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ABSTRACT

Archaeological practice has a major impact on the production of archaeological knowledge, as demonstrated by analysis of the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector of Ayia Irini (Kea, Greece), a small Bronze Age center in the Greek islands that flourished throughout much of the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C. The stratigraphy of the Northern Sector, a small, but long-occupied part of the settlement, has largely remained unpublished since being excavated in the 1960s and early 1970s. Studies of particular categories of artifacts, such as ceramics, depend on a firm understanding of find contexts. For this reason, one significant contribution of my thesis is the thorough documentation of the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector, a well-defined complex of rooms built next to the stone fortification wall that enclosed the site ca. 1700 B.C. and used systematically till the destruction and abandonment of the settlement ca. 1400 B.C. In the context of a discussion of the cultural history of the entire site, I delineate the formation processes that have been responsible for the stratigraphy which the excavators of the site observed. I document how the archaeological practices of the excavators have shaped the archaeological record of Ayia Irini and the potential interpretations of the record every bit as much as have past natural and cultural formation processes. My analysis thus contributes to filling a lacuna that has existed in archaeological publications of sites in the Mediterranean, where archaeologists have rarely concerned themselves either with the history of archaeology or archaeological practice. I intend this study to speak to archaeologists working in other places and time periods, as well as to my fellow Aegean prehistorians.
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INTRODUCTION

The present thesis focuses on the archaeological site of Ayia Irini, located on the island of Kea (Cyclades, Greece), which was excavated by J. L. Caskey in the 1960s and 70s. In writing this thesis my intent is two-fold. The primary goal of this dissertation is the study and presentation of the unpublished deposits from the Northern Sector of the site. In essence, the study continues the tradition of the publication program as established by Caskey and the Ayia Irini team, making available to the scholarly community one more area of the site. A second goal of the dissertation is to improve understanding of the processes through which archaeological practice conditions archaeological knowledge using the excavations at Ayia Irini as a case study.

The surviving finds and the archaeological documentation (excavation notebooks, pottery processing notebooks, sketches, architectural plans and stratigraphic sections, and various lists) constitute a body of evidence that is used to reconstruct the stratigraphic history of the Northern Sector of the site, to offer a plan of the area used during different time periods, and to clarify stratigraphic relationships. The same material provided the impetus for the study of the historical and intellectual structures within which the archaeological finds and data were produced.

Even though numerous publications about the site of Ayia Irini have appeared over the years, the Northern Sector has not enjoyed much attention. Some deposits are included in
“Period” publications,¹ but the Northern Sector, unlike House A or the Western Sector,² has not been studied in its entirety. For this reason, the stratigraphy in the area has not been well understood. “Disturbance and much recent denudation” of the stone blocks has made it difficult to determine the sequence of deposits,³ necessitating a careful approach to the archaeological material coming from the Northern Sector.

In spite of the lack of publications, the Northern Sector is a very important area. It includes a rather long stretch of the fortification wall of the town, with bastions and rooms adjacent to it, where the people of Ayia Irini lived, worked, and fought. The structures and the movable finds seem to indicate that these areas were used intensively from the end of the MBA (when the area was included within the confines of the town in Period V) through the Late Bronze Age IIIA period (hereafter LBA; Periods VI-VIII) and the Archaic/Classical period (and even during the Late Roman/Byzantine times) (Fig. 1 and Table 1).⁴

¹ Caskey (1979) codified the nomenclature for referring to the phases of the site. The term “Period” (Periods I through VIII) was used for the major stratigraphic phases at the site. For an explication of the relative and absolute chronology of each Period, see Tables 1 and 2. For the deposits that have been published in Period publications, see Wilson 1999, pp. 213-215; Overbeck 1989, pp. 5-7, p. 8, pp. 119-147, p. 181; and Davis 1986, pp. 12-14 and pp. 38-68.
² Cummer and Schofield 1984; Schofield forthcoming.
⁴ Earlier material is attested in the area of the Northern Sector. However, it is usually mixed with later material, except for the case of Group DF (Overbeck 1989, p. 181).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ceramic period</th>
<th>Relative chronology</th>
<th>Absolute chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I A</td>
<td>Latest Neolithic (Final Neolithic)</td>
<td>Second half of the 4th millennium B.C.(^7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B</td>
<td>Later Early Bronze Age II (late phases Early Cycladic II/Early Helladic II)</td>
<td>2500/2450-2200/2150(^8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III C</td>
<td>End of Early Bronze Age II (final phase of Early Cycladic II/Early Helladic II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV D</td>
<td>Early and Middle phases of the Middle Cycladic era (Middle Helladic II/Middle Minoan IIA)</td>
<td>1900-1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V F</td>
<td>The final phase of the Middle Cycladic era (Middle Cycladic III/Middle Minoan IIB/III/ Late Middle Helladic)</td>
<td>1700-1550(^9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI G</td>
<td>Late Cycladic I (Late Minoan IA/Late Helladic I)</td>
<td>1550-1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII H</td>
<td>Late Cycladic II (Late Minoan IB/Late Helladic II)</td>
<td>1500-1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII J, K, L, M</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age III (Late Helladic IIIA, IIIB and IIIC)</td>
<td>1450-1050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Caskey 1979, p. 412.

\(^6\) Caskey 1972.

\(^7\) Wilson 1999, pp. 1 and 227.

\(^8\) Wilson 1999, pp. 1 and 227-231.

\(^9\) Caskey 1979; Davis 1986, p. 1.

Table 1: Ayia Irini periods.

The timing of this dissertation, three or more decades after the completion of the excavation, has enabled me to benefit substantially from advances in archaeological theory and method. Thus, in cataloguing and interpreting the finds from the excavations of the Northern...
Sector, advances in the comprehension of stratigraphy and site formation processes, fabric analysis and provenience studies in the Aegean were instrumental in the research design.

Moreover, the advent of New Archaeology and the introduction of recent contextual approaches to material culture in the methodological toolkit of Classical archaeology have eroded the fundamental belief in empiricism which has been a constant since the inception of the discipline. Until very recently it was this profound belief in empiricism that assured archaeologists of the past generation that it was proper to rely on the "reality" of their observations and dismiss to a mere paragraph any necessary discussion of method, since the method was one and the same, an "arbitrary but common partition of reality, sharing intuitive procedures and tacit understandings."\(^{10}\) Under the influence of the processual and post-processual schools of thought, greater emphasis on methodology slowly but gradually has ushered the discipline into an era of greater methodological and theoretical consciousness.

The introduction of surface survey in the methodological toolkit of Classical archaeology has made archaeologists starkly aware of the fact that the questions asked dictate the methods used, which in turn predetermine the type of data recovered. For instance, in respect to questions of demography, the appropriate method is surface survey, whereas excavation appropriately addresses an area’s cultural sequence. This does not necessarily mean that data from one method cannot be used to answer alternate questions; however, the researcher needs to employ a series of methodological adjustments to make the data conform to the research requirements.

\(^{10}\) Clarke 1973, p. 6.
It follows, thus, that our questions and methods evolve over time and diachronic investigations of this change provide us with insights into the evolution of the discipline of archaeology. An important step towards this goal was affected by Lucas. In his 2001 book, Lucas successfully illustrated the impact of the evolution of archaeological theory or thought on archaeological practice in the field.\textsuperscript{11} However, the applicability of his narrative to Classical archaeology is limited since it seems that the field of Greek archaeology, especially after the 1930s, diverged and followed its own trajectory with its very own disciplinary traditions and goals. Thus, the discipline of Greek archaeology and the evolution of archaeological thought present an opportunity and a challenge beckoning us to study it in its own right.

Thus, this dissertation, alongside the study and presentation of the stratigraphy, broaches the subject of archaeological practice in Greek archaeology. I use the term \textit{practice} to refer to the relationship between theory and data. Through archaeological practice the archaeologist constructs his/her dataset by choosing those aspects of the overall phenomenon, site or category of artifacts that are the focus of study.\textsuperscript{12} The archaeologist does this while being in a continuous dialectical relationship with historical legacies, traditions, and socio-political circumstances, not to mention a number of unforeseen situations (e.g., deals falling through, shortage of locally available storeroom space, and change in political situations, among others) which never figure into a research design. Furthermore, the aspects that researchers choose to investigate are

\textsuperscript{11} Lucas 2001.

\textsuperscript{12} Lucas 2001, p. 10.
contingent upon what is currently considered relevant or interesting in the discipline at large and/or the wider intellectual discourse of the times.

The acceptance of context as an important factor (in that context conditions what we consider interesting or how we formulate questions and also how we construct meaning and interpret the data recovered) has led archaeologists to adjust recording methods while in the field, so that the archaeological process itself is recorded and accounted for alongside the finds.\textsuperscript{13} The reasoning behind this extension of field recording to include the archaeological process is that it provides us with a “thick description” of the context of an archaeological feature, be it an object or the site itself, as a whole, which in turn provides us with an enhanced opportunity to gauge meaning or to appropriately employ material for inter-site or inter-project comparisons.

Hence, I realized that there was much to be gained from an examination of archaeological practice and its impact on the archaeological record (and concomitantly on archaeological knowledge) based on the material from the Northern Sector of Ayia Irini. In doing so, I found that Ayia Irini was an ideal site for such a line of research since the lapse of time and the development of archaeological methods in Greek archaeology cast in relief the processes through which archaeological practices influence (or even condition) the archaeological record and, through its potential interpretation, archaeological knowledge (the \textit{chaîne opératoire} of archaeological knowledge). In the case of Ayia Irini it is also obvious that the practices which were employed for the processing of the material have conditioned and delineated the types of

\textsuperscript{13} Hodder 2000; Edgeworth 2006; Papaconstantinou 2006.
questions that can be asked about it. The study of these practices and their placement in their intellectual and historical background provide us with a rare insight into how archaeologists think and how we condition archaeological knowledge without, in most cases, being aware of it.

However, providing a “thick description” for archaeological features produced by an excavation that ended in the 1970s necessitates methods radically different than the ones advocated for on-going archaeological projects. In the case of Ayia Irini, as is the case with all archaeological bodies of material published by somebody else other than the excavator, the site has become a “text.” Excavation journals, pottery notes, and end of the season reports, along with the finds and extant publications of them, constitute the body of the material that provides one with the context of the excavation.

Dealing with such a body of material, the researcher has to adopt an almost philological and historical approach for a critical examination of the textual and artifactual data about an excavation. For the present dissertation, I regard the archaeological process at Ayia Irini as a whole (from the excavation to the publication) and contextualize it in its historical and intellectual framework. This reveals interesting patterns about the subtle imposition of meaning on the archaeological material by its excavator/primary investigator and the effects of this imposition in the construction of a unified narrative about the site.

In this dissertation I show that Caskey’s archaeological reasoning and theoretical perspective, influenced by his education, his experience and the archaeological establishment of

the time, were firmly rooted in the culture historical paradigm. His theoretical disposition was of
critical importance in his choice of sites for investigation, his choice of methods in the field (the
excavation and the finds’ processing), as well as his choice of publication format. Ultimately,
Caskey’s interests and ideas shaped archaeological practice while at the same time conditioning
archaeological knowledge, since his methods and the data produced favor certain approaches
(e.g., informed by culture historical concerns) while rendering others (e.g., behavioral) rather
difficult to gauge.

Within this grand scheme of things, the project I was entrusted with for my dissertation is
very important for a number of reasons. The study and presentation of the deposits of the
Northern Sector, which is my primary goal, continues the tradition of the publication program
envisioned for the whole site. The publication of the Northern Sector is important because it
presents deposits of Periods VI and VII (the main phase of the site) and is a cornerstone in filling
the lacuna in our knowledge about life at the site and in the Cyclades during the early Late
Bronze Age. The early periods of the site are known fairly well since the deposits dating to
Periods I through V have been published in full detail; however, later deposits have not received
similar treatment. The only publication of the main phase of the site is the publication of House
A, but even that presents a very selective sample of whole and complete vessels; in most cases
the sample is solely for chronological purposes and largely ignores the context pottery. In this
dissertation, extant ceramics (including not only the inventoried vessels but also the context
pottery) have been studied in full detail and presented here in a preliminary fashion anticipating
the publication of the deposits at a later time. The primary goal in this dissertation is the dating
of the deposits and the reconstruction of the stratigraphy, but the detailed study of the deposits
has enabled me to make preliminary observations on the different facets of life at the settlement (see Chapter 4).

Moreover, the phases represented by the deposits of the Northern Sector represent a very dynamic period in the history of the Aegean. During this time, the palatial polities of Crete expanded their sphere of interaction to the north, probably in the search of metals, other raw materials and prestige goods to satisfy the needs created by the emergence of the palaces. This expansion of activities can be traced through the distribution of Minoan imports, both in the Cyclades and on the Greek Mainland, left at the sites with which the Cretans established exchange relationships. The distribution of Minoan imports, as well as evidence of Minoan cultural influence, shows that this exchange was directional.\(^{15}\) Not all the sites of the Cyclades or in the Aegean present the same picture. On the contrary, even after one hundred years of intensive archaeological activity that has decreased the possibility of this pattern being an accident of research, sites like Ayia Irini on Kea, Phylakopi on Melos, and Akrotiri on Thera, as well as Miletus and Iasos on the western coast of Turkey and Ialysos in Rhodes, seem to have been nodes in an exchange network that began from Crete and, in a directional fashion, progressed along a western and an eastern trajectory to the north.

\(^{15}\) The geographic distribution of imports in the Aegean during this time shows that trade was directional in the sense that imports are concentrated at specific sites leading us to the conclusion that these sites were specifically chosen as trading partners. For directional trade, see Renfrew 1972, pp. 471-472.
Through time, Ayia Irini, Phylakopi, and Akrotiri became important nodes in an environment of sustained and intensified intraregional contact and exchange. This environment fostered a more globalized setting in which competition between communities or groups within communities encouraged emulation of Minoan, and later Mycenaean, material and non-material culture. This emulation is evidence in minoanizing styles of pottery, women’s fashions, wall painting, writing (with the adoption of the Cretan Linear A script to cover their needs), the Minoan system of weights and measures, as well as new technology, such as the Minoan upright loom and a faster potter’s wheel.

In a recent essay, Davis and I suggest that this emulation “may be best interpreted as a reflection of the desires of indigenous Cycladic factions to identify themselves as belonging to this ‘new environment’ in which the ‘fashions’ prevalent on the island of Crete, and later on the Greek Mainland, were the cultural language of power that Aegean communities co-opted to serve their symbolic and economic needs.” Even though the special character of these Cycladic communities that participated in the new environment has been exalted in the literature, their internal social composition has never been considered.

Thus, the completion of the study of the Northern Sector is the first step in a long-term research plan which will promote a greater understanding of the cultural processes occurring at the site, as well as a reassessment of the views that have been expressed by scholars trying to explain these cultural processes. Moreover, it opens up the scope of investigations to include

intra-site analyses aimed at revealing facets of the social organization of communities of the Middle and Late Bronze Age – the very loci where local and interregional social identities were negotiated – identifying the existence of competing social groups and exploring the manifestation of social interaction and competition among them.

The new horizons which the proliferation of research has made possible allow for new sets of analyses that promote a greater understanding of the communities in the Aegean. Such analyses that include inter-site comparisons necessitate a firm understanding of the methods that have produced the units or categories involved in these comparisons. Thus, this dissertation, with its dual focus on the finds and on the processes that produced them, is a first step towards enabling such comparisons. A discussion of Caskey’s intellectual heritage and methods bring these processes to the forefront and obliges the reader to regard the results while being conscious of the parameters and limitations of the material when using it in reconstructions.

Furthermore, this line of research in its own right is one of the first examinations of archaeological practice in Greek archaeology. Over the last three decades many archaeologists working in the Aegean region have integrated theoretical approaches into the interpretation of archaeological material and patterns;17 others have dealt with the history of archaeological activity in Greece or the institutional and intellectual framework that has influenced it.18 However, very few have examined the structures that produce the archaeological material itself

17 For example, see Broodbank 2000.

18 Morris 1994; Shanks 1996.
(i.e., methodologies and practices employed in fieldwork, particularly in excavation). Thus, this dissertation contributes to the discourse on the history of Greek archaeology by examining in detail one of its pioneers, Jack Caskey.

**Thesis Outline**

In this section I offer a synoptic description of the whole dissertation. Chapters 1 and 2 discuss the concept of archaeological practice and its consequences in Greek archaeology as a whole (Chapter 1) and at Ayia Irini more specifically (Chapter 2). After reviewing the literature on archaeological practice, I examine the specific practices that were in operation during the Ayia Irini excavations (Chapter 2). Why were specific aspects of the past selected to become the archaeological present? The answers that I offer to readers are related to the history of the discipline and more specifically to the questions that were considered central in the development of the discipline. They are also related to people, including Caskey and his excavators, with personal likes and dislikes, personal histories, and personal and intellectual alliances. In these chapters I show that since the archaeological praxis is not just recovery of data but also an interpretive exercise, the general intellectual framework in which an archaeologist operates, as well as the current disciplinary questions, condition and shape the body of archaeological material produced by an excavation (or an archaeological surface survey for that matter). The consequences of this process are manifold; on the one hand, the range of questions future
archaeologists can ask the body of archaeological material is limited to questions theoretically akin to the ones posed by the principal investigator (or allowed by the constraints of the material itself); on the other hand, the body of archaeological material becomes a historical document that, if contextualized, reveals to its analyst the principal investigator(s)’s mental templates in regards to theoretical disposition and questions worthy of investigation.

In the specific case of Ayia Irini, Caskey’s own intellectual interests were influenced by the cultural historical tradition. This is obvious, for example, from his choice of sites for investigation. Ayia Irini followed two previous projects, Eutresis and Lerna, which addressed very similar goals and motivations. All of these sites were investigated in order to clarify issues pertaining to the stylistic chronological sequence that they belong to and to correlate firmly this sequence with stratigraphic evidence. This goal necessitated a system of excavation employing tight controls (especially in terms of the vertical axis), since temporal changes between strata harbored the very answers that Caskey sought.

In the process of investigating Ayia Irini (and also Lerna), Caskey implemented a system of excavation and post-excavation procedures influenced by contemporary methodological practices in Greek archaeology. The system entailed careful sorting of the pottery from each excavation unit and the subsequent discarding of “undiagnostic” ceramic material. A second part of the system was the “construction of deposits” (combined lots) which were created by the physical combination of the ceramics remaining from the already sorted original excavation

---

19 For a fuller exploration of this issue, see Chapter 1.
units. This method, I argue, imposed on the archaeological material the “reality” of the site according to its excavators’ perceptions. Moreover, the material was “textualized,” since the combined new deposits or combined lots contained only whatever Caskey thought worthy for inclusion in the final publication of the site.

The issues visited in Chapter 1 are not of parochial interest. This study, as many others of a similar nature, is neither a criticism nor a forum to cast blame on past archaeological practitioners. All knowledge, and its production, is by definition codified; during any project, large quantities of data are processed and distilled to produce an interpretation, which does not objectively (without bias) and accurately represent the phenomenon in its entirety. Certain aspects are analyzed, whereas others of lesser interest at a given time are omitted from the discussion. Thus we, the practitioners of today, are subject to the same criticism that we might direct at our archaeological ancestors. This chapter stems from the desire to understand the parameters and the reasons that shape the production of archaeological knowledge of the past as well as that of the present day. I consider this research to be the necessary prelude to a discussion of the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector of Ayia Irini.

Chapter 3 presents the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector. First, a short synopsis of the history of the site of Ayia Irini as a whole, which has been reconstructed through the publications of different categories of material, will help the reader situate the information offered in the analysis of the stratigraphy. After a short description of the structures (and their interior arrangement) included in the Northern Sector, discussion of the stratigraphical sequence observed in each unit follows. The discussion is organized by architectural unit or “room” (a term that is used to describe discrete spaces and not imply function). This stratigraphical sequence is explicated through presentation of the excavation process and the post-excavation
processing of the material which categorized the finds in horizons or combined lots. The sequence of deposits is discussed and the architectural history of the rooms is reconstructed and interpreted. My goal in this chapter is to offer the reader a firm understanding of the stratigraphy and of the excavation process. In this way the reader is able to arrive at a historical reconstruction of the site, always being conscious of the presence and influence of archaeological practice.

The fourth and final chapter of this dissertation synthesizes the results of the previous chapters. In the first section, the synthesis assumes the form of a diachronic discussion of the Northern Sector which transforms the stratigraphic descriptions from Chapter 3 into a concise architectural history. I also offer an account of the creation of the archaeological site of Ayia Irini, which started with the first traces of cultural activity in the general area of the Northern Sector and was finally completed with Caskey’s excavation. Finally, I offer a very short and preliminary discussion of the finds and what they tell us about the people who lived in the Northern Sector. In the second part of this chapter, I assess the impact of the excavation processes on the body of archaeological material produced by the excavation at Ayia Irini.
CHAPTER 1: ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTICE, ARCHAEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, AND GREEK ARCHAEOLOGY

In the 1980s and 1990s, the volatile adversarial dialogue between the processualist/positivist and the post-processualist schools of thought in archaeology rocked most of the archaeological world. At the heart of the debate was the juxtaposition between the empiricist ideal of the scientific method and the concept of dependence of archaeological data on theory. On the one hand, the empiricists asserted that the scientific method or a coherent body of techniques, which can be used by scientists for the observation of the natural world, produces facts. On the other, the adherents of “theory-ladenness” proclaimed that there is no uniform and autonomous basis to judge the truth or the credibility of a theory, thus observation and data that depend on theory are meaningful (or they “speak” to us) only when they are placed in a context or set of contexts.

Curiously enough, the struggle between objectivity and subjectivity is not a recent phenomenon; it can be observed in the writings of archaeologists as early as the late 19th century. On the one hand, the destructive nature of archaeological fieldwork, especially excavation, early on imposed an ethos of careful recording of the process of fieldwork, first discussed by Pitt

---

20 Renfrew 1989, p. 38; see also Binford 1989.
21 Shanks and Tilley 1987, p. 104.
Rivers in 1887. The careful recording of every detail was meant to compensate for the destruction and allow researchers to recreate the process if need be:

Excavators, as a rule, record only those things which appear to them important at the time, but fresh problems in Archaeology and Anthropology are constantly arising, and it can hardly fail to have escaped the notice of anthropologists […] that, on turning back to old accounts in search of evidence, the points which would have been most valuable have been passed over from being thought uninteresting at the time. Every detail should, therefore, be recorded in the manner most conducive to facility of reference, and it ought at all times to be the chief object of an excavator to reduce his own personal equation to a minimum.22

Similar attitudes abounded in Greek archaeology of the late 19th century, and, ever since, objectivity, and careful recording, has been a topos; a recent popular book on the archaeological process promotes the quality of objectivity and the suppression of the personal voice in the writing of excavation journals.23

On the other hand, another school of thought, first represented by Flinders Petrie, holds that one collects and recognizes whatever is meaningful to oneself, casting into obscurity all the rest. This is not by any lack of rigorousness, but either because of simple incapability of recognition or irrelevance to current questions. Thus, Petrie noted that:

22 Pitt-Rivers 1887, p. xvii.
23 Sakellarakis 1996, pp. 143-144.
... in recording, the first difficulty is to know what to record. To state every fact about everything found would be useless, as no one could wade through the mass of statements. It would be like a detective who would photograph and measure every man on London Bridge to search for a criminal: the complication would entirely defeat the object.\textsuperscript{24}

Archaeology and archaeological practice has always vacillated between these two very valid points of view:\textsuperscript{25} one heralding the value of objectivity and the other one taking into account the individual and his or her impact on the archaeological process and interpretation. Although this duality will probably continue as long as archaeology is practiced, in the last two decades some resolution may have been reached, as expressed in the following:

…the archaeologist will always have an effect on the phenomena under study but […] the phenomena still exist in a real sense and are not a figment of the archaeologist’s mind. Thus, in so far as archaeologists will select what aspects to investigate, based on what at the time is considered relevant, they construct the

\textsuperscript{24} Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 49; also see Shanks (1996, pp. 120) who uses an almost identical analogy: “As in detection, at the scene of a crime there is much that is irrelevant. It may not even look as if a crime had been committed there. And, of course, the place is not only a scene of crime. Yet it may, if the detective is sensitive enough, yield particles which may be connected to something that happened; though the carving knife is not reducible to the murder. A scene of crime can be used to tell so many other things - witness the genre of detective stories.”

\textsuperscript{25} Carver 1990, pp. 45-48.
data. This of course changes as new questions and new theoretical perspectives guide the investigative process.\textsuperscript{26}

Perhaps such a position is indeed a happy medium. Certainly, the destructive nature of archaeology necessitates preservationist attitudes towards the archaeological record. However, financial constraints and academic and professional pressure thwart even archaeologists who might have taken it upon themselves to “record everything,” since this procedure would produce massive amounts of data that are not publishable or immediately usable.\textsuperscript{27} However, what does “record everything” mean? There is always a limit to our perception, and the rise of new techniques and new questions create new categories of data that could not have been anticipated before.

As mentioned previously, in addition to studying and synthesizing the archaeological data from the site of Ayia Irini, this dissertation discusses archaeological practice in the Ayia Irini excavations. The definition of the term “archaeological practice” used here follows closely the happy medium discussed above. As such, \textit{practice} is the relationship between theory and data.\textsuperscript{28} Through archaeological practice the archaeologist constructs his/her dataset by choosing those aspects of the overall phenomenon, site, or category of artifacts to be studied. The archaeologist


\textsuperscript{27} See also Bernbeck and Pollock 2004 for the differences that differential sources of funding and traditions impose on the style of projects.

\textsuperscript{28} Lucas 2001, p. 10.
does this while existing within a continuous dialectical relationship with historical legacies, traditions, and socio-political circumstances, not to mention various unforeseen situations that had not figured in the original research design, which prompt the archaeologist to improvised acts, which in turn, if repeated, set trends. Furthermore, the aspects that researchers choose to investigate are contingent upon what is currently relevant in the discipline or wider intellectual discourse.

Thus, archaeological practice is not just the “recovery of artifacts but also an interpretive exercise.”29 This interpretive exercise affects and conditions archaeology more than anything else; it affects the body of material (what categories of material are deemed worthy of recognition, recording, sampling, and recovery) that constitutes the basis for the construction of narratives about the past, i.e., archaeological knowledge.

The inclusion of separate chapters dedicated to archaeological practice is a novelty in the context of Greek archaeology, since it is customary for such issues to be relegated to the introduction of a study and to be discussed in one or more paragraphs. There are several reasons for allotting so much space and energy to this subject. On the one hand, it is intrinsically interesting to see what factors influence and condition the way archaeologists choose to practice archaeology and how bodies of archaeological material are affected by methodological decisions which are conditioned by the range of questions we ask at the time of excavation. On the other

hand, providing a context for archaeological data enhances understanding and allows researchers to construct more nuanced narratives.

One avenue that can be used to access the mental templates of the excavators and to deduce archaeological reasoning (thus, the assumptions involved in the interpretive exercise of excavation) is the study of the publications. Nevertheless, the standard for academic publications in archaeology usually masks the conditions of data production. As Hodder notes, “Most reports have been ‘cleaned up’ – the debates and intuitions condemned to the margins, present if at all in acknowledgements, asides, or in diaries lost in archives.”

Especially in the genre of the Greek archaeological site report, the prevailing empiricism precluded the description of methods as part of the report. The implicit assumption was that the method was known to all and had been established as the true scientific method (one that has lent credence to archaeology as a science overall); but methods have changed over time. Sakellarakis (and he is not alone) admits to the fact that one cannot (and should not) compare older excavation journals with contemporary ones because excavation techniques have changed over time.

Failure to describe the methods with which archaeological data have been produced deprives the reader of information that contextualizes the archaeological data. In this dissertation, by focusing on the mechanisms through which the archaeological objects and data have been

---

30 Hodder 1999, p. 31.
construed, the reader is endowed with a more accurate and insightful perspective that is helpful for reading and evaluating the information presented.

In this chapter, I explore the evolution of archaeological practice from the inception of the discipline until the 1980s; more specifically, attention is paid to the place of fieldwork in the practice of archaeology and to how methods changed to accommodate changing attitudes towards the various goals in archaeology. This discussion, I believe, is a necessary precursor to any discussion of archaeological practice at Ayia Irini, since it will help contextualize the latter in its wider historical and methodological context.

In the discussion of the development of archaeological practice, for the first fifty or so years from the inception of archaeology, I examine archaeology as a unified discipline without any particular focus on specializations within the discipline. However, during the very end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, specializations started to emerge only to become standardized by the 1930s. Thus, I have considered and concentrated my discussion on the Anglo-American tradition in Greek archaeology. Limiting this discussion to Anglo-American archaeologists is not a statement of “archaeological superiority,” for there were great theoreticians, such as Deonna, who wrote in other languages and whose contributions should be appraised in the larger framework of Greek archaeology. The limited scope is not only

32 I hope that in the future I will extend the scope of my study to include the other schools in Greece, as well as the intellectual exchange and interplay among them.

33 Deonna 1922; also see, Farnoux 2003.
necessary for practical considerations (including the enormity of the endeavor), but is also justified since the goal is a contextualization of Caskey’s practices and intellectual heritage. It seems only proper, therefore, to restrict the discussion to the Anglo-American tradition because of Caskey’s own long and intensive association with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and especially because of the close ties that the American and the British Schools at Athens maintain, due to their spatial proximity, commonality of language, and personal relationships (e.g., Wace and Blegen).

In this chapter, I explore the place of the fieldwork within the discipline and also bring out the main trends in fieldwork methods, as well the intellectual foundations of their “enforcers.” I have chosen to discuss the two issues of the place of fieldwork and of archaeological practice not narrowly within the context of Aegean Bronze Age archaeology (under which Kea’s stratigraphy falls), but within the wider context of Greek archaeology. This was a deliberate choice based on a number of factors. Most importantly, I was introduced to archaeology through Greek higher education in which the archaeology of the lands included within the borders of the Modern Greek state is treated as a continuum. Thus, I second Farnoux, who claims that it is regrettable that histories of archaeology and its epistemology reproduce academic subdivisions (such as Aegean Prehistory, Classical Archaeology) by projecting a modern organization of disciplines into the past and thus skewing and narrowing the scholarly focus of such studies.34

34 Farnoux 2006, p. 360.
More importantly, no matter the specialization, it has been customary for archaeologists working in Greece (especially the ones connected with the foreign schools in Greece) to receive their fieldwork training on excavations, such as Corinth. Thus, Blegen, Caskey, and other prehistorians had received (as prehistorians still do) the identical methodological training as those colleagues whose interests were geared towards Greek classical antiquity. Even if the methods were adjusted to address the needs of a prehistoric excavation (rather than an historical site), the shared training refers us to a common thread in the methods of historical and prehistoric Greek archaeologists alike.

As mentioned above, this chapter traces this common methodological thread and evaluates its impact on Greek archaeology and the production of archaeological knowledge. In writing this chapter I realized that the extant literature is very selective in its coverage of the issues with which the present dissertation is concerned. The period of the beginning of Greek archaeology is well covered in books that discuss the whole discipline from the perspective of anthropological archaeology;\textsuperscript{35} Schliemann and the pioneering generation of Greek archaeologists are discussed alongside their colleagues working in other areas of the world. However, these same books do not contain any information on the subsequent phases in the development of Greek archaeology, especially since it developed into a totally independent discipline (from its anthropological counterpart) with its own disciplinary traditions and goals. Treatises on the phases of Greek archaeology covering the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, and more specifically

\textsuperscript{35} E.g., Daniel 1976 and 1981; Trigger 1989.
from the 1930s and on, read like histories of great discoveries rather than examinations of the development of archaeological thought. I therefore have drawn as much as I could from the extant literature, especially for the first part of this chapter. However, the gaps in the literature led me to conduct my own independent research examining both primary sources (i.e., excavation manuals, publications) and pertinent secondary literature inside and outside the discipline of Greek archaeology in order to construct one of the first narratives on the development of the discipline beyond the “great discoveries” account.

Thus, in this chapter I offer a narrative on the developments in archaeological practice and techniques from the end of the 19th century to the 1960s. I discuss those developments referring to excavation manuals that were written by archaeologists who had sufficiently close contact with Greek archaeology to influence its practices. I also discuss developments introduced by specific figures or projects. The discussion follows a roughly linear chronological order that is not an entirely deliberate choice. I hold that the developments in archaeological practice are personal choices made by specific excavators which were informed by their educational and intellectual backgrounds, but at the same time were departures from established methods of the time. In retrospect, their “personal choices,” which probably had differential degrees of “absorption” in the archaeological mainstream, constitute the body of history of archaeological practice.

Greek Archaeology In-trenched: From the Collection to the Field

The place of fieldwork within the discipline of archaeology today cannot be disputed. The general public can hardly think of archaeology without evoking images, often imbued with overtones of romanticism, of archaeologists brushing away dirt in the trenches. Its importance
within the discipline can be further realized by the fact that the histories of archaeology blatantly bypass archaeologists who did not dig, either by circumstance or conviction.  

It is therefore perhaps surprising to note that this was not the case at the beginning of Greek archaeology or of archaeology in general.

Fieldwork became a part of the discipline of archaeology only in the later part of the 19th century, in tandem with similar processes in other sciences. Prior to this, scientists, from natural historians to anthropologists and archaeologists, based their work on collections of material either accumulated (often times by imperialist practices) or specifically obtained by naturalists and travelers. These collections were a commodity (sold alongside furniture and jewelry) purchased by individuals or learned societies that manifested the wealth of the prosperous; natural specimens, ancient artifacts, even non-Western people were brought in to be part of these collections and offer to the learned elites a corpus for study.

These learned elites, who were responsible for the construction of the typologies that stand at the heart of many modern-day disciplines, were opposed to the idea of fieldwork conducted by themselves deeming it un-gentlemanly according to the social norms of the time.

36 Farnoux 2006, pp. 358-359.
38 Kuklick 1997, pp. 54-55.
39 Of course, there were indeed some exceptions to this rule, such as Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace, but these scientists were rather unique and operated outside the norm.
Fieldwork was left to individuals of lesser social standing who did not share the same sensibilities with the elite circles. This split between fieldwork and science or research was celebrated by the learned elite circles as the optimum (most objective) method; since the biases of the researcher did not have any effect on the collection of data, the samples were held as inherently unbiased and objective. Thus, the whole approach was considered not only objective and valid, but also held as proof of superior science.40

In the later part of the 19th century, and with the professionalization of disciplines, fieldwork came to be an integral part of the scientific process and the guarantor of its validity. The new breed of scientist conducted his/her own research in the field rather than commissioning it to somebody else, and afterwards published the results accordingly. By the 1870s, archaeological fieldwork had become an established component of the discipline of archaeology, especially in Western Europe and the United States. Archaeological fieldwork, i.e., excavation and survey, became established as the base of the discipline, a method of scientific validation of hypotheses. This process of professionalization went hand in hand with greater awareness of standards for archaeological excavations (see below).41

40 Kucklick 1997, p. 54. Obviously, their method or the samples that they studied are not considered unbiased or valid today, since this divorce between the researcher and the fieldworker is the very grounds for criticism and dismissal of the early theories, especially in the social sciences.

41 Daniel 1976, pp. 159-160.
The 1870s were also pivotal for the Greek archaeological world. Previously, archaeological fieldwork had not been an integral part of the study of ancient Greece. A telling example is the so-called “father of Greek archaeology,” Johann Winckelmann, who never set foot in Greece despite numerous invitations. Even after the Grand Tour had been expanded to include Greece and its monuments, philology and source criticism continued to provide the “bread and butter” of the discipline. Studies of material culture were connected with the study of collections (mainly with collections of works of “art” and not of artifacts that were deemed mundane in general). As Morris has illustrated, fieldwork and archaeology were actually perceived as threats to the predominant paradigm of Hellenism - the idealized and timeless notion of ancient Greece - since they were capable of producing evidence about the daily life of the ancient Greek populations and changes that occurred over time.

Despite this ideological clash between Hellenism and archaeological fieldwork, throughout the 19th century several different projects were organized (Kea, Acropolis, Rhodes, Olympia, etc., see below in this chapter), but most of them were in essence treasure-hunting expeditions that sought to uncover antiquities and ship them to museums and collections in Europe and the United States. This was consonant with the definition of archaeology as the

---


44 See Norton's address as quoted in Hinsley 1985, p. 55; Shanks 1996, pp. 44-47. For the same practices in the international field of archaeology in the early 19th century, see Daniel 1976, pp. 152-159.
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A study of human products;\textsuperscript{45} thus, emphasis was entirely on the object as a bearer of all information needed in order to exercise archaeological science.

Heinrich Schliemann, the absolute maverick of Greek archaeology,\textsuperscript{46} turned the tide and inaugurated the epoch of fieldwork archaeology by demonstrating that fieldwork can produce finds and at the same time evaluate a research question (i.e., the location of Homer's Troy, a very popular topic in the scholarship of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century).\textsuperscript{47} Prior to Schliemann, there was insufficient political and public support to launch a program of archaeological fieldwork.\textsuperscript{48} Schliemann was the perfect figurehead for this approach since he was independently wealthy and not party to the academic and scholarly confines of his colleagues. In designing his research agenda, he followed a pattern which was adopted by researchers long before and after him: the “Pausanias approach.” According to this approach, the archaeological praxis, since archaeology was structurally and conceptually related to classics, was instigated through the texts.\textsuperscript{49} Schliemann, like many others after him, drew his research questions from Homer, seeking to evaluate the historicity of the Homeric poems.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Farnoux 2006, p. 363.
  \item Shanks 1996, p. 100.
  \item Fitton 1996, pp. 51-53.
  \item See Curtius' difficulties in securing support for a program of excavations, as described in Morris 1994, p. 26.
  \item Shanks 1996, pp. 49-52
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
In most manuals of the history of archaeology, Schliemann is synonymous with bad excavation practices. Certainly, his methods leave much to be desired, but in his defense Hermann\textsuperscript{50} points out that prior to Schliemann’s excavations at Troy no stratigraphical investigations had been carried out at comparable sites, and thus there was no clear concept of the superimposition of cultural strata and how they present themselves to the archaeologist. Therefore, “Schliemann demonstrated the applicability of stratigraphy to a mound consisting of superimposed occupation levels.”\textsuperscript{51} The documentation of the depth of each find was one of his preoccupations from the beginning of the excavation and, when he brought in Dörpfeld in 1882, it became still more efficient.\textsuperscript{52} Even in the publication of the first season of excavations, he tried to make sense of the strata and suggest a template for the cultural history of the site that was subsequently revised and reformulated (Troy I, II, III, etc.). Thus one could suggest that “Schliemann laid the methodological foundations for a general picture of history and cultural history; he never presented them in an explicit way but they were nevertheless disseminated in numerous publications, and they stimulated discussions. His work in Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns and Orchomenos furthered the advance of the comparative method in archaeology.”\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{50} Herrmann 1981, p. 130

\textsuperscript{51} Daniel 1981, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{52} Hermann 1981, p. 130.

\textsuperscript{53} Hermann 1981, p. 131.
The international attention that the Troy excavations drew to the archaeology of the classical lands paved the way for many excavators after Schliemann, including Conze in Samothrace and Curtius in Olympia. Trigger notes that “both archaeologists aimed to record the plans and stratigraphy of their excavations of major ancient buildings in sufficient detail that their reports would be a substitute for what their digging had destroyed.” Moreover, both excavations employed professional architects and photographers to document the uncovered structures. These excavations, irrespective of their unsophisticated collection and recording procedures, produced masses of material, beyond the sculpture and works of art that the intellectual establishment already knew how to process and categorize. They generated material such as pottery and small finds that were treated and discussed in their publications instead of being excluded as uninteresting.

During the same era, the growing interest in and appeal of fieldwork prompted the foreign missions to Greece to establish their presence by founding national archaeological schools. After the establishment of the Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία in 1837, the French school was established as early as 1846; the Germans followed in 1874, as did the Americans and the British in 1881 and 1886, respectively. The mission of the foreign schools was to accommodate their fellow countrymen and women who wished to pursue study in Greece.

54 See also Shanks 1996, p. 46-47 and idem, Chapter 4.
55 Trigger 1989, p. 196.
The aforementioned developments in the sciences and archaeology occurred at a time when the culture-historical paradigm was taking root. According to Trigger, at the end of the 19th century faith in human progress started to falter and nationalism was on the rise after almost a century of formation of new ethnic states from outdated imperial structures. This interest in ethnicity encouraged archaeological research that sought to delineate the past of specific ethnic populations, giving rise to the concept of archaeological cultures. These cultures were groupings of artifacts of distinctive character that occurred together in the archaeological record; the groupings were geographically and temporally distinct entities, which, at this time, were identified with cultural designations, such as Trojan, Mycenaean, Greek, and Aegean. The development of the culture historical approach was a significant factor in the refinement of archaeological fieldwork methods. The historical questions that were posed in research needed a method with tighter chronological and cultural controls, since temporal changes in archaeological assemblages were seen as harboring the answers sought by archaeologists. This trend was especially pronounced in Greek archaeology at the time, and remained so until very recently.

57 Trigger 1989, p. 162.
THE CULTURAL HISTORICAL PARADIGM TAKING ROOT: END OF THE 19TH

CENTURY UNTIL THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Sir William Flinders Petrie is considered one of the pioneers of Egyptology (some would say even the “father” of Egyptology), and also of systematic archaeological methodology; in this role, he published a manual on the aims and goals of archaeology in 1904.\(^{58}\) Flinders Petrie was associated with several members of the British School at Athens (BSA), both collaborators and personal friends, with whom he corresponded and later visited (1891) in an effort to resolve issues concerning Aegean material discovered at his Egyptian sites.\(^{59}\) Even before the publication of his archaeological manual, Petrie’s methodology had devout followers in the BSA.\(^{60}\) Momigliano mentions that Mackenzie never claimed any methodological influence from Petrie, unlike other contemporaries of his at the British School; nevertheless, Mackenzie’s excavation methods (spits and open area excavation) and his preoccupation with seriation of the ceramics suggests influence by Petrie.\(^{61}\)

Petrie was a strong advocate of archaeological fieldwork. According to him, archaeology was a science that studies all classes of common objects of the past (rather than a single branch

\(^{58}\) Flinders Petrie 1904.

\(^{59}\) Phillips 2006.

\(^{60}\) E.g., Hogarth; see Momigliano 1999, p. 25.

of the subject, such as art or inscriptions).\footnote{Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 2.} The goal of the study was to chart the history of the objects and their transformations. Archaeological fieldwork was the medium necessary for such an endeavor, since it provided provenience information.\footnote{Petrie (1904, pp. 169-172) makes a firm distinction among real archaeological fieldwork, bad archaeological fieldwork and plundering for profit, and museums and collections, and he protests against all activities that do not preserve or record provenience.}

The method Petrie suggests as the optimal method for digging is a combination of open area excavation with strip-digging. In this particular method the spoil from the excavation of one certain area was dumped in a previously excavated area or nearby for immediate backfilling.\footnote{Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 41-47.} This method was conducive to the uncovering of the plan of the site, which he thought significant; moreover, it offered the optimum management of the soil heaps as well as the protection of the architectural features themselves after the end of the excavation.

---

\footnote{Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 2.}

\footnote{Petrie (1904, pp. 169-172) makes a firm distinction among real archaeological fieldwork, bad archaeological fieldwork and plundering for profit, and museums and collections, and he protests against all activities that do not preserve or record provenience.}

\footnote{By the term provenience, in this context as well as throughout this dissertation, I mean spatial designation (whether this is in descriptive terms, e.g., southwest corner of the room, or coordinates). As far as context is concerned, I have adopted Renfrew and Bahn’s definition, where “a finds’ (whether artifact, feature, structure, or organic remain) context consists of its immediate matrix (the material surrounding it, usually some sort of sediment as gravel, sand, or clay), its provenience (horizontal and vertical position within the matrix), and its association with other finds (occurrence together with other archaeological remains, usually in the same matrix.” (Renfrew and Bahn 2000, p. 50).}

\footnote{Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 41-47.}
Petrie’s excavations clearly did not pay much attention to the stratigraphy. His book on methods does not make any reference to drawing sections of stratigraphy, and his assessment of a worker’s value depending on his ability to move earth indicates his lack of concern. This attitude may partly be attributed to the nature of the sites that he excavated, since most of his sites were occupied for a short period of time. In addition, he considered stratigraphy less efficient than seriation.  

What did Petrie think worth recording, then? He argued for “scaled recording,” that is, the recording of less data for the periods about which more is known, and more for the less-known periods. Furthermore, what constituted “data” according to Petrie? Even though he dedicated an entire chapter to recording, there is hardly any discussion of the diary or the dig notebook, except for the insistence that the style of expression in it should aim for accuracy and certainty, the certainty obtainable when observations are based on sensory experience. It is meaningful, according to him, to slow down the excavation in order to record the “facts” before they are removed, adding that “all this needs practice and a full knowledge of what is important and what is trivial.” In a later section, when he actually talks about the methods of “systematic archaeology,” he reveals what he means by “trivial” and “important.” The methods he advocates

65 Flinders Petrie 1899, p. 297.
66 Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 49-50.
67 Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 50.
are the construction of corpora and seriation.\textsuperscript{68} In advocating the need for a corpus, after praising the early systematizers of archaeological material, he says:

The early history of the forum at Rome hangs now upon the safety of little groups of potsherds lying in a shed, yet unclassed and unstudied, and certain to be swept away someday by some one who does not value them. Instead of this we ought to have a corpus for reference, and then the contents of each of the archaic wells could be at once denoted and published by the numbers of the types; the historic material would be safe, and could be studied at any future time irrespective of the conservation of the heaps of sherds. [...] Without a corpus such discoveries are but a pathetic destruction of material; with corpus notation they would form the basis of a thorough history of the site and of all its changes.\textsuperscript{69}

The substance of this passage is that the artifacts are the focus of the method in as much as they provide the archaeologist with the chronological information to reconstruct the history of the site (i.e., what periods are represented on the site and what kinds of peoples are present).\textsuperscript{70}

It is clear, therefore, that Petrie’s focus was entirely on the artifacts as bearers of chronological and typological information. Thus, according to Petrie’s method, the primary goal

\textsuperscript{68} Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{69} Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 125-126.

\textsuperscript{70} The long discussion about the relationship between Egypt and “early Europe,” i.e., the Aegean during the Bronze through Classical period, is illustrative. This topic is explored through an enumeration of artifacts from these areas found in the other areas and consideration of how they play into relative chronologies and synchronisms. (Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 141-168).
of recording during excavation was to identify artifacts by their corpus number (which preserves the chronological and typological information) and mark their provenience on an architectural plan (solely their horizontal or two-dimensional location).  

MACKENZIE AND THE BRITISH SCHOOL EXCAVATIONS

At the turn of the century, the academic program for the students coming to Greece to study in the British and the American Schools did not include fieldwork; it included familiarization with the German language (but, remarkably, not with Greek), instruction, lectures, and trips to ancient sites and museums. Most of the students had no prior exposure to fieldwork in their home countries. Learning to conduct fieldwork, and more specifically to excavate, was very much an ad hoc process.

---

71 Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 125.
73 See French 2006, where she mentions that Wace had no practical (or theoretical) training; see also Atkinson (1949, p. v), where he confesses to the fact that “In common with many other students of archaeology in this country, I have received little direct instruction in field methods, and such knowledge as I have gained has for the most part been picked up piecemeal.”
74 E.g., about Mackenzie, see Momigliano 1999, pp. 19-21; also French (2006, p. 261) says that “it was not […] until his third session in Greece that Wace actually took part in any field work” with his participation in Laconia and at Geraki.
This is certainly true for Mackenzie who is heralded as the first scientific excavator in Greek archaeology. Mackenzie was associated with the excavations at Phylakopi and Knossos, where he was the acting field director. Many have stressed the importance of the Phylakopi excavations for the development of Greek archaeology, not only from the perspective of archaeological knowledge, but also from the perspective of practice.\textsuperscript{75}

Mackenzie’s continual presence at the excavation made possible the day-to-day recording of the excavation, the supervision of the workers, and the inspection of the pottery on the spot.\textsuperscript{76} Mackenzie’s daybooks indicate his “systematic archaeological reasoning, his quickness in drawing general historical conclusions on the basis of his precise stratigraphical observations, and his use of direct historical analogy.”\textsuperscript{77}

It is clear from the daybooks and other sources that Mackenzie had intended to investigate (and did, to an extent) the site by removing the earth in layers after having dug an exploratory trench down to the bedrock to reveal the layers on the section. It is also clear, though, that the concept and value of archaeological stratigraphy was not fully formed.\textsuperscript{78} Perhaps

\textsuperscript{75} Renfrew in Mackenzie 1963.

\textsuperscript{76} Mackenzie 1963, Entry for Thursday 12 May 1896.

\textsuperscript{77} Momigliano 1999, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{78} Momigliano (1999, pp. 27-28) notes that he seemed to have favored unauthorized excavations from which he acquired artifacts for study and display in the Ashmolean Museum, a practice which was usual among archaeologists at the time.
out of necessity (for he was mostly alone at the excavations at Phylakopi and charged to supervise a massive unskilled workforce), he was excavating in arbitrary levels, sometimes placing wagers (or bets) with his workers (mostly at Knossos) about who would dig faster. The main criterion for establishing the phases that he delineated in the publication was the presence and characterization of the pottery, which he took upon himself to scrutinize on the spot. All these methods are evident in the quote that follows: “The earth was to be removed in layers of 0.50 deep, the pottery and other finds from each successive layer being collected and kept separate with a view toward arriving at some statistic of dominant varieties in the different layers from the surface to the rock. This test of pottery was undertaken on the suggestion of Mr. J. L. Myres.”

The other archaeological sites excavated by the British School during the first decade of 20th century are likely to have been excavated in the same way: that is, reliance on workers to do the digging, few supervising archaeologists, and digging in arbitrary levels. It is particularly probable that Palaikastro was also excavated using this methodology, since one of its excavators was J. L. Myres, whom Mackenzie credited with the recommendation for the methodology followed by the latter.

---

79 Mackenzie 1963, Entry for 11 April 1898.

80 Cadogan 2000, p. 25.
ARCHAEOLOGY AFTER THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Petrie’s views may be seen as the culmination of archaeological methodology of the 19th century, although they went out of currency rather quickly; not more than a decade after the publication of his book, Droop’s explanation of methodology expresses a complete departure.

Droop was a member of the British School and one of the archaeologists who participated in the Geraki and Phylakopi excavations (1911).\(^\text{81}\) In 1915 he wrote a book explaining the methods of archaeological excavation, which, however, was not as well received as Petrie's.\(^\text{82}\) It can be said that Droop was the first to approximate the contemporary notion of stratigraphic excavation, and to express overall, in no uncertain terms, the principles of excavation that are commonplace in contemporary classical archaeology, as the following quotation illustrates:

An excavation should be so conducted that it would be possible in theory to build up the site again with every object replaced exactly in its original position. For it is not until after excavation has disclosed fully what may be called the geological nature of the site, the original contours of the virgin soil, and the source and order of the subsequent accumulations, that reasoned conclusions can be formed as to the history of the objects found; and these conclusions cannot be formed, or at least cannot be formed with the same certainty, if the relations of the individual finds either with one another or with the geological conditions are not accurately known. Should the objects have been taken out in a higgledy-piggledy manner no

\(^{81}\) Dawkins and Droop 1911.

\(^{82}\) Droop 1915; for the difference in reception, see Barker 1982, pp. 14-15.
subsequent knowledge of the history of the accumulations will be of much of the avail, and instead of having evidence from stratification the student will be reduced to evidence from style. And this may mean that all that he can say with certainty about the site will be the fruit of his previous knowledge.83

In this quote, Droop pointed the way towards stratigraphic excavation, according to which an excavator is to peel each layer of deposition separately and in an orderly fashion relating the finds to the layer and defining their location in space not only horizontally but also vertically. He also covertly criticized Petrie's emphasis on the importance of seriation (stylistic dating) vis à vis stratigraphy. As such, he criticized Petrie's normative perspective on science, which, according to Droop, fostered the reproduction of categories already in place. Moreover, he advocated an opinion that presented a fine merging of the Pitt Rivers school of thought (which advocated careful recording of everything that is found on an excavation) and the Totalwissenschaft of the German Bildung, arguing that one ought to record and keep everything because sometimes “many facts that appear to have no interest at the time may become of first-rate importance in the future though the discovery of similar facts elsewhere.”84

According to Droop, the excavation should be manned with a large staff (supervisors, architects, photographers, museum staff) who would work at slow pace, a departure from the

83 Droop 1915, pp. 7-8.
84 Droop 1915, p. 3.
norm at the time.\textsuperscript{85} The paid laborers themselves would be trained to report and to value changes in the soil as much as any find discovery,\textsuperscript{86} and to peel off one layer at a time.

Moreover, the excavator should subdivide the site under investigation into more manageable and better controlled units both horizontally (i.e., trenches, rooms, etc.) and vertically (i.e., lots, excavation units, etc.) using either physical or architectural features or arbitrary boundaries.\textsuperscript{87} Droop’s description betrays relative lack of confidence in the recognition of the strata while digging and without the assistance of a section, unless the interfaces (i.e., floors) were clearly marked with stone slabs.\textsuperscript{88} In this endeavor, the dumpy level played a crucial role, since it offered the excavator an extra control for the recording of the units in three-dimensional space, and allowed him to reconstruct the site properly, even in the case that stratum recognition was not done in time.

In terms of record keeping, the excavation notes should be as accurate and complete as possible, erring “in the direction of fullness rather than concision” (although no specific

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{85} Droop 1915, pp. 4-6.
\textsuperscript{86} Droop 1915, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{87} Droop 1915, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{88} Droop (1915, p. 11) notes that “vertical divisions are also sometimes provided ready to hand, as for instance the floors of a house. But these, even should they exist, are not always easily detected in the actual digging unless they consist of stone slabs or cobbles. It is true that afterwards traces of them can frequently be detected in section in the walls, but then unless other steps have been taken it might be difficult to decide, however beautifully the order of successive finds was preserved, at what point in that order the floor level came.”
\end{flushright}
instructions are given on the kinds of information that should be recorded). As part of the graphic record, he encourages numerous rough sketches, plans and sections, and photographs by the individual excavator to supplement the official plans, section drawings, and photographs of the excavation. Finds should be clearly marked and soil samples are advised, since they allow for the possibility of checking the field observations after excavation.

Droop’s concept of stratigraphy has often been criticized in terms of being more geological in essence than archaeological. However, as Harris pointed out, “the book […] contained several of the earliest specimen diagrams of the nature of stratification. These drawings show an appreciation of the importance of the interface between layers, suggest the distribution of artifacts as seen in a section and explain the method of periodization of walls.”

The method is not to be mistaken for the modern standards of excavation; nor what we mean by the term stratigraphy with what Droop calls “stratigraphy.” Nevertheless, Droop was unquestionably one of the forerunners of the method used in Greek archaeological excavations even today.

---

89 Droop 1915, p. 27.
90 Droop 1915, p. 17.
91 Droop 1915, p. 17.
92 Harris 1989, p. 9.
93 At some point he advocates that 50 cm spits are a good unit of measurement, although he suggested 20 cm spits for more delicate sites (Droop 1915, p. 12).
A sine qua non in any discussion of archaeological practice in the Aegean is the contribution of Carl W. Blegen. Blegen was respected by his peers and students not only as a scholar but also as a field archaeologist and excavator.94

Blegen received his fieldwork experience next to Bert Hodge Hill, with whom he would be a close collaborator and friend. Hill’s methods and contribution to Greek archaeology have not been assessed adequately, but it can be maintained with certainty that he taught Blegen and other young scholars sojourning at the American School in the 1910s how to excavate. In Blegen’s own words, on the qualities of his teacher, then turned advisor and friend:

In his many activities, Bert Hodge Hill was consistently a perfectionist. When conducting excavation, for instance, he devoted unwearying attention to the recognition and the exhaustive examination of all observable evidence, insisting as well on its clear, accurate recording and its logical interpretation: even the minutest striations in a stratified deposit, or apparently trifling irregularities in the masonry of a wall might yield some missing link of information. In his teaching, which was blessed with an inspired gift of infusing his hearers with a share of his own interest and enthusiasm, he never failed to stress the need for exact

94 Blegen was held in the highest regard as an excavator by both Mervyn Popham (Hatzaki, pers. comm.) and Dimitris Theocharis (Kotsakis, pers. comm.). Theocharis had gotten to know Blegen personally in 1952, when he - as an assistant to George Mylonas - excavated at the Palace of Nestor (Blegen 1994, pp. 72-73, entry of June 1st, 1952).
observation and the supreme value of accuracy and thoroughness. As a friendly sponsor, critic and advisor he played an outstanding role, giving cheerfully and in generous measure of his time and thought to the manuscripts of his students, whom he always helped and encouraged with sound constructive suggestions. The light of his spirit shines through in the work of those who had the benefit of his teaching.95

Blegen can be credited with the introduction of many innovations in the methodology of fieldwork in the Aegean. In the preface to an edition of Blegen’s letters written by Cedric G. Boulter, who was Blegen’s advisee and long standing friend and colleague,96 he is described as having “broadened the horizons and the techniques of the archaeological process.” Early in the 1930s, Blegen initiated the collection of animal bones during the excavation at Troy, and he later brought in a specialist, Nils-Gustav Gejvall, to examine them and to publish the results in a similar fashion to the artifacts.97

This was not the only departure from the established norms. Blegen is exceptional among classical archaeologists in his open exposition of his methodology; in his publication of the archaeological site of Korakou, he discusses explicitly his aims and the significance of the site; his project and publication present a clear (if not the clearest) example of archaeological practice in the Aegean, in the sense that a specific methodology was chosen to address specific questions

95 Hill 1964, p. v.
97 Blegen 1994, p. viii. Gejvall later became a member of Caskey’s teams at Lerna (Gejvall 1969) and Kea.
connected to a specific theoretical agenda. Korakou, Blegen’s first major excavation, whose results he submitted as his Ph.D. dissertation at Yale University, was conceived from the start as a “problem-oriented” project.

In the first quarter of the 20th century, Blegen, along with Wace, following in the footsteps of Evans and the Phylakopi excavators, embarked on a similar endeavor, i.e., the construction of a Helladic chronology.98 Whereas the Minoan and Cycladic chronologies were based on only one site each, Knossos and Phylakopi respectively, Blegen’s mainland chronology was based on the stratigraphy of several relatively obscure sites:99 Gonia, Korakou, Hagiorgitika, and Zygouries, all of which were investigated between 1915 and 1927. These sites were a testing ground for Blegen and Wace’s Helladic “sequence of ceramic fabrics, shapes and decorative motifs that recurred in roughly the same relative order at different sites,”100 which was published in 1918 under the title “The Pre-Mycenaean Pottery of the Mainland.”101 The first of the final

98 The Helladic chronology was constructed before the Palace of Minos appeared. The system owed “much to Wace’s work in Thessaly and to the still earlier British work at Phylakopi and in Crete.” (McDonald and Thomas 1990, p. 201).

99 McDonald and Thomas (1990, pp. 199-200) note that Blegen’s sites were obscure for two reasons: firstly, because they were not identified with any of the sites in the “Catalogue of Ships;” secondly, they were “also obscure in terms of their original, relative historical importance,” the literary sources, and tradition.

100 McDonald and Thomas 1990, p. 200.

101 Blegen and Wace 1916-17; 1917-18.
publications of one of these sites, that of Korakou, appeared in 1921.\textsuperscript{102} It was a landmark in the history of Aegean archaeology, and it subsequently served as a model for other publications.

It has been observed in some discussions of the history of Aegean Archaeology that the novelty of the Korakou excavation was the attention paid by Blegen to the exact recording of the layer from which specific artifacts came, i.e., their stratigraphical context.\textsuperscript{103} For the first time in the Aegean, a project was planned targeting the study of stratigraphy as a means to sequence artifacts. As Blegen himself wrote about the significance of this contribution, “the importance of the site at Korakou lies in the fact that, supplying the evidence which was lacking at Tiryns and Mycenae, it now establishes the sequence of these prehistoric wares.”\textsuperscript{104}

In a sense, Blegen’s contribution was “cutting edge” methodologically, since it realized several principles that Droop had so adamantly advocated in his manual of archaeological methods a few years earlier: the emphasis on the importance of stratigraphy in sequencing artifacts and the emphasis on the study of all artifactual categories, not just pottery and architecture, but also Linear B tablets\textsuperscript{105} and animal bones to name a few.

\textsuperscript{102} Blegen 1921, 1928, 1937.

\textsuperscript{103} McDonald and Thomas 1990, p. 204.

\textsuperscript{104} Blegen 1921, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{105} Cedric Boulter mentions that Blegen favored the publication of all the tablets from the Palace of Nestor, whereas Evans had published relatively few from the Palace of Minos (Blegen 1994, p. ix).
The last archaeological project with which Blegen was involved was the excavation of the Palace of Nestor. There he descended upon the site with his faithful and hard-working collaborator Marion Rawson, whose unpaid contribution not only to the excavation but also to the swift publication of Blegen’s excavations at Prosymna, Troy, and at the Palace of Nestor is beyond reckoning.\textsuperscript{106} Rawson was, it seems, the acting field director, since Blegen was frequently busy with accounting, escorting visitors, and interacting with the authorities. In other words “Blegen was the leader, but Marion emerged as the manager.”\textsuperscript{107} In addition to her managerial skills, Rawson was very meticulous in keeping the records of the palace, and she is unique in that she consistently drew sections of the stratigraphy of the rooms she was excavating. Hofstra states that “the overwhelming majority of the excavators treated Pylos as a one period site with very simple stratigraphy. Archaeologists conducting recent studies at the site have observed that any reconstruction of stratigraphy [is] complicated by the fact that no one on the excavation did stratigraphic drawings, only narrative descriptions, with the exception of Marion Rawson.”\textsuperscript{108}

To be sure, the limited time-span of occupation lends itself to such techniques of excavation more favorably than others. But two questions cast in relief the methods employed by Blegen, since they cannot be addressed based on the excavation records: the question of squatters

\textsuperscript{106} Blegen et al. 1950; Blegen 1937; Blegen and Rawson 1966; Blegen et al. 1973.

\textsuperscript{107} Blegen 1994, pp. xviii-xix.

\textsuperscript{108} Hofstra (pers. comm.).
and of upper storey collapse. Blegen hints at the possibility of squatters, which had probably taken up residence among the ruins of the palace, long after its destruction. These squatters have been loosely associated with a layer of “greasy black earth,” which was noted by the excavators in some areas of the palace; the presence of squatters, however, remains unclear since there is nothing in the publication of the palace to substantiate their presence. Nor is there any recorded evidence for the collapse of the upper stories and the associated equipment that the upper floors bore. His lack of clear recognition and discussion of the stratigraphy dates his approach and classifies him with an earlier generation of scholars whose concept of stratigraphy was not fully formed.

AGORA

In the 1930s the landscape of Greek archaeology changed dramatically. The American School, with the Athenian Agora Excavations, played an especially important role in the culmination of the big-dig template in Greek Archaeology, which had been initiated by the French and the German archaeological schools at Delphi and Olympia, and of course the Corinth

109 Hofstra (pers. comm.); Hofstra 2000.

110 The question of the squatters has been revisited by Davis and Lynch (forthcoming). The authors, after a thorough examination of the material, refute the interpretation of post-Bronze age evidence as being the remnants of cultic activity starting during the Dark Ages onwards. They attribute the post-Bronze Age finds to squatter reoccupation of “hollows in the debris, former courts in particular, [which] were perhaps used for shelter until the walls that defined them collapsed totally — resulting in stone-fall of the sort that lay above Court 88.”
excavations.\textsuperscript{111} The enormity of the operation set standards not only in the direction of research (which targeted the public areas of ancient towns, e.g., the market place, sanctuaries, cemeteries, and theaters, which has often been criticized by anthropological archaeologists - but at the same time were better documented in the textual sources), but also in the organizational structure of a dig, which is carefully described by T. Leslie Shear in a preliminary report of 1938.\textsuperscript{112}

Already in the 1930s, all the necessary specializations that Wheeler (two decades later) mentions that a proper excavation should have, were in place.\textsuperscript{113} Shear describes seven different departments in the organization of the excavation, i.e., the digging staff (supervisors and skilled workmen), the architects, the cataloguer,\textsuperscript{114} the draftsperson, the chemistry lab, the photographer,\textsuperscript{115} and the pot menders.\textsuperscript{116} In the beginning, the staff of the Athenian Agora Excavations consisted of teams of young archaeologists\textsuperscript{117} who worked during field seasons that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{111} Morris 1994, p. 35.
  \item \textsuperscript{112} Shear 1938, pp. 314-318; see also Mauzy 2006, pp. 26-27.
  \item \textsuperscript{113} Wheeler 1954, pp. 130-152.
  \item \textsuperscript{114} Mauzy 2006, p. 19.
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Mauzy 2006, pp. 14-18.
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Shear 1938, pp. 314-318.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} For the teams in the 1930s, see Papadopoulos in Lawall et al. 2001; see also Mauzy 2006, pp. 109-119.
\end{itemize}
lasted almost five months.  

The duration of the season was shortened to the summer months, probably during the 1980s.

Until the beginning of the 1980s, the Athenian Agora Excavations employed paid labor for the digging, like most projects (even today). In a report on the progress of the excavation in 1940, Shear, Sr. mentions that 215 laborers had been employed during the season. In the 1960s the number of paid laborers was reduced, and in 1980 they were eliminated. The laborers were replaced by students in an effort to open the Athenian Agora Excavations to a wider audience and to train a wider range of students and, perhaps, to limit the expenses of the whole operation.

The methods and organization of the operation have not changed much since the beginning of the excavation in 1931. From the start, the method of excavation was an open area excavation. The site was subdivided into sections and each section was dug by following the strata, and the deposits of a stratum were excavated with one or multiple units (depending on the size of the stratum) in order to maintain better control of the stratigraphy. The field notebooks

118 Lynch (pers. comm.); Rotroff and Lamberton 2006, p. 53; see also Shear 1938 about Thompson getting a job in Toronto and about the need for a resident epigraphist.

119 Shear 1940, p. 261; see also Mauzy 2006, pp. 24-25.

120 Mauzy 2006, p. 119.

121 Even though it is not a training dig, per se.

122 The description of the archaeological procedures at the excavation is based on personal communication with Kathleen M. Lynch and Susan I. Rotroff.
contain a high level of detail; specifically, in some of them, such as those written by Dorothy Burr [Thompson], one may recognize a pursuit of the “total excavation record.” In the 1960s and 1970s the instruction given to supervisors was to write their notes on the right side of the notebook and their graphic record, plans and sections, on the left side of the notebook; of course, the application of these instructions was variable according to the excavator in charge. Nevertheless, in keeping with the practices of most excavations of the time, field supervisors were responsible for large areas. The measure for a productive excavation was the volume of the earth moved.

The excavation unit was the *zemibili*, or basket, which received a temporary sequential number in pencil. At the end of the day the excavators did a preliminary reading of the excavation unit/ zembili for chronological purposes, after which they then threw away ceramics deemed obviously useless. At the end of the excavation season, each excavator sorted and

---


125 Rotroff (pers. comm.).

126 Rotroff (pers. comm.).

127 Shear (1940, p. 261), summing up the first nine years of excavation (1931-1939), mentions that 246,000 tons of earth had been moved.
papsed\textsuperscript{128} the pottery of each zembili and then combined the remnants into a deposit (level or unit) identified by a permanent sequential number. They also selected artifacts to be inventoried and stored by type, while the rest of the context pottery was stored in tins by section. The cataloguing and system of organization was devised and implemented by Lucy Talcott who developed “an elaborately cross-referenced recording system of finds and photographs making it simple to move from any one aspect of the excavation to all relevant data”;\textsuperscript{129} her approach to it was particularly insightful considering the fact that the transition from a card-based catalogue to a computerized system in the last decade of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century was smooth and almost devoid of problems.\textsuperscript{130}

The current system of the whole operation at the Agora is similar (if not identical) to the one established in the 1930s. The greatest and most significant difference is the scale of the operation, which has been altered in significant ways, and the advances in technology. The area of investigation has been gradually reduced and the number of supervising excavators significantly increased, so that there is closer control and monitoring of the area under investigation. Also, continually decreasing quantities of contextual pottery have been discarded.

\textsuperscript{128} “Papse” is a verb that probably was coined by Blegen; it is a corruption of the Greek word “παύω” - “cease or silence” (Overbeck, pers. comm.). An alternative, and less likely, derivation might be from the verb “πετώ” - “throw away” (Rutter 1974, p. 28, note 2).

\textsuperscript{129} Rotroff and Lamberton 2006, pp. 46-47; see also Mauzy 2006, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{130} Lynch (pers. comm.).
FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE 1960S

After the Second World War, archaeology in general, and Aegean archaeology more specifically, was influenced by the Wheeler-Kenyon system of archaeological excavation.131 This system was developed and codified by Sir Mortimer Wheeler and his student Kathleen Kenyon in two books about archaeological methods published in the 1950s.132 Even more significantly, Kenyon and Wheeler, who worked in Britain, India, and Jericho, held posts at the Institute of Archaeology in London,133 where they trained an entire generation of archaeologists. Among them, names such as Sinclair Hood and Elizabeth French134 feature prominently, and the influence of their system can be readily detected in many subsequent projects. Nichoria is presented here as a characteristic case.

Droop, in 1915, had already championed the significance of stratigraphy and the employment of tighter vertical and horizontal controls during excavation and recording, articulating for the first time the concept of “(proto-) context.” Wheeler and Kenyon elaborated these two themes further. Spatial control became a goal attained by the employment of the “box”

131 The technique was developed based on the experiences of Wheeler’s excavation at Verulamium (1930-1935). Considerable refinement on the method was achieved by his student Kathleen Kenyon during her excavations at the site of Jericho (1952-1958).

132 Kenyon 1953; Wheeler 1954.

133 For Kathleen Kenyon, see Moorey 1979; Dever 2004. For Mortimer Wheeler, see Hawkes 1982.

134 French 2006.
system and other techniques, which facilitated the recording of objects, features, and strata in two- and three-dimensional space. Wheeler first developed and applied his system on his excavation at Maiden Castle.\textsuperscript{135} There, he imposed a grid of squares that were divided by 1 m baulks (along the axes of the grid), which served a dual function: as corridors around the squares under excavation and as freestanding sections showcasing the stratigraphy of each excavated square.\textsuperscript{136} The pegs marking these squares played an important role in measuring the spatial coordinates of finds and features.

Site supervisors were allotted a sufficiently compact area to control so that “scarcely a shovelful of earth is removed save under their eyes,”\textsuperscript{137} and photographs from his excavations testify to adherence to this goal.\textsuperscript{138} This meant that the ratio between site supervisors and laborers was significantly different from the one used in previous Aegean excavations (e.g., Phylakopi or Knossos) or the excavations that Wheeler criticizes in the Near East and Palestine.\textsuperscript{139}

The site supervisors were to keep careful records about all aspects of the excavation:

\textsuperscript{135} Lucas 2001, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{136} Wheeler 1954, pl. IVb.
\textsuperscript{137} Wheeler 1954, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{138} Wheeler 1954, pl. IVb.
\textsuperscript{139} For his criticism, see Wheeler 1954, p. 21.
All finds will be recorded by strata with reference to the nearest recorded section, normally with the nearest side of the square. Structures, pits, or important objects, together with the position of all measured sections, will be planned carefully in the supervisors' notebook in relation to the four surveyed corner pegs of the square. “Finds” will be classified in the notebook by serial numbers, section label, stratum, and sketch.\textsuperscript{140}

The emphasis on the section is an omnipresent theme. According to Wheeler, the excavator should always control the stratigraphy “from the section;”\textsuperscript{141} thus, the control trench and the control pit feature prominently in the archaeological process. The control trench was deemed especially important; before the beginning of a dig, a trench was to be excavated down to bedrock (note that water was not an acceptable excuse for not reaching the bedrock), the stratigraphy was interpreted, and only then would digging the trench from the side be started.\textsuperscript{142} In Wheeler’s own words: “stratification must, by its nature, always be controlled from the side, i.e., from the side of the control pit, since it obviously cannot be controlled prophetically from the top: \textit{vertical digging first, horizontal digging afterwards, must be the rule.}”\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{140} Wheeler 1954, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{141} Cf. Droop (1915, p. 15) who strongly disagreed with digging “from the section,” which, according to him, should be avoided at all costs because it is sloppy digging and “fatal to the knowledge of stratification.”
\textsuperscript{142} Wheeler 1954, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{143} Wheeler 1954, p. 66.
Moreover, all finds were to be related to the nearest section and the strata represented on it. That is why the record regarding the section was of outmost importance in Wheeler’s mind:

The preparation of the record of the section was to begin with the first spadeful dug. From the outset, the strata were carefully observed and distinguished, and they were labeled as the work proceeded. It was, of course, as the work proceeded that “finds” were isolated and recorded, and their record was necessarily integral with that of the strata from which they were derived. The supervisor needed, therefore, to make up his mind clearly from moment to moment as to the limits and nomenclature of the strata; and those decisions, whether ultimately approved or modified, had to be susceptible to an accurate delineation, if only for the subsequent correlation of the finds. In other words, both the excavator and the spectator or the future reader must know exactly what the stratigraphy was thought to be while the excavation was in progress.\textsuperscript{144}

Thus, the sections, which were painstakingly recorded, were the basis of reconstructing the stratigraphy and were almost synonymous with it.\textsuperscript{145} Rigorous examination of the stratigraphy provided solid chronological information. Wheeler's emphasis on the importance on the section - not devaluing the importance of the plan- has to do with Wheeler's concept of culture. His concept can be extrapolated from a passage that discusses the merits of both the vertical and horizontal approach to excavation:

\textsuperscript{144} Wheeler 1954, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{145} Kenyon 1953, p. 69; Wheeler 1927, p. 817.
Let us consider the nature of the evidence which the two methods [i.e., the vertical and horizontal approaches] may be expected to supply. Vertical excavation alone, whilst supplying a key to the length of an occupation, to its continuity or intermittency, and to some part of its cultural equipment, cannot be expected to reveal save in the most scrappy fashion the significant environment - economic, religious, administrative- of a human society. In other words, it leaves us in the dark as to those very factors which fit a past culture or civilization into the story of human endeavor and so make its recovery worthwhile. It is the railway time-table without a train. On the other hand, the extensive horizontal excavations which were in effect the normal practice before stratification was adequately understood generally produced an abstraction -often a very confused and misleading abstraction- unrelated with any sort of precision to the sequence of human development. They were trains without a timetable.\textsuperscript{146}

For Wheeler absolute chronology mattered almost as much as relative chronology since it functioned as a measure enabling cultural variability to be commensurable both in terms of change and the rate of change.\textsuperscript{147} His concept of culture was pluralistic and took into

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[147] Lucas 2001, p. 45. Lucas draws a stark contrast between Wheeler’s and Petrie’s conceptions of time. He maintains that for Petrie, time was relative, consonant with his evolutionary sensibilities, whereas for Wheeler time was both relative and absolute, in line with the culture historical approach. I think that this stark contrast is an overstatement. In evaluating Petrie's approach, it should not be forgotten that (apart from the fact that absolute chronology was not an attainable goal at the time) in the area of the world in which he was working (Egypt, Syria, }
\end{footnotesize}
consideration both the space and time contingencies, in tune with the sensibilities of the culture historical approach. In a sense, his insistence on the section and the delineation of strata can be attributed to the fact that he considered the stratum in its three dimensions to be the meeting point of space and time, and, as Lucas says, a mutual check upon the other’s validity.¹⁴⁸

He also advocated a humanistic approach to archaeology and archaeological interpretation, which emphasized the connection between the archaeological remains and their equivalent modern cultures, as well as the importance of interpreting archaeological data in a manner that placed the human element in the forefront.¹⁴⁹ Last, but not least, Wheeler stressed the importance of hands-on training for archaeologists. For him “the reading of a section is the reading of a language which can only be learned by demonstration and experience.”¹⁵⁰ He seems to have given considerable contemplation to issues of training and gradual acculturation of students in the system of excavation, resulting in a pairing or mentor system in which an older student would train a younger student in the ways of excavation.

and Greece) there were synchronisms between cultures that he carefully discusses in his book (Flinders Petrie 1904, p. 142-168.). Therefore, he should not be accused of disregard towards absolute chronology.

¹⁴⁸ Lucas 2001, p. 45.

¹⁴⁹ Wheeler 1954, pp. 3 and 204.

¹⁵⁰ Wheeler 1954, p. 49.
Nichoria (1965-1975) was undoubtedly the excavation that signposted the way for the introduction of new excavation techniques in the field of Greek archaeology.\textsuperscript{151} Nichoria was a big-dig with a multidisciplinary twist, like the survey from which it was an off-shoot. In terms of its research design the goals were quite traditional and firmly grounded in the culture historical tradition. According to the articulation of the research strategy presented in the publication, the excavation focused “on establishing a firmer ceramic sequence for the SW Peloponnese, exposing as much as possible of the village plan in important occupation phases, and recovering a wide range of associated artifacts and architecture.”\textsuperscript{152}

However, the list of the participants, which features prominently in the publication, as well as the list of specialists of different disciplines (from geology to photogrammetric plotting and aerial photography), indicates the serious commitment of the directors to multidisciplinarity. Both in the field and during the study seasons, the interaction between natural scientists and archaeologists working on the same material produced integrated results.\textsuperscript{153}

The excavation of Nichoria employed a number of paid laborers ranging from 15 to 45 depending on the scale of operations each year. The workers were overseen by trench

\textsuperscript{151} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978; McDonald et al. 1983; McDonald and Wilkie 1992.

\textsuperscript{152} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, p. 266.

\textsuperscript{153} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, p. 266.
supervisors (up to nine overall), each of whom was in charge of four to six workers working in two or more contiguous trenches.\textsuperscript{154}

The first chapter of the first volume of the publication explicates the methodology of the excavation to a degree unusual at that time in Greek archaeology.\textsuperscript{155} The site was excavated in a regular grid of 4 x 4 m squares with a 1 m wide baulk in between. The excavation was done in stratigraphic units or levels that were described as such:

The \textit{level}, which is the major vertical excavational unit, is defined as an earth layer of variable thickness and extent. It is a working assumption that a level was deposited: (1) in a relatively short interval or (2) under circumstances that remained relatively constant or that changed only very gradually. A level is a hypothetical stratum, i.e., its top, thickness, and bottom reflect the excavator’s working hypothesis of what will finally be judged a distinct stratum. Associated with each level is a pottery lot (or lots) with a unique numerical designation. A pass (sometimes referred to by British excavators as a “spit”) was a relatively thin layer within a level, varying between 2 and 10 cm in thickness. Levels are dug “pass by pass.” The word “pass” also defines all the earth removed as workmen proceed across a trench digging with a small, one-handed pick which removes earth to an average depth of ca. 7 cm per swing. The passes within a level are uniquely designated and their materials kept separate, at least initially. Later study may reveal the lack of significant differentiation between one pass and the preceding one(s). Thus the pass is an arbitrary, vertical excavation unit.

\textsuperscript{154} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{155} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, pp. 8-12.
Provisional segregation of a level into several discrete pass units is a precautionary measure to avoid combining what may turn out to be significant differences. Passes are sometimes segmented horizontally as the excavator sees fit.\textsuperscript{156}

Considerable emphasis was given to the section. Since the excavation was conducted on the box system, there were a plethora of sections on the baulks between trenches for the edification of the excavators. Towards the end of the excavation most of the baulks were taken down, although a number of them were left standing as “stratigraphic monuments.”\textsuperscript{157} The sections were drawn and photographed and processed in order to record the stratigraphy they displayed. The stratigraphy for the first time in Greek archaeology was not described only in archaeological terms, but geology was incorporated to complement the description of the archaeological record.

The plan received a different kind of attention. The multiple sketches and drawings of every trench and every phase were replaced by photography and photogrammetric plotting.

\textsuperscript{156} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{157} Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1978, p. 9.
CREATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

“Discovery dates only from the time of the record of it, and not from the time of its being found in the soil.”158 With this often quoted utterance, Pitt Rivers epitomized the importance of publication in the grand scheme of the archaeological process.159 Since then, every archaeologist and every archaeological manual stresses the importance of the publication which characterizes the nature of archaeological work and distinguishes it from looting.160 The centrality of publication in the very definition of archaeology has obviously been emphasized in consequence to the amount of thought that has gone into shaping the form in which archaeological data are to be presented. Thus, one can argue that changing attitudes towards archaeological practice can also be deduced though a diachronic study of the changing modes of representation.161 For the purposes of this study I have used as a sample publications of the American projects in Greece conducted under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens.

Archaeological site reports today have a very specific format. A typical site report will include an introduction (including geographic location of the site, history of research, etc.), a chapter on the architecture, a chapter on pottery and other finds, and a conclusion. This is the

158 Quoted in Wheeler 1954, p. 182.
159 Morris 1994, p. 27.
161 For a similar project, see Hodder 1989.
standard (probably international) format that was established at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, when archaeology was making its first strides towards specialization and professionalization of the discipline.

Previously the format of the archaeological site report was remarkably different in both structure and style. Hodder showed that the template for reporting excavations in the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century was a date stamped letter in which the “archaeologist” reported the happenings in an excavation and the finds in narrative form, a discursive and rather imprecise manner and in the first person.\textsuperscript{162} Morris has claimed that this same format and style was also used for publications in the field of classical archaeology.\textsuperscript{163} Perhaps the most eloquent examples are the writings of Heinrich Schliemann. In them, measurements of ancient buildings under excavation and discussion of finds coexist with mention of the Emperor of Brazil and an excursion in Euboea in a seamless narrative.\textsuperscript{164}

The institutionalization and the professionalization of the discipline of archaeology at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century slowly introduced new tropes in the style and the structure of the site report. The narrative style of writing gave way; a new non-narrative and analytical style for archaeological texts began to be preferred. The new style of publication was meant to differentiate archaeology from the non-professional guises, such as the products of dilettantes,

\textsuperscript{162} Hodder 1989, pp. 268-269.

\textsuperscript{163} Morris 1994, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{164} Schliemann 1878, pp. 139-145.
and travelers. From the end of the 19th century and on, Hodder notes a trend towards “more distant, abstract, decontextualized accounts within which finds are to be described,” filled with specialist nomenclature (jargon) and where the role of the individual is obscured and present only in the introduction.165 This new style resonated “science” in a science that was trying to prove itself as one.

Lucas has noted that Pitt Rivers' publication of Cranborne Chase was the monograph that in many respects established the structure that we still follow today in archaeological publications.166 The report featured a topographic introduction, a presentation of excavated features, followed by reports on the finds from the site, from artifacts to faunal and botanical remains. Besides the text, the publication was supplemented with ample illustrations (with legends), measured sections (with vertical location of finds) and drawings, followed by tabulated summaries and list of finds.167 Emphasis was put on the high amount of detail and on the presentation of everything that came out of the ground.

In Greek archaeology, a similar trend (from narrative to non-narrative texts) can be observed.168 Shanks writes that in an attempt to differentiate “real” archaeology from the other non-professional flavors of the discipline, such as the writings of dilettantes and antiquaries,

\[\text{165 Hodder 1989, p. 271.}\]
\[\text{166 Lucas 2001, p. 23.}\]
\[\text{167 Lucas 2001, pp. 23-24.}\]
\[\text{168 Morris 1994, p. 27.}\]
philosophies of art, and aesthetic appreciation, Eduard Gerhard promoted the development of an archaeology that produced positive historical knowledge rooted in critical knowledge of the literatures.\textsuperscript{169} According to Gerhard, archaeology would free itself from its past once it became a science of antiquity, i.e., \textit{Altertumswissenschaft}.\textsuperscript{170}

The adoption of the techniques of research from the allied (and more established) science of philology, i.e., source criticism, was meant to earn classical archaeology a place among the sciences. The outcome of this adoption was the development of an artifact-focused, detail-oriented style monograph, which for the most part assumed the form of a catalogue. The monograph discussed in great depth the tangible aspects of archaeology, such as architecture and movable finds, while omitting the less tangible aspects, such as people.\textsuperscript{171} The architecture and artifacts were studied in a fashion best summed up by Grafton:

Like philologists, archaeologists did not read (lesen) ancient literature [or the material record], they read it to pieces (zerlesen) in their frenzied search for raw materials from which to make new lexica and handbooks – but never a new vision of the past.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{169} Shanks 1996, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{170} Gerhard 1850, pp. 203-205 reprinted in Gerhard 2004; For Gerhard’s contribution to Classical archaeology, see also Schnapp 2004.

\textsuperscript{171} Morris 1994, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{172} Grafton 1991, p. 215.
The catalogue, of course, was not an invention of this era. Catalogues of antiquities had been compiled by art dealers for some time before the professionalization of archaeology. But this time around, as Morris has pointed out, “[in] the late 19th century archaeologists of Greece decided that the compiler and classifier of excavated data in a multi-volume site report was the ideal creative persona.”¹⁷³ Ordering and classification became a mode of explanation.

The appropriation of the catalogue and the corpus as one of the main media of publication was motivated by the theoretical perspective of culture history, which was gaining momentum at the time, and its associated views on recording. The recording of a vase or an artifact in a corpus or a catalogue was the ultimate ideal since in this way the historical information that the object could convey was safe and at home in the libraries of the Western world.¹⁷⁴ That concept and its tenets were, I think, what ultimately formed the idea of a final publication, the complete text, which, as Shanks noted, was to serve as “reference point even when superseded by new finds which blur the precision.”¹⁷⁵

Perhaps the first and most celebrated incarnation of the *Altertumswissenschaft* was the publication of the excavations at Samothrace and Olympia, by Conze and Curtius respectively.¹⁷⁶ Morris holds that these excavations, irrespective of their unsophisticated collection and recording

¹⁷³ Morris 1994, p. 27.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Flinders Petrie 1904, about the value of a corpus.

¹⁷⁵ Shanks 1996, p. 93.

¹⁷⁶ See also Shanks 1996, p. 46-47 and Chapter 4.
procedures, produced masses of material and necessitated a new technical language and style of publication, which was influenced by contemporary practices in the rest of the archaeological world rather than relying solely on procedures based on the earlier idealized view of Greece influenced by Hellenism. 177 The result was two monumental publications. In the publication of the Olympia excavations, which covers five oversize volumes, all classes of material, except pottery, were treated in a catalogue format which included a short discussion, a generic find spot, and drawings. 178 The architecture and the sculptural fragments were recorded on a color coded plan indicating location of the find and showing the first indication, perhaps, of the realization of provenience being an important class of information to be gathered for the “important” finds. As for Conze’s publication of the excavations at Samothrace, according to Daniel, it was the “first ‘modern’ excavation report;” 179 it contained detailed architectural plans and photographs, which made their first appearance in an excavation report. 180

At the beginning of the century the exploration of Gournia marked another landmark. The project and the subsequent publication did not pertain to a public area or site of “palatial” and/or “Homeric” importance; on the contrary, Gournia was a “βιομηχανική πόλις,” according to the

178 Curtius 1890-97.
179 Daniel 1976, p. 166.
180 Conze 1875-80.
workmen of Harriet Boyd Hawes, whose opinion she quoted in the publication.\textsuperscript{181} Classes of artifacts, such as household objects and utensils, which were not treated before in prior publications, now find their place among the architecture and other finds. These “humble” classes of artifacts are elevated to a celebrated status, since it is for these classes of artifacts that Gournia was remarkable (and probably still is). The main author, Boyd Hawes, is responsible for most of the publication, allocating specific classes of artifacts, and the publication of a whole different site, that of Vasiliki, to her collaborators. Architectural plans, photographs of the site and drawings of the artifacts in ink and in watercolor make up a publication of truly monumental proportions in an elephant folio.

The monumentality of these productions seems to shrink slightly in the first part of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, that is the period of construction of the artifactual sequences that still comprise the backbone of the discipline and are the foundation for the cultural history of the Aegean.\textsuperscript{182} The tradition of luxurious oversize volumes continues, but overall publications seem to settle for a size smaller than A3 (or bigger for folios).\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{181} Hawes et al. 1908, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{182} The emphasis put on historical reconstruction of the architectural and cultural history of the Mycenaean acropolis is evident in Wace’s publication of his excavations at Mycenae. (McDonald and Thomas 1990, pp. 251-252).

\textsuperscript{183} E.g., the Corinth or Agora publication series.
In perusing the publications of the American School projects, there is an observable
distinction that exists between the site reports of small projects and the “big-dig” publication
template. The small projects (usually prehistoric)\textsuperscript{184} conformed better with the “site report” type
of publication in which the site was discussed in tandem with its architecture, phasing, and finds.
The model for the site report can be gauged by the publication of Korakou and Eutresis.\textsuperscript{185} These
publications show that by this time there is an established format for the “site report,” almost
always composed by a main author, who was the director of the excavations. The author/director
was responsible for presenting the entire corpus of material excavated from the site, relegating to
specialists only a few categories of finds, such as flora, fauna or secondary phases present on
site. The “site report” included the introduction (with geographical information about the site and
its history of research), a description of the phases of a site with emphasis on the architecture, a
discussion of the pottery and the small finds in different sections and by phase. The mortuary
data as well as phases of secondary importance are attached to the end of the report. The method
of publication clearly emphasized finds – stratigraphy as we mean it today (after Harris) played
an almost secondary role as a vehicle for understanding artifactual sequences at the site. In other

\textsuperscript{184} The list of projects (Thompson 1980, pp. 267-268) that forms the sample for this discussion, are
publications ranging in date from the beginning of the century until the 1970s. It includes: Gournia, Korakou,

\textsuperscript{185} Blegen 1921; Goldman 1931.
words, “the site was merely context for the finds.”\textsuperscript{186} The emphasis on sequencing is not accompanied by an emphasis on stratigraphy \textit{per se}; the publications include one (or none) stratigraphic profile, although they do contain numerous photos of artifacts and structures as well as plans. Moreover, the results seem to be organized by period, precluding any analysis of spatial variation within the site for a given phase, or, indeed, any real understanding of the specific archaeological context of objects, as we define it today.

As far as the “big-digs” are concerned, the “site report” template does not hold except in a few cases, as the examination of the publication series for the results of the Corinth excavations shows. The protracted period of time and the extent of the excavations as well as the volume of the finds favored a more fractured and itemized treatment of the site that focuses on artifact categories rather than the publication of a specific area of the site with all its contents. For example, the reports on the results of the Corinth excavations, published from the 1930s until the Second World War, do not preserve the structure of the “site report,” since most of them are publications of specific buildings or artifactual categories. The volumes that focus on the buildings of the site publish the architecture of the building itself in remarkable detail complete with sculpture and inscriptions. They do not include (or refer to), though, anything of the contents of the building apart from fleeting references to the dating that the pottery indicates (even though in most cases that is independent corroboration of the dating suggested by the sources and coins). The other artifact categories are published separately in the corpus or

\textsuperscript{186} Lucas 2001, pp. 31-32.
catalogue format. Their interpretive caliber often relies upon decoration for the explication of issues such as religion or domestic life, whereas the spatial information is nowhere to be found.

In defense of this approach, the nature of these sites (i.e., public, used over a long period of time, with buildings refurbished and cleaned out regularly) did not lend itself to the more integrative “site report” approach, where buildings and their contents were published together. Most of the material comes from deposits of secondary or tertiary deposition and in some respects one could be justified in saying that the material did not belong with a specific building with which it was found. That is not to say that the concept of assemblage did not exist. It did, as one can see, but it was limited to obviously closed contexts such as graves or wells, which, receiving special treatment, were published according to deposit and not according to artifactual category.

In any case, this distinction is not to be exaggerated. The culture-historical paradigm reigned supreme in the first part of the 20th century when archaeologists were trying to establish the artifactual sequences, and the principal interest in the phasing of finds was purely of historical interest. The main difference was that in the prehistoric projects the phasing was not established by external evidence such as textual sources or coinage. The phasing had to be worked out and information on it had to be offered as evidence to the wider archaeological audience that perhaps was tormented by the same issues of dating in their own site. In prehistoric publications, pottery became the currency and scale that allocated dates to the excavated remains.

The Second World War seems also to represent a transition in the history of archaeological publication in the Aegean. The distinction mentioned above between smaller (prehistoric) projects and big-dig publications seems to dissipate gradually.
The publication of Corinth’s potters’ quarter signals this trend. There, even though Stillwell (and later her collaborators)\textsuperscript{187} still maintains the structure of the “site report” of the previous period, nevertheless, she perceived the potters’ quarter as a whole deemed worthy to be published in a more integrative manner, an honor previously reserved only for graves and wells (see above).

Mylonas’ \textit{Aghios Kosmas}, though, is written in a fashion that became characteristic of publications produced during this period (until the 1970s).\textsuperscript{188} Mylonas, even though he maintained a chronological structure for the presentation of the archaeological record, also introduced a novel way of publishing the finds and architecture. The artifactual categories were no longer divorced from each other, but finds were published in their spatial context, i.e., by room, or architectural entity, before they were discussed as an artifactual group.

Blegen and Rawson’s publication of the excavations at the Palace of Nestor also cast this trend in relief.\textsuperscript{189} In 1962, Blegen (who always steered clear of any and all self-aggrandizement) wrote in one of the letters to his family about the publication: “If we ever get it done, our work on the Palace of Nestor will be the first systematic, factual description of such a Minoan or

\textsuperscript{187} Stillwell 1948; Stillwell et al. 1984.

\textsuperscript{188} Mylonas 1959; cf. Mylonas 1932, where the same author uses the template of the earlier period discussed above.

\textsuperscript{189} Blegen and Rawson 1966; Blegen et al. 1973.
Mycenaean palace, telling about each room and what was found in it. Perhaps not an exciting work to read, but it will give the basic evidence for a good many more interesting works.”

The tendency towards more specialization in final site publications, an increased emphasis on recording and including information about find spots (i.e., rooms), as well as a greater amount of typological detail, required that even small or prehistoric excavations share the preparation of reports among multiple authors.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter’s goal was the delineation of two historical processes in Greek archaeology: the development of archaeological thought and practice, and the development of the publication genre. As I mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, I found this type of narrative necessary since I wanted to place Caskey, his archaeological practice, and the excavation of Ayia Irini in their proper context. Where does Caskey stand in the continuum of Greek archaeological practice? Was Caskey unique in his choice of archaeological practice(s)? This chapter is

---

190 Blegen 1994.

191 This increased specialization was not welcomed by everybody. With respect to this, Overbeck (pers. comm.) relayed to me a story he had heard from Jack Caskey. Hetty Goldman once lamented to Caskey the aforementioned trend, saying that when she had found an Archaic kouros statue at Eutresis, she herself published it but that this was shortly to become an unacceptable practice.
designed to provide a background for appreciating Caskey’s place in Greek archaeological thought, as well as anticipating the discussion in the next chapter which focuses specifically on Caskey’s archaeological practice at Ayia Irini.

By way of drawing the preceding discussion together, methodologically Greek archaeologists have “traveled” a long way since the inception of the discipline. In terms of stratigraphy, the geological perception of stratification, where artifacts were simply “horizon markers,” has given way to a more complex regard for stratigraphy where features and interfaces are looked upon as informative and as important as their contents. In terms of the role of the object in our studies, we have moved from the object being the sole bearer of information to the object being a mere participant in a complex matrix of associations with other classes of evidence whose concerted interpretation opens up new avenues in the investigation of meaning. In terms of political perspective, we have moved from an oligarchic aesthetic in both people and classes of artifacts that participate in the interpretive process to a more democratic system of presentation that allows for and encourages pluralism in interpretation and publication. Last, but not least, we have gone from an epoch of methodological innocence where the prevailing ideal of empiricism precluded any detailed exposition of methodology (where methodology has to be coaxed out of publications and off-hand remarks), since the implicit assumption was that the method was known to all, to the present day when the proliferation of methodologies has brought their explication to the forefront and perhaps has led us to a complete loss of innocence with the problematization of a single unified past.

Within this great continuum, Caskey played his role as a mediator facilitating some trends and inhibiting others in materializing this process that I have put into a unified narrative. At Ayia Irini (and Lerna), Caskey was at the apex of his career, having been an established name
in Greek archaeology owing to both his service as a Director of the ASCSA and as a professor at the University of Cincinnati, as well as his scholarly record for Troy and Eutresis. His fortunate and well-deserved standing put him in a position to realize his theoretical goals through his projects, which ended up being an amalgamation of his theoretical perspective inherited from his own training and intellectual environment, and of intelligent responses to a changing world and a changing field. In the chapter that follows, I examine and analyze in detail this amalgamation, exploring the possible repercussions of and for his archaeological practice.
CHAPTER 2: THE KEA CHRONICLES: THE ANATOMY OF AN EXCAVATION

In this chapter, discussion focuses expressly on the Ayia Irini excavations, John L. Caskey, and the specific practices that were used at Ayia Irini. It is an examination of Caskey’s archaeological practice as it pertains to the research design of the Ayia Irini excavation, the excavation and post-excavation processes with specific reference to techniques and methodologies used, as well as the publication program. The techniques and methodologies employed are defined, and the theoretical underpinnings and reasoning behind these practices are explored.

A HISTORY OF INTEREST IN KEIAN ANTIQUITIES AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Interest in the antiquities of Kea can be documented as early as the 16th century AD. From the late 17th until the early 19th century a multitude of travelers wrote accounts of their journeys to the island. Although these travels were conducted for a variety of reasons, descriptions of the island’s antiquities (as well as identifications with places described in the

193 For a complete list of travelers and references to their works, see Bennet and Voutsaki 1991, table 19.1.
ancient sources) feature in most of them. Interest, however, in the antiquities of the island was not limited to literary descriptions. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, antiquarianism was at its apogée and the retrieval of antiquities for their inclusion in collections and museums was the norm.\textsuperscript{195}

The expedition that marks a transition for the archaeology of the island was organized by P.O. Brönsted and M.J. Linkch and took place from 1811-1813. The two men came to the island and conducted “excavations” at the site of Karthaia. Although their excavation methods leave much to be desired (in actuality these excavations were treasure hunting expeditions), they nevertheless published the results of their work, as well as the results of their “walks” around the island during which they recorded the locations of many sites of archaeological interest.\textsuperscript{196} The first truly archaeological excavation at Karthaia was conducted in 1902 by Paul Graindor under the auspices of the French Archaeological School.\textsuperscript{197}

Until the 1960s, interest in Keian antiquities focused almost exclusively on the historical/classical remains on the island, mainly the topography (identification) of the four city-

\textsuperscript{195} Mendoni (1998, p. 19) has collected and lists several instance of looting that targeted the antiquities of the island. Moreover, the locals talk about more looting expeditions, both past and present; more specifically they talk about one specific expedition that targeted Poles (Karthaia), during which the ship that was loaded with the antiquities sank on the way to its final destination.

\textsuperscript{196} Brönsted 1826. They can also be credited with the correct identification of Karthaia with Poles, since most of previous travelers thought and referred to the town of Chora (modern Ioulida) as Karthaia.

\textsuperscript{197} Graindor 1905; 1906.
states and inscriptions. However, the turning point for the emergence of Kea as a point of reference for Cycladic and Aegean Prehistory was the excavation by John L. Caskey at Ayia Irini. The excavations were conducted from 1960 to 1968 (a period punctuated by seasons dedicated to the study of the finds) with minor tests carried out afterwards until 1976.

It should be noted that Ayia Irini was not the only site investigated under the auspices of Caskey’s excavations. Even though Ayia Irini was the undisputed point of focus of the project (especially in the light of the breathtaking discoveries of the very first season of excavation, i.e., the discovery of the Temple, the statues, House A, and the Great Fortifications), Caskey’s intellectual heritage did not permit the examination of the site in isolation from its regional framework and landscape. As such, this interest materialized in the small scale projects (Kephala, Troullos, Paoura, and Sykamias) and unsystematic walks around the island that individual members of the team performed during the field seasons.

These unsystematic walks evolved into another type of research project in the 1980s. Two different members of the Ayia Irini team, Hara Georgiou and Jack Davis, initiated projects that focused on the investigation of the island’s regional landscape. Hara Georgiou, along with Nicolas Faraklas, surveyed the island and recorded archaeological sites over the course of nine

\[198\] See Mendoni 1998, pp. 18-22 and passim.

years, with an emphasis on the northern part of the island.\textsuperscript{200} The Northern Keos Survey project, directed by John F. Cherry, Jack L. Davis and Eleni Matzourani, also focused on the north part of the island, but this project approached the regional landscape surrounding Ayia Irini from a totally different perspective, that of systematic intensive surface survey.\textsuperscript{201} They surveyed the landscape over the course of one season, producing a diachronic account of human activity from the “earliest settlement [of the island] until modern times.”\textsuperscript{202} The rest of the island to the south was targeted (also in the 1980s) by a team of Greek researchers, concentrating the south-west and the south-east part of Kea, the areas of Poiessa and Karthaia.\textsuperscript{203}

The 1990s and the beginning of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century have been a relative lull in terms of archaeological research on Kea. Apart from a European Union (EU) funded project focusing on the Classical site of Karthaia, which is primarily geared toward making the archaeological site

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Georgiou and Faraklas 1985 and 1993.
\item For methodology and other projects, see Alcock and Cherry 2004 with references to previous scholarship.
\item Cherry et al. 1991.
\item The survey that targeted Poiessa was conducted from 1983-1986 and its results have been published in: Mendoni and Papageorgiadou 1989; Galani et al. 1982; Papageorgiadou 1990; Mendoni 1994.
\item The Karthaia survey was conducted from 1987 until 1995 and its results have been published in: Mendoni 1989; Mendoni 1994; Mendoni 1990; Doukellis 1998.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
accessible to visitors, there have been only a few rescue excavations conducted by the responsible Ephorates.\(^{204}\)

To this day, Ayia Irini is the first, and to date the only, systematically and extensively excavated prehistoric site on Kea. The excavations and subsequent publications made the site’s significance far exceed its insular limits.

**Caskey and the Ayia Irini Research Design**

The site of Ayia Irini was known to locals and researchers long before Caskey’s excavations; the erosion on the sides of the peninsula offered views of ancient walls and other structures noticed by local antiquarians, Manthos\(^{205}\) and Psyllas,\(^{206}\) who included the site in their histories. In the western archaeological world, the existence and potential of Ayia Irini became known through the works of Welter\(^{207}\) and Scholes,\(^{208}\) the latter of whom includes the site in gazetteers published during the 1950s.

\(^{204}\) Since 2004 Kea has been included in the umbrella of authority of the KA’ Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (Cyclades); previously it was under the auspices of the A’ Ephorate of Acropolis.

\(^{205}\) Manthos 1991, p. 32.

\(^{206}\) Psyllas (1921, p. 303) mentions remains of masonry and fragments of pottery.

\(^{207}\) Welter 1954, cols. 50-52.

\(^{208}\) Scholes 1956, p. 11; see also Welter 1954, cols. 50-52. The latter is based on Welter’s trial excavations at the site.
About a decade earlier than the publication of these synthetic works, Welter had performed trial excavations. A letter of 1940 (accompanied by four pictures) from Welter to his friend Wace reveals that he recognized the potential of the site, since it had not been disturbed at all other than the building of a church in the 1930s, and, moreover, that he intended to launch an excavation in collaboration with Wace “on that symbolic site” appropriately named Ayia Irini (Holy Peace), after the end of the World War that had cast the two colleagues in opposing sides. Welter’s plans for this collaboration never materialized, even though he did explore it briefly by himself as reported in his 1954 article.

In the 1950s, Caskey was looking around for sites in the Cyclades to be used in a similar research program which would correlate the stylistic chronological sequences with stratigraphic evidence, as his previous excavation projects at Eutresis and Lerna had done for the EBA and MBA Mainland sequences. It is perhaps important that the impetus for such a campaign came a few years after the publication of the two synthetic articles, by Welter and by Scholes, which took stock of the status of archaeological knowledge about the Cyclades.

---

209 Letter from Welter to Wace, September 20, 1940 (courtesy of the Archives of the Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati donated by Elizabeth French).

210 Welter 1954, cols. 50-52.

211 Welter 1954.

212 Scholes 1956.
This new excavation program, Caskey hoped, would enhance knowledge about Cycladic cultural history and would test and refine the relative chronological sequence in the Cyclades, which up to that point had been dependent solely on the Phylakopi stratigraphy. Caskey’s interests in relative chronology and stratigraphic sequences are evident from his research projects conducted before he landed on Kea, i.e., at Eutresis and Lerna. Caskey himself noted in the first preliminary report about work on Kea: “A few early settlements are known, however, and others can be found. They offer a singularly interesting array of problems, to the solution of which a new series of excavations, conducted in the light of accumulated experience, may reasonably be expected to contribute.”

Ayia Irini was very much the target in this excavation program. But Caskey was interested in the regional and archaeological context of the site. This interest was expressed in the multitude of excavations he performed at other sites on the island (not only at Kephala, but also at Troullos, Paoura, Sykamias), as well as unsystematic walks around the island that members of the team performed during the field seasons. The archetype for such regional

---

213 Atkinson et al. 1904; Barber 1974.

214 Caskey and Caskey 1960; Caskey 1960; Caskey 1968.

215 Caskey 1962, p. 263.


program of excavations, of course, was Blegen’s similar ventures for the mainland. The first one consisted of Blegen’s investigations at Korakou, Gonia, and Zygouries that had established the “Helladic” chronological sequence.\textsuperscript{218} The second one was the Pylian expedition during which the excavations at the Palace of Nestor were accompanied by unsystematic (yet recorded in notebooks) regional investigations in the vicinity, which were the source of inspiration and information for the later University of Minnesota Messenia Expedition.

Ayia Irini turned out to be a much more interesting site than Caskey had anticipated. During the very first season, the excavation team, consisting of himself and Elizabeth Caskey with a few workmen, uncovered the remains of House A and the Temple with the almost life-size female terracotta statues, and the Great Fortifications.

Following the initial season, the exploration of the site was conducted by an excavation team that consisted of Jack Caskey himself as field director, and included nine to 18 archaeologists filling the duties of trench supervisors and pottery processors, as well as specialists. This team was assisted by one or two foremen, conservators, and 25 workmen. Finally, the excavation was supervised by a representative from the Ephoreia.\textsuperscript{219} The project typically started in mid-June and continued through August, during which time excavation would last for about a month and a half with additional time at the end for the processing of the finds.

\textsuperscript{218} Blegen 1921, 1928, and 1937.

\textsuperscript{219} The excavation was supervised by Christos Doumas, (1960-1962) and Eleni Lazaridou (1963-1970).
Most of the people whom Caskey brought with him were his students. There was clearly a system of recording and a method of excavation that he gently enforced, but his style of directorship was more detached, providing his students some real opportunities to grow and learn from their mistakes.

THE EXCAVATION PROCESS

One of the goals of this chapter, as mentioned in the chapter introduction, is the delineation of Caskey’s methodology and exploration of his methodological underpinnings. This is not a straightforward task for several reasons. Most importantly, Caskey belonged to a generation of scholars in Greek archaeology who were confident in their own disciplinary tradition, one which espoused empiricism and positivism; the “truth” was there to be recovered by anybody who applied herself to it provided that they were well versed in the artificial sequences. Caskey himself had no use for theory or fieldwork methodology in its academic guise. Fieldwork methodology was not considered by Caskey to be a proper subject for instruction in a formal academic setting, but rather the kind of knowledge to be acquired in the field from the pickman. A statement of methodology was probably considered silly or redundant, since everybody “already had” an implicit understanding of the method.

Thus, in tracing Caskey’s personal concept of excavation methods and practices, as well as his style of documentation, one has to resort to the study of the notebooks, in addition to other

220 Davis (pers. comm.); Schofield (pers. comm.).
publications, as historical sources for the examination of which I have adopted an approach that approximates source criticism. I studied the notebooks from my sector as well as the general notebooks kept by Caskey himself. The first question that arose from this examination was: to what extent did these notebooks reflect Caskey’s own system and not adaptations and/or elaborations on a theme by the excavators that dug the Northern Sector. In order to answer this question, I sought out Caskey’s own notebooks, especially those from the 1960 season during which he had dug rather than just directed the excavation, as well as samples of his earlier work, i.e., at Troy, in an effort to define the system he followed, as well as its development through time. Before I turn to the description of the system and the process in place, it is necessary to note for the reader that coaxing methodological definitions out of the notebooks does not always provide us with precise answers. Therefore, in the exposition that follows there are a lot of gaps or questions that arise to which I cannot provide an answer because of the limitation imposed by the nature and the style of my sources.

Caskey’s notebooks from the Troy excavations are invaluable, since one can see very clear indications of a very concise and factual style of excavation recording already in place. The description of the archaeological process is almost non-existent, whereas a lot of attention is paid to the description of features and artifacts discovered. Architectural features were illustrated in plan and sometimes in elevation, whereas stratigraphical sketches are (surprisingly) very scarce if present at all, although Caskey was accomplished at sorting out the stratigraphy and the

---

221 Caskey 1935.
artifactual sequences. Important finds are noted and, oftentimes, also illustrated in rough sketches.

The same trends are observed in Caskey’s notebook from the exploratory season of 1960 on Kea. In 1960 Jack and Elizabeth Caskey with the help of workmen conducted the excavation of trial trenches throughout the site in order to gauge the feasibility of a larger project. The documentation that Jack Caskey kept for the excavation of these trial trenches is very informative and illustrative of the trends that he followed in conducting the excavation as a whole.

The excavation at Ayia Irini did not follow a regular grid. Although a 10 m grid was set up over the site during the first season of excavation (1960), the trial trenches did not conform to any particular premeditated pattern. The placement of the trenches was decided according to architectural remains that were visible. The trenches had different shapes and dimensions dictated ad hoc. This almost organic development of the grid is evident in the resulting final trench plan (see Fig. 5).

---

222 Kea Excavation Notebook I.

223 More specifically in the Northern Sector, the excavation was organized around the course of the fortification wall running through it. Remnants of the enclosure were (and still are) readily visible in the shallow waters on the west side of the peninsula. Several architectural fragments were sufficiently visible to guide the main excavator of the Northern Sector to lay the trenches strategically in such a way that they would investigate the whole route of the fortification wall through Area N. After the recovery of the course of the wall was complete, trenches filled in the enclosed area.
An excavation unit probably represented a unit of exploration consisting of an area of similar qualities, such as soil color, texture, etc., even though there is no specific definition in any of the primary sources. Nevertheless, the description of some excavation units reveals that sometimes soil color variations were explored as part of the same unit. Descriptions of soil colors or soil texture occur only when these are blatantly distinct and these instances are more of a side-note rather than a standardized part of the description of the unit. Similarly, taphonomic processes did not concern Caskey. He was concerned with the identification of features, such as floors and fills which were usually identified during artifact processing and not in the field, but not the process of site formation per se. The deposition of artifacts was considered only insofar as it could be used to inform Caskey on the evolution of artifacts types and style, and the historical events that these changes represent.

Each excavation unit received a sequential number and a “cut” number, in addition to the rest of the vertical spatial information, usually starting elevation for the unit. The concept of the cut was the organizing principle that enabled the excavator to order the excavation units from top to bottom. The introduction of this additional category of data was necessary since the excavator was investigating more than one trench at a time and the sequential numbering of excavation units followed the excavator’s activities in different trenches and not the sequence within any one trench.
A cut could include several passes\textsuperscript{224} and usually was the equivalent of an excavation unit (lot). However, in some cases, more than one cut could be combined into an excavation unit, e.g., units N07-32 and -46. The excavation of a trench started with the surface cut(s) (usually not numbered). Below the surface cut(s) the excavator proceeded with the sequential numbering of the cuts.

The sequence of the cuts was only relevant to the excavation of a particular feature and no effort was expended in relating the sequence of cuts of adjacent “features” or trenches that ended up belonging to the same context. For instance, in room N.8 the excavator investigated the room with one sequence of cuts. In the same room he excavated a separate feature, a rock fall or tumbled wall, with another sequence of cuts that do not correspond with the ones of the room. Even though it was pretty obvious that the room’s matrix and the feature had resulted from the same processes, i.e., the collapse of the north wall of the room (probably in period VI), no attempt was made to link the two cut sequences.

The permanent storage and processing of the finds were done in a plot of land adjacent to the site to the north.\textsuperscript{225} From the beginning, the agreement with the supervising Ephor was that

\textsuperscript{224} A pass is an arbitrary, relatively thin layer of earth removed across the area under investigation. One excavation unit can comprise one or more passes.

\textsuperscript{225} The plot of land that the archaeological site occupied was the property of the Michalinos company, which permitted the excavation and use of the land for archaeological purposes (\textit{Kea Excavation Notebook I}, p. 9).
the trenches would be left uncovered during the winter and that “useless sherds [would be dumped] near the enclosure wall on the east side of the site.”

After the end of every excavation season, the supervisors of every trench would strew their pottery. Caskey instructed his excavators to construct deposits. The construction of a deposit or a “combined lot” (in the official terminology of the excavation) resulted from the physical combination of ceramics from two or more stratigraphical units that were lumped together into a single group. The combination was performed after the pottery was sorted and most coarse, plain, and undecorated wares had been discarded. Each excavator went through the excavation units from his/her trench(es) and physically combined those that were thought to come from contemporary excavation units, usually from the same room.

The same methods were also used at Lerna and have been described by Banks and Vitelli, on whose accounts the following description of the process is based. According to them, the material went through at least two (sometimes three) episodes of discarding. The first phase

---

226 Kea Excavation Notebook I, p. 32.

227 There is no description in the records as to what the excavators regarded as coarse ware. Nevertheless, I assume that the coarse category included pottery with gritty texture and clay matrix which contains inclusions 0.5 mm. or larger (Rice 1987, p. 32, fig. 2.2).

228 In 1970, Caskey himself performed this process for the finds from the Temple, when a large portion of the pottery was papsed. He was particularly keen on papsing, especially for the purpose of storage space management. (Davis, pers. comm.; Overbeck, pers. comm.).

would take place at the end of each excavation day, when the supervising archaeologist went through the day's pottery, which had been “washed in water or a solution of HCl, and discarded a substantial percentage of the featureless coarse and pithos sherds; these were subsequently used to fill up Classical wells at the site.”

In some cases, at Lerna, as well as Kea, a record was kept of quantities discarded at the site; more often, it was not.

After the first phase, the material would go to the pot menders who would go through the ceramic material and look for joining sherds. Subsequently, and probably at the end of each season, the trench supervisor would carry out phase two of discarding the featureless material and of the combination of lots. Each excavator went through the excavation units from his/her trench and created the combined lots described above from pottery that was thought to come from contemporary deposits. Sometimes the sherds from the contributing excavation units would be marked in pencil with the number of the original excavation unit, but this was by far the exception rather than the rule (especially in the Northern Sector). At Lerna, excavators combined only two or three excavation units from adjacent deposits. At Ayia Irini, the practice was more widespread; the average number of excavation units that were included in a new combined lot is ten, whereas the lowest number is two and the maximum is 53. As mentioned above, even though, the criteria for combination are not articulated anywhere, for the most part, the combined lots were put together from adjacent units consisting of material that dated to the same period or

\[230\] Banks 1995, p. 1; also Schofield (pers. comm.).

\[231\] Vitelli 2007.
the same range of periods. Sometimes, and rather often in the Northern Sector, lots from a broad area, including the interior and exterior spaces around one or more rooms, were combined into one large combined lot.

During phase two, the process of sorting was recorded in the pottery notebooks, as well as on wooden tags included with the combined lot, with an entry in the following format: N (area), 3 (trench), 18 (original lot number), cut 5; W. of Wall F, +1.00-1.06 (description of spatial position); V.102 (Excavation Notebook Reference); ¼ tin (volume of the lot before discarding or combination); 90% discarded: 2 c[onical] c[cups]; 1 large leg (mention of discarded artifacts with features) (see Fig. 91). Sometimes this entry also included a mention of bones, but this depended almost entirely on the discretion of the recorder. Banks and Vitelli note that it is difficult to surmise the criteria for discarding at Lerna (and the same can be said about Ayia Irini), since no instructions were ever written down.

At Ayia Irini, there was a third stage of discarding. This was not recorded anywhere, but when Elizabeth Schofield studied the deposits of Periods VI and VII in 1982 from the Northern Sector, she found that, in several cases, the volume that should have been left after combination and recording in the pottery notebook was significantly smaller than the entry (for examples of lots, i.e., N17CL, with reduced volume, see Fig. 68). It is most likely that this third discarding took place while Caskey was preparing the phasing for the entire site, the results of which have been published in the article “Conspectus of the Pottery.”232

232 Caskey 1972.
This processing method (sorting, papping, and combined lot construction) imposed on the archaeological material the “reality” of the site as the excavators perceived it; i.e., the contents of the room were formed by a certain number of events that had resulted in a certain number of deposits/strata, which the combination process reconstituted after their separation during the excavation. Thus, the excavators imposed their own authorial style on the data, erasing to a certain extent the traces of the archaeological process (i.e., the original excavation units).

In choosing such a research design, Caskey combined different objectives. On the one hand, the principal objective was to establish a closely-dated and stratigraphically-based chronological sequence of pottery that was very much influenced by Blegen’s intellectual pursuits in constructing artifactual sequences, such as the Helladic sequence based on the excavations at Korakou, Gonia, Hagiorigitika, and Zygouries. On the other hand, Caskey wanted to emphasize the importance of documenting finds by individual architectural unit. This was also an influence of Blegen’s, who, as early as the Troy publication (in which Caskey participated), insisted in the publication of finds according to the architectural unit they belonged (a trend which appears in Blegen and Rawson’s publication of the Palace of Nestor). These two different objectives resulted in the choice of a research design that would merge both of these approaches plus massively reduce the volume of artifacts for storage, since the latter apparently was one of his concerns.233

233 Overbeck (pers. comm.).
By choosing the method of combined lots, Caskey in essence “materialized” a technique of publication of archaeological stratigraphy. As it was not meaningful at the time (nor is it considered meaningful now by most practitioners of Greek archaeology) to publish an excavation according to individual excavation units, excavators often chose to synthesize their data according to stratigraphic layers or strata or deposits within a specified area or architectural unit.

In preparation for the publication, Caskey instructed his excavators to create physically the deposits that would later be published in the final “Site Report.” The technique could be said to have “materialized” the publication, since the sherds that survived the sorting and papsing bore diagnostic value of chronological type which would be presented in the final publication as evidence for the dating of a given deposit. The impact of this processing has many repercussions. On the one hand, this practice constituted new deposits (that were created on the basis of a series of assumptions about what is important) that lack in contextual definition of the original excavation units. Even though a researcher can reconstruct the sequence of the original excavation units on paper based on the notebooks (see Chapter 3), the pottery was combined in these new lots that in most cases does not allow one to reverse the process. Moreover, the papsing of the uninformative pottery without proper quantification has produced artificial deposits that offer information mainly for dating purposes.\(^{234}\)

\(^{234}\) Secondarily, since imported wares and fabrics were less discriminated against during papsing, these deposits can provide information on Ayia Irini’s place in the Aegean.
This process of “materialization” of the publication was not the invention of Jack Caskey, but seemed to be a common practice among the excavators of his era. The genealogy of this system can be traced back to the Corinth and Athenian Agora Excavations and possibly the Mycenae investigations under Wace.\textsuperscript{235}

**CASKEY AND THE FINAL PUBLICATION**

Caskey had in mind a model for the final publication of his projects, influenced more by the publication trends of the earlier part of the century. He planned to publish the ceramic material and other finds by phases in a publication not dissimilar to his 1972 article, publishing the preliminary observations on periods of occupation at the site, since his goal was to establish Cycladic chronology on the basis on stratigraphic and ceramic correlations. He probably intended largely to ignore particular find-spots and contexts, even though, in all probability, he wanted to categorize finds according to the architectural spaces in which they were found. His colleagues and close friends, Marion Rawson and Carl Blegen (the latter also his former thesis advisor and mentor), were doing the same thing in the publication of the Palace of Nestor, which was being prepared while Ayia Irini was under excavation.

Certainly, at Lerna Caskey planned to publish the material himself, probably with the assistance of Elizabeth Caskey. Elizabeth Banks clearly described his intentions in her forward to *Lerna* III: “As an important step to the final publications, which Caskey meant to prepare himself

\textsuperscript{235} Kim Shelton (pers. comm.).
with the assistance of Elizabeth G. Caskey and a few collaborators on specialized topics, in 1957-1958 another review of the sherd material that then remained in Old Corinth was undertaken…”

Caskey was an excellent writer and a perfectionist; several of his students and colleagues still praise his literary style, which was concise and flowing. He invested great care and energy into each of his manuscripts. His ideas about the final publication were very much typical of his time. He wanted to produce the “final” publication of each of his excavations, an authoritative account of the findings of his excavations with minimum interpretation and theorizing. His cautious and analytical character prevented him from publishing anything about which he harbored any uncertainty. He believed that theorizing and discussions of the material did not belong in a final publication, but in articles. He considered the latter format to be ephemeral in nature, especially compared to the final publication, and thus the proper medium for advancing ideas, theories (almost always historical in nature), and interpretations. Practicing


237 Konsola (pers. comm.; Dora Konsola earned an M.A. under Caskey’s advisorship); see also Petruso 1992, p. viii.
what he preached, he wrote a large number of articles in the course of his career, but in the end he did not manage to produce a final publication for either of his two major excavations.238

Ayia Irini and Lerna ultimately have been published in a manner quite different from that which Caskey had intended. The final publication for both of these sites ended up appearing in the form of multi-volume, multi-authored publications, in a style consonant with other publications produced at the time of their authorship. By the time results from the Ayia Irini excavation were ready to be published in definitive form, the new models presented by sites (and their publications) such as Nichoria had dramatically altered normal standards for the final reports on prehistoric excavations in Greece. To publish Lerna and Ayia Irini according to such a model, i.e., the model used for Nichoria, was a Herculean task that lay beyond the capabilities of a single man.

It is clear that at an early stage Caskey began to realize the necessity of adjusting his ideas and practices. It seems that shortly after the start of the excavation at Kea he decided to assign bodies of materials to younger colleagues and to his current (at the time) and former students (as he also did at Lerna in the waning years of his life). He first assigned the publication of the Kephala cemetery to John Coleman,239 who was responsible for the excavation of the

238 His remarkable writing talent was invested in: a) preliminary reports of excavation seasons, b) preliminary discussions of ceramic sequences, c) forewords, d) various short articles, e) contributions in works like the CAH, and f) the Troy volumes in collaboration with Blegen, Rawson, and Sperling (Blegen et al. 1950).

Elizabeth Schofield, née Milburn, was awarded in 1968 the ceramic material from House A, having catalogued the pottery from room 21 in 1964 and defended it as comparanda in her 1965 dissertation on the pottery from House C, which she herself had excavated. Aliki Bikaki was given the responsibility of House B. Initially, Area N (Northern Sector) was assigned to William Kittredge, who had excavated a large portion of it. Last, but not least, the terracotta statues from the Temple were allocated to Miriam Ervin Caskey in 1964-1965, while Jack Caskey kept for himself the marble figurines, the EBA phase, and the study of the stratigraphy from the Temple. For all these studies Caskey envisioned a volume or section detailing the stratigraphy of the area or sector, followed by a detailed analysis of the ceramic material.

In addition to the volumes outlined above, which were intended to treat particular areas of Ayia Irini during its most extensively explored (Late Bronze Age) levels, or a separate outlying site, other students were assigned studies of earlier periods of occupation at Ayia Irini. Finally, separate studies on a number of specialized classes of objects, including the

---

240 Coleman 1977.
241 Caskey 1966, p. 373.
242 Milburn 1965; Cummer and Schofield 1984.
243 “Precise dating of these architectural stages will have to await Mr. Kittredge’s further study of the pottery and objects from the associated strata” (Caskey 1966, p. 365).
244 Caskey 1966, p. 369; Caskey et al. 1986.
245 The EBA was later bequeathed to Mary Eliot (Davis, pers. comm.).
246 John Overbeck (Overbeck 1989) and Jack Davis (Davis 1986).
potter’s marks, certain categories of domestic and industrial pottery, and the lead weights were to be published as separate volumes by experts in those fields (Bikaki, Georgiou, and Petruso, respectively), following the model established by Blegen with the publication of the animal bones as a supplementary volume in the Troy series by Gevjal. Specialist studies of smaller bodies of material – the frescoes, the seals, the archaic/classical deposit – were published as articles and/or as part of the corpus of publication of Aegean seals and sealings by Abramovitz, Younger, and Butt.

The boldness, but also novelty, of this decision to apportion the material out to Caskey’s students and colleagues is underlined in a celebratory fashion by George S. Korres in a book review on the publication progress of the site. In this book review, Korres says:

Εξ άλλου, ο καθηγητής κ. Κάσκεϊ ήκολούθησε μέθοδον ορθήν, διότι, ευθύς εξ αρχής, παρέσχε πλήρη πρωτοβουλίαν εις τους συνεργάτες του, εις τους οποίους, μάλιστα, ανέθεσεν υπευθύνως ωρισμένους όλως σημαντικούς τομείς της εκτεταμένης ανασκαφής του και εις τους συνεργάτας του αυτούς ανέθεσεν αντιστοίχως και τη δημοσίευσην των ευρημάτων των. Αυτή είναι η καλύτερα μέθοδος η οποία είναι δυνατόν να εφαρμοσθῇ εις εν παρομοίας εκτάσεως και παρόμοιας σημασίας έργου και τούτο διότι, ώς απεδείχθη, ήρχονταν εκδιδόμενα εις συντομώτατον χρονικών διάστημα επί μέρους έργα αντιστιχούντα εις τομείς της ανασκαφής ή εις σύνολα ευρημάτων. Ούτω, τίθενται εις την διάθεσιν των ειδικών επιστημόνων, ευθύς αμα τη συμπλήρωσει της ανασκαφής τα σχετικά ευρήματα.


Whether this inclusion of Caskey’s students and collaborators in all the stages of the excavation and post-excavation process was intentional or not, Ayia Irini was a very democratic dig and in this sense ahead of its time. The division of labor between fieldworkers and the “intellectuals” or thinkers, ingrained in the formation of the discipline\textsuperscript{250} was abolished at the

\textsuperscript{249} “Professor Caskey followed the right method, because right from the beginning he gave initiative to his collaborators; he trusted them to supervise responsibly very important sectors of the excavation; he also trusted the supervisors with the publication of the finds of their excavations. This is the best method that could be applied to an operation of such extent and significance, because in a very short period of time studies of the separate excavation sectors or groups of finds started being published. Thus, the finds and findings are rendered accessible to scholars immediately after the completion of the excavation, a situation which is very rare for excavations in Greece. Should Professor Caskey have opted to undertake the publication of all the finds of his excavation on his own, the realization of the publication would have been delayed without a doubt” (Korres 1978, p. 797; translated by author).

\textsuperscript{250} Kucklick (1997, pp. 53-55) noted that the division of labor and differential social status between archaeological thinkers or theorists and fieldworkers in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century has never really been overturned. Even today, in most projects there is a distinction between the people that are allowed to think, theorize, and synthesize and the fieldworkers. One of the most striking examples is the widely diverging attitudes between British academia and British contract archaeologists not only in terms of social status but also in terms of methodological stance (see discussion in Carver 1990; on the issue of “democracy” on the dig see, Lucas 2001, pp. 6-9).
Ayia Irini excavations, in contrast to previous and current mega-projects in Greek archaeology.

The members of the Ayia Irini excavations were involved in all (or almost all) the steps of the process. They dug, sorted pottery, identified, synthesized, and were intended to publish, thus bridging the gap between the fieldworkers and “intellectuals” of archaeology.

**CONCLUSION**

In Chapter 1, the reader was introduced to a summary of the continuum of Greek archaeological thought and practice. This was designed to function as background in appreciating the place and contribution of Caskey within this continuum, as well as his archaeological practice at Ayia Irini. The focus in this chapter is on Ayia Irini, the archaeological practice during the excavations, and its publication program. Apart from the intrinsic interest in archaeological practice, the description of the archaeological process at Ayia Irini is useful and a kind of prelude to Chapter 3. After reading this chapter the reader is equipped with the necessary background for a more nuanced reading of Chapter 3, which presents the stratigraphy, dating, and finds associated with architectural units of the Northern Sector.

In this chapter I have examined in detail the archaeological practice of Caskey at Ayia Irini. In gauging this issue, I used primary sources (notebooks and other documents that recorded the excavation), as well as verbal communications with Caskey’s students and collaborators to form an idea about his methods and techniques.

A characterization of Caskey’s research was necessary, since for the Ayia Irini excavations there is no published statement of research design. As mentioned earlier, Caskey considered redundant any methodological description. The method is singular, common, and implicit for all who seriously dedicate themselves to the study of the past of the Greek lands.
Equally singular and unambiguous was the connection between the proliferation of archaeological research (i.e., more excavations)\textsuperscript{251} and the discovery of the “truth” about the historical events in Aegean (pre-)history.

Caskey’s system of recording and processing established for the excavation of Ayia Irini reflects that faith in the method and presents clear affinities to the archaeological practice(s) prevalent in Greek archaeology at the time, and more specifically the archaeological practices of the projects of the American School typified by the Athenian Agora Excavations. Moreover, archaeological practice bore the clear influence of Caskey’s advisor, collaborator, and friend, Carl Blegen. The system of combined lots reconciled the archaeological practice of the ASCSA projects with a need to keep intact the relationship between finds and spatial unit of recovery in study and publication, something that was not emphasized as much in the two bastions of ASCSA research (i.e., Agora and Corinth) due to the nature of the sites (i.e., public, used over long period of times). Nevertheless, spatial control that went beyond the abstraction level of the excavation unit or the combined lot was not as emphasized by the archaeological practice at Ayia Irini.

Thus, this chapter aims to lay bare the inner workings of this singular, common, and implicit method. The description of archaeological practice has made, I think, obvious the theoretical underpinnings of the research design and archaeological practice, as well as intellectual relationship of Caskey with his time and intellectual environment. It also highlights

\textsuperscript{251} For instance, see Caskey 1962, p. 263.
the impact of archaeological practice on the data (i.e., finds and recorded information on them, as well as the excavation process) from an excavation and, therefore, on archaeological knowledge. As mentioned above, the construction of combined lots was a practice that favored the construction of deposits out of material of high diagnostic value mainly for chronological purposes. Therefore, these deposits excellently served Caskey’s culture historical purposes, since they can be easily taken, especially the pure deposits, as examples of the ideal cultural sequence for the Cyclades that Caskey wanted to present to the academic community.

Even though I examine the impact of this method on archaeological knowledge in Chapter 4, here it will suffice to say that the focus on culture historical concerns has posed limitations on the material when used to answer other questions. Thus, the papping of “undiagnostic material” without proper recording and preservation of examples of classes thrown away severely hampers any attempts at quantification, pursuit of social, economic, and behavioral questions as well as questions of site formation.

To point out the limitations of the method is far from being pessimistic or condemning of a much admired figure like Caskey. It is more of a cautionary tale since no researcher is immune to similar future “faux-pas” or future methodological criticism. On the other hand, this methodological exposition reveals the limitation for future researchers coming to material from old excavations with questions inspired by contemporary research concerns. Unless the questions approximate the central questions of the PI’s research design, the material will almost always fall short, necessitating a series of methodological adjustments.

As it was mentioned in the concluding remarks for Chapter 1, I consider that Caskey played a mediating role in facilitating some trends and inhibiting others in his archaeological practice; this was an amalgamation of his theoretical perspective, as well as intelligent responses
to a changing world and a changing field. His theoretical underpinnings classed him with an earlier generation of archaeologists. Ayia Irini was the last project of his career, so in certain respects it was not methodologically in the front lines of Greek archaeology. In a time when there was emphasis on tighter spatial controls and taphonomic processes, Caskey’s combined lots were a little outdated.

On the other hand, Caskey had the foresight to recognize the changing times and alter his publication plan from his original intention. The new plan included a list of numerous authors, most of which were his students and colleagues. If there is a concern today with pluralism and democratic practices in archaeology and the integration of diggers and analysts of archaeological material, Caskey can be said to have spearheaded the trend. Korres’ critique and reaction (see above) makes obvious the novelty of the practice that in theory would also ascertain speedier publication of the excavation. Not everything about the publication program went as Caskey had planned. Nevertheless, the fact that Ayia Irini is one of the better published sites in the Aegean speaks volumes about both the intended program as well as the man who inspired it.
CHAPTER 3: ARCHITECTURE AND STRATIGRAPHY OF THE NORTHERN SECTOR

This chapter is dedicated to the analysis of the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector (Area N) of the site of Ayia Irini. After a brief introduction which presents the status of archaeological knowledge of the site as a whole, I present the specifics of the Northern Sector. Following that, there is an overview of the architectural structures included in the Northern Sector. This overview is necessary background for the analysis of the stratigraphy. Last, but not least, the stratigraphy of each of these spaces is examined separately.

In this chapter the stratigraphy of the Northern Sector is examined without focusing on any specific period. As was mentioned in the introduction, the deposits of Periods IV and V have been published by Overbeck and Davis respectively. Thus, my own contribution, besides looking at the stratigraphy in an integrated fashion, is the first presentation of the post Period V deposits of the Northern Sector, most importantly the main phases of the site, Periods VI and VII.

AYIA IRINI: THE SITE AND ITS HISTORY

This section offers a short examination of the history of the site as previously reconstructed by the archaeologists of the Kea excavations and the Kea publications.

The site of Ayia Irini is located on the northeastern part of the bay of Ayios Nikolaos, a wide protected gulf with two bays. This bay offers shelter to any vessel that might travel “from Piraeus, the Saronic Gulf, and northeastern Peloponnesos round the cape of Sounion and mov[ing] through the channel to the Euripos or out into the northern Aegean. Others, small craft particularly, find shelter on a southward passage by hugging the shores of the western Cyclades
from Keos to Melos.\textsuperscript{252} In the westernmost bay a landing is located at the port of Koresia (Κορησία or Λιβάδι) which is the mooring used by the modern liners coming from the Mainland port of Laurion and is protected from all but northerly winds. The easternmost bay or the bay of Vourkari (currently frequented by yachts and sailing ships, as well as local boats) also offers protection from the northerly winds. There lies the site of Ayia Irini, which today has the form of a small peninsula (less that 1.5 ha) that juts out into the bay of Vourkari.

The site did not present this picture in antiquity. A substantial part of the site has eroded, especially the western and southeastern sides (see Fig. 7), which are also submerged under water because of a change in sea level, estimated at approximately 3.5 m.\textsuperscript{253} Indeed, parts of the fortification wall can readily be seen extending into the sea on both the western and eastern sides of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{254} An underwater survey conducted in the bay by Lloyd Cotsen in 1974\textsuperscript{255} offers some observations on the extent and features of the submerged area, even though the architectural remains were obscured by silt and vegetation. The survey suggests that the fortification wall probably ran around the peninsula, and not only the northern part of it.\textsuperscript{256} The town probably extended 35-41 m to the west of the peninsula, 25-32 m to the south, and 27.5-

\textsuperscript{252} Caskey 1962, p. 266.


\textsuperscript{254} Caskey 1962, p. 277 and fig. 1, Area D.


\textsuperscript{256} Caskey 1978, p. 760.
33.5 m to the southwest.\textsuperscript{257} Even though the extent of the town has not been ascertained, it is safe to say that during the main phases of the site (i.e., Phases V-VII) the town was probably twice as big as it remains today.\textsuperscript{258}

**PERIOD I**

The earliest human activity at Ayia Irini (Period I, or “Latest Neolithic”) has been dated a little later than the above mentioned sites, but earlier than the Grotta-Pelos phase (EC I) in the Cyclades.\textsuperscript{259} EC I appears to be absent from the island, since it is not found at Ayia Irini or in the wider area of northern Kea.\textsuperscript{260} Period I is represented by a small number of deposits that were found in rock cavities.\textsuperscript{261}

\textsuperscript{257} Mourtzas and Kolaiti 1998, p. 681.

\textsuperscript{258} Mourtzas and Kolaiti 1998, p. 690 and fig. 5.

\textsuperscript{259} Wilson 1999, p. 227.

\textsuperscript{260} Cherry et al. 1991a, pp. 165-166; however, Wilson (1999, p. 227) mentions the existence of two marble footed-jars found by Caskey (1972, p. 362).

\textsuperscript{261} For the deposits, see Caskey 1972, pp. 360-362; for the discussion of the position in the general chronological sequence, see Coleman 1977, p. 99.
PERIOD II

The first large scale phase of occupation (Period II) happened after the beginning of the late EB II period elsewhere in the Aegean.\textsuperscript{262} Period II was relatively short, and its closest cultural affinities occur in East Attica.\textsuperscript{263} This phase is represented by several deposits around the site, mainly in some pavements and drains (belonging to the earliest Period II) and in the rooms that preceded House E.\textsuperscript{264} Some of these deposits were stratified over Period I deposits, which were in cavities in the stereo, under the floors of the rooms of the Period II phase. Most of the deposits seem to be concentrated in the Western Sector of the site, where excavation went down to stereo (see Fig. 2).

The reason why the Period II settlers showed a preference for the Western Sector was probably due to the existence of a spring, which in later phases was developed into the so-called Spring Chamber. Schofield has claimed that the use of the spring was initiated in this period and its existence conditioned to an extent the organizational form of the settlement around it. She has also commented on the general state of the Period II settlement, its organization and extent:

The spring started to be used in EC II, when the bedrock was cut out to create a deep basin for the water. A great cobbled roadway was constructed, leading from

\textsuperscript{262} The term EB is used by Wilson (1999, p. 227) because it reflects more accurately the “eclecticism of material culture,” which shows equally close affinities to EH II as well as EC II.

\textsuperscript{263} Wilson 1999, p. 228.

\textsuperscript{264} Wilson 1999, p. 228.
the terrace on which some of the houses stood, down the slope of the hill, and heading straight towards the spring. This feature, plus the series of drainage channels in this area (and indeed elsewhere on the site) suggests that the Western Sector was quite carefully planned almost, if not quite, from the start. Some drains are simple channels cut in the bedrock, while others are built. The houses themselves contain large, spacious rooms, and the walls are exceptionally well constructed (better than in most later periods). Everything about this EBA settlement suggests sophisticated communal planning. Furthermore, it seems to have extended over almost as wide an area as the LBA settlement.265

From the fragmentary remains one can comment on the very neat masonry employed for the buildings of the period, which consists of small flat slabs carefully laid and fitted.266 The suites of rooms dated to this period seem to be rectangular and with a SW to NE orientation. These rooms contained pottery, regular hearths, as well as large pan hearths (some of them stamped across the rim), stone implements and miscellaneous objects.267

**PERIOD III**

Period III followed Period II without any obvious interruption. This period was probably as long as Period II, as Wilson surmised from its two major and successive building phases.268

265 Schofield 1998, pp. 119-120.
Deposits come principally from House E in the western sector of the site.\textsuperscript{269} In ceramic terms, the end of the phase should be placed before the beginning of the EH/EC III and before the end of Lefkandi I.\textsuperscript{270}

**PERIOD IV**

After a period of occupational hiatus,\textsuperscript{271} during which the site seems to have been abandoned, settlers, probably from the Mainland arrived and established their settlement on the exact same spot that the previous inhabitants of Ayia Irini had occupied.\textsuperscript{272} Period IV is roughly equivalent to MM IIA on Crete (going as far back as MM IB and into MM IIB) and MH II on the

\textsuperscript{269} Caskey 1971, pp. 368-372, fig. 7; see also Wilson and Eliot 1984.

\textsuperscript{270} Wilson (1999, p. 230) notes that the ceramics of this phase are characterized by the presence of Anatolianizing features, which divide sites in the Aegean area in two spheres of influence. The first region – absence of Anatolianizing features- includes the Corinthia and the Peloponnesus. The second region – presence of Anatolianizing shapes- includes East Attica, Boeotia, Euboea, the Sporades, the Cyclades and southern Thessaly.

\textsuperscript{271} For justification of the hiatus, see Overbeck 1984, p. 109.

\textsuperscript{272} Overbeck (1984, p. 109) states that “structures of Ayia Irini IV are entirely new and that their layout ignores the earlier buildings beneath.” As for the origin of the settlers, Overbeck and Crego (2008) have argued for Aegina more specifically.
Mainland\textsuperscript{273} (see Table 2). Furthermore, it is subdivided into three phases: IVa, b and c (see Fig. 3).\textsuperscript{274}  

A fortification wall with a horseshoe-shaped tower was constructed during Phase IVa to protect the site. The wall, the most extensive remains of which are located in the Western Sector of the site, was serviced by a gate, also in the Western Sector - which provided access to the spring - with an earthen ramp leading up to it. At the end of IVa the gateway was blocked, an event that signifies the beginning of the next phase, IVb. During this phase, the wall continued in use but the earthen ramp disappeared under succeeding deposits, into which burials were placed. There does not seem to have been a passage through the wall in order to approach the spring at this time. The IVc phase is the period after the fortification system fell into disuse and disrepair, the cemetery was abandoned, and prior to the construction of the Great Fortifications of Period V. During this last period the settlement expanded northward beyond the old fortification and above the cemetery.\textsuperscript{275}  

As mentioned above, the bulk of the material dated to Period IV comes from the Western Sector (Fig. 3); in addition significant deposits come also from underneath House A and the Temple, Temple Lane, and Temple Road.\textsuperscript{276} The distribution of the deposits shows that “the

\textsuperscript{273} Overbeck, 1989, p. 1.  
\textsuperscript{274} For explication of the phases, see Overbeck 1984, p. 108; 1989, p. 1.  
\textsuperscript{275} Schofield 1998, p. 120.  
\textsuperscript{276} Overbeck 1989, pp. 1-2.
settlement expanded beyond its rather narrow fortified area, and the new wall [of Period V] was swung northwards to include this expansion.”277 The settlement flourished in Period IV and had external contacts with Crete, the Mainland and the southern Cyclades.278 The degree of “affluence” could be gauged from the wealth represented in the cemeteries of the period, which were located beyond the walls of the town in three cemetery areas, West Cemetery North, West Cemetery South, and East Cemetery (Fig. 4). The inhumations were interred in a variety of grave types (jar burials, cist graves, stone-built structures, and simple burials) and contained jewelry in gold, silver, and other semi-precious stones.279

277 Overbeck 1984, pp. 108.
278 Overbeck 1984, pp. 111-112.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayia Irini Period</th>
<th>Phylakopi</th>
<th>Akrotiri 280</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Cycladic Sequence</th>
<th>Minoan Sequence</th>
<th>Mainland Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>II-ii</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MC early</td>
<td>MM IB-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>II-iii</td>
<td>C (D=MM IIIB)</td>
<td>MC late</td>
<td>MM IIIA</td>
<td>MH III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>III-i</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LC I</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>III-ii</td>
<td></td>
<td>LC II</td>
<td>LM IB</td>
<td>LH II A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>III-iii</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LC III early</td>
<td>LM IA</td>
<td>LH III A-B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ayios Andeas on Siphnos Koukounaries on Paros</td>
<td>LC III middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrine phases 2b-3a</td>
<td>Koukounaries on Paros Naxos: Grotta, Aplomata, Kamini</td>
<td>LC III late</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lefkandi</td>
<td>LC III final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ayia Irini periods correlated with other Cycladic, Mainland, Minoan sequences.
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PERIOD V

In Period V a major reorganization of the site occurred\(^{281}\) (for relative chronology and synchronisms, see Table 2). A second wall, the Great Fortifications as it was called by Caskey, was erected to fortify the site. This was a “massive wall with Cyclopean masonry on the north face and a backing of rubble on the inner side,” \(^{282}\) with a gate, bastions and smaller openings for purposes of drainage. The new wall augmented the size of the site (1/3 bigger than Period IV), and new buildings were probably erected to accommodate the needs of a growing population.\(^{283}\)

The wall was built closer to the spring, even though it was not included within the confines of the town, nor was access provided to it. Possible explanations for this are that the spring was not usable or that its existence was unknown to the builders of the wall.\(^{284}\)

The distribution of Period V deposits shows that the entire area north of the modern church was occupied by buildings.\(^{285}\) Nevertheless, because of subsequent building phases the remains of Period V have been obliterated and, as Davis notes, “the largest group of finds were

\(^{281}\) Davis (1986, p. 1) notes that the definition of the period was done purely on architectural terms since no interruption could be singled out in terms of material culture.

\(^{282}\) Caskey 1962, p. 277.

\(^{283}\) Davis 1986, p. 102.

\(^{284}\) Schofield (1998, p. 120) suggests that “it must have dried up or become severely contaminated, perhaps by overdrawing of the water. Probably the cleft filled up with debris.”

\(^{285}\) Davis 1986, p. 78.
recovered from rooms just inside this enceinte, but even there, few walls of the period and still fewer rooms have been preserved. We do not have a complete plan of even a single structure.”

The flow of imported goods, which had begun in the previous period, intensified during Period V.

**MAIN PERIOD OF THE SITE: PERIODS VI AND VII (A AND B)**

The next two periods, VI and VII, represent the main periods of the site, since most of the extant remains can be dated to this time range. Chronologically, VI is marked “by the first appearance of LM IA wares from Crete and LH I from the Mainland,” and VII is marked by the appearance of LM IB wares from Crete and LH IIA from the Mainland (see Table 2). Unfortunately, the periods after V have not yet been treated in publications, and only the publication of House A, as well as the preliminary reports and a trickle of articles on various subjects, explore how the site fared during these periods.

A major building program during Periods VI and VII transformed the town, which at this time probably attained its largest population; estimates range from approximately 500 people

---

286 Davis 1986, p. 2.
(according to Schofield\textsuperscript{290}) to 780-1250 people (according to Davis\textsuperscript{291}). The building program, whether centrally organized or not, included House A (LC I and LC II),\textsuperscript{292} House B,\textsuperscript{293} House C (late LC I),\textsuperscript{294} structures in Area L,\textsuperscript{295} and House F,\textsuperscript{296} to name a few. Of these buildings, House A merits a brief description.

House A was the largest building of the settlement, occupying an extremely focal point within it. The building’s central location today at the site may be misleading, since part of the settlement is submerged in the water. However, strong testimony for its important placement is its close proximity to the Main Gate of the settlement and to the Temple, whose main phase is also dated to Periods VI and VII,\textsuperscript{297} during which the terracotta figures would have stood and acted as a focal point of religious activity. Schofield chose the term “Mansion” to describe this building. Even though House A cannot be deemed a palatial complex, nevertheless, in terms of the diversity of its functions, it could be viewed as a microcosm of the major palaces, since it

\textsuperscript{290} Schofield 1998, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{291} Cherry et al. 1991b, pp. 229-230.
\textsuperscript{292} Schofield 1998, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{293} Caskey 1962, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{294} Caskey 1962, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{295} Caskey 1964, p. 322; 1971, p. 383.
\textsuperscript{296} Caskey 1966, 373-374; 1971, 386; Preston 1972.
combined elite residence (with a considerable degree of luxury), large scale storage facilities, and small industries.\footnote{298}

| Within and probably very near the end of Kea VI | Catastrophe at Akrotiri |
| At the end of Kea VIIb | Abandonment of Kastri in Kythera |
| | LM IB destructions in Crete |
| At the end of Kea VIIb or beginning of VIII | Partial Destruction of Phylakopi III-ii |

Table 3: Synchronisms of Kea VI and VII with destructive events in the Aegean area. (Schofield 1984, p. 182).

During the periods of its use, House A (and the site) suffered a multitude of destructions, “most or all probably by natural forces.”\footnote{299} These destructions, subsequent rebuilding (or not), and selective abandonment of spaces within the complex (whenever they would be deemed inappropriate for use for whatever reason), have resulted in House A being a very complicated building to untangle and publish. The greater part of House A had evidently been planned from the start in Period VI, but ultimately the execution of the plan was done piecemeal in clearly defined units.\footnote{300} The construction of the Period VI building (i.e., the entire northern part of the building was built as well as a protruding suite of rooms (16-18) to the south) was initiated over

\footnote{298} Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 1.  
\footnote{299} Schofield 1984, p. 179.  
\footnote{300} Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 32.
the ruins of at least one earlier architectural complex dating to Period V.\textsuperscript{301} Towards the end of Period VI (see Table 3) the building suffered serious damage by earthquake and fire.\textsuperscript{302} It seems that Period VI was long enough to have three stratigraphically distinguishable phases.\textsuperscript{303} Unfortunately, the earthquake that occurred at the end of Period VI, as well as the subsequent clearing of the rubble, has complicated the stratigraphical picture, resulting in the deposits of Period VI material that were either very small or not stratified directly below the Period VII levels.\textsuperscript{304}

In the early part of Period VII (VIIa) repairs were done in many rooms, plus the entire southern part of the complex was added.\textsuperscript{305} In the middle of Period VII it seems that the building was once again severely affected by an earthquake (see Table 3). The catastrophe had one known

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{301} The phases of the building are described in Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 30-34 and pl. 4.
\item\textsuperscript{302} Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 32.
\item\textsuperscript{303} Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 141.
\item\textsuperscript{304} See Cummer and Schofield 1984, pp. 141-142.
\item\textsuperscript{305} The division of Period VII into two periods was proposed by Schofield (1984). Evidence for the earlier phase comes from House A as well as from Area G, a unit of rooms contiguous to House F, west of House C, within House EJ and the Tower ne. These areas preserve this material because they were not immediately rebuilt, since the practice of the rebuilders was to clear away debris almost to the original floor levels. The result of these practices is that even though there is good evidence for the early phase, there is no clear stratigraphic distinction between the two phases of the period. (Schofield 1984, p. 179).
\end{itemize}
victim, a woman. The structural damage that occurred was remedied with rebuilding, repairs, buttressing, and, in some cases, selective abandonment; the latter has been suggested in the case of certain basements, since they were found to have been apparently virtually empty at the time of the final catastrophe. The final catastrophe came at the end of Period VII (VIIb, see Table 3) with yet another earthquake, which “almost completely destroyed House A and most of the other buildings within the town. […] The final catastrophe must have been preceded by preliminary tremors, for the inhabitants of the town almost certainly received sufficient warning to remove themselves and their most valuable possessions to safety.”

THE POST-GREAT DESTRUCTION PERIOD

The aftermath of the destruction at the end of Period VIIb probably, as Caskey speculated, found the inhabitants of Ayia Irini “exhausted economically, and political changes may well have taken place.” The site, however, was not abandoned. Deposits immediately following the “Great Destruction” were recognized and designated by Schofield as Period VIIc. Deposits of this period have been recognized in rooms 14, 15, and 16 of House A, the

---

306 Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 33.
307 Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 33.
Western Sector (infill between Houses C and EJ), and House AB. The distribution of these deposits indicate that the town might have shrunk in size.

Period VIIc was one of rapid rebuilding. Hershenson suggests that activities during this period were taking place on wooden floors, which lay over earlier floor deposits that the inhabitants of the site did not simply take the time to clear out. Nevertheless, despite the rapid rebuilding and uninterrupted continuation of life at the site, deposits of VIIc show signs of economic hardship and/or marginalization of the site. The Minoan imports and the fine decorated wares from the Cyclades decline dramatically in numbers. The ceramic assemblage comprised of a small amount of decorated wares (mostly Ephyrean ware), plain and Acropolis Burnished ware.

---

310 Hershenson 1998, p. 162. It should be noted here that Schofield, even though she recognized the chronological distinction between the deposits of VIIb and VIIc (Schofield 1984, p. 155), did not however proceed in stressing this point in the publication of House A, since Caskey was not convinced about the existence of this sub-period.

311 Schofield forthcoming.

312 Hershenson (pers. comm.).


316 Hershenson 1998.
The extent of the settlement grew slightly in the next period, dated to the LH IIIA period, designated VIII, although the population never regained its VIIb levels. Two phases are represented in the settlement evidence; a LH IIIA1 and a LH IIIA2 horizon. LH IIIA1 deposits are preserved in a destruction horizon in many parts of the site, such as the Western Sector: Houses F and C, House AB, and House A. In the area of House A there is some evidence for reuse of earlier walls and the construction of new ones.\textsuperscript{317} Deposits of the LH IIIA2 horizon are represented in settlement debris from House J, the fill of the Spring Chamber;\textsuperscript{318} the Temple (see below), and a bothros in House A.\textsuperscript{319}

The pottery from this period (LH IIIA) is characterized by “the presence of large quantities of Mycenaean, and from the contrasting absence of the strong Minoan influence,”\textsuperscript{320} which was characteristic of the deposits before the “Great Destruction.” Two major changes are well known: the disappearance of Minoan pottery and of Cycladic decorated wares. There is also evidence for continuity of local domestic wares and Mycenaean pottery,\textsuperscript{321} whose presence in large quantities is a continuation or expansion of a pre-existing pattern. Mycenaean pottery had

\textsuperscript{317} Cummer and Schofield 1984, pp. 33-34.
\textsuperscript{318} Hershenson (pers. comm.).
\textsuperscript{319} Morris and Jones 1998, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{321} Morris and Jones 1998, pp.189-190.
been present in the previous periods; i.e., in House A there were equal quantities of Minoan and Mycenaean pottery.  

Evidence for Period VIII also comes from the area of the Temple which contained ceramics from the entire span of LH III. The Temple, probably built in Period IV, was destroyed with the rest of the town during the earthquake at the end of Period VIIb. Material evidence shows that religious ritual continued at the Temple through the end of the Bronze Age, and in the Iron Age down to Hellenistic times.

The site has revealed some evidence for use during Late Roman times. In early modern times the peninsula was selected as a focus of religious ritual, this time in the form of a small chapel to Ayia Irini that gives its name to the promontory. This chapel in its present state was built in the 1930s, but Caskey mentions that an earlier building stood in the exact same place. In the first decades of the 20th century, a modern road was carved through the site bordering the Northern Sector to its north. This development probably opened the site to stone-robbing as a source of readily available building material for the inhabitants of the island.

---

322 Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 146.
323 Caskey 1964, p. 332.
324 Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 34.
325 Caskey 1962, p. 266.
326 Caskey 1964, p. 322
THE NORTHERN SECTOR: STRATIGRAPHY AND INTERPRETATION

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the stratigraphy of the excavated deposits from the Northern Sector. It comprises the primary synthesis of the excavation data from the excavation journals. But before commencing the discussion, some explication of the thought process behind this section and the terminology that has been used is warranted.

My intention is to follow the format of the *Keos* publications; this continuity will foster and allow comparison between the Northern Sector and the rest of the site (especially the areas that have already been published). Thus, the narrative has been organized by architectural unit (or room, which is a term used to describe descript spaces and not function) and combined lots or the stratigraphic layers within that space. On the other hand, I aim to maintain a closer connection to the excavation documents than the *Keos* publications by referring constantly to the way those specific spaces were excavated. In this way I mediate between the style of the *Keos* publications (which totally obliterates the excavation process, thus lending it a more positivist authorial style) and the undigested information from the excavation notebooks. My goal is to offer the reader a firm understanding of the stratigraphy without losing sight of the excavation process. In this way the reader is able to arrive at an historical reconstruction of the site and at the same time be conscious of the fact that archaeological practice – excavation, recording, and post-excavation processing of the material – has heavily influenced the way the site and stratigraphy of Ayia Irini are perceived today.

This is not always an unproblematic balance to maintain. The site as it has been “processed” lends itself to the *Keos* publication style, for that processing smoothes out all inconsistencies including the most obvious one, a room being excavated with two different trenches as in the case of room N.10 or the NE Bastion; nevertheless, the benefits of presenting a
more detailed picture of the deposits and their excavation far outweigh the polished look of previous publications.

The terminology I use also merits some explanation. For the most part I try to follow the terms established by both the *Keos* publications and the excavation journals. In cases where feature names have changed in the publication from those in the excavation notebooks, I follow the published version, but I also provide the excavation notebook nomenclature in footnotes and in concordances.

I also introduce some new terminology. The reason for this is that there are several categories of information that have the same or very similar names, distinguished only by their punctuation. Names for trenches (Area and trench number, e.g., N2) and combined lots (Area and number of combined lot, circled, e.g., N2) in the excavation records are very similar to the room names in the publications (Area-.-room number, e.g., N.2). In this case I chose to retain the original name but add signifiers that make the distinctions between them more obvious. Table 4 explains in detail the system of notation used in this dissertation.

In the descriptions that follow, each room (a term which is used to connote a distinct architectural unit and does not imply function) is first located relative to surrounding rooms. Its dimensions are given and the walls that bound the room on each side are listed, as well as any doorways that connect the room to neighboring spaces. Finally, the trenches that explored the room are also mentioned. In the description of the stratigraphy, architectural features that were revealed are described along with the soil and moveable finds from each excavation cut. All elevations referred to in the text are above sea level. The post-excavation processing of the finds from each room is described next, with the composition of the combined lots and the dates
assignable to each of them. Finally, the history and interpretation of the area based on the evidence previously presented is discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Excavation Units</td>
<td>Area, trench number-sequential number of original uncombined unit</td>
<td>N02-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Lots</td>
<td>Area, combined lot number, CL</td>
<td>N02CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenches</td>
<td>Area, trench number, T</td>
<td>N02T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>Area - . - room number designation as is in <em>Keos</em> volumes</td>
<td>N.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: System of notation used in the present dissertation.

**Description of Architectural Features of Area N**

In the 1920s or 1930s, the site was cut by a roadway that ran through it (Fig. 6). This modern intervention destroyed all the structures and deposits that stood in its way, except the deposits at deeper elevations, such as rooms N.16, N.17, N.18, and the Northeast Tower. At the time of the excavation this road served as an artificial boundary which divided the site into investigative units; the area lying north of this road was called by the excavators Area N or the Northern Sector.

The investigations revealed that Area N included the northern segment of the circuit of the fortification wall and the rooms adjacent to it, which in all likelihood were ground floor and/or basements. However, there are firm indications, such as stairwells, that point to the existence of a second storey.

The fortification wall “first turns westward to a place where a small jog suggests that there was a tower (nw); then after another space of total erosion it is seen again running eastward. [...] Near the center of Area N the wall as first laid out turned south, then east again,
then south in an almost straight line to a projecting tower, E, between Areas L and M."\textsuperscript{327} This first circuit of the wall was built in Period V, but soon after that some alterations were effected in the northeastern part of the circuit (Fig. 7). An additional stretch of the wall was added, so that the wall continued straight to the east for an additional 16 m and then turned southward continuing its course and before jutting out eastward to the tower, ne. From the Northeast Tower (Tower ne) the wall turns south and then west to meet the old circuit of the wall. The area between the Northeast Bastion and its juncture with the old circuit was disturbed by the road cut mentioned above, but some remains of the curtain wall lay at a low elevation and were untouched during the construction of the road.

The space enclosed by, and adjacent to, the circuit wall was subdivided into rooms. Inside the older part of the wall, the initial arrangement of rooms was as follows (Fig. 7.) Tower nw seemed to be occupied by one room. It is unclear how Tower nw communicated with room N.1 to the east (see further below). To the east of the tower there was a series of four rooms (N.1, N.2, N.3, and N.4) defined by three cross walls. Immediately to the south, there was another series of rooms (N.7, N.8 and N.9) probably accessible through an entrance in the eastern wall of room N.8. To the east of this complex there was a rectangular oblong room, N.10 (long axis north-south), and another two narrow rooms (N.11 and N.12), which probably hosted a staircase that accessed the upper floor of the building. Another two rooms, N.13 and N.14, were formed by subdividing a large, almost square room on an east-west axis. These two rooms may have

\textsuperscript{327} Caskey 1971, p.373.
been reached through an opening at the southwest corner of room N.14. Between rooms N.13 and N.14 and the easternmost projection of the fortification wall was another room, N.15, which was accessible only from the upper floor.

The second phase of the fortification wall provided the area with a few more rooms. The north part of the addition was formed by two L-shaped extensions. The first was room N.5, immediately east of the N.2-N.4 suite. Room N.5 was actually a suite of two rooms, since the space was divided by a short north-south cross wall. Room N.5 had no ground-storey entrance, but the floor and platform in this space indicate that it must have been accessible, presumably from an upper storey. The second was room N.6, a small room at the very northeastern corner of the circuit where it turns southward. Like the neighboring space, room N.6 had no ground-storey doorway; no floor was observed in this space, however, and it is possible that it was not meant to be entered at all, but served only as support for an upper-storey room.328

The addition of the Northeast Tower complex enclosed five more spaces: a corridor (N.16) led to the Northeast Bastion proper and then through a doorway on its southwestern corner to another corridor (N.17) that gave access to two rooms, N.18 and N.20. Units N.17, N.18, and N.20 will not be discussed in this dissertation, since they were excavated as part of another area of the site, Area M.

**TOWER NW**

Tower nw (Fig. 8) is the westernmost architectural feature in the Northern Sector. It lies immediately to the west of room N.1. The tower itself is a rectangular room measuring approximately 7.8 x 8.5 m. It is bounded by walls F on the west, J on the south, and G on the east; the north wall of the room is not extant.

The tower was examined in a multitude of trenches: N03T, N04T, N11T, N30T, N13T and part of N29T (extension 2). These trenches revealed that the bedrock in this area rose to a higher elevation, and the deposits were very shallow or, as was the case with the interior of the tower, were totally denuded.

The discussion of the deposits from this feature and their excavation is divided into two parts. The first part discusses the northern section of the tower investigated with trenches N11T, N30T and N13T; the second part provides information on the southern section of the tower excavated with trenches N03T, N04T, and N29T extension.

Before the excavation some architectural features in the wider area of Tower nw were visible; three blocks were almost certainly part of the west wall (wall F) of the tower but were eradicated by modern activities on the site;\(^{329}\) several stones of the southern wall of the tower (wall J) were visible in the scarp of the road cut.\(^{330}\)

---

\(^{329}\) Their elevations were +1.75, +2.31, and +2.17. (Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 98).

\(^{330}\) Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 104.
Northern Part of Tower nw

The northern part of Tower nw (Figs. 8 and 9) was investigated in trenches N11T, N30T, and N13T. In this area the deposits were very thin and all of them except one (N30-346) were very disturbed. Their removal uncovered nothing other than bedrock. Nevertheless, the projection of the extant walls in other trenches provides good indications about the course of the north wall of the tower.

As mentioned above, most of the deposits were disturbed. The material in these deposits ranges in date from the EBA to Late Roman (N16CL and N42CL). There was only one uncontaminated deposit dated to Period V (which has been combined in N07CL).

Southern Part of Tower nw

The southern part of Tower nw (Figs. 8 and 9) was investigated in trenches N03T, N04T, and N13T. The surface deposits (cuts 0-4) were removed in excavation units N03-013, N03-014, N03-015, N03-016, N03-043, N04-019, N04-040, and N04-042. Investigation here revealed the top of walls F (N03-13; elevation +2.10) and J (N04-019 and 040; elevation +2.55) (Fig. 8). Wall F (the west wall of the tower) ran north-south, was founded directly on the bedrock, and

331 “Holes have been dug in fairly recent past in the southwest corner with the earth pile mostly south of the trench and just north of NE corner. They are about 1.20 m in diameter and ca 0.40 deep.” (Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 139).

332 Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 100.
had a facing of large stones backed by smaller ones,\textsuperscript{333} while wall J (the south wall of the tower) ran east-west.\textsuperscript{334} N04-042 included the area south of wall G, which consisted of “many small stones black earth indicative of fire just below the surface of cut [… the] black earth extends only about 1.10 [m] from eastern edge of trench.”\textsuperscript{335}

In the northwestern part of this area, bedrock was reached at the bottom of N03-043. Elsewhere, investigation continued in units N03-018, N03-017, and N04-042 (cut 5). N03-17 uncovered walls G and M;\textsuperscript{336} wall G ran north-south and was the eastern wall of the tower, whereas wall M was a flimsy east-west wall outside the eastern side of the tower (not drawn on official plans). The bedrock was probably reached at the bottom of unit N03-017.

In the southern part of the area, excavation was limited to the area east of wall F. It was investigated in N03-031, -048, and -052 (cuts 6-8). In the southeast, investigation included the area south of wall G, which was examined in N04-044 and N04-047.\textsuperscript{337} The exterior wall of the tower was in a very poor condition and was difficult to define. It preserved its two faces but the packing between was missing, to the extent that the excavator thought he had uncovered two

\begin{itemize}
    \item\textsuperscript{333} Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 129.
    \item\textsuperscript{334} Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 104.
    \item\textsuperscript{335} This unit went below the “black earth.”(Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 126).
    \item\textsuperscript{336} Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 102.
    \item\textsuperscript{337} Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 128.
\end{itemize}
separate walls, the easternmost of which was called K. The top of the wall was uncovered in unit N04-47.

The excavation demonstrated that the southern part of Tower nw was founded during Period V, probably on deposits of Periods IV and III. The area had undergone considerable disturbance. Just as in the case of the northern part of tower, the top layers of the southern part of Tower nw were thoroughly mixed and contained material ranging from the EBA to Classical and Roman in date (N16CL and N42CL). In some cases the disturbance had caused inverted stratigraphy. For example, in one part of the interior of the tower a level containing material of Periods V and VI (unit N03-013: N07CL and N03-014: N53CL) was found to be superimposed over the more disturbed levels (N03-018: N42CL). The agent of the disturbance had excavated some deposits of Period V and VI and then dumped them here. This disturbance probably occurred in the Late Roman/Early Byzantine period when other parts of the Northern Sector appear to have been robbed of their walls; the stones probably ended up in a limekiln built outside the fortification wall, to the east of room N.15 and north of N.16 (Fig. 32). Nevertheless, the possibility cannot be absolutely excluded that this disturbance occurred more recently when the modern road was built.

\[338\] Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 129.

\[339\] Kea Excavation Notebook V, p. 129.
N42CL

N42CL (Tables 5, 6, and 76) combines three units which examined the deposits over Tower nw from the surface +2.85/1.45 down to bedrock. The original quantity of the combined lot was two tins, of which 70% of the ceramics were discarded, including fragments of seven conical cups and nine tripod legs. This was a disturbed deposit containing ceramic material that ranged in date from the EBA to the Classical and even the Late Roman/Byzantine period. All of the context pottery had been discarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N04-019</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>N +1.45, E +2.85</td>
<td>V.104</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area over the south wall of Tower nw and outside (south and east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-043</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area over west wall of Tower nw (wall F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N30-344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE +2.45, N +2.28, SW +2.10, NW +1.93</td>
<td>VIII.139</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Conjectured area of north wall of Tower nw and area outside of the wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Original excavation units contained in N42CL.

---

Table 6: N42CL small finds.

N53CL

This combined lot (Tables 7 and 76) consists of seven excavation units from the south side and the interior of Tower nw, which investigated deposits from the surface to bedrock (probably at +1.90). These units produced two tins of ceramic material, of which 77.5% was initially discarded, including fragments of seven conical cups and four tripod legs. The records show that 90% of the ceramic material consisted of coarse ware.

At some point in time the entire lot was papsed. The information about the discarded ceramic material shows that this lot contained fragments of Gray Minyan, local Black Burnished (Period IV), Minoan “oatmeal” (especially in the upper excavation units), Cycladic bowls, “Cycladic polychrome,” as well as large fragments of a Classical amphora toe and body sherds. Only obsidian chips, fragments, blades and a fragment of a core (N-1.158, N-1.161, and N-1.168) have been recorded for this lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N03-014</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.098</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Area inside Tower nw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.10, +2.10</td>
<td>V.100</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Area over south wall of Tower nw, and east of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N04-040</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.126</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area of wall J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-031</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.120</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of wall F, which extends from the peeking bedrock – under wall F - to wall G in the east part of the trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-048</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.10</td>
<td>V.129</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Inside Tower nw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-052</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.00</td>
<td>V.133</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Inside Tower nw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N04-047</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.129</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Area of wall K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Original excavation units contained in N53CL.

N54CL

N54CL (Tables 8, 9, and 76) combines two excavation units that investigated the deposits from +2.55 to +1.76 in the east part of Tower nw. The lot had been papped and its original quantity is unknown.\(^\text{343}\) The excavator noted that 90% of the ceramic material was coarse, including only one conical cup.\(^\text{344}\) Moreover, the notes mention that the deposit was mixed, containing material which dated from the EBA to Period V. Other pots of diagnostic value

\(^{343}\) No quantity information had been recorded for unit N04-042.

mentioned in the excavator’s notes are: a cup bottom with a mat impression, two tankard handles, and one fragment of “oatmeal” ware.\textsuperscript{345} Two inventoried pots and a small find survive from this lot; these are: a conical cup (K.927), a one-handed cup (K.1346), and a stone tool (K1.356).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebooks Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N04-042</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>+2.55</td>
<td>V.126</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area south of wall G, east of Tower nw (south of wall G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N04-044</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.128</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Area south of wall G, east of Tower nw (south of wall G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Original excavation units contained in N54CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1.356</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Stone tool</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Obsidian chips</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: N54CL small finds.

\textsuperscript{345} Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook T, p. 281.
N16CL

Combined lot N16CL (Tables 10, 11, and 75) contains ceramic material from seven excavation units that investigated deposits in the north part of Tower nw, from the surface to bedrock. The original quantity of the lot was approximately four tins, containing 99% coarse wares; 72% of the material had been discarded. This was a mixed lot containing ceramic material that ranged in date from the EBA to the Late Roman/Byzantine period, even though the excavator mentions that the bulk dates to Period VII. This lot had been papsed, but the excavator’s notes mention the presence of diagnostic fragments, such as sauceboats, pithos fragments with plastic bands and incised decoration, two Mycenaean kylikes, classical black glaze, and Roman combed ware.

348 Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook N, p. 79.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N13-060</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>V.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Conjectured area of NE corner of Tower nw and outside the wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11-051</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>V.129</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Conjectured area of NE corner of Tower nw and outside the wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-015</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>V.098</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Area over south wall of Tower nw, and east of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13-071</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>V.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Conjectured area of NE corner of Tower nw and outside the wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13-076</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>V.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Conjectured area of north wall of Tower nw and area outside of the Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>V.102</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Area outside Tower nw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13-080</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>V.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Conjectured area of north wall of Tower nw and area outside of the Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> 72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Original excavation units contained in N16CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1.250</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.252</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.450</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.600</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Twisted metal bracelet</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1.177</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1.201</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Obsidian chips</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: N16CL small finds.
SUITE OF ROOMS N.1 TO N.4

The suite of rooms N.1, N.2, N.3, and N.4 (Fig. 10) is immediately to the east of Tower nw, to the west of room N.5 and to the north of the suite of rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9. The suite of rooms N.1-N.4 share a north and a south wall; wall N or the fortification wall (in its earlier phase) acts as their north wall, whereas wall AB is their south. Perhaps before the second phase of the fortification wall was built, this space, as Davis notes, incorporated two rooms, since a north-south wall, wall AH, was found in the area of the later room N.3.349 This configuration was then abandoned for a four-room arrangement, which was affected by the dismantlement of the old north-south cross wall and the addition of two new walls, AF and Y.

Fragments of artifacts found in rooms N.1, N.2 and N.3 of the suite were found to join during the post-excavation treatment of the material. This phenomenon drove the excavator to believe that the deposits found in these three rooms derived from a single deposit which had fallen from an upper floor; he thus combined all sherd material from the three rooms into a single combined lot, N07CL, published as Period V, Group U by Davis.350 The material from room N.4 was not found to join with that in rooms to its west and was thus kept separate as combined lot N08CL published by Davis as Period V, Group V.351 Nevertheless, the pottery from N.4 was

349 Davis 1986, p. 39.
350 Davis 1986, pp. 39-47.
very similar in character to that in rooms N.1, N.2, and N.3. The rooms are discussed separately below.

**ROOM N.1**

N.1 (Figs. 10 and 11a) was a nearly square room measuring 2.5 x 2.40-2.80 m. It was bounded by walls N to the north, AQ to the west, AB to the south, and G to the west. The room was connected to N.2 through a doorway in the southern part of wall AQ.

The room was examined with trench N29T. The surface deposits (in N29T proper: cuts 0-3 equivalent to units N29-324, -327, -330, -332; in extension 1: cuts 0-1 equivalent to N29-333 and -334; in extension 2: N29-343 and -345) were removed to reveal two architectural features. The first was a wall running north-south (wall AQ). This wall terminated to the south at a doorpost belonging to a doorway, which gave access to room N.2 from the west. The second feature was another wall running east-west continuing the line of wall AB; this wall served as the second doorpost to the doorway between rooms N.1 and N.2.

The removal of surface cuts revealed two distinct soils: one that was much “darker” (hereafter referred to as “black”) and another that was “reddish.” The black soil was principally in room N.1 (center and east part of the room), but extended to the north of wall N (the

---

352 Davis 1986, p. 47.
353 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 135.
fortification wall) and south of wall AB. In N.1, it was removed in units N29-337, -340, and -342 (cuts 2-4) in extension 1 and in N29-347 and -350 (cuts 2-3) in extension 2; the area north of wall N was investigated in N29-337, -340, and -341 (cuts 2-4) and the area south of wall AB in N29-347 (cut 2) in extension 2. Several features in room N.1 were revealed; a threshold that marked the doorway between rooms N.1 and N.2, and a structure interpreted as a “bin” by Davis in the northeast corner of room N.1 at an elevation of +2.85 (N29-340). (Fig. 11b) This “bin” was attached to walls N and AQ and its bottom was filled with small stones.

The area of “reddish” soil was concentrated in the western part of the room (N29 extension 2). Curiously this soil was especially abundant outside of room N.1, to the west of wall G and south of wall AB. In part, it covered the black soil in a restricted area to the east of wall G (see discussion of N29-348 below). This soil was removed in N29-348, -349, and -351 (cuts 2-4 in extension 2). The entirety of wall G was exposed in N29-348 (cut 2).

The excavation of this area demonstrated that the interior space of Tower nw and room N.1 to the east were separated by wall G. Davis suggested that it served as an access corridor that provided communication between the tower and rooms N.2, N.3, and N.4 and that there may have been a door at the northwestern corner of room N.1, even though “this is uncertain since the northwest corner of the room has been almost completely destroyed. Later [but always during

\[\text{355 Davis 1986, p. 39.}\]

\[\text{356 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 135 and 137.}\]

\[\text{357 The top of the wall was located at ca. +2.70.}\]
period V], however, a small bin was built in the northeast corner of the room, after which it would have been impossible to enter from the west; at its southwest corner, the bin abuts a short wall which, although it now appears to be a pier, was probably attached to the west wall of the room.” 358 In my opinion, the room was probably only accessed from N.2 through a doorway in its east wall.

The entire room was filled with earth that contained pottery and other finds dating to Period V (N07CL). The floor of the room at this time probably lay at +2.74, where the threshold was found, although no actual floor was detected by the excavator.

**ROOM N.2**

Room N.2 (Figs. 10 and 12) was a 2 x 3.5 m space bounded by walls AF to the east, AB to the south, and AQ to the west. It communicated with N.1 to the west (through a doorway furnished with a threshold in wall AQ) and with N.3 to the east (via a doorway in the southeastern corner of the room above the preserved level of the earlier wall AH).

The room was examined in trench N31T359 and partly in N29T and N21T-extension 3. Surface deposits were examined in units N31-352, -353, -365, -363 and N21-181, -184, which exposed most of the west face of wall AF and part of wall AB.360

---

358 Davis 1986, p. 39 and pl. 6c.

359 Trench N31T was 2 x 4 m and was oriented north-south.

360 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, pp. 143, 79.
Beneath these units, the north part of the room was filled with deposits of “dark earth” and stones, and the south part with deposits of “yellow earth.”\textsuperscript{361} The dark earth was removed in N31-355, -357, -359, -361, -364, N29-339, and N21-186 and -190 (cuts 2 to 5).\textsuperscript{362} The yellow earth was confined to a strip ca. 0.80 m wide along wall AB and was excavated in units N31-354, -356, -358, -360, -367, and -366 (cuts 2 to 6).\textsuperscript{363}

It was clear from excavation that room N.2 had abutted the fortification wall, i.e., the north wall of the room was the fortification wall itself. However, the wall had been entirely eroded away or robbed off at this point. Along its presumed course, only a few small stones were found that could have been the packing laid on bedrock to support the missing blocks.\textsuperscript{364} Even though no readily recognizable floor was observed during the excavation of this room, the level of the threshold lining the door between this room and N.1 indicates that a floor had existed at +2.74.

\textsuperscript{361} Cut 2 (equivalent to excavation unit N31-354 and N31-355) revealed this diversified picture in the room with distinct areas of yellow and dark earth. At first the area of dark earth was confined to the middle of the trench/room, while there were strips of yellow earth confined to the northern and southern part of the room along the walls (\textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, p. 143).

\textsuperscript{362} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, pp. 143 and 145; also p. 79.

\textsuperscript{363} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, pp. 143 and 145.

\textsuperscript{364} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, p. 79.
The excavator believed that all deposits in the room were of Period V. For this reason all units except one (N21-190)\textsuperscript{365} were combined into N07CL; the exception was added to N08CL, which was also dated to Period V.

It is somewhat surprising that, even though the stones of wall N had been robbed, the deposits, according to the excavator, did not preserve any evidence of disturbance (at least in the units that investigated the area over the missing trace of wall N). In other areas of the site, such as in the cases of the northern part of Tower nw and the northern part of room N.5 (see below), the robbing of the walls resulted in the deposition of later archaeological material. Therefore, it is quite possible that some later ceramic material went unnoticed and was thus discarded.

**ROOM N.3**

Room N.3 (Figs. 10 and 13) is an oblong (2.2 x 3.5 m) room bounded by wall N to the north, wall Y to the east, wall AB to the south, and wall AF to the west. It communicated with N.2 to the east through a door opening in the southwest corner of the room and N.4 to the west through a second door opening in the southeast corner; both doors were aligned with each other. The room was examined in trenches N21T and N21T extension 1. Surface deposits were investigated in N21-167, -170, -172, and -174.\textsuperscript{366} In these, the walls of the room were revealed

\textsuperscript{365} No reason is offered in the pottery notebooks for the exclusion of this unit from the combined lot that included all the finds of this room.

\textsuperscript{366} *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 69.
with sufficient clarity for the excavator to limit excavation within the room; the northern and southern walls, N and AB respectively, were entirely exposed.

At the bottom of the next unit, N21-189, stones were strewn across the room; the stones were most densely packed alongside wall N and they had probably fallen from it. In this unit the courses of the eastern and western walls of the room, Y and AF, were clarified. At the southern end of wall Y the eastern doorway was uncovered.\(^{367}\)

Further investigation of the room in excavation units N21-195, -198, -210, -213 and -211 (cuts 3 and 4),\(^{368}\) showed that the area near the eastern doorway was filled with “black earth” that contained charcoal.\(^{369}\) At the bottom of these units bedrock was found in the northern part of the room, and there was an area of “ashy earth” (0.70 x 0.50 m) against wall AF (+2.93).\(^{370}\)

N21-214 (cut 5) covered the entire room, including both doorways; unexcavated earth remained in several places, especially in the south, where the bedrock sloped from north to south. There, a strip of unexcavated deposit extended along wall AB to a point 2 m north of it.\(^{371}\) In this

---

\(^{367}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 81.

\(^{368}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 87.


\(^{370}\) “Ashy earth” excavated in uncombined lot N21-213. (*Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 87).

\(^{371}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 87.
cut, a piece of plaster with a wide yellow band was found.\footnote{N-4.227.} Furthermore, an insubstantial wall, AH, was exposed; it was two stones thick and preserved only to a single course.

Wall AH (Fig. 14) clearly predated cross walls AF and Y. Their construction had completely reconfigured the organization of space after wall AH went out of use. The remaining deposits to the east of wall AH were cleared in N21-235 and -238 (cuts 6 and 7), and those to the west of it in N21-236. The bedrock was completely exposed at an elevation of +2.44.\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 87.}

As is obvious from the foregoing description the room, and the whole suite in general, had two construction phases. Wall AH belongs to the first phase of this room (and of the entire suite N.1 to N.4). No floor associated with wall AF was recognized during excavation. The plaster fragment with the yellow band probably belongs to the first phase of the room, since it was discovered in the fill under the floor of the second phase.

The second phase of the room is associated with the construction of walls AF and Y. No floor for this phase was recognized either, but it is fair to assume that the level of the floor was at approximately +2.88/2.74, which is the level of the floor in rooms N.1 and N.2 and the level of a floor deposit in room N.4 (see below).

Pottery from all units from the room was combined into a single deposit, N07CL, which dates to Period V. Finds associated with the first phase of the room were thus lumped with the contents of the room associated with the second phase. Davis noted that “remains from beneath
possible floor levels in rooms N.1, N.2, and N.3 were combined with the deposit above so the possibility exists that earlier artifacts – from earth used as filling to level up the floors – are mixed with the Period V debris. In fact, the few EBA and Period IV sherds found in the deposit are probably from this filling.”

ROOM N.4

Room N.4 (Figs. 10, 16, 17, and 18) comprises a 2.20 x 3.30 m space to the east of N.3, where the earliest circuit of the fortification turns to the south (walls N and P/AE). The room is bounded by walls N to the north, Y to the west and AB to the south. The excavation showed that the bedrock rises at this point and the eastern wall P/AE in all likelihood had been eroded away or its stones were intentionally removed in their entirety. N.4 communicated with room N.3 through a doorway in the southwestern side of the room.

The room was investigated in trench N21T (extensions 1 and 2). The surface deposits (cuts 0-1) over the room were investigated in units N21-172, -173, -174 and part of -182. N21-174 uncovered the southern face of wall N, which is 1.5 m wide, and wall Y, which is 0.80 m wide; the latter runs north-south from wall N.

374 Davis 1986, p. 39.
375 Davis 1986, p. 47.
376 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 73.
Investigation of the room proceeded with N21-177, -176, -179b, part of -182, -179a, -180, and -183 (cuts 2-3). On the west side of the room, the excavation of N21-179b, which cleared the doorway in wall Y, showed that the doorway was filled with stones.\textsuperscript{377}

In N21-185, -196, and -197 (cuts 4 to 6), the excavator reached bedrock. In cut 4 it was exposed ca. 0.40 m to the east of wall Y.\textsuperscript{378} In the soil trapped in a pocket between the wall and the bedrock, the excavator found a rather large number of complete vessels resting at an elevation of +2.88: these included at least two conical cups, a taller cup, a small jug, a one-handled cup, a hole-mouth jar, and lime or coarse plaster (Fig. 15).\textsuperscript{379} A similar deposit of complete vessels was found in the southeast corner of the room at approximately the same elevation. The two deposits constitute evidence for the placement of the possible floor at an elevation of +2.88/2.74. The excavation of the fill in the doorway between rooms N.4 and N.3 showed that there was a “clear stratum of burned earth from fire”\textsuperscript{380} (Fig. 16).

All of the pottery found in the 75-cm-deep deposit in this room was combined into N08CL, except the surface unit N21-174, which was combined into N07CL. The deposit was

\textsuperscript{377} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{378} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{379} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 76-77.
\textsuperscript{380} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 77.
dated to Period V by Davis and published as Group V.\textsuperscript{381} Scant finds of later date attest to
subsequent disturbances in this area, namely the robbing of the walls.

\textbf{N07CL}

This lot (Tables 12-15, and 74) combines excavation units that had investigated the
deposits in rooms N.1, N.2, and N.3 from the surface (N.1: +3.21/2.82; N.2: +3.33/3.22; N.3:
+3.44/3.36) to bedrock. The original quantity of the lot was 16.6 tins, and according to the
records 44\% had been discarded.\textsuperscript{382} Nevertheless, there are only two tins of material remaining
today, which represents only 12\% of the original quantity. The lot represents a layer of
destruction debris in the three rooms as well as the fills beneath the floors. The lot has been dated
to Period V and published by Davis as Group U.\textsuperscript{383} Thus no further discussion is warranted here.

\textsuperscript{381} Davis 1986, pp. 47-48.

\textsuperscript{382} Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook D, pp. 91-95.

\textsuperscript{383} Davis 1986, pp. 39-47.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N03-013</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.098</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Area outside the Wall, west of Northwest Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03-017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.102</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Area to the east of wall F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Surface deposits over rooms N.3, N.7, and west of wall Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3.36</td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Surface deposits over rooms N.3, N.7, and west of wall Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>very small</td>
<td></td>
<td>North of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +3.44, S +3.37</td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surface deposits over rooms N.3 and N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E +3.33, W +3.24</td>
<td>VIII.079</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and north of wall N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3.15</td>
<td>VIII.079</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and north of wall N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-186</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E +3.08, W +3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-189</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N +3.29, S +3.25</td>
<td>VIII.081</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-195</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3.15</td>
<td>VIII.081</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-198</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.00</td>
<td>VIII.081</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3.09</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.3 (east of doorway in black earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-211</td>
<td></td>
<td>E doorway black earth +2.96</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.3 (east of doorway in black earth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Original excavation units contained in N07CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N21-213</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.3 (ashy earth against AF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-214</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NE +2.86, NW +2.91, S+2.88</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-235</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N +2.74</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.74</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-238</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.57</td>
<td>VIII.087</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE +3.21, NE +3.13, SW +3.07, NW +2.92</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE +3.14, NE +3.11, NW +2.95</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE +3.05, NE +2.93</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S +2.90, N +2.84</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N +2.73, SE +3.02, SW +2.82</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1 and north of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE +2.87, NW +2.49</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1 and north of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S +2.66, NE +2.64</td>
<td>VIII.135</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N.1 and north of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +2.60, W +2.64</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N.1 and north of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-339</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.90</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Original excavation units contained in N07CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N29-341</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.15</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>North of the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-342</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.27</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE +3.02, NW +2.58</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Trench 29 extension 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE +2.87, SW +2.51, NE +2.93, NW +2.96</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Trench 29 extension 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N30-346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE +2.20, SW +2.03, NE +2.10, NW +1.83</td>
<td>VIII.139</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjectured area of north wall of Tower nw and area outside of the wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-347</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +2.64, NW +2.40</td>
<td>VIII.137</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-348</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E+2.97, W +2.72</td>
<td>VIII.141</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Under fallen stone near wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-349</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N+2.41, S +2.45, E +2.49</td>
<td>VIII.141</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Yellow earth west of the room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-350</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E +2.52, W +2.48</td>
<td>VIII.141</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Black earth north of wall AN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N29-351</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SE +2.89, NE, +2.80, NW +2.79, SW +2.70</td>
<td>VIII.141</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Room N.1 and east side of Tower nw (Red earth north of wall M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Original excavation units contained in N07CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N31-352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NW +3.22, SE +3.39</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and south of wall AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3.35, NW +3.19</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and south of wall AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SE +3.23, NW +3.10</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-355</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.10</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-356</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +3.18, S +3.12</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-357</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S +3.15, N +3.05</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-358</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NW +2.98, SE 3.09</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-359</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.99</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-360</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E +3.00, W +2.87</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-361</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N +2.97, S +2.92</td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and south of wall AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-364</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.2 and south of wall AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-366</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.143</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 m north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N31-367</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.87</td>
<td>VIII.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.2 (south part - 0.80 m north of wall AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.655</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Original excavation units contained in N07CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N21-172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Surface deposits over rooms N.3, N.4, and N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.34</td>
<td>VIII.073</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.4 (east corner of walls N and Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-179b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.11</td>
<td>VIII.075</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.4 (doorway of wall Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-180</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S+3.12, N+3.09</td>
<td>VIII.075</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-182</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>N+3.01, S+3.12</td>
<td>VIII.077</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N+2.97, S+3.05</td>
<td>VIII.077</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-185</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whole room +2.91, SW +3.01</td>
<td>VIII.077</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-190</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.2 (north part: dark earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NE +2.86, SE +2.98, SW +2.89</td>
<td>VIII.076</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-197</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NE +2.65, SE +2.84, SW +2.75</td>
<td>VIII.076</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-179a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.077</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.4(below wall Y and east baulk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Original excavation units contained in N08CL.**

**N08CL**

This lot (Tables 16 and 74) includes excavation units that had investigated deposits in room N.4 from the surface (+3.44/3.36) to bedrock (probably +3.60). The lot’s original quantity
was one and a half tins of which 66.2% was discarded.\textsuperscript{384} It represents the destruction debris of the room that dates to Period V. The lot has been published by Davis as Group V.\textsuperscript{385}

**Room N.5**

Room N.5 (Figs. 19 and 20) is a 8.8 x 3.5-3.7 m space bounded by walls N to the north, Q to the east, B/P to the south and AE to the west; the space was subdivided into two smaller rooms by the addition of a north-south cross wall, V. N.5 was added when the northeast corner of the original circuit of the fortification wall was modified, still in Period V. Its south wall was the original outer face of the town wall, and its north wall the inner face of the addition.\textsuperscript{386} No ground floor entrance to room N.5 was found during excavation; thus, it is quite possible that the room was reached from an upper storey.

Room N.5 was examined in trenches N24T, N20T, N25T and the northern part of N17T. Surface deposits were removed in units N24-221, N20-147, and -148, N25-273 and N17-117, -119, and -122.\textsuperscript{387} Those in trenches N24T, N20T, and N25T were mixed and included pottery ranging from the EBA to the pre-modern era (N17CL), in contrast to that in N17T, which dated entirely to Period VI (N03CL). Removal of surface deposits revealed the top of wall V, which

\textsuperscript{384} Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook D, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{385} Davis 1986, pp. 47-48.

\textsuperscript{386} Davis 1986, p. 60 and pls. 5, 6.e.

\textsuperscript{387} *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, pp. 101, 55, 111; XIV, p. 121.
subdivided room N.5 into west and east sections. The excavation of wall V and its surroundings showed that the wall had been dismantled, or robbed, especially its northern part where it may have met wall N.\textsuperscript{388} The absence of the northern part of wall V precludes us from knowing whether the eastern and western sections of N.5 were communicating with each other or they were entirely independent.

In the west, the area where the excavator surmised he would find wall N delimiting the west room to the north was examined by N24-230, -254, and -265.\textsuperscript{389} Wall N was not located, but bedrock was uncovered; in this area wall N was missing. In the middle of the room where wall V should have met wall N, the deposits overlying wall N were investigated with N20-148, -151, and -152.\textsuperscript{390} The removal of these deposits revealed that only the north face of wall N was fully preserved, and that several stones from its south face had been removed. The excavation of the negative imprint of the stones with N20-157, -160, and -163\textsuperscript{391} certified the robbing, since bedrock was revealed at the bottom of these units.

\textsuperscript{388} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{389} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 85 and 107.

\textsuperscript{390} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 55 and 59.

\textsuperscript{391} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 63.
The wall and its overlying deposits in the eastern room were investigated in N25-277, -282, -286, -287, and -289.\textsuperscript{392} The bottom of N25-287 uncovered the top of wall N (+1.61 to +1.69), which was cleaned in N25-289. These units were disturbed.\textsuperscript{393}

All the aforementioned units from both the western and eastern parts of the room were combined into a single lot, N18CL. The lot contained ceramic material mostly dating to Periods VI and VII, but also the Late Roman period.

The presence of Late Roman pottery in earlier deposits has been observed in several other places, along the course of wall N. This phenomenon points to a process of dismantling the wall and robbing its stones, which has resulted in the preservation of only one (or so) course in most instances and, in some cases, such as the northwest corner of room N.5, in the total elimination of the wall.\textsuperscript{394} In such cases the imprint left in the earth after the removal of the wall had been filled with archaeological materials from the surrounding area, which occasionally contained finds contemporary (Late Roman) with the dismantling of the wall. It is clear that the stone robbers were exclusively interested in large stone blocks that constituted the wall, which they removed only where they were visible and accessible. No damage was done to deposits of Period V in the interior of the room, which in some cases are preserved at a higher elevation than the disturbed ones (i.e., the ones that replaced the removed stones of the wall).

\textsuperscript{392} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 111, 119, and 121.

\textsuperscript{393} In N25-289 one Roman sherd was mentioned by the excavator but not saved.

\textsuperscript{394} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 107.
Western Part of Room N.5

The western part of the room was filled with a dark soil, which was removed in units N24-231, -242, and -245. Under it there was soil of reddish color. The reddish soil was first reached in the area north of wall B (average elevation +2.67), but subsequently was found to cover the entire room. The bedrock first appeared in this room at the bottom of unit N24-247 at an elevation of approximately +2.40. Here, the bedrock sloped from north to south. Deposits beneath this elevation that were trapped between the sloping bedrock and wall P were investigated in N24-247, -256 and -260.  

In the area south of wall N, more specifically in the area of wall P/AE, the excavator examined the deposits in units N24-266, -269, -272, -274396 and N20-158, -161, and -164.397 Here he thought that he would find the continuations of walls P/AE and N but instead found only bedrock. All units excavated in the western part of N.5 contained material artifacts ranging in date from the EBA to Period VI (N19CL). The area had probably been disturbed in antiquity, but the excavator may have confused matters further by combining in an inappropriate manner the pottery from stratigraphically distinct features.

The excavator described a stratigraphic section in the room as follows: “At the end of wall V there is a thin layer on top. It is gray. Below this is [a] trace of murex shells seen in the

397 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 63.
west baulk. It is not so thick. The soil with them is a little red. Below are very loose small stones in ash gray. They slope down toward the north end of the back edge of wall N. Below this is a gray layer, below it a little bit redder and flecks with black."

This stratigraphy was independently corroborated a decade later, when a grid marker in the southwestern room and deposits beneath it were excavated by a different archaeologist. The process of exposing the north face of wall B/P showed that the upper part of wall, B, which protruded to the north by approximately 1 m, had been set on top of the earlier fortification wall, P (Fig. 21).

The stratification found beneath the grid marker can be described as follows. Under the surface layer was a layer composed of earth mixed with small stones (units N24-553 and 563). The removal of this layer revealed a number of large stones, presumably fallen, which extended under wall B (N24-554 and part of 564), and more small stones mixed with earth (N24-555, 556 and part of 564). The floor of the room was found below this layer and consisted of a thin layer of gray earth (N24-557 and part of 564), a paved surface with two courses of small flat stones (N24-558), and a layer of packed clay (N24-558). The area below the Period V floor and over the bedrock was strewn with packing of small flat stones with very little earth (N24-559), which functioned as the substratum for the floor of the room. Below the packing of the stones was a pit in the bedrock filled with red soil; the pit was cleared in N24-560, 561, and 562. Davis notes

---

that the red soil in the pit contained material dating to Period IV and to the EBA, which was retained as combined lot N55CL published by Overbeck as Period IV Group DF.\footnote{Davis 1986, p. 61. For Period IV Group DF, see Overbeck 1989, p. 181.}

**Eastern Part of Room N.5**

Investigations in the eastern part of room of N.5 demonstrated immediately (in N25-278) that most of this part of the room was occupied by a platform structure; only narrow strips of earth existed to the west, north and east of it. To the west (N25-280)\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 111.} these deposits were “soft and yellow” but to the north (N25-281, 283, and 292)\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 111 and 121.} they were very loose and full of small stones with only a little earth. The concreted murex shell layer (top elevation +2.37 and bottom +2.53) was found here, as it had been located in the west room.\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 119.}

At the northeast the platform seems to have been connected to the east wall of the room, wall Q. Even though this area was thoroughly investigated (in N17-126, -130, -131, -132 and -133),\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, pp. 129 and 133.} the excavator concluded that: “the nature of the area is unclear and excavation did not go to bedrock.”\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 119.}
A Note on Room N.5

The excavation of room N.5 showed that this room had been severely disturbed in the past, especially the area of walls N, AE and V in the western part of room N.5. As it has been mentioned before, this disturbance is to be credited on the removal of the stone material for the needs of the Late Roman limekiln. Nevertheless, there were undisturbed deposits (especially in the western part of room N.5) adjacent to the wall B/P representing the original contents of the room. The examination of these deposits showed that the room was definitely an addition, after the completion of the earlier circuit but still in Period V.

The room itself was founded on the bedrock. Cavities in the bedrock, filled with Period IV ceramic material, indicated that this area was in use by the inhabitants of Ayia Irini prior to the construction of the Great Fortifications.\(^\text{406}\) The bedrock was strewn with small packing stones which served as a substratum for the room, both the walls but also the fill below the floor of the room. The floor of the room was located at a level of approximately +1.99 and it was strewn with small flat stones that were set in a layer of gray earth.\(^\text{407}\) Above the floor there was a fill that probably represents a destruction incident to which we can attribute the layer of fallen stones below the ground surface.

\(^{406}\) Davis 1986, p. 61. For Period IV Group DF, see Overbeck 1989, p. 181.

\(^{407}\) Davis 1986, p. 61.
The units that investigated the undisturbed deposits of the room were combined into lot N19CL. Moreover the units that investigated the units under the grid marker were combined into NN1CL and NN2CL. 408

N17CL

This is a lot (Tables 17-21, and 75), which combines 40 original excavation units that investigated the surface deposits over the fortification wall in the area of room N.5 and north of it (trenches N14T, N15T, N20T, N24T, and N25T). The original quantity was 5.4 tins, 77% of which was discarded during the first strewing in the sherd yard. Today the quantity that remains is a little less than half a tin. The excavator’s notes indicated that there was very little fine ware in this lot. 409

The bulk of ceramics in this lot date to Periods VI and VII, but it also includes ceramics from the EBA, MBA, Period VIII, Late Roman/Byzantine, and Modern periods. The excavator noted that the stratification of these lots was inverted, with the upper units containing sparse LBA sherds, while the lower ones contained most of the LBA material; 410 this situation should be attributed to the removal of the boulders of the fortification walls during the Late

408 Even though these two combined lots were kept separate from N19CL, there was no substantial chronological differentiation in the pottery and were thus treated as parts of the same deposit.


Roman/Byzantine times to feed them to the lime kiln. The excavator also noted the presence of Late Roman pottery in connection with many of the original excavation units combined in this lot. As for the Period VI (Figs. 48 and 49) and VII material (Figs. 49 and 50), these ceramics reflect the destruction deposits, whose remains (architectural and stratigraphic) have been obliterated, that would have existed in the area of room N.5. The quality of the ceramic material from these periods (VI and VII) is very high and probably reflects the status of the residents of these rooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N14-064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-066</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-069</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-078</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-081</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-082</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.137</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.187</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Unstratified (sherds fallen from the baulk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14-086</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.16</td>
<td>V.147</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (around skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.055</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.5 and outside the fortification (north of room N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +1.40, S. +2.25</td>
<td>VIII.055</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside of the fortification wall (north of the N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-155</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +1.45, S +1.95</td>
<td>VIII.059</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside of the fortification wall (north of the N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-165</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +1.65</td>
<td>VIII.063</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside of the fortification wall (north of the N.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Original excavation units contained in N17CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N24-221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SW +2.99, NE +1.45, middle +2.34</td>
<td>VIII.101</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.05 and outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW +2.25, NW +1.90</td>
<td>XIV.105</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Surface deposits over room N.6 and north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S +1.90, N +1.80</td>
<td>XIV.105</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-091</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S +1.70, N +1.50</td>
<td>XIV.105</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-093</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>S +1.50, N +1.45</td>
<td>XIV.107</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-096</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1.35</td>
<td>XIV.107</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.30</td>
<td>XIV.111</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6) (among stones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.30</td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6) (in grave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-110</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.10</td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-114</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.30</td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Original excavation units contained in N17CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N15-118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NW +1.15, NE +0.90, S +0.95</td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Deposits north of fortification wall (north of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW +1.35,70 NE 1.31, SW 2.05, SE 2.03</td>
<td>VIII.059</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside of the fortification wall (north of the N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +1.48, S +2.30</td>
<td>VIII.101</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W 2.12, SE 2.14, NE 1.54</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +1.58, S +1.87</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-268</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +1.55, S +1.74</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N +2.10, mid. +3.00, S +3.32</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.5 and outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +1.36, S +2.03</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-284</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N +1.24</td>
<td>VIII.119</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-290</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.121</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-293</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.121</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-296</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E +1.74, W +1.98</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-298</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E +1.67, W +1.71</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Original excavation units contained in N17CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N25-300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +1.33, W +1.55</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +0.99, S +1.11</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+2.52</td>
<td>VIII.115</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall (north of N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.033</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Original excavation units contained in N17CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.248</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>Neck of marble figurine, joined to head K9.12</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.453</td>
<td>093</td>
<td>Bone handle with bronze rivet</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.722</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Loomweight (fragment)</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.119</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.141</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Obsidian Arrowhead</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.155</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.166</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.188</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Bronze bowl fragments</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.195</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Stone drill core</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.416</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Large piece of obsidian</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>069 078 149</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-185; Kl.636</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Obsidian blade fragment</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-192</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Obsidian chips</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-203</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Obsidian fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.69</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.82</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Obsidian arrowhead</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.140</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Obsidian core</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3.1</td>
<td>82-91</td>
<td>Obsidian blades and chips</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: N17CL smalls finds.
**N17CL Catalogue**

1 Open vessel (N17-14). Fig. 48
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, golden brown, gray bluish, silver mica, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6 with 7.5YR 6/4-5/4; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 5/4-5/6 and 5YR 4/2-3/2) paint. 1a. Curvilinear lines in red and dark brown. 1b. Inside: Circle with dots on its perimeter (rosette) in red and another thinner diagonal line in dark brown.
Period VI

2 Closed vessel (N17-15). Fig. 48
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Coarse clay with dark gray, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, gold mica, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 4/6; Surface 5YR 5/4; Slip 10YR 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 5/4-5/6 and 2.5YR 4/1) paint. Large foliate band (in red) with triple thin line for central stem (in dark brown). The foliate band is framed between two thin dark brown lines (horizontal, parallel). Beyond them, horizontal parallel bands in red, with interval between them.
Period VI

3 Closed vessel (N17-17). Fig. 48
Base (flat) and lower body sherd. Base Diam. 5; Max. H. 2.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.8.
Aeginetan – Polychrome Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, gray, gray-purplish schist, gold mica, and quartz inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 4/6 and 2.5YR 4/1) paint. Band over the base in brown and then another one higher up. In between them, horizontal row of dots (filled in) in dark brown.
Period VI

4 Closed vessel (amphora?) (N17-23). Fig. 48
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay; Core 7.5YR 7/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-7/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6) paint. Band on shoulder; above it foliate band. Under the band floral decoration with double leaf-like motifs and wavy interconnecting stems between them.
Period VI

5 Closed vessel (hole-mouthed jar?) (N17-16). Fig. 48
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with white, dark grey-purplish, vegetable temper, marble, and gold mica inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6; Int. surface 7.5YR 7/6-6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with Lustrous (2.5YR 5/6) paint. -band lower on the sherd, over it ripple pattern.
Period VI

6 Closed vessel (N17-32). Fig. 49
Body sherd with round vertical handle. Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.4.
Melian - Painted. Medium coarse clay with calcareous, gray, off-white, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/1-7/2; Surface 2.5Y 7/3-7/4.
Wiped exterior surface. Decorated with matt (Gley 1 2.5/N) paint. A large circle (band) with dot for center. Band on handle, and trace of horizontal band over the handle.
Period VI

7 Globular cup (N17-31). Fig. 49
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 10; Max. H. 2.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.4.
Mainland(?) - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, and red brown inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4 with 5YR 6/6; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 4/2-3/2) paint. Band on the rim inside and out. Another band on the base of lip. On the lip in between the bands is a wavy line. Vertical line, panel(?) on body.
Period VI

8 Keftiu cup (N17-33). Fig. 49
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.
Minoan. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Period VI

9 Closed vessel (rhyton?) (N17-24). Fig.49
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, red brown, light gray, dark gray-purplish, vegetable temper, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6 with 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Rock pattern fill with
rosettes with in-filled dot for center.
Period VII

10 Closed vessel (N17-25). Fig. 49
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.1.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, off-white, purplish, and grog inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Hatched loops on stem (2 stems visible) and in between them dotted rosettes.
Period VII

11 Alabastron (straight-sided) (N17-26). Fig. 49
Large fragment of shoulder and body with beginning of base; trace of handle stump. Max. H. 7.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/3) paint. Two bands (one thick and one thin) high on shoulder. Another on carination between shoulder and body. Another on carination between body and base. On the shoulder, three wavy parallel lines with sprigs. On body two horizontal parallel lines and in between them zigzag.
Period VII

12 Closed vessel (N17-28). Fig. 50
Three fragments, two joining and one non-joining. Max. H. 9.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, white, and dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3 with 2.5Y 7/1; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Regular rock pattern fill, with small trefoil rock and argonauts with spirally tentacles.
Period VII

13 Cup (N17-27). Fig. 50
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.1.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay; Core 10YR 8/3.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Dotted scale pattern (festoon) and quirk with two dots. Monochrome inside.
Period VII

14 Keftiu cup (N17-20). Fig. 50
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous inclusions; Core 10YR 8/4-7/4 with 5YR 6/6-6/8;
Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 4/6) paint. Foliate band with three lines for stem. Band on the lip inside and out and another one lower on the body.
Period VII (LH IIB)

15 Cup (N17-29). Fig. 50
Rim sherd. Est. Est. Rim Diam. 14; Max. H. 5.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.3.
Mainland(?) - Painted. Fine clay; Core 10YR 8/2 with Gley 1 8/10N; Surface 10YR 8/2.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/3) paint. Band on rim inside and out and another one lower. Two incised lines, one below the rim and another one lower accentuate the bands. Two thin bands lower on the body. In between bands, pendant concentric semi-circles.
Period VII

16 Bowl (marine style) (N17-36). Fig. 50
Rim and body fragment. Est. Rim Diam. 30; Max. H. 10.7.
Minoan(?). Fine pink-tan clay and buff slip.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous black paint on exterior and brown on interior. The interior is unslipped; band at rim and paint splashes below. Multiple tricurved arch on rock pattern; seaweed; two whorls with tips of starfish above.
Period VII

N18CL

This lot is very similar to N17CL in that they are both products of overzealous combination and represent a similar range of dates (Tables 22-23, and 75). N18CL includes fifteen original excavation units that investigated the deposits from the area over the fortification wall, wall N (trenches N15T, N20T, N24T, and N25T) in room N.5. The original quantity of this lot was almost five and a half tins, 77% of which was discarded during the first strewing in the
sherd yard.\textsuperscript{411} Today, the quantity that remains is a little less than half a tin. The excavator’s notes indicated that there was very little fine ware in this lot.

The bulk of ceramics in this lot date to Periods VI and VII, but also includes ceramics from the EBA, MBA, and Modern periods (Figs. 51, 52, and 53). There are several joins between sherds from this lot and sherds from lot N17CL, especially from trenches N20T and N25T (e.g., in the case of N18-56).

\textsuperscript{411} Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook N, p. 85.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N15-111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.10</td>
<td>XIV.117</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Wall N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S +2.75, N +2.25</td>
<td>VIII.055</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over north part of N.5 and the wall (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW +2.05, NE +2.03, SW 2.52, SE +2.39</td>
<td>VIII.059</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Surface deposits over north part of N.5 and the wall (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-152</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +2.00, S +2.30</td>
<td>VIII.059</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over north part of N.5 and the wall (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NW +1.41, NE +1.94, SW +2.00</td>
<td>VIII.063</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N+1.84, S +1.92</td>
<td>VIII.063</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-163</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N +1.70, S +1.85</td>
<td>VIII.063</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.101</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-254</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW +2.09, NE +2.17, SE +2.16</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-265</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +1.57, S+2.00</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N+2.03, S+2.31</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-282</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NE +1.95, SW 2.23</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +1.96, W +2.09</td>
<td>VIII.119</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-287</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +1.93, S +1.91</td>
<td>VIII.121</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-289</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N +1.78, S +0.88</td>
<td>VIII.121</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.5 (wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Original excavation units contained in N18CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.51</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Lead weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.379</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Three fragments of a bronze sheet with punctuated design</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.137</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Gem stone (crystal)</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.495</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Bone awl</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.17</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Stone vessel fragment (fluted)</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.21</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Spool fragment</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.120</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Obsidian chips</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: N18CL small finds.
N18CL Catalogue

17 Pithos (N18-96). Fig. 51
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 20; Max. H. 6.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 15.
Minoan(?). Medium fine clay with calcareous, gray, dark gray, gray bluish, and marble inclusions; Core 10YR 6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1 and faded white) paint. Monochrome painted(?) inside with a wavy line in faded white. 17b: Rim (top surface): seven curvy short vertical lines and on either side of them floral motif. On both edges of the rim there are bands. Rim (side): short lines. 17a: Rim (below): band. Upper body: foliate band. Period VI (LC I)

18 Closed vessel; body sherd (N18-97). Fig. 51
Max. H. 6.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.5.
Minoan(?). Medium fine clay with calcareous, gray, dark gray-purplish, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4-6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 3/1) paint. Two parallel horizontal bands lower on the body sherd. Over the higher band ripple pattern. Period VI

19 Open vessel (N18-64). Fig. 51
Body sherd with handle stump. Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.1.
Mainland – Polychrome Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/4-6/6 with 10YR 6/3; Surface 5YR 7/4-7/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Part of checkerboard motif near the handle stump. Period VI

20 Keftiu cup (N18-29). Fig. 51
Base (flat) and lower body sherd. Base Diam. 7; Max. H. 6.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.1.
Uncertain - Painted. Medium coarse clay with calcareous, gray, red brown, gray-greenish, off-white, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4-6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/4) paint. A horizontal band on the base and underneath the base stroke (irregular). Vertical lines on body. Period VI
21 Open vessel (N18-35). Fig. 51
Rim sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.6.
Aeginetan – Polychrome Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous silver mica, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 4/1 and 10R 3/3) paint. Band in dark brown below rim. Another band (thinner) in red and part of spiral. On rim, short vertical lines. Period VI to VII

22 Bridge spouted jar(?) (N18-56). Fig. 52
Metallic rib around the base of the neck; 43 joining and non-joining body sherds. Max. H. 10; Max. Pres. Dim. 20.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. At least four horizontal parallel bands (of irregular width) lower on the body of the vessel. Two thin bands higher up on the shoulder. The rest of the space is covered by scale pattern (FM 70) with tongues. Band around the handle. Interior of neck painted. On the base of the neck metallic rib with dotted line on it. Over it and below it bands. Period VII (LH IIA)

23 Closed vessel (N18-31). Fig. 52
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.3.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, dark gray-purplish, red brown, calcareous, and gold mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/2-7/2; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-7/3.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Traces of two hatched loops and trace of a band(?) or another hatched loop. Period VII (LH II)

24 Alabastron(?) (N18-67). Fig. 52
Shoulder sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay; Core 7.5YR 7/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 2/2) paint. Traces of two hatched loops. Period VII (LH II)

25 Closed vessel; (N18-70). Fig. 52
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with light brown inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Period VII (LH II)

26 Closed vessel (N18-71). Fig. 52
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.1.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with light brown inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 2/1) paint. Double axe.
Period VII (LH II)

27 Closed vessel (rhyton?) (N18-83). Fig. 52
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.6.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, red brown, and light red brown inclusions; Core 10YR 7/2-7/3; Surface 2.5YR 8/3-7/2.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Rock pattern fill with two concentric circles.
Period VII (LH II)

28 Open vessel; body sherd (N18-92). Fig. 52
Body sherd. Max. H. 8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.4.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6 with 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6) paint. Three bands lower and above it two curvilinear lines that turn parallel higher up. Filled dot in between lines.
Period VII

29 Open vessel (N18-33). Fig. 53
Body sherd. Max. H. 7; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.1.
Aeginetan – Polychrome Painted. Fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Period VII

30 Open vessel (N18-36). Fig. 53
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 10; Max. H. 4.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.6.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Period VII

31 Globular cup (N18-75). Fig. 53
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 12; Max. H. 3.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.1.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3;
Surface 10YR 8/2-7/2.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band on the rim inside
and out. Lower on the body are traces of double axes.
Period VII

32 Cup (N18-82). Fig. 53
Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 5YR
7/4-7/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1 and 2.5YR 5/6) paint. Dotted scale
pattern with swastikas in dark brown and monochrome painted inside in dark red.
Period VII (LH II)

33 Jar (N18-102). Fig. 53
Flat base and cylindrical body; ten joining and 6 non-joining sherds. Est. Rim Diam. 11; Base
Diam. 10; Max. H. 9.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.8.
Uncertain. Fine clay with calcareous, and white inclusions; Core 10R 5/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1-3/2) paint. Glazed interior and
exterior body (except the base).
Modern

N03CL

See room N.13.

N04CL

This lot comes from the eastern and southern side of room N.5 (trench N17T); the area is
bounded by wall N to the north, wall Q to the east, P to the south and the obscure structure to the
west. The excavators’ notes indicate that the nature of the area is unclear and excavation did not continue to the bedrock.

The five excavation units that comprise this lot produced 2.3 tins of ceramics, 65% of which was discarded (Tables 24-25, and 74). The bulk of the ceramics date to Periods VI and VII, whereas three black glazed sherds show that the deposit has been slightly disturbed during the Classical period. The presence of rather large fragments of vessels indicate that perhaps this lot is a fraction of a destruction deposit from Period VII now lost to us (Figs. 54-56).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N17-126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SW +2.20, NE+2.05</td>
<td>XIV.129</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.5 (from south edge of wall P to wall N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.00</td>
<td>XIV.129</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1.85</td>
<td>XIV.133</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.75</td>
<td>XIV.133</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.55</td>
<td>XIV.133</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Original excavation units contained in N04CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K3.608</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Incised tile</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.609</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Incised tile</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.589</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Worked stone</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: List of N04 small finds.

N04CL Catalogue

34 Closed vessel (N04-7). Fig. 54
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.5.
Local - Painted. Medium coarse clay with white-light brown, gray-greenish (golden brown),
golden brown, gray bluish, off-white vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6-
6/6; Surface 2.5YR 7/6-6/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 4/4 and 10YR 8/3) paint. Two spirals
slightly overlapping one another.
Period V to Period VI

35 Closed vessel (N04-36). Fig. 54
Minoan(?). Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, light brown, gray bluish , and vegetable temper
inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6-6/6; Surface 2.5YR 7/6-6/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 4/4 and 10YR 8/3) paint. Two spirals of
white on a red background.
Period VI

36 Spouted jug (N04-33). Fig. 54
Slight undulations on the rim (almost trefoil); plastic knob on the handle (juncture with rim);
groove on the base of the neck. Max. H. 5.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 11.5.
Minoan. Fine clay with white, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6-4/6;
Surface 2.5YR 6/6-5/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 4/3 and faded white) paint. Background
of (very thin) red paint but stringy appearance (like erratic brush strokes); a faded white double
line-curvilinear motif on the shoulder.
Period VI

37 Large open vessel (basin?) (N04-8). Fig. 54
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 64(?); Max. H. 6.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 15.4.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with white, dark gray, off-white, vegetable
temper, schist, marble, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 4/6 with 2.5Y 5/1-4/1; Slip 10YR
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1 and 7.5YR 4/6) paint. On the interior surface curvilinear motif (floral), with dark outline and light brown solid interior; on the outside surface the slip has flaked off stripping also the decoration.

Period VI

### 38 Large open vessel (basin?) (N04-9). Fig. 54


Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with white, dark gray-purplish, gray-greenish, white-light gray, gray-greenish, red brown, vegetable temper, schist, marble, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6-5/6 with 10YR 5/3; Slip 10YR 7/4.

Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 4/2, 5YR 5/4, and 2.5YR 4/6 to 10R 5/3) paint. Outside: a red band around the handle. On the handle there is a red band along the long axis flanked by two thinner black wavy lines; inside: traces of curvilinear motif made of one thicker red line flanked by two thinner black ones.

Period VI

### 39 Large open vessel or plaque (N04-10). Fig. 54

Sherd (totally flat) with rim or finished edge. Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.

Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with white, dark gray, gray bluish, vegetable temper, schist, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/4-5/4; Slip 2.5Y 8/2-8/3.

Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 4/2) paint. Trace of motif(?) on the upper surface. Band on the lip or finished edge.

Period VI

### 40 Large open vessel (N04-11). Fig. 54

Body sherd. Max. H. 2.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.2.

Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with light brown, red brown, golden brown, dark gray, off-white, gray-greenish, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/4-5/4; Slip 2.5Y 8/2-8/3.

Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 4/2 and faded white) paint. Trace of spiral, with band on the lower part of the sherd and on top a white band (decoration on the inside of the vessel).

Period VI

### 41 Closed vessel (N04-18). Fig. 54

Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.5.

Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 5/2) paint. Floral motif(?). Period VI

42 Goblet (N04-21). Fig. 54
Low pedestalled base. Base Diam. 5.6; Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 12.
Mainland – Burnished; Gray Minyan. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 5/1; Surface 2.5Y 5/1.
Burnished exterior surface.
Period VI

43 Panelled cup (N04-30). Fig. 55
Base and lower part of body. Base Diam. 5.1; Max. H. 3.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 5/2) paint. Band around the base and floral motifs.
Period VI

44 Cycladic bowl (N04-32). Fig. 55
Rim and body sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 16; Max. H. 7.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.4.
Melian - Slipped and Burnished. Medium fine clay with dark gray (shiny), calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 6/1.
Period VI

45 Keftiu cup (N04-37). Fig. 56
Rim sherd. Base Diam. 12; Max. H. 3.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.3.
Minoan(?). Fine clay with off-white grog inclusions; Core 5YR 7/4-7.5YR 7/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-7/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 2/1 and faded white) paint. Light on dark; dark gray/black inside and out; outside is faded white decoration of three vertical lines under the lip delineated by a thin horizontal line; below it is a trace of a spiral.
Period VI

46 Jar (medium size) (N04-6). Fig. 55
Lower body and base non-joining fragments. Base Diam. 9; Max. H. 13.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 13.8.
Local - Painted. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, light brown, golden, golden brown, off-white, gray-greenish, gray bluish, vegetable temper, marble, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR
5/6; Surface 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (faded white) paint. Horizontal parallel bands
(lower body of vessel); saw-tooth pattern on the shoulder.
Period VI to Period VII

47 Bridge-spouted jar (N04-14). Fig. 55
Spout. Max. H. 4.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.2.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with light brown, off-white, white, gray-
greenish marble, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 4/4-5YR 4/4 with 10YR
3/2; Surface 10YR 3/1; Slip 2.5YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 2/1) paint. Band on the edge of the spout
and on the rim.
Period VI to Period VII

48 Cooking pot (N04-15). Fig. 55
Lower body and part of one handle. Base Diam. 5; Max. H. 12.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 12.
Aeginetan - Plain. Coarse clay with dark gray (shiny), calcareous, white, light gray, dark gray-
purplish vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 5YR 6/6-5/6; Slip
10YR 7/2.
Wiped exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

49 Closed(?) vessel (amphora or hydria?) (N04-17). Fig. 54
Body sherd. Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.3.
Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray gold mica, and vegetable
temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3-2.5Y 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/3-2.5Y 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 4/1) paint. Two curvilinear lines (spiral?).
Period VI to Period VII

50 Closed vessel (N04-19). Fig. 54
Body sherd. Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.3.
Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, dark gray (shiny), vegetable temper, and
gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3-2.5Y 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/3-2.5Y 7/3.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 4/1) paint. Unknown motif; preserved are
three(?) dashes or ends of lines.
Period VI to Period VII

51 Large closed vessel (N04-12). Fig. 55
Rim and body sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 46; Max. H. 9.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 12.5.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with light brown, off-white, light red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 5/2; Surface 5YR 5/6; Slip 2.5Y 8/3-8/4. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5Y 3/1 and 7.5YR 3/1) paint. Inside surface: band under rim, from which pendant semicircles (festoons) in dark brown-greenish paint with two semicircular lines around them in dark brown paint. Lower on the sherd is a vertical band with curved end in dark brown paint. Outside surface: slipped, with a band under the lip, and traces of motifs lower on the body. Traces of slip and motifs on the rim in both paints (probably in-filled circles).
Period VI to Period VII

52 Cup (N04-25). Fig. 56
Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Period VII

53 Semi-globular cup (N04-26). Fig. 56
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.9.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4 5YR 6/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 4/6 and 10YR 2/1) paint. Band on the base of the lip and under it is part of a spiral; monochrome painted inside.
Period VII

54 Semi-globular cup (N04-27). Fig. 56
Body sherd. Max. H. 1.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.2.
Period VII

55 Skyphos (N04-38). Fig. 56
Base sherd. Base Diam. 6; Max. H. 2.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.2.
Archaic/Classical
Skyphos (N04-39). Fig. 56
Base sherd. Base Diam. 3.2; Max. H. 1.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.2.
Attic. Fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 6/4 with 2.5Y 5/1.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5Y 3/1) paint. Monochrome painted out.
Archaic/Classical

N19CL

This lot (see Tables 26-28, and 75) consists of material from 19 excavation units excavated in the north end of room N.5. The original quantity of this deposit was almost six and a half tins of pottery, of which 98% was coarse.413 Even though the pottery notes (see below, Table 77) indicate that only 70% was discarded, the remaining quantity seems to be only 7.5% of the original deposit. The deposit contains ceramics that range in date from the EBA to Period VI or early Period VII (LH IIA) (Figs. 57-58).414

In the excavation notebooks, the deposits are connected with a layer of red soil that is normally found directly over bedrock and associated with the soil on which the Period V buildings were founded (see discussion of N.5 above). Indeed, a significant percentage of the material in this lot dates to Period V, which shows that the later activities disturbed the destruction deposit of Period V, the same as in the south part of the room. Both the Period V

413 Kittredge n.d., Pottery Notebook N, p. 86.
414 Davis (1986, p. 60) notes that the deposit contained LH III material, but in the lot I could not see any undisputed evidence for LH III.
ceramics as well as patches of the murex shell layer belong to the Period V use of the room. However, the presence of material later than Period V (dated to Periods VI and VIIa) is evidence for a disturbance of the deposits that dates back to the Bronze Age; perhaps the disturbance may be connected to an improvement program of the fortification system in late Period VI to early Period VII that is evident in other areas of the Northern Sector. Even though the deposit has been included in the Period V publication by Davis as Group AC, the deposit is included here because only a handful of ceramics were published.\footnote{Davis 1986, p. 62 (deposit AC).}
Table 26: Original excavation units contained in N19CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N24-260</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NE +2.34; SW +2.53</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.5 (red earth 2.0 m north of wall B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20-261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW +2.72, SW +2.94</td>
<td>VIII.063</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.5 (south part of trench N20T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-266</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NE +2.08, SW +2.44, SE +2.29</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-269</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NE +1.90, SW +2.26</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-272</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.93</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-274</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+1.84</td>
<td>VIII.107</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>, NE +2.24, NW +2.39, SE +2.39, SW +2.54</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2.50</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2.19</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-283</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.09</td>
<td>VIII.111</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-292</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.78</td>
<td>VIII.121</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4225</td>
<td>70.2632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Original excavation units contained in N19CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.146</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Worked white stone</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.157</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.158</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.167</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.475</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.494</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Bone tool</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: N19CL small finds.
N19CL Catalogue

57 Spouted bowl (N19-17). Fig. 57
Body sherd with rim and spout. Est. Rim Diam. 14; Max. H. 6.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 16.3.
Local - Painted. Medium coarse clay with gray bluish, off-white, white, golden brown, dark gray-purplish, vegetable temper, marble, silver mica, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-5/6; Surface 5YR 5/4-5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5Y 7/2) paint. Running spirals and band over them and below the rim. Band on rim and on spout edge.
Period V to Period VI

58 Closed vessel (N19-20). Fig. 57
Handle (horizontal round). Max. H. 3.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 9.5.
Local - Painted. Coarse clay with gray, gray-greenish, off-white, dark gray, golden brown, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6 with 5Y 5/1-5/2; Surface 5YR 5/4-5/6.
Wiped exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 8/2) paint. Band on base of handle and another four vertical lines spread along regular intervals.
Period V to Period VI

59 Bowl (N19-29). Fig. 57
Lower body sherd and base (flat). Base Diam. 8; Max. H. 6.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with gray-purplish, light gray, dark gray-purplish and gold mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/6; Surface 7.5YR 6/6; Slip 10YR 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/1-41) paint. Two horizontal bands and another one higher up on the body.
Period V to Period VI

60 Panelled cup (N19-58). Fig. 57
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/2-7/2; Surface 2.5Y 7/3; Slip 2.5YR 6/8.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/1-41) paint. Slip inside only. Panel with two “floors-parts.” The upper part has a wavy line on tom and underneath multiple vertical long leaves resting on a baseline. Underneath lower part two horizontal lines of dots and below another batch of multiple vertical long leaves.
Period V to Period VI

61 Jar(?) (N19-24). Fig. 58
Rim sherd with projecting flat rim. Est. Rim Diam. 34; Max. H. 7; Max. Pres. Dim. 9.5.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with dark gray-purplish, golden brown,
silver-gray, white, gray bluish silver mica, marble, schist, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core
5YR 5/4-5/6; Slip 10YR 7/3-6/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1 and 10R 5/6) paint. Bands under the
rim in dark brown and red paint. On rim, one band in dark brown paint and zigzag.
Period VI

62 Kalathos (N19-1). Fig. 58
Handle and rim fragment. Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.1.
Local - Plain. Medium fine clay with golden brown, dark gray, gray, gray-greenish, and gold
mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 5YR 5/6; Slip 5YR 5/2.
Wiped exterior surface.
Period VI (LH I)

63 Closed vessel (N19-27). Fig. 58
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.9.
Aeginetan – Painted (Polychrome). Medium fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, purplish, and
gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-7/6; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
in red over a band in black with another line to the left.
Period VI

64 Closed vessel (N19-47). Fig. 58
Mainland – Polychrome Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3-
7/3; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 3/1) paint. Band and over it a series
of “V”.
Period VI

65 Keftiu cup (N19-60). Fig. 58
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Minoan. Fine clay with calcareous and red brown vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/4;
Surface 5YR 6/3-5/3.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with (10R 4/1) paint. Three horizontal parallel bands. Over
the bands ripple pattern.
Period VI (LM IA)

**66 Keftiu cup (N19-49).** Fig. 58
Body sherd with rib. Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark brown-purplish and dark gray inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6 with 10YR 7/4; Surface 5YR 6/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 4/6) paint. Ripple pattern.
Period VI to Period VII (LH IIA)

**NN1CL and NN2CL**

NN1 and NN2 (Tables 29-30, and 76) examined the undisturbed deposit above the Period V floor. The deposit has been published by Davis as part of Group AB, thus no further discussion is warranted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N24-553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LI.145</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>N.5 (grid marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-554</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LI.145</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5 (grid marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-555</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LI.145</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.5 (grid marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LI.145</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.5 (grid marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LI.149</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.5 (grid marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Original excavation units contained in NN1CL.

---

416 Davis 1986, p. 61 (deposit AB)
Table 30: Original excavation units contained in NN2CL.

N55CL

N55CL (Tables 31 and 76) combines three excavation units in a pit in the bedrock located in the area of room N.5. The original quantity of this lot is 0.7 tin, of which 73.3% was discarded.417 This combined lot has been dated to Period IV and published by John Overbeck as Group DF, thus no further analysis is warranted here.418

Table 31: Original excavation units contained in N55CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N24-560</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.03</td>
<td>LI.147</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pit in the bedrock (room N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-561</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+1.70</td>
<td>LI.149</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Pit in the bedrock (room N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24-562</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+1.65</td>
<td>LI.149</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pit in the bedrock (room N.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROOM N.6**

Room N.6 (Figs. 32 and 22) is trapezoidal and measures ca. 3 x 2.6-1.8 m. The room was enclosed when a new corner was added east of room N.5 and the earlier circuit at the northeast corner of the fortification wall. The room was bounded by walls N to the north, K to the east, P to the south, and Q to the west. No ground floor entrance to the room was located during the excavation. This room was investigated in N15T and in the western part of N09T.

The overburden above room N.6 and in the area east of it was removed in units N15-87 and N09-045 (cut 1); these units (combined lots N17CL and N28CL, respectively) contained material ranging in date from the EBA to the Late Roman period.
In the western part of the room, a uniform deposit was excavated in units N06-88, -90, -92, and -95 (cuts 2-5). The soil was red and contained material ranging in date from the MBA period to LH I (or II?); finds were combined into N05CL. Towards the bottom of this deposit the excavator noted that there were “red lumps of soil,” but the red soil was a mass that was “centered about 1 m from the east baulk and 2.0 [m] from wall P.”

The eastern part of the room had been disturbed by the robbing of the stones from the fortification wall. The deposits that took the place of the robbed stones contained material from the EBA through the Late Roman period (N28CL and N27CL).

At approximately +1.35/1.20 the excavator began removing what he thought was an undisturbed deposit. The sediment here was red and seemed to cover most of the area, extending from the center of the room to within ca. 0.50 m from wall Q, to a point ca. 0.80 m from wall P, and to the south “line” of wall N; it was examined with units N15-97, -100, and N09-54 (cut 5). In the south part of the room (N15-100), the red earth covered the whole area except strips along walls Q and P. The excavator remarked that the red earth did not seem to be decayed mudbrick or the remnants of a hearth, but instead he thought it was the product of decayed stone.

---

419 Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, pp. 105 and 107.
421 Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 111.
422 Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 111.
Lower in the room, excavation of the same deposit continued in units N15-102, -103, -105, and N09-57 (cuts 7, 8 and 9). These units took the level of the room below that of the surrounding walls, i.e., wall Q and west part of wall P. In 103, and especially next to wall Q, the soil was ashy in texture.

Units N15-108 and N15-113 (cuts 10 and 11) examined the deposit that lay under the bottom of the walls. The number of small stones increased with depth. In the northwest corner, three stones in line with each other were uncovered (wall U). The stones were surrounded by red soil (+0.49/0.25), which was removed in N15-115. The rest of the room, which was covered with dark soil, was excavated in N15-116.

All find in red soil down to bedrock were added to one combined lot, N06CL. The pottery ranged in date from the EBA to Period VI. The excavator noted that the EBA material was more frequent in the lower levels of the room; probably the levels below the bottoms of the walls should have been kept separate since they were associated with wall U, and must have reflected activities prior to the construction of the fortification wall.

---

424 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 113.
425 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 113.
426 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 119.
427 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 119.
428 The combined lot contained one Period VII sherd, but the excavator notes in the pottery notebooks that it is from unit N15-97, i.e., at the top of the deposit.
No floor and no ground storey entrance were found in this space. It is quite possible that the room was not meant to be entered at all, but served only as support for an upper-storey room.\textsuperscript{429}

N\textsuperscript{28}CL

This is a massive combined lot which includes 35 excavation units from a variety of areas in the eastern part of the Northern Sector (Tables 32-34, and 76). The units mainly came from the area west of rooms N.6 and N.15 and represent the layers deposited over the fortification walls after the wall had been dismantled and burned in the lime kiln during the late Roman/Byzantine period. However, there is also one unit that comes from the area south of rooms N.15 and N.14. Only three excavation units (N09-45, -49, and -53) investigated the area of N.6 and more specifically the deposits over the fortification wall, which constitutes the east wall of room N.6.

The original quantity of this lot was 13 tins of pottery of which 73.5\% had been discarded according to the records, including fragments of 258 conical cups; 95\% of the pottery was

\textsuperscript{429} This suggestion, for which I thank Carol Hershenson, is based on parallels in Minoan architecture, where some doorless spaces seem to have functioned only as support for upper storey structures and were probably not accessible at the ground storey level (see McEnroe 1982, pp. 7-9.)
coarse. At present, the remaining quantity represents 4% of the original quantity indicating that that material underwent another unrecorded episode of discarding.

The records indicate that the lot contained ceramics dating to the EBA (several sauceboat fragments, and rim sherds from inturned rim bowls among others), MBA (Gray Minyan, Black Burnished, Minoan “oatmeal” fabric), Period VI (Keftiu cup with ripple decoration, and cup with floral band), Period VII (semi-globular cups and goblets), Period VIII (fragments of angular alabastra), as well as a crucible fragment and conical cups of Period VII type. The lot also contains cup with the foliate band pattern, at least a fragment of a deep bowl fragment (LH IIIA-B?) and a large fragment of combed ware. Thus, N28CL preserves traces of cultural activity in this area of the Northern Sector that dates from the EBA to the Late Roman/Byzantine periods.

There are only two items that are marked with excavation unit numbers from the area of N.6. These are a conical cup of local fabric (K.1276) and a rim sherd from a plain goblet that can be dated to Periods VII and VIII.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N05-020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.106</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05-021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.106</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05-022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.106</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05-023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05-024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.110</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05-026b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.112</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N06-028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.118</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N08-038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W+0.91, E +0.87</td>
<td>V.124</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Area outside the fortification wall (east of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N08-041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.124?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area outside the fortification wall (east of N.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09-045</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.128</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Deposits over the fortification wall and east of room N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09-049</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.130</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Deposits over the fortification wall and east of room N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09-053</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposits over the fortification wall and east of room N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-065</td>
<td>+1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.139</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.139</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-070</td>
<td>+1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.139</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Original excavation units contained in N28CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N12-073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.140</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-075</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.140</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-077</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>V.140</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.140</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.143</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area south of N.14 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-317</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>VIII.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-455</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.05</td>
<td>XLVI.081</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.6 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.081</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.6 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.081</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.6 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12-515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.027</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N37-534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LI.047</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N37-535</td>
<td>N +1.00, middle +0.75, S +0.76</td>
<td>LI.047</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N37-536</td>
<td>N +0.58, middle +0.42, S +0.38</td>
<td>LI.047</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N37-537</td>
<td>N +0.35, middle +0.31, S +0.35</td>
<td>LI.047</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LI.111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Area east of N.6 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N06-026a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.116</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Area east of N.6 and N.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33: Original excavation units contained in N28CL.
### Table 34: N28CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1.382</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Terracotta whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.545</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Terracotta whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.472</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.562</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Stone pestle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.473</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.383</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Terracotta whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Incised seal or bead</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.471</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.474</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.161</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Terracotta disc</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plaster: several fragments of coarse plaster and a fragment of thin plaster preserving red color</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-151</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Obsidian chips (20) and fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-152</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Obsidian chips (7) and fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-166</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Obsidian chips and fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-182</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Obsidian blade fragment</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-202</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Obsidian chips (3) and fragments (5)</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### N27CL

Similar to N28CL, this lot (Tables 35-36, and 76) contains the remains of seventeen excavation units from the area north and east of room N.6. Only one of these units (N09+10-050) has investigated deposits over the area of room N.6, and more specifically the deposits over the fortification wall bordering N.6 on its east side.
The original quantity of this lot was 7.35 tins of pottery of which 76.8% has been discarded. This is probably another miscombination. The records indicate that there was a qualitative difference between the pottery coming from the areas of N07T and N10T and the area of N32T, namely, the former area seems to have produced almost no fine ware.

Most of the sherds are Late Bronze Age, the earliest being Period VI and the latest possibly as late as LH IIIB, with the bulk of the LBA pottery dating to Period VIII (LH IIIA). There is also a group of sherds (mostly black glazed skyphoi and drinking vessels, as well as a possible cooking pot fragment) that date to the Classical period. Finally, there are specimens of late Roman combed ware and grooved ware. Unfortunately, none of the extant sherds bear the excavation unit number that investigated this area.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N07-030</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.118</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N07-032</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+1.20</td>
<td>V.120</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10-046</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.138</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09+10-050</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.130</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10-055</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10-059</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.144</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-372</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.144</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.144</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-381</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +0.95, S+0.76</td>
<td>XXXIX.103</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-382</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +0.61, S+0.64</td>
<td>XXXIX.048</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-387</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NE +0.99, SE +0.94; SW +1.00; NW +1.02</td>
<td>XXXIX.059</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32-388</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NE +0.78, SE +0.73, SW +0.80, NW +0.76</td>
<td>XXXIX.059</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32A-412B</td>
<td></td>
<td>N +0.69, S +0.76</td>
<td>XXXIX.103</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32A-406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1.49</td>
<td>XXXIX.093</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32A-409</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SW +0.91, SE +0.96</td>
<td>XXXIX.174</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N32A-418</td>
<td></td>
<td>N +0.69, S +0.76</td>
<td>XXXIX.103</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Outside the fortification wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: Original excavation units contained in N27CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.386</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.434</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Fragment of stone vessel; rim with handle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.427</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Carnelian bead</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.431</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Obsidian arrowhead</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7.251</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>Black stone fragment of a blossom bowl</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7.246</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Stone pommel</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.461</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Bronze strip</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.353</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Surface find (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.379</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.455</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Bronze wire</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.456</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Bronze strap</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.457</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Bronze strap</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.458</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Bronze strap</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.462</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Bronze strip</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.466</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Lead weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.502</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Bronze strap</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-156</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Obsidian chips, fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-166</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Obsidian chips, fragments</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.221</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Obsidian arrowhead</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36: N27CL small finds.

N17CL

For the description of this combined lot, see room N.5 above.
These lots (Tables 37-38, and 74) represent the deposit from the surface to the top of the lowest preserved walls (+2.00 to +1.20/1.00) in room N.6. The original quantity of this lot was 3.9 tins of which 72.5% was discarded, including fragments of 105 conical cups and 14 legs.434

The excavator noted that “although stones were probably removed from the walls in both ancient and modern times, no Roman or later traces were found.”435 There were no whole pots found in the deposit nor were there joins of old breaks. Moreover, no two sherds seem without doubt to have come from the same pot. The lack of whole pots and joins of old breaks suggest that the deposit represents a fill probably placed there deliberately in one event instead of accumulating overtime. Even though there are a few ceramics of earlier date, most of ceramics in the lot are dated to Period VI, while there is one kylix fragment (probably intrusive) that dates to a late Period VII or VIII phase (Figs. 59, 60, and 61).


### Table 37: Original excavation units contained in N05CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N15-088</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2.00</td>
<td>XIV.105</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-090</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1.70</td>
<td>XIV.105</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-092</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.60</td>
<td>XIV.107</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-095</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1.40</td>
<td>XIV.107</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 38: N05CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K3.446</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Bottom of stone vessel</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### N05CL Catalogue

**67 Closed vessel (N05-52). Fig. 59**  
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.4.  
Mainland – Polychrome Painted. Fine clay with calcareous vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/4; Surface 5YR 7/6-6/6.  
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/1 and 5YR 4/6) paint. Multiple stem and tongue.  
Period VI

**68 Closed vessel (N05-53). Fig. 59**  
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.4.  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 6/1-6/2; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-6/4.  
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/1) paint. Hatched racket or spiral.  
Period VI

**69 Closed vessel (N05-59). Fig. 59**  
Minoan. Fine clay with gray bluish inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/4 with 5YR 6/4-5/4; Surface
7.5YR 7/4-7/6; Slip 2.5Y 4/1-4/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (faded white) paint. Floral decoration.
Period VI

70 Keftiu cup (N05-57). Fig. 59
Body sherd. Base Diam. 10; Max. H. 5.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.1.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with light gray, dark gray silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/2-7/2; Surface 10YR 7/4-2.5Y 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR ¾) paint. Band above the base and above it ripple pattern.
Period VI

71 Cup (N05-23). Fig. 59
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 14; Max. H. 4.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.2.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with golden, light brown, white, dark gray, vegetable temper, schist, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6-4/6; Surface 10YR 4/2; Slip 2.5Y 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Rock pattern outside pendent from the rim; possible thick band on the body.
Period VI

72 Pithos (N05-4). Fig. 59
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 44; Max. H. 5.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 11.7.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with light gray-greenish, white-light brown, silver mica, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-4/4; Surface 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6; Slip 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6.
Decorated with two bands of rope pattern.
Period VI to VII?

73 Bridge spouted jar (N05-8). Fig. 60
Handle with rim. Max. H. 5.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.7.
Local - Plain. Medium fine clay with light gray-greenish, white-light gray schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 4/3; Slip 7.5YR 5/2-4/2.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

74 Flower pot (N05-12). Fig. 60
Base of large vessel with hole at its bottom. Base Diam. 7; Max. H. 5.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 13.3.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with white-light gray, gray-greenish,
vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Slip 10YR 7/4. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 5/4) paint. Band on the base and under it and over it a star like motif with dotted center. Period VI to Period VII

**75** Large closed vessel or plaque (N05-13). Fig. 60
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with white-light gray, brown red, golden brown, white-light brown, dark gray (shiny), gray-greenish, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/8; Surface 5YR 5/8; Slip 2.5Y 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Traces of motif. Period VI to Period VII

**76** Open vessel (N05-14). Fig. 60
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with white-light gray, brown red, golden brown, white-light brown, dark gray (shiny), gray-greenish vegetable temper, schist, marble, silver mica, and gold mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6 with 2.5Y 5/2; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 4/1) paint. Three parallel curvilinear lines. Period VI to Period VII

**77** Amphora or hydria (N05-29). Fig. 60
Neck sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 16; Max. H. 5.4.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, and golden mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 7/3 with 2.5Y 7/4; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 4/1) paint. Band on the rim and two horizontal bands (thin) below the rim on the neck. Period VI to Period VII

**78** Open vessel (?) (N05-38). Fig. 60
Body sherd. Max. H. 7.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.5.
Dodecanesian?. Fine clay with white silver mica, marble, and gold mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/2-6/2 5YR 5/8; Surface 7.5YR 6/4; Slip 10YR 8/2-7/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/1) paint. Two horizontal bands and in between them running infilled spirals. One groove above and one plastic horizontal rib below it. Period VI to Period VII

**79** Cup (N05-50). Fig. 61
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1 and faded white) paint. Bands above and below and in between running spirals (in-filled) (paint1); band in faded white with row of dots above.
Period VI to Period VII

80 Cup (N05-51). Fig. 61
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.6.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Period VI to Period VII (LH IIA)

81 Kylix (N05-40). Fig. 61
Lower part of body. Max. H. 7; Max. Pres. Dim. 9.5.
Mainland Plain. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/4-6/6; Slip 7.5YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VIII

N06CL
This lot (Tables 39-40, 74) combines ceramics included from excavation units in room N.6, from the level below the walls (+1.20/1.00) to bedrock which was found at approximately +0.00. The information about the individual excavation units is incomplete (see below, Table
74); the original quantity for which data is available was 4.6 tins, of which more than 66.7% was discarded, including fragments of sixty-nine conical cups and nine legs.436

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N09-054</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.20</td>
<td>V.132</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N.6 (west of wall K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09-057</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>V.134</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.6 (west of wall K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-097</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.20</td>
<td>XIV.107</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1.35/1.00</td>
<td>XIV.111</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>XIV.111</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-103</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+0.90</td>
<td>XIV.113</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
<td>XIV.113</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+0.55</td>
<td>XIV.113</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
<td>XIV.113</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
<td>XIV.119</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.6 (wall U-red soil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15-116</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>XIV.119</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.6 (dark soil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: Original excavation units contained in N06CL.

This deposit includes the remains of an earlier wall (U) which probably dates to the EBA. According to the excavator, the lower units contained more EBA ceramics. In general, the lot is very scrappy containing ceramics that date to the EBA, Period IV, and Period VI (Figs. 62-65).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 40: N06CL small finds.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1.408</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Lead weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.650</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Piece of lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.474</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Bone ball</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N06CL Catalogue

82 Basin (N06-4). Fig. 62
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 43; Max. H. 8.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.9.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray, dark gray (shiny) silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 10YR 4/1; Surface 5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with thick plastic band with impressed vertical bars (rope pattern) below the rim.
EBA

83 Large open vessel (N06-5). Fig. 62
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.8.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray, dark gray (shiny) silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-4/4 with 10YR 4/1; Surface 5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with thick plastic band with impressed vertical bars (rope pattern) below the rim.
EBA

84 Open vessel (N06-6). Fig. 62
Rim sherd with handle (horizontal arched, round profile). Max. H. 4.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.7.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray, dark gray (shiny), silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-5/6; Surface 5YR 5/4-5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
EBA

85 Open vessel (N06-9). Fig. 62
Lug (arched). Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6 with 10YR 4/1; Surface 5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
EBA to V
86 Open vessel (N06-11). Fig. 62
Base sherd (flat with string-cut striations). Base Diam. 8; Max. H. 2.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.2.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, golden brown, gray bluish, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6-5/6; Surface 2.5YR 6/6-5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
EBA to V

87 Panneled cup (N06-23). Fig. 63
Base and lower body. Base Diam. 5.5; Max. H. 4.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.2.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with golden brown, silver-gray, dark gray, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Slip 2.5Y 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 4/2) paint. Band above the base; perhaps cross on the base underneath.
Period V to VI

88 Open vessel (N06-28). Fig. 63
Base sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 16; Max. H. 4.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.8.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, silver-gray, dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, off-white, white-pink, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 5YR 5/6; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 5/4-4/4) paint. Band under the rim; lower vertical curved stripes (ripple imitation?).
Period VI

89 Open vessel (N06-39). Fig. 63
Mainland – Burnished (Argive Minyan). Fine clay with silver-gray, white, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 2.5Y 4/1-4/2.
Burnished exterior surface.
Period VI

90 Goblet (N06-40). Fig. 63
Mainland – Burnished (Gray Minyan). Fine clay with silver-gray, white, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 5/1-5/2; Surface 10YR 4/1.
Burnished exterior surface.
Period VI
91 Closed vessel (N06-55). Fig. 63
Body sherd. Max. H. 10; Max. Pres. Dim. 8.3.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 5/2) paint. Three groups of three horizontal parallel bands in triangular formation.
Period VI

92 Beaked neck jug (N06-57). Fig. 63
Neck with small part of rim. Max. H. 3.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.1.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Band and circle.
Period VI

93 Keftiu cup (N06-59). Fig. 64
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 8; Max. H. 4.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.8.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-10YR 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 4/2) paint. Band on rim inside and out; under it pendent loops. Lower on the body three horizontal bands.
Period VI

94 Cup (N06-60). Fig. 64
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-10YR 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Loops in between bands; band around handle stump.
Period VI

95 Closed vessel (N06-61). Fig. 64
Melian (?) Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/3-7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Two bands and in between them continuous diamonds.
Period VI
Closed vessel (N06-62). Fig. 64
Body sherd. Max. H. 8.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.3.
Melian (?) Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, silver mica, gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/3.
Period VI

Closed vessel (N06-65). Fig. 64
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.9.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with purplish, dark gray, red brown, vegetable temper, silver mica, and grog inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6-6/6; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-7/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 3/1 and 10R 4/4-4/6) paint. Wavy band (vertical) in dark brown paint and in-filled circle (reddish paint).
Period VI

Large closed vessel (N06-69). Fig. 64
Body sherd. Max. H. 6.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.3.
Minoan. Fine clay with light brown, gray bluish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6-6/6; Surface 5YR 7/6-6/6; Slip 5YR 4/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 3/1) paint. Dark curvilinear motifs on reddish background.
Period VI

Large closed vessel (N06-71). Fig. 65
Body sherd. Max. H. 7.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.3.
Minoan. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/4-5/4; Surface 2.5YR 6/4-5/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 4/1-3/1 and faded white) paint. Trace of curvilinear motif concentric circles(?) on dark background.
Period VI

Large closed vessel (N06-74). Fig. 65
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.7.
Minoan. Fine clay with dark gray, red brown, calcareous, dark gray-purplish, gray bluish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/4-6/6; Surface 2.5YR 6/4-6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 3/1 and faded red?) paint. Dark brown paint as background and curvilinear motif in faded red.
Period VI

101 Large closed vessel (N06-75). Fig. 65
Minoan. Fine clay with gray bluish, red brown, off-white, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6; Surface 2.5YR 7/4-6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 2.5/2 and 2.5YR 3/1) paint. Vertical (radial?) bands reddish brown paint on dark brown background.
Period VI

102 Bridge spouted jar (N06-80). Fig. 65
Handle fragment. Max. H. 5.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.9.
Minoan?. Fine clay with dark gray vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6-7.5YR 7/6; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-7/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 4/4 and 2.5YR 3/1) paint. Monochrome outside (?).
Period VI

SUITE OF ROOMS N.7, N.8, AND N.9

Rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9 (Fig. 20) comprise a suite of rooms between walls AB (to the north), AG (to the east), X (to the south), and Z (to the west). It is located to the south of the suite N.2-N.4, with which it shares wall AB. The suite was probably connected to room N.10 through an entrance that passed through a stone platform, which was the Period V wall P (fortification wall); the existence of a large monolithic threshold (top +3.35) built into the southern end of wall
AE suggests that this suite, as well as room N.10, could have been reached from other rooms in the vicinity or from an upstairs floor.\textsuperscript{437}

Three walls divide this space into three rooms: wall AC between rooms N.7 and N.8, wall AD between N.8 and N.9, and wall AA between N.7 and N.9.

**ROOM N.7**

Room N.7 (Figs. 20 and 23) was a 1.3 x 3.3-2.6 m space bounded by walls AB to the north, AC to the east, AA to the south, and Z to the west.\textsuperscript{438} It communicated with N.8 via a door opening in the northeastern corner of the room north of wall AC.

N.7 was investigated in trench N21T (proper and extension 1). The removal of the surface deposits (cuts 0-1, units N21-167, -172 and N21-170, -175, -178) exposed all of the walls of the room: wall Z (170), AB (175), AC and AA (178). AA was a flimsy wall composed of six single stones that ran from wall Z diagonally towards the eastern baulk; the excavator imagined at first it was a terrace wall (wall AA), and that its northern face defined the outer edge of the terrace.\textsuperscript{439} At its east end, this wall seemed to stop at wall AD.

\textsuperscript{437} *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 91. The remains of Period VII (both wall and associated deposits) north of the threshold had been obliterated or seriously disturbed prior to the beginning of the excavation, either by the modern road building activities or by the Late Roman activities associated with the limekiln.

\textsuperscript{438} *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 83.

\textsuperscript{439} *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 75.
N21-191, -199, and -200 (cuts 2-4) showed that there was a layer of fallen stones
(approximately 0.30 m thick) in the room.\textsuperscript{440} N21-199 also showed that there was an opening at
the northern end of wall AC, a door that gave access to room N.8.\textsuperscript{441} Pottery from the top of the
“fallen stone” layer (N21-191) was combined into unit N09CL, and mostly belongs to Period
VIIa (although there are a few scraps of Period VIII). The lower part of the stone layer contained
finds that were combined as unit N10CL of Period V date (Fig. 24).

As excavation reached the bottom of the layer of fallen stone, it became evident that the
soil in the northern part of the room differed from that in the southern part of the room.\textsuperscript{442} In the
northern part of the room (1.10 m south of wall AB), the soil was dark and full of small stones
and chips; it was examined as N21-219 and -222 (cuts 5 and 6). In the southern part of the room
(1.30 to the north of wall AA) the soil was reddish; it was investigated in N21-220 and -223 (cuts
5 and 6). It is clear that the reddish soil was deposited before the dark soil since the excavator
found that it lay under the latter and covered the whole room. The bottom of N21-223 was at a
level below all the walls of the room and bedrock had been exposed in the southeastern corner of
the room. The two soils also differed in the density of artifacts that they contained, with the dark
soil being remarkably richer in artifact than its reddish equivalent.\textsuperscript{443} The remaining deposits

\textsuperscript{440} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 83.

\textsuperscript{441} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 83.

\textsuperscript{442} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 83; 99 for the color description.

\textsuperscript{443} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 99.
covering the bedrock were examined in N21-225 and -228 (cuts 7 and 8). At the bottom of N21-228, the bedrock that had been exposed was described as follows:

After cut 8 bedrock extends into trench about 0.80 [m] from south roughly parallel to [wall ] AA. There is a narrow flat shelf under AA about 0.30 [m], and then it slopes down and ends in a vertical break. On the slope is a man made hole [at] + 2.45. The top of the bedrock is + 2.72, bottom of trench +2.28. It is hard, red and full of chips very little pottery - no walls - no more work contemplated. (Fig. 25).

The units associated with the dark soil were combined into N10CL, which contained material dating to Period V and has been publish as Period V Group W by Davis.444 The units associated with the red soil beneath the bottom of the walls of the room were combined as N11CL, which contained pottery ranging in date from the EBA to Period V and have been published by Davis as Period V Group X.445

ROOM N.8

Room N.8 (2.4 x 1.7-1.1 m) is bounded by wall AB on the north, by wall AG on the east, by wall AD on the south, and by wall AC on the west (Figs. 20 and 26). The room was entered through a door at its east side from a stone platform that occupied the area south of N.5, and

444 Davis 1986, p. 49.
445 Davis 1986, pp. 50-51.
north of N.10; the entryway to N.8 passed over this platform just south of the large monolithic threshold built into the southern end of wall AE (see above).

The room was investigated in the northwestern part of trench N22T and in N21T (extension 1). When surface deposits were removed in N21-172, -175, -178\(^{446}\) and N22-192 and -193\(^{447}\) (cuts 0 and 1) all four walls of the room were exposed: AB (N21-175), AC (N21-178), AD (N21-178, N22-193), and AG (N22-193).

The entire room was investigated in N22-205 (cut 2), which exposed the monolithic threshold that bordered the northern edge of the stone platform (see Fig. 27). At the time of excavation, the excavator surmised that the threshold offered access to a staircase that led to an upper floor.\(^{448}\) Excavation also revealed that the northern part of the room adjacent to wall AB was covered with small packed stones (“stone heap”). The excavator, thus, decided to investigate the “stone heap” separately (see below).

The remainder of the room was examined in N22-227 (cut 3), which was filled with stones (see Fig. 28). The stones increased in density in the next level, N22-232 (cut 4), and then decreased in density in N22-233 (cut 5). After N22-234 (cut 6) it became apparent that wall AD consisted of only a single course and that there was no clearly definable floor that could be

446 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 69, 73, and 75.
447 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 85 and 89.
448 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 91.
associated with it.\textsuperscript{449} Beneath the bottom of wall AD another two levels, N22-237 and N22-238 (cuts 7-8), were excavated.

The “stone heap” was removed in units N22-226, -241, -244, -246 and -251 (cuts 3 to 7) after the excavation of the remainder of the room.\textsuperscript{450} During the excavation of these levels, the excavator observed that the stones were concentrated in cuts 3 and 4. Below this level, stones seemed to be less dense and in cuts 6 and 7 the soil turned redder.\textsuperscript{451}

Study of pottery allowed three ceramic horizons in the room to be defined. Units N22-192, -193, -205, -226, -227, and -241 were combined into N09CL, which includes material dating to Period VII (and two fragments from Period VIII). Units N22-232, -233, and -244 were combined into N10CL, which contains material of Period V and has been published by Davis as Period V Group W.\textsuperscript{452} The deepest horizon (N11CL), represented by units N22-234, -237, -239, -246, and -251, contained ceramics dating from the EBA to Period V; this combined lot has been published by Davis as Period V Group X.\textsuperscript{453}

\textsuperscript{449} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{450} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{451} \textit{Kea Excavation Notebook} VIII, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{452} Davis 1986, p. 49.

\textsuperscript{453} Davis 1986, pp. 50-51.
Room N.9

Room N.9 (Figs. 20 and 26) is a large trapezoidal room (4.4 x 2.2-3.5 m). It is bounded on the north by walls AD and AA, on the east by wall AG, on the south by wall X/A, and on the west by wall Z. No entrance was identified for this room.

The room was investigated in the northwest part of trench N22T, in N21T and N21T extension 1. Surface deposits were removed in N21-167, -170, -171, -172, -175, -178, and N22-192 and -193 (cuts 0 and 1). Parts of wall X were visible prior to the start of excavation. Wall Z was uncovered in N21-171, X/A in N21-175, AG in N22-193, AD in N21-178 and N22-193, and AA in N21-178.

N22-206 (cut 2) examined the whole room, whereas N21-209 (cut 3) investigated only the southern part of the room (a 1 m wide strip north of wall X/A). In these units, there were many fallen stones, consistent with the picture in other rooms of the suite. Beneath this level

Note that in the published plan of the site, Room N.9 is mistakenly shown to have a totally different form than the one shown in the excavation notebooks. In the excavation notebooks room N.9 encompasses N.9 proper and the southern part of N.7.

Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 93.

Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 69, 73, and 75.

Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 85 and 89.

Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 69.
excavation was discontinued without explanation; the excavator did not note that bedrock was reached but does not mention that wall AC was discovered.

All units in the room, except unit N22-209, were combined into N09CL, which dates to Period VII (VIII?). N22-209 was combined in N10CL dating to Period V. The sequence of strata in this room is the same as that in the other rooms in this suite.

ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF SUITE OF ROOMS N.7, N.8, AND N.9

The suite had at least two architectural and occupation phases. The evidence for the latest occupation phase of the room is rather problematic (see N09CL Catalogue). An act of miscombination has bequeathed us a mixed lot, which complicated the dating of this phase. Therefore, the following is a hypothetical reconstruction. The complex was probably rebuilt/repaired during Period VI (or early VIIa) incorporating all the outer walls of the complex, walls AB, Z, X, AG, AD, and AA. During this period there were only two rooms. The first room covered the area of rooms N.7 and N.8; the floor of the room passed over wall AC. In its southwest corner there was an opening over wall AA (which was probably a curb) that led into the room N.9. The entire complex was reached through an entrance in room N.8, which afforded communication with room N.10. The floor of the complex probably lay at approximately +3.35 in room N.9 and +3.25 for room N.7/N.8; this floor rested on top of a fallen stone layer. The stone layer in all likelihood represents packing under the Period VI floor; the debris from the destruction at the end of Period V was probably used as the substratum of a new floor.
The earlier phase dates to Period V, just after the fortification wall was built. The suite then appears to have had three rooms, even though deposits of Period V have been recovered only from room N.7 and N.9.\textsuperscript{459} Room N.8, in the form that is represented on the architectural plan (Figs. 7 and 20), communicated with N.7 through an opening in the north part of wall AC. Room N.7 probably extended all the way to the south wall of the complex, wall X, which was delimited on the east by wall AC, part of which was probably dismantled when the suite was filled with stones and Period V debris. There is no predecessor to the later monolithic threshold block at the entry to the suite from Room N.10, and in its earliest phase the suite may have been accessible only from above.

The entire architectural complex was founded on a red soil that was filled with pottery, the date of which ranges from the EBA to Period V. This red soil represents remains of cultural activities in the area of the Northern Sector before the fortification wall was erected.

\textbf{N08CL}

For a description of N08CL, see room N.4 above.

\textbf{N09CL}

N09CL (Tables 41-42, and 74) combined a series of lots which examined the deposits of rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9, from the surface to +3.30. It is the product of another miscombination,

\textsuperscript{459} Group W in Davis 1986, pp. 49-51.
since the rooms were dug separately and later were combined into lots that mixed ceramic material from all three rooms. Of the units that had been combined in this lot initially, N22-241 and N22-227 probably belonged with N10CL.

The original quantity of the lot was 7.7 tins. 71% of the ceramics recovered from these excavation units had been discarded, including fragments of 112 conical cups and several fragments with rope pattern decoration. The excavator noted that these lots were very scrappy (especially considering that they covered all of three rooms), contained proportionally little painted wares, and featured very few joins.460

According to the excavator, N09CL is the “the latest period of occupation of which there are remains.”461 The combined lot, however, seems to be an assortment of ceramics dating to different periods ranging from Period V to VII (with two kylix fragments dating to VIII). The larger diagnostic fragments (as well as the conical cups, see nos. N09-13, 14, and 16) and the small finds date to Period VI; nevertheless, the lot also includes specimens dating to an early phase of Period VII (see, Figs 66, 67, and 68).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N21-370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West of rooms N.7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8, and N.9 (west of wall Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3.60, +3.56</td>
<td>VIII.085</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Surface deposits over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.7, N.8, N.9, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +3.37, S +3.43</td>
<td>VIII.069</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Surface deposits over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rooms N.7 and N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-193</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +3.50, S +3.53</td>
<td>VIII.085</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.7, N.8, N.9, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3.33</td>
<td>VIII.079</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>South of rooms N.7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8, and N.9 (south of wall X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-178</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NW +3.28, NE 3.38,</td>
<td>VIII.073</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Surface deposits over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW +3.32, SE 3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rooms N.7 and N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-191</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N +3.29, S +3.26</td>
<td>VIII.083</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-205</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.40</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.42</td>
<td>VIII.093</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N +3.30, S +3.33</td>
<td>VIII.079</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>South of rooms N.7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8, and N.9 (south of wall X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-226</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.41</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: Original excavation units contained in N09CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.52</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Lead weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.465</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Lead weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.46</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Flint sickle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.83</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Flint sickle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.95</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Flint sickle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.99</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Flint sickle</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.91</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.102</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.33</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.18</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.40</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42: N09CL small finds.
**N09CL Catalogue**

103 Conical cup (ledge rim bowl) (N09-13). Fig. 66
H. 5; Rim Diam. 11.9; Base Diam. 5.5.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, gray bluish, gray-greenish, calcareous, off-white, schist, marble, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/8-5YR 5/8; Surface 2.5YR 6/6-5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

104 Conical cup (N09-14). Fig. 66
H. 3.3; Rim Diam. 10; Base Diam. 5.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, off-white, silver-gray, dark gray-brown, gray bluish, schist, marble, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core; Surface 7.5YR 5/6-4/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

105 Open vessel (N09-42). Fig. 67
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, off-white, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 7/1-6/1; Surface 10YR 7/3-6/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 4/1 and 5YR 4/3) paint. Inside: two parallel lines and under them running spiral; under the running spiral trace of motif (rock pattern?). Outside: probably running spiral.
Period VI

106 Closed vessel (N09-43). Fig. 67
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 6/4; Surface 10YR 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Ripple pattern over band.
Period VI
107 Open vessel (N09-46). Fig. 67
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.2.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/3-7/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5Y 4/1) paint. Foliate band.
Period VI

108 Straight sided cup (N09-47). Fig. 67
Rim sherd. Max. H. 2.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with purplish and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5Y 4/1) paint. Foliate band (with double horizontal lines) under the rim;
band under rim inside.
Period VI

109 Conical cup (N09-16). Fig. 67
H. 4.3-4; Rim Diam. 10.0-9.2; Base Diam. 5.1-4.8.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with silver-gray, gray-greenish, golden brown, red brown, off-white, white-pink, schist, vegetable temper, silver mica, and grog inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/8-5/8-5YR 6/8-5/8; Surface 5YR 5/6 7.5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII (LH IIA)

110 Closed vessel (N09-18). Fig. 67
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with silver-gray, white, dark gray, light gray, dark gray (shiny), gray-greenish, marble, schist, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 7.5YR 6/6; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band lower on the sherd and ripple pattern over it.
Period VI to Period VII (LH IIA)

111 Rounded cup (N09-24). Fig. 67
Base and body sherds, 1/3 preserved. Max. H. 7.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 9.7.
Aeginetan (?) - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, and red brown inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-6/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6-4/6) paint. Band over the base and ripple pattern; band inside.
Period VI to Period VII (LH IIA)

112 Rounded cup (N09-25). Fig. 68
Rim sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band on rim out; monochrome inside and curved lines of dots with three dots in the middle of the triangle.
Period VII

113 Open vessel (N09-29). Fig. 68
Body sherd (shoulder). Max. H. 4.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.2.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, brown, purplish, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 8/3-2.5Y 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band and below it line of dots as background and trace motif; band inside.
Period VII (LH IIA)

114 Closed vessel (N09-37). Fig. 68
Body sherd (shoulder). Max. H. 4.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.7.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with white, light brown, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4; Slip 2.5Y 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Curved stripes, and band stemming from horizontal band.
Period VII

115 Jug (N09-39). Fig. 68
Rim sherd. Max. H. 4.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.7.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/3 with 2.5Y 6/1; Surface 10YR 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Racket with hatching and trace of another motif.
Period VII
N10CL

This lot (Tables 43 and 74) combines excavation units that examined the fill deposits below the early Period VII floor (+3.30 to +2.76). The original quantity of the lot was 6.1 tins of which 75.8% had been discarded.\textsuperscript{462} The lot has been dated to Period V and published by Davis as Group X.\textsuperscript{463} Thus, no further discussion is warranted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N21-199</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3.09</td>
<td>VIII.093</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.00</td>
<td>VIII.083</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +3.27, W +3.24</td>
<td>VIII.093</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-219</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+2.90</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+2.90</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-222</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.88</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-227</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3.30</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-232</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.16</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-233</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3.05</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-241A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>E +3.32, W +3.39</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-244</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3.02</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43: Original excavation units contained in N10CL.

\textsuperscript{462} Kittredge, n.d., Pottery notebook D, p. 121.

\textsuperscript{463} Davis 1986, pp. 50-51.
N11CL

N11CL (Tables 44 and 74) contains excavation units that investigated the fill below the bottom of the dividing wall in rooms N.7 and N.8, from an elevation of +2.76 down to bedrock. The original quantity of the lot was 2.1 tins, of which 62.8% had been discarded. The lot has been dated to Period V and published by Davis as Group W. Thus, no further discussion is warranted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N21-223</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.76</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-225</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.67</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21-228</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.58</td>
<td>VIII.099</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.95</td>
<td>VIII.091</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-246</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+2.74</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-237</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.76</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-251</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.52</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-239</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.65</td>
<td>VIII.105</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44: Original excavation units contained in N11CL.

---


465 Davis 1986, p. 49.
Room N.10

Room N.10 (Figs. 20, 29, 30, and 31a,b) was a 4.6 x 2.2-1.7 m room with the long axis running north-south. The room was bounded by walls P/B to the north, C to the east, A to the south, and AG to the west. The room was reached through a stone platform (over wall P), which provided access to both rooms N.10 and N.8. In the north side of the platform, there was a long monolithic threshold (+3.35) built in wall AE. We are unable to determine whether the monolithic threshold lead to an upper floor (via a staircase) or to rooms at the same level to the north of it. It is equally unclear if room N.10 communicated with the neighboring room N.11, since, as is seen below, the excavator first thought that there was an opening in the north part of wall C, but as the excavation proceeded he abandoned that view.

Room N.10 was investigated in trenches N01T and N22T. The removal of the surface deposits in N01-001 and N22-192 (cuts 1 and 2) exposed two walls of the room, especially in N01T, Wall A in the south and wall B in the north. The other two walls of this room, C and

---

466 Cuts in this room are not consistently described because N01T, which uncovered the room, was dug by two excavators who had totally different views concerning excavation procedure and documentation, resulting in sequences for cuts which are incompatible with each other. Here I have adjusted the sequence of the first excavator to fit that of the second.

467 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 4.
AG, were uncovered in the course of N01-002, N22-193, N01-003 and N22-204 (cuts 3, 4 and 5).468

The room was filled with soil that was described as “gray earth with many chips and white pebbles,”469 (see also Fig. 30) as well as stones that probably had once belonged to the walls of the rooms. This soil was characteristic of the surface deposits as well as units N01-004, -012, -166 (partly), -168 and N22-204, -218, and -369. In this stratum, two areas seemed to point to specific activities, and were excavated separately in N01-168 and N22-369. The first area consisted of the south 2 m of trench N01T, where the soil was “dark” and “ashy” in texture. The extent of this deposit became more restricted the deeper the excavation progressed.470 The second area was a “nest” of 25 to 30 conical cups that lay in the southwest corner of the room, along wall AG.471 Units N01-166 and -168 contained many stones; at the bottom of -166 small stones concentrated in the north 2 m of the room, while at the bottom of -168 there were larger stones (in the south 2 m of N01T). At the bottom of units N22-218, N01-166, and -168 the soil changed to a color that was “slightly yellower with fewer small stones and no pebbles.”472

468 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, pp. 5-6.
469 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 94.
470 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 67.
471 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 95.
472 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 94.
The next unit, N01-169, covered the east side of the room except for an area of dark soil about 1.5 m wide along the south wall.\textsuperscript{473} In both N01-169 and -168 a red and gritty floor was observed to extend beneath the bottom of wall A.\textsuperscript{474} The excavator noted that a “small neat wall [(top at +2.90/2.87)] was uncovered below wall A projecting to the south for 0.78 m. It was 0.55 [m] wide.”\textsuperscript{475} The red and gritty soil was removed in N01-187, -188\textsuperscript{476} and N22-224.\textsuperscript{477} A “hard and smooth floor” appeared within -188; it consisted of “hard packed red earth” and was 0.07 m thick (Fig. 31b). Below it was a layer of black soil, probably also removed in -188 and -224.

N01-188 and N22-224 reached the bedrock in an area that extended from the middle of the room to a point approximately 1.0 m south of wall A.\textsuperscript{478} The next lowest unit, N01-194, covered the areas where bedrock had not been exposed in the north part (1.30 m wide along wall P) and in the SE corner of the room.

The bedrock appears to have had several depressions, which could have been, but were not necessarily, “man-made” according to the excavator. The first one contained a pot, whose top had appeared already at the top of unit N01-187. “The pot mentioned above had no rim or

\textsuperscript{473} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{474} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{475} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{476} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{477} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{478} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 72.
bottom but the body was complete but broken. It was roughly 0.25 [m] in diameter and rested directly over a man-made hole in the bedrock. This is 0.15 [m] in diameter and 0.15 [m] deep. It is tangent to the west baulk 1.30 [m] N of wall A. The second one was almost under wall C and 2.10 m north from wall A; it was oblong to rounded and “0.50 x 0.25 [m] running NW.”

There was a third feature at the bottom of the trench, the so-called “south feature,” which later was identified as wall P, the earliest circuit of the fortification wall.

Three cultural horizons can be distinguished in this room. The highest horizon is represented by units N01-001, -002, -003, -004, N22-204 and -369 (combined into N21CL), and N22-192 and -193 (combined into N09CL) and dates to a late phase of Period VII (VIIb). The deposit rested on a floor (+3.30/3.28) that was associated with walls B, C and the threshold in wall AE.

The second horizon consisted of units N01-012, -166, -168, -169, N22-218 and -240, all of which were combined into N22CL (except for N01-169, which was mistakenly combined into lot N23CL). This deposit sat on a lower floor (+3.00/2.95) and dated to an early phase of

---

479 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 72.
480 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 72.
481 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 72.
482 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 67.
483 N22-218 and -240 probably went beyond the level of the second floor.
Period VII (VIIa). The layer of stones that was observed at an elevation of +3.11 probably represents debris from a destruction episode in the middle of Period VII.

Below it was a third horizon associated with the black soil covering the bedrock. This horizon is represented by combined lot N23CL, which included units N22-224, N01-187, -188, and -194 containing ceramics that dated to Periods V and VII. It appears that wall P, AG, and the “small neat wall” under wall A were constructed first during Period V and then walls A, B, and C were built at a later date, probably in Period VII.

N21CL

This combined lot (Tables 45-46, and 75) includes units from +3.70 to 3.20/3.15 mainly in room N.10 (one of the units comes from rooms N.11 and N.12, see Table 46). The original quantity of the lot was 7.7 tins, 77% of which had been discarded, including fragments of conical cups (104 cups discarded in 1961/64 and seventy more in 1969), eleven tripod legs, several fragments with rope decoration, and a coarse bridge spout. 90% of the original quantity was coarse.484

This was probably a floor deposit (since several whole pots have survived) dating to a late phase of Period VII late (LH IIB) (Figs. 69 and 70). The most distinctive features of the lot today are the plain and monochrome goblets, of which seven survive.\textsuperscript{485}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N01-001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3.70/3.60</td>
<td>VIII.001</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3.60/3.55</td>
<td>VIII.004</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.55</td>
<td>VIII.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.005</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-005</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>+3.65/3.55/3.45</td>
<td>VIII.006</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.11, N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.40</td>
<td>VIII.072</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-369</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3.30</td>
<td>VIII.095</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Original excavation units contained in N21CL.

\textsuperscript{485} The excavator had noted the existence of 17 in addition to the inventoried ones. (Kittredge, n.d., Pottery notebook N, p. 97).
Table 46: N21CL small finds.

### N21CL Catalogue

**116 Keftiu cup (N21-34). Fig. 69**
Upper part of body with rim and stumps of handles. Est. Rim Diam. 12; Max. H. 6.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 2.5Y 7/4.
Period VI

**117 Globular cup or goblet; rim sherd (N21-36). Fig. 69**
Max. H. 4; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR3/2) paint. Band on rim inside and out.
Running spirals on body.
Period VI to Period VII

**118 Goblet (N21-37). Fig. 69**
Rim fragment. Est. Rim Diam. 10; Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.8.
Mainland - Painted. Coarse clay; Core 5YR 7/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 3/2) paint. Band on rim inside and out;
spiral and traces of another band.
Period VI to Period VII

119 Closed vessel (N21-46). Fig. 69
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 4/4) paint. Two diagonal lines and
dotted line between them.
Period VI to Period VII

120 Flaring bowl with conical foot (N21-2). Fig. 70
Rim Diam. 15.2; Max. H. 4.5.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, pink-orangeish, gray-greenish, white,
light gray, white-light brown, dark gray vegetable temper, schist, marble, and silver mica
inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-4/4; Surface 5YR 5/4-4/4.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VII

121 Goblet (N21-13). Fig. 70
Lower part of bowl and foot. Base Diam. 6; Max. H. 4.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.9.
Mainland – Burnished (Akropolis Burnished). Fine clay with calcareous, gray-purplish, and
vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 5/4) paint.
Period VII

122 Goblet (N21-14). Fig. 70
Foot and lower body fragment. Base Diam. 5.1; Max. H. 4; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.
Mainland – Burnished (Akropolis Burnished). Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, and silver
mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/6-6/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10R 6/6-5/6) paint.
Period VII

123 Goblet (N21-18). Fig. 70
Foot almost flat underneath. H. 8.6; Rim Diam. 11; Base Diam. 5.5.
Mainland – Burnished (Akropolis Burnished). Fine clay with calcareous, white-light brown, light
gray-greenish, brown red, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/4; Surface
5YR 7/4-7.5YR 7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 5/6) paint.
Period VII

124 Goblet (N21-26). Fig. 70
Foot hollowed. H. 13.3-12.7; Rim Diam. 16; Base Diam. 7.2.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core; Surface 5YR 7/4-6/4.
Period VII

125 Globular cup (N21-39). Fig. 69
Rim and body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with gray, dark gray, silver mica, and schist inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4.
Period VII

126 Collar necked jar(?) (N21-40). Fig. 70
Rim sherd (ridge on the base of the neck-metallic imitation). Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6-6/6; Surface 10YR 8/3-8/4.
Period VII

127 Closed vessel (N21-44). Fig. 70
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.7.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white, purplish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/3 with 5Y 6/1.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with (Gley 2 2.5/5PB) paint. Cross-hatching and traces of spiral.
Period VII (LH IIA)

128 Jug (N21-47). Fig. 70
Fragment of spout or neck. Max. H. 5; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.4.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, and dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4.
Period VII

**129 Open vessel (N21-48).** Fig. 69  
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.5.  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, dark gray, and calcareous inclusions; Core.  
Period VII (LH IIA)

**130 Alabastron (?) (N21-50).** Fig. 70  
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with light brown, dark gray (shiny) inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6.  
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 4/2) paint. Ivy.  
Period VII (LH IIA)

**131 Jar (N21-51).** Fig. 70  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-brown, light brown, and dark brown inclusions; Core 10YR 8/4.  
Period VII

**132 Alabastron (N21-31).** Fig. 70  
Base sherd. Base Diam. 7; Max. H. 1.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 10.8.  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with light brown, gray, calcareous vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/8.  
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR3/2) paint. Bands on lower part of body and bands on base circling a wavy cross.  
Period VII to Period VIII

**N22CL**

N22CL (Tables 47-48, and 75) represents a fill deposit between the two floors in room N.10 (+3.20/3.15 to +3.07). The earlier floor of the room would have existed at an elevation of +3.07; no floor deposit is associated with it, indicating that the floor was cleaned up before the
room was filled in and the Period VII late floor was laid over it. The original quantity of this very scrappy lot was 5.4 tins of pottery, 95% of which was coarse. 90% had been discarded, including fragments of 128 conical cups and twelve tripod legs.\footnote{Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook N, p. 100.} N01-168 had been combined in this lot mistakenly. According to the excavator, this was done “though on the elevation it looks beneath the floor, because [of] its contents and the fact that it was in dark soil lead one to believe it to be a bothros. Since N01-169 had no conical cups it seems likely that the floor was just above rather than below it.”\footnote{Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook N, pp. 100-101.} But it seems clear from the excavation notebook that the floor was below N01-169 and it should have been included here. However, N22-218 and N240 seem to have proceeded well below the earlier floor and therefore should not have been mixed with this lot. As presently constituted, the lot contains pottery that dates to Period VII (Figs. 71 and 72).
### Table 47: Original excavation units contained in N22CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N22-218</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +3.28, S +3.33</td>
<td>VIII.095</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.25/3.15</td>
<td>VIII.054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22-240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.20</td>
<td>VIII.095</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-166</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NW +3.11; +3.14 at doorway</td>
<td>VIII.067</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01-168</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3.10</td>
<td>VIII.067</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 48: N22CL small finds.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.63</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.657</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.104</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.125</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.126</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.574</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Spool</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.15</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N22CL Catalogue**

133 Closed vessel (N22-37). Fig. 71  
Body sherd. Max. H. 4; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.4.  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with silver mica inclusions; Core; Surface 5YR 7/4-6/4.  
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 5/1 and 10R 4/4) paint. Slightly diagonal vertical lines (black) and in between red area with perimeter of black.  
Period VI

134 Open vessel (N22-38). Fig. 71  
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, and red brown inclusions; Core 10YR 8/4-7/4; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR3/1) paint. Two parallel horizontal lines. Concentric triangles (3) with two vertical dots along their vertical axis. Trace of another dot.
Period V to Period VI

135 Open vessel (N22-41). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.4.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray and light brown inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3-7/3; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 4/2) paint. Probably vertical parallel bands.
Period V to Period VI

136 Keftiu cup (N22-43). Fig. 71
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 10; Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.5.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray and silver mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR3/2) paint. Band on lip, spiral on body, monochrome inside.
Period V to Period VI

137 Keftiu cup (N22-44). Fig. 71
Body sherd with vertical flat handle. Max. H. 5.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.8.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6; Surface 10YR 7/4-8/4.
Wiped exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 3/2) paint. Two parallel diagonal lines on body. On handle two parallel line, in between them cross-hatched.
Period V to Period VI

138 Closed vessel (N22-45). Fig. 71
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-7/6; Surface 10YR 7/4-7/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 4/2 and 2.5YR 4/6) paint. Two parallel lines, cross-hatching in the two colors between them. Underneath pendant curvilinear lines.
Period V to Period VI
139 Spouted closed vessel (N22-46). Fig. 71
Spout. Max. H. 5.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.5.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous and dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 8/4-7/4; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/2) paint. Eye (circle with dot in the middle) and band on edge of spout and around base.
Period V to Period VI

140 Open vessel (N22-47). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.3.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray-purplish inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4 2.5YR 8/3-7/3; Surface 7.5YR 7/4.
Period V to Period VI

141 Cooking pot (N22-6). Fig. 71
Rim sherd with horizontal triangular lug. Est. Rim Diam. 16; Max. H. 8.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 8.8.
Local - Plain. Coarse clay with dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, off-white, golden brown and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 4/6; Slip 7.5YR 8/3.
Period VII

142 Strainer (N22-7). Fig. 71
Base and lower body sherd. Base Diam. 5.5; Max. H. 3.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 8.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, off-white, golden brown and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/8.
Polished exterior surface.
Period VII

143 Imitation of blossom bowl (N22-8). Fig. 71
Rim sherd with plastic ribs. Max. H. 3.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.
Local - Plain. Coarse clay with dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, off-white, golden brown, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with diagonal plastic motif (some of them have come undone).
Period VII
144 Closed vessel (N22-14). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.9.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 2.5YR 8/4-7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Horizontal dotted lines and a band (trace) lower.
Period VII

145 Cup (N22-15). Fig. 71
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 10; Max. H. 3.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.4.
Aeginetan (?) - Painted. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, gray-purplish, silver mica, marble, and gold mica inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR3/1) paint. Traces only of two vertical lines starting from rim, one horizontal and curvilinear.
Period VII

146 Closed vessel (N22-16). Fig. 72
Base and part of lower body and vertical non-joining handle; hole at the bottom of the base. Base Diam. 4.5.
Cycladic. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, calcareous, red brown, silver mica, vegetable temper, quartz, and schist inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/6 with 2.5Y 4/1; Surface 7.5YR 6/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 4/6) paint. Bands on body; band on base and underneath.
Period VII

147 Large closed vessel (N22-17). Fig. 72
Body fragment (two joining sherds). Max. H. 4.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.2.
Dodecanesian. Medium coarse clay with dark gray-purplish, calcareous, gold mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4 with Gley 1 7/10Y; Surface 5YR 6/4-6/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 8/2 and 10YR 5/2) paint. Two whitish bands. Underneath one darker band and trace of whitish filled disc.
Period VII

148 Closed vessel (N22-19). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white, silver mica, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3 with 10YR 6/1; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Marine motif (seaweed or rockwork)
Chapter 3  Gorogianni

Period VII (LM IB)

149 Closed vessel (N22-23). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6; Surface 7.5YR 7/4; Slip 7.5YR 7/4.
Period VII

150 Small closed vessel (N22-24). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6.
Period VII

151 Keftiu cup (?) (N22-26). Fig. 71
Rim sherd with stump handle. Est. Rim Diam. 9; Max. H. 4; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.6.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay; Core 10YR 8/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Vertical band on handle; horizontal lines of dots; monochrome inside.
Period VII

152 Closed vessel (N22-28). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 6.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown and dark gray-purplish inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6 with 7.5YR 8/3; Surface 7.5YR 7/4.
Period VII

153 Closed vessel (N22-31). Fig. 71
Handle with plastic rivet on its base. Max. H. 5.8.
Mainland - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Period VII
Globular cup (N22-34). Fig. 71
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 12; Max. H. 1.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown and calcareous inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6; Surface
5YR 6/6.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 3/2) paint. Band on base of rim and
traces of paint on rim inside. Dotted line on lip.
Period VII

Cup (?) (N22-36). Fig. 71
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous and dark gray inclusions; Core 2.5Y 7/3; Surface
2.5Y 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Horizontal dotted lines.
Period VII

N23CL

N23CL (Tables 49 and 75) combines all the excavation units below the second floor of
room N.10, which would have existed at +3.07, down to bedrock (probably at +2.65/2.55). As
mentioned in the discussion of N22CL, N01-169 actually belongs in this lot. The lot originally
contained 1.7 tins of pottery, of which 95% was coarse. 77% had been discarded, including
fragments of nine conical cups.488

The lot contains ceramics dating to Period V and Period VII and represents the fill set in
place below the Period VII early floor (Figs. 73 and 74). Only one obsidian fragment (N-4.16)
was recorded in the small finds recorded in this lot.

Table 49: Original excavation units contained in N23CL.

### N23CL Catalogue

**156** Conical cup (ledge rim bowl; type B1) (N23-3). Fig. 73  
H. 3.5-3.2; Rim Diam. 11.8; Base Diam. 6.  
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, off-white, gray bluish, silver-gray, gray-greenish, calcareous, dark gray-brown, dark gray, schist, marble, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 4/6-5YR 4/6; Surface 5YR 5/4-5/6.  
Smoothed exterior surface.  
Period VI?

**157** Conical cup (ledge rim bowl; type B2) (N23-2). Fig. 73  
H. 3.8-3.5; Rim Diam. 11.2-10.9; Base Diam. 5.6.  
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, gray-greenish, off-white, silver-gray, gray bluish, schist, marble, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 7.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6.  
Smoothed exterior surface.  
Period VI

**158** Handless cup (N23-1). Fig. 73  
H. 8.3; Rim Diam. 10.5; Base Diam. 5.3.  
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with off-white, dark gray, golden brown, gray-greenish, dark gray-purplish, vegetable temper, silver mica, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VII

159 Cup (N23-9). Fig. 73
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous and red brown inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6; Surface 5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 4/4) paint. Dotted curved line and double axe trace (FM 35).
Period VII

160 Goblet (N23-7). Fig. 74
Handle. Est. Rim Diam. 22; Max. H. 7.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.3.
Mainland – Burnished (Akropolis Burnished). Fine clay with dark gray inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4; Surface 2.5YR 6/6-5/6; Slip 2.5YR 6/6-5/6.
Burnished exterior surface.
Period VII

ROOMS N.11 AND N.12

Rooms N.11 and N.12 (Figs. 32, 33, 34, and 35) lay to the east of room N.10 and to the west of rooms N.13 and N.14. The complex is composed of walls P to the north, E to the east,\textsuperscript{489} A to the south, and B to the west. The two rooms are separated by cross wall D\textsuperscript{490} and communicated with each other via a passage beyond the southern end of wall D. The two rooms

\textsuperscript{489} Wall E was parallel to walls C and D at a distance of approximately 0.6 m from wall D.

\textsuperscript{490} Wall D was approximately 0.6 m wide and 4.8 m long running north-south.
are oblong (1.3 x 4.6 m and 1.1 x 4.6 m respectively), oriented north-south and probably belonged to a staircase. Rooms N.11 and N.12\textsuperscript{491} were excavated in trenches N02T and N25T.\textsuperscript{492}

At the time of the excavation, the deposit in the two rooms seemed to be more or less homogeneous; thus the two spaces were excavated as a single unit, except a sounding in the north part of room N.12 (south of wall P) was investigated separately as part of trench N25T (see below).

The surface deposits over rooms N.11 and N.12 were investigated in N02-005 (cuts 1-2) which exposed wall D approximately 1.3 m to the east of wall C and parallel to it. Wall E was uncovered in N02-006 (cut 3). Fallen stones lay to the south and southeast of wall D, probably fallen from that wall.

Both rooms were filled with artifacts in two extremely dense concentrations (Fig. 36). The first deposit was located in the southwest corner of room N.11, where walls A and C intersect, and was excavated in N02-006 and N02-007 (cuts 3-4).\textsuperscript{493} It included 454 conical cups together with other pottery and small finds. The second deposit was located in the northeast corner of N.12 and was excavated in N02-008 (cut 4); at least 254 conical cups, other vessels and small finds (including a large amount of pumice stone and at least five stone lids) were recovered. This deposit was associated with “some yellowish clay like surface, possibly unbaked

\textsuperscript{491} In excavation records, they are Rooms I and II respectively.

\textsuperscript{492} The north end of N.12 was examined as part of N25 even though it was beyond its formal boundaries.

\textsuperscript{493} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 14.
Beneath these deposits two additional units, N02-010 and -011 (cuts 5-6), took excavation within the two rooms down to an elevation of +3.09 in the north and +3.00 in the south. Bedrock was never exposed in either room within trench N02T, nor had the southern face of wall P been cleared.

At a later date than the excavation of the entire complex, a sounding (0.90 x 1.20 m) was attempted in the north part of room N.12 south of wall P; the sounding was recorded as part of trench N25T. The excavator first cleared the north edge of wall P (N25-262) and then proceeded with the investigation of the deposits below the elevation at which the excavation of the room had stopped in units N25-297, -298, and -301. Unit 297 yielded two nearly complete pots; discovery of a “spot of soft gray earth -ash actually- and some reddened earth,” also made clear that there was another wall under wall D that postdated the construction of the fortification wall (wall P). Furthermore, another wall was found under wall E; this wall, wall AK, was investigated by N25-301 and seemed to have “been substantially destroyed before E was

---

494 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 49.
495 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 130.
496 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 125.
497 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 124.
built” on top of it. At the north end of wall E/AK, unexcavated deposits in a cavity (0.59 x 0.59-0.82 m) in the wall were removed in N25-318, -319, -320, -335, and -336.

There were two cultural horizons in rooms N.11 and N.12. The highest consisted of all units (except N02-005, which was combined in N21CL); these were combined into N45CL and date to a late phase of Period VII. No floor was detected during excavation. The multitude of conical cups that were found in the southwest corner of room N.11 and the north part of N.12 were probably the contents of cupboards or stashes of pottery that fell onto earlier fill (at an elevation of +3.25/3.20 m in N.11 and +3.25/3.15 in N.12) when the staircase was destroyed or disintegrated.

The second cultural horizon lay below +3.09 and consisted of units N25-318, -319, -320, -335, and -336. Ceramic material from these units was combined into N51CL and published as Period V Group Y. No floor was detected in relation to this horizon; however the spatial configuration of room N.12 during Period V seems to have been identical to the LBA one.

498 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 130.
499 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 130.
500 N25-262 was combined in N50CL, which included ceramic material dating from Period V to Classical times. Pottery from N25-298, probably through an error in judgment, was split between N17CL and N51CL.
501 Davis 1986, pp. 51-52.
N17CL

See room N.5 above.

N25-262

N25-262 examined the surface deposits from the northeast corner of N.12 (corner of walls P/B and AK). Originally, it was included in N50CL, a rather curious combination since the other two excavation units in it were from an area spatially removed from N25-262 (an area west of room N.16).502 The reason for this rather odd combination is not mentioned, especially considering the fact that the units west of N.16 seem to contain ceramics that range in date from the MBA to Classical periods, whereas N25-262 seems to date to Period VII. The excavation notes mention the “presence of a polychrome ‘shaft grave’ style sherd and another of like fabric, undecorated” (i.e., Mainland polychrome and Yellow Minyan), “a few earlier sherds” and another three sherds that look no later than Period VII (see Fig. 75).503 This lot had been discarded and no ceramics or other material remains of it.

N21CL

For description of N21CL, see room N.10 above.

502 Lot N50CL initially included excavation units N27-308 and -309 and later N25-262 was added on (Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook T, p. 271).

This lot (Tables 50-51, and 76) combines excavation units that investigated deposits in both rooms (N.11 and N.12), from +3.45 to +3.05. Floors were not recognized during excavation, but pottery deposits suggest that the floor probably existed at +3.25/3.20 in room N.11 and at +3.25/3.15 in room N.12 (N02-011 probably cut into the floor).

Originally the quantity was 13.25 tins of which 90% was coarse. The records state 88% of the ceramics had been discarded, including fragments of 418 conical cups (230 of them in N02-007, 66 in N02-010, and 21 in N02-011); nevertheless, little sherd material remains, which means that the volume had been reduced further. The lot seems to be a mixture of Periods VI and VII. This is probably a very early Period VII deposit (Figs. 76, 77, and 78). The earlier material includes two panelled cups (N45-27 and -28) and three fragments of Keftiu cups with ripple decoration.

---


505 Unless the Period VI material came from the northeast corner of the trench, outside of room N.11 proper (as do the Period VI conical cups).
### Table 50: Original excavation units contained in N45CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N02-006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3.45/3.35</td>
<td>VIII.014</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.30</td>
<td>VIII.014</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.35/3.25</td>
<td>VIII.014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3.35/3.25</td>
<td>VIII.014</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3.25/3.15</td>
<td>VIII.049</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02-011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+3.15/3.05</td>
<td>VIII.052</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>N.11 and N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 51: N45CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1.229</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marble disc</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.342</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pounder/grinder</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.220</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.225</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.521</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.163</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.168</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.239</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.245</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.254</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.265</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1.270</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N45CL Catalogue

161 Jug with nipples (N45-95). Fig. 76
Handle stump with plastic knob; also vertical perforation on handle
Max. H. 4; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.5.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Period VI

162 Keftiu cup with rib (N45-96). Fig. 76
Base (1/2 preserved). Base Diam. 5; Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.4.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, light gray vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3 with 2.5Y 7/1; Surface 10YR 8/3-2.5Y 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Ripple pattern, band on base and rib.
Period VI

163 Keftiu cup with rib (N45-97). Fig. 76
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, off-white, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/4-7/6; Surface 10YR 8/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Ripple pattern, band on rib.
Period VI

164 Keftiu cup with rib (N45-98). Fig. 76
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3-7/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3.
Period VI

165 Panelled cup (N45-112). Fig. 76
Base sherd with foot. Base Diam. 4.3; Max. H. 4.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 8.2.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 7/4-7.5YR 7/4; Surface 5YR 7/4-7.5YR 7/4; Slip YR 7/4. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 4/1) paint. Two vertical lines and in between them two thin and one thick horizontal band; over them spirals(?). Period V to Period VI

166 Closed vessel (N45-113). Fig. 76
Base sherd with foot. Base Diam. 4.1; Max. H. 5.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.8.
Melian - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/6-6/6; Surface 7.5YR 7/6-6/6; Slip YR 8/3. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Two horizontal parallel lines. Period VI

167 Goblet (N45-92). Fig. 76
Clumsy imitation of the Minyan shape. Conical body with carination so rounded that’s imperceptible. Lip slightly spreading and hollow conical foot. Small flat handles. One handle missing and half of foot missing and restored. H. 15.1; Rim Diam. 13.3; Max. Diam. 13.5; Base Diam. 7.6. Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with dark gray-purplish, golden brown, silver mica, schist, and vegetable temper inclusions; Surface 5YR 5/6-4/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (faded dark) paint. Traces of two bands; one thick under the maximum diameter and another one thinner lower; possibly another one on the lip. Period VI

168 Tripod pouring vessel with one handle (N45-1). Fig. 76
Slightly spreading rim and globular body. Round vertical handle. Small spout restored opposite the handle; at right angles to the handle and the spout there are two nipples of the maximum diameter; tall tapering legs. Potter’s mark near the base of one of the legs. Blackened around spout. H. 11.9; Rim Diam. 10.4; Max. Diam. 11.5. Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with light gray-greenish, golden brown, white, light brown silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Surface 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6. Wiped exterior surface. Potter’s mark published in Bikaki 1984, VII-9. Period VI to Period VII
169 Domestic kalathos (N45-2). Fig. 77
Most of rim missing. H. 12.5; Rim Diam. 30; Base Diam. 7.6.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray bluish, golden brown, dark gray, silver mica, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6-4/6; Surface 5YR 5/4.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

170 Firebox (N45-79). Fig. 77
Rim missing. Top is rounded, underside more conical. Large hole below rim joint formed by insertion of thumb. 14 smaller holes cover rest of surface, all carefully made by the same instrument and pierced from outside to inside. Max. H. 4.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.3.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with calcareous, dark gray, gray-greenish, gray bluish, off-white, white-light gray, dark gray-purplish, vegetable temper, silver mica, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

171 Spouted bowl (N45-93). Fig. 77
Rim sherd and spout. Est. Rim Diam. 12; Max. H. 2.9; Max. Pres. Dim. 9.2.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, calcareous, dark gray-purplish, golden brown, red brown, gray-greenish vegetable temper, schist, and silver mica inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6; Surface 2.5YR 5/6-5YR 5/6; Slip 10YR 8/2-2.5Y 8/2.
Period VI to Period VII

172 Closed vessel; (N45-100). Fig. 77
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.1.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, dark gray (shiny), vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-7/6; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-7/6; Slip 2.5Y 8/3.
Period VII

173 Closed vessel (N45-103). Fig. 77
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with off-white, dark gray-purplish, purplish, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 2.5/1) paint. Rock pattern background and double axe.
Period VII

174 Closed vessel (alabastron?) (N45-104). Fig. 77
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, purplish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4-6/4; Slip 10YR 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 2.5/1) paint. Rock pattern background and double axe.
Period VII

175 Closed vessel (alabastron?) (N45-105). Fig. 77
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, purplish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3-7/3; Surface 10YR 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band (horizontal) and another motif.
Period VII

176 Closed vessel (N45-106). Fig. 77
Body sherd and handle stump. Max. H. 4.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, purplish, light gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3 with 10YR 7/3; Surface 10YR 7/4-6/4; Slip 10YR 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 2.5/1) paint. Angular motif.
Period VII

177 Bridge-spouted jar (?) (N45-107). Fig. 78
Rim sherd. Max. H. 3.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.2.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with red brown, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/4-7/6 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 4/4) paint. Band on rim and rib and between running spiral with dots as filler; monochrome inside.
Period VII

178 Closed vessel (N45-111). Fig. 78
Body sherd. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.1.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6-6/6 with 10YR 7/4; Surface 5YR 7/6-6/6.
Period VII

179 Goblet (N45-101). Fig. 78
Rim sherd and non-joining foot fragment. Est. Rim Diam. 11; Base Diam. 5.6; Max. H. 5.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.7.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6-5YR 6/6; Surface 5YR 7/6-6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6) paint. Monochrome inside and out.
Period VII

180 Globular cup (N45-108). Fig. 78
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 12; Max. H. 3.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.8.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 8/3-7/3; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 3/1) paint. Band on base of lip; on lip wavy line of dots with one infilled dot in each curve; on belly tricurved arches (?); monochrome inside.
Period VII
N51CL

This lot (Tables 52-53, and 76) represents a sounding under the early Period VII floor of room N.12. Its original quantity was about 1.5 tins of which 52.5% was discarded, including fourteen conical cups. The excavator notes that 98% of the ceramic material was coarse and thus papsed. The remnants of this lot have been dated to Period V and published by Davis as deposit Y. Thus, no further discussion is warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N25-297</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>+3.09</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-298</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E +1.67, W +1.71</td>
<td>VIII.125</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-301</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>E +2.71, W +2.78</td>
<td>VIII.124</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-318</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E +3.09</td>
<td>VIII.124</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-319</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.85</td>
<td>VIII.124</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-320</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+2.75</td>
<td>VIII.124</td>
<td>20 sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-335</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+2.68</td>
<td>VIII.130</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N25-336</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+2.58</td>
<td>VIII.130</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52: Original excavation units contained in N51CL.


507 Davis 1986, pp. 51-52 (deposit Y).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.193</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.201</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.200</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.196</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.199</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.278</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.227</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.256</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.254</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53: N51CL small finds.

**ROOM N.13**

Room N.13 (Figs. 32 and 37) is located to the north of room N.14 and to the east of the northern portion of N.12. Room N.13 (3.7 x 2.2 m) is bounded by wall P on the north, wall AI/R on the east, wall S on the south, and wall AK/E/T on the west. Wall S, part of which was visible before the start of investigation, stopped partway through the room, leaving an opening approximately 0.40 m wide that was equipped with a large threshold block (top +3.09/3.06), on top of which was a course of stones (Fig. 38). The threshold block and course of stones represent an architectural phase later than the period represented by the deposit that filled the room. This
area had suffered during road construction, and “part of the north face of wall S to a depth of about 1.0 m” had already been exposed.508 Thus it is likely that the upper strata of room N.13 were also removed at that time.

The room was investigated in trench N17T. Investigation of the room began in N17-119 (cut 1), which cleaned and exposed completely wall S. Towards the bottom of -119, the excavator thought that he detected a soil change since he mentions the appearance of “ashy soil” near wall S. Shortly thereafter bedrock was reached in the southwest part of the trench at the bottom of -119 at an elevation of +2.58.

N17-122 (cut 2) investigated those parts of the room in which bedrock was not exposed, a smaller and smaller area with increasing depth. “In the SE corner there [were] a group of conical cups that seem to rest on and among the small stones seen in the W baulk of [N16T].”509 At the bottom of -122, there were only strips of unexcavated deposit along the walls of the room. At this elevation (+2.30/2.15), three more walls were uncovered; one under wall S, one under wall R, and a third in the northwest corner of the room. The last was L-shaped and clearly predated both walls P and T since it seemed to run under them.510

508 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 121. N17-117 derived from wall S: it contained many conical cup fragments and two stone lids.

509 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 121.

510 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 129.
The strips of unexcavated deposits that remained along the walls of the room were examined in N17-125, -127, and -128. N17-125 explored an area 1 m wide along wall T; in -127, the deposit consisted of a concentration of pottery and small finds against wall S, and -128 removed a deposit along wall R (the most diagnostic artifact found being the rim of an EBA carinated cup).

The contents of all the deposits in this room were combined into N03CL; most of the pottery is of Period VI. No floors were obvious. Nonetheless, it is clear from the relationships of the various walls that the room had several architectural phases. The threshold (top at +3.09 and bottom at approximately +3.00) seems to be associated with the latest architectural phase, to which belonged wall AK/E; the other three walls of the room, P, R, and S, were of an earlier construction phase but remained in use during this period. Any associated floor would have been higher than the preserved ground surface at the start of excavation. It is likely that this phase of the room belonged to Period VII.

The units excavated in this room were all associated with an earlier phase, to which walls S, T, P, and R belonged. The floor in this phase probably lay at an elevation of approximately +2.58; this was the elevation of the bedrock in the room, assuming that the floor was level without the bedrock protruding above the floor in the middle of the room. Substantial quantities

---

511 Excavation notebooks refer to a flat conical cup rim, a small lamp, a piece of antler that has been sawn and drilled, and a rim of a heavy shallow plaster bowl; in the second pass were carbon flecks near wall P (Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 129).
of pottery and small finds, which comprised the destruction deposit of the room, though, were found resting against wall S at a lower elevation of +2.30/2.15. If indeed the floor was located at +2.58, then we would have to assume that the builders of the room had not sufficiently packed the substratum of the floor and the artifacts seeped lower in the areas not covered by the bedrock; alternately, the floor might have been composed of wood and the destruction deposit fell to a lower elevation when the floor was destroyed or disintegrated.

N03CL

N03CL (Tables 54-55, and 74) combines a series of lots which examined the deposits in room N.13, from the surface (+2.75) to bedrock (probably +2.00). Unit N23-249 was mistakenly combined in this lot and belongs with the units of room N.14. It is impossible, though, to uncombined the lot since individual sherds do not have their original lot number written on them. The original quantity of the lot was 5.3 tins of pottery, of which 67% was discarded, including fragments of 135 conical cups (quite a few of which belonged to the LC I type with flat rim), and twelve tripod legs.\(^{512}\) The units combined in this lot also produced bones (2.5 bags).

Chapter 3

Table 54: Original excavation units contained in N03CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N17-117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>XIV.121</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.05 and N.13; cleaning face wall S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NE +2.15, SE +2.30, SW +2.75, W +2.35, NW +2.25</td>
<td>XIV.121</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.05 and N.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NE +1.95, SE +2.30</td>
<td>XIV.121</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Surface deposits over N.05 and N.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.40</td>
<td>XVI.129</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N.13; SW corner west of bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-127</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.30</td>
<td>XVI.129</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.13; N of wall S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17-128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.15</td>
<td>XVI.129</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.13; along wall R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-249</td>
<td>+3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.098</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>over wall R-cleaning among stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 55: Original excavation units contained in N03CL.

This is a destruction deposit dated to Period VI (with very few earlier sherds and only one possible later fragment of a goblet or kylix), which was sitting on the bedrock/floor of the room.

The lot contains number of pots, including Grey and Yellow Minyan, bridge-spouted jars (both local and imported), and a large storage jar from Aegina with ripple decoration. (Figs. 79, 80, and 81).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K3.466</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.476</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3.561</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Worked antler</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.90</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>Plaster: fragment with red and blue paint</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 55: N03CL small finds.
N03CL Catalogue

181 Bridge-spouted jar (N03-19). Fig. 79
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 13; Max. H. 4.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 6.3.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, golden brown, gray bluish, gray-greenish, purplish, off-white, silver mica, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/4-4/4; Surface 2.5YR 5/4-4/4; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1-2/1 and 10R 4/6) paint. Circle in red paint and black dots around it.
Period VI

182 Bridge-spouted jar (N03-20). Fig. 79
Rim sherd. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.6.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with golden brown, dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, schist, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4; Surface 5YR 5/4-5/6; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10R 4/4-4/6 and 10YR 5/1-4/1) paint. Red band on rim and a pair of thinner black bands and in between them thin wavy line.
Period VI

183 Large closed vessel (N03-35). Fig. 80
Base Diam. 12; Max. H. 30; Max. Pres. Dim. 31.5.
Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, dark gray (shiny), dark gray, off-white, vegetable temper, grog, and gold mica inclusions; Core 5YR 6/4-5/4 with Gley 1 5/N; Surface 5YR 6/4-5/4; Slip buff faded.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 5/6-4/6) paint. Decoration with bands and vertical stripes between them. Probably seven irregular zones of ripple pattern, delineated by solid bands.
Period VI

184 Closed vessel; base and body sherd (N03-54). Fig. 80
Base Diam. 12.6; Max. H. 9.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 15.8.
Melian - Painted. Medium coarse clay with calcareous, dark gray, white-light gray, red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/2-7/2 Gley 1 6/10Y; Surface 10YR 8/2-2.5Y 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 4/6) paint. Thick bands almost horizontal and not parallel to each other on the body; band around the base.
Period VI

185 Large closed vessel (N03-55). Fig. 80
Body sherd. Max. H. 8.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 17.5.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, light gray, dark gray, red brown, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, marble, and grog inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4; Slip buff faded.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5YR 4/1 and 2.5YR 5/6) paint. Two pairs of thinner black bands with red band between them. On the lower part of the vessel black band with diagonal wavy lines springing from it (below it).
Period VI

186 Bridge-spouted jar (N03-56). Fig. 79
Rim sherd. Max. H. 2.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.5.
Melian - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray, calcareous, light brown, schist, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/2; Surface 10YR 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Band on rim and below.
Period VI

187 Beaked jug with nipples (N03-59). Fig. 80
Neck sherd with start of handle. Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 10.2.
Minoan?. Medium fine clay with calcareous, light gray, dark gray, vegetable temper, and marble inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4-10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (Gley 1 2.5/N) paint.
Period VI

188 Keftiu cup (N03-5). Fig. 80
Full profile; almost 1/3 preserved. H. 6; Est. Rim Diam. 8; Base Diam. 6.
Local - Plain. Medium fine clay with dark gray (shiny), silver-gray, golden, silver mica, schist, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 5/1; Surface 10YR 4/1.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

189 Keftiu cup (N03-17). Fig. 80
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, golden brown, gray blush, gray-greenish, purplish, silver mica, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4 with 10YR 4/1; Slip 7.5YR 6/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Three grooves delineated with
paint and above it four horizontal rows of dots.

Period VI

190 Cup (semi-globular); rim and body sherd (N03-18). Fig. 80
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with dark gray, golden brown, gray bluish, gray-greenish, purplish, off-white, gray, silver mica, vegetable temper, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/4-5/6 with 2.5Y 5/1; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Wiped exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 4/1) paint. Thin band over the maximum diameter; the rest of the space to the lip filled with dots.

Period VI

191 Open vessel (N03-36). Fig. 81
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.7.
Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with calcareous, red brown, dark gray, purplish, dark gray (shiny), quartz, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 4/4 with 7.5YR 4/3; Surface 5YR 6/4-6/6; Slip 10YR 7/3-2.5Y 7/3.

Period VI

192 Open vessel (N03-38). Fig. 81
Body sherd. Max. H. 8.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 8.5.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, gray, red brown vegetable temper, grog, and gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 8/2; Surface 10YR 8/2-2.5Y 8/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 4/3) paint. Thick band on the lower part of the sherd and ripple pattern above it; possible light gray lines in the thick band

Period VI

193 Goblet (N03-45). Fig. 81
Rim sherd. Est. Rim Diam. 28; Max. H. 3.6; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.6.
Mainland - Burnished. Fine clay with calcareous and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 5/1; Surface 2.5Y 5/1.
Burnished exterior surface.

Period VI

194 Open vessel (N03-46). Fig. 81
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.5.
Mainland - Burnished. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6; Surface 5YR 6/6.
Burnished exterior surface.
Period VI

195 Large open vessel (N03-11). Fig. 81
Vessel with straight sides or very large diameter, flat lip flat; part of upper body with round plastic knob; Max. H. 13.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 16.5.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, light brown, gray-greenish, gray bluish, red brown, light gray, silver mica, vegetable temper, quartz, schist, and gold mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 4/1-4/2; Surface 2.5YR 4/4; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

196 Closed vessel (N03-23). Fig. 81
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.3.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with light brown, golden brown, light gray, dark gray, off-white, gray-greenish, quartz, vegetable temper, silver mica, marble, and schist inclusions; Core 5YR 5/8; Surface 5YR 6/4-6/6; Slip 7.5YR 8/3-7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1 and faded red?) paint. Trace of spirals in a panel; traces of red.
Period VI to Period VII

197 Closed vessel (N03-24). Fig. 81
Body sherd. Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.7.
Local - Painted on Yellow Slipped. Medium fine clay with brown red, red brown, dark gray-purplish, golden brown, off-white, gray-greenish, quartz, vegetable temper, silver mica, and schist inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/3-7/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Trace of floral motif (?).
Period VI to Period VII

198 Kalathos (N03-3). Fig. 81
1/3 preserved. H. 10; Est. Rim Diam. 28 (irregular); Max. Pres. Dim. 27.4.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, gray bluish, off-white, white-light brown, golden, silver mica, gold mica, marble, and schist inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/8-4/8; Slip 2.5YR 6/3-5/3.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

199 Baking sheet (?) with straight sides (N03-6). Fig. 81
Max. H. 5.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 10.
Local - Plain. Coarse clay with dark gray, golden brown, off-white, gray-greenish, gray, gray bluish, white-light gray, quartz, vegetable temper, and marble inclusions; Core 5YR 5/4-7/4 with 10YR 6/2-5/2.
Wiped exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

**ROOM N.14**

Room N.14 (Figs. 32, 39, and 41) was 3.5 x 1.7 m in size and was bounded by walls S to the north, R to the east, H to the south, and C/E to the west. The room communicated with N.13 to the north through a door at the west end of wall S and with an open-air space to the south through a door at the west end of wall H. It must be mentioned that the open-air space may not have existed in antiquity, since this is where the early 20th century road had been cut through the site, subsequently destroying any architecture or other features which may have shed light on the nature of the space.

Room N.14 was investigated in trench N23T. At the start of excavation, however, the south face of wall H had been partly exposed by road building.\(^{513}\) Initially, the excavator cleaned the surface of the trench, which was rich in finds (N23-201); subsequently, the surface deposits were themselves excavated in N23-202,\(^{514}\) uncovering the top of wall H (+3.63) in the process.

---

\(^{513}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 89.

\(^{514}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 89.
The course of wall H and the other walls of the room was clarified in -203 and -207 (cuts 1 and 2); part of the west jamb of a doorway in wall H had collapsed to the south.\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 89.}

The room was investigated further in N23-208, -212, -216, -241, and -249 (cuts 3 to 5).\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 97.} “The west end of the threshold block in wall S was just below surface at start of 216 [(+ 3.09)]. It is a large and impressive stone and looks almost dressed. Hole from doorpost uncovered.”\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 97.} The doorpost socket was revealed almost in the middle of the block and the west jamb was about 1.05 m west of the socket, which probably served for pinning the door closed.\footnote{Cf. the excavator that perhaps these two features had been products of rebuilding at a later time. (Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 103).} The elevation of the threshold, and thus the elevation of the floor associated with the threshold, was +3.09/3.06.\footnote{Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 103.} In N23-257 the west jamb of the doorway in wall S was removed, demonstrating that it was part of wall T. Wall AK seemed to be associated with this architectural phase.

In the western part of the room, there was a layer of fallen stones, the top of which seems to have been reached immediately beneath the surface at the start of excavation. The bottom of
this layer of stones was more or less level with the threshold block and probably rested on the floor (Fig. 39). Fragments of plaster with blue and red paint were found inside and outside of the room (in 249?) and indicate that in all probability the walls of the room (or of an upper storey room) were decorated with polychrome plaster.\textsuperscript{521}

In N23-243 (cut 6),\textsuperscript{522} the entirety of the room was investigated; it was clear that the strata had been disturbed in the 20th century since six or more machine gun slugs were found. However, in situ was found a “row of small thin stone[s] set on edge against wall S and a row perpendicular to these between S and a heavy part of [wall] H. The first row is 0.95 [m], the second row 1.10 [m] long. With the remains of the east wall they form a rectangle.”\textsuperscript{523} This feature, which occupied the eastern part of the room, lay on a thin layer of soil (at + 2.95) and a floor of heavy stucco (Fig. 39) and chips (at an elevation of + 2.85 (top), to + 2.78 (bottom). The floor extended to wall S and to a point 0.45 m west of the rectangle where its edge was marked by coarse stucco or baked clay which must have functioned as a sub-floor support for the row of stones that delimited the floor to the west.\textsuperscript{524}

\textsuperscript{521} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{522} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{523} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 103.

\textsuperscript{524} Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 102.
The area covered by the stucco floor was examined separately in N23-248. Further investigation in N23-253 of the west part of the room showed that wall T was a later addition. This wall may have been added to buttress wall AK (Fig. 40). Wall AI was also removed in the same unit and proved to be two courses high. Finally, the entirety of the room was examined in N23-258, the lowest unit in the room. It is unclear if bedrock was reached.

The units of this room were thought to represent three horizons and thus were grouped into four combined lots, although the validity of these combinations is called into question by the machine gun slugs found in unit N23-208 and -243, a classical sherd in -243, and a kylix stem in -248. Three of the four combined units can currently be found in the Ayia Irini storerooms.

The units comprised of surface deposits down to the top of the walls of the room, i.e., N23-201, -202, -203, and -207, were combined into N44CL; pottery ranges in date from the EBA to Period VIII. The deposits from +3.41 to +2.95 were combined into N43CL; this pottery largely dates to Period VI, even though there was an Attic black glaze sherd in the lot. One unit, N23-243 (NN6CL), in which the stucco floor was removed, was left uncombined. In this unit there was nothing necessarily later than Period VI, except a kylix stem (Period VIII). Units N23-248, -253, and -258 were combined into N47CL, which probably contained material from Periods VI.

---

525 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 102.
527 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 102.
Even though the deposits of the room were disturbed, there are a few conjectures that can be made about the stratigraphic history of the room. The threshold block indicates that the room had a floor at approximately +3.09/3.06. The layer of stones that was resting on the floor probably resulted from a destruction episode at the end of Period VI. Among the stones were gaps and cavities into which artifacts of later date must have settled (e.g., the machine gun slugs). Below the Period VI floor there was another occupation surface, a stucco floor (at +2.85) in the eastern part of the room. The floor had been laid on a deposit that probably dated to Period VI.

N44CL

N44CL (Tables 56-57, and 76) combines four excavation units which investigated deposits in room N.14, from an elevation of +3.76 to +3.23. These units produced 2.2 tins of ceramic material, of which 87.5% was pashed during the initial sorting. The records show that 90% of the ceramic material was coarse. Among the material discarded, there were twenty-three conical cups, four tripod legs, three fragments with rope pattern decoration, as well as Gray Minyan ring-stemmed goblet specimen(s) and short stemmed kylix bases. The information about the discarded ceramic material shows that this combined lot contained material from a range of dates, the latest being Period VIII. Moreover, the excavation journals also note the presence of machine gun slugs recovered from deposits below this deposit. The entire lot was pashed.

---

### Table 56: Original excavation units contained in N44CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N23-201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.089</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>N.14 (on surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E +3.43; W +3.67</td>
<td>VIII.089</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E +3.31; W +3.56</td>
<td>VIII.089</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-207</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W +3.48; NE +3.33; SE +3.23</td>
<td>VIII.089</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 57: N44CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original lot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.490</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Painted tile</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.47</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### N43CL

N43CL (Tables 58-59, and 76) combines a series of lots that investigated the deposits from +3.37/3.15 to +3.04/3.01 in room N.14. The lot had been papsed. Originally, the ceramic material produced was 1.5 tins, 95% being coarse, including fifty-three conical cups and several pieces of rope pattern decoration.\(^{529}\) The excavator’s notes indicate that the combined lot dates to Period V, while most of the sherds were Cycladic. Other pots of diagnostic value mentioned are:

---

a local yellow slipped panelled cup, with decoration of dull black lines and cross on the bottom; two Cycladic Keftiu cups, two fragments of Gray Minyan, and a scrap of Attic black glaze. The recovery of machine-gun slugs, as well as the Classical sherd, indicates that the deposit was disturbed. Nevertheless, both the description of diagnostic sherds now papsed, the four pots inventoried (conical cups, which belong to Period VI types, Fig. 82), as well as its placement over NN6CL corroborate a date of Period VI for the bulk of the deposit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N23-208</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NW +3.37, NE +3.23, SW +3.41, SE +3.15</td>
<td>VIII.089</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>W +3.20, E +3.00</td>
<td>VIII.097</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-216</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W +3.09, E +3.03</td>
<td>VIII.097</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-241B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3.47</td>
<td>VIII.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.14; clearing the door in wall S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.109</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.14; removal of west jamb in door in wall S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.123</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>N.12; cleaning north end of wall E Wrongly combined here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58: Original excavation units contained in N43CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.101</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Terracotta whorl</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.183</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Terracotta loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.205</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Terracotta spool</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59: N43CL small finds.
N43CL Catalogue

200 Conical cup (N43-1). Fig. 82
H. 4.4-3.5; Rim Diam. 10.1; Base Diam. 4-4.3.
Local - Plain. Coarse clay with gray bluish, gray-greenish, off-white, golden brown, schist, marble, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 4/6; Surface 5YR 5/6-4/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

201 Conical cup (N43-2). Fig. 82
H. 3.3; Rim Diam. 9.4; Base Diam. 4.6.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with golden brown, gray-greenish, off-white, silver-gray, gray bluish, calcareous, schist, marble, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6-5/8; Surface 5YR 5/6-5/8.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

202 Conical cup (N43-3). Fig. 82
H. 3.9; Rim Diam. 9.7; Base Diam. 4.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with dark gray, calcareous, off-white, silver-gray, schist, marble, vegetable temper, and silver mica inclusions; Core 5YR 5/6; Surface 5YR 5/6 7.5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

203 Tall conical cup with protruding lip (N43-4). Fig. 82
H. 8.9; Rim Diam. 10.3; Base Diam. 5.1-4.8.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with silver-gray, gray-greenish, golden brown, red brown, off-white, white-pink, white, gray bluish schist, vegetable temper, silver mica, marble inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6-5/6-7.5YR 6/6-5/6; Surface 5YR 6/6-5/6-7.5YR 6/6-5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI

NN6CL: N23-243

NN6CL (Tables 60 and 76) is one lot which had not been combined for undisclosed reasons. The unit examined a deposit in room N.14 starting at an elevation of +3.04/3.01 to
+2.95/2.79. The original quantity of ceramic material was 0.375 of a tin and 85% of it was discarded in 1964, including four conical cups. Eight sherds survive today. Most of the sherds, with the exception of two kylix stems dating to Period VIII, are comfortably dated no later than Period VI. Thus, if the remaining material accurately represents the deposit, it probably dates to a very early phase of Period VII (Fig. 83).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original lot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.147</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Stone object or vessel</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60: NN6CL small finds.

NN6CL Catalogue

204 Closed vessel (NN6-5). Fig. 83
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.4. Melian?. Fine clay with dark gray, gray bluish, gray-greenish, dark gray (shiny), red brown, calcareous, off-white, vegetable temper, silver mica, schist, and gold mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/6; Surface 5YR 6/6-7.5YR 6/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Paint has faded and only trace of it remains. Band and ripple pattern. Period VI

205 Goblet (?) (NN6-1). Fig. 83
Ring stem foot fragment. Max. H. 6.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.5. Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with gray-greenish, gray bluish, calcareous, off-white, golden brown, silver mica, vegetable temper, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/6-4/6 with 10YR 5/2; Surface 10R 4/4-4/6; Slip 10R 4/4-4/6. Smoothed exterior surface. Period VI

206 Open vessel (NN6-6). Fig. 83
Rim sherd. Max. H. 2.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.3. Melian?. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white grog, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y
207 Goblet (NN6-2). Fig. 83
Base of bowl with stem stump. Max. H. 1.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.3.
Aeginetan - Plain. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, dark gray (shiny), white-pink, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 5YR 6/6-7.5YR 6/6; Surface 5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VII to Period VIII

208 Goblet or kylix (NN6-3). Fig. 83
Base of bowl with stem stump. Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.5.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray, vegetable temper, and grog inclusions; Core 10YR 7/4 with 10YR 6/3; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with (2.5YR 5/6) paint. Monochrome outside.
Period VII to Period VIII

N47CL

This lot (Tables 61 and 76) combines four units that investigated a deposit from
+2.95/2.79 to approximately +2.50 and corresponds to the level of the stucco floor of room N.14.
The original quantity of ceramics included in the lot was 0.6 tin, of which 85% was discarded
during the initial sorting, including eleven conical cups.\(^{530}\) The excavator’s notes mention that
95% of the material was coarse. This lot was also papsed. From the description of the excavator,

the lot contained two fragments of Minoan light-on-dark, and a fragment of a local yellow slipped Keftiu cup.\textsuperscript{531} Based on this description, the lot contains nothing later than Period VI. Three obsidian blades are listed in connection with this lot (N-1.125, N-1.126, N-1.127).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original unit</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N23-248</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2.95</td>
<td>VIII.102</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-255</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+3.00</td>
<td>VIII.102</td>
<td>15 sherds</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-253</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.69</td>
<td>VIII.102</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23-258</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+2.78</td>
<td>VIII.109</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61: Original excavation units contained in N47CL.

**ROOM N.15**

Room N.15 (Figs. 32 and 42) measured 3.7 x 8.4 m and was located east of rooms N.13 and N.14. It is bounded by walls P to the north, K (the fortification wall) on the east, H to the south, and R to the west. Wall H was already exposed at the start of the excavation. No ground floor entrance was located during excavation.

The room was investigated in trench N16T. The surface deposits covering it were removed in units N16-94 and -98; the latter of these units exposed the tops of wall R\textsuperscript{532} and P.

\textsuperscript{531} Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook T, p. 265.
A layer with a high concentration of pottery, especially complete vessels, was reached at an elevation of ca. +1.80/2.0 m; the density increased with depth and complete vessels were found towards the bottom of the layer.\textsuperscript{533} The layer was investigated in N16-99, -104, -106, and -112 (cut 3-6). Apart from the ceramic material, some ash and carbon flecks were detected at the bottom of -99, at approximately +1.90.\textsuperscript{534} In unit -112, wall R (first noticed in unit -94) was completely uncovered in its full length to wall P; the wall was missing two of its courses in its west side.\textsuperscript{535} In the same unit the top of wall P was exposed. At the bottom of the unit, some ashen colored soil appeared.\textsuperscript{536}

This ashen colored soil continued in N16-121 and -123 (cuts 7 and 8) and became more pronounced with depth.\textsuperscript{537} Complete or nearly complete pots were found. Other finds of interest included a door-pivot stone and a hearth.\textsuperscript{538} The hearth was located in the southeastern corner of the room and contained red soil (+1.86).\textsuperscript{539}

\textsuperscript{532} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{533} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{534} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{535} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{536} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 123.
\textsuperscript{537} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, pp. 123 and 131.
\textsuperscript{538} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 123.
\textsuperscript{539} Kea Excavation Notebook XIV, p. 123.
N16-124, -129, and -134 (cuts 9 to 11)\(^{540}\) covered the entire room except for the hearth; the hearth was removed in unit -153 and the deposits underneath in -154 and -155.\(^ {541}\) The ash did not continue to be found in these cuts, and the earth became reddish brown.\(^ {542}\) In the northern part of the room the excavator encountered a layer full of stone chips. At approximately +1.50, bedrock was reached near the southwest corner\(^ {543}\) and was exposed in the entire area of the room at an elevation of approximately +1.28.

Walls K and P were founded on bedrock, as was the western phase of wall R; the eastern face of wall R rested, however, on small stone chips and stones.\(^ {544}\) Wall H was bedded on a layer of earth at the level of the highest stone of the hearth.

Levels in this room may be divided into two chronological horizons, both of Period V. Units N16-99, -104, -106, -112, -121, and -123 (cuts 1-8) represent the first horizon, combined into N01CL and published as Period V Group Z.\(^ {545}\) Units N16-124, -129, -134, -153, -154, and -156 (cuts 9 to 11) constitute the second horizon, represented by artifacts combined in N02CL and published as Period V Group AA.\(^ {546}\)

\(^{540}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, pp. 123 and 131.

\(^{541}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, pp. 57 and 61.

\(^{542}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 131.

\(^{543}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 131.

\(^{544}\) *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 57.

\(^{545}\) Davis 1986, pp. 52-54.

\(^{546}\) Davis 1986, pp. 54-60.
Within the first horizon, there was an area of ashen colored soil, which started approximately at an average elevation of +1.80, represented by units -121 and -123, and ended at the level of the Period V floor at +1.50/1.75. It is fair to assume that this layer corresponded to the destruction horizon replete with complete vessels. If this is so, then the deposits above the ashen layer have probably resulted from a different formation process, perhaps the collapse of the upper floor, or deliberate backfilling of the room with deposits containing artifacts dating to Period V.

As Davis notes, no floor *per se* was discovered in the room, but the deposit of complete vessels and the hearth are a sure indication for the existence of a Period V floor.\textsuperscript{547} Moreover, Davis suggests that assuming that “the layer of chips represents the working surface at the time of the construction of the town wall, this filling had probably been dumped only shortly before that, but certainly after the layout of the room had been decided.”\textsuperscript{548} This is definitely supported by the evidence offered by the pottery, since the ceramic material in the filling and among the chips is similar to that in the destruction debris of the room, suggesting that the time that lapsed between the building of the fortification wall and the event that resulted in the destruction layer of the room was too short to be reflected in the pottery.\textsuperscript{549}

\textsuperscript{547} Davis 1986, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{548} Davis 1986, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{549} Davis 1986, p. 52.
It is quite probable that the room preserves two architectural phases, both in Period V. The first phase is represented by walls K, P, and R and the hearth. The second phase is represented by the addition of wall H, the bottom of which stands at an elevation of +1.86, which is the level of the highest stone of the hearth and stood on a layer of earth above the bedrock. Furthermore, although the room as it is preserved today has no doorway, the discovery of the hearth indicates that it must have been entered, probably from the south. The presence of the hearth also indicates that this was a single-storey room since an escape for smoke would have been needed.

N01CL

N01CL (Tables 62 and 74) combines excavation units that investigated the destruction deposit in room N.15 from the surface to the level of the Period V floor in the room (+1.75/1.50). The original quantity of the lot was 13.1 tins of pottery. The deposit has been dated to Period V and published by Davis as Group AA.²⁵⁰

²⁵⁰ Davis 1986, pp. 54-60.
Table 62: Original excavation units contained in N01CL.

N02CL

N02CL (Tables 63 and 74) combines excavation units that investigated the fill under the Period V floor in room N.15 (+1.75/1.50 to the bedrock, probably at +1.40/1.00). The original quantity of the lot was 3.8 tins of pottery. The deposit has been dated to Period V and published by Davis as Group Z.551

551 Davis 1986, pp. 52-54.
Room N.16

Room N.16 (Figs. 44, 45, and 47) is an oblong room (8.8 x 2.2.4 m) to the west of Tower ne and probably acted as a corridor connecting the tower with the other rooms laying to the west and southwest of it. The room was bounded by walls I to the north, AM to the east, AJ to the south, and AP to the west. It was accessed through two doorways. The first doorway was located in the southwestern corner of the room (at the western end of wall AJ) and connected the room with a corridor that gave access to room N.17 and N.18. The second doorway, which was furnished with a threshold (-0.20), was located in the eastern wall of the room, AM; via this doorway room N.16 communicated with the interior space of Tower ne.

Room N.16 was investigated in trenches N26T and N27T. Both of these trenches examined an area that lay well below the modern road. Here, the bedrock sloped significantly to the east, so that accumulated soil protected the architectural remains. In reference to the
accumulated soil, the excavator remarked that “judging from the banks about 1.5 m [of the modern road ditch] was removed from the west end […] tapering to 0.30 in the east of the room.”

The faces of walls I, K and H were explored in trench N27T, even though these walls were not within the trench boundaries. Cleaning the south face of wall I in N27-305, -308, and -309 (cuts 0 to 2) exposed bedrock to the southwest of it.

A modern water channel seemed to have passed over wall I (Fig. 43). The channel (1.60 m long and 0.60 m wide) was cut through bedrock and was supported by a short terrace wall to its south. Its course could be traced farther to the west; at a distance of ca. 1.80 m, where the level of the bedrock rises, the excavator found another channel. The construction of the channel had damaged wall I, which was preserved one course lower in N27T than in N26T.

The interior of the room seemed to be covered with earth that was uniformly red-brown and full of gravel, and that contained many stones of all sizes; these decreased in number with depth. The layer was investigated in N26-267 and -275, -279, -285, and N27-306, -310, -315, and -325.

552 Kittredge n.d., p. 125.
553 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 129.
554 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, pp. 129 and 128.
555 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 129.
556 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 113.
The top of AP, the western wall of the room, was revealed in N27-306, whereas the top of AJ, the southern wall, was uncovered in units N26-263, -270 and N27-310. A considerable amount of plaster was recovered from these units.

At an elevation of +0.37/0.39, the excavator observed that especially in the eastern part of the room, the soil seemed to contain cobbles, suggesting to him that he had reached a possible cobble stone floor. The level of the cobbles was investigated in N26-288 and N27-325 in the eastern and the western parts of the room respectively.

The soil beneath these units down to the level of the water table was investigated in N26-291, -295 and N27-328, -338. The physical presence of wall AP was not detected in the northwestern corner of the room, but its corner was found carved in the bedrock; the area where the corner of the wall would have stood was also strewn with rounded stones. The doorway near its southeast corner, which passed through wall AJ, was investigated in N27-338. When the doorway was cleared, a threshold was located at an elevation of ca. +0.21.

---

557 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 117.


559 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 129.

560 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, pp. 113, and 129.

561 The cobbles were loose and were removed effortlessly. (*Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 117).


564 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 128.
Two soundings were made in room N.16. The first was 1 m wide along wall I in order to determine how deeply founded it was. N26-321 (cut 7) reached a level of -0.90 without finding the bottom of wall I. Because of this, the excavator suggested that: “This means the north face of I at this point is standing to at least 2.10 [m].”

A second sounding was made at the eastern side of the room to test for the floor against wall AM. Three units N26-482, -485, and -487 (cuts 7-9) were excavated. Unit -485 uncovered a threshold (-0.18), which seemed to consist of one large slab resting on top of four stones. Thus, unit N26-487 excavated the substratum of the presumed floor associated to the threshold in wall AM.

The units were pooled into two combined lots. N12CL consists of all units from the ground surface to the water table, including those in the first sounding; it contains pottery that ranges in date from the EBA to the Classical period. This combined lot also includes units below the cobble stone floor to the level of the water table. The second combined lot, N48CL, includes all units of the second sounding; the pottery dates to period VII.

Excavation in the room did not reveal an occupation surface. I am inclined to believe that the excavator’s “cobble floor” at an elevation +0.37/0.39 was not a floor but debris from an

---

566 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 77.
567 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 77.
upper storey collapse.\textsuperscript{568} The deposits that were excavated above the cobbling contained a number of fresco fragments, some of them with figural decoration. It is unfortunate that units below the floor (N27-328, N26-291, -295, and -321) were not kept separate from those above the cobbling. Keeping them separate would have provided future researchers with the opportunity, on the one hand, to reevaluate whether these units were indeed disturbed like the ones above the cobbling, and on the other to reassess whether there is any qualitative difference between the units above and below the cobbling. The latter would have ascertained the validity of the hypothesis about the upper storey collapse.

Nevertheless, there probably was an occupation surface in the room. This occupation surface was associated with the threshold (top at +0.21) found in the western end of wall AJ and the threshold (between N.16 and Tower ne) that was encountered at -0.18/0.20, and it was sloping from west to east. This surface which could assumed the form of a wooden ramp or stepped corridor, would provide access to Tower ne that stood at a lower elevation than the rest of the buildings to the west. This occupation surface should be dated to period VII.

N12CL

N12CL (Tables 64-66, and 74) combines a series of lots which examined the deposits in room N.16 from the surface to +0.21 to 0.08 in most of room N.16, and to -0.90 in the trial trench along wall I. The original quantity of this lot was 5.6 tins of pottery. 77\% of the ceramics

\textsuperscript{568} The cobbles were in mud and easy to remove.
contained in this lot were discarded, including sixty-seven conical cups, six tripod legs, and several pithos fragments.\textsuperscript{569} This is a mixed lot containing a fair amount of Grey Minyan and several MM sherds, a few EBA sherds, and one LH IIIA kylix stem, as well as a few Archaic/Classical sherds. The bulk of the pottery dates to Period VII and probably represents a destruction deposit (Fig. 84) that has suffered substantial disturbance as a result of the road building activities in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Ending elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N26-263</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N +0.80</td>
<td>N +0.74, S +0.71</td>
<td>VIII.113</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.129</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N27-306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E +0.75 E, W +0.71</td>
<td>E +0.67, W +0.69</td>
<td>VIII.129</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Surface deposits over west part of N.16 and west of the room (modern road ditch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-267</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N +0.74, S +0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.113</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 64: Original excavation units contained in N12CL.

\textsuperscript{569} Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook D, p. 125.
### Table 65: Original excavation units contained in N12CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Ending elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N26-275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E +0.67, W +0.62</td>
<td>E+0.49, W +0.49</td>
<td>VIII.129</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N27-310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E +0.72, W 0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-279</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E +0.49, W +0.49</td>
<td>E +0.34, W +0.39</td>
<td>VIII.116</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N27-315</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E +0.57, W +0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-285</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E +0.34, W +0.39</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
<td>VIII.116</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-288</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E +0.39, W +0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N27-328</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.116</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N27-338</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>VIII.128</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-291</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-295</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-321</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>VIII.117</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 66: N12CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original lot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4.213</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.503</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clamp</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4.563</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lug of Pithos</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4.153</td>
<td>267 310 279 315</td>
<td>Plaster: several fragments of plaster preserving colors (red, blue, white, and black) and a human figure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 66: N12CL small finds.
N48 CL

N48CL (Tables 67 and 76) combines the ceramic finds retrieved from a sounding sunk in the eastern part of room N.16. The sounding examined deposits from +0.20 to -0.40 (or so)\(^{570}\) in the eastern end of the room and the area the doorway. At an elevation of -0.18, the threshold of the doorway was found; thus, unit 487 examined the substratum of the floor connected to the doorway and threshold. Initially, 87% of this small deposit (1.75 tin) was discarded, including twelve conical cups, five tripod legs, and two pithos bases;\(^{571}\) however, later the entire lot was papsed with the exception of fragments from a bridge spouted jar, N48-1. Many additional fragments of the jar (Fig. 85) were found in combined lot N12CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N26-482</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
<td>XLVI.077</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-485</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>XLVI.077</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.16 (eastern 1.0 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N26-487</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>XLVI.077</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 67: Original excavation units contained in N48CL.

N12CL and N48 CL Catalogue

\(^{570}\) No ending elevation is mentioned in the records.

209 Large closed vessel, pithos (N12-10). Fig. 84
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.7.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with white, dark gray, gray bluish, silver-gray, vegetable temper, silver mica, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 5/4-4/4 with 5YR 5/2-5/3; Surface 2.5YR 5/4-4/4; Slip 2.5YR 4/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with two plastic vertical ribs.
Period VII

210 Large closed vessel, pithos (N12-13). Fig. 84
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.3; Max. Pres. Dim. 2.7.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with white, dark gray, gray bluish, silver-gray, off-white, white-pink, golden brown, vegetable temper, silver mica, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/8-5/8 with 2.5Y 5/1; Surface 2.5YR 6/8-5/8.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with one plastic horizontal band.
Period VII

211 Large open spouted (?) vessel (N12-22). Fig. 84
Rim sherd with spout. Est. Rim Diam. 44; Max. H. 8.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 10.8.
Local - Plain. Medium coarse clay with white, dark gray, gray bluish, silver-gray, golden brown, off-white, white-pink, vegetable temper, silver mica, schist, and marble inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/8-5/8 with 2.5Y 5/1; Surface 5YR 5/6.
Smoothed exterior surface.
Period VI to Period VII

212 Closed vessel (piriform jar/alabastron?); (N12-68). Fig. 84
Non-joining body sherds and handle. Max. H. 11.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 11.7.
Aeginetan. Fine clay with dark gray, calcareous , golden, light gray, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 2.5Y 7/2; Surface 2.5Y 7/2.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 3/1) paint. Spirals and monochrome handle; a line (vertical) with lines of dots on either side runs through the handle and runs into one of these spirals lower. Band on the base of the neck inside and out.
Period VII (LH IIA)

213 Closed vessel (rhyton?) (N12-173). Fig. 84
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.8.
Mainland (Boiotian?) - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6; Surface 2.5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 3/2) paint. Zones of curved stripes (FM 67:1) alternating with row of dots.
Period VII (LH IIA)

214 Closed vessel (alabastron) (N12-176). Fig. 84
Body sherd of lower body; three joining sherds. Max. H. 3.1; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.7.
Mainland (Boiotian?) - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, white, and vegetable temper
inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6 with 10YR 7/3; Surface 2.5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 3/6) paint. Bands two horizontal
parallel ones; over it lines of dots and spiral and another diagonal line.
Period VII (LH IIA)

215 Bridge spouted jar (N48-1). Fig. 84
Non-joining sherds from base, body, handle, neck, spout. H. 30 est; Est. Rim Diam. 10; Base
Diam. 18.9.
Minoan. Fine clay with white, light brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3-7/4;
Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Spout painted solid;
oblique strokes on handle; foliate band on neck. Two zones of pendants with festoons,
intermediate zone of elaborate wavy line, bands to base. Quirks on rim.
Period VII (LH IIA)

216 Closed vessel (?) (N12-171). Fig. 85
Base. Base Diam. 3.7; Max. H. 3.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 7.4.
Mainland (Boiotian?) - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white, and vegetable temper
inclusions; Core 2.5YR 6/6 5YR 6/6; Surface 2.5YR 6/6 5YR 6/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 3/3) paint. Band on base and running
spiral.
Period VII to Period VIII
**TOWER NE**

Tower ne (Figs. 46 and 47) was found beneath the surface of the modern road. The tower (2.4 x 3.7-4.2 m) was bounded by walls AN in the north, AL in the east, AO in the south, and AM in the west. The room was accessed from room N.16 (to the west) through a doorway furnished with a threshold (-0.20) in the southwestern corner of the room.

The Northeast Tower was examined with trenches N18T and M04T. The surface deposits of the southern part of the tower were investigated in M04T, but soon after that the excavator decided that the excavation of M04T should continue as part of the N18T sequence. The two trenches were in the area of the modern road ditch that had cut through the site in the 20th century. The construction works had removed ca. 0.30 m of the deposits at the east end of the room and rather more at the west.

The surface deposits were investigated in N18-136, -135 and M04-014, -016, and -021. The removal of these deposits provided definition to the structure that became visible, and it was suggested that it was a tower connected with the rest of the structures of the Northern Sector to the west with wall I.

---

572 *Kea Excavation Notebook* VIII, p. 127.

573 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, pp. 145 and 141.

574 *Kea Excavation Notebook* XIV, p. 145.
The room was filled with fallen stones, which stopped at an elevation of approximately -0.25 m. From this early stage in the excavation it was obvious that the upper part of the room had never been rebuilt after the destruction that had produced the fallen stones. The soil that was contained in this layer was not uniform. In the upper part, investigated by N18-299, -303, -307, M04-16 and M04-21, it was filled with a “soft” “slightly red brown” soil. The bottom elevation for this layer was +0.34. Below that, the deposits, which were investigated in N18-460, -461, -462, -471, -472, -473, and -474, presented a totally different picture. The soil became very mottled, red and dark. The excavator remarked that it looked like “bits of partially burnt brick. [...] The red earth is scattered all over the room in shapeless patches of varying size, largest oval roughly 0.10 x 0.30 [m, covering] about 1/8 of [the] area.” Based on the proximity of these deposits to the water table, the mottling should probably be attributed to wetting and drying of the soil over time with the changes in the level of the water table.

Units N18-462 and -474 were possibly the interface between post-destruction layers and an occupation surface/layer. There are several indications pointing to this possibility. This is more or less the level at which the loose fallen stones stopped (-0.25). N18-474 revealed the

575 Kea Excavation Notebook VIII, p. 127.
576 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 61.
577 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 61 and 64.
578 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 64.
threshold of the door leading into the room of Tower ne, which stood at an elevation of –0.20.\textsuperscript{579} It is quite possible that the floor was paved with flat stones.\textsuperscript{580} Moreover, the excavator noted the presence of several conical cups and several other sherds suggestive of a destruction deposit/occupation surface.\textsuperscript{581}

Below this conjectured occupation surface the walls of the tower, especially in the NE and NW corners, preserved stones were found projecting into the room, creating a ledge of sorts that is preserved in all four walls of the room, except on a section of the south wall of the tower.\textsuperscript{582} This area (from -0.25/0.20 to -0.59) was investigated with units N18-463, -475, and -476.\textsuperscript{583} The deposit contained many complete and fragmented pots, as well as plaster, which dated to an early phase of period VII (VIIa). The deposit was resting on a different layer starting at -0.59, in which the earth was harder and contained more gravel. This soil between the bottom of the deposit of the fallen stones and the gravel layer was investigated in units N18-463, -464, -465, 466, -467, -477, -478, -481, -511, -513, -516, -518, -520, -521, -523, -525, -526, -527, and -529.\textsuperscript{584} Bedrock was reached at an elevation of -2.10 to -2.05.\textsuperscript{585}

\textsuperscript{579} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{580} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{581} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{582} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 71, and 70.
\textsuperscript{583} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 61, 65, 71, 77, 70, and 93.
\textsuperscript{584} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 65, 70, 93, and 99.
\textsuperscript{585} Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 83 and 99.
When the interior of the tower was cleaned up, the excavator observed that the walls below the ledge (-0.25/0.20) featured projecting stones (especially in the corners of the room) down to an elevation of -1.52 to -1.59, below which, and for 0.50 to 0.70 m, the walls preserved smooth faces and square corners (see below the discussion of the architectural and occupation history of the tower).

When ceramics from the room were examined three combined lots were created, excluding the surface deposits (for specifics on these lots, see Catalogue below). N13CL contained the units from +0.88 to -0.37, which were units N18-299, -303, -307, -460, -461, -462, -471, -473, -474, M04-16, and M04-21. The latest material from this combined lot dates to period VIII. N20CL included material from deposits from -0.37 to -0.66, i.e., units N18-463, -475, and -476; its material is early VII (VIIa with some VI). N24CL included the rest of the deposits to the bedrock investigated in units N18-468, -464, -465, -466, -467, -478, -481, -511, -513, -516, -518, -520, -521, -523, -525, -526, -527, and -529; this lot contains ceramic material that ranges in date from the EBA to Period VI.

587 Kea Excavation Notebook XLVI, pp. 70, 83, 93, and 99.
588 Unit N18-477 was mistakenly combined in N20CL; it belonged with the units that were combined in unit N24CL.
ARCHITECTURAL AND OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY OF TOWER NE

Tower ne was founded on the bedrock during Period VI in deposits that contained pottery from earlier periods (N24 CL). The fact that the walls of the tower are smooth (from -2.10 to -1.59/1.52) indicates that the walls of the tower at this elevation were meant to be seen. Above -1.59/1.52, the walls do not preserve the same smooth appearance, as the stones blocks are projecting into the room creating a ledge. These two zones of differential wall treatment indicate, in my opinion, two architectural phases, both of which date to Period VI. That means that the Period VI builders built the tower and soon after that deemed it necessary to raise the walls of the tower higher and concomitantly the level of the floor. If this supposition holds true, then within this deposit represented by the excavation units combined in N24CL there should have been an occupation surface associated with the first architectural phase, whose traces are now lost.

The occupation surface associated with Period VI probably did not rest directly on the deposit equated with N24CL, but probably on a wooden floor supported by the ledge at an elevation of -0.20/0.25 (which also corresponds to the threshold in wall AM). At the end of Period VI, when the natural disaster struck the site, the tower must not have suffered substantial damage; whatever damage was done to ceramics and other furnishings of the room would have been easily cleaned up, leaving no evidence in the archaeological record.

---

589 Cf., Caskey (1971, p. 371) who suggested that the section with walls made of projecting stones was actually a cellar.

However, the seismic event that struck Ayia Irini at the end of period VIIa resulted in the collapse or destruction of the wooden floor. The cleanup that ensued filled the space that existed between the level of the floor and the surface of the earlier fill (N24CL) with debris associated with occupation dating to the time before the destruction event (N20CL). After the cleaning operation, a new occupation surface was established. This surface was probably paved with flat stones and was used for the remainder of VII and perhaps during period VIII.

At some point during the latter period, the walls of the tower collapsed completely filling up the space of the room with debris (large stones, possibly mudbrick, ceramic and other finds) in a sudden event of deposition (represented by N13CL). The differential coloration of the soil of this deposit should be attributed to the proximity of the lower part of the deposit to the water table, of which contributed to its mottled appearance. The two units that explored the bottom of this deposit, N18-462 and -474, represent the destruction deposit and should probably have been kept separate. Schofield thought that this floor should have dated to Period VII late (VIIb), but unfortunately the two crucial units have been combined with the ceramic material from the rest of the deposit into N13CL.

The last chapter in the life history of the tower happened some time during of end of the 4th century B.C. The surface units over the tower consisted of a large deposit of large stones mixed with pottery ranging from the Geometric period (few specimens) to the early Hellenistic period that spread over the tower and the area north and northwest of it represented by N15CL.

Kathryn Butt, who has studied and published this deposit, has suggested that it has ritual character and originated from a shrine probably established in the area of the tower (perhaps associated with its ruins).\textsuperscript{592} Another episode of collapse of the ruined tower probably led to the discarding or deposition of the pottery combined in N15CL (see also the discussion of N15CL below).

**N15CL**

The surface units (N18-135 and M-14) in the area of Tower ne were incorporated into combined lot N15CL (Table 75).\textsuperscript{593} This lot represents a deposit that was spread over the area of the tower, as well as to the north and northwest of it, and was dumped there at some point near the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. The deposit has been published by Kathryn Butt,\textsuperscript{594} and thus its contents will only briefly be summarized here.

In this area, the blocks fallen off the north wall of the tower were mixed with a deposit of Archaic and Classical pottery (with a few fragments of Geometric style) that was mixed with both smaller quantities of earlier pottery (LH IIIA) and later (Late Roman/Byzantine, from the use of the lime kiln that existed at the corner made by walls I and K).\textsuperscript{595} In areas, the deposit was

\textsuperscript{592} Butt 1977.
\textsuperscript{593} Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook U, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{594} Butt 1977.
\textsuperscript{595} Butt 1977, p. 299.
as thick as 50 cm. and had infiltrated among the blocks. After sorting and discarding the deposit, “three-and-a-half tinfuls of Greek pottery have been kept. Of this amount 85% by volume was of fine and glazed wares. Fragments of at least 300 vases were present.”\textsuperscript{596} The shapes of the pottery showed a concentration of drinking wares, with few large closed and open vessels,\textsuperscript{597} whereas some of the specimens bore graffiti.\textsuperscript{598} The overwhelming majority of the vessels were imported from Attica, Siphnos, Corinth, and other places, and very few specimens composed of the local fabric were recovered. The chronological range indicated by the deposit spans the Geometric to the Hellenistic period. Butt notes that two-thirds of the deposit dated to the last quarter of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century, and one-third to the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries B.C. Moreover, “after 500 B.C. Siphnian pottery is replaced by Attic and Corinthian products, which are equally represented in the assemblage, until the end of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century when the Corinthian pottery is completely supplanted by the Attic products.”\textsuperscript{599}

\textsuperscript{596} Butt 1977, pp. 299-300.

\textsuperscript{597} Butt (1977) records the following shapes:

- Attic (8\% of the glazed wares): skyphoi (of Corinthian type, of Attic type A, and cup skyphoi), kylakes, bolsal, amphora (type I), kraters, oinochoai.
- Corinthian (12\% of the glazed wares): kotylaí, a black-glazed saucer and a miniature column krater.
- Siphnian (70\% of the glazed wares): skyphoi, mugs (group 1), kylix, kantharos, oinochoe.
- Other fine wares: mugs (group 2) and miscellaneous other.
- Household types: drinking vessels, jugs, large closed vessels, lekanai.
- Coarse Ware: 15\% of the pottery saved, of which few pieces were informative: amphoras (in many different fabrics), a beehive, and a pithos.

\textsuperscript{598} Butt 1977, p. 310.

\textsuperscript{599} Butt 1977, pp. 312-313.
Contrary to Caskey’s original suggestion, which was that the deposit had been rejected from the Temple area during a cleaning operation, Butt remarked that the pottery of the deposit seemed to be remarkably similar (in range of shapes, degree of wear, and presence of graffiti) and appears to be contemporary with the deposits of the Temple, and is thus unlikely to have originated from the Temple. Moreover, the fact that the deposit was over and among the fallen blocks of the tower suggests that a rather short period of time elapsed between the collapse of the blocks and the deposition of the pottery. Thus, Butt conjectures the presence of yet another shrine of sorts in (or in the wider area of) Tower ne, whose traces might not have been recovered due to the widespread disturbance of the area.

The small finds that accompanied the pottery were: “of bronze, an illegible coin, and of iron, pieces of five or more spikes and a lump (none inventoried), of terracotta,” and an unglazed four-sided pyramid votive of rather coarse clay (K3.593) which can probably be dated to the 6th and 5th centuries B.C.

N13CL

N13CL (Tables 68-69, and 75) combines a series of lots that investigated the deposits from +0.90/0.88 to -0.37/0.17 in Tower ne. The original quantity of this lot was 4.1 tins of

600 Caskey 1968, p. 389.
602 Butt 1977, p. 310.
pottery. 62% of the ceramic material was discarded, including ninety-eight conical cups and several sherds with rope pattern decoration.\textsuperscript{603} The bulk of the ceramics are dated to Period VIII. The lot is rather scrappy to represent a destruction deposit. There is some earlier material, such as one fragment of Grey Minyan, one fragment of Mainland Polychrome, as well as some Period VII specimens (Fig. 86 and 87). The two lots that would have represented the destruction deposit (N18-462 and -474) have unfortunately been combined in this lot, so it is not possible to say much about the destruction deposit itself. From the recorded numbers of the discarded conical cups, a swelling in the numbers can be observed in the lower units of this combined lot, especially in the southern part of the tower.

\textsuperscript{603} Kittredge, n.d., Pottery Notebook D, p. 126.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N19-146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+0.90</td>
<td>XIV.157</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-299</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N +0.88, S +0.80</td>
<td>VIII.127</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M04-016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E +0.95</td>
<td>XIV.141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposits over Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-303</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N +0.64</td>
<td>VIII.127</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M04-021</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>E +0.95</td>
<td>XIV.141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposits over Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-307</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N +0.50</td>
<td>VIII.127</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-460</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N +0.50, S +0.36</td>
<td>XLVI.061</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-471</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NE +0.37, SE +0.35, SW +0.33, NW +0.33</td>
<td>XLVI.064</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Tower ne (south part)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-461</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E -0.16, W +0.08</td>
<td>XLVI.061</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-472B</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>NE +0.12, SW +0.11, NW +0.10</td>
<td>XLVI.064</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tower ne (south part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-473</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>-0.08, -0.08, -0.09, -0.07</td>
<td>XLVI.071</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tower ne (south part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-462</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E -0.21</td>
<td>XLVI.061</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Tower ne (north part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-474</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NE -0.28, SE -0.23, SW -0.18, NW -0.17</td>
<td>XLVI.071</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tower ne (south part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 68: Original excavation units contained in N13CL.
Kea Inventory No | Original unit | Shape | Material |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
K.3796 | Marked Base | Clay |
K8.460 | 474 | fragment of stand | Clay |
K7.422 | 461 | Ribbon | Bronze |
K8.460 | 474 | Fragment of stand | Terracotta |
K8.369 | 471 | Loomweight | Terracotta |

Table 69: N13CL small finds.

**N13CL Catalogue**

**217** Alabastron, squat (N13-18). Fig. 86
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6-6/6 with 10YR 7/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4; Slip 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR 3/2) paint. Band on the rim inside and out; outside below band another thinner line. On shoulder rows of dots and blob (perhaps rock pattern?). Lower on body two (or more bands). On base underneath linear pattern of crossing lines (?).
Period VII (LH IIA)

**218** Alabastron, squat (N13-15). Fig. 86
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, silver mica, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/4-7/4; Surface 2.5Y 8/4-7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/2) paint. Rock pattern outlined by row of dots; stroke on handle; three horizontal concentric lines on the base; another two on lower body and above them a thicker band. Band on rim inside and out.
Period VIII

**219** Alabastron (?) (N13-46). Fig. 86
Body sherd. Max. H. 4.2; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6-5/8) paint. Vertical band and part of other motif.
Period VIII

220 Alabastron (?) (N13-55). Fig. 86
Body sherd with handle stump. Max. H. 2.7; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.
Uncertain. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5YR 7/6-6/6 with 10YR 7/4; Surface 5YR 7/6.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 4/3) paint. Stroke on the handle and quirks; stem of a floral motif (?).
Period VIII

221 Kylix or goblet (N13-22). Fig. 87
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-6/4; Surface 10YR 7/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 5/6) paint. Two bands on lower body (close to the foot attachment). Three thin lines higher; over them trace of motif probably spiral. Stroke on handle attachment.
Period VIII (LH IIIA1)

222 Kylix or goblet (N13-23). Fig. 87
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 5YR 7/6 (light) with 10YR 7/4; Surface 10YR 8/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5YR 4/3) paint. Band on rim inside and out, upright lily with short stems (part).
Period VIII (LH IIIA1)

223 Kylix or goblet (N13-24). Fig. 87
Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.3.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 8/4-7/4; Surface 10YR 8/4.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (7.5YR 3/1) paint. Horizontal band and over it running spiral.
Period VIII (LH IIIA1)

224 Kylix or goblet (N13-25). Fig. 87
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, dark gray-purplish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3-6/3 with 7.5YR 7/2-6/2; Surface 10YR 7/3-6/3. Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Horizontal band on rim inside and out and running spiral. Period VIII (LH IIIA1)

N20CL

N20CL (Tables 70, 71, and 75) combines three lots which represent the deposits from -0.37/0.17 to -0.64/0.69 in Tower ne. Originally, the excavator had included a fourth lot, N18-477, which should not have been included in N20CL, since it probably belongs with N24CL. The original quantity of the combined lot (without N18-477) was 1.375 tins and contained 90% coarse wares. 86% of the ceramic material was discarded, including thirty-six conical cups, and six tripod legs. Only one-fifth of a tin survives today.

The lot is very scrappy and does not represent a destruction deposit. It contains an amount of Grey Minyan (most of which probably comes from Aegina), Polychrome Matt Painted, some fragments from Aeginetan amphoras or hydrias, and one fragment of Minoan oatmeal fabric (Fig. 88). Most of the ceramics date to Period VI (e.g., N20-34 and -41), except a cup (N20-39) which is to be dated to an early phase of Period VII.

Table 70: Original excavation units contained in N20CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N18-463</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>XLVI.065</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-475</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>NE -0.33, SE -0.34, NW -0.34</td>
<td>XLVI.071</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-476</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>NE -0.41, SE -0.53, NW -0.49</td>
<td>XLVI.077</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71: N20CL small finds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kea Inventory No</th>
<th>Original lot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K8.421</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Bronze knife</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.424</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Bronze object</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.404</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>Boar’s tusk plaque</td>
<td>Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.403</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Stone bowl fragment</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.342</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Stone spheroid</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.362</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.365</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8.367</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Loomweight</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N20CL Catalogue**

225 Closed vessel (N20-34). Fig. 88
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray, gray bluish, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 6/6 with 7.5YR 6/4-5/4; Surface 7.5YR 6/6.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with matt (5YR 3/2 and 7.5YR 6/4-6/6) paint. Band horizontal, and two vertical lines over the horizontal triangles.
Period VI
Chapter 3

226 Closed vessel (N20-41). Fig. 88
Body sherd. Max. H. 5.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 3.7.
Minoan. Fine clay with dark gray, light brown, dark gray-purplish, and grog inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4-7/6; Surface 10YR 8/4-7/4.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (10YR 3/1) paint. Band and ripple above it. Period VI

227 Cup (N20-39). Fig. 88
Base and lower body Base Diam. 4.2; Max. H. 4.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 11.5.
Mainland - Painted. Fine clay with calcareous, red brown, and dark gray inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3-7/3.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (2.5Y 2.5/1) paint. Band on base, double axes and dotted vertical lines.
Period VII (LH IIA)

N24CL

This lot (see Tables 72, 73, and 75) has combined units that represent the deposit from -0.64/0.69 to bedrock, which was located at -2.09/2.10 in Tower ne. Units N18-467, -507, and 531 have been combined in this lot mistakenly, since these units examined modern fills and earth fallen from the banks of the trench. The original quantity of ceramics included in the lot was 12.7 tins, of which 90% was discarded, including 457 conical cups.605

The lot contains a mixture of ceramics dating from the EBA (e.g., sauceboat rims and rim sherd of coarse ware vessels with rope pattern decoration and incised lugs and MBA (MM light-

on-dark sherds) to Period VI (e.g., Mainland Polychrome of Aeginetan provenience, one Minoan sherd with ripple decoration), which is the terminus ante quem for this deposit (Figs. 89 and 90).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Unit no</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Starting Elevation</th>
<th>Excavation Notebook Reference</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Percentage Discarded</th>
<th>Area of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N18-468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.65</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne (earth fallen from bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.93</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Tower ne (last summer's fill. No significant stratification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne (earth fallen from bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-464</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>XLVI.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-465</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>XLVI.65</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-477</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>E -0.56, W -0.57</td>
<td>XLVI.071</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-478</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>E -0.69, W -0.66</td>
<td>XLVI.70</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-466</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>XLVI.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-511</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E 1.25, N -0.82, S -0.79</td>
<td>XLVI.93</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-513</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N -0.90, S -0.92</td>
<td>XLVI.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-467</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>E -0.97, W -1.02</td>
<td>XLVI.65</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-469</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>XLVI.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-516</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N -1.06, S -1.11</td>
<td>XLVI.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-518</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N -1.21, S -1.23</td>
<td>XLVI.93</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-481</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N 1.50, S -1.65</td>
<td>XLVI.70</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-520</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N -1.35, S -1.39</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-521</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N -1.52, S -1.59</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-523A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N -1.72, S -1.65</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-525</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N -1.81, S -1.77</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-527</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N -1.96, S -1.83</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tower ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18-529</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N -2.03, S -1.95</td>
<td>XLVI.99</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Tower ne (from 1.40 south of wall AN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6875</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 72: Original excavation units contained in N24CL.
N24CL Catalogue

228 Cut away jug (N24-37). Fig. 90.
95% preserved, restored. Round handle; small abrupt convex base
H. 28.4; Rim Diam. 10.6; Max. Diam. 25.4; Base Diam. 6.7.
Aeginetan Polychrome. Medium fine greenish-yellowish buff clay.
Decorated with matt paint. Band inside and out at lip and cut-away neck; circle around stump of
handle; on shoulder and upper part of belly large horizontal double quirks, spreading triple or
double vertical lines, and pairs of wriggles.
Published in Caskey 1971, plate 70e.
Period VI

229 Open vessel (N24-23). Fig. 89
Half of base and lower body. Base Diam. 7.5; Max. H. 6; Max. Pres. Dim. 13.1.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with light brown, dark gray, white-light brown, gray bluish, and
vegetable temper inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3-7/4; Surface 10YR 7/3-7/4.
Wiped exterior surface. Decorated with matt (2.5Y 4/1 and 10R 4/3) paint. Band on base (black)
and another immediately adjacent to it in red (?) Above the band spirals. Base underneath two
parallel lines along the diameter. Band on the base inside.
Period VI

230 Krater (N24-24). Fig. 89
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with gray, calcareous, dark gray (shiny), vegetable temper, and
gold mica inclusions; Core 10YR 7/3; Surface 7.5YR 7/6; Slip 10YR 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (10YR 5/1) paint. Band on rim and underneath, trace of wavy line.  
Period VI

**231** Cup (N24-28). Fig. 89  
Base and lower body sherd. Base Diam. 6; Max. H. 2.8; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.3.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with dark gray-purplish, dark gray, light gray, vegetable temper, and gold mica inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/4; Surface 7.5YR 7/4; Slip 2.5Y 8/3.
Smoothed exterior surface. Decorated with matt (7.5YR 2.5/1-3/1) paint. Band on base, and ripple.  
Period VI

**232** Carinated cup with everted rim (N24-30). Fig. 89  
Rim sherd. Max. H. 3.5; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.8.
Aeginetan - Painted. Medium fine clay with dark gray and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/3; Surface 2.5Y 8/3.
Burnished exterior surface. Decorated with (10YR 4/1) paint. A band of two lines with a diagonal in between them, under the rim and another band under the carination. Vertical lines on rim.  
Period VI

**233** Krater or cup (N24-35). Fig. 89  
Body sherd with rim (flat). Est. Rim Diam. 16; Max. H. 3.4; Max. Pres. Dim. 4.2.
Aeginetan - Painted. Fine clay with off-white, calcareous, dark gray, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 2.5Y 8/2; Surface 2.5Y 8/3.
Period VI

**234** Open vessel (N24-75). Fig. 89  
Body sherd. Max. H. 3; Max. Pres. Dim. 5.8.
Minoan?. Fine clay with dark gray, off-white, gray, red brown, and vegetable temper inclusions; Core 7.5YR 7/3-6/3; Surface 7.5YR 7/3-6/3.
Polished exterior surface. Decorated with lustrous (5YR2.5/1) paint. Ripple and band underneath.  
Period VI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comb. Lot no</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Earliest date</th>
<th>Latest date</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Type of deposit</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Coarse Disc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N01CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>Few intrusive VI and VII sherds</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>? (&gt;44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor under the period V floor</td>
<td>Few intrusive VI sherds</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>? (&gt;39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03CL</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>Only one possible later fragment of a goblet or kylix</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N04CL</td>
<td>MH to Archaic/Classical, but mainly VI and VII</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>Mostly VI and VII</td>
<td>Mixed deposit: fill deposit preserving remnants of a transitional VI-VII deposit</td>
<td>Three black glazed sherds show that the deposit has been slightly disturbed during the classical period</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N05CL</td>
<td>MBA to VI</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N06CL</td>
<td>EBA, MBA to VI</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit (mostly?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N07CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>Few intrusive VIII sherds</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>&gt;44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N08CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>Few intrusive VI sherds</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N09CL</td>
<td>VI to early VIIa (LH IA)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>Mostly VI and VIIa</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Few intrusive VIII sherds</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fill deposit below Period VI floor</td>
<td>Few intrusive VI sherds</td>
<td>&gt;6.1</td>
<td>&gt;76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11CL</td>
<td>EBA to V</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12CL</td>
<td>EBA to Classical</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>VI and mostly VIIb</td>
<td>Mixed deposit with remnants of Period VII floor deposit</td>
<td>Substantial disturbance as a result of the road building activities in the area</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74: Combined lots N01CL to N12CL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comb. Lot no</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Earliest date</th>
<th>Latest date</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Type of deposit</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Coarse</th>
<th>Disc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N13CL</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15CL</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16CL</td>
<td>EBA to the Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Substantial disturbance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17CL</td>
<td>EBA to Modern</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>VI and VII</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>Substantial disturbance</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18CL</td>
<td>Mostly VI to Modern</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>VI and VII</td>
<td>Fill deposit - replacement after the removal of the wall</td>
<td>Substantial disturbance as a result of the removal of the fortification wall in the Late Roman/Byzantine period as well as modern activities</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19CL</td>
<td>EBA to VI/early VIIa</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Disturbance in the early VIIa</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20CL</td>
<td>VI to early VII (VIIa)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Disturbance in the early VIIa</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21CL</td>
<td>Late phase of period VII (LH IIb)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIIb</td>
<td>VIIb</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22CL</td>
<td>Early phase of Period VII (VIIa/LM IIB)</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23CL</td>
<td>V and VII</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>Fill deposit below the early Period VII floor with a few remnants of the earlier floor deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N24CL</td>
<td>EBA to VI</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 75: Combined lots N13CL to N24CL.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comb. Lot no</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Earliest date</th>
<th>Latest date</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Type of deposit</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Original Volume</th>
<th>Coarse</th>
<th>Disc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N27CL</td>
<td>VII to Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>Disturbance in the Late Roman/Byzantine period</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N28CL</td>
<td>EBA to Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>VII/VIII</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>Disturbance in the Late Roman/Byzantine period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N42CL</td>
<td>EBA to Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>Disturbance in the Late Roman/Byzantine period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N43CL</td>
<td>VI to Classical</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Disturbance in modern times (machine slugs)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N44CL</td>
<td>EBA to VIII</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>Disturbance in modern times (machine slugs)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N45CL</td>
<td>Very early phase of VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>VI and VIIa</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N47CL</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N48CL</td>
<td>VII (LC II)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIIb</td>
<td>VIIb</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N51CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N53CL</td>
<td>IV to Classical</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Archaic/Classical</td>
<td>IV and V</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>Disturbance during the Archaic/Classical period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N54CL</td>
<td>EBA to V</td>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N55CL</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN1CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN2CL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Floor deposit</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN6CL</td>
<td>Very early phase of VII</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VIIa</td>
<td>VI and VIIa</td>
<td>Fill deposit</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 76: Combined lots N27CL to NN6CL.
CHAPTER 4: SYNTHESIS

In the beginning of her pottery notebook that includes material from the Northern Sector, Elizabeth Schofield had scribbled a note to whomever reviewed her lot descriptions. The note said, “Treatment of individual pottery lots is intentionally selective. Somebody, someday, should attempt detailed analyses.” 606 More than 20 years later this dissertation offers an attempt to carry out her recommendation for the Northern Sector – a study of the stratigraphy of that area of Ayia Irini in its entirety, neither differentiating nor giving precedence to deposits of a specific period, and providing a clear understanding of the history of this part of the site.

The study and presentation of the deposits of the Northern Sector, which is the primary goal of this dissertation, advance the publication program for the site set by Caskey, making available one of the specific areas that he had portioned out to his students and colleagues as an intended volume. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Caskey’s publication program for Ayia Irini during its main periods of occupation included a stratigraphic contribution for every sector of the site that would later be supplemented by a detailed analysis of the pottery of each period and of the finds in various typological categories. 607 The only area currently published according to this

607 Each area/major building was supposed to be published in a stratigraphic volume covering Periods V-VIII (as appropriate to that area), and then Period volumes discussing the pottery from the whole site for a particular period were supposed to be produced (of which Jack Davis’ Period V volume is the only one from the ‘main’
strategy is House A; the 1984 volume presents the stratigraphy of this building, though detailed analyses of the pottery and the finds were relegated to supplemental volumes that were to appear at a later time (but for the most part have not to date). The study of the Northern Sector, therefore, continues one of the most significant publication programs in Aegean archaeology and constitutes one more step towards the full publication of the site. In essence, the present dissertation fills the gap in our knowledge for this part of the site, a gap that both Caskey and Elizabeth Schofield tried ardently to fill by aiding and promoting the study and presentation of the deposits.

The publication of the Northern Sector is important for an additional reason: it presents deposits of Period VI and VII (and one of Period VIII) and is a cornerstone in filling the lacuna in our knowledge about life at the site and in the Cyclades during the early Late Bronze Age (LH I, LH II/LMIA, and LMIA). The early periods of the site are known relatively well since the deposits from the EBA and the MBA have been published in considerable detail; however, later deposits have not yet received similar treatment. Even the publication of House A, which periods of the site to have been completed). The earlier strata (I-III, and IV) were being handled separately, since there was little or no continuity of architecture between them and the V-VIII constructions.

608 Keos X: The Western Sector, in a format similar to Keos III: House A, is forthcoming.

609 For the ceramics in the deposits of Periods I-III, see Keos IX, Part 1; the publication of the architecture and stratigraphy is still pending. As for Period IV, John Overbeck’s published volume (Keos VII, Part 1) has the stratigraphy and architecture from Period IV, but only brief descriptions of the pottery, which are soon to be published in detail as Keos VII, Part 2.
harbored deposits that date to Periods VI and VII, illustrates a very selective sample of diagnostic and complete vessels, “principally those which have an obvious bearing on questions of chronology,” and de-emphasizing the context pottery. In this dissertation, deposits are presented in full detail.

In the section that follows I offer a diachronic discussion of the Northern Sector, which condenses the stratigraphic descriptions from Chapter 3 into a concise history of this part of the site of Ayia Irini. I offer an account of the creation of the archaeological site in this part of Ayia Irini, which started with the first traces of cultural activity in the general area of the Northern Sector and was finally completed with Caskey’s excavation.

Even though, by its research design, this dissertation has not dealt with finding the “people” in the archaeological record, it nevertheless makes it possible to start looking for them. Thus, I offer here a very short and preliminary discussion of the finds and what they reveal about the people who lived in the Northern Sector.

Finally, in the second part of this chapter, I assess the impact of the excavation “processes” on the body of archaeological material produced by the excavation at Ayia Irini.

THE CREATION OF THE NORTHERN SECTOR

The Northern Sector (Fig. 7) became part of the site of Ayia Irini through its inclusion within the fortification system during Period V (see Table 1). Prior to Period V, cultural activity

in the area of the Northern Sector is attested by the presence of earlier ceramic material (such as fragments of sauceboats, talc ware, coarse ware with rope pattern decoration) mixed in with later deposits. For example, ceramic material dating to Periods II and III was found mixed with material from Period IV and sealed under a Period V floor and its associated fill. In general, according to excavation records, the deposits containing earlier material (i.e., earlier than Period V) were often associated with a reddish soil covering the bedrock.

In Period V the construction of the Great Fortifications and the rooms adjacent to them (Fig. 7) indicate an intensification in the degree of use of the Northern Sector. The extant plan of the defensive system was constructed in two phases. During the first phase, the earliest circuit of the fortification wall had an indented appearance. Rooms N.1 through N.4 (Fig. 10) projected slightly to the north in relation to the conjectured north face of Tower nw, whereas the north face of rooms N.11, N.12, N.13, and N.15 were set back even further to the south (Fig. 7).

Not long after the completion of the fortification wall, but still during Period V, the inhabitants of Ayia Irini implemented an addition to the earliest circuit. This was an L-shaped addition, room N.5 (Fig. 20), which transformed the previously indented appearance of the earlier circuit to an almost straight, uniform north face. Structural stability and/or defensive


612 This correlation is indeed a very interesting issue. Even though the following suggestion is far from certain, nevertheless I think that the reddish soil was the original soil matrix of the area.
considerations might have contributed to this addition, as well as to the subsequent alterations made to the circuit wall.

Remains of Period V are abundant in the Northern Sector. As Fig. 1 illustrates, the remains of Period V are by far the most frequently preserved; there are fill deposits as well as floor deposits containing a large number of complete or nearly complete pots. The floors of the Northern Sector and the elevations at which these stood indicate that the whole structure, after it was completed, must have presented a stepped appearance. This stepped appearance is to be attributed to the presence of the rocky ridge or spine on top of which the structures of the Northern Sector were founded. In the area of the Northern Sector the rocky ridge itself preserves three “shelves.” The main shelf probably supported floors at elevations from +2.74 to +2.93 and acted as the foundation for rooms N.1 through N.4, N.7 through N.9, and N.14 (and probably also N.13, although later activities in the room obliterated the deposits belonging to Period V). Immediately to the north of this was another “shelf” supporting the floor of room N.5 at an elevation of +1.93. Finally, a third “shelf” (to the east of the second and north of the main shelf) supported room N.15 at an elevation of +1.50-1.75. Unless the builders compensated for the differences in elevation by constructing taller walls for the rooms sitting on the shelves of lower elevations, the fortifications would have had a stepped appearance in their roof-line as well as an indented appearance in their original façade.

613 Caskey 1971, pp. 362-363 and fig. 4.
This stepped appearance would have been accentuated even more by the presence of upper floors, which are certain above at least two groups of rooms, namely the suite of rooms N.1 through N.4, and room N.15. The upper floors would have been accessed either by removable ladders through openings in the ceiling of the ground-story rooms, or by a permanent staircase, evidenced by rooms N.11 and N.12.

The architectural plan of the area during Period V would have been more or less the same as that in the LBA. In the case of room N.12, excavation showed that earlier walls existed under the walls of the Period VII room, which preserved the format of the earlier plan. The same can be seen in the case of the suite of rooms N.7 through N.9; here, the exterior walls of the Period V suite were preserved and alterations in the interior dividing walls transformed the space from a three-room complex into a two-room group.

The rooms that preserve remains of Period V show that the inhabitants of the Northern Sector during this period occupied themselves with the manufacture of products, such as cloth and pottery, documented by the presence of loomweights and potter’s wheels. They were also very well connected with the rest of the Aegean world. Figure 92 shows that among the remaining ceramic material in the combined lots several classes of imported material are represented. Minoan material is definitely the most frequently represented in this period, followed by Mainland and Melian material.
The end of Period V is marked by a destruction that can be attributed to an earthquake. As Davis notes, the fortifications themselves were severely damaged not long after the completion of the building since “a block fallen from the fortification wall was buried in a stratum of pottery similar in style to that from deposits associated with its construction.”

Period VI, defined ceramically by the importation of LM IA pottery, is not as well represented in the Northern Sector in terms of floor deposits (see, Fig. 1). On the main “shelf” only one floor level in room N.13 was detected during excavation (N03CL). Apart from this, fill deposits in the eastern part of the site, i.e., room N.6 and Tower ne, represent the activities of the Ayia Irini inhabitants during Period VI. There is relative certainty that the floor deposits were completely removed in an extensive clearing of the rooms following the destruction at the end of Period VI (also attributed to an earthquake).

Even though abundance of indisputable evidence pertaining to floors and fill deposits is lacking, it is nevertheless certain that Period VI was very significant for the Northern Sector. This is the period during which the inhabitants of Ayia Irini executed more additions to the defensive system, consisting of room N.6 and the Tower ne complex (Figs. 32 and 47).

Room N.6 was an L-shaped addition to the northeast corner of the fortification wall just east of room N.5; it probably improved the stability and defensive capabilities of the corner.

---

615 Davis 1986, p. 1.
616 Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 32.
However, in the case of the Tower ne complex, a more ambitious project was affected. This project entailed the addition of a long corridor, room N.16 (probably a sloping ramp), running east from the former eastern façade of the fortification wall and ending on the east with a rectangular tower protruding still further to the east as well as to the north.

The scarcity of floor deposits (or fill deposits that are not contaminated) makes the reconstruction of the life of the inhabitants of the Northern Sector during Period VI a rather difficult task. If the deposits present a reliable picture of the area’s connection to the rest of the Aegean world, the ceramic material shows that during this period the Northern Sector was receiving more ceramic imports from the Mainland and Aegina than from Minoan Crete or the rest of the Cyclades (Fig. 93). This is rather interesting, since Period VI is considered the period when Cretan cultural dominance over the entire Aegean was at its peak. Among the activities that occurred in the Northern Sector, cloth production seems to have continued to be practiced, as suggested by loomweights, spindle whorls, and spools (though in small quantities). Moreover, the presence of a worked antler may indicate lithic production or leather working was also carried out; however, there is no other evidence apart from the worked antler for such activities.

Archaeological remains belonging to Period VII, characterized by the presence of LM IB and LH II imports, are also underrepresented in the Northern Sector. In all likelihood, most rooms of the Northern Sector were occupied during this period. The rooms of the main “shelf” preserve deposits (and/or indications) of Period VII (rooms N.7 through N.9, N.11 and N.12, N.14, and Tower ne). The area of the Period VI addition also preserves Period VII deposits and/or floors.

There are clear indications that the Period VII deposits of the Northern Sector, as well as those of the succeeding periods, have suffered extensively since they were the most vulnerable to
denudation, disturbance, and stone robbing. This is very clear in the case of room N.13 where the
Period VII deposits are actually missing, leaving only the threshold between N.13 and N.14
(dated to Period VII) as a witness to their previous existence. Similarly, the Period VII deposits
overlying rooms N.1 through N.6 have also been obliterated by later activities and natural
processes, leaving behind traces (e.g., the case of mixed lot N19CL) which demonstrate that the
status of the residents was high enough for them to be the recipients of high quality imported
goods; not coincidentally, these rooms with scant remains from Period VII are located on the
highest shelf of the bedrock, and their denudation is evidence that floor levels continued to
follow the contours of the natural ridge. These rooms were part of the first floor of the complex,
a complex made even taller with a second floor as indicated by the existence of a staircase in
rooms N.11 and N.12.

Two distinct phases are attested during Period VII in the Northern Sector (Periods VIIa
and VIIb). The first phase, Period VIIa, is characterized by deposits that contain Period VI
ceramics and pottery that dates to an early phase of Period VII (LH IIA/LM IB). These deposits
are located in rooms N.5 (N19CL), N.7-N.9 (N09CL), N.10 (N22CL and N23CL), N.11 and
N.12 (N45CL), N.14 (NN6CL), and Tower ne (N20CL). Most are fill deposits with only one
floor deposit (N45CL). The provenience distribution of the deposits indicates that the pattern
seen in Period VI persists in Period VII, and especially the early phase of VII (Fig. 94). Mainland
ceramics are by far the largest imported category of ceramics, with Aeginetan and Melian pottery
prevailing over Minoan; the predominance of Mainland over Minoan imports appears to have been in accordance with the estimated proportions of imported wares in other deposits from Ayia Irini during this period.\textsuperscript{617} In terms of activities during this period, the small finds (loomweights and spindle whorls) indicate that cloth production continued to be one of the manufacturing activities in the sector; in addition, lead weights and Linear A inscriptions show that the Northern Sector was a seat of economic activity that was equipped with the capacity to administer their products independently as well as to produce goods.\textsuperscript{618}

The second phase, Period VIIb, dates to a late phase of Period VII and is characterized by deposits including some LH IIB ceramics. These deposits are located in rooms N.10 (N21CL) and N.16 (N12CL and N48CL), and only one of them is a floor deposit (N48CL).\textsuperscript{619} In this phase, the pattern of imported wares from the previous period persists largely unchanged, except that Melian imports are now non-existent, at least in the extant deposits of the Northern Sector (Fig. 95) The activities represented in the small finds of these deposits are again similar in their range to Period VIIa.

Most of the floor features of all periods in the Northern Sector, except in very rare cases (such as N.13), have been conjectured based on archaeological features, such as thresholds, or

\textsuperscript{617} Milburn 1965, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{618} See Michailidou 1999.

\textsuperscript{619} Unfortunately, N48CL was a very small portion of the floor deposit and N45CL was a sounding which has been compromised by the combination process; see Chapter 3.
the deposits themselves. Floor deposits have been excavated in a few cases. One possible explanation for the lack of readily definable floor features has been put forth by Schofield and Cummer in the publication of House A.\textsuperscript{620} They suggested that wooden floors were used, which could have overlain earlier deposits that had not been cleared after a destruction event. Even though no supporting holes in the walls of the Northern Sector have been noted in the course of the excavation (except in Tower ne), the possibility of similar wooden floors should not be ruled out.\textsuperscript{621}

The later periods, i.e., Period VIII, Archaic/Classical, and Late Roman/Byzantine, are also underrepresented within the confines of the fortification wall because of erosion and post-depositional processes. Deposits of Period VIII have been noted in the area of Tower ne, and especially outside of the fortification wall north of both the tower and room N.16. Even though the area outside the fortification wall has not been treated in the present dissertation, it will suffice to say here that it served as a dump hosting refuse from the activities of the site during Period VIII. Similarly, there was an Archaic/Classical deposit/dump to the north and east of Tower ne.\textsuperscript{622}

Remains of the Late/Roman Byzantine period, characterized by the presence of combed wares, were found in deposits associated with the dismantling of the fortification wall, as in the

\textsuperscript{620} Cummer and Schofield 1984, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{621} The examination of the architecture is a separate project entrusted to Rodney Fitzsimons.

\textsuperscript{622} For this deposit, see N15CL below.
cases of wall N in room N.5 and Tower nw. A limekiln in the area outside the fortification wall to the east of room N.15 and north of N.16 (Fig. 5) (not treated in this dissertation) explains the dismantling of the wall; it had become a source of convenient stone material for the operators of the kiln.

Finally, the creation of the Northern Sector was completed by the modern intervention for the construction of the road at the beginning of the 20th century, and of course the excavation itself, which is discussed in the following section.

**NORTHERN SECTOR IN SUMMARY**

The Northern Sector (Fig. 7) was a peripheral area, located on the fringes of the town with its buildings abutting the fortification wall to the north. Its very location suggests that this was not an area inhabited by the ruling elite of the town, and was probably reserved, apart from habitation, for commercial and industrial uses, and in some cases for religious purposes.

The functions of the rooms of the Northern Sector, which would contribute to a reconstruction of the life of the site, cannot be determined with certainty. The nature of the deposits, which are mostly fills, poses one set of difficulties. Very few floor deposits (see Tables 74-76) were preserved intact to indicate the activities in each room. Moreover, in the cases where remains of floor deposits were recovered, those floor deposits have been merged with the fill above or below the floor in a single combined lot. Nevertheless, it is fairly reasonable to assume that the rooms that are today visible in the site plan (Fig. 5), especially the ones right up against the fortification wall, were spaces dedicated to storage and industry, whereas domestic quarters, if any, would have been located on the upper storey.
The only elite architectural marker preserved within the Northern Sector is the colored plaster bearing decoration that was found in several rooms, including room N.3 (in Period V levels), and rooms N.14, N.16, and the Northeast Bastion that date to Period VII. It is quite possible, however, that there were other features that have become undetectable due to post-depositional processes that have severely impacted the area.

There are few small finds of value from the Northern Sector; this is unsurprising, because, as previously mentioned, most of the deposits are fills. Even in the case of floor deposits, the residents would have removed the valuable material by sifting through the debris. Nevertheless, there are a few luxury goods (mostly from mixed deposits), such as a bronze bracelet (N16CL), a bronze vessel (N16CL), a gem stone (N18CL), a carnelian bead (N27CL), an incised seal or bead (N28CL), and a boar’s tusk plaque (N20CL). The most numerous of the small finds are, of course, the loomweights, obsidian, and spindle whorls, followed by bronze artifacts, stone lids, lead weights and other artifacts, as well as other finds in diminishing numbers. Among the industries for which there is evidence in the Northern Sector should be mentioned weaving (indicated by the presence of loomweights and spindle whorls), metalworking (indicated by the presence of at least one crucible fragment (dated to Period V), tuyeres, as well as a number bronze objects), and pottery making (Period V). Even though the presence of a prehistoric kiln and/or workshop installation has not been ascertained in and/or near the Northern Sector, the presence of potter’s wheels corroborates the last assertion. It should
be noted that four of the seven potter’s wheels that have been found at Ayia Irini were discovered in the Northern Sector, an indication perhaps that this was the potter’s quarter, at least in Period V.623

Finally, despite its peripheral nature, the Northern Sector presents the same range of imports as House A, indicating that the Northern Sector had unrestricted access to the same categories of imported materials, either directly or indirectly through local exchange.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTICE AND THE CREATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

In recent literature reviewing the status of archaeology in the Cyclades, it has been noted that the current explosion of research has accorded researchers a significant amount of data from Aegean sites for comparative examination of the evolution of material culture, as well as (to an extent) of the communities themselves.624 However, the problem of methodology arises in any analysis which requires comparing deposits from different sites or different research projects. Were the deposits or categories under comparison produced by the same or similar methodologies or processes? Are any similarities or perceived differences real or are they the


624 Davis 2001; Davis et al. 2001; for the most recent bibliography, see also Broodbank 2004 and Davis and Gorogianni 2008, p. 379.
result of the methods and the processes employed? In the end, are we comparing similar categories or apples to oranges?

Since the 1960s and the advent of New Archaeology, a statement of the methodology used in a particular project has come to be considered a *sine qua non* for every presentation of archaeological data in anthropological archaeology, since it provides to researchers the framework within which the data were produced and guidelines to keep in mind when discussing and comparing the material. This practice was introduced into the language of Classical archaeology during the 1970s and 1980s, largely with the introduction of intensive surface survey. The adoption of the new technique by the wider archaeological audience necessitated a thorough presentation of its methodology, practices, and reasoning.625 In the literature of the early examples of the technique, the rhetoric espoused by the survey practitioners stressed the complementarity of the new method (surface survey) to the old method (excavation) by underlining the differences in the datasets produced and in the questions addressed by the two techniques; surface survey could not address questions of dating and stratigraphy, though it could give excellent results about settlement patterns, cultural and political boundaries, and demography.

625 See Bintliff 1985, 2000; Bintliff and Snodgrass 1985; Bintliff et al. 1999; Cherry 1983; Cherry et al. 1991c; Cherry et al. 1991d; Keller and Rupp 1983. For a recent attempt to compare and bridge the issues of different methodologies, see Alcock and Cherry 2004.
Surface survey is now an established and widespread archaeological method, a point implicitly recognized in its regulation by the Greek Ministry of Culture, and few archaeologists would dispute its usefulness in addressing questions that pertain to the regional scale and even fewer would think twice about the fact that different questions warrant the appropriate archaeological method; for an investigation of demography, surface survey is “the way to go,” whereas stratigraphy and/or chronological sequence of a culture necessitates excavation.

Similarly, in excavation itself, the methods chosen by an excavator produce a dataset with parameters that are designed and best suited to address those questions forwarded by the primary investigator. This does not necessarily mean that the specific material cannot be used to examine alternate questions or to reconstruct different “pasts” other than the one(s) in which the primary investigator was interested; however, a series of methodological adjustments by the researcher would be needed in order to arrive at reliable results.

In a recent article, Papaconstantinou notes that evaluation of archaeological fieldwork (and, concomitantly, efficient use of the data that it produces) is hindered by “the diversity among archaeological practices, which is a consequence of differences among archaeological traditions in the field, the unique nature of each archaeological site, and also the deficiencies of any assessment that depends on what has been kept as the record of a process rather than the process itself.”626 In order to minimize the effects of these hindrances, the latest trends in archaeological research design advocate not only a statement of methodology, but the conscious
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incorporation and integration of archaeological process in the recorded data of a given project. This is usually accomplished by the employment of rigorous and/or novel methods recording not only the archaeological finds and the process of their discovery, but also of the archaeological process itself and the archaeologists involved in it. Thus, personal journals, videotaping, and blogs, as well as cultural anthropologists brought in to record and study the people and the process, have been enlisted to attain a “thick description” of the context of the archaeological site and object as well as the process of production of archaeological knowledge. This enhanced level of reflexivity facilitates the delineation of the process of archaeological reasoning, which provides the reader with a clear map of the assumptions and influences of the researcher, as well as nuances of what the researcher recognized best or failed to acknowledge. As such, it also provides a context for the produced data, which is especially useful when comparing datasets since it offers a framework to gauge the appropriate methodological adjustments.

One of the champions of contextualized archaeology, Ian Hodder, notes that archaeological reasoning is notoriously difficult to deduce. If deduction of archaeological reasoning is difficult in an on-going archaeological project, it is even harder to do for a past project, for which the only evidence is the archaeological finds left behind and the documentation of the excavation, and it then requires a different approach. Since the site and the archaeological process have been reduced to documentation, the site has become a “text.”


Therefore, the researcher has to adopt an almost philological and historical approach for the critical examination of the finds, the records, and the past publications on the material of the site, and regard them as integral parts of a whole or of a process. Such an examination reveals the subtle imposition of meaning on deposits/contexts by their excavator/field director. Moreover, it underscores the process of reduction of these contexts to text, which is meant to recount the story the excavator himself was imagining while designing and conducting the project.

Since the publication with its orderly systematic nature and appearance masks the processes behind it and the role of the archaeologist, the research leading to the present dissertation was a remarkable opportunity. My dissertation project was made possible not only by the completion of the excavation but also by the completion of a significant component of the original publication program. This has enabled me to look at the entire process from the excavation and its records (and the changes of recording over time) all the way through the end process marked by the syntheses of the site’s data. Thus, this study of the Northern Sector, besides the obvious merit of the presentation of the area’s deposits, offered me a welcome chance to “peek behind the scenes” and to examine the whole process from an insider’s perspective, gaining valuable insight on archaeological practice and how it conditions archaeological knowledge. My discussion of Caskey’s intellectual heritage and methods brings these processes to the forefront and obliges the results to be regarded from the reader’s own perspective, being conscious of the parameters and limitations of the material in reconstructions for which it had not originally been intended.

Thus, in the case of Ayia Irini, I have reconstructed the archaeological practice and process of the excavation (see Chapter 2) using the extant records and oral histories as recounted to me by members of the excavation. In doing so, I have tried to delineate Caskey’s
archaeological reasoning and theoretical perspective (without, I hope, reducing him to a “straw man,” by definition monolithic and without contradictions) and his dialectic relationship with the intellectual and collegial environment in Greek archaeology from its inception to the 1970s, both of which influenced Caskey in designing his research strategy and effected changes in the implementation of the research strategy and his publication program.

Caskey’s education, experiences and collaborations (e.g., in his facet as an advisee and collaborator of Blegen’s), as well as the influence of the whole archaeological establishment of the time, played a significant role in shaping his theoretical disposition and the choice of specific methodologies to be applied to his excavations. Caskey’s interests were firmly rooted in the cultural historical paradigm, which emphasizes the construction of cultural artifactual sequences as the framework for the construction of historical narratives.

This is evident in his choice to excavate Ayia Irini. As described in Chapter 2, after Eutresis and Lerna, Caskey sought a site that represented a cultural sequence where his stratigraphic interests and expertise would best serve the discipline. For Caskey, the goal was the establishment of a closely-dated and stratigraphically based chronological ceramic sequence that could be used in comparisons and could function as a control for the sequence from Phylakopi on Melos. In this sense, Ayia Irini realized its anticipated potential by yielding an important artifactual sequence in the Cyclades and the Aegean as a whole.

Caskey’s disposition toward a culture-historical approach is also evident in his choice of methods for constructing deposits that represent chronological phases (and not depositional episodes), subordinating the spatial control of finds. The recording system of the site was designed to record the vertical sequence of excavation units and to associate the finds with an original excavation unit, and by extension with a combined lot. In addition, small finds (and
anything else that would in current practice require provenience or coordinates) are listed along with the excavation unit number and only in a few cases are related to surrounding architectural features (i.e., walls).

The lack of concern for three-dimensional recording is further evident in the verbal description of the excavation units themselves. Even though general information is chronicled on the location of the unit, the recorded data are not consistent and far from complete, making the reconstruction of the stratigraphy at a later time a difficult and, in some cases, an interpretive/creative exercise. This limitation of the extant data became apparent to me during my attempt to depict the sequence of lots in Harris matrices, since part of my initial research design was a three-dimensional reconstruction of the stratigraphy. Even if the technical difficulties involved in the achievement of such a project could be easily resolved, I realized that many liberties would have to be taken in delineating excavation units and combined lots in three-dimensional space. The excavation unit number and, most importantly, the cut number were the crucial pieces of recorded information that in the end assisted in the creation of the matrices. Clearly, the research focus was on the sequence of excavation units and the sequencing of their finds and not on their spatial distribution.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the culture-historical ideal of recording was the recording of the artifact and its historical information in a corpus or a catalogue; in this way the historical information conveyed by the object would be safe from the vicissitudes of preservation and accessible to other researchers. The combination process employed by Caskey preserves clear indications of such an aspiration, i.e., to preserve the historical “truth” of each deposit/combined lot and to construct units that would function as reference for inter-site chronological comparisons, compromising in the process alternate approaches. The above assertions are
evidenced by the types of data that were recorded during the combination and papsing process at Ayia Irini.

During the combination process only one of the two or three stages of discarding was recorded systematically.\(^{629}\) Phase two, which was basically the phase of construction of the combined lots, was recorded in detail and the records on the combined lots (as well as the ceramics that survived the papsing process) show primarily a preoccupation with issues of chronology. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the data recorded in conjunction with each original excavation unit were: an estimated initial volume of the ceramic material contained in the excavation unit (using olive oil tins as a measuring standard); an estimated percentage of the volume discarded; and a shorthand list of diagnostic features in the volume that was discarded (see Fig. 91). This last category of data is the only one that is recorded in any kind of quantified detail, i.e., raw counts. Diagnostic features, such as “bottoms” or “bases,” “rims” (flat or horizontal), “legs” (flat or round in section; small, large or medium in size), “conical cups” (sometimes distinguished according to their rims, i.e., flat rim or no rim), “handles” (round; large

\(^{629}\) The first sorting and discarding (performed in the sherd yard when the original excavation units were first strewn) went unrecorded. After the second phase of papsing was complete, certain lots were papsed a third time, and no records were kept on this process. The cases of combined lots N17CL and N18CL on Table 68 prove the existence of a third phase of papsing; the percentages of material papsed from the excavation records do not agree with the percentages of the volume left (which was calculated based on the extant quantities of ceramics that have survived). The data indicate that an additional 16% of the ceramics were papsed from N17CL and another 10% from N18CL.
or small; horizontal, vertical, etc.), and instances of “rope pattern” decoration, were listed, accompanied by raw counts. This detailed record was supposed to connote the chronological and typological information that the discarded material had to offer, since details such as the section of handles are chronologically diagnostic. In essence, the excavator/pottery processor at Ayia Irini could be said to have literally materialized Flinders Petrie’s exhortation for the construction of a corpus as the optimum way of salvaging and systematizing ceramic data without necessarily having them present.630

The criteria that were used in the process of combination and papsing seem to have favored ceramics that would provide dating information. Thus, coarse wares, which do not display rapid stylistic and typological changes over time (in comparison to fine wares), were severely discriminated against, as Table 77 clearly shows. In the end, Caskey succeeded in his goals of constructing the history of the site, but in the process sacrificed its people by way of his archaeological practice. For example, any detailed examination of coarse wares has been severely hindered by the papsing process detailed above, severely limiting investigation of everyday life - household economy and management - at Ayia Irini, because more complete information about the range of types and frequencies of storage and cooking vessels would be needed for such an inquiry.

In retrospect, and taking into account the nature of the formation history of the Northern Sector, the combination process was particularly inapt for this area. This process might have

630 See above Chapter 1 and Flinders Petrie 1904, pp. 125-126.
been better suited for other sites, but the rich occupational and depositional history of the
Northern Sector had created a very complex depositional picture. This picture could have been
disentangled and analyzed more effectively through a method of excavation and publication that
had the context as its unit of analysis and interpretation, and one that would permit the re-
examination of the original excavation units in the raw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Type of deposit</th>
<th>Original volume in tins of 17 liters</th>
<th>Volume left in tins of 17 liters</th>
<th>Estimate % of volume left</th>
<th>% papsed</th>
<th>% of volume of coarse before papsing</th>
<th>% of volume of fine before papsing</th>
<th>% based on counts of Coarse after papsing</th>
<th>% based on counts of Fine after papsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N17CL</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18CL</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19CL</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20CL</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21CL</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22CL</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23CL</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N28CL</td>
<td>Surface deposits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N45CL</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 77: Impact that papsing had on the combined lots.

An important point is that this focus on archaeological process was not selected in an
effort to underline what, with the benefit of hindsight, the future may view as mistakes. Anyone
who has worked on an excavation will testify that no matter how hard we try to avoid mistakes,
to be proactive, to plan in advance and to apply rigorous methodological protocols, nothing we
do can make us immune to errors of judgment, the unexpected, and especially what
archaeologists of subsequent generations will consider bad decisions and outdated
methodologies. Nonetheless, by bringing the excavation process to the foreground, methodological patterns become apparent. These methodological patterns are connected with specific intellectual and theoretical traditions that evolve with time and with the transformation of current disciplinary questions. Thus, each project, its methodology and publication, is “date-stamped” and perpetuates the structures of archaeological knowledge of the time and context in which it was produced. This becomes plainly obvious from the discussion of archaeological practice over time in classical archaeology as presented in Chapter 1, and more specifically from the examination of the development of the concept of context and stratigraphy through time, which I summarize here.

The raw data of archaeology consists only of artifacts, features, and ecofacts with their physical and chemical specification and their locations in space. In particular, the spatial control of finds, and thus stratigraphy and the recording of their contexts, are the characteristics that separate archaeology from antiquarianism and looting, and the evolving definition of what constitutes “spatial control” is the very question that lies at the heart of the discipline, its theories, and its methods. As explicated in Chapter 1, for Flinders Petrie spatial control meant knowing the site and the room the artifact came from, with more emphasis on the horizontal dimension of findspots and allocating issues of dating to seriating artifacts, which functioned as “horizon markers.” Therefore, strip-digging as an excavation method was totally appropriate for meeting the goals of this research design. For Droop, spatial control took on another
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dimension, the vertical. To meet the criteria of a decent research design, according to Droop, the artifact had to be firmly associated with a specific layer within a room or area, since the typological, morphological, and chronological data of the artifacts characterized the layer as whole. Thus, for Droop, stratigraphic excavation, peeling off one layer at a time, was the excavation method of choice. Finally, for Mortimer Wheeler and the Kenyon school of excavation, the artifact/feature took on yet another dimension presaging today’s widespread use of three-dimensional recording and Cartesian grid dimensions, as well as the context as the unit of interpretation in gauging the meaning of an artifact or the behavior that it represents.

Perhaps it is common sense to say that each and every excavation project by these pioneers of archaeology, as well as by all archaeologists that followed and will follow them, produced data (finds and spatial associations) that were detailed enough to address the specific questions that those excavators had in mind, questions that were informed by the theoretical disposition of the discipline, which more or less ordained what questions were thought to be of archaeological interest. It is probably equally common sense to note that none of these datasets can satisfactorily (and without additional steps to make up for the biases imposed on the material through archaeological practice) address questions divorced from the questions of the research designer (e.g., it is next to impossible to talk about the stratigraphy of Petrie’s sites). Thus, the designer of a research strategy is, in a sense, the author of the publication for the material - that is, the publication of a final and authoritative word, which always has to be taken into account. The case of Ayia Irini is a very eloquent example of precisely this generalization.

The diachronic examination of archaeological practice in Greek archaeology in Chapter 1 was necessary because the excavation of Ayia Irini occurred in a period when paradigms were slowly but surely shifting. The excavation was conducted in a certain way according to Caskey’s
educational, experiential, and theoretical background, but by the time the publication process was ready to begin, Caskey’s paradigm was already considered outdated. The examination of this transition and the development of paradigms were necessary in order to contextualize the Ayia Irini excavation and appreciate the challenges posed by this paradigm shift.

The end result is the publication of Ayia Irini in a much different format and process than the ones Caskey had originally intended, a circumstance that still continues to create numerous difficulties for investigators. These difficulties stem from the fact that investigators attempt to publish material according to contemporary standards, whereas the material recovered from Ayia Irini was simply not excavated with these standards and questions in mind; in short, researchers find themselves confronted with the task of trying to pound round pegs into square holes.

As has been mentioned, the processing of the archaeological material prepared it for inclusion in the final publication by getting rid of perceived extraneous and uninformative material. The process of inclusion and exclusion of ceramic material that resulted in the creation of the combined lots as I experienced them was also very successful in creating, in essence, “type-units” for reference and comparisons with other sites in the Aegean.632 Reviewing the published deposits from the Northern Sector and comparing them against the extant material in the storerooms of the site is a very educational experience in terms of learning the artifactual

632 The extant Ayia Irini Period publications and the frequency with which they are cited in scholarly works, as representative of ceramic material present in particular phases, are testimonies to the success of Caskey’s pursuit.
sequences at Ayia Irini. In the cases of deposits that had already been published, i.e., Period V deposits, almost without exception every single piece in the combined lots was included in the publication of the Period deposits.

It is fair to argue, therefore, that the excavators, and by extension their director and advisor, Caskey, “textualized” the finds of the site and materialized the final publication of the site without necessarily writing a word of it. Whatever Caskey thought worthy for inclusion in the final publication of the site, based on contemporary disciplinary questions and sensibilities and on the analytical methods available, was left in the tins. In a sense, the excavators “wrote the final report” on the spot according to their perception of the “reality” of the site at the time.

This has limitations in terms of the range of approaches future archaeologists can apply to the material of Ayia Irini, and to any material from past excavations for that matter. I mention above the challenges of a three-dimensional reconstruction of the deposits in the case of the Northern Sector; the absence of systematically recorded three-dimensional data make this very important project of visualization and analysis of the deposits a creative/interpretive exercise, a subject for future research, since it is necessary to extrapolate the missing data based on extant information in the notebooks.

Another example of this finality is the fact that no accurate quantitative analysis can provide reliable information that can be compared with other sites that have not been excavated and processed in a similar manner. Percentages from the presence of different categories of material (such as local and imported, coarse/semi-coarse/fine wares, table wares/cooking wares/storage wares) have to be based on a series of assumptions and speculations. In the case of imported versus local wares, the estimated percentages are not necessarily fictive, since imported wares recognized macroscopically were not as discriminated against and were usually included
in the combined lots. However, estimates of table wares versus cooking and storage wares are unattainable since cooking and storage vessels were severely discriminated against during sorting.

Furthermore, the loss of contextual information that was affected in the process of discarding and combination has precluded answers to questions pertaining to formation processes at the site. A good example of this can be seen in the case of rooms N.1 to N.3. Here, combination has obliterated not only spatial information pertaining to the vertical axis, but also to the horizontal, since finds from three different rooms were pooled together in a single lot. Surely, the excavator’s impression of the material belonging to the same deposit that fell from an upper floor was justified on the basis of joins. However, any distinctions between contemporaneous (or nearly contemporaneous) material belonging to the upper floor deposit and the one potentially present in the basement spaces represented by rooms N.1 through N.3 cannot be drawn; this inability, in turn, will impact the possibility of distinguishing the activities on different floors, or of suggesting an explanation for the painted plaster decoration of some rooms in the Northern Sector during some periods, or even of answering such basic questions as whether these rooms included habitation quarters or had some other purpose. It is also not a coincidence that the activities attested in the Northern Sector - fabric production, potting, and metalworking - are all ones for which small finds, which were consistently kept and catalogued by the excavation at Ayia Irini, constitute the evidence, rather than pottery, particularly coarse ware vessels.

In the introduction to this thesis I argued that the range of questions future archaeologists can ask the body of archaeological material is limited to questions theoretically akin to the ones posed by the principal investigator (or allowed by the constraints of the material itself). Indeed,
the body of archaeological material from Ayia Irini, as it exists today, allows for only a specific range of questions. A study or the general evolution of wares has a fair chance of producing results of chronological and typological interest. If, however, other parameters and a pursuit of other issues are to be included, such as questions pertaining to the behaviors of the community that inhabited the site, or the meaning with which they invested different components of their life (e.g., the nature of everyday activities on the site or social organization or similar lines of investigation requiring contextual information of the kind that most excavations now routinely produce), then only general patterns and a “frustratingly vague sense of activities” can be attained. Perhaps it is not an accident that Ayia Irini’s deposits are most often cited in typological/chronological examinations or in issues of historical interest, such as the issue of Minoanization/Minoan Thalassocracy (according to different interpretations), and not in studies of alternate theoretical objectives (e.g., behavioral, interpretive).

As previously mentioned, alternate questions and interpretations of the past are possible provided the expectations of the researcher are adjusted to the information that the extant data offers, and that the biases of the excavator as imposed on the body of archaeological material are counteracted by application of the appropriate methodological adjustments. Counteracting such biases requires awareness and understanding of the processes that have impacted the body of material in the first place. My examination of Caskey’s methodologies and presentation of archaeological practice at Ayia Irini, alongside the presentation of the stratigraphy of the

Northern Sector, offer the reader a description of the processes that produced the material. These set the necessary parameters to consider in future uses and evaluation of the deposits, which enable future studies that potentially will expand the possible the range of interpretations of the material, perhaps satisfying archaeologists’ urge to extend the limits of understanding about the past.

Last, but not least, this project’s focus on archaeological practice and archaeological knowledge is one of the first such examinations in Greek archaeology. Thus, this dissertation contributes to the discourse on the history of Greek archaeology by examining in detail one of its pioneers, Jack Caskey. The delineation of mental templates, intellectual frameworks, and the limits that they impose on our data may seem to many to be a negative conclusion, since it brings to the forefront our limitations and what we cannot know. However, this is not a negative conclusion. Awareness of limitations and in general awareness of the history of the discipline makes us appreciate where we are. As Clarke eloquently said, “the loss of disciplinary innocence is the price of expanding consciousness; certainly the price is high but the loss is irreversible and the prize substantial.”

---
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FIGURES
Figure 1: Distribution of Northern Sector deposits (i.e., combined lots) per Ayia Irini period (Caskey 1979).

Figure 2: Early Helladic remains in the Western Sector in relation to the fortification wall of Period IV (Caskey 1971, fig. 1.7).
Figure 3: Plan of the site indicating remains belonging to Periods I through IV among the later structures. Room numbers indicate the Period IV deposits (Overbeck 1989, pl. 2).
Figure 4: Period IV settlement and cemeteries (Overbeck 1989, pl. 3).
Figure 5: Trench plan of the Northern Sector.

Figure 6: Ayia Irini before the excavation (courtesy of the Archives of the Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati).
Figure 7: Plan of Ayia Irini.
Figure 8: Plan of Tower nw.
Figure 9: Harris matrix for Tower nw; on the left units are color-coded by period and on the right by combined lot.
Figure 10: Plan of suite of rooms N.1, N.2, N.3, and N.4; the walls in yellow represent the first building phase of the room and the ones in green represent the second.
Figure 11: a. Harris matrix for room N.1; b. Structure in room N.1, from SE.
Figure 12: Harris matrix for room N.2.
Figure 13: Harris matrix for room N.3.

Figure 14: Room N.3, wall AH and bedrock at the end of the excavation, from S.
Figure 15: Room N.4, walls N and Y with pots visible, from SE.

Figure 16: Room N.4, burnt layer in door of wall Y, from W.
Figure 17: Room N.4, with fortification wall missing on the eastern side; grid marker abutting against wall AB was later removed, from N.

Figure 18: Harris matrix for room N.4.
Figure 19: Harris matrix for room N.5.
Figure 20: Plan of rooms N.5 and N.7 to N.14.
Figure 21: Section through N.5; looking north (after Davis 1986, pl. 16a).
Figure 22: Harris matrix for room N.6; the matrix on the left shows units by period and the one on the right shows units by combined lot.
Figure 23: Harris matrix for room N.7; the matrix on the left shows units by period and the one on the right shows units by combined lot.
Figure 24: Room N.7, layer of fallen stones, from S.

Figure 25: Room N.7 at the end of excavation, from S.
Figure 26: Harris matrix for rooms N.8 and N.9.

Figure 27: Room N.8, threshold block in wall AB, from N.
Figure 28: Room N.8, from W.

Figure 29: Harris matrix for room N.10.
Figure 30: Schematic representation of soil units in west baulk of N01T. Scale applies only to the horizontal dimension (Kea VIII, p. 94).

Figure 31: a. Room N.10 with structure in the north end of the room visible, from S; b. Room N.10 during excavation of the west baulk of N01T. Red stratum is visible, from S.
Figure 32: Plan of rooms N.5, N.6, and N.11 to N.15.
Figure 33: Harris matrix for rooms N.11 and N.12.
Figure 34: Excavation plan of N02T with rooms N.11 and N.12 (Kea VIII, p. 11).
Figure 35: Rooms N.11 and N.12, from SE.

Figure 36: Conical cup deposit in rooms N.11 and N.12.
Figure 37: Harris matrix for room N.13.

Figure 38: Large threshold block at the entrance of room N.13 visible in the course of stones sitting on top of the threshold block, from N.
Figure 39: Room N.14, fallen stones visible from W.

Figure 40: Stucco floor in east part of room N.14, from N.
Figure 41: Harris matrix for room N.14.

Figure 42: Harris matrix for room N.15; on the left units are color-coded by period and on the right by combined lot.
Figure 43: Water channel over wall I, from W.

Figure 44: Room N.16, from W.
Figure 45: Harris matrix for room N.16.
Figure 46: Harris matrix for Tower ne.
Figure 47: Plan of Tower ne.
Figure 48: Period VI ceramics in N17CL (Room N.5).
Figure 49: Ceramics in N17CL (Room N.5); nos. 6-8: Period VI; nos. 9-11: Period VII.
Figure 50: Period VII ceramics in N17CL (Room N.5).
Figure 51: Ceramics from lot N18CL (Room N.5); nos. 17-20: Period VI; no. 21: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 52: Period VII ceramics from lot N18CL (Room N.5).
Figure 53: Ceramics from lot N18CL (Room N.5); nos. 29-32: Period VII; no. 33: Modern.
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Figure 54: Period VI ceramics from lot N04CL (Room N.5).
Figure 55: Selected ceramics from N04CL (Room N.5); nos. 43-45: Period VI; nos. 46-51: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 56: Selected ceramics from N04CL (Room N.5); no. 45: Period VI; nos 52-54: Period VII; nos. 55-56: Archaic/Classical.

57. N19-17
58. N19-20
59. N19-29
60. N19-58
Figure 57: Selected ceramics from N19CL (Room N.5); nos. 57-60: Periods V to VI.
Figure 58: N19CL ceramics (Room N.5); nos. 61-65: Period VI; no. 66: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 59: N05CL ceramics (Room N.6); nos. 67-71: Period VI; no. 72: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 60: N05CL ceramics (Room N.6); nos. 73-78: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 61: N05CL ceramics (Room N.6); nos. 79-80: Periods VI to VII; no. 81: Period VIII.

Figure 62: N06CL ceramics (Room N.6); nos. 82-85: EBA; no. 86: EBA to Period V.
Figure 63: N06CL ceramics (Room N.6); no. 87: Periods V to VI; nos. 88-92: Period VI.
Figure 64: N06CL ceramics dating to Period VI (Room N.6).
Figure 65: N06CL ceramics dating to Period VI (Room N.6).

Figure 66: Selected ceramics from N09CL dating to Period VI (Rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9).
Figure 67: Selected ceramics from N09CL (Rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9); nos. 105-108: Period V1; nos. 109-111: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 68: Selected ceramics from N09CL (Rooms N.7, N.8, and N.9) dating to Period VII.

Figure 69: N21CL ceramics (Room N.10); no. 116: Period VI; nos. 117-119: Periods VI to VII; nos. 125 and 129: Period VII.
Figure 70: N21CL ceramics (Room N.10); nos. 120-124, 126, 127-128, 130-131: Period VII; no. 132: Periods VII to VIII.
Figure 71: N22CL ceramics (Room N.10); nos. 134-140: Periods V to VI; no. 133: Period VI; nos. 141-145, 148-155: Period VII.
Figure 72: N22CL ceramics dating to an early phase of Period VII (Room N.10).

Figure 73: N23CL ceramics from the lowest fill deposit below the early Period VII floor (Room N.10); nos. 156-157: Period VI; nos. 158-159: Period VII.
Figure 74: N23CL ceramics from the lowest fill deposit below the early Period VII floor (Room N.10).

Figure 75: Drawings of sherds from N25-262.
Figure 76: N45CL ceramics from the floor deposit (Rooms N.11 and N.12); nos. 161-166: Period VI; nos. 167-168: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 77: N45CL ceramics from the floor deposit (Rooms N.11 and N.12); nos. 169-171: Periods VI to VII; nos. 172-176: Period VII.
Figure 78: N45CL ceramics from the floor deposit dated to a very early phase of Period VII (Rooms N.11 and N.12).

Figure 79: N03CL ceramics from the destruction deposit in room N.13; nos. 181-182 and 186: Period VI
Figure 80: N03CL ceramics from the destruction deposit in room N.13; nos. 183-190: Period VI.
Figure 81: N03CL ceramics from the destruction deposit in room N.13; nos. 191-196 and 198-199: Periods VI to VII.
Figure 82: Inventoried pots from N43CL dated to Period VI.
Figure 83: NN6CL ceramics from room N.14; nos. 204-206: Period VI; nos. 207-208: Periods VII to VIII.
Figure 84: Selected ceramics from lots N12CL and N48CL (Room N.16) dated to Period VII.
Figure 85: Selected ceramics from lots N12CL and N48CL (Room N.16) dating to Periods VII to VIII.

Figure 86: Representative sherds from N13CL (Tower ne); no. 217: Period VII; nos. 218-220: Period VIII.
Figure 87: Representative sherds from N13CL (Tower ne) dating to Period VIII.
Figure 88: Representative sherds from N20CL; nos. 225-226: Period VI; no. 227: Period VII.
Figure 89: Representative ceramics from N24CL dating to Period VI.
Figure 90: Vessel representing Period VI in N24CL.
Figure 91: Sample page from the pottery notes showcasing the recording of a combined lot.
Figure 92: Percentages of imports in Period V deposits.

Figure 93: Percentages of imports in Period VI deposits.
Figure 94: Percentages of imports in Period VIIa deposits.

Figure 95: Percentages of imports in Period VIIb deposits.