit.II/3681A</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) ?Kourion B1139</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse: FS 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9A</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Incised Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/58</td>
<td>piriform jar, FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/31</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/77</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Enk.Br.T.68</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/55</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>HST F6031/596</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/53</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/54</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>HST T.1/52</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>TI 27.428</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>TI 27.431</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/5</td>
<td>jar: FS 110 (pictorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/74</td>
<td>jar: FS 110 (pictorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.7/11</td>
<td>krater (pictorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/6</td>
<td>krater: FS 55 (pictorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/48</td>
<td>krater: FS 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>Enk.Sw.T.18/47</td>
<td>krater: FS 281 (pictorial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#9B</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MeB T.VI/1f</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#10</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enk.1957.SS</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incised Marks

#11A
(a) Akhara T.1/13
(b) Kourion B1113
(c) RS 27.402
(d) KAD 535
(e) RS T.IV pt.14
(f) Enk.20.230

(g) ?RS T.VII (See Appendix 1, no.221). piriform jar: FS 36?

#11B
(a) HST 1971 3-25-2
(b) TI 27.427

piriform jar: FS 36
piriform jar

#11C?
RS T.VII

piriform jar: FS 36?

#11D
Beth Shan

large SJ, fine

#11E
(a) Akhara T.1/13
(b) Pierides 235

piriform jar: FS 36
kylix: FS 255 or 256

#11F
MeB T.VI/1i

piriform jar

#11G
Ti Neg.562

piriform jar

#11?
Enk.20.229

krater
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#12</th>
<th>1. TI LXII 43/56-58 IX</th>
<th>closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ?RS pt.4466</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#13</th>
<th>1. 1. MEB T.VI/1j</th>
<th>stirrup jar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ?MeB T.VI/1e</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#14</th>
<th>1. HST F2003/2036</th>
<th>piriform jar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. HST 98 12-1 311</td>
<td>piriform jar; FS 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #14 or #15? | Lapithos T.502/98c | large SJ, fine: FS 164? 167? |

| #15 | CM A 1580          | large SJ, coarse: FS 164 |
Incised Marks

#12
(a) 
(b) 

#13
(a) 
(b) 

#14
(a)* 
(b)* 

#15 

.
| #16A  | HST ch.T.20A | piriform jar? stirrup jar? |
| #16B  | Makritikhos | large SJ, coarse |
| #16C  | (a) HST 1948/III-4/3  | piriform jar |
|       | (b) Enk.Ay.Iak | krater |
| #16D  | CM 1943/II-20/1 | krater: FS 281 (pictorial) |
| #16E  | TI LXIV 44/85 VI | base |
| #16F  | Enk.Fr.T.12/36 | closed |
|       |               | large SJ, coarse: FS 164 |
Incised Marks

#16A

#16B

#16C (a) (b)

#16D

#16E

#16F
#17  
(a) Dhenia 1937/IV-13/1  
(b) ?MeB T.V  

large SJ, coarse: FS 164
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#18A  
(a) KAD 40  
(b) Enk.3595/1  

large SJ, fine: FS 167?  
closed

#18B  
Athienou 2156+3112  

large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#19A  
(a) Akanthou CS 997.no.31  
(b) Kit.T.9/51  

large SJ, coarse: FS 164  
jar: FS 105

#19B  
HST T.1/52  

piriform jar: FS 36
Incised Marks

#17

(a)*

#18A

(a)*

(b)*

#188

#19A

(a)*

(b)

#198
20A
(a) CM A1650b
Enk.Sw.T.18/57

20B or 21?
Enk.Sw.T.18/74

21
(a) Dhenia 1938/X-10/2
(b) Enk.T.82

Not pictured:
21?
Enk.6009/5

22
MeB T.VI/1L

Incised Marks

piriform jar: FS 36
piriform jar: FS 36
 base

jar: FS 110 (pictorial)
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
krater: FS 281 (pictorial)

large SJ, coarse

piriform jar
Incised Marks

#20A

(a)  

(b)  

#20B?  #21?

#21

(a)  

(b)  

#22

√
#23A
(a) Kit.T.4+5/110  
jar  
jar  
deep bowl: FS 279?

(b) Kit.T.4+5/207  

(c) Kit.T.4+5/108  

#23B
(a) Enk.Sw.T.18/47  
krater: FS 281 (pictorial)  
fragment  

(b) ?HST F1523A  

#24A
(a) Kit.T.4+5/107  
piriform jar: FS 36  
piriform jar: FS 36  
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

(b) Kourion B1114  

(c) RS T.1  

(d) TAH 47-1615  

#24B
Enk.1848/12  
large SJ, coarse  

#24C
Enk.Sw.T.18/47  
krater: FS 281 (pictorial)  
base-ring  

#25A
(a) Kit.T.4+5/116  
depth bowl: FS 284  
(b) Kit.T.4+5/108  
deep bowl: FS 279?  
(c) TI 27.421  
closed  
(d) TI 27.246  
closed

Incised Marks

#25A or B?
(a) Enk.Br.T.48/967  
large SJ, fine: FS 164  
(b) Kit.T.4+5/110  
jar  
(c) Erlangen  
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#25 B
Enk.Sw.T.11/24  
piriform jar: FS 36

#25B or C?
Enk.5903/4  
large SJ, coarse

#25 C
Deir el Balah T.114  
piriform jar: FS 36

#25 D
(a) Kit.T.4+5/207  
jar  
(b) MeB T.V  
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#25 E
Enk.Fr.T.12/36  
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#25?
TI LXI 36/7 IV/G  
large SJ, fine
Incised Marks

#25A

(a) *  (b) *  (c)  (d)

#25AYB?

(a) *  (b) *

#25B

(a)  (c)

#25B? C7

#25C

#25E

#25F
#26A
(a) MeB T.VI/1b
(b) HST F6031/644
(c) HST BM C379

piriform jar; FS 36?
small piriform jar?
piriform jar

#26B
PyIa-Kk 27

large SJ, coarse
Incised Marks

#26A

(a)  

(b)  

(c)*

#26B

*
#27
(a) Enk.Br.T.45
(b) Cesnola 775

Not pictured:
   RS "est du Grand Palais" piriform jar

#28
(a) MeB T.VI/1h
(b) Kourion B1063

Not pictured:
   ?Amnisos

#29
Kouklia KC 402

#30
Kit.II/5120

piriform jar: FS 36
large SJ, fine

piriform jar
large SJ, coarse

piriform jar
large SJ, fine
Incised Marks

#31
(a) TL LXIII 44/61 III
(b) MeB T.III
(c) MeB T.VI/1d

large SJ, fine
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
piriform jar

#32
(a) MeB T.VI/1k
(b) MeB T.VI

piriform jar
mug: FS 226

#33A
Enk.Sw.T.3

fragment

#33B
(a) TL LXII 44/13 II
(b) HST 51.330

large SJ, fine
piriform jar? stirrup jar?

#33C
HST 1971 3-25

piriform jar: FS 36

#33D
RS exc:1936

piriform jar: FS 36?

#33E
Kourion B1129

large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#33F
?Enk.20.229

krater
#34
(a) LM 53
(b) HST C434
(c) HST 98 12-1 310

large SJ, fine: FS 164? 167?
piriform jar: FS 36 (pictorial)
piriform jar: FS 36

#35 A
(a) Enk.T.3/272
(b) Enk.Sw.T.18/57
(c) TI Neg.639

krater: FS 54 (pictorial)
piriform jar: FS 36
stirrup jar? piriform jar?

#35 B
CM A 1650b

piriform jar: FS 36

#35 C
(a) TI LXII 40/36 II
(b) Erlangen

large SJ, fine
large SJ, coarse: FS 164
Incised Marks

#34
(a) 
(b)*
(c)*

#35A
(a) 
(b) 
(c)

#35B

#35C
# 36A
Byblos K.11/T.3
large SJ, fine: FS 164?

# 36B
TAH 34-717
piriform jar: FS 36

# 37
RS pt.4574
open

Incised Marks

body
#38
Asine

large SJ, fine

#39
(a) San Antonio

large SJ, coarse: FS 164

(b) ?KAD 234

?large SJ, fine

(c) ?HST F1548 lyr.4

piriform-jar?
#40
(a) KitBam K76-5592
(b) Kouklia KA 200

piriform jar: FS 36
stirrup jar

#41
Cesnola 434

cup: FS 220

#42 A
KAD 619

?large SJ, fine

#42 B
KitBam KEF-334 + KEF-372

piriform jar: FS 36

#42 C
(a) KitBam KEF-334 + KEF-372
(b) TI acrop?

piriform jar: FS 36
piriform jar

#42 D
MY Anm 57 nr.1

large SJ, fine

#42 E
KAD 234

?large SJ, fine

#43
Nauplia 27.418

closed
Incised Marks

(a)*

(b)

#40

#41

#42

#42A

#42B

#42C

(a)*

(b)

#42D

#42E

#43
#44A
(a) Enk.Sw.T.18/74
(b) Kit.T.9/74

jar: FS 110 (pictorial)

stirrup jar

#44B
(a) TI LXIV 44/85 IIb
(b) Midea
(c) Tripi
ti

large SJ, fine
large SJ, fine
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#44C
(a) Enk.Sw.T.11/24
(b) Kommos

piriform jar: FS 36
large SJ, coarse

(c) ?Kit.II/5375
(d) ?Cesnola 775

piriform jar
large SJ, fine: FS 164
Incised Marks

#44A

(a) X

(b)*

#44B

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

#44C

(a) X

(b) X

(c)* T

(d) X
Incised Marks

#45
(a) Enk.5791/1
(b) HST C434
(c) Alalakh
(d) TI LXI 43/9 XV
(e) TI 27.430
(f) 7HST F1756 lyr.3

large SJ, coarse
piriform jar: FS 36 (pictorial)
piriform jar: FS 36?
large SJ, fine
large SJ, fine

base

#46
KitBarn KEF-322

piriform jar: FS 36

#47
HST 98 12-1 310

piriform jar: FS 36

#48
Dhenia 1937/IV-13/1

large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#49
Enk.1962 no.8

large SJ, coarse

#50
TI 27.433

large SJ, fine

#51
TI 27.432

large SJ, fine
Incised Marks

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d) 

(e) 

(f) 

#45

#46

#47

#48

#49

#50

#51
#52A
HST 1953no.391
piriform jar

#52B
(a) HST F6031/648
(b) ?HST F6139/6056
piriform jar
piriform jar

#52C
Akanthou CS 997no.31
large SJ, coarse: FS 164

#53
Enk.4551/2
large SJ, coarse

#54
MeB Tr.aux lampes
large SJ, coarse

#55
(a) CM 1943/II-20/1
(b) Pierides 235
krater: FS 281 (pictorial)

#56
MeB T.VI/1c
kylix: FS 255 or 256

piriform jar

Incised Marks
base
### Fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Kourion B1112</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 45?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) TAH 37-418 (?)</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Kit.3438</td>
<td>bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Enk.5903/4</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) MeB T.VI/1a</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) TAH 47-1615/1</td>
<td>FS 36? FS 164?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) TAH 47-1616</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Enk.1957 SS</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) TAH 37.417</td>
<td>large SJ, fine: FS 164?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** printed upside down in this figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(j) Enk.20,229</td>
<td>krater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Enk.1960no.366</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) KAD 234</td>
<td>?large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) HST F1756 lyr.3</td>
<td>bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Kourion B1137</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Kourion B1140</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse: FS 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Akanthou 1961/VIII-12/1</td>
<td>large SJ, coarse: FS 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) Kit.I/687/1</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r) KAD 427</td>
<td>fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s) Maa 1954/2</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t) Enk.1949no.5113</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(u) Apiliki</td>
<td>piriform jar: FS 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) TI LXI 36/7 IV/G</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w) KitBam KEF-186</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) MeB T.VI/1e</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y) Lapithos T.502/98c</td>
<td>large SJ, fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(z) HST F6139/6056</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aa) HST F1548 lyr.4</td>
<td>piriform jar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incised Marks

- **base**
- **below rim**
- **disc**

**Not pictured:**

- TI 27.428
- TI 27.429
- Enk.T.78
- Kit.II/5375
- Enk.1848/11

- Large SJ, fine
- Large SJ, fine
- Krater: FS 8
- Piriform jar (see #44C)
- Large SJ, coarse
Incised Marks

(a)  (b)  (c)*  (d)*
(e)  (f)  (g)  
(h)*  (i)
(j)  
(k)  
(l)*  (m)*  (n)  (o)  (p)  
(q)*  
(r)*  (s)  (t)  (u)  
(v)  (w)*  (x)  (y)
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