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ABSTRACT

The megaron of the Palace of Nestor at Pylos comprises three interconnected, axially aligned rooms located at the core of the palace’s Main Building, constructed in the 13th century B.C. Current theories about this suite, and particularly its “Throne Room,” imagine that it was used for feasting, that it served as a royal reception hall, and/or that it was a setting for religious rituals. It has not been possible to discriminate among these competing theories – each individually compelling – because of evidential lacunae in the original publication of the Pylos megaron by excavators Carl W. Blegen and Marion Rawson. This dissertation presents in great detail both published and previously unpublished remains from the megaron. The three rooms and their stratigraphy, objects, built features, and painted decoration are described and assessed based on systematic examination of archaeological field records and firsthand observations of material evidence. It is demonstrated that extant pottery and small finds do not support claims for palatial period feasting. Built features and painted decoration, however, corroborate propositions that the megaron was used for religious activities and visitor reception during this period, which is in turn shown to have been the first of the suite’s three (or possibly four) use-phases.
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Figure 4.63: Detail from the “Miniature Frieze” from the West House at Akrotiri, showing a galloping griffin. Doumas 1992, p. 65, pl. 32.

Figure 4.64: Detail of the decoration on the blade of the ceremonial axe of Queen Ahhotep. PM I, p. 551, fig. 462.

Figure 4.65: LM IB cup rhyton from a tomb east of Hogarth’s House B, Knossos (a) and section (b). Andreadaki-Vlazaki et al. 2008, p. 263, pl. 217; Koehl 2006, fig. 44, no. 1247.

Figure 4.66: Short side of the LM IIIA sarcophagus from Hagia Triada. Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 2008, p. 141, fig. 9 (detail).

Figure 4.67: Line drawing of the impression of a flattened signet bead with recumbent griffin. from Pylos Tholos IV. CMS I, no. 293.
Figure 4.68: Fragments of tables of offerings from Pylos catalogued by Lang. PN II pls. 114-115 and L (details), modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure 4.69. Fragments of tables of offerings from Pylos not catalogued by Lang with rising flame decoration on their exterior vertical edges. WP151.008-MNe (a), WP147.070-SW (b), WP068.046-31 (c), and WP201.267 (d). Photos by E. C. Egan.

Figure 4.70: Fragment of a table of offerings with flame decoration from the Ramp House at Mycenae. Lamb and Wace 1919/1920-1920/1921, pl. X, no. ii.

Figure 4.71: Reconstructed table of offerings (“Altar II”) with wavy line decoration from Mycenae. Wace et al. 1921-1923, pl. XXXVIIId.

Figure 4.72: Fragment of a table of offerings from Tiryns with wavy line decoration. Rodenwaldt 1912, p. 63, fig. 25.

Figure 4.73: Hearth from Pylos Hall 46, detail of painted spiral decoration. PN I, fig. 149.

Figure 4.74: Reconstruction of Pylos plaster fragment group 11 M 46 (the “chimney piece”) collapsed into Hall 46. P. de Jong. PN II, pl. 142.

Figure 4.75: Floor mosaic from Ostia Terme di Nettuno, Room C. Clarke 1979, fig. 34.

Figure 4.76: Floor mosaic from Ostia Terme dei Cisiari, Room C. Clarke 1979, fig. 27.

Figure 4.77: Pylos wall painting fragment group 45 H 6 (“Male Procession to Right?”). PN II, pl. A.

Figure 4.78: Reconstructed view of the Pylos throne from across the central hearth. Thaler 2012, p. 203, figs. 6a-b.

Figure 4.79: Reconstruction of the griffin to the left of the throne in the Knossian Throne Room. PM IV, pl. XXXII.

Figure 4.80: Proposed reconstruction of the Knossos Throne Room griffins with wings. E. Shank after M. A. S. Cameron. Shank 2007, p. 164, fig. 19.5.

Figure 4.81: Reconstructed section of the South House, Knossos, showing pillar crypt. PM II, p. 389, fig. 223.

Figure 4.82: Stone pedestalled lamp from the Pillar Basement of the South East House, Knossos. PM I, p. 345, fig. 249.
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Figure 5.1: View of the west corner of the Pylos Portico, showing preserved limestone baseboards. PN I, fig. 53.
Figure 5.2: *In situ* wall painting 9 D 6 (“Southeast Wall”) on the northern section of the SE wall of the Pylos Throne Room. *PN II*, pl. 97.

Figure 5.3: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting fragment group 5 H 5 (“Kilted Male Procession to the Left”). P. de Jong. Published in *PN II*, pl. N. Image from Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, P. de Jong watercolor Inv. No. 535.

Figure 5.4 Line drawing of a composition from the NW wall of the Pylos Vestibule showing a procession. P. de Jong. Wright 2004, p. 42, fig. 12, after *PN II*, pl. 119.

Figure 5.5: Pylos wall painting fragment group 6 A 5 (“Fragment of a Façade”). *PN II*, pl. I.
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Figure 5.8: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting fragment group 2 M 6 (“Fragmentary Stone Vase”). P. de Jong. Published in black and white in *PN II*, pl. 141. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive, Piet de Jong Watercolor 84. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.9. Pylos wall painting fragment group 43 H 6 (“Lyre Player and Bird”). *PN II*, pl. A.

Figure 5.10: Sketch of a composition from the NE wall of the Pylos Throne Room showing paired lion and griffin, a large bull, seated diners, and a lyre player. P. de Jong. *PN II*, pl. 125.

Figure 5.11: Outmoded reconstruction of the heraldic lions and griffins on the NE wall of the Pylos Throne Room, with attached vellum sketch. P. de Jong. Published in black and white in Blegen 1956, pl. 40, fig. 2. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive, Piet de Jong Watercolor 61. Photo by J. and A. Stephens.
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Figure 5.15: Reconstruction of the decoration on the NE wall of the Pylos Throne Room. L. R. McCallum. McCallum 1987, p. 198, pl. IX.
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Figure 5.19: Detail from the long side (“panel B”) of the LM IIIA sarcophagus from Hagia Triada, showing a stone libation vessel. Preziosi and Hitchcock 1999, p. 178, fig. 118 (detail).
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Figure 5.29: Reconstruction of the decorated floors in the Portico and Vestibule of the Pylos megaron. P. de Jong. PN I, fig. 56, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.30: Reconstruction of the decorated floor in the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron. P. de Jong. PN I, fig. 73.

Figure 5.31: Detail of the octopus found in square F8 of the Pylos Throne Room. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.F14.
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Figure 5.43: Detail of the upper half of the field plan of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room. D. Theocharis, with additions by P. de Jong. GEM 1952, back pocket.
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Figure 5.46: Watercolor reconstruction of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room. P. de Jong. Photo by C. Mauzy. Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.47: Watercolor reconstruction of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room with areas of
preserved painted surface highlighted. P. de Jong. Photo by C. Mauzy. Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c, modified by E. C. Egan.
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Figure 5.63: Pylos wall painting fragment group 9 F nws (“Bluebird Frieze”). PN II, pl. J.

Figure 5.64: Detail of the short end of the plastered bench (4 M 10) in Pylos Room 10, showing
stone veining. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide (no number).

Figure 5.65: Painted decoration on the floors of the court of the megaron at Mycenae as reconstructed by Lamb (a) and Rodenwaldt (b). Hirsch 1977, pl. 6, figs. 13, 14.

Figure 5.66: Detail of the decoration along the hem of a skirt worn by a female figure in the Knossos Procession Fresco. PM II, p. 729, fig 456a.

Figure 5.67: Reconstructed female figure from the Tiryns Große Frauenprozession. Rodenwaldt 1912, p. 8.

Figure 5.68: Reconstructed central panel of the Taureador Frescoes from the Court of the Stone Spout, Knossos. Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 2005, pp. 194-195.

Figure 5.69: Renderings of sections from the painted ceiling of the tomb of Senenmut (TT71). N. de Garis Davies. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Acc. No. 31.6.37.

Figure 5.70: Line drawing of the decoration on the skirt worn by the dancing woman in a wall painting from Hagia Triada. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 56, fig. 3.

Figure 5.71: Line drawing and reconstruction of “Pattern E” from the Procession Fresco at Knossos. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 58, figs. 1E and col. pl. 2E.
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Figure 5.74: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting fragment 18 M ne (“Papyrus Net”). P. de Jong. Published in PN II, pl. R. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, P. de Jong watercolor Inv. No. 266.

Figure 5.75: Line drawing and reconstruction of “Pattern B” from the Procession Fresco at Knossos. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 54, fig. 1B and col. pl. 2B.
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Figure 5.87: Reconstructed view into the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron from the Vestibule, looking northwest. E. A. Markin and E. C. Egan, using elements from Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c.

Figure 5.88: View of the two faces of the plastered bench (4 M 10) in Pylos Room 10. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide (no number).

Figure 5.89: Pylos wall painting fragment group 13 D 44 (“Variegated dado”). PNI II, pl. 98.
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Figure 5.94: Reconstruction of the floor decoration in the megaron at Tiryns with a complete, rather than partial, design system. Thaler 2012a, p. 201, fig. 5b.
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Figure A1.1: Plan of the Palace of Nestor showing the locations of 1939 Trench I (in brown) and 1952 Trench Z (in green) by E. C. Egan, overlaid onto key plan by J. Travlos. PN II, pl. 143.

Figure A1.2: Relationship matrices for Pylos Trench I (a), Trench Z (b), Trench Zb (c), and Trench Zc (d). E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.3: The Pylos hearth as found on June 5, 1952, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.6.

Figure A1.4: Field plan of the Pylos Throne Room showing the locations of Trenches Z, Zb, and Zc. GEM 1952, p. 72.

Figure A1.5: Plan of the trenches in the Pylos megaron by E. C. Egan overlaid, onto state plan by M. C. Nelson. Nelson 2001, fig. 15.

Figure A1.6: Excavation the Pylos hearth showing a “guard” left at the intersection of Trenches Z and Zb. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.8.

Figure A1.7: Plan showing locations of trenches and strata in the Pylos megaron by E. C. Egan, overlaid onto state plan by M. C. Nelson. Nelson 2001, fig. 15.

Figure A1.8: Field sketch of the northwest profile of the southwestern half of Pylos Trench Z. GEM 1952, p. 36, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.9: Excavation of the “4th 5 m. stretch” of Pylos Trench Z, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.3, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.10: Field sketch showing the positions of deposits found over the hearth in Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 26, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.11: Field sketch of the southwest profile of Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 46, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.12: Elevations of deposits in Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 35, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.13: Elevations of deposits in Pylos Trench Zc. GEM 1952, p. 34, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.14: Excavation of the end of Pylos Trench Zc in the doorway of the Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.26, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.15: Relationship matrices for the SW Quadrant (a), NW Quadrant (b), SE Quadrant (c), and the NE Quadrant (d) of the Pylos Throne Room. E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.16: Field sketch of the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room after the removal of the plowed earth. GEM 1952, p. 38, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.17: Excavation of the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.9, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.18: Field sketch strata just above the floor in the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room. GEM 1952, p. 50.

Figure A1.19: Removal of earth overlying the hearth in the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide 52.

Figure A1.20: Field sketch of the NW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, after the removal of stratum b8 and the top part of stratum r6. GEM 1952, p. 48, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.21: The Pylos throne space and libation channel, after excavation. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide 52-26.

Figure A1.22: The Pylos throne space after cleaning in 2012, showing interior sondage. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.23: Excavation of the NE Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.15, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.24: Field sketch of the cutting in the floor of the Pylos Vestibule near the door to the Portico. MR 1960, p. 135, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.25: Cutting in the floor of the Pylos Vestibule, looking northwest. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph F55B P.60.IV.

Figure A1.26: Relationship matrices for Trench T (a), Trench T, South (b), and Trench T, Extension (c) in the Pylos Portico. E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.27: Field sketch of the location of trenches in the Pylos Portico. GEM 1952, p. 118.

Figure A1.28: Southeast profile of Pylos Trench T, Extension. GEM 1952, p. 127.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since its discovery in 1939, the Palace of Nestor at Pylos has been recognized as an outstanding example of a Mycenaean palace. Located on the elevated plateau of Epano Englianos in southwest Messenia, Greece, the palace (Figure 1.1) was excavated until 1964 under the direction of Carl W. Blegen, professor of archaeology at the University of Cincinnati, who unearthed thousands of complete ceramic vessels, abundant wall painting fragments with both familiar and previously unknown motifs, the first archive of Linear B tablets discovered on the Greek mainland, and examples of Late Bronze Age palatial architecture un-obscured by later constructions. At the core of this impressive structure, Blegen and his colleagues made another remarkable discovery: a three-room suite widely regarded as the best-preserved example of a Mycenaean palatial megaron.

The megaron is a standard component of all Mycenaean palaces. Versions of the structure, which date from roughly the fourteenth to the early twelfth century B.C., appear at Gla and Midea and, in their most canonical manifestations, at Mycenae, Tiryns, and Pylos (Figure 1.2).¹ The archaeological term “megaron” derives from the Homeric Greek word “µέγαρον,” used in its most basic sense to refer to the main room in a house or palace.² In a palatial setting, the µέγαρον was a grand hall with a hearth in which visitors were received and activities such as dining, musical entertainment, and even wool-spinning took place, most famously in the palaces

---

¹ Palatial megaras at Gla (de Ridder 1894; Spyropoulos 1974; Iakovides 1983, pp. 99-101; 2001) and Midea (Walberg 1998, esp. p. 177; 2007) are considered non-canonical on account of variations (e.g., absent hearths, columns, and/or a different number or arrangement of rooms) in their physical forms. A fifth proposed example on the Athenian Acropolis has been refuted (Holland 1939; Iakovides 1983, p. 87). The oldest palatial megaron, dating to the fourteenth century B.C. (LH IIIA) comes from Tiryns (Kilian 1987a; Maran 2001). In some cases two “megara” have been identified in a Mycenaean palace, most notably at Tiryns, which Kurt Müller (1930, pp. 168-171) identified as a “Doppelpalast.” The “megaron” to which I refer in this dissertation is the larger structure typically located at the center of a Late Bronze Age palace and sometimes called the “Main” or “Great” megaron (e.g., Maran 2006b, pp. 82-85).

² Autenrieth 1958, p. 183.
of Menelaus, Alcinous, Odysseus, and Nestor, described in the *Odyssey*. In his epics, however, Homer also used the term “µέγαρον” to refer to other parts of the palace as well as to the overall building itself. This variable usage has contributed to a fluid interpretation of the archaeological term, resulting in its application (and that of the corresponding adjective “megaroid”) to a wide range of rooms and structures dating from the Early to Late Bronze Ages.

Such inconsistencies have prompted some scholars, most notably Pierre Darcque, to call for the abandonment of the term “megaron” in archaeological discourse. Others, however, have attempted to regularize its use. To prevent confusion, in discussions of excavated Mycenaean palaces the capitalized term “Megaron” (or “Megaron proper”) is frequently used to convey the first Homeric definition, i.e., that of a single large hall, whereas the lowercase term “megaron” refers to a suite of rooms consisting of this hall (also termed the “hearth room,” “throne room,” “δῶμα,” or “δόμος”/domos) together with the shallow anteroom (the “vestibule” or “πρόδομος”/prodomos) and formal entryway with two columns in antis (the “porch,” “portico,” or “αἴθουσα”/aithousa) by which it was accessed. At Pylos, the lowercase term “megaron” and the accompanying terms “Throne Room,” “Vestibule,” and “Portico” (all capitalized) were preferred by Blegen and his chief collaborator Marion Rawson, and are maintained in this

---

3 E.g, *Od*. 3.388-3.446 (Nestor), 4.15-19, 37-54 (Menelaus), 6.305-6.307, 7.81-7.102, 8.65-8.70 (Alcinous), 16.288, 17. 97, 328-335, 602-606, 18.304-311, 19.36-39, 478 (Odysseus). In some of these instances, the more general word “δόμος” is used instead of “µέγαρον,” but the intended meaning is the same.
5 Such structures, both in the Aegean and in Anatolia, have been discussed in detail by Kjell Werner (1993). That the form of the Mycenaean palatial megaron derived from Middle Helladic domestic architecture was proposed by Klaus Kilian (1987a).
6 Darcque 1990. See also Jung 2000.
7 Recent examples of the use of the terms “megaron” and “Megaron” in this way appear in the work of Ulrich Thaler (2005; 2006; 2007), James Wright (1994), Oliver Dickinson (1994), who employs the term “megaron suite,” and Thomas Palaima (1995; 2004), who uses the term “megaron complex.” Older usages appear in the studies by Alan Wace (1951; Wace et al. 1921-1923) and George Mylonas (1966). In many early studies, however, this correlation between the spelling and meaning of the term “M/megaron” is not apparent. Heinrich Schliemann and Wilhelm Dörpfeld (Schliemann 1885) as well as Emily Vermeule (1972), for example, each used the lowercase term to refer to a single room.
dissertation. For discussions of other Mycenaean sites (and in some secondary references to the Pylian suite), the terms “megaron” and “Megaron” are used as defined above.

**Defining the Problem**

As a central feature of all Mycenaean palaces, the megaron has been a frequent topic of scholarly discussion and debate. The megaron at Pylos, on account of its excellent preservation (which extends to its architectural plan (Figure 1.3), built features, and decoration), is predominant in such discourse. Among the most commonly addressed topics is that of the suite’s function. The most frequently proposed interpretations include the use of its Throne Room as a royal reception hall, as the site of religious rituals, and/or as an elite dining space. While these interpretations are compelling, they are potentially problematic. First, arguments for such theories have often been based on only a few classes of evidence. Striking wall paintings and built features such as the hearth, for example, have regularly received far greater attention in studies of function than small finds, ceramics, and floor decoration, which are routinely ignored. Second, some arguments have utilized what are expressly tentative interpretations of the megaron’s more unusual features. These features, which include the suite’s so-called “libation channel,” are not reassessed from the ground up (as is warranted, given their enigmatic status) but rather taken “as is” and their interpretations used as foundations for further speculation.

Finally, many arguments have relied on Homer as a primary source of interpretive insight. While the popularity of this approach has diminished considerably in recent years, its legacy is still apparent in current scholarship. Because the term “megaron” has been ascribed to the Pylos structure (and to similar structures at other Mycenaean palaces) for so long, Homeric

---

8 *PN* I, pp. 65-92.
9 For further details and bibliography, see Chapter 2.
uses of the space, particularly as location for elite dining, unsurprisingly remain vivid in the scholarly imagination and continue to impact deductions about the suite’s function. An excellent parallel for this phenomenon comes from the site of Pompeii, where Penelope Allison has illustrated how the late eighteenth-century convention of assigning Latin nomenclature (e.g., cubiculum, oecus, etc.) derived from Varro, Vitruvius, and Pliny the Elder to rooms of houses at the site has led to lasting assumptions of corresponding function between literary terms and archaeological remains. In both this case and at Pylos, such connections can be misleading and often result in the under-utilization of the material record.

Superficially, these problematic patterns of argumentation concerning the Pylos megaron are the result of scholarly predilections for the study of impressive, “eye-catching” evidence, of a resistance to rethinking preliminary ideas, and/or of an unshakable desire to ally archaeological discoveries of the Bronze Age with Homeric narratives. More fundamentally, however, they are also products of lacunae in the accounts of the suite and its contents offered by Blegen and Rawson and their colleague Mabel Lang in the site’s monograph series: The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia.

As final publications, the first and second volumes of this work (hereafter, PN I and PN II), produced in 1966 and 1969 respectively, are excellent. Given the immense amount of material recovered from the Palace of Nestor, the excavators provided thorough and thoughtful overviews of what was found and made significant contributions toward the analysis of both individual finds and overarching themes. The presentation of such a vast quantity of material in a timely fashion, however, naturally necessitated that certain types of information be prioritized over others. For this reason, some lacunae exist in accounts of the stratigraphy, finds, features, and decoration of the three rooms of the megaron, designated as Room 4 (the Portico), Room 5

(the Vestibule), and Room 6 (the Throne Room) (see Figure 1.1). In PN I, the strata within the suite were reported using short paragraphs of descriptive text unaccompanied by section drawings, relationship matrices, and in many cases, photographs. While more “valuable” finds produced from metal, stone, ivory, paste (kyanos), or clay (e.g., Linear B tablets and a “table of offerings”) were described individually and sometimes placed within their archaeological contexts, more quotidian ceramic sherds were presented *en masse*, in a laundry list of vessel shapes, types of decoration, and/or general date ranges with limited (or no) accompanying information about the objects’ locations within the excavated strata. No sherds from the megaron were photographed and small finds often appeared in “group shots,” in which individual objects were not identified. Accounts of the megaron’s fixed components and surface decoration were also truncated. Descriptions in PN I frequently omitted specific details of features’ physical appearance, construction, condition, and/or relationship to the surrounding stratigraphy, while PN II often lacked precise descriptions of paintings’ find spots, high-resolution images, and a complete account of the excavated corpus, much of which was found in poor condition.

Photographs in both volumes were published almost exclusively in black and white, with color reserved for exceptional wall paintings and full room reconstructions, most famously those of the Throne Room and the Court of the megaron painted by artist Piet de Jong (Figures 1.4 and 1.5).

Because of this curtailed presentation of the Pylos megaron in PN I and PN II, all studies of the function of the suite undertaken in the past nearly fifty years have been built on an incomplete (and in a few cases erroneous) picture of the archaeological evidence. As a result, in their current state proposed theories cannot be objectively evaluated, nor can they relied upon as foundations for future investigations.

---

11 These accounts appear primarily in the room-by-room “palace surveys” in PN I (pp. 65-92) and PN II (pp. 192-196).
Goals, Methodology, and Chapter Overview

It is the goal of this dissertation to produce a more comprehensive, contextualized picture of the Pylos megaron in order to assess the validity of existing interpretations about its function and, where possible, to propose new ideas regarding not only its use but also its lifespan, traditionally dated from the beginning of LH IIIB to the start of LH IIIC early (ca. 1300-1200 B.C.). The method I employ is rigorously inductive. Rather than working backward from assumptions (Homeric or otherwise), the archaeological record is re-prioritized and scrutinized as the primary unit of analysis. Using both published and unpublished evidence, the contents of the three rooms of the Pylos megaron are re-examined individually in detail (for both their physical attributes and contextual associations) before being reassembled into a new foundation on which interpretive theories are constructed. The purpose of this approach, which is not so much novel as overdue, is to “break down” and even “de-familiarize” the megaron, distancing the structure from the bias of its name in a way that allows current theories about its interpretation to be critically reassessed and new ideas to be put forward. Attempts are made to identify connections between different components of the suite and in two cases (that of the decorated floor and hearth) cognitive approaches are applied in order to understand the potential impact of visual stimuli on ancient visitors’ perceptions of, and kinesthetic responses to, the built environment.

At the core of this analysis is my careful and systematic examination of field records from the excavation of the Pylos megaron stored in archives in Greece (at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA)) and in Ohio (in the Classics Department of the University of Cincinnati), of finds on display and stored in the Chora Museum, and of built

12 PN 1, p. 422; Mountjoy 1997; Nelson 2001, p. 208.
features and decoration still in situ at the Epano Englianos site. Field notebooks as well as preliminary drawings, plans, photographs, slides, and pottery notes were used to investigate the character of the stratigraphic deposits and their contents. Over the course of my analysis, more than 450 sherds and small finds were catalogued (with detailed physical descriptions, measurements, and photographs) and roughly two-thirds of these objects were reassigned to their original excavation strata. A small number of ceramics (both sherds and nearly complete vessels) from other rooms of the palace with clear joins or associations with material from the megaron were also catalogued.

The built features and decoration of the megaron were assessed by way of direct visual examination as well as through the study of field descriptions, sketches, photographs, slides, and watercolor reconstructions produced by de Jong. In addition, two of the Throne Room’s features, the throne space and libation channel, as well as the eastern corner of its decorated floor, were cleaned by myself and conservator Alexandros Zokos in July of 2012 under the auspices of the (C)Hora Apotheke Reorganization Project (HARP), directed by Sharon Stocker. This project entailed the complete removal of the modern earth protecting these delicate plaster (or plaster lined) features and revealed many new aspects of their physical character that have direct bearing on their ancient production and use.

Following an overview of previous interpretations of the megaron’s function in Chapter 2, the data and results of my archaeological analyses are presented in Chapters 3-5, each of which focuses on a particular type of evidence. Chapter 3 examines the stratigraphy and small finds of the megaron and introduces the terminology I have developed to refer to both. The bulk of the evidence for this chapter, including a detailed account of the megaron’s excavation

---

13 Such fine resolution was largely possible for sherds and finds from the Throne Room and Vestibule, but less so for material from the Portico (see explanation and illustration in Chapter 3 and Appendices 1 and 2).
history, my catalogue of the suite’s ceramics and small finds, and quantitative breakdowns of artifacts from different rooms, is found in Appendices 1 and 2. Chapter 4 looks at the megaron’s built features and Chapter 5 deals with its painted surface decoration, primarily its floor painting. Each of these chapters has a similar internal structure.\textsuperscript{14} In general, first the published descriptions and interpretations of a given component (e.g., stratigraphy/small finds, a built feature, a painted surface) offered in \textit{PN} I and/or \textit{PN} II are reviewed in detail. Second, scholarly interpretations of the component suggested subsequent to (and therefore based on data available in) the original publications are discussed.\textsuperscript{15} Third, new evidence for the physical appearance and/or character of the component is presented (in the form of new data and often the interpretations thereof), and fourth, existing theories about the component’s function and/or significance are re-assessed and new ideas are proposed. In Chapter 6, the results of Chapters 3-5 are synthesized and overarching conclusions are drawn.

\textit{Importance of the Study}

The contributions of this dissertation are significant both for Pylian studies and for the broader field of Aegean prehistory. At Pylos, the accumulated data and proposed results help first and foremost to clarify further the character of the palace. Located at the heart of this structure, the megaron has long been identified as the physical and symbolic hub around which other palatial activities occurred and understanding how it was used is central to piecing together a synthetic picture of life on the Epano Englianos ridge. By returning to the original excavation records and physical remains, I begin to fill out this picture. For example, by elucidating the

\footnote{14 A slight variation on this presentation format occurs in Chapter 5, and is described in the chapter’s introduction.}
\footnote{15 These interpretations frequently appear also in the Chapter 2 survey. In Chapters 3-5, however, the isolation of ideas pertaining to particular components is intended to aid in-depth discussion rather than contribute to a broad narrative.}
types of artifacts excavated in the megaron and reassigning them to their stratigraphic contexts, I expand the lifespan of the suite to include not one but three (or possibly four) use-phases and show conclusively that objects recovered in the megaron do not represent the remains of *in situ* palatial period feasts. By inspecting the megaron’s built features and decoration, I corroborate and refine ideas that this space was used for religious activities and for the reception of visitors.

In addition, the data and conclusions generated by this dissertation provide a valuable reference for ongoing and future studies of the Palace of Nestor. For artifact analyses, descriptions of field methodologies and recording procedures will help to define the types of questions that can and cannot be asked of published material and also help to contextualize new discoveries. In particular, results presented herein will impact the upcoming reexamination of the megaron’s wall paintings, the only class of material not receiving full attention in this dissertation. While many of these paintings were found sufficiently well-preserved to permit their reconstruction and interpretation by Lang, de Jong, and most recently, Lucinda McCallum (discussed in Chapter 5), a sizeable number remain heavily encrusted with salts that obscure their decorated surfaces.\(^\text{16}\) A program of cleaning, conservation, and reconstruction of these fragments by HARP specialists has already begun. Once completed, the resulting new compositions will be impacted by (and will also likely impact) the conclusions presented here.

Beyond Pylos, the results of this dissertation tie into larger narratives regarding Mycenaean palaces. In particular, they have direct bearing on questions concerning regional diversity. As has been known for many years, there is considerable repetition between the built components of the different mainland palaces of the Late Bronze Age. The palaces at Pylos, Tiryns, and Mycenae share construction styles, lavishly painted and carved decoration, and suites of rooms for storage, craft production, and domestic living. The most familiar and celebrated

\(^{16}\) *PN* II, pp. 192-196; McCallum 1987.
shared component of these palaces, however, is the megaron, the “type fossil”\(^\text{17}\) (to borrow a term from ceramic studies) of the Mycenaean palace *par excellence*. Because of overt physical similarities in their design and decoration, these megara are easily assumed to have functioned in a similar (if not identical) way at each palace. While shared features certainly suggest a degree of uniformity among the conception and use of these structures, this dissertation highlights ways in which the Pylos megaron was unique – not simply an iteration of a monolithic idea, but a nuanced, individualized structure designed, at least in part, to respond to local stimuli and to meet local needs.

\(^{17}\) On the meaning of this term see recently Hatzaki 2007, pp. 152-154. In an architectural context, this use of the term “type fossil” is congruent with early assumptions about Mycenaean megara made by Dörpfeld, who is said to have had a “long lasting impact on the course of research... insofar as he introduced the notion of using specific architectural features to identify the whole [palace]” (Maran 2006b, p. 77).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF EARLIER RELEVANT STUDIES

Over the past fifty years, the function of the Pylos megaron, and in particular its main hall, or “Throne Room,” has been investigated in a wide range of scholarly publications. While many of these discussions are brief and/or derivative, there exists a core of literature, beginning with the final publication of the excavations at the Palace of Nestor in 1966 (PN I), in which this topic is addressed directly, in novel ways, and with supporting evidence. A summary of these studies is presented below. This survey is important not only as a means to contextualize the current investigation, but also as a way to illustrate how and why certain ideas have come to dominate the discussion. For this reason, the survey opens with an overview of trends in the interpretation of palatial megara prior to 1966. Because the megaron at Pylos was the last of the three canonical palatial examples to be unearthed (after megara at Tiryns and Mycenae), previous studies were critical to the development of scholarly thought about its use and demand close attention as sources of information.

Formative Studies of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

Historically, discussions of the use of Mycenaean palatial megara originated not in reference to standing archaeological remains, but as part of philological studies concerned with the layout of the Homeric palace. Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, scholars attempted to deduce the formal arrangement of rooms in the palaces (or “houses”) of Menelaus, Alcinous, Nestor, and, most commonly, Odysseus, described in the books of Homer’s Odyssey. In order to

18 As discussed in Chapter 1, the term “Throne Room” is that used by Blegen and Rawson to refer to the innermost room of the Pylos megaron. At other sites, however, the capitalized term “Megaron” was and is more commonly used for this purpose and will be employed below. Differences between this term and the lowercase term “megaron” are explained in Chapter 1.

19 As stated, this survey contains only studies of the megaron and/or its features that are concerned with the question of the suite’s function. Smaller, isolated interpretations of individual features not directly tied into larger use narratives are presented in the relevant data chapters (i.e., Chapters 3-5).
draw their floor plans, scholars relied not only on the bard’s architectural descriptions, but also his accounts of characters’ physical movements through, and activities in, these spaces. The room for which the greatest amount of detail was acquired was the μέγαρον, the undisputed core of the palace in which many pivotal events took place.

Although earlier plans had been proposed by scholars including Arthur Winckler, William Watkiss Lloyd, Joannes Protodikos, and Andrew Lang in the eighteen-sixties and seventies, the first attempt at an in-depth study of the Homeric house was undertaken by British Classicist Percy Gardner in 1882.20 Through a close reading of Homer’s text, Gardner produced a plan of the house of Odysseus (Figure 2.1) that centered around what he considered to be the three canonical parts of the houses of the “Homeric chiefs”: the court (αὐλή) with an altar to Zeus Ἐρκεῖος and a round structure (θόλος), the men’s hall (μέγαρον), and the women’s quarters (θάλαμος), all arranged along a single axis.21 According to Gardner’s plan, the μέγαρον sat at the center of these three spaces and was fronted by a narrow porch (αἴθουσα) with four columns supporting the roof above. In the doorway of the μέγαρον was a long, raised threshold made of ash (μέλινος οὐδός) on which stood a spear stand (δουροδόκη). The center of the μέγαρον contained two rows of columns that divided the room into three aisles (in the manner of a Christian church or a Medieval hall) and at its rear was a large circular hearth (ἐσχάρα).22 In the side wall of the μέγαρον was a small postern (ὀρσοθύρη) and behind the hearth was a second doorway marked by another stone threshold (λάινος οὐδός) and two standing columns that gave access to the women’s θάλαμος. The two doorways reconstructed at either end of the megaron

20 Winckler 1868, fig. 1; Lloyd 1877; Protodikos 1877; Butcher and Lang 1879, pp. 413-415.
21 Gardner 1882, p. 265.
22 For comparisons between Homeric megara and Scandinavian chieftain’s halls (skali) and/or halls in English Medieval manor houses and/or colleges at Oxford or Cambridge (e.g., Trinity Hall), see Gardner 1882, p. 265 and earlier, Butcher and Lang 1879, pp. 413-414. More recently, see Wace and Stubbings 1962, p. 494.
were closed by folding wooden doors, hung on pivot posts and secured by wooden bolts.\textsuperscript{23} Along

the sides of the house were two narrow corridors (\(\lambda\alpha\omega\rho\varepsilon\zeta\)) accessible from the \(\alpha\omega\lambda\eta\), the \(\mu\varepsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\) (by means of the \(\delta\rho\sigma\sigma\theta\omicron\rho\eta\)), and two doors on either side of the \(\theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\omicron\).\textsuperscript{23}

To produce his plan of the \(\mu\varepsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\), Gardner took note of specific activities described by

Homer as taking place in this room in the House of Odysseus. These included: sleeping (in the

ashes next to the fire, by Laertes and his slaves), cooking (at the hearth, as indicated by

descriptions of rising smoke), the reception of visitors (namely, Odysseus in the guise of a

beggar), eating/banqueting (as done by Odysseus and Peiraeus as well as Penelope’s suitors, who

sat at small tables set up for the event), contests (namely, shooting Odysseus’ bow through

twelve axes that Telemachus set into the room’s floor), musical performance (by the bard

Phemius), and bathing (of Odysseus, who is washed and anointed with oil).\textsuperscript{24} While these

activities featured male actors, women too, Gardner noted, were allowed inside Homer’s,

\(\mu\varepsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\).\textsuperscript{25} Penelope’s maidservants, he observed, enter the hall to clean up after the suitors’

feasts and to add fuel to the braziers, while Penelope herself stands in the doorway as the suitors

dine and leans against a chair spinning wool while Telemachus and Peiraeus have a quiet meal.\textsuperscript{26}

Not long after Gardner’s seminal study, impressions of the Homeric house took a

dramatic turn following excavations at the Mycenaean palace at Tiryns in the western Argolid by

Heinrich Schliemann and Wilhelm Dörpfeld in 1884.\textsuperscript{27} At the core of the structure, the

excavators unearthed rooms and features congruent with descriptions in Homer (and reproduced

in Gardner’s rendering) including a large room with a round hearth fronted by smaller rooms

\textsuperscript{23} Gardner 1882, p. 269.

\textsuperscript{24} As referenced by Gardner (1882): \textit{Od}. 11.190 (sleeping), 16.288-290 (cooking), 17.336 \textit{ff}. (reception of visitors):

27-32, \textit{passim} (eating and banqueting), 21.120 \textit{ff} (contests), 17.358-359 (musical performance), 19.386-507

(bathing).

\textsuperscript{25} Gardner 1882, pp. 271-272.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Od}. 18.307, 17.96-97.

\textsuperscript{27} Schliemann 1885. Prior to 1884, Schliemann had excavated trial trenches at Tiryns in 1876 (Schliemann 1878).
opening onto an open court that contained the remains of a low circular altar (Figure 2.2). The court, Dörpfeld identified as the Homeric αὐλή, while the room with the hearth was readily equated with the Homeric μέγαρον fronted by an expanded entry system. Following the Homeric model, the excavators declared that the Megaron was “the most important part of the palace” at Tiryns and gave it the alternative descriptive term “Men’s Hall” (“Männerwohnung”), implying the practice of male-centric activities (banqueting, story-telling, contests, etc.) similar to those that had taken place in the μέγαρα of the Odysseus, Alcinous, and Menelaus.

Despite these apparent congruencies, a number of differences between the architectural remains at Tiryns and the reconstructed Homeric house plan were also apparent. Concerning the megaron (Figure 2.3) and μέγαρον, disparities were evident in the layout of the suites, in their access patterns, and in the interior arrangement of their built features. Contrary to Gardner’s plan, at Tiryns the prodromos was its own room (located between the Megaron and the aithousa), while the Megaron possessed no interior doorways connecting it either to women’s quarters or to a flanking corridor system. Furthermore, at Tiryns, the hearth was found positioned not at the far end of the Megaron, approached, as Gardner had proposed, by twin colonnades, but rather in the center of the hall, surrounded by four columns arranged in a square.

These differences, Dörpfeld argued, did not necessarily make the layout of the Tiryns palace un-Homeric. For one, the central position of the hearth surrounded by four columns

28 Dörpfeld 1885a, p. 208; 1885b, pp. 337-340.
29 Dörpfeld 1885a, pp. 207-208.
30 As noted in Chapter 1, Schliemann and Dörpfeld used the lowercase version of this term in their publication to refer to a single room. In order to prevent confusion with the larger suite, which is more typically spelled in this way, I have capitalized the Tirynthian term here.
31 Dörpfeld 1885a, pp. 210, 216.
32 The absence of a rear doorway in the Tiryns Megaron also meant that the women’s quarters were not located behind the main hall (as indicated in Gardner’s plan), prompting Dörpfeld to situate them in a smaller megaron (see Figure 2.2) with its own aithousa and court in the eastern part of the palace (Dörpfeld 1885a, p. 216). In contrast to the main “men’s Megaron,” the smaller “women’s Megaron” had a square hearth and a single anteroom with no colonnade. This interpretation of the smaller megaron as the women’s quarters, however, was later challenged (see esp. Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 265-266; Wace 1951a, p. 204; Lorimer 1950, p. 413; Mylonas 1966, p. 47).
33 Dörpfeld 1885a, pp. 222-223.
worked well with Homer’s description of the μέγαρον in the House of Alcinous, where Odysseus is told by Nausicaa that he will find queen Arete leaning against a pillar while she spins wool by the fire.  

The position of the women’s quarters apart from the men’s megaron, Dörpfeld further suggested, was also acceptable given that the Homeric passages commonly cited in defense of the position of this room behind the μέγαρον did not, in fact, give solid evidence for this arrangement.

In the year after the results of the Tiryns excavations were published, Schliemann and Dörpfeld’s equation of the Tiryns Megaron with the Homeric μέγαρον received support in a study by John Henry Middleton, who produced an elevation of the room (Figure 2.4) based on the archaeological remains. The excavators’ ideas, however, were also heavily criticized. In an 1886 issue of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Classical philologist Richard Claverhouse Jebb drew new attention to the discrepancies between the Homeric and Tirynthian structures, including the different positions and numbers of the doors into the Megaron/μέγαρον, the locations of their hearths, and the connections between these rooms and the women’s quarters, all of which, he argued, were irreconcilable. To illustrate his conception of the “correct” Homeric structure, Jebb produced a revised version of Gardner’s plan (Figure 2.5) that affirmed the position of the μέγαρον between the αἴθουσα and the θάλαμος, its two rows of interior columns, and its rear hearth.

Jebb’s protests had little effect on the archaeological community. Also in 1886, Schliemann and Dörpfeld’s conclusions were echoed by Christos Tsountas of the Greek

---

34 Dörpfeld 1885a, p. 223; *Od.* 6.305-307. Reiterated in Tsountas and Manatt 1897, p. 64 and in Myres 1900, p. 140. Dörpfeld argued in particular that the short distance between the hearth and the columns at Tiryns would have encouraged people “at the fire” to lean up against them.

35 “…in the first four of these passages (*Od.* 1.133, 16.415, 28.209, 21.64), the doorposts of the great door into the megaron are intended, and in the last (*Od.* 21.236) the poet only speaks of the well-folding doors of the women’s apartment, without in the least implying that it opened into the men’s hall” (Dörpfeld 1885a, p. 227).

36 Middleton 1886.

37 Jebb 1886, reiterated in Jebb 1898 (pp. 175-185).
Archaeological Society, who had recently concluded excavations of a second Late Bronze Age palace on the citadel at Mycenae (Figure 2.6).\textsuperscript{38} This edifice, Tsountas observed, had much in common with the palace at Tiryns including a central room with a large hearth surrounded by columns that he likewise termed the “Megaron” (Figure 2.7).\textsuperscript{39} Like Schliemann and Dörpfeld, Tsountas identified the room as a “μέγαρο τῶν ἀνδρῶν,” which functioned as a Homeric style banqueting hall where a king, on the model of Alcinous, would have sat and drank wine while surrounded by a retinue of his esteemed peers seated “against the [room’s] wall from end to end.”\textsuperscript{40} Chairs such as those described in Alcinous’ Megaron, Tsountas further added, would have fit nicely on the cut stone floor slabs that he found around the perimeter of the hall at Mycenae.\textsuperscript{41}

As a result of the excavations at Tiryns and Mycenae, as well as those at the site of Gla (or “Gha”) in Boeotia by André de Ridder in 1893, Jebb’s insistence on a linear plan for the Homeric megaron was variably accepted by philologists.\textsuperscript{42} In the early twentieth century, scholars including Thomas D. Seymour agreed with Jebb’s reasoning, while others such as Walter Leaf, John Linton Myres, Guy Dickins, and Samuel E. Bassett proposed alternative floor plans that incorporated aspects of the archaeological model (Figures 2.8-2.10).\textsuperscript{43} These latter

\textsuperscript{38} Tsountas’ excavations followed earlier work at Mycenae by Schliemann in 1876, whose efforts, while substantial, did not produce a clear plan of the upper citadel (Schliemann 1878).

\textsuperscript{39} Tsountas 1886, pp. 64-70 (also see discussion in Tsountas and Manatt 1897, p. 63).

\textsuperscript{40} Tsountas and Manatt 1897, p. 64, referencing the description of activities in the megaron of Alcinous in Od. 5.305.

\textsuperscript{41} Tsountas and Manatt 1897, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{42} André de Ridder (1894, p. 281). Prior to de Ridder’s excavations, a plan of the site had been drawn (without excavation) by Ferdinand Noack (1894).

\textsuperscript{43} Seymour 1907, pp. 189, 197; Leaf and Bayfield 1895, pp. 559-560, pl. VI; Myres 1900; Dickins 1903 (also using evidence from the palace at Knossos); Bassett 1919. The ‘archaeological’ component shared between these plans is the location of the women’s quarters somewhere other than the rear of the (men’s) megaron. On this subject, also see the discussion by Ernest Gardner (1901), who, as Lorimer (1950, p. 411, n. 4) noted, identified problems with the current understanding of the Greek house (on which that of Odysseus is strongly based) on account of incorrect readings of Vitruvius.
illustrations, however, while informed by archaeological discoveries, were predominantly reliant on new readings of Homer’s texts. Because certain features of the archaeological remains were seen as fundamentally incompatible with the textual accounts, and because the excavated palaces were not at Ithaca, Sparta, Phaeacia, or any of the other citadels discussed in detail in the *Odyssey*, it was generally decided that the two classes of evidence need not directly intersect. Bassett, writing in 1919, puts it clearly:

“The palaces at Tiryns, Mycenae, and Gha are alike in the use of megaron with vestibule, single or double, and of other rooms opening on corridors. They differ in the situation of the apartments of secondary importance with respect to the megaron. Hence it is not necessary to believe that the palace of Odysseus was arranged like that at Mycenae or Tiryns, unless such an arrangement suits the narrative better than any other. A structure so complex as a palace was in all probability a growth to meet the increasing needs of the family and the estate, and the size, shape, and especially the location of the subsidiary apartments must have depended not only on these needs but on the peculiarities of the site and on the individual taste of the proprietor.”

As a result of this new attitude, archaeological evidence was largely removed from philological discourse. In the absence of convincing correlations with material remains, Homeric scholars were permitted (and even encouraged) to assess the house plans of Odysseus and other heroes primarily as literary constructs deduced from close analysis of Homer’s language. Key terms in Homer, not archaeological evidence, it was believed, would unlock the mystery of how rooms in the palaces of the *Odyssey* were interconnected.

---

44 In addition to the sites of Tiryns, Mycenae, and Gla, some scholars including Dickins (1903, pp. 329-330) also referenced the “palaces” at Phylakopi on Melos and at Knossos on Crete.

45 Bassett 1919, pp. 289-290. For this same attitude, see also Seymour (1907, p. 178) and much later, Palmer (1948), who practically ignores the prehistoric evidence in his analysis of the Homeric μέγαρον.

46 See in particular Seymour (1907, pp. 178-207) who inserted archaeological references into his early discussion of Homeric houses only when direct correspondences were apparent with the text.

47 See famously Myres’ interpretation of ἀνά and κατά as referring to the parts of the Homeric μέγαρον that were closer and farther from the doorway respectively (Myres 1900). Strong objections to this approach, however, were voiced by Wace, who argued that the new plans of Homeric houses generated in ignorance of archaeological data were not livable spaces (a concern also expressed by Palmer 1948, p. 92) and that they ignored clear indications of multiple stories. In opposition to these “bungalow type” single-story house plans, Wace produced his own interpretation of the Homeric house as a multi-story structure closely resembling the House of Columns, which he had excavated at Mycenae in 1939 (Wace 1951a).
In archaeological literature, however, the connection between material and text was not so easily severed. Because of the eagerness of excavators to equate their new finds with the palaces from the Homeric epics (and their perceived success in doing so) the bond between what was written and what was visible on the ground was rapidly cemented. This was evident not only in the continued application of Homeric room names to architectural units at Tiryns, Mycenae, and Gla, but also in the continued ascription of Homeric functions to each of those rooms and particularly to the most central room of all, the Megaron.\textsuperscript{48}

\textit{Ideas of the Mid-Twentieth Century}

Influenced by the studies of Schliemann, Dörpfeld, and Tsountas, archaeologists working at Mycenae and Tiryns in the early twentieth century continued to emphasize the Homeric function of these sites’ Megara. Between 1921 and 1923, when the results of the British School at Athens’ excavations at Mycenae were comprehensively published, Alan Wace interpreted the excavated Megaron as one of the “official reception rooms where the ruler of Mycenae would have sat in state to give audience to his people, to envoys and to other distinguished visitors.”\textsuperscript{49} In 1930, Kurt Müller’s re-analysis of the palatial architecture at Tiryns produced a similar assessment. The Megaron, he argued, was not a “Männerwohnung” but a royal chamber, as indicated by the presence of a throne against the right-hand wall of the room.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48} In addition to archaeological literature, a true melding of Homeric and archaeological evidence is also evident around this time in a study, \textit{The Homeric Palace}, by architect Norman Isham, who sought, in his own words, “to reconstruct..., from such sources as are open to us, a typical royal dwelling of the Homeric time...the final assemblage of the parts is, except in a general way, never the same in any two cases, and it would be as foolish to think that the plan was wrong because, after we had accounted for every room or court which Homer mentions, it did not exactly resemble that of the Tirynthian palace as it would be to condemn a restoration of the Chateau Gaillard which did not present the same plan as the Tower of London” (Isham 1898, pp. 4-5, italics added).
\textsuperscript{49} Wace et al. 1921-1923, p. 267, reiterated in Wace 1949, pp. 76, 80. The other “room” to which this passage refers is the so-called “Room of the Throne” (Room 52, located on the west side of the megaron’s court).
\textsuperscript{50} Müller 1930, pp. 145-146, 171, 198. Müller located the reception areas for foreign visitors and other distinguished guests in the western wing of the Tiryns palace (1930, p. 198).
Both the Megara at Mycenae and Tiryns were also interpreted as loci for the performance of religious rituals. At Mycenae, Wace’s colleague Winifred Lamb observed a close similarity between the “notched plume” decoration on the Megaron’s hearth and the decoration on portable tripod “altars/hearths” found by Arthur Evans at Knossos, leading her to infer that the former “should itself be regarded as a large immovable altar or table of offering rather than a hearth for purely domestic uses.” At Tiryns, Müller proposed that the grand size of the hearth and its close association with the throne implied that whatever took place there must have been “feierliche Handlung,” namely, ritual sacrifices. Following such sacrifices, Müller further contended, the hall itself would have been used for banqueting, as was thought to have occurred in more modest Bronze Age megaroid structures located in the Tiryns Unterburg and elsewhere on the Greek mainland.

Despite these arguments, reconstructions of the palatial Megaron as a religious space were not universally embraced. In 1939, for example, this arguably “un-Homeric” interpretation was challenged by Leister B. Holland, who claimed to have identified the remains of a Mycenaean palace on the Athenian Acropolis in the area of the “Dörpfeld foundations,” immediately south of the Classical Erechtheion. Quoting passages from Homer’s description of the palace of Alcinous, Holland proclaimed emphatically that the Athenian Megaron was not a shrine but a place where men of high rank “…feasted together at public expense. Such conclaves it was a duty as well as a privilege to attend, for here the royal policies were outlined and the public councils prepared.”

51 Wace et al. 1921-1923, p. 241. See also Müller (1930, pp. 197-198), who cited the round shapes of both features as a point of similarity.
52 Müller 1930, pp. 197-198.
53 Müller 1930, p. 198. Other such megaroid structures include those from Korakou, excavated and published by Blegen (1921).
54 Holland 1939.
55 Holland 1939, pp. 291-292.
Syntheses of the 1950s and Early 1960s

Following the excavations at Mycenae, Tiryns, Gla, and Athens, in the 1950s and 1960s synthetic studies of Greek Bronze Age archaeology appeared which reiterated (and reinforced) circulating ideas about the function of the palatial Megaron. In 1950, William B. Dinsmoor echoed the idea that the Megaron was the “men’s apartment” in his *Architecture of Ancient Greece*, while Hilda Lorimer stated in her *Homer and the Monuments* that the room at Mycenae was a place where the “king could give audience to foreign envoys.” In their 1962 *Companion to Homer*, Wace and Frank Stubbings presented their assessment of the Megaron as a “large reception room or dining hall,” while Emily Vermeule, in her 1964 *Greece in the Bronze Age*, proclaimed that the room “was by situation and by desire a focal point for business requiring the king’s voice, for reception of guests, and for large evening gatherings.”

Two years later, in 1966, George Mylonas in his *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age* identified the Pylos Throne Room (which had been published preliminarily by Blegen in the *American Journal of Archaeology*) as the seat of the king, as a place for royal libations, and as a reception room for guests – the latter on account of similarities between the room and the hall visited by Telemachus during his visit to Pylos in Book 3 of the *Odyssey*. In his discussion of the Megaron at Tiryns, Mylonas reiterated similar ideas, stating that this “was the unit where the king received his visitors, held public audiences, and perhaps public affairs like state banquets, etc.”

---

56 Dinsmoor 1950, p. 19; Lorimer 1950, p. 413.
59 Mylonas 1966, p. 47.
Also in 1966, Blegen and Rawson published their own interpretations of the megaron of the Palace of Nestor in PN I. In their discussion, the excavators argued that the features of the suite’s Throne Room marked it as a “great ceremonial hall.”60 The rectangular void found against the room’s right-hand wall, the excavators suggested, was occupied by a royal throne fashioned from inlaid wood, while an adjacent floor channel, they tentatively posited, may have been designed to receive ceremonial libations poured by the king.61 A plastered tripod table found on the floor they identified as for votive offerings (placed in two miniature kylíkes) and the great central hearth they suggested functioned not only as a source of heat but also as a place for roasting large quantities of meat (perhaps a whole ox) for royal banquets.62 In the megaron’s Vestibule, Blegen and Rawson further postulated that a hole in its floor may have made to support the base of a spear stand (δουροδόξη) like that used by Telemachus during his visit to the palace of Odysseus in Odyssey Book 1, while plaster-lined rectangles in this room and in the Portico may have once served as stands for sentries posted to guard the suite.63

With the exception of the spear-rack (and the decision to call the structure the “megaron” of the “Palace of Nestor”), Blegen and Rawson’s interpretations of the Pylos megaron were less overtly Homeric than theories offered by their predecessors about megara in the Argolid. Rather than declaring its main room to be the location of generalized Homeric activities (the reception of visitors, council meetings, dining,64 etc.), the excavators attempted to reason out the uses of individual built features and employed terms like “ceremonial hall” that left much to the

---

60 PN I, p. 34.
61 PN I, p. 88.
62 PN I, pp. 78, 89.
63 PN I, p. 72. Although not stated, this idea may tie into the earlier suggestion, made by Michael Jameson in a paper about prehistoric Greek sacrifice, that the hearths of the palatial megara were used for the consecration of burnt animal offerings (Jameson 1958).
64 While Blegen and Rawson did refer to the possible use of the Throne Room’s hearth to roast meat, they did not, unlike other scholars, state specifically that this room was used for dining.
imagination. This apparent restraint, however, had little impact on scholars writing immediately after PN I was published. William McDonald, for example, who had served as field director at Pylos in 1939, crafted a lavish, overtly Homeric reconstruction of events in the site’s megaron in his 1967 Progress Into the Past. Speaking in the first person, McDonald recounted how, following a visit to the palace’s Northeast Building, Telemachus and his party were taken to the Throne Room where:

“Nestor takes his seat on the wooden throne decorated with costly inlay and a servant brings him a cup of wine. He pledges us a welcome and passes the cup to us. When it is handed back to him, he pours the remainder of the libation into a depression in the floor at his right from which it trickles along a channel to a second depression. His wife and family, servants and courtiers gather in the throne room or look down from a sort of gallery or mezzanine with its railing framed by the tall slender columns. We are formally introduced and offered light refreshments.”

Following this reception, the guests are bathed and then taken on a tour of the palace. At the end,

“…just as darkness is falling and torches are being lit, we are summoned to dinner in the great hall. Tables have been set up and are loaded with food. As eating gives way to serious sampling of the products of the Pylian vineyards, Nestor calls for a song. A distinguished figure rises from his place at table and picks up a lyre. Leaning on a column and with the torchlight fitfully illuminating his fine old face, he begins the epic tale of the Neleid conquest of the Pylos region.”

In the same year that McDonald presented the Pylos Throne Room as a Homeric-style reception and banquet hall, the latter idea was called into question by J. Walter Graham, who argued, on the basis of textual and archaeological evidence, that this room was not a place for formal dining. In Homer, Graham observed, Odysseus’ meal at the palace of Alcinous in Odyssey Book 7 was something of a “pick-up supper served to him at a small table in the megaron, while his hosts continue with their rounds of wine.” Equally, the food eaten in the Megaron of Odysseus by the “lawless suitors” in Book 21, Graham contended, was not likely

---

65 McDonald 1967, pp. 341-342.
66 McDonald 1967, p. 345.
part of normal procedure given that the royal household was, at this point in time, “utterly disorganized.”

Looking at the excavated architecture, Graham contended that while the Pylos Throne Room’s layout was similar to that of Minoan banquet halls, its available floor space would have been severely limited by the central hearth and its surrounding columns, by the throne, and by the need to keep the area near the doorway clear in order to accommodate the movement of servants. “Even if we credit the hardy Mycenaean Greeks with less nicely developed aesthetic sensibilities than the Minoan Cretans,” Graham reasoned, “Homer’s verbal picture of them, or their own pictorial representations of themselves, hardly justify our thinking of them as uncouth boors quaffing their wine and devouring their joints of meat crowded together in rude simplicity.”

As an alternative, Graham suggested that banqueting at Pylos took place in Halls 64 and 65 of the palace’s Southwest Building, which, he reasoned, had more floor space, loftier ceilings, and better access to rooms for food preparation and vessel storage.

*Moving Away from Homeric Models: 1973-1980*

While studies of the use of palatial Megara up to and through the 1960s relied frequently on Homeric models, scholarship took a dramatic turn in the 1970s, as evidenced by articles published by Bernard C. Dietrich and Mary O. Knox in 1973. In the former, appearing in *Rivista Storica dell’Antichità*, Dietrich proposed a new interpretation of archaeological Megara based on linguistic evidence. By tracing the Greek term “µέγαρον” back to the Hebrew word “mēšara,” or “cave,” Dietrich proposed that the great hall was the site of a primitive fertility/vegetation cult that had been transferred from a natural setting first to the Minoan and then to the Mycenaean

---

70 Graham 1967, p. 360.
palaces during the Late Bronze Age.71 The term’s religious meaning, he noted, was preserved in historical Greek festivals such as the Arrhe(to)phoria, the Thesmophoria, and the Skirophoria, which were focused on rebirth and which made use of “μέγαρα” (i.e., subterranean “caves”) for the deposition of ritual objects and animals.72 When the rituals were transferred from outdoor cave settings to the indoor structures of the Bronze Age palaces (and later to Greek temples of Demeter), Dietrich reasoned, the term “μέγαρον” persisted, preserving the history of the rites’ origin.73

While Dietrich tested the potential of non-Homeric sources as a means to understand the Megaron’s function, Knox, writing for *Classical Quarterly*, attempted to drive a permanent wedge between excavated Megara and the Homeric institution in her article: “Megarons and ΜΕΓΑΡΑ: Homer and Archaeology.”74 Based on a close reading of the epics, Knox determined that nearly all of the important features of Homeric μέγαρα, including the hearth as a cooking surface, the pitched design of the roof,75 the earthen covering of the floor, and the form and position of its attendant courts, that were essential to the plots of the epics were clear reflections not of the Mycenaean period, but of the Iron Age.76 The reason for this, Knox argued, was Homer’s intention for his stories to be not only entertaining but also credible to his eighth century audience. While Late Bronze Age details were occasionally added to enliven the story,

---

71 Dietrich 1973, pp. 4-5. This theory is modeled to a large extent on Dietrich’s earlier contention that such a cult moved from caves to the palace at Knossos (1973, p. 5, referencing Dietrich 1967, p. 402). Also see Dietrich 1974, pp. 136-139. For an earlier discussion of the Hebrew derivation of the term “Megaron,” see Palmer 1948, p. 100.

72 Dietrich 1973, p. 5, citing a scholion on Lucian (D. Meretr. 275.23ff) and a passage by Pausanias (9.8.1).

73 Dietrich 1973, p. 8, n. 47. See for example, the temples to Demeter on Paros (Herod., 6, 134), Delos (Inscr. de Délos, 440A, 41, and at Piraeus (IG, II, 1177, 6f).


75 The roof of the Mycenaean megaron has been a topic of considerable debate. See especially: Dörpfeld 1885a, pp. 248-250; Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 270-280; Dinsmoor 1942; Smith 1942; Blegen 1945; Hopkins 1968, pp. 50-53; Iakovidès 1990. Currently, the preferred interpretation of the roof of the palatial megaron is that it was flat, as illustrated by de Jong’s reconstruction from Pylos (see Figure 3.4).

descriptions of contemporary, familiar Iron Age structures were necessary, Knox reasoned, to craft a believable tale.77

At the time they were written, Knox’s conclusions were illustrative of a growing trend among scholars to divorce archaeological remains from the Homeric epics based on a more widespread understanding of the process of oral composition.78 As a result, from the 1970s onward, studies of prehistoric structures, including the megaron, placed increasing emphasis on archaeological material as the primary source of evidence. In a 1980 issue of *Opuscula Atheniensia*, Gösta Säflund produced one of the first of such studies using material from the Palace of Nestor. Judging from the thousands of kylikes found at the site, he argued that the palace had once been the site of large-scale sacrificial banquets. The location of these banquets (and of the accompanying animal sacrifice), he contended, was the Throne Room as indicated by scenes of dining (see Figure 5.10) and of processing figures painted on the walls of this room and its connected Vestibule (see Figure 5.4).79 As ritual actions, these large banquets seemed to Säflund to be forerunners of historical πανηγύρια, and he identified the palace (including the Throne Room) at Pylos as a hieron – a sanctuary that served as an abode for both the “chief Pylian deities and their priesthood.”80

*The Megaron and Religion: 1981-2001*

For the next two decades, discussions of the religious function of the palatial Megaron continued to dominate scholarship. In a series of papers published in 1981, 1985 and 1995, Robin Hägg identified the room as a locus of Mycenaean cult on account of its large central

---

78 Based on anthropological studies of oral performances in pre-modern societies. See most canonically the perspectives on this topic offered by Albert Lord (1960) and Milman Parry (1971).
79 Säflund 1980, p. 241, with reference to reconstructions in *PN II*.
80 Säflund 1980, pp. 244-245.
hearth. Following Lamb and Müller before him, Hägg argued that the size and location of this canonical fixed feature indicated that it had a “ceremonial function,” and stated further that this was accentuated at Pylos by the in situ table of offerings (which he identified as a piece of Minoan cult equipment) found nearby. Hägg also called attention to the “ritual” character of the wall-painted procession and banqueting scenes in the Vestibule and Throne Room (noted by Säflund), as well as of the fragmentary representation of a stone jug (see Figure 5.8), which he connected with the “libation channel” cut into the Throne Room’s floor. Collectively, Hägg argued, these elements offered evidence for practices connected with what he termed Mycenaean “state” or “official” cult associated with the wanax, a powerful figure (usually identified as a lord or king) appearing in both the Homeric epics (ἀναξ) and in Linear B texts (wa-na-ka).

In the later 1980s and 1990s, increasing emphasis was placed on this connection between the Megaron, religion, and the wanax. At Pylos, McCallum highlighted the links between these three elements in her 1987 doctoral dissertation on the suite’s wall paintings. Combining evidence published by Lang in PN II with her own observations of unpublished wall painting fragments, McCallum interpreted the scenes painted on the walls of the Pylos Vestibule and Throne Room as parts of a connected program designed to reflect (and reinforce) the wanax’s political power. The scenes of processing figures, animal sacrifice, musical performance, and feasting (for which she offered revised reconstructions, see Figures 5.16 and 5.17) she argued

---

81 Hägg 1981, p. 36.
83 Hägg 1981, p. 36; 1995, p. 389, citing earlier work on this subject at Tiryns by Kilian (1981; 1992). On the translation of the Homeric term “ἀναξ,” see Autenrieth 1958, p. 28. For translation of the Linear B term “wa-na-ka,” see Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 589. As noted by Palaima (1995, p. 123), the term “wanax” is not Indo-European in origin, but is instead a foreign loan word. As one “unprovable” option, Palaima suggests that the word may have been borrowed from the Minoans, who themselves picked it up from cultures in the Near East: “It is more reasonable to attribute the borrowed aspects of the most important figure in Mycenaean society to the influence of the predominant culture [i.e., the Minoans] within the Aegean prior to (MH II-III) and during (LH I-IIA) the formative stages of palatial culture” (Palaima 1995, p. 128).
84 McCallum 1987.
85 McCallum 1987, p. 142.
represented the different components of a religious festival. Details of the scene underscored the political-religious function of the room by illustrating the power of the *wanax* to undertake and sustain such festivals thereby insuring the “kingdom’s prosperity through adequate provisioning of the gods.”

Klaus Kilian, director of excavations at Tiryns, also inferred a ritual character for the palatial Megaron. Building on his 1984 assessment of the Pylos example, in which he concluded that the throne was occupied by a person of religious importance (the *wanax*), he demonstrated, in a published conference paper, how the room, with its large ceremonial hearth and elaborate wall paintings, was at the end of an approach that featured large-scale processions of female offering bearers. In 1988, Kilian refined his argument further in the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, where he proposed that the entire architectural and decorative program of the Mycenaean palace was designed to connect to and emphasize the *wanax*. Because of the prominent position of the throne at the center of the palace (i.e., in the Megaron), Kilian contended that the layout, construction, and decoration of the surrounding edifice were forms of purposeful and skillfully executed royal propaganda, indicative of what he termed a “*wanax*-ideology.”

In 1993, a synthetic study of Bronze Age Megara published by Kjell Werner reaffirmed the use of these structures as settings for displays of power. Following Kilian, Werner wrote that palatial Megara were the “architectonic climax of the palaces…skillfully planned, built, and embellished.” On the subject of rituals and feasts, however, Werner was more skeptical. Although admitting that such activities were probable, he concluded that they were likely only a
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small part of the Megaron’s usage – supplementary to the room’s primary function as a “centre of daily life.” The strongest evidence for this argument, Werner cited, were the Megara’s large central hearths, which, he argued, could not have been justified “only to heat a hall for official activities and feasts, and, in between, a room that was usually empty.” This more practical interpretation echoed ideas published in 1990 by Géry de Pierpont, who suggested that palatial hearths were intended primarily for providing light, heat, and surfaces for cooking – the last indicated by vessels found in palatial Megara, which he claimed were rooms for feasts.

In 1994, James Wright renewed discussion of a ritual interpretation for the Megaron by redefining the nature of the connection between the room’s architecture and the wanax in a seminal paper in Susan Alcock and Robin Osbourne’s edited volume, *Placing the Gods*. Adding to the conclusions reached by Kilian in 1988, Wright proposed a direct connection between the wanax and the Megaron’s central hearth with which the royal throne was aligned. The nature of this bond, which formed the basis of what Wright termed “hearth-wanax ideology,” was primarily religious. The great hearth, located “at the centre of the physical sphere of Mycenaean society” (the *axis mundi*), Wright identified as the site of rituals conducted by the wanax, which ensured the prosperity of the kingdom. As Wright explained: “[the wanax]…may have been the guardian of the hearth, and, in so far as the hearth represents the household, also the guardian of the family, protector of the household, and guarantor of its future.” At Pylos,
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the religious character of the throne and hearth was further reinforced, Wright inferred, by the presence of nearby ritual paraphernalia including the table of offerings and the libation channel.96

Another year later, in 1995, the religious character of the Megaron was again claimed by Thomas Palaima, Paul Rehak, and Jane Carter. Working from the evidence of Linear B texts, Palaima, in his discussion of the “Nature of the Mycenaean *Wanax,*” asserted that the Throne Room at Pylos was a center for “community-uniting ceremonies,” and that “at least some symbolic ritual activities must have taken place [within it],” overseen by a male *wanax* with supreme religious authority.97 Rehak, by contrast, suggested in the proceedings of the fifth *Aegaeum* conference, *POLITEIA: State and Society in the Bronze Age,* that it was a woman, not a man, who principally sat the Pylian throne. Drawing on evidence of seated female figures in Late Bronze Age art including examples in glyptic from Tiryns (see Figure 4.19) and in wall paintings from Knossos (see Figure 4.20), he concluded that the thrones of each of the palatial Megara could have been occupied by female priestesses, or perhaps queens.98 Seated, these women did not receive guests or dispense justice (in the manner of the Homeric *ἄναξ*) but rather oversaw ritualized communal drinking events, which, Rehak argued, were the primary activities of the Throne Room at Pylos as indicated by iconographic representations and by the copious kylikes found in and around the site.99

Also in 1995, Jane Carter, in a published tribute to Vermeule, suggested that the Pylian Throne Room may have been used in ceremonies connected to ancestor cult. This argument hinged on her proposed identification of the megaron as the “Mycenaean equivalent” of a Syro-

96 Wright 1994, p. 57.
97 Palaima 1995, pp. 132-134. Also see this view in Hägg 1995, p. 388. To quote Palaima (1995, p. 134), “Piet de Jong’s color reconstruction of the Throne Room at Pylos in inaccurate in many ways, but I think it is most accurate in its most imaginative detail: there is a male *wanax* sitting on the throne.”
98 Rehak 1995, p. 117.
Palestinian bet marzéah, the owned or leased house of an association of prominent men, who engaged in ritual activities beneficial to the local community. In this case, Carter proposed, feasts and ceremonies would have been held in the Megara in order to “nourish the bonds among living and dead, part of a mutually reinforcing complex of religious, political, and social system.” Drinking rituals, she added, would have been central to such occasions and at Pylos may have made use of the room’s libation channel.

Finally, discussions of a religious use of the palatial Megaron culminated in 2001 in a paper on Mycenaean sanctuaries published by Gabrielle Albers in the proceedings of the 8th Aegaeum conference, POTNIA: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age. Albers, following Hägg, argued that the Megaron was the main venue of the “official” or “state” cult system, where “ritual affairs were taken care of under the immediate supervision and probably also active participation of the ruler [i.e., the wanax].” Contrary to the earlier arguments of Säflund, Albers made clear that this cult practice did not imply that the Megaron was a sanctuary (hieron) or similar type of divine residence. Because, she stressed, the Megaron was “first and foremost…the residence of the ruler and the seat of power of his all-authoritative administrative system,” the forms of divine veneration that took place within its walls were inherently political, the prerogative of the wanax who followed patterns prescribed by a “Mycenaean fixed annual cycle of religious events.”

100 Carter 1995, pp. 300-304.
103 Albers 2001, p. 133.
104 The Mycenaean equivalent of a ‘temple,’ Albers argued was the public communal sanctuary, like the Cult Center at Mycenae that was set apart from the main palace structure (2001, p. 133). This scenario is complicated, Albers also conceded, if the wanax himself was considered not just a “religious personality,” but truly divine (2001, pp. 133-134).
105 Albers 2001, p. 133.
In discussions of the function of the palatial Megaron, 2001 also marked the year in which scholars began to explore its use as an arena for propaganda and display. John Bennet, for example, in an edited volume on Mycenaean economy and politics, posited that the painted composition on the NE wall of the Pylos Throne Room only “worked” when the image was completed by the live figure of the wanax sitting on his throne. The large-scale lions and griffins to either side of the throne (see Figure 1.4), he suggested, served as “focalizing devices,” drawing attention towards the seated figure and thereby enhancing his authority.106 In 2007, Bennet refined his idea even further, referring to the Throne Room’s life-size wall decoration as “participatory space,” in which a “‘first-person’ iconography of power” was constructed on “appropriate occasions.”107

Also in 2007, Bennet’s idea was taken a step further by Joseph Maran and Eftychia Stavrianopoulou, who proposed at a conference on Bronze Age elites and elite lifestyles that the palatial Megaron was used for the performance of divine epiphany. Merging Bennet’s reconstruction of the “framed” wanax with Helga Reusch’s suggestion that the throne at Knossos was occupied by a priestess performing the role of a goddess, Maran and Stavrianopoulou proposed that the thrones at Pylos, Mycenae, and Tiryns were locations where the male wanax may have also ritually embodied the goddess.108 They argue that while extant iconography suggests a female incumbent during such rituals,

“…we think it is necessary to differentiate between the female deity who appears in the images and is indeed likely to have been regarded as the owner of the throne, and the actual person responsible for enacting the epiphany in ritual. We don’t see any reason why this shouldn’t have been the wanax and we would even suggest that
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106 Bennet 2001, pp. 33-34.
holding the main role of the epiphany ritual belonged to the central tasks within the 
\textit{wanax} ideology."\textsuperscript{109}

Rather than enacting the arrival of the goddess via a sudden appearance (as Wolf-Dietrich 
Niemeier had proposed for the performance of the rite in the Throne Room at Knossos, where a 
priestess may have emerged from a connected sanctuary), Maran and Stavrianopoulou suggested 
that the transformation may have been effected when the \textit{wanax} was viewed through the 
"flickering hearth fire."\textsuperscript{110} In such a scenario, they argued, the male \textit{wanax} would have embodied 
human and divine roles simultaneously, helping to explain his “curiously ambivalent” character 
in the Linear B texts.\textsuperscript{111}

In the midst of discussion over the use of the throne, scholarly interest also returned to 
the idea of communal dining, as evidenced by the 2004 publication of a \textit{Hesperia} supplement 
entitled: “The Mycenaean Feast.” In this volume, contributions by Wright, Palaima, Stocker and 
Jack Davis, and Susan Sherratt all connected ritual feasting with the Pylos megaron, which 
featured wall paintings, ceramics, foodstuffs, and furniture reflective of and/or suitable for large 
banquets.\textsuperscript{112} At Pylos, it was largely contended that banquets were held in one or more of the 
palace’s outdoor courts, i.e., Courts 63 and 88.\textsuperscript{113} The idea that the Throne Room may have been 
tangentially involved in such dining events was explored by Stocker and Davis, who proposed
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series).
\textsuperscript{113} For discussion of the outdoor environment of feasting at Pylos, see Stocker and Davis 2004, p. 191, esp. n. 59. 
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that feast-related rituals involving miniature kylikes might have occurred in this room, where such vessels were “in use at the time of the final destruction of the palace.”

That feasts were actually held in the Throne Room at Pylos was proposed by Lisa Bendall in another 2004 edited volume: *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*. Taking a different approach than that used by Säflund and other previous proponents of the feasting theory, Bendall analyzed the distribution of banqueting vessels (mainly kylikes) at Pylos to demonstrate that palatial feasts were hierarchical and utilized different locations in the palace to reinforce differences in social standing among the participants. At the Palace of Nestor, she argued for three distinct dining areas. Those guests from the lowest social echelon feasted in Court 58 (using ceramic dishes of “inferior” quality from Pantry 60), while those on the “middle” tier sat in Court 63 (using fine wares from Pantries 18-22). The most esteemed guests, who constituted the smallest social group, Bendall contended, feasted in the Throne Room itself, using valuable metal vessels as indicated by fragments of silver and bronze, which she noted, were found “concentrated” in the megaron.

Bendall’s argument received tentative support from Bennet, who, in a 2007 festschrift for Stefan Hiller, emphasized the connection between the *wanax* and feasting in the Throne Room’s wall paintings. Building on his argument from 2001, he compared the large-scale lions and griffins to either side of the throne with the smaller scale scenes of the lyre player and paired diners positioned at the southeastern end of the room’s NE wall (see Figure 5.10). While the latter compositions created a different type of viewer experience (their small scale marking them as “detached observer”/“panoptic” space rather than “inclusive”/“participatory” space), Bennet

argued that their inclusion on the same wall as the lions and griffins and their physical proximity to the throne implied a “link between the wanax and such [feasting] activities.”117 This evidence, together with that of portable artifacts, Bennet inferred, could indicate that feasts at Pylos took place in Court 63 (as he and Davis had argued previously in 1999) as well as in the open spaces in front of the palace, and in the Throne Room itself.118

In 2008, feasting in the palatial Megara was again purported in the publication of the proceedings from the twelfth Aegaeum conference: DAIS: the Aegean Feast. In her article on decorated dining halls, Elizabeth Shank argued for feasting in the Pylos Throne Room based on the wall paintings, which provided “an iconography of the feast itself” as well as the “proximity of large storerooms…and the extensive remains of burned faunal material at the palace.”119 This contention was echoed by Helène Whittaker, who in the same volume affirmed Bendall’s interpretation of metal vessel fragments from the Pylos megaron as evidence for their use in palatial feasting, and by Rachel Fox, who drew attention to the physical exclusivity and comfort of the Pylos Throne Room as part of her study of the role of sensory perceptions and patterns of access at Mycenaean banquets.120

Despite its resurgence in the literature, the idea that feasts were held in palatial Megara was not universally accepted. A dissenting opinion, for example, was offered by Cynthia Shelmerdine, who in the DAIS volume built a case against feasting in the Pylos Throne Room based on its limited ventilation, the depictions of foliage in its wall-painted banquet scene as reconstructed by McCallum (providing further evidence for “al fresco” dining), and its lack of

117 Bennet 2007, p. 13. Such a link, Bennet further reasoned, was indicated in the Pylos Linear B records, specifically in PY Un 2, which recorded a feast at pa-ki-ja-ne on the occasion of the “initiation” of the wanax, and PY Ta 711, which inventoried materials for a feast on the occasion of the wanax’s appointment of a da-mo-ko-ro, discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.
118 Bennet 2007, p. 17, citing Davis and Bennet 1995.
120 Whittaker 2008b, p. 95; Fox 2008, p. 134. On sensory perception, see also recent work by Joanne Murphy (2010) on the role played by the use of perfumed oil during palatial feasting events.
access to storerooms. In response to Bendall, she further added that the metal fragments found in the megaron were not nearly sufficient to qualify as a “concentration,” and also that such pieces were likely to have fallen into the rooms from an upper story as evidenced by their discovery in fill “well above” the rooms’ floors.

The Pylos Megaron in Recent Discourse: 2011-present

The most recent hypotheses concerning the function of the Pylos Megaron, presented by Jarrett L. Farmer and Michael Lane and by Ulrich Thaler, move away from feasting to focus again on the use of the room as symbolic and performative space. In two conference papers delivered in 2011 and 2012, Farmer and Lane argued against the identification of the Pylos Megaron as an administrative “Throne Room” in which a male wanax held royal audiences and managed the realm’s bureaucratic affairs. This model, they argued, was based on Homeric readings and analogies with the great halls of Medieval Europe and did not match either the archaeological or textual evidence. Instead, they suggested that the Megaron, which they alternately termed the “Hearth Room,” functioned as a locale for ritualized elite drinking and for the symbolic and epiphanic presentation of seated individuals (likely, following Rehak’s earlier argument, a woman). Situated on the right-hand side of the room, the seated figure, they suggested, would have been invisible to the viewer as he entered the room – and would only have been revealed when he approached the hearth and/or circled around the room’s four columns.

121 Shelmerdine 2008, p. 405.
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123 Farmer 2011; Farmer and Lane 2012.
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Thaler, who has closely studied the architecture of the Pylos palace and its access patterns, also placed emphasis on the experience of the Throne Room as a built environment. Beginning in the mid-2000s, he suggested that the Pylos megaron was designed as the focal point of the palace. Building on previous approaches to the study of Tiryns, Thaler proposed that the path of visitors to the Pylos Throne Room was lengthened by real and perceived (i.e., physical and sensory) thresholds, which together reinforced and intensified the visitor’s experience as he made his way into this central space. Examples of such thresholds included the megaron’s sentry stands, which helped to “highlight” transitions between different rooms and distance the wanax from the outside. In 2012, Thaler further contended that those individuals who ultimately arrived in the Throne Room moved through the space in a clockwise direction, mimicking the movement of processing figures painted on the room’s SE wall (preserved in Pylos fragment group 45 H 6 (see Figure 4.77)). By moving to the left, the visitor, he proposed, would have gained an impressive view of Bennet’s “first-person” tableau of the enthroned wanax framed not only by pairs of lions and griffins but also by the room’s columns (see Figure 4.78). If permitted, the visitor could have then continued his clockwise circuit, moving deeper into the space and reaching the table offerings, on which he might deposit a miniature kylix, and the northwestern basin of the libation channel, into which he might pour an offering to (or together with) the seated wanax.

Synthesis

126 Thaler 2005, p. 334; 2006, p. 101. For studies of directed movement to the megaron at Tiryns using architecture and decorative elements, see Wright 2006b; Maran 2006b.
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Collectively, the preceding studies provide a synthetic overview of ideas regarding the function of the Pylos megaron over the past nearly fifty years. Rooted in discussions and hypotheses about Homeric μέγαρα and excavated palatial megara dating back to the late 1800s, these interpretations primarily cast the space as having been used in one or more of three ways: for feasting and/or drinking, for religious rituals and ceremonies, and/or for the reception visitors (and royal propaganda). While each of these ideas had a “heyday,” none was chronologically exclusive. As a result, each is now fundamental to our conception of the use of this central space. Inasmuch as these ideas are compelling, however, they cannot be productively evaluated given the lack of details about many classes of archaeological evidence in the suite’s final publications. In the following chapters, these lacunae are filled through the complete presentation and (re)study of the megaron’s stratigraphy, portable finds, and built features, and a substantial reexamination of its painted decoration. The results of these investigations enable the existing theories to be appraised and new ideas to be proposed.
CHAPTER 3: STRATIGRAPHY, POTTERY, AND SMALL FINDS

The first components of the Pylos megaron to be reexamined in order to assess current theories about the latter’s use are its stratigraphy, pottery, and small finds. In this chapter, these elements are studied in detail in order to elucidate their character and determine how they contribute to our understanding of the suite. For clarity, the chapter is divided into four parts. First, the published descriptions and interpretations of the stratigraphy and portable finds offered by Blegen and Rawson in *PN* I are reviewed. Second, scholarly interpretations of these layers and/or finds suggested subsequent to (and therefore based on the data available in) the original publications are discussed. Third, a full account of the megaron’s strata, contexts, and contents is presented, with frequent reference to data compiled in Appendices 1 and 2. Fourth, these observations are interpreted and the results are used to evaluate existing theories of the megaron’s function and to generate new ideas.

**Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations**

As noted in Chapter 1, Blegen and Rawson published the stratigraphy and artifacts from the Pylos megaron in *PN* I as part of their survey of the contents of Rooms 4, 5, and 6. The stratigraphy was reported using roughly a paragraph of descriptive text, typically situated as a “coda” at the end of each room’s entry. No section profiles or matrices were provided, nor were references to published photographs. In some cases, precise depth measurements were included, particularly for the plowed surface earth, which ranged between 0.15 m. and 0.25 m. deep. Different contexts were not named, but were described according to their location, shape, color, texture, and/or inclusions (both artifacts and building materials). In some cases, specific finds were mentioned in association with a deposit and/or as occupying a particular location within a
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room. These descriptions of the stratigraphy from each of the megaron’s three rooms (beginning with the largest room, the Throne Room, and working outward) are quoted in full below.

**The Throne Room (Room 6):**

“The deposit covering the Throne Room had a maximum depth in its southeastern section of 1.25 m. but it grew much shallower, following the descending slope of the hill toward its northwestern end where the depth was only 0.70 m. At the top was a plowed layer, 0.15 m. to 0.25 m. deep. Beneath it was a stratum of black earth and small stones occupying somewhat more than the whole central square of the hall reaching a depth of 0.40 m. to 0.48 m. Beneath the black stratum and spread out over the area of the hearth, from -0.42 m. to -0.50 m., were numerous small fragments of coarse terracotta which eventually were recognized to be remains of the chimney fragments mentioned above (p. 81). Underneath these pieces the hearth was covered with yellowish disintegrated brick, hard and filled with burned matter, charcoal, and ashes. The area outside the central square, from plowed earth to the floor, was filled with debris of burned and dissolved crude brick, generally red but with a sloping patch of yellow toward the western corner. In the northwestern section the deposit of red burned brick with an admixture of black was very loose in contrast to the southwestern section where it was extraordinarily hard. Masses of relatively large stones fallen from the walls appeared in all sections, in many places going down to the floor, and a particularly large heap of stones was observed just inside the doorway all the way across the width of the opening and more. Near the northeast wall were the crumbling remains of poros blocks. Extending ca. 4 m. from the eastern corner alongside the northeast wall, lying face down or sloping, was a considerable concentration of fragments of fallen plaster. They continued northwestward to the end of the wall in diminishing quantity perhaps corresponding to the diminishing depth of the deposit. A fair amount of fallen plaster was recovered beside the southeastern wall but very little along the southwestern and northwestern.

Very few objects of any kind were found on the floor. Almost all of the objects were recovered in the debris of disintegrated brick, plaster, and stones that fell outside the central square of the room.”  

Additionally, in the area of the so-called Throne Space, the excavators note that “the central part of the space enclosed within the rim was found filled with burned red earth extending down to virgin soil at a depth of ca. -0.40 m.”

**The Vestibule (Room 5):**

“The deepest part of the accumulation covering the palace stretched across the Vestibule, ranging from 1.20 m. to 1.30 m. in depth, sloping gently downward toward the southwest. At the top, plowed soil accounted for 0.25 m.; next below, reddish debris from the destruction containing a great mass of large stones extended to the floor. On the latter, vitrified remains of a pot were noted near the north corner of the room. The fallen wreckage contained the usual quota of potsherds.”
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The Portico (Room 4):

“The Portico was buried under accumulation, ca. 1.25 m. deep: plowed earth at the top, beneath it, in the center, a continuation of the depression fills with black earth and stones seen in the Court [3], here 0.50 m. deep. Under the black stony deposit and at each end of the depression, fine brown earth, dry, ashy and sandy but fairly hard with many patches of dissolved red crude brick. At bottom, resting on the floor, a firm light brown stratum.

…The deposit filling the Portico contained in addition to a good many miscellaneous objects made of various materials, badly damaged by fire and for the most part of recognizable use, a fairly large quantity of scattered potsherds and a coarse pot which lay on the floor.”

Based on these published descriptions, Blegen and Rawson’s view of the stratigraphic contexts of each room can be reconstructed as follows:

In the Throne Room:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th1</strong>:</td>
<td>The plowed stratum (ca. 0.15-0.20 m. deep).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th2</strong>:</td>
<td>A stratum of black earth with small stones covering the room’s “central square” [i.e., the area of the hearth framed by the four columns] with an elevation of -0.25 m. to -0.40/-0.48 m. below surface level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th3</strong>:</td>
<td>A stratum of hard yellowish “disintegrated brick” filled with burned matter under the black earth, also localized in the room’s central square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th4</strong>:</td>
<td>A stratum of “burned and dissolved crude brick” located outside the central square - “generally red but with a sloping yellow patch toward the western corner.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th5</strong>:</td>
<td>A loose deposit of “red burned brick with an admixture of black” located in the room’s NW Quadrant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th6</strong>:</td>
<td>A deposit of “yellowish disintegrated brick, hard and filled with burned matter, charcoal, and ashes” deposited on the surface of the hearth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th7</strong>:</td>
<td>A deposit of “burned red earth” filling the central part of the “throne space” and reaching a depth of -0.40 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134 PN I, p. 70.
In the Vestibule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>The plowed stratum (ca. 0.25 m. deep).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>A stratum of “reddish debris from the destruction” containing many large stones and reaching down to the floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Portico:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>The plowed stratum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Black stony earth contained in a depression in the central part of the room (the continuation of a similar deposit in the adjacent Court 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>A “fine brown earth, dry, ashy and sandy but fairly hard with many patches of dissolved red crude brick” underneath the black stony earth and along its sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>A “firm light brown stratum” directly overlying the floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In combination with these context descriptions, Blegen and Rawson included accounts of the finds in each room. Some of these accounts were presented as part of the room-by-room narrative. This is the case primarily for collapsed wall paintings (discussed further in Chapter 5). Some fragments and scenes were described in detail, as were the primary locations of the deposits. For example, in the Portico, Blegen and Rawson discussed the presence of painted dado fragments (presumed to have fallen from the room’s walls during the final destruction) as well as “a few small fragments, possibly from compositions representing animals [which] may have come from crude bricks or the clay filling of the wall.”135

In the Vestibule, the excavators described wall paintings found on the floor, particularly in the room’s north corner. Subjects represented included a group of processing men carrying
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objects and a heavily burnt group of men wearing kilts (see Figure 5.3). Some fragments, the excavators observed, “escaped with relatively little discoloration; whether they all actually came from the walls of the relatively dark Vestibule or, in the course of the destructive fire, spilled over from the Throne Room or fell from an upper story, remains uncertain.” Finally, in their account of the Throne Room, Blegen and Rawson described the discovery of wall painting fragments on the floor alongside the room’s NE and SE walls. Discernable scenes, presumed to have fallen from the NE wall, included a large-scale heraldic lion and griffin composition and the so-called “Lyre Player,” seated on a rocky outcrop (see Figure 5.10).

Most finds from the megaron, however, were discussed not in the narrative but in a separate section, entitled: “Objects Found.” In this section, finds were presented in two ways. First, those artifacts made of metal, stone, ivory, paste (kyanos), or clay were listed, grouped by material (rather than stratum) and accompanied by individual descriptions. These descriptions included references to where in the room a find was uncovered (e.g., the Quadrant), an exact (in m.) or an approximate (“in the debris,” “on the floor,” “in surface soil,” etc.) indication of its depth in a deposit, its physical characteristics (size, color, shape, and/or dimensions), its museum number(s), and/or references to any published photographs in PN I. The same protocol was used to describe the rare complete (or nearly complete) ceramic vessels
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found in the three rooms. The most thorough descriptions were given to finds from the Throne Room and the Vestibule. Descriptions of the finds from the Portico were noticeably poorer – entirely lacking, for example, in information about their find spots within the room.

A full transcription of these individually-published artifacts, which today might be called “small finds,” is too lengthy to present here. Notable examples from across all three rooms, however, included: small pieces of metal (including bits of jewelry, vessels, and weapons in gold, silver, and/or bronze), stone beads, conuli, and a pendant, bits of worked ivory, seventeen fragments of Linear B tablets, a handful of complete ceramic vessels, and a plastered tripod “table of offerings.” Complete (or nearly complete) vessels included: a vitrified “three-handled” bowl, a krater, a basin, three miniature kylikes, a pedestalled krater with spiral decoration, and a small decorated stirrup vase. As stated by Blegen and Rawson, while some objects (e.g., most of the complete vessels, the table of offerings, and a few pieces of gold and stone) were found resting on or near the floor, by and large the small finds listed in the “Objects Found” section were discovered in the “fallen debris.”

Among these small finds, the object that merited the most discussion was the so-called “table of offerings,” which Blegen and Rawson contended was meant to receive dedications as indicated by two in situ miniature kylikes found on its surface. Lang, however, suggested that it might instead have “served as a token substitute for the large hearth’s sacred function when the outside temperature made a large fire undesirable.” Although not stated, Lang’s suggestion

---

143 One vessel that may be nearly complete, but which is missing from this list is a large pithos, partially coated with plaster and with fragments found reaching from floor level to 0.70 m. above the floor and the two chimneys. A brief account does appear, however, in the Throne Room’s narrative and the fragments are included in the list of the room’s sherds (PN I, pp. 89, 91).
144 PN I, pp. 70-71, 75-76, 90-91.
145 PN I, pp. 70-71, 75-76, 90-92.
146 PN I, pp. 70-71, 75-76, 90-92.
147 Blegen 1953, p. 61; PN I, p. 89.
was likely based on Evans’ interpretation of similar tables with traces of burning and/or charcoal on their surfaces found in the West Court Koulores at Knossos (Figure 3.1), in Chamber Tomb 14 at Zapher Papoura (Figure 3.2), and in the Isopata Royal Tomb as “tripod hearths.”

Also included in the Throne Room’s “Objects Found” section was a special sub-section dedicated to what Blegen and Rawson termed a: “small treasure found under the place of the throne.” This “treasure,” the excavators stated, was found in the upper part of a deposit of burned red earth and included two small groups of artifacts, which they named “Group A” and “Group B.” Group A comprised a fragmentary stone pendant, a piece of kyanos, and a gold bead, while Group B included a silver/bronze ring, loops of gold and silver wire, a piece of bronze, half of a terracotta whorl, and carnelian, agate, and amethyst beads. The function of this “treasure” was not interpreted by the excavators, who declared the find to be a “minor mystery.”

The second presentation format used by Blegen and Rawson in the “Objects Found” sections of PN I was the laundry list. While “valuable” small finds received individualized entries, more “quotidian” discoveries, namely, ceramic sherds, were presented en masse and grouped according to vessel shape, type of decoration, and/or general date range. Within the lists of vessel shapes, divisions were made between coarse and fine wares. Lengthy descriptions of individual sherds were rare, as was specific information about their find spots. The only exceptions were references among the Throne Room’s sherds to “a few Geometric fragments,”

---

149 PM IV, p. 180 (West Court); Evans 1906, pp. 36-37 (Zapher Papoura), p. 143 (Isopata Royal Tomb). See also discussion in Muhly 1984, p. 276.
150 PN I, pp. 91-92.
151 PN I, p. 88.
152 PN I, pp. 91-92.
153 PN I, p. 88.
which the excavators documented as coming “from surface soil,” and to a few pieces of early (i.e., MH-LH II) date, which they inferred “may have come from crude dissolved brick.”

The latter of these two comments is particularly important. Buried in the lengthy sherd list, it represents the excavators’ attempt not just to describe, but also to interpret the megaron’s finds in light of the surrounding stratigraphy. Additional interpretations of the Throne Room’s strata appeared in connection with the distributions of finds and construction materials. First, in their narrative description of the room, Blegen and Rawson concluded that the discovery of many of the room’s finds (e.g., “fragments of tablets, a number of bits of gold, silver, and bronze and a good many fragments of pottery”) outside the “central rectangle” and “well above the floor” indicated that these objects fell from a second story balcony, wrapped around the room’s perimeter. This balcony, the excavators proposed, was constructed of wood and supported by the room’s four ground floor columns (Figure 3.3; see also Figure 1.4). Second, Blegen and Rawson suggested that the layer of black earth with “small stones and clay” that rested high in the fill and directly above the hearth may have been the remains of the packing that once “sheathed” the room’s chimneys, which they suggested were set side-by-side into the ceiling of a roof lantern (Figure 3.4). In the Vestibule and Portico, the excavators’ interpretations were far more limited, including only references to the red and/or yellow deposits as “dissolved crude brick” and/or “debris from the destruction.”

154  PN I, p. 91. As noted above, this “crude dissolved brick” was identified in the narrative as the Throne Room’s red and yellow earth (PN I, p. 89).
155  PN I, p. 81. Notably, in their account Blegen and Rawson refer specifically to “14 fragments” of Linear B tablets rather than the 16 listed in the Throne Room’s catalogue. This is likely a wording error – the sentence should read “fragments of 14 tablets” as in 1966 there were 16 fragments thought to represent 14 discrete tablets (with La 622 and Xa 638 having two fragments each). Currently, additional associations are evident between fragments La 623 and La 625 (Melena 2000-2001, p. 366) and between La 622 and La 638 (formerly PY Xa 638) (Bennet 1992, p. 115).
156  PN I, p. 81. The idea of a wooden balcony was reiterated by Lang (PN II, p. 194).
157  PN I, pp. 81-82.
158  PN I, pp. 70, 75.
Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies

Whether convinced by Blegen and Rawson’s interpretations or deterred by the lacunae in their published accounts, scholars have been reticent to revisit the megaron’s overburden and its finds. Only two studies exist, both of which attempt to interpret the relationship between these components. The first was undertaken by Bendall in 2004. As discussed in Chapter 2, Bendall used the varying quantities and qualities of banquet vessels (mainly kylikes) found in different parts of the Palace of Nestor to argue for a system of hierarchical dining. Guests of the lowest social standing, she proposed, drank from kylikes of “inferior” quality (i.e., “dark and smoky-looking”) from Pantry 60, while those of higher status used kylikes made of cream-colored fine ware from Pantries 18-22. Guests of the highest ranking, Bendall contended, feasted in the Throne Room, where they drank out of metal vessels, which “seem to be concentrated in the megaron, although some may have fallen from an upper floor (e.g., fragments of a silver cup reported as coming from a ‘layer of fallen debris’).” In addition, she commented that “Silver and bronze vessels are present [in the Throne Room], and in the vestibule are more of bronze. Pieces of a silver cup with inlaid gold and niello heads found principally in the Propylon may be related.” In 2008, this argument was affirmed by Whittaker, but critiqued by Shelmerdine, who contended that “[Bendall’s] claim that metal vessels were ‘concentrated in the megaron’ is misleading: the total of bronze vessel fragments found there is two decorated fragments, two rims, and a round-sectioned handle, and there is just one fragment from the Vestibule. This is not a significant concentration.”

159 Bendall 2004, pp. 112-122.
160 Bendall 2004, pp. 122-123.
The second study, or more accurately group of studies, concerned with the relationship between the stratigraphy and artifacts in the Pylos megaron were those conducted by José Melena and by Christina Skelton, who re-examined the room’s Linear B tablets. In the Palace of Nestor, the megaron is an unusual location for the discovery of tablets, which typically appear in archive complexes (e.g., Rooms 7 and 8) and/or in rooms associated with commodities (e.g., Room 23, an oil magazine).\(^{163}\) To explain this apparent oddity, first Melena and later Skelton proposed that the Throne Room tablets were produced in LH IIIA rather than in LH IIIB and represented not debris from a upper story collapse (as Blegen and Rawson had contended), but rather construction fill incorporated into the structure of the LH IIIB megaron.\(^{164}\) In her more recent assessment, Skelton cited as evidence the tablets’ “archaic” paleography (resembling that of the LH IIIA tablets from the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos), their almost “miniature” size (also characteristic of early tablets), the heavy erosion of their surfaces, the “lack of old breaks and joins with other tablets, the lack of spilling fragments, and the red color of the tablets, which indicates an open fire with plenty of oxygen.”\(^{165}\) As a final point, Skelton called attention to the red color of the earth in which the tablets were excavated. This earth she correlated with the red deposit containing early (i.e., MH to LH II) sherds, which Blegen and Rawson had previously interpreted as mudbrick temper.\(^{166}\)

While scholars have been reluctant to re-interpret the relationship between the megaron’s earth and its finds, the same is not true for isolated objects recovered in the suite. The collapsed wall paintings, for example, have received significant attention in recent literature, which will be

\(^{163}\) PN I, pp. 95, 99, 100, 137.
\(^{165}\) Skelton 2010, esp. p. 118.
\(^{166}\) Skelton 2010, pp. 117-119, referencing PN I, p. 91.
surveyed in Chapter 5. For other small finds, however, far less work has been done. The most substantial study was completed in 2000 by Susanne Hofstra, who examined the small finds collected at the Palace of Nestor for her doctoral dissertation.\footnote{Hofstra 2000.} In her impressive study, Hofstra was able to record new details about many of the artifacts (both published and unpublished) from the Pylos megaron and references to her work can be found in the catalogue in Appendix 1. Her primary interest in craft production at the palace, however, led Hofstra to focus her interpretive efforts on other parts in the palace, leaving some of the megaron material unstudied.

Other studies have focused on individual finds. The most frequently assessed object has been the plastered table discovered in the Throne Room, which the excavators interpreted as a “table of offerings” and which Lang identified as a “portable hearth.”\footnote{Blegen 1953, p. 61; \textit{PN} I, p. 89; \textit{PN} II, p. 187. For similar interpretations of these objects at Mycenae as “tables of offering,” “altars,” and/or “movable hearths,” see Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 154, 224-226.} Subsequent to the publication of \textit{PN} I, the latter idea (by far the less popular of the two), was reiterated by Vermeule and more recently by Werner.\footnote{Vermeule 1972, pp. 168, 173; Werner 1993, p. 108.} The first idea, by contrast, has been affirmed frequently in scholarly analyses. Among the earliest proponents of this theory was Hägg, who, as discussed in Chapter 2, asserted (following Blegen and Rawson) that table was used for liquid dedications.\footnote{Hägg 1981, p. 36, 1990, p. 183.} Since Hägg’s study, his interpretation has been repeated countless times, including in the work of Wright, Thaler, Farmer, Chrysanthi Gallou, and Brent Davis, who further observed that such liquids would have evaporated quickly due to the proximity of the table to the Throne Room’s central hearth.\footnote{Wright 1994, p. 57; Thaler 2006, p. 102; 2012b; Farmer 2011, p. 14; Gallou 2005, pp. 83-84; Davis 2008, p. 51. Davis erroneously states, however, that this table was “found on the edge of the hearth” whereas in reality it was found a short distance away, next to the Throne Room’s west column.} That the table was used for liquid offerings is also suggested in Polymnia Muhly’s comprehensive study of “Minoan offering tables,” in which she concludes that tripod tables of the Pylos type, despite being portable, were employed primarily as
stationary multi-purpose “stands” designed to support “containers of fire, food, drink and even of offerings to the gods.” The last proposal has been re-argued by Whittaker, who further suggests that such offerings were made on a regular basis as part of a ritualized “feeding” of the gods. Whittaker’s conclusion, which builds on David Gill’s 1974 interpretation of the Pylos table as an apparatus for holding the “god’s portion” of sacrificial remains (the Homeric “trapezomata”), is part of her larger attempt to explain Linear B accounts of divine food distributions on non-singular occasions (i.e., on occasions other than feasts). During such “provisionings,” she suggests, tables of offering, including the Pylian example, may have been “used as trays on which meals to the gods were laid out.”

The other find from the megaron to have undergone re-analysis is the throne space “treasure,” for which Blegen and Rawson offered no explanation. Since PN I was published, two theories have been proposed. As discussed in Chapter 2, the first was by Säflund, who posited that these finds represented “some scanty remains of what was possibly some cult adornment, perhaps preserved and deposited for the sake of their sanctity.” The second theory was proposed by Rehak, who suggested that the objects represented the remains of a “foundation deposit.”

Part III: New Evidence

Collectively, existing interpretations of the megaron’s stratigraphy and artifacts have much to recommend them. Each is well-reasoned based on extant data in the PN I publication. From

173 Whittaker 2008b, pp. 91-92, citing parallels with comparable activities described in second millennium texts from Sumeria and Babylonia (p. 91).
175 Whittaker 2008b, pp. 91-92.
176 PN I, p. 88.
the preceding descriptions, however, it is clear that the publication is deficient in many details. The stratigraphy was given only cursory attention and many published objects lack useful descriptions and/or specific contextual information.

As a result of these omissions, each of the studies discussed above was built on an incomplete account of the megaron’s material record and its relationship to the stratigraphy. In order to make such data useful as a means to understand the suite, it is necessary to review it in full. Such an account is presented below. Importantly, this account not only enumerates and describes the relevant strata and finds but also situates them within their “discovery contexts,” i.e., the conditions under which they were first recovered by Blegen and his colleagues in the field. Central to this approach is the consideration of the practice of the excavation itself, including the layout of the trenches and the modes of digging and recording.179 Starting with such information helps us to “move through the paces” of recovery side-by-side with the excavators, and to clarify more easily the relationships between the earthen overburden and what was found within it.

Structure of Presentation

The full account of the stratigraphy and artifact data from the Pylos megaron is split between the main text and Appendices 1 and 2. The excavation history and catalogue are presented together in Appendix 1. Following a brief overview of the preliminary work done across the entire megaron in 1939, the systematic excavations in 1952 are described in detail. For each of the suite’s three rooms, an overview of the excavation timeline and methods is first given, followed by a description of the stratigraphy observed in each trench. As indicated in field records and in Blegen and Rawson’s published descriptions, five discrete types of earth were

179 For the relevance of this approach, see Hodder 2006.
observed, each of which had a distinctive color and texture. The uppermost layer, designated as the “plowed layer,” was described as a soft chestnut brown earth between 0.15 m. and 0.25 m. Beneath this layer lay one or more of three different earths: “black burned” earth, “brick-red” earth (identified in the field as dissolved burnt crude mudbrick), and a “hard-packed yellow” earth (presumed to consist of dissolved unburnt mudbrick). In the Portico, a firm light brown earth was also detected lying directly on the floor. For clarity, each of these depositional layers (referred to henceforth as “strata”) is assigned a unique alpha-numeric name. This name is composed of a letter prefix (a lowercase “p” for plowed earth, “b” for black-burned, “r” for brick-red, and “y” for yellow, and “bn” for light brown) combined with a sequentially assigned number.

Following the stratigraphic overview, the finds from each stratum in each trench are presented. The accounts begin at the level of the unexcavated surface earth and progress downward to the floor. All depths are measured from the surface, as was done in the field. When possible, strata are subdivided into smaller collection units, or “passes,” defined by their depths. Finds with unknown contexts appear in a list at the end of each room’s catalogue. Sherds with illegible pencil numbers (which comprise a healthy portion of the finds with unknown context, see below) are assigned to rooms based on pen numbers written on the sherds themselves and/or on the labels of the storage bags.

Information about the find contexts of the objects comes primarily from five main sources: the “Objects Found” sections at the end of the room descriptions in PN I, George

---

180 E.g., GEM 1952, pp. 5, 9.
181 E.g., GEM 1952, p. 16.
182 It is recognized that there are pitfalls with this approach, because (as will be discussed later) the room indicated by a sherd’s pencil number can sometimes conflict with the number on its storage bag. However, there is no other way to assign these sherds to rooms, and the pen numbers agree with bag labels in the majority of instances.
Mylonas’ 1952 field notebook (GEM 1952),\(^{183}\) provenance labels on boxes and tags associated with finds stored in the Chora Museum, Rawson’s pottery notebooks, and a series of informal pottery notes made by Mylonas and Eugene Vanderpool in 1952 and by Rawson in 1953.\(^{184}\) These informal notes are particularly important. Located in Folders 2 and 3 in Box 5 of the ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive, they comprise 39 sheets of loose leaf paper on which are written detailed observations about the pottery lots from individual stratigraphic passes removed from each of the megaron’s rooms.\(^{185}\) For the Portico (Folder 2), a brief description is given for each layer of removed earth including a breakdown of percentages of fine vs. coarse wares and lists of individual vessels/fragments that were both kept and papsed (i.e., discarded).\(^{186}\) For the Throne Room and Vestibule (Folder 3),\(^{187}\) short summaries of ceramic forms from different trenches are recorded, as is a list of sequential numbers from 1-65 with excavation dates, contextual information, and notes about characteristic sherds. This numerical list is untitled, but clearly represents lot numbers for sherds collected in 1952, many of which still preserve pencil numbers in the same 1-65 numerical range.\(^{188}\) This list is critical for the identification of precise contexts for ceramics from the Pylos megaron. Such information is not recorded elsewhere and correspondences between the numbers in this list and those written on the sherds are the only

\(^{183}\) Occasional notes also come from Rawson’s 1960 field notebook (MR 1960).

\(^{184}\) The authors of these notes are not recorded. Based on similarities in handwriting, however, Mylonas and Vanderpool are likely responsible for the 1952 sherd notes in Folder 3 of the ASCSA Pylos Excavations Archive, while Rawson was likely responsible for the 1953 sherd notes in Folder 2. The artifact depths recorded in these notes provide the depths listed in the catalogue in Appendix 1. Apparent “gaps” in the listed depths are caused by lacunae in the original excavation notes.

\(^{185}\) Eleven sheets were found in Folder 2 (1953) and 28 sheets were found in Folder 3 (1952). Occasionally, these pottery lists also contain information about other types of finds (bone, stone, metal, Linear B tablets, etc.) from the ceramic lots.

\(^{186}\) For the origin of the term “papse,” see Gorogianni 2008, p. 65, n. 128.

\(^{187}\) This folder, although not labeled as such, was found also to contain considerable information about the finds from the Portico.

\(^{188}\) The numerical list appears in ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, pp. 4-9. That these pencil numbers represent pottery lots is clearly indicated by a reference in GEM 1952 (p. 193) to a Linear B tablet fragment that was found among the sherds in “Lot 39,” and which was also described in the entry for “39” in the loose leaf pottery notes. Although pencil numbers are not preserved on all sherds, it is likely that all were originally labeled.
way to identify the find spots of individual sherds, many of which were stored in bags by room (the number of which is written, sometimes erroneously, on the sherds in ink), rather than by the stratigraphical layer in which they were excavated. At present, these bags of sherds are housed in Apotheke 2 of the Chora Museum inside a wooden box labeled “PON, Rooms 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, Numbered Sherds.”

For each stratum, a full account of all documented saved and unsaved objects is given. The former group, labeled in Appendix 1 and in the text below as “Catalogued,” includes both objects that I was able to see and/or handle in person and objects that are published and/or known to be stored in museums. Those items I did not observe personally are marked with an asterisk (*) before the catalogue number. The second group, referred to as “Associated, Not Catalogued,” comprises artifacts that were documented in the excavators’ paper field records, but for which I could not find evidence in the Chora Museum.

Each Catalogued find is given a catalogue number in boldface, composed of a capital letter prefix indicating the type of find, i.e., “M” for metal, “S” for stone, “I” for ivory, “B” for bone, “K” for kyanos (paste), “W” for wood, “C” for clay, and “P” for pottery plus a sequentially assigned number (assigned within each find class) connected to the prefix by a hyphen (e.g., P-100). This is followed by the object’s identification, its find context (indicated

189 Loose in these bags are wooden field tags with contextual information pertaining to specific excavated strata. This storage system seems to have been put in place in 1952 because of the descriptive heading, “Large bag full of representative sherds from the Throne Room,” on the first page of the 1952 Sherd Lot list. Stored in this way, the tags have lost all clear connection to individual sherds. Because of the preserved pencil numbers, however, many sherds were able to be reassigned to their original contexts. During this process, however, a total of 59 labeling errors were detected, all of which incorrectly assigned sherds from the Portico and the Vestibule to the Throne Room.

190 The descriptions of those “Catalogued” finds that I was not able to observe in person but which are known to have been saved after the excavation (e.g., the Linear B tablets) are based on published accounts and photographs. The correlation between the tablets found in the Pylos megaron excavations and the assigned PY numbers is based on the chart prepared by Palaima 1988, p. 137.

191 Notably, plaster, while included in the dataset below, does not have any catalogued entries and therefore does not present a conflict with the use of “P” as a prefix for pottery. The same is also true of shell (a class of find not noted in PN I), which includes no catalogued examples and thus does not conflict with the use of “S” as a prefix for stone.
either generally by a pottery lot number, or specifically, by measured coordinates), its state of preservation, important dimensions, a physical description, its production date/date range (if determinable), references to the object in field notebooks, publication citations, and/or notable comparanda. Storage locations for individual objects are noted, as are any pre-existing identification/catalogue codes. For pottery, a list of sherds that join and/or may belong to the same vessel is also given when evident. Illustrations for Catalogued finds appear in Plates 1-117. Color photographs are provided for those objects I viewed firsthand. Those objects I did not see are either not pictured or illustrated with published photographs and/or line drawings. In contrast to Catalogued finds, “Associated” finds receive shorter descriptions comprising details offered in field notebooks and/or sherd lot notes.

When possible, entries for catalogued ceramics include vessel shape identification numbers. Both MRT (“Marion Rawson Type”) and FS (“Furumark Shape”) numbers are used, the former referring to the ceramic shapes identified by Rawson in PN I. For everted, undecorated fine ware rims, shape identifications are frequently based on the dimensions recorded by Rawson in PN I for the various sizes of kylikes, bowls, cups, and dippers found in abundance at the palace. Because many of these shapes have overlapping dimensions, a range of

---

192 Such references refer exclusively to notes about individual finds recorded in either the field notebooks kept by the excavators or in Rawson’s official pottery notebooks. For ceramic finds, additional references to individual sherds can often be found in the sherd lot descriptions.

193 Publication citations for catalogued finds include only explicit references to the artifacts in question. The citations do not include mentions of broad classes to which the artifacts might belong. These classes, which group finds according to their shapes, decorative styles, quality of production, etc., constitute a primary form of publication used by Blegen and his colleagues, who, as noted above, often elected to describe artifacts en masse rather than individually. Such classes are undoubtedly an important source of published data. However, because these classes cannot be linked with certainty to individual objects they will be dealt with separately in the discussion later in this chapter rather than included as “citations” in the catalogue.

194 In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, the storage location of sherds (i.e., in the box labeled “PON, Rooms 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, Numbered Sherds” in Apotheke 2 of the Chora Museum – see above) is not noted in the individual catalogue descriptions. Locations of all other finds are indicated using the abbreviations “CM” (for the Chora Museum) and “NM” (for the National Museum in Athens). For small finds, the CM abbreviation is equal to the “MX” (Μουσείο Χώρας) used by Susanne Hofstra (2000).

195 PN I, pp. 350-418. The term “Marion Rawson Type” is preferred in current studies of Pylian pottery (see recently Hruby 2006; 2010).
options frequently results. Uncertainty about a posited shape and/or an MRT or FS number is indicated by a “?”196 When no shape identification is possible due to the small size of a sherd or its lack of diagnostic features, “shape indeterminate” is used, sometimes prefaced by “open/closed vessel” when one or the other is clear. Ceramic fabrics are distinguished broadly (fine, semi-coarse, coarse) and Munsell codes are provided.

Using this data presented in Appendix 1, observations about the megaron’s stratigraphy and artifacts are quantified in Appendix 2 and synthesized in the main text below. For each room, the strata from individual trenches are combined into coherent “contexts” and the finds are collated. Subsequently, both contexts and finds are compared to the information published in PN I. Once this is completed for each room, larger, over-arching conclusions are drawn about the character and inter-relationships of the different deposits and their contents. Based on these conclusions, previous theories about strata and finds in the megaron are assessed and new theories are proposed.

Megaron Stratigraphy: Synthesis

In total, 21 discrete stratigraphical contexts are evident in the Pylos megaron, each composed of contiguous earthen strata with very similar (if not identical) physical characteristics. Each context is designated by a name composed of the prefix “Th” (Throne Room), “V” (Vestibule), or “P” (Portico), a capital letter designating the primary color of the earth (“B” = black-burned, “R” = brick-red, “Y” = yellow, or “Bn” = light brown), and, when

---

196 A “?” following an entire entry indicates uncertainty regarding both posited shape and number, while a “?” contained within the MRT and/or FS parentheses signifies uncertainty in the number alone. Unfortunately, due to the corrosive character of Pylian soil, the surfaces of many sherds are worn making it often difficult even to judge whether a sherd comes from an open or closed vessel.
necessary,\textsuperscript{197} a sequentially assigned number. The plowed earth is designated simply by the room prefix plus the capital letters “PL.” An overview of these new contexts appears in Tables 1-3 below. A plan showing their locations can be found in Figure 3.5 and modified Harris matrices illustrating their physical relationships appears in Figure 3.6.\textsuperscript{198}

Table 1: New Throne Room Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CONTEXT</th>
<th>INCLUDED STRATA</th>
<th>CONTEXT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p0, p1, p2, p3, p4, p5, p6, p7, p8</td>
<td>Chestnut brown earth constituting the uppermost stratum overlying the entire Throne Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b2, b3, b4, b5, b6, b8, b11, b12</td>
<td>Black burned earth with small stones located underneath the plowed earth (context ThPL) over the hearth and surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB2</td>
<td>b7</td>
<td>Black burned earth with very few small stones and a lens of plaster located in the area over the hearth, under a context of brick-red earth (context ThR1) and above yellow earth (context ThY3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>Black burned earth without stones on the floor of the SW Quadrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB4</td>
<td>b9</td>
<td>Black burned earth directly on the surface of the hearth and mingled with the yellow deposit (context ThY3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB5</td>
<td>b10</td>
<td>Black burned earth without stones on the floor of the NW Quadrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r1, r2, r3, r4, r5, r6, r8, r9</td>
<td>Hard packed brick-red earth with large stones located under the black burned earth (context ThB2) and extending throughout the Throne Room. Concentrated in the NW, NE, and SE Quadrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR2</td>
<td>r7</td>
<td>Loose brick-red earth containing a large “rectangle of plaster” and located under firmer strata of brick-red (context ThR1) and black burned (context ThB2) in the NW Quadrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR3</td>
<td>th1</td>
<td>Layer of reddish-yellow earth found between the preserved sections of plaster bedding in the upper part of the throne space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR4</td>
<td>th2</td>
<td>Hard-packed reddish-yellow earth at the base of the cut made by Blegen into the subfloor of the throne space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>Lens of firm yellow earth located under the plowed stratum (context ThPL) on the border between Trench Z and the SW Quadrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{197} This specifically refers to the Throne Room, where multiple contexts with similarly colored earth are apparent.

\textsuperscript{198} The colors employed in these (and all subsequent) plans and matrices approximate the hues (red, yellow, black, and brown) of the labeled contexts/strata.
**Table 2: New Vestibule Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CONTEXT</th>
<th>INCLUDED STRATA</th>
<th>CONTEXT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p9, p10, p11, p12, p13</td>
<td>Chestnut brown earth constituting the uppermost stratum overlying the entire Vestibule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r10, r11, r12, r13, r14</td>
<td>Red earth containing a large quantity of large stones reaching down to the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>b13</td>
<td>Burnt, ashy earth found inside a hole cut into the plaster floor of the Vestibule north of the door to the Portico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: New Portico Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CONTEXT</th>
<th>INCLUDED STRATA</th>
<th>CONTEXT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>p14, p15, p16</td>
<td>Chestnut brown earth constituting the uppermost stratum overlying the entire Portico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>r15, r16, r17, r18</td>
<td>Hard, sandy reddish earth found under the plowed earth (context PPL) surrounding the stony black earth Portico in Trenches T, T, South and T, Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>y6</td>
<td>Dry, yellowish earth with admixture of gray ash found underneath the red strata (context PR) in Trench T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>b14, b15</td>
<td>Stratum of black stony earth deposited under the plowed earth (context PPL) and in the “hollow” at the center of the red sandy deposit (context PR) in Trenches T, South and T, Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>bn1, bn2</td>
<td>Firm light brown resting on the floor underneath the black stony earth (context PB) and parts of the red deposits in Trenches T, South and T, Extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Old vs. New Contexts*
These 21 new contexts defined for the Throne Room, Vestibule, and Portico both agree with and differ from the contexts published in PN I, transcribed at the beginning of this chapter. The relationships between these two sets of contexts are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Concordance of Old and New Megaron Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD Throne Room</th>
<th>NEW Throne Room</th>
<th>OLD Vestibule</th>
<th>NEW Vestibule</th>
<th>OLD Portico</th>
<th>NEW Portico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th1</td>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th2</td>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>VR</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>ThB2</td>
<td>- (under V2)</td>
<td>VB</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>PY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th6</td>
<td>ThB4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>PBn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th5</td>
<td>ThB5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th3, Th4</td>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th5</td>
<td>ThR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th7</td>
<td>ThR3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th7</td>
<td>ThR4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th4</td>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th4</td>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th6</td>
<td>ThY3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 4, in the Throne Room, thirteen contexts are now defined as opposed to the seven identified by the excavators. New contexts ThPL and ThB1 can be directly correlated with old contexts Th1 and Th2, respectively. New context ThR1 contains old context Th3, but is red in color rather than yellow. New contexts ThY1, ThY2, ThR1, and ThR4 contain old context Th4, and new contexts ThR2 and ThB5 are both included in old context Th5. New contexts ThB4 and ThY3 are found in old context Th6, and, finally, new context
ThR3 is included in old context Th7. New contexts ThB2 and ThB3 have no clear matches among the original contexts recorded by the excavators.

In the Vestibule, three new contexts are defined, two of which cleanly match the two previously identified by Blegen and Rawson. New context VPL is equivalent to old context V1 and new context VR is equivalent to old context V2. New context VB, representing the ashy earth found in a hole in the floor, was found under old context V2 but is not equivalent to it.

In the Portico, five new contexts are defined, as opposed to the four identified by the excavators. New contexts PPL and PB can be directly correlated with old contexts P1 and P2, respectively. New contexts PR and PBn are essentially equivalent to old contexts P3 and P4, but with different spatial positioning within the room. New context PY is contained within old context P3. For clarity, a summary of these relationships can be found below in Table 4.

Explanation of Differences

The disparity between Blegen and Rawson’s original contexts and the new contexts I have presented is largely a product of differences in how each set of contexts was defined. In the Throne Room, for example, the absence of new contexts ThB2 and ThB3 suggests that the excavators preferred not to isolate small variations in the soil and instead subsumed these anomalies into larger “debris” layers. This habit is further evidenced by old context Th5, which combines both red and black earth (new contexts ThR2 and ThB5) and old context Th6, which combines black and yellow earth (new contexts ThB4 and ThY3). Similarly, new context ThB3, found immediately on top of the floor in the SW Quadrant, was likely incorporated into the
brick-red stratum overlying it (old context Th4), while new context ThB2 was integrated with adjacent black-burned old context Th3.199

The more complex relationships between Throne Room new contexts ThR1, ThR2, ThY1, ThY2 and old contexts Th3 and Th4, and between Portico new contexts PY and PBn and old contexts P3 and P4 require different explanations. In the Throne Room, it is clear from the description in PN I that Blegen and Rawson utilized physical position as a primary parameter when identifying certain contexts. Old context Th3, located within the “central rectangle” of the Throne Room, was identified as separate from old context Th4, located around the room’s perimeter.200 To the contrary, however, excavation data indicate that much of the earth constituting old contexts Th4 and Th3 belonged to the same deposit.201

In the Portico, the descriptions of the physical locations of old contexts P3 and P4 are a bit over-simplified. While the excavators stated that the “dry, ashy, and sandy” reddish earth (old context P3) was found “under the black stony deposit,” the field records indicate that the former is the case only for a small area along the black deposit’s perimeter.202 In the description of Trenches T, South and T, Extension, the black stony earth is clearly stated to have rested directly on the “firm light brown earth” (old context P4).203 The original position of the dry red layer seems to have been alongside the walls of the Portico, giving the context a “U” shape with its open end facing southeast, into Court 3.

Finally, the light brown old context P4 is described by the excavators as located “at bottom, resting on the floor” of the Portico. This is certainly the case for the floor underneath the

199 For comparison, see Blegen and Rawson’s original context Th5, which was composed of both disintegrated brick and black earth found in the Throne Room’s NW Quarter.
200 PN I, pp. 81, 89. The only exceptions they noted were fragments of the ceramic chimney fragments (to be discussed below).
201 See illustration of this phenomenon in Figures A1.8 (stratum r1) and A1.11 (stratum y3).
202 GEM 1952, p. 111.
203 GEM 1952, pp. 105, 121.
black earth in Trenches T, South and T, Extension (just noted), as well for the floor under the mounds of red earth (old context P3) at the northeast and southwest edges of these trenches.\textsuperscript{204} This is not the case, however, for the floor in Trench T, which was recorded in the field as being overlaid by a yellow deposit with ash.\textsuperscript{205}

\textit{Megaron Finds: Synthesis}

Based on the data in Appendix 1, the distribution and range of artifacts recovered from the rooms of the Pylos megaron is now clear. The results are summarized in Appendix 2, Tables 5-8. The newly identified objects both match and differ from those published in \textit{PN I}.\textsuperscript{206} This is the case for both small finds with individual entries (i.e., those grouped under the headings: Metal, Stone, Bone, Paste, Clay, and Pottery (complete vessels)), as well as sherds published \textit{en masse} under the heading “Shapes Recognized.”

\textit{Small Finds:}

From the Throne Room, I was able to find evidence for all of the small finds published by Blegen and Rawson except the following: \textit{Gold}: two of the fragments from the floor of the room (*\textbf{M-34} and *\textbf{M-40}), one of the fragments from the SW Quadrant (*\textbf{M-7}), and two of the fragments from the SE Quadrant (*\textbf{M-35}); \textit{Silver}: one fragment from the NW Quadrant with gold attached to it (*\textbf{M-27}), three fragments from the SW Quadrant (*\textbf{M-8}), and ten fragments from the SE Quadrant (*\textbf{M-36}) including seven pieces of a silver cup; \textit{Bronze}: twenty-four fragments from the NW Quadrant (*\textbf{M-28}), seventy-six fragments from the SW Quadrant (*\textbf{M-9}), fifty-two fragments from the SE Quadrant (*\textbf{M-37}), and seven fragments from the NE

\textsuperscript{204} GEM 1952, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{205} GEM 1952, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{206} \textit{PN I}, pp. 90-92.
Quadrant (*M-38); Stone: one flint blade from the SW Quadrant (*S-3) and one chunk of quartz from the NE Quadrant (*S-10).

From the Vestibule, I was able to find evidence for all published small finds except:

*Gold*: one small piece of thin plate from the SW Quadrant (*M-52); *Silver*: one thin bent piece from the NE Quadrant (*M-47); *Bronze*: eleven pieces from the SE Quadrant including a blade (*M-55, *M-57, and *M-58), eight small flat pieces from the NE Quadrant (*M-49 and *M-50), eight fragments from the surface soil of the NW Quadrant (*M-45), and seven thin flat bits from the SW Quadrant (*M-53); *Ivory*: two flat pieces from the NE Quadrant (*I-1), and one burned fragment in each of the SW and SE Quadrants (*I-2 and *I-3), respectively.

In the Portico, I found evidence for all published small finds except: *Silver*: five thin fragments (*M-63); *Bronze*: a knife (*M-64) and thirty-six fragments including a piece of thin wire, the rim of a vessel, a piece with a rivet hole and a piece with a rivet end (*M-66); *Ivory*: seven fragments (*I-5); and *Kyanos*: one piece (*K-3).

It is probable that many of these “missing” small finds are objects with storage or display labels that associate them with the Throne Room, the Vestibule, or the Portico, but which do not include specific contextual information. For the Throne Room, this is likely the case for the metal finds, which may be among entries *M-3, *M-5, *M-11, *M-16, *M-20, *M-30, M-39, M-42, and M-43 and/or the two pieces of gold associated with stratum r5 in the SW Quadrant, and also for the “chunk” of quartz, which may be among the fragments catalogued as S-11. For the Vestibule, the “missing” metal finds are likely among the artifacts catalogued as M-59, M-60, M-61, and M-62, while the ivory may be included with the fragments catalogued as I-4. For the Portico, one of the many fragments of “missing” bronze may be among the fragments.
associated with stratum r15 in Trench T. No such matches, however, are possible for the Throne Room’s flint blade, or for the “missing” finds of silver, ivory or kyanos from the Portico.\textsuperscript{207}

References to a small number of unpublished finds were also found in the megaron’s excavation records. For the Throne Room, these include: a small stone handle associated with stratum r4 in Trench Zc and the many fragments of bone associated with strata r1 and r2 in Trench Z; stratum y3 in Trench Zb; strata b5/r4 in Trench Zc; strata r5, b6/r5/b7, and y4 in the SW Quadrant; strata r6/r7 and r7 in the NW Quadrant; stratum r8 in the SE Quadrant; and stratum r9 in the NE Quadrant.\textsuperscript{208}

For the Vestibule, unpublished finds include: two sea shells associated with stratum p9/r10 in Trench Q; a piece of carbon, fragments of carbonized wood, and a “flat conical piece of stone” associated with stratum r11 in the NW Quadrant; pieces of bone associated with stratum r11 in the NW Quadrant; and two tiny splinters of gold associated with stratum r14 in the SE Quadrant. Finally, for the Portico, newly identified finds include two obsidian blades associated with stratum br2 in Trench T, Extension.

\textit{Sherds}

From the Throne Room, I was able to find evidence for all of the vessel types listed by the excavators except: the tankard, the squat alabastron, matt-painted sherds\textsuperscript{209}, and “Geometric fragments,” the last said to come from the surface soil. Sherds found, but which differ from their published descriptions, include fragments with a fat zigzag pattern (published as “parallel

\textsuperscript{207} These objects, however, are likely not “lost” but either escaped my attention in the Chora Museum or are stored in the National Museum in Athens.

\textsuperscript{208} In addition to these textual references, one new object was physically found: one of the two small pieces of gold associated with stratum r5 in the SW Quadrant (whichever does not match the “unmatched” published example).

\textsuperscript{209} The only examples of such sherds from this room come from the 2012 cleaning project. No examples are evident among the sherds collected in 1952.
chevrons”). In the Portico, the cooking pot, handleless/conical cup, and alabastron are unaccounted for, while in Vestibule, evidence for all of the vessel types listed by the excavators was found.

Some seemingly “absent” vessel types may be represented by catalogued sherds of “indeterminate” shape, while others may appear in the groups of “Associated, Not Catalogued” sherds, specific features of which were not recorded by the excavators. Examples of such “Associated” sherds, often described in the excavation documents simply as “crude,” “plain,” or “poor,” appear in the account of 1939 Trench I; in 1952 Sherd Lots 5, 6, 9, 10, 14 16, 26, and 33 from the Throne Room; in 1952 Lots 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 46, 47, and 49 from the Vestibule; and in 1952 Lots 51, 52, 56 and 57 from the Portico.210

It is equally possible that sherds representing the “missing” shapes were discarded. The descriptions of the 1952 sherd lots indicate clearly that many sherds were thrown after being examined in the field. Phrases used include: “Nothing kept, except…” (Lot 1), “Practically nothing worth preserving” (Lot 2), “Few sherds kept” (Lot 4), “Kept a few samples” (Lot 11), “Nothing of interest” (Lot 19), “Selection kept…” (Lot 59), and “Nothing worth keeping” (Lots 10, 25, 46, and 54).211 Further evidence for this practice comes from the lists of sherds from trenches in Court 3, directly southeast of the megaron, recorded in ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, pp. 1-7. These pages include lists of types and counts of sherds that were “Kept” and those that were “Papsed.”212 In these accounts, it is clear that papsed sherds

210 See also a generalized reference to “crude” Throne Room sherds in GEM 1952, p. 5. Notably, these references appear under the “Associated, Not Catalogued” heading because they constitute the sole evidence for plain (i.e., undecorated) pottery in a stratum. If plain sherds are physically extant, these more general entries are omitted from the “Finds” sections as it is possible (if not likely) that it is to these catalogued sherds that the entries refer.

211 ASCSA Archives, Pylos Excavations Box 5, Folder 3, pp. 4-9.

212 Although both groups are present, “Kept” sherds are listed more frequently than “Papsed” ones.
consisted predominantly of coarse wares and undecorated fine wares. Some painted sherds (including one described as “possibly Geometric”), however, were occasionally discarded.\textsuperscript{213}

Based on this evidence, it is likely that the some of the plainer shapes, namely the tankard or squat alabastron (and even perhaps the matt-painted sherds?) from the Throne Room are either included among the “Associated” sherds in my catalogue, or were discarded. The same may be true of the cooking pot and the handleless/conical cup from the Portico. The missing “Geometric fragments” from the Throne Room, however, have a different explanation. In this case, nine Geometric, or, to use William Coulson’s term, “Dark Age,”\textsuperscript{214} sherds (grouped as \textbf{P-272, P-273, P-274, P-275, P-286}) with pencil codes assigning them to the Portico were mislabeled in pen with the (room) number “6.” Such mix-ups, as noted at the beginning of this chapter, presumably occurred when sherds from different strata were combined into single storage bags after their excavation. Such errors are not infrequent, and they underscore the importance of the pencil codes and written field records for understanding the character of the megaron’s contents.

\textit{Previously Unpublished Vessel Types}

Previously unpublished vessel types have also been identified among the megaron’s saved assemblage. In the Throne Room, types include: \textit{LH IIIA-LH IIIB}: the jar/jug, stirrup jar, spouted bowl, shallow cup, deep bowl (Group A), larnax, and wheel-made bovid; \textit{LH I-II}: the Vapheio cup (Type III), beak-spouted jug, tall alabastron, Palace Style Jar, squat jug, and cup rhyton; \textit{MH}: fine (rather than coarse) incised ware and possibly the double-bowl; \textit{Indeterminate date}: pithos with applied thumb-impressed bands.

\textsuperscript{213} See, for example, the discarded fragments of “oatmeal wear with painted bands,” the “outturned rim of a jar that looks matt painted,” and the “possibly Geometric” sherds from layer 2 in Trench P2 and/or the floor layer in Trench T4 (ASCSA Pyllos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, pp. 2, 6).
\textsuperscript{214} Coulson 1986. The term “Dark Age” (rather than the more current term “Iron Age”) is maintained in this dissertation on account of the former’s dominance in published pottery studies from the region of Messenia.
In the Vestibule, previously unpublished shapes include: *LH IIIA-LH IIIB*: the jar/jug, stirrup jar, piriform jar, squat jug, krater, belly-handled amphora, spouted bowl, carinated conical cup, and flask; *LH I-II*: the beak-spouted jug, Vapheio cup (Type III), and tall alabastron; *MH*: matt-painted and plain burnished-ware. Finally, in the Portico we now have evidence for: *LH IIIB2*: the deep bowl (Group B); *LH IIIA-IIIB*: the jar/jug, piriform jar, stirrup jar, and krater; *LH I-II*: the squat jug, shallow cup, and Vapheio cup (Type III); *MH*: burnished and matt-painted ware; *DA II-III*: the krater, deep bowl/krateriskos, carinated skyphos, trefoil oinochoe, and flat-bottomed cup.

Collectively, these finds indicate that the ceramic assemblage from the Pylos megaron was more varied than the excavators originally believed. More shapes are represented and a wider date range is evident in both the Vestibule (MH to LH IIIA-IIIB) and the Portico (MH to DA II-III). The Throne Room, while expanding its shape repertoire, now shows a contracted date range of MH to LH IIIA-IIIB.

**Unprecedented and/or Unusual Vessels**

Some of these new vessel types are also interesting in their own right and significantly expand the repertoire of the wider palace. Such vessels include the Group B deep bowl represented by fragments P-242, P-315, P-316, P-317, P-318, P-319, P-320, P-321, P-322, P-373, P-374 (see Plates 79, 98, 99, 100, 115) found in the Portico. The Group B deep bowl is a shape previously thought to be completely absent from Pylos. This absence, discussed recently by Salvatore Vitale, has frustrated the identification of LH IIIB contexts at the Palace of Nestor, and in the nineteen-nineties even facilitated proposals that the palace was destroyed in very early
(as opposed to late) LH IIIB. Such proposals have long since been dismissed, but can now be done so with added confidence.

The DA III Type B2 (medium) krater (P-340; see Plate 107), is another important new find. In a recent study of the post-Bronze Age pottery from Pylos, Jack Davis and Kathleen Lynch determined conclusively that there was no ceramic evidence for extensive re-use of the site for a Dark Age village (proposed by Charles Griebel), a Dark Age hero cult (proposed by Coulson), or an Archaic temple (proposed by Todd Brenningmeyer). The handful of DA II-III ceramics they did find, Davis and Lynch proposed, were instead used for small-scale, non-ritualized drinking activities in parts of the palace that were still accessible (e.g., courts) after its buildings had collapsed. Based on the predominance of open shapes (e.g., flat-bottomed cups), and the discovery of only one Dark Age krater (evidenced by its pedestalled foot, in Court 42) Davis and Lynch further concluded that: “…it is not possible to define a ‘drinking set’ for the post-Bronze Age palace occupants.”

While the discovery of a single additional krater does not refute this conclusion, it does take another step toward fleshing out the “drinking set” for the DA III period at Pylos. As in Court 42, the krater from the Portico of the megaron was found together with flat-bottomed cups (at least five – based on the number of catalogued bases), the majority of which came from the same stratum, b15, in context PB. In addition, this stratum also contained fragments of the rim

---

215 Vitale 2006. A destruction date of early LH IIIB was proposed by Mervyn Popham (1991). Notably, as indicated in the catalogue, some of these Group B deep bowls may in fact be “deep band deep bowls” (Mountjoy 1997) if the vessels to which they belong prove not to have decoration in the zone between their handles.
217 Davis and Lynch Forthcoming; Coulson 1986, p. 9 dates the DA II and III periods in Messenia to ca. 975-750 B.C.
218 PN I, p. 185, fig. 347, no. 618; Coulson 1986, pp. 63, 110, 146, pl. 15, no. 363.
219 Davis and Lynch Forthcoming.
(P-342), neck (P-343), and body (P-344) of the published DA III oinochoe (P-375), found in adjacent Court 3 (see Plates 107, 108, 116).220

Another important ceramic discovery from the Pylos megaron is a larnax rim fragment (P-199; see Plate 65) from the Throne Room. This fragment is notable for its use of “coil-joint strengthening,” an unusual technique used in Bronze Age ceramic production recently highlighted by Jeremy Rutter. In the technique, the joints between the coils (or between the coils and attached features like rims) used to form large vessels were reinforced by the addition of small, evenly-spaced depressions and raised bumps (see Plate 65b), which, when overlaid during the coiling process, fit together like tiny “mortises and tenons.”221 In 2006, this unusual technique (which I would note is also evident in the construction of the enormous ribbed pithos from Pylos Archives Room 7 (Figures 3.7 and 3.8)), has been identified by Rutter in a LH IIIB Kytheran pithos found at Kommos.222 The compatibility of construction techniques may suggest that the Pylian larnax (and likely the pithos as well), were Kytheran imports.223

A similar use of “coil-joint strengthening” is also evident on Pylos Portico sherd P-313 (see Plates 97, 117). This sherd, which undoubtedly belongs with the fragments of a late Palace Style jar found in Pylos Room 38 (P-378; see Plate 117), preserves in its cross-section three depressions that served as “mortises” (see Plates 97e-f).224 What is unusual about these depressions, however, is that they do not extend through the entire profile of the sherd, but are confined to a thin layer of fine clay in the sherd’s (i.e., vessel’s) interior, sandwiched between two thicker layers of coarser clay. This technique of pot construction, which combines fine and

220 PN I, p. 64, pl. 347, no. 827; Coulson 1986, pp. 67-68, 109-110, 146, pl. 15, no. 364.
221 Rutter pers. comm. I offer many thanks to Jerry for kindly sharing his thoughts with me and for helping me to identify the unusual marks on the megaron larnax sherd as evidence of coil-joint strengthening.
222 Rutter 2006, pp. 571-572, 77/6, pl. 3.84. For discussion of the Pylos pithos, see PN I, p. 92, 95, fig. 381 (CM 1147).
223 That the large pithos from Room 7 was a Kytheran import has been suggested already by Rutter (2005, pp. 37-38), and is now further supported by the new evidence of the coil-jointing technique used in its construction.
224 PN I, p. 390, pl. 344; Kalogeropoulos 1998 (Amphora 3).
coarse fabric, is to my knowledge not characteristic of the Greek mainland and may also suggest a Kytheran origin for this vessel.

The Pylos Bovid

The most remarkable new discovery among the ceramic sherds collected in the Pylos megaron is a fragment of a large wheel-made bovid figure (P-84; see Plates 36, 37, 38), found in stratum r6/r7 of the Throne Room.225 This fragment, identified by Mylonas in 1952 as a “curious top or bottom with perforation,” represents roughly 1/3 of the animal’s circular rump (D. 0.17 m.) and is embellished with part of an applied wavy tail flanked by a firing hole.226 Another large piece of the rump (P-369; see Plates 36, 37, 38), which joins perfectly to fragment P-84, I uncovered among the sherds excavated in Pylos Court 3.227 This second fragment, which Rawson identified in 1953 as part of an “odd tankard,”228 preserves a second firing hole as well as painted decoration: a cluster of four wavy vertical bands on the rear end (to the left of the tail), and vertical wavy and semi-circular bands along the sides of the cylindrical body. At the base of the rump, where the outer surface of the clay has broken away, are the remains of a linear gouge (see Plate 37b) passing through the wall of the figure and into its hollow interior. The shape of the gouge suggests that it was made by a narrow stick that was used either to attach the animal’s left hind leg or to support the heavy body of the figure as it was being assembled.229

225 I graciously thank Lisa French for her help identifying this figure, which I initially believed to be anthropomorphic, as a bovid, similar to those she published from Phylakopi on Melos (French 1985, pp. 236-280). French is also responsible for coining the term “figure” (as opposed to “figurine”) for large animal and anthropoid terracottas (1981).

226 ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 3.

227 The joining of the fragments from the Throne Room and Court 3 was greatly facilitated by the unusual color of the sherds, which had a creamy buff exterior and a bright salmon-pink interior. This color combination is evident also among the Pylos sherds and appears to be indicative of a local fabric.

228 ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive, Box 5, Folder 2, p. 5.

229 The use of sticks to prop up wheel-made animals before firing has been cited by French in her discussion of the Phylakopi bovids, in particularly SFs 836, 850, and 1032 (1985, pp. 242-244) and by Kourou and Karetsou (1997, p.
A third and final fragment likely belonging to this figure is a large horn (P-370; see Plates 37, 38) found in Room 72 of the palace’s Southwestern Building. Measuring 0.078 m. from base to tip, the horn is made of a fine buff clay and has an interior hole where a stick may have been inserted to attach the piece to the bovid’s head. The exterior of the horn is decorated with four painted vertical lines: one on the horn’s back, one on its outer face, and two along its inner face. Where the horn attached to the bovid’s head are the remains of painted horizontal lines. A proposed reconstruction of the complete figure is shown in Figure 3.9.

Based on the forms of its extant fragments, this bovid belongs to the so-called “Mycenaean” type dated between LH IIIA and LH IIIC and characterized by a barrel-shaped body, a short vertical neck, and no modeled dewlap or genitals. By contrast, more naturalistic wheel-made bovids (dating from LH IIIA2 to LM IIIC and continuing into the Geometric period) are largely found on Crete where the added attributes are believed to derive from hollow handmade bulls produced on the island during the Old and New Palace Periods. In Greece, Mycenaean type wheel-made bovids are known from many sites. Examples have been found, for example, at Amyklai (Figure 3.10), Tiryns (Figure 3.11), Mycenae (Figure 3.12), Midea, Delphi (Figure 3.13), Epidaurus (Figure 3.14), Athens, and Kalapodi, as well as at Phylakopi on Melos (Figure 3.15). The majority of these examples date to LH IIIB and LH IIIC, although some

---

110), who note that clay legs of Cretan figures were often built around sticks before being inserted into the figures’ bodies.

230 I am grateful to Hofstra for bringing the existence of this horn, which she discovered during the course of research for her dissertation (2000), to my attention. Notably, the large body fragment from Court 3 is composed of two fragments that were glued together prior to my reexamination of the megaron material.

231 Kourou-Karetsou 1997, p. 112.

232 Kourou-Karetsou 1997, pp. 114-115; Muhly 2008. Such early handmade bulls are also known from the islands, including an LC I example from Akrotiri (Guggisberg 1996, pp. 119-120, plate 29, no. 9). Although this type of naturalistic wheel-made figure is largely found on Crete, an example, dating to LH IIIA:2, is also known from Dimini (Adrimi-Sismani 1993, p. 31).

figures, namely an example from Mycenae and possibly figures from Phylakopi and from Delphi, date to LH IIIA.234

The Date of the Bovid

The Pylos figure is the first of its kind to be identified at the Palace of Nestor and in the wider region of Messenia. It is also difficult to date. Typically, figures of the “Mycenaean” type are dated by their decoration, which typically followed contemporary trends in vase painting.235 Excellent examples of this tendency are seen in LH IIIC bovids from Amyklai, which are decorated in the so-called “Close Style” (see Figure 3.10a). Employing this model, the two motifs visible on the flank of the Pylos bovid, i.e., the vertical wavy band and the concentric semi-circle, are broadly characteristic of Late Helladic pottery. In Messenia, however, Penelope Mountjoy has noted a particular predilection for wide curved bands in LH IIIB and in the Transitional LH IIIB2-LH IIIC early period, as illustrated by an LH IIIB jug with cutaway neck from the Veves tholos at Nichoria (Figure 3.16).236 On this vessel, the grouping of the vertical curved stripes (FM 67) closely resembles the arrangement of lines on the rear of the Pylos bovid.237

The highly fragmentary nature of the Pylian figure, however, and the discovery of its extant pieces in debris layers in three non-contiguous rooms argues against such a late date.

234 Guggisberg 1996, pp. French (1985, pp. 238-239) suggests that the Phylakopi bovids should be “contemporary with the building of the shrine,” which in the case of the West Shrine is as early as LH IIIA:2. Nicholls (1970, p. 9) suggests a possible LH IIIA:2 date for the Delphi bovid based on the use of rock pattern on its chest.
235 Guggisberg 1996, p. 369. This is not surprising as the technology used to produce the wheel-made bovids is identical to that used in the production of ceramic pots.
236 Mountjoy 1999, p. 310. Concerning Transitional LH IIIB:2-LH IIIC Early: “Most of the closed shapes have simple linear decoration with large reserved areas on the lower body; others have curved stripes, a favourite local motif.”
237 Mountjoy 1999, p. 341, no. 80. She notes that the decoration of this vase is unusual: “groups of medium width stripes…differs from the usual type which has groups of narrow stripes alternating with single broad stripes. It seems to be a local variant.”
These factors strongly suggest that the pieces of the bovid were incorporated into the wall matrix of the final Pylian palace, built in early LH IIIB (see more on this below). As construction material, the bovid could not have been produced and/or used in the activities of the LH IIIB palace, but rather must have been produced, used, and destroyed during the palace’s “pre-palatial” phase(s). For this reason, I date the Pylos bovid to LH IIIA, a known period of large-scale occupation at Pylos, as argued by Nelson,238 and the first phase of wheel-made figures’ popularity on the Greek mainland, as observed by Martin Guggisberg.239 An LH IIIA date is further supported by similarities between the sinuous body decoration of the Pylos figure and the “Wavy Type 2” decoration (with thick, wavy lines) identified by French on the small, handmade Mycenaean quadruped figurines of this period (Figures 3.17 and 3.18).240 Such a connection with small figurines, Guggisberg notes, is a known feature of hollow bovids, but is more common in the case of large handmade, rather than wheel-made examples.241 Examples of the latter, however, do exist among the bovids from Phylakopi, many of which are decorated with parallel wavy lines (see Figure 3.15).242

Finally, an early date for the Pylos bovid is confirmed by a comparison between it and LH IIIC figures from Amyklai, which among known sites with wheel-made bovids is the closest geographically to the Palace of Nestor. In 2012, I had the opportunity to examine firsthand three of the more complete figures (NM 15123, NM 13290/4385 (see Figure 3.10, bottom half), and

---

238 Nelson 2001, pp. 200-207. It also may be significant that the architecture of this period at Pylos was markedly more “Minoan” in character, as evidenced primarily by the use of ashlar masonry (see Nelson 2001, pp. 205-207). Such a context might be considered more “appropriate” for the use of an object (the bovid) that has its origins in Cretan prototypes (Muhly 2008, see above).


240 French 1971, p. 154, pl. 24d. Notably, this LH IIIA date differs from the LH IIIB date that I suggested for this figure in my 2012 AIA presentation: “A Bull Among the China: A Wheel-Made Bovid from the Palace of Nestor.” I revised my opinion based on the evidence of the horn fragment, which Hofstra brought to my attention after the paper had been delivered.


242 See in particular Phylakopi figure SF 2690 (French 1985, p. 239, fig. 6.18, p. 242, fig. 6.20, p. 248), which has vertical wavy bands on its rump that are similar to those on the Pylos bovid.
NM 6259) stored in the Athens National Museum, where I confirmed the differences in fabric, construction, and decoration between these bovids and the Pylian example. Most notably, all three Amyklai figures were made of a coarser fabric (with visible inclusions). Additionally, while one bovid (NM 15123) featured a tail-side firing hole, the legs preserved on another (NM 13290/4385) were attached without piercing the figure’s body. Lastly, the thin, concentric decoration on each of the Amyklai figures is clearly more stylistically “advanced” than that on the Pylos bovid, affirming that the latter figure, like the LH IIIA examples from Mycenae and perhaps Delphi, should be assigned to the early rather than the late development of this figural type on the Greek mainland.

The Function of the Bovid

The function of the Pylos bovid in LH IIIA was almost certainly cultic. Although no evidence about the figure’s original use context is preserved, discoveries of in situ wheel-made bovids found at other sites strongly support this inference. Of those figures with a clear (or least probable) use context, most were found in what might be called “dedicated cult spaces.” These included enclosed citadel shrines (e.g., at Tiryns, in chamber KW 7 of the Unterberg, and in the adjacent East and West Shrines at Phylakopi), as well as open-air rural shrines (e.g., at Amyklai). The function of the bovids within these different areas has been a topic of much debate. In a pioneering article written by Richard V. Nicholls in 1970, it was argued that terracotta bovids found at open-air sites on the Greek mainland functioned primarily as votive

---

243 I extend warm thanks to the Hellenic Ministry of Culture, the staff of the National Museum in Athens (particularly Kostas Paschalidis), and Katie Demakopoulou for their assistance and for permission to study these figures.
244 Kilian 1987b; French 1985; Demakopoulou 1982, pp. 60-61.
offerings used either to commemorate animal sacrifices or to substitute for them. More recently, similar arguments have been made by Katie Demakopoulou, who identifies the bovids found at Amyklai as votive offerings, and by Guggisberg, who contends that the large bovid figures deposited at Kalapodi represent dedications by young men who had recently undergone initiation into adulthood.

Bovids found in indoor shrines, however, have received a different interpretation. Guggisberg suggests that such figures were also votives, dedicated perhaps for their associations with "fertility and divine power." The most common interpretation of these figures, however, is that they served as cult equipment or as objects of veneration. At Phylakopi, the presence of bovids on raised platforms and in rear areas of the two shrines led French and Colin Renfrew to suggest that they were employed during cult practice. The excavators also argued that some bovids with open vessels on their backs (Figure 3.19) were used for liquid offerings. In recent years, this interpretation has been refined by Robert Koehl, who identifies these spouted figures as *bibri*: zoomorphic vessels, popular among the Hittites, with openings through which liquid contents were consumed via long straws. Alternatively, Gabrielle Albers has interpreted the

---

246 Evidence for such hunts, Guggisberg argues, comes from Strabo, who recorded Ephoros’ fourth century account of this practice on Crete, noting that "the successful completion of this rite was celebrated by the sacrifice of a bull" (Guggisberg 2009, p. 128, citing Strabo's *Geography* X.4.21).
247 Guggisberg 2009, pp. 127-133. On the subject of bovids found in intramural spaces, Guggisberg notes that "it seems logical to assume that they were deposited primarily for their symbolic significance within the Mycenaean and Late Minoan religious ideology. It may have sufficient here to refer to the important role of the bull, the most prominent among the animals depicted in wheel-made terracotta sculpture in Late Bronze Age religion. Its symbolism, in all likelihood, was connected with concepts of fertility and divine power" (2009, p. 126).
248 Renfrew 1985, p. 373.
249 French 1985, pp. 239-240. While she used the term "rhyta" to describe these bovids, French noted that they did not function in the traditional sense because there were no openings in their mouths. Instead, she reasoned, liquid would have been poured in through the vases on their backs and then poured out through the same opening.
250 Koehl 2013. For comparison, see also Koehl’s identification of the silver stag rhyton from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae as a *bibru* (2013; 1995).
Phylakopi bovids as “addressees of veneration” because of their large size and prominent placement within the shrines.\textsuperscript{251}

Which (if any) of these interpretations is appropriate for the Pylos bovid is impossible to determine. Little help is offered by the site’s small handmade figurines, which, as observed by Ioulia Tzonou-Herbst, are fragmentary, extremely few in number (ca. 50 vs. the 5493 examples found at Mycenae and Prosymna), and come almost exclusively from rubbish deposits (many pre-dating the construction of the final palace) and/or wall fill.\textsuperscript{252} Such a deposition pattern says nothing about the use of the figurines, but does suggest that they may have been more popular in LH IIIA than in LH IIIB at Pylos.\textsuperscript{253}

Even without clear archaeological evidence, the use of a wheel-made bovid in ritual activities at Pylos would not be surprising. If evidence from the site’s Linear B tablets is considered, bulls were exceedingly important as sacrifices for communal feasts in LH IIIB. As noted by Palaima, in tablet Un 718 the bull is listed as the specific offering of the \textit{wanax} (designated by the personal name \textit{e-ke-ra2-wo} or, “\textit{Egkhes-Lauon}”) at the regional site of sa-ra-pe-da.\textsuperscript{254} At Pylos itself, similar sacrifices are evidenced in tablet Un 138, by the large bull in the procession scene painted on the wall of the Vestibule of the megaron, and by the many deposits of burnt bovine mandibles, humeri, and femurs in and around the palace, including one in

\textsuperscript{251} Albers 2009, p. 97. In her interpretation, Albers likens the use of the wheel-made bovids to that of the large wheel-made female figures found at the site, as well as at Tiryns, Midea, and in the Cult Center at Mycenae.
\textsuperscript{252} Tzonou-Herbst 2002, pp. 177-180. One exception, she suggests, may be a hollow psi figure in relatively good condition found in the main drain which may have come from the LH IIIB palace. Unusually, the palace’s small handmade figurines represent only women and animals. Other figurine fragments come from Room 24, Room 27, Court 63, Room 65, Room 82, Room 97, Room 99, Corridor 95, and from outside the exterior wall of the Southwest Building.
\textsuperscript{253} This hypothesis is further supported by the more frequent discovery of figurines in LH IIIA (vs. LH IIIB) tombs near the palace (Tzonou-Herbst 2002, pp. 179-180).
\textsuperscript{254} Palaima 1995, pp. 132-133; 2004, p. 231. See also tablet PY Un 6. Further support for the identification of \textit{e-ke-ra2-wo} as the personal name of the \textit{wanax} can be found in Ventris and Chadwick 1956, p. 265; Nakassis 2012, pp. 2, 7-9.
Archive Room 7 recently studied by Stocker and Davis.\textsuperscript{255} If these offerings are used as a model, and if it is possible to extrapolate backward into LH IIIA, it is possible that bovine gifts were a royal prerogative at Pylos, and that the terracotta wheel-made bovid served as a royal votive.

**Imports**

One final group of significant new finds from the Pylos megaron consists of possible ceramic imports. As noted above, the “coil-joint strengthening” technique used on the larnax rim from the Throne Room (P-199) and in the “sandwiched” Palace Style jar fragment (P-313) may suggest that these objects were produced on Kythera, possibly during LH IIIA and LH IIIB respectively. If true, the same origin should be ascribed to P-378, the late Palace Style jar from Room 38 to which sherd P-313 likely belongs. Additional imports of LH III date may include: a decorated shallow cup (P-277; see Plate 88), two painted jugs (P-77 and P-226; see Plates 34, 73), a piriform jar (P-366; see Plate 113), a monochrome kylix (P-232 and P-246; see Plates 74, 79), and a decorated kylix (P-252; see Plate 80) from the Argolid. Unlike the local pottery, with its soft fabric and fugitive paint, these sherds are extremely hard-fired (they “clink” when dropped) and preserve the vivid, lustrous paint characteristic of Argive pots.

From earlier Late Helladic periods, likely imports include: an LH I-II red micaceous pointed-leg tripod (P-181; see Plate 61) perhaps from Kythera, and two LH IIA Palace Style Jars (P-18, and P-141, P-183, and P-166+P-231; see Plates 17, 52, 56, 62) with octopus and fat

\textsuperscript{255} Stocker and Davis, 2004. Identified as the “physical record” of a palatial feast. Cf. Whittaker (2008a, p. 186), who is doubtful of Stocker and Davis’ identification of the bones from Archive Room as the “physical proof” of a state-sponsored sacrifice. For recent discussion of the bull in the wall paintings, see Wright 2004, p. 161, with references to the work of Lang and McCallum. That the large figure associated with the one bull illustrated on the NW wall of the Vestibule may have been a representation of the \textit{wanax} himself has been suggested by Kilian (1988, p. 300, n. 1).
zigzag motifs, potentially from north central Crete.\footnote{That these vessels come from Crete is corroborated by the dark inclusions in the clay fabric, which are likely bits of mudstone.} Finally, two of the megaron’s burnished Middle Helladic sherds (\textbf{P-174} and \textbf{P-291}; see Plates 59, 91) may, on account of their exceptionally dark color and fine surface and/or decoration, be examples of true “Black Minyan” ware imported to Pylos from the Argolid and/or central Greece.

\textit{Megaron Finds in Their Stratigraphical Contexts}

By combining the information presented above (and in Appendix 1) with the new stratigraphical contexts, it is possible to acquire a clearer picture of the contexts’ character. Quantitative breakdowns of the saved and/or reported pottery and small finds found in the different strata and contexts of the megaron are given in Appendix 2, Tables 10-16.\footnote{In Tables 10-16, uncertainties about dating indicated by “?s” in the catalogue in Appendix 1 are maintained. In the narrative summaries below, however, sherd counts are calculated without the “?s” in order to provide a more concrete version of the assemblages (as currently interpreted).} In order to keep like materials together, complete (or largely complete) ceramic vessels are presented with the sherds instead of the small finds. When an unknown quantity of an artifact type is represented in a stratum, the symbol “+” is used. In the breakdowns as well as in the synopses below, the ceramics are divided into four categories in order to illustrate more clearly their chronological relationship to the construction and use of megaron. These categories are: “early,” “palatial,” “early-or-palatial,” and “post-palatial.”

For the purposes of this dissertation, “early” ceramics are those that predate the construction of the megaron, dated by Nelson to early LH IIIB.\footnote{Nelson 2001, p. 208.} These ceramics range in date from MH to LH IIIA2. Middle Helladic sherds come predominately from vessels with a fine dark burnished surface and a red core\footnote{And occasionally the opposite, with a red surface and a black core.} (“burnished ware”), with linear incised decoration (“Adriatic
ware”), or with a powdery orange surface, while sherds falling in the LH I-IIIA date range include distinctive shapes such as the Vapheio cup, ewer, tankard, flask, and Palace Style jar produced in a variety of pale pink or buff wares with decoration in red or black matt (for LH I) or lustrous paint.

“Palatial” ceramics are contemporary with the primary use of the megaron and range in date from LH IIIB1 to LH IIIC early. A small number of shapes, mainly the deep bowl, are represented – typically made from buff clay and decorated with lustrous dark paint. “Early-or-palatial,” (abbreviated henceforth as “EOP”) sherds date either to the early or to the palatial periods, i.e., between LH II/IIIA to LH IIIC early. EOP shapes includes jars, kraters, handleless/conical cups (typically dated between LH II and LH IIIB1 on the Greek mainland260), and undecorated table wares such as kylikes, dippers, and bowls. While it is very tempting to assign the latter fine wares to the palatial period on account of their similarities to the thousands of pots stored in the palace’s pantries (Rooms 18-22)261, it is clear from published studies and local evidence (see below) that similar vessels were also present in LH IIIA.

Finally, “post-palatial” ceramics are those that belong to vessels that post-date the “palatial” period at Pylos. These sherds range in date from LH IIIC late to the Hellenistic/Roman periods and include a wide range of shapes. Most of sherds from this group date to the so-called Dark Age (dated by Coulson262 to ca. 1075-750 B.C.) and include drinking shapes with streaky monochrome slip and/or grooved decoration such as the flat-bottomed cup, trefoil oinochoe, bowl with conical foot, and krater.

261 The material from the Pylos pantries was originally published by Rawson (PN I, pp. 350-418) and has been reexamined by Jill Carrington-Smith (1999), Michael Galaty (1999), and Hruby (2006; 2010)
In addition to these categories, sherds of apparently Mycenaean production (as suggested by their fabric, shape, etc.) that do not exhibit closely datable characteristics are classified generally as “Myc.,” while sherds that I was unable to date confidently in any way are classed as “Indeter.” (Indeterminate).  

The Throne Room

Quantitative breakdowns of the sherds (and complete vessels) and small finds saved and/or reported from the strata and contexts excavated in the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron are given in Appendix 2, Tables 11 and 12. When known, elevations for individual finds are included. Based on this data and that presented in Appendix 1, the contents of the Throne Room’s contexts are summarized below.

Context ThPL

Context ThPL, the plowed earth overlying the entire Throne Room, contained few sherds and fewer, if any, small finds. A minimum of six sherds come from this context. Of these, six sherds are datable and an unknown number are of indeterminate date. All six datable sherds belong to the EOP group and were found in stratum p2. When “mixed contexts” that include

---

263 The perhaps surprisingly low numbers of this last category are likely due to the culling of many “undiagnostic” sherds in the field, resulting in an “overly-diagnostic” preserved assemblage.

264 In this case, and throughout the room summaries, the numerical counts reflect the numbers of sherds or small finds indicated in the charts in Appendix 2. For those sherd/find types whose precise quantity is unknown (i.e., marked by an “*” in the charts) this is indicated in the summaries with the terms “minimum of” or “at least.” In other words, a “+” does not translate to a hard number.

265 This term is used here and throughout the following discussions to refer to contexts that include parts of different “homogeneous” contexts because of the “mixed” character of their included strata. For example, context ThR1/ThR2 includes strata from context ThR1 and ThR2. Typically, the names of these mixed contexts (which are included in Appendices 1 and 2) are unique, but in a few cases they are duplicated. In this event, the context is further defined by its included strata, marked in parentheses, e.g., context ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 (stratum p5/b6/r5). In the text, the descriptive phrase “When mixed contexts that include context X are considered,…” is often shortened to “When mixed contexts are considered,…” In these cases, the reader should assume that “mixed” refers to contexts that include the “homogenous” context currently under discussion.
context ThPL are considered, the EOP sherd count is increased by at least four sherds.\(^{266}\) Of the six sherds from context ThPL, none show evidence of burning and no joins or associations are apparent.

No small finds come from context ThPL. When mixed contexts are included, the count is increased to two fragments of plaster recovered in context ThPL/ThB1/ThR1, strata p5/b6/r5 and p6/b8/r6.

**Context ThR1**

Plan: Figure 3.20

The majority of ceramics and small finds recovered in the Pylos Throne Room come from context ThR1, located directly underneath the plowed earth (context ThPL) and predominantly in the room’s NW, NE, and SW Quadrants. A minimum of 82 sherds, one complete vessel, and an unknown number of chimney fragments come from this context. Of these, 61 sherds, the complete vessel, and the chimney fragments are datable, seven sherds are identifiably “Myc.,” and at least 14 sherds are of indeterminate date. Context ThR1 contained a total of 23 early sherds. These include as many as six MH sherds and up to 17 LH I-IIIA sherds. When mixed contexts are considered, the early sherd count is increased by eight sherds.\(^{267}\)

Of the 23 early sherds from context ThR1, 18 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor, while five come from elevations less than 0.20 m.\(^{268}\) From the latter group, one early sherd (a possible MH perforated handle, P-55) was found on or just above

---

\(^{266}\) Mixed contexts include: ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 (stratum p5/b6/r5) and ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 (stratum p6/b8/r6).

\(^{267}\) Mixed contexts include: ThR1/ThR2, ThY2/ThR1, ThR1/ThB1, and ThB1/ThR1 (stratum b5/r4).

\(^{268}\) In this and all subsequent cases, these numbers are calculated based on contexts that have strata/passes whose depths clearly fall into this range. Those strata/passes with less specific depths (e.g., stratum r4, -0.50 to the floor) are not included.
the floor, in stratum r5.\textsuperscript{269} Nine of the 23 early sherds preserve traces of burning, and three joins are apparent. These are: a body sherd of an LH IIA Palace Style jar (P-166, context ThR1, stratum r8/r9/r4), which joins to a body sherd from the Vestibule (P-231, context VPL/VR, stratum p10/r11); a rim sherd of an LH IIIA2 jar (P-125, context ThR1, stratum r8), which joins to another rim sherd (P-29, context ThB1/ThR1, stratum b5/r4); and a body sherd of an LH IIIA2 jar (P-126, context ThR1, stratum r8) that joins to another body sherd (P-371) from Room 18. When mixed contexts are considered, a final join occurs between a fragment of the rump of the LH IIIA wheel-made bovid (P-84, context ThR1/ThR2, stratum r6/r7), which joins to another rump fragment (P-369) from Court 3.

Physical similarities are also evident among non-joining early sherds and sherd groups from context ThR1, and between these sherds and those found elsewhere in the palace, that suggest a common vessel origin. Strong similarities exist between: joined rim sherds P-125+P-29 and joined body sherds P-126+P-371, which may belong to the same piriform jar; joined body sherds P-166+P-231 and body sherds P-141 (stratum r9) and P-183 (Throne Room, no context), which may come from the same Palace Style jar; and joined fragments P-84+P-369 and a clay horn (P-370) from Room 72, which likely belong to the same wheel-made bovid.

Associations are also likely between a body sherd (P-128, stratum r8) and a body sherd from the Vestibule (P-243, context VPL, stratum p12), which may come from the same Mycenaean jar/jug; and a neck sherd with a raised ring (P-124, context ThR1, stratum r14) and body sherds P-28 (context ThB1/ThR1, stratum b5/r4), P-190 (Throne Room, context/stratum unknown), P-250 and P-251 (both from context VR, stratum r14), and P-257 (from the Vestibule, contexts/strata unknown), neck sherd P-269 (context VPL/VB, stratum p15/b14), P-282 (context

\textsuperscript{269} In this and all subsequent cases, this group is determined from descriptions of strata that state specifically that they are located “on” or “just above” the floors of these rooms.
PBn, stratum bn1), and body sherd P-372 (from Court 3), all of which may belong to the same LH IIB-IIIA1 piriform jar with scale decoration.

Also from context ThR1 are as many as three sherds and one complete basin of palatial date. When mixed contexts are considered, the palatial sherd count is increased by three sherds. Of the three palatial sherds from context ThR1, two come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor, while the basin and one sherd come from elevations less than 0.20 m. The basin (P-136, in stratum r8) and a possible rim fragment of an LH IIIB Group A deep bowl (P-163, from stratum r8/r9) were found on or just above the floor. All three palatial sherds and the basin preserve evidence of burning and joins are apparent in the basin. Additional joins are likely between the chimney fragments from this context (P-14, from stratum r1/r2) and those found in contexts ThB1, ThR1/ThB2, ThR1/ThR2, and ThB4. When mixed contexts are considered, additional joins are evident in the two nearly complete miniature kylikes (P-72 and P-73) that Blegen and Rawson associated with the table of offerings found in context ThY2/ThR1, stratum y4/r5.

The largest group of ceramics from context ThR1 are EOP sherds, which number at least 34 in total. When EOP sherds from mixed contexts are considered, this count is increased by at least 31 sherds. Of the 34 EOP sherds from context ThR1, at least 18 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor, while at least 16 sherds come from elevations less than 0.20 m. From the latter group, as many as 10 EOP sherds were found on or just above the floors, in strata r5 and r8/r9. These include: the rim of a handleless/conical cup.

---

270 Mixed contexts include: ThR1/ThR2, ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 and ThY2/ThR1.
272 As before, these numbers are calculated based on contexts that have strata/passes whose depths clearly fall into this range.
six rim fragments of unpainted kylix(kes) (P-57, P-159, P-160); one fragment of a small kylix, cup, or dipper (P-161); one fragment of a standard kylix or dipper (P-162); and the rim of a monochrome kylix (P-56). Thirteen EOP sherds are burnt and three joins are apparent. Joins exist between the three kylix fragments grouped as P-159 and between the two kylix fragments grouped as P-160, all from stratum r8/r9. At least 10 EOP sherds from context ThR1 were found in strata (i.e., r5 and r8/r9/r4) that also contained both early and palatial sherds.273 By contrast, at least 20 EOP sherds were found in four strata (r2, r5, r8, and r9) that contained no identifiably palatial sherds.

Finally, only one “post-palatial” sherd was found in context ThR1. The sherd is a rim fragment (P-171) of a Hellenistic or Roman plate found in stratum r8/r9/r4. Consideration of mixed contexts adds no additional sherds to this group, and no joins or associations for P-171 are apparent. Among those sherds from context ThR1 with unknown dates, an association is likely between the plastered pithos rim (*P-9, stratum r1) and an unnumbered pithos rim sherd found in context ThB1, stratum b5.

Context ThR1 also contained at least 50 small finds. These include at least 12 scraps of metal (gold, silver, and bronze), three pieces of worked stone, an unknown quantity of unworked stone, at least 16 bits of bone, three chunks of carbonized wood, at least three pieces of plaster, and 13 fragments of Linear B tablets. When mixed contexts are considered, the small finds count is increased by at least 34 finds, including the Throne Room “table of offerings” (C-9, context ThY2/ThR1, stratum y4/r5) and three fragments of Linear B tablets.274

273 This number is increased from 10 to at least 18 when EOP sherds from mixed context ThT2/ThR1 (stratum y4/r5) are considered.
Out of the more than 50 small finds from context ThR1, at least 34 come from elevations greater than 0.25 m. above the Throne Room’s floor, while at least 16 come from elevations less than 0.25 m. In the latter group, 11 small finds were found on or just above the floor in strata r5, r6/r7, and r9. These finds are: a piece of carbonized wood (W-3, stratum r5); nine unnumbered bits of bone (strata r5 and r8/r9); and a stone conulus (S-9, stratum r9). When mixed contexts are considered, two additional small finds also come from the floor: the table of offerings (C-9) and one tiny speck of gold (M-15, context ThR1/ThY2, stratum r6/r7).

Joins between small finds associated with context ThR1 are restricted to those fragments that compose the table of offerings (C-9), found in the mixed context ThY2/ThR1. As for associations, those finds that could conceivably form a “set,” i.e., the Linear B tablets, are dispersed between five strata in context ThR1 (r1, r5, r6, r8, r9) and two mixed strata in mixed contexts (ThB1/ThR1, stratum b5/r4 and ThY2/ThR1, stratum y4/r5), and range in elevation from -0.20 m. to -0.60 m. below surface level. Two finds only, the stone conulus (S-9) and the table of offerings (C-9), constitute complete (or nearly complete) objects.

Context ThR2

Plan: Figure 3.21

Context ThR2, a deposit of loose red earth located in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room and surrounded by context ThR1, contained a small quantity of sherds and small finds. In total, 24 sherds come from this context. Of these, 12 sherds are datable, one is generally “Myc.,” and 11 sherds are of indeterminate date. Context ThR2 contained a total of four early sherds, including three MH sherds and one LH I-IIIA sherd. When mixed contexts that include context
ThR2 are considered, the early sherd count is increased by as many as three sherds. ThR2 are considered, the early sherd count is increased by as many as three sherds.275 Three of the four early sherds from context ThR2 preserve traces of burning and no joins are apparent. When mixed contexts are considered, two joins are evident: one between a rim sherd of an LH IIIA2 jar (P-29, context ThB1/ThR1, stratum b5/r4), which joins to a rim sherd (P-125, context ThR1, stratum r8); and one between the two fragments of the rump of the wheel-made bovid (P-84+P-369), both discussed above. Strong similarities also exist between the joined rump fragments and the horn (P-370), which, as already noted, likely belongs to the same figure.

Also found in context ThR2 were two sherds of palatial date. When mixed contexts are considered, the palatial sherd count is increased by two sherds.276 Both of the two palatial sherds from context ThR2 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m above the Throne Room’s floor. Neither sherd preserves traces of burning and no joins are apparent. When mixed contexts are considered, joins are evident in the two miniature kylikes (P-72 and P-73) from context ThY2/ThR1, stratum y4/r5, noted above. Strong associations also occur between rim sherd P-98 and body sherd P-99 (both from context ThR2, stratum r7), which may belong to the same LH IIIC early(?) monochrome deep bowl.

EOP sherds, which number six in total, form the largest sherd group from context ThR2. When mixed contexts are considered, the EOP sherd count is increased by five sherds.277 All six of the EOP sherds from context ThR2 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor. No EOP sherds are burnt and no joins are apparent. Of the six sherds, the three found in the “regular” part of stratum r7 were accompanied by both early and palatial sherds, while the three found in the “rectangle of plaster” in the same stratum were accompanied by no identifiably palatial sherds.

275 Mixed context: ThR1/ThR2.
276 Mixed context: ThR1/ThR2.
277 Mixed context: ThR1/ThB1.
Context ThR2 contained at least 10 small finds. These include: six scraps of metal (gold, silver, and bronze), one bit of bone, and at least three fragments of plaster. When mixed contexts are considered, the small finds count is increased by at least seven finds.\textsuperscript{278} All 10 small finds from context ThR2 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor and no joins are apparent.

*Context ThB1*

Plan: Figure 3.22

Context ThB1, located directly underneath the plowed earth (context ThPL) in the area above the central hearth, contained few sherds and even fewer small finds. In total, two sherds, one nearly complete vessel, and an unknown number of chimney fragments come from this context. Of these, the nearly complete vessel and chimney fragments are datable, while the two sherds are of indeterminate date. Both the vessel (a stirrup jar, P-15) and the chimney fragments (P-16) come from stratum b4 and date to the palatial period. When sherds from mixed contexts are considered, the total sherd count is increased by four early sherds, at least 15 EOP sherds, and one palatial sherd.\textsuperscript{279}

The stirrup jar from context ThB1, composed of six joining sherds, is nearly complete (except for the handles and false spout) and shows no traces of burning. Additional joins are likely between the chimney fragments from this context and similar fragments found in contexts ThR1, ThR1/ThB2, ThR1/ThR2, and ThB4. Associations are likely between a fragment of an unnumbered, undated pithos rim (context ThB1, stratum b5) and the plastered rim fragment *P-


9 (from context ThR1, stratum r1), discussed above. When mixed contexts are considered, associations are likely between the body sherd with scale decoration (P-28) and body sherds (P-124, P-190, P-250, P-251, P-257, P-269, P-282, and P-372), all of which, as discussed above, may belong to the same LH IIB-IIIA1 piriform jar.

In terms of small finds, context ThB2 contained two scraps of bronze, a few pieces of silver, and some fragments of plaster, all from stratum b8. When mixed contexts are considered, the small finds count is increased by at least seven finds. All small finds from context ThB2 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the Throne Room’s floor and no joins are apparent.

**Context ThY1**

Plan: Figure 3.23

Context ThY1, occupying a narrow strip underneath the plowed earth (context ThPL) in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room, contained no sherds or small finds.

**Context ThY2**

Plan: Figure 3.24

The second largest quantity of ceramics found in the Throne Room comes from context ThY2, located predominantly in the room’s SW Quadrant and directly underneath the plowed earth (context ThPL). In total, at least 25 sherds come from this context. Of these, 20 sherds are datable, one is generally “Myc.,” and at least four sherds are of indeterminate date. Context ThY2 contained a total of five early sherds. One MH-LH II sherd comes from stratum y3, while

---

280 Mixed contexts include: ThB1/ThR1 (stratum b5/r4), ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 (stratum p6/b8/r6), and ThB1/ThR1 (stratum b12/r9).
four LH I-IIIA sherds come from strata y3 and y4. When mixed contexts are considered, the early sherd count is increased by one sherd.\textsuperscript{281} None of the four early sherds from context ThY2 preserve traces of burning and no joins are apparent.

No palatial sherds were found in context ThY2. When mixed contexts are considered, the palatial sherd count is increased to one sherd.\textsuperscript{282} Fifteen EOP sherds were found in strata y3 and y4. When mixed contexts are considered, the EOP sherd count is increased by 11 sherds.\textsuperscript{283} None of the 15 EOP sherds from context ThY2 sherds are burnt, and joins are apparent only between three fragments constituting the lower bowl and stem of an undecorated kylix (P-70). No other joins or associations are apparent.

Small finds from context ThY2 include at least two pieces of bone and four fragments of plaster, both from stratum y4. When mixed contexts are considered, the small finds count is increased by eight finds including the table of offerings (C-9), discussed above.\textsuperscript{284}

\textit{Context ThB2}

Plan: Figure 3.25

No sherds or small finds can be specifically assigned to context ThB2, located under the red earth (context ThR1) and above the yellow earth (context ThY3) overlying the central hearth in the Throne Room. When mixed contexts are considered, an unknown number of EOP sherds, an unknown number of sherds of indeterminate date, an unknown number of palatial period chimney fragments (P-59, from context ThR1/ThB2), and two pieces of bone are added to the

\textsuperscript{281} Mixed context: ThY2/ThR1.
\textsuperscript{282} Mixed context: ThY2/ThR1.
\textsuperscript{283} Mixed contexts include: ThY2/ThR1 and ThR1/ThY2
\textsuperscript{284} Mixed contexts include: ThY2/ThR1 and ThR1/ThY2.
counts.\textsuperscript{285} Among the ceramics, joins are likely between the chimney fragments from this context and similar fragments found in contexts ThR1, ThB1, ThR1/ThR2, and ThB4.

\textit{Context ThY3}

Plan: Figure 3.26

Context ThY3, located beneath the black earth (context ThB2) and above the crust of ashes (context ThB4) on the surface of the central hearth in the Throne Room, contained no sherds or small finds.

\textit{Context ThB4}

Plan: Figure 3.27

Context ThB4, the crust of ashes directly overlying the central hearth in the Throne Room, contained only an unknown quantity of palatial period chimney fragments (P-113, stratum b9). These fragments likely join with similar fragments found in contexts ThR1, ThB1, ThR1/ThB2, and ThR1/ThR2. Small finds from context ThB4 include one piece of carbonized wood (W-4) found on the surface of the hearth.

\textit{Context ThB3}

Plan: Figure 3.28

Context ThB3, located on the floor of the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room, contained no sherds or small finds.

\textit{Context ThB5}

\textsuperscript{285} Mixed contexts include: ThB1/ThR1/ThB2 and ThR1/ThB2.
Context **ThB5**, located on the floor of the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room, contained no sherds and very few small finds. The latter include a drop of gold (*M-20*) and one fragment of carbonized wood (*W-5*) found inside the floor cutting for the base of the room’s northern column.

**Context ThR3**

Plan: Figure 3.30

Context **ThR3**, located in the upper part of the “throne space” against the NE wall of the Throne Room, contained no sherds. It did contain, however, two clusters of small finds referred to as “Group A” and “Group B” of the throne space “treasure.” Group A comprises a gold bead (*M-21*), part of an agate pendant (*S-5*), and fragments of kyanos (*K-1*), while Group B includes a piece of twisted gold wire (*M-22*), a damaged finger ring (*M-23*), a piece of twisted silver wire (*M-24*), a bronze bead (*M-25*), fragments of bronze (*M-26*), beads of carnelian (*S-6*), agate (*S-7*), and amethyst (*S-8*), and half of a clay whorl (*C-12*). Out of these 12 finds, seven constitute complete (or nearly complete) objects. These include: the finger ring, the beads of bronze, carnelian, agate, and amethyst, and the two bits of twisted gold and silver wire. These 12 finds from context **ThR3** also represent the only finds from the Throne Room (and the megaron generally) that were found clustered together rather than dispersed through a stratum (or multiple strata) of a given context.

**Context ThR4**

Plan: Figure 3.31
The final excavated context from the Pylos Throne Room, context ThR4, is located directly underneath context ThR3. Context ThR4 contained a total of three sherds, all found in stratum th2. Two of these sherds are early and one is of indeterminate date. The early sherds (P-114 and P-115) are unburnt. They do not join but likely belong to the same LH I matt-painted jar/jug. The indeterminate sherd (P-116) is burnt-through and likely belonged to a cooking vessel. No small finds were recovered from this context.

The Vestibule

Quantitative breakdowns of the sherds (and complete vessels) and small finds saved and/or reported from the strata and contexts excavated in the Vestibule of the Pylos megaron are given in Appendix 2, Tables 13 and 14. When known, specific elevations of individual finds are included. Based on this data and that presented in Appendix 1, the contents of the Vestibule’s contexts are summarized below.

Context VPL

Context VPL, the plowed earth overlying the entire Vestibule, contained very few sherds and few, if any, small finds. In total, at least nine sherds come from this context, all from the room’s SW Quadrant. Of these sherds, at least seven are datable, one is generally “Myc.,” and at least one is of indeterminate date. The datable sherd group comprises five early sherds (one MH and four LH I-IIIA), one palatial sherd, and at least one EOP sherd. When mixed contexts that include context VPL are considered, the early sherd count is increased by five early sherds and two EOP sherds, and at least 11 sherds of indeterminate date, all found in the room’s NW
Quadrant. Of the nine sherds from context VPL, two of the early sherds (P-236 and P-238) and the one palatial sherd (P-241) show evidence of burning. Associations are apparent only between two body sherds: P-243 (context VPL, stratum p12) and P-128 (context ThR1, stratum r8), which, as mentioned above, may come from the same Mycenaean jar/jug.

In terms of small finds, 20 pieces of bronze were found in context VPL, in the room’s NW and SE Quadrants. When mixed contexts are included, the find count is increased by two fragments of ivory, both from Trench Q.

**Context VR**

Plan: Figure 3.32

The majority of ceramics and small finds recovered in the Pylos Vestibule come from context VR, located directly underneath the plowed earth (context VPL). In total, at least 38 sherds and one nearly complete vessel come from this context. Of these, the 34 sherds and the vessel (a Group A deep bowl) are datable, while at least four sherds are of indeterminate date. Context VR contained a total of 11 early sherds. These include one MH sherd and 10 sherds falling in the LH I-IIIA date range. When mixed contexts are considered, the early sherd count is increased by five LH I-IIIA sherds. Of the 11 early sherds from context VR, six come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the room’s floor, while five come from elevations less than 0.20 m. From the latter group, one early sherd (P-246) from an imported (?) LH IIIA2 monochrome kylix was found on or just above the floor in stratum r13.

One of the 11 early sherds is burnt (P-213, with an angular stem pattern), and no joins are apparent save those constituting the complete deep bowl (P-235), which was found vitrified and

---

286 Mixed context: VPL/VR.
287 Mixed context: VPL/VR.
288 Mixed context: VPL/VR.
fused to the floor in the Vestibule’s east corner in stratum r12. When mixed contexts are considered, one join is present between a body sherd of an LH IIA Palace Style jar, P-231 (context VPL/VR, stratum p10/r11) and a body sherd from the Throne Room, P-166 (context ThR1, stratum r8/r9/r4). Strong associations are clear between P-246 and P-232 (context VPL/VR, stratum p10/r11), which likely belong to the same LH IIIA2 monochrome kylix, and between body sherds P-250 and P-251 (both from stratum r14) and sherds P-28, P-124, P-190, P-257, P-269, P-282, and P-372, which, as discussed above, may belong to the same LH IIB-III A1 piriform jar.

The largest group of ceramics from context VR are EOP sherds, which number at least 22. When mixed contexts are considered, the EOP sherd count is increased by two sherds. Of the 22 EOP sherds from context VR, at least 17 come from elevations greater than 0.20 m. above the rooms’ floors, while at least five come from elevations less than 0.20 m. Two EOP sherds are burnt (P-217 and P-218), and no joins are apparent. All 22 EOP sherds were found in strata (r11, r13, and r14) that contained no identifiably palatial sherds.

Finally, only one post-palatial sherd was included among the material saved from context VR. The sherd (P-228) is a body fragment with a combed wavy band from stratum r11. Its date is unknown but is likely to be post-Dark Age.

Context VR also contained at least 56 small finds. These include at least 27 scraps of metal (gold, silver, and bronze), a bronze arrow point (M-48) and a gold inlaid brooch (M-56) in the shape of a tiny ewer, four pieces of unworked stone, five bits of bone, six fragments of kyanos, at least one chunk of carbonized wood, at least seven pieces of plaster, and one fragment of a Linear B tablet. When mixed contexts are considered, the small finds count is increased by

---

289 Mixed context: VPL/VR.
two pieces of unworked ivory and two pieces of shell, all found in stratum p9/r10.²⁹⁰ Of the small finds from context VR, at least 33 objects come from elevations greater than 0.25 m. above the room’s floors, while at least 23 come from elevations less than 0.25 m. No small finds came from on or just above the floor. No joins are apparent among small finds from context VR, and only two finds constitute complete (or nearly complete) objects: the bronze arrow point (M-48) from stratum r12, and the inlaid gold brooch (M-56) from stratum r14.

*Context VB*

Plan: Figure 3.33

Context VB, located in a small hole in the floor of the Vestibule next to the doorway to the Portico, contained no sherds or small finds.

*The Portico*

Quantitative breakdowns of the sherds (and complete vessels) and small finds saved and/or reported from the strata and contexts excavated in the Portico of the Pylos megaron are given in Appendix 2, Tables 15 and 16. When known, specific elevations of individual finds are included. Based on this data and that presented in Appendix 1, the contents of the Portico’s contexts are summarized below. It should be noted, however, that unlike the Throne Room and Vestibule the majority of the artifacts found in the Portico of the megaron cannot be assigned with absolute confidence to specific strata and/or contexts. The find spots of nearly all of the small finds from this room were described generally by the excavators and most of the sherds lack pencil numbers, necessitating that contextual information be inferred from labels on storage bags full of mixed material. In only one case can unnumbered sherds be assigned with some

²⁹⁰ Mixed context: VPL/VR.
confidence a single stratum. These are the sherds from stratum p16/b15*/r18/bn2, which, as noted on the label of their storage bag, come primarily the “black stony” earth, i.e., stratum b15. For this reason, these sherds, which constitute the largest group of ceramics from the Portico, are included below in the summary of sherds from context PB rather than mixed context PPL/PB/PR/PBn.  

**Context PPL**

Context PPL, the plowed earth overlying the entire Portico, contains no ceramics. When mixed contexts are considered, the count is increased to three early sherds, one palatial sherd, at least four EOP sherds, four post-palatial sherds, and one sherd of indeterminate date. Among these added sherds, two show signs of burning: a domed kylix base (P-267) from stratum p14/r15/y6 and an everted rim sherd of a small kylix, cup or dipper (P-278) from stratum p15/b14/r16. No joins are present among sherds from context PPL, but associations are apparent between a neck sherd (P-269, from stratum p15/b14), and sherds P-28, P-124, P-190, P-250, P-251, P-257, P-282, and P-372, which may belong to the same LH IIIB-III A1 piriform jar, as discussed above.

No small finds were found in context PPL. When mixed contexts are considered, the count is increased by an unknown quantity of plaster fragments found in context PPL/PR/PY, stratum p14/r15/y6.

**Context PB**

---

291 This is done so as not to skew the numbers of these mixed contexts, as the sherd counts in this particular mixed stratum are so high.
292 Mixed contexts include: PPL/PR, PPL/PR/PY, PPL/PB, and PPL/PB/PR. As explained in the introduction to this section, mixed context PPL/PB*/PR/PBn is not included in these sherd counts.
Plan: Figure 3.34

Context PB, a deposit of black earth located underneath the plowed earth (context PPL) in the central and southeastern parts of the Portico, contained the largest quantity of sherds excavated in this room. As noted above, these sherds come from the mixed stratum p16/b15*/r18/bn2, which consists predominantly of material from black stratum b15. In total, at least 138 sherds come from this mixed context. Of these, at least 122 sherds are datable, four are generally “Myc.,” and at least 16 sherds are of indeterminate date. The datable sherds include at least 11 early sherds (three MH and eight LH I-IIIA), 19 EOP sherds, 15 palatial sherds, and 89 Dark Age sherds. When additional mixed contexts are considered, the sherd counts are increased by as many as three early (LH I-IIIA) sherds, two EOP sherds, one palatial sherd, four DA sherds, and one sherd of indiscriminate date.\(^{293}\)

Among the sherds from stratum p16/b15*/r18/bn2, four clearly exhibit signs of burning (P-290, P-308, P-322, and P-323) and numerous joins and associations are apparent. Joins occur between two fragments (P-326) of the grooved conical base of a DA III deep bowl/krateriskos and an additional base fragment (P-273, from stratum p15/b14); between six rim fragments of a grooved DA III krater (P-340 and P-341); and between two trefoil rim fragments (P-342) and a grooved neck sherd (P-343), which join to the nearly complete DA III oinochoe (P-375) from Court 3. Joins are also present between six fragments of a grooved krater rim (P-340), and between three rim sherds (P-316 and P-373, the latter group from Court 3), and two body sherds (P-318 and P-374, the latter from Court 3), from LH IIIB2 Group B deep bowls.

Associations are present between the krater rim (P-340) and 12 non-joining body sherds (P-341); between the three rim and neck sherds (P-342 and P-343), the oinochoe (P-375), and seven body sherds (P-344); between the Group B deep bowl rim sherds (P-316+P-373) and two

\(^{293}\) Additional mixed contexts include: PPL/PR, PR/PY, PPL/PR/PY, PPL/PB/PR, and PR/PBn.
body sherds (P-321); between the Group B deep bowl/deep-band deep bowl body sherds P-318+P-374 and six other body sherds (P-315, P-317, P-319, P-320, and P-322); between a body sherd (P-294) and the upper stem (P-377, from Court 3) of an LH IIIB monochrome goblet; and between a painted body sherd (P-313) and a nearly complete LH IIIB “late” Palace Style jar with zigzag decoration found in Room 38 (P-378).

No small finds were recovered in context PB.

Context PR

Plan: Figure 3.35

No sherds can be specifically assigned to context PR, the red earth found directly underneath the plowed layer (context PPL) along the NE and SW walls of the Portico. When mixed contexts are considered, the counts are increased to one early sherd (LH I-IIIA), three EOP sherds, and an unknown number of sherds of indeterminate date. Among these added sherds, two show signs of burning: a domed kylix base (P-267, from stratum p14/r15/y6) and an everted rim sherd (P-278, from stratum p15/b14/r16).

No small finds were found in context PR. When mixed contexts are considered, the count is increased by unknown quantities of plaster fragments in context PPL/PR/PY, stratum p14/r15/y6 and in context PPL/PR, stratum p16/r18. Additional plaster fragments as well as a small fragment of bronze were found in context PR/PY, stratum r14/y6.

Context PY

Plan: Figure 3.36

294 Mixed contexts include: PPL/PR, PPL/PR/PY, PR/PY, and PPL/PB/PR. As explained above, mixed context PPL/PB*/PR/PBn is not included in these sherd counts.
No sherds can be specifically assigned to context PY, located underneath the plowed earth in the northwestern part of the Portico. When mixed contexts including context PY are considered, the ceramics counts are increased to two EOP sherds and an unknown quantity of sherds of indeterminate date. Among these added sherds, one shows signs of burning: the domed kylix base (P-267), discussed above.

No small finds can be specifically assigned to context PY. When mixed contexts are considered, the count includes unknown quantities of plaster fragments from context PPL/PR/PY, and the plaster fragments and small piece of bronze from context PR/PY, just mentioned.

Context PBn

Plan: Figure 3.37

Context PBn, located on the floor of the Portico underneath the deep deposit of black earth (context PB), is the only context in the room to which ceramics and small finds can be assigned with confidence. Context PBn contained at least 15 sherds and two nearly complete vessels. Of these, nine sherds and one vessel (roughly half of a crushed amphora) are datable, while at least six sherds and one vessel (a crushed coarse vessel) are of indeterminate date. The datable sherds include six early sherds (all LH I-IIIA), two EOP sherds, and one DA sherd, while the crushed amphora dates to the palatial period. When mixed contexts are considered, the sherd count is increased by an unknown number of sherds of indeterminate date.

Among the sherds from the context PBn, joins are present only between sherds from the partial amphora (P-367) and the crushed coarse vessel (P-368), both of which are also heavily

---

295 Mixed contexts include: PPL/PR/PY and PR/PY.
296 Mixed context: PR/PBn. As explained above, mixed context PPL/PB*/PR/PBn is not included in the sherd counts for context PBn.
burnt. Associations are apparent between the body sherd with scale decoration (P-282, stratum \textbf{bn1}) and sherds P-28, P-124, P-190, P-250, P-251, P-257, P-269, and P-372, which may belong to the same LH IIB-IIIA1 piriform jar, discussed above.

Small finds from context \textbf{PBn} include two obsidian blades, one piece of plaster, and one fragment of a Linear B tablet with no characters, all from stratum \textbf{bn2}.

\textit{Part IV: Context Interpretations, Evaluations of Existing Theories, and New Ideas}

Based on the data presented above, it is possible to interpret and sequence the different stratigraphical contexts excavated in the Pylos megaron and to use the conclusions to evaluate theories about its use. These interpretations and sequences are explained in detail below and summarized in Appendix 2, Tables 17 and 18. Collectively, the 21 new contexts identified in the Pylos megaron can be assigned to 10 discrete phases of activity (construction, damage, destruction, use, etc.). These phases are listed in order in Table 18 and are referenced in the context descriptions below. Four of these phases (numbers 1, 4, 7, and 8) mark periods of deliberate ancient use. The careful and thorough recording techniques used by the excavators allow these conclusions to be made with considerable confidence, despite the noted fact that some artifacts were not fully documented and/or were discarded during the sorting process (e.g., plainware sherds). The extant data is enough to give a reliable picture of the different deposits and to permit accurate inferences to be made regarding their origins.

\textit{Contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR: Collapsed Walls}

Megaron Phases: 6, 7
Based on the character of their contents, contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR from the Pylos Throne Room and Vestibule likely represent the matrix of collapsed walls. This interpretation is supported by the quantities of large stones found in the deposits and by the heavy fragmentation of associated artifacts. With the exception of the basin (P-136) and the vitrified Group A deep bowl (P-235) found on the rooms’ floors, the miniature kylikes (or perhaps kylix, see below) found on the table of offerings (C-9), the stemmed krater (*P-1), and the pithos (including sherd *P-9) found in the fill (all to be discussed further below), no complete, or nearly complete, ceramic vessels are represented.\textsuperscript{297} Joins and associations between sherds are extremely few and often widely dispersed through different strata, contexts, or even rooms, which could be non-adjacent.

Small finds, with rare exceptions including the gold ewer-shaped brooch (M-56); the two chipped stone conuli (S-2 and S-9); the bronze ring (M-23), gold (M-21), bronze (*M-25), and precious stone (S-6, S-7, and S-8) beads from the “throne space treasure;” and the table of offerings (C-9), are also only scraps of material. This is true of finds in shell, ivory, and kyanos, as well as pieces of bone (often described as in “bits”), stone (including fragments of vessels), Linear B tablets, and metal finds. Catalogued fragments of gold, for example, are small or even tiny and do not in any way represent full objects. This is also true of fragments of silver and bronze, which, although slightly larger in size, are clearly not part of mendable objects. For bronze, the situation is aptly summarized by Susanne Hofstra, who observed that while some substantial pieces of bronze vessels were found in the Pylos palace what was preserved had the appearance of “scraps and parts not detached at any obvious point like the join of a body to a

\textsuperscript{297} Notably, the stemmed krater *P-1 is only roughly 1/3 complete. For the pithos, many fragments (including sherd *P-9) are indicated in the field notes, but given that I was unable to locate the pieces in storage it is unclear exactly how much of the vessel is preserved.
handle, [but instead] rather violently broken with no sign of the rest of the object.”

Given their condition, the metal finds from the megaron have the appearance of items that were damaged and/or discarded already at the time of the palace’s destruction, and did not, as Bendall has proposed, come from vessels that were still functioning in the megaron during its palatial use-phase.

The interpretation of the artifacts from contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR as construction material is also supported by the dates of the sherds, by the distribution of both sherds and small finds within the deposits, and by the inclusion of a cracked sherd. Among the datable ceramics, the majority are early. This is clearly the case for MH and LH I-IIIA sherds, and is a distinct (and I think likely) possibility for many of the EOP sherds, which have the potential to date stylistically to LH IIIA rather than LH IIIB-IIIC early. Early dates and the absence of joins among sherds suggests that the latter had been re-purposed as building material and were not parts of vessels that were in use during the megaron’s palatial phase. This conclusion confirms Blegen and Rawson’s theory that early sherds ended up in the megaron’s overburden because they “popped out” of the walls, but expands the picture to show that this was not only the case for a few sherds (as the excavators supposed) but instead for a sizable portion of the ceramic assemblage and accompanying small finds.

Turning to distribution, it is further significant that no concentrated deposits of palatial sherds were found in contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR and that most EOP sherds were found together with early (rather than palatial) material. It is also notable that most of the sherds and small finds found in the megaron were recovered at depths of greater than 0.25 m. above the

---

298 Hofstra 2000, p. 86.
299 Bendall 2004, pp. 122-123.
300 Alternatively, it is possible that some of the small finds found in contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR fell into the Throne Room from an upper storeroom to the northeast (see discussion below).
301 PN I, p. 91.
rooms’ floors. In these positions, these artifacts cannot possibly have belonged to objects in use in the megaron at the time of its destruction. The same is almost certainly true of the majority of the sherds and small finds found fewer than 0.20-0.25 m. above the rooms’ floors. The sherds found in this position are non-mending and include only one example of a possibly palatial fragment (P-163, tentatively identified as part of the rim of an LH IIIB Group A deep bowl), which may represent a vessel broken during the fire and/or destruction of the suite. Small finds found on or just above the room’s floors include: seven fragments of gold (M-15, *M-32, *M-33, and *M-34), one piece of silver (*M-47), nine fragments of bronze (M-48, *M-49, M-50), several pieces of quartz, a stone conulus (S-9), nine bits of bone, six fragments of kyanos (K-2), and two pieces of ivory (*I-1). In all cases, these finds are simply too fragmentary to represent the remains of complete objects that were broken and/or damaged during the suite’s destruction and as such are more likely to have been incorporated into its architecture.302

Finally, a cracked sherd found in context ThR1 arguably represents a vessel that was never used in the palace. This vessel is conical cup P-167, which features a deep Y-shaped crack (see Plate 56e) in its thick base likely indicative of differential clay shrinkage during firing.303 While vessels of poor craftsmanship are known to have been used in the palace (most notably the hundreds of asymmetrical and/or warped plain wares stored in Rooms 18-22, which Hruby has demonstrated were thrown rapidly304), a vessel like P-167 with a flaw that rendered it difficult or impossible to use was likely discarded and re-purposed as construction material.

The Role of Pier-Wall Construction

---

302 Alternatively, some of these finds as well as some sherds from these floor contexts could have belonged to objects and vessels fallen into the space from upper floors during the palace’s collapse (see discussion below).
303 Rice 1987, pp. 67-68. Additional evidence that this vessel was never used includes the drips of slip along its interior wall (see Plate 56e) that presumably would have worn away during use.
Further support for the interpretation of contexts **ThR1, ThR2, and VR** as collapsed wall matrix comes from Michael Nelson’s recent re-interpretation of the construction technique used for the erection of the megaron’s walls. In *PN I*, Blegen and Rawson proposed that the suite’s walls were constructed using the system of *xylodesia* (a modern Greek term), in which a three-dimensional wooden framework was erected and filled with stone and/or mudbrick.\(^{305}\) This interpretation was based on the presence of chases running through the walls in the suite (and in many other rooms of the LH IIIB palace) (Figure 3.38) into which the excavators supposed a wooden framework had been set. During his close examination of these chases, however, Nelson discovered that they were nearly all filled with hard-packed small stones and mud.\(^{306}\) This filler, he deduced, was not debris which had flowed into the chases during the palace’s destruction (as the excavators believed), but part of the original construction of the wall and thus indicative of the use of a *temporary*, moveable wooden framework to shape a mixture of stones, rubble, mud, and calcium carbonate into free-standing piers (Figure 3.39).\(^{307}\)

In contexts **ThR1, ThR2, and VR**, evidence for this building style, which Nelson termed “pier-wall” construction, includes the deposits’ “extraordinarily” hard consistency (frequently noted by the excavators) likely caused by the calcium carbonate added to the piers to make them load-bearing.\(^{308}\) The only exception to this rule is context **ThR2**, located in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room, where the earth was noticeably “looser.”\(^{309}\) That this context also represented collapsed wall matrix is confirmed, I would argue, by the so-called “rectangle of plaster” excavated in stratum r7 [-0.60 m. to -0.80 m.]. This unusual deposit, which Mylonas described in

---

\(^{305}\) *PN I*, pp. 37-38.
\(^{307}\) Nelson 2001, pp. 155-169. Those chases which preserved bits of burnt wood and/or no small stones and mud, Nelson contended, were places where the formwork became stuck to the piers (as sometimes happens in modern cement construction) and could not be removed (*ibid.*, p. 166). For a published reference to the extreme hardness of the red earth, see *PN I*, p. 89.
\(^{309}\) GEM 1952, p. 54; *PN I*, p. 88.
the field as comprising “fused material” including “little stones and crumbled plaster,” I contend is an un-dissolved remnant of one of the room’s pier-walls following Nelson’s interpretation of such agglomerations, “which came down in large, solid masses.”

If my identification is correct, the artifacts (including a number of EOP sherds, 1 scrap of gold (see Figure A1.20), and three scraps of bronze) found in the “rectangle” can be seen as clear examples of early material incorporated into the matrix of the Throne Room’s NE wall, while the looseness of the surrounding soil can be interpreted as the result of a later disturbance to the deposit (discussed below) rather than as an indication of its different origin.

How such artifacts came to be incorporated into the megaron’s pier-walls is related to how the walls were built. In pier-wall construction, sherds could have easily been added to the rubble that composed the piers. Nelson makes reference to the use at Phaistos of a similar construction technique that the excavators termed “calcestruzzo,” which incorporated “stones, clay, lime, and pottery fragments.” Furthermore, because of the pier technique, the Pylian walls also could have included large sherds without compromising their structural integrity – a common problem with mudbricks. This helps to explain the presence of sizeable sherds including P-85 (from the bovid, measuring ca. 0.10 m. x 0.06 m.) in context ThR1/ThR2 and possibly the pieces of the enormous pithos that Mylonas found scattered throughout the Throne Room in strata r1 (*P-9 [-0.40 m. to the floor at -1.07 m.]), b5 [-0.20 m. to -0.40 m.], y4/y5 [-0.70 m. to floor], r6/r7 [-0.30 m. to -0.60 m.], r8 [-0.30 m. to -0.70 m.], and r11 [-0.90 m. to the floor], and r13 [the southwest half of the SW Quadrant, on the floor]. Because many pieces of
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310 GEM 1952, pp. 54, 57, 60, 62-63; Nelson 2001, p. 159. In the field, such hard masses of material were described as “migma.”

311 Nelson 2001, p. 157, n. 446 with references to discussions of this material by Joseph Shaw (1973, pp. 222-224) and Graham (1987, pp. 147-148). In his revised discussion of calcestruzzo published in 2009, Shaw notes the presence of similarly hard deposits at other Cretan sites and further indicates that it could sometimes include not just pot sherds but whole vessels (pp. 155-156).
this pithos were recovered, Mylonas (and later Blegen and Rawson) inferred that it had fallen into the room from an upper story during the palace’s destruction.\(^{312}\) The fragments’ broad horizontal and vertical distribution in the fill (ranging from on the floor to a height of +0.70 m. in the fill), however, suggests that the pithos was broken prior to the room’s collapse and that it may have been incorporated into the wall matrix.\(^{313}\)

Based on the small numbers of sherds and small finds found in Pylos megaron contexts ThR1, ThR2 and VR it is likely that these objects were added to the wall mixtures in an \textit{ad hoc} manner rather than as a deliberate “temper.” Given the long history of settlement at Epano Englianos, debris from earlier destructions (e.g., that by fire the end of LH IIIA, theorized by Blegen and Rawson and subsequently by Nelson\(^{314}\)) would have been abundant in the area of the palace, and could have been incorporated into the LH IIIB pier-wall framework as a quick and easy filler. Such destruction debris may have even been “stored” in heaps on or near plateau, following the model of outmoded wall paintings, which were striped from the palace and deposited in dumps around its perimeter.\(^{315}\)

\textit{Eliminating the Throne Room Balcony}

While my interpretation of the sherds and small finds from the Pylos megaron contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR as wall matrix is compatible with Blegen and Rawson’s theory about the origin of “early” sherds from the suite, it directly conflicts with their theory that many finds from

\(^{312}\) GEM 1952, p. 73; \textit{PN} I, p. 89. More specifically, Blegen and Rawson assigned this pithos to the balcony directly above the Throne Room - a feature which will be discussed in greater detail shortly.

\(^{313}\) This solution is perhaps corroborated by the thick “plaster coating” that Mylonas noticed on both the interior and exterior surfaces of some of the pithos fragments (GEM 1952, pp. 73, 77) that may have been accretions of the calcium carbonate (i.e., lime) added to the pier mixtures. That these fragments truly belong to pithoi and not to chimney pipes is indicated by Mylonas’ field descriptions, which include references to a base and a broad rim.

\(^{314}\) \textit{PN} I, pp. 34, 423; Nelson 2001, p. 207. \textit{Cf.} Shelmerdine, who has expressed doubt about a fire at the end of this period (1987, p. 558, n. 8).

\(^{315}\) \textit{PN} II, pp. 217-220.
the Throne Room fell from an upper story wooden balcony. This idea, as discussed above, was based on the concentration of artifacts around the room’s perimeter.\textsuperscript{316} When finds with known spatial coordinates are plotted onto a plan of the Throne Room (Figure 3.40), it is clear that this distribution is essentially correct. Nevertheless, the existence of a balcony is highly doubtful.

First, as argued by Melena and Skelton, the Linear B tablets could not possibly have fallen from such a balcony given their physical and paleographic character, which indicates that they were old records \textit{not} in use in the LH IIIB-IIIC early palace.\textsuperscript{317} Second, there is no physical evidence for a balcony. As observed recently by Shannon LaFayette in her doctoral thesis, there is a dearth of both carbonized wood and floor plaster in the debris overlying the Throne Room.\textsuperscript{318} Based on this evidence, as well as the potential dangers incurred by placing a wooden balcony in close proximity to an open hearth, LaFayette proposed that the room was single-storied – a “lofty hall,” which rose uninterrupted to the roof at a height of roughly 7.00 m. (Figure 3.41).\textsuperscript{319} This compelling argument, along with the evidence of the Linear B tablets, necessitates an alternative explanation for the finds’ distribution. Presuming that the pattern is not purely accidental (which it very well might be), one possible explanation derives from the sequence in which the structural elements of the Throne Room may have collapsed. As observed by Julie Hruby in her protracted study of the demise of early modern houses in Messenia, it is generally the case that the roofs of mud and stone structures collapse before their supporting walls.\textsuperscript{320} In the Throne Room of the Palace of Nestor, such early roof collapse is indicated by the fallen chimney pipes, some fragments of which were found quite deep in the fill (ca. \textminus 0.90 m.), immediately on top of the hearth in context ThB4. The discovery of additional chimney fragments higher in the fill (at a

\textsuperscript{316} PN I, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{318} LaFayette 2011, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{319} LaFayette 2011, pp. 14-19.
\textsuperscript{320} Hruby 2006, pp. 26-28, fig. 2.2.
depth of ca. -0.40 m.), however, suggests that the chimney fell together with a good deal of ceiling/roof debris and perhaps the remains of a built enclosure composed, as LaFayette has suggested, of a “timber frame built into the roof beams” and packed with mudbrick (see context ThB2 below).\(^{321}\) This fallen debris, as indicated in a field drawing (see Figure A1.8), formed a small mound in the area over the hearth. The curvature of this mound, I suggest, may have impeded the fall of collapsing bits of wall, causing them to “roll” down the mound’s slopes and accumulate around its perimeter in a ring-like pattern.

**Second-Story Collapse?**

While it is clear that the sherds and small finds found in the Throne Room did not fall from a balcony, it remains possible that some of these objects fell from an adjacent second story room. Notably, the types of small finds found in the Throne Room (e.g., fragments of cut stone, metal, kyanos, ivory, and quartz) are similar to those collected in nearby Room 31.\(^{322}\) These latter finds, Blegen and Rawson argued, fell into Room 31 from an upper story.\(^{323}\) More recently, Hofstra has further proposed that this upper floor room may have been part of a single “substantial storeroom” for high quality objects (many inlaid with ivory) covering Rooms 28-33 (Figure 3.42).\(^{324}\) If such a room did exist, it would be a promising candidate for the origin of some (or perhaps even many or all) of the small finds and the palatial sherds from contexts ThR1, ThR2, and VR, and perhaps also the fragments of the large pithos (including sherd *P-9) found scattered throughout the Throne Room. An upper floor would also be a plausible origin for the partially-preserved LH IIIB2 stemmed krater *P-1. This vessel, which lacks a clear find

---

\(^{321}\) LaFayette 2011, p. 14, n. 46. See also discussion of the use of mud to affix modern chimneys on Crete by Margaret Mook (2000, p. 99).

\(^{322}\) PN I, pp. 154-155.

\(^{323}\) PN I, p. 154.

context, I would suggest is more likely to have originated from outside rather than inside the megaron based on the fact that its fragments are unburnt.

Corroboration for this reconstruction comes from the probable inward (i.e., southwestward) collapse of the Throne Room’s NE wall, which separated this room from the proposed storeroom. That this wall fell inward was originally proposed in PN II by Lang, who cited as evidence the find spots of the fragments of the Lion and Griffin wall painting.\textsuperscript{325} Further support comes the plaster floors of Hofstra’s proposed storeroom, some of which LaFayette has argued may have deteriorated slowly.\textsuperscript{326} The floor above Room 31, for example, LaFayette concluded first developed a crack in its southwestern side through which “burnt material and ivories from the upper floor gradually slid off” and accumulated on the floor below.\textsuperscript{327} This debris was later covered over by the remainder of the upper floor and the room’s surrounding walls, which “caved in on the sides.”\textsuperscript{328} If other sections of upper floor in this area also collapsed gradually, without cracking, some of their accumulated debris could have spilled into the Throne Room when its NE wall fell inward. In this reconstruction, the Throne Room’s small finds, which were clearly not parts of complete curated objects, could represent valuable scraps cached in the upper story storeroom prior to being reused and/or recycled.\textsuperscript{329}

\textit{Evidence for Objects In Use In Contexts ThR1 and VR}

Megaron Phases: 1, 2

\textsuperscript{325} PN II, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{326} LaFayette 2011, p. 170.
\textsuperscript{327} LaFayette 2011, p. 170.
\textsuperscript{328} LaFayette 2001, pp. 170-171.
\textsuperscript{329} The one problem with this scenario is that bronze finds, which make up a large percentage of those objects recovered from the Throne Room, are reported by Hofstra as being rare in the area of Rooms 28-33.
While the majority of objects found in contexts ThRI and VR were clearly not in use in the Throne Room or Vestibule during the palatial period, a small handful were as indicated by their find spots and/or exceptional condition. These objects include: wall-paintings found alongside the NE wall of the Throne Room, and the vitrified Group A deep bowl (P-235), the basin (P-136), and the table of offerings (C-9) found on the floors in this room and in the Vestibule.

In the Throne Room, the discovery of many joining fragments of wall paintings alongside its NE wall strongly suggests that the murals were (as Lang purported) in place on the wall at the time of the room’s collapse. The iconography of these paintings will be discussed in Chapter 5, but it is useful here to reiterate that their find spots in the fill strongly suggest that the NE wall of the Throne Room fell inward.

_The Vestibule Deep Bowl and the Throne Room Basin_

Megaron Phases: 1, 2

Concerning the portable objects, their condition (largely complete, but burnt) and find spots on the floors of the Throne Room and Vestibule confirm that they must have been used and deposited before the megaron was consumed by fire. The complete Mycenaean Group A deep bowl with spiral decoration (P-235; see Plates 75, 76), incorrectly published by Blegen and Rawson as a “three-handled bowl,” was found melted and fused to the floor in the north corner of the Vestibule in context VR (see Figure 3.40). The vitrified condition of the bowl indicates

---

330 _PN_ II, p. 195.
331 It is also possible, however, that the painted plaster slid from the wall during a period of abandonment prior to the walls’ collapse. Falling plaster is mentioned by Hruby as one of the first collapse events in abandoned mud and stone buildings (2006, p. 26).
332 GEM 1952, p. 120. In the field notes, the exact position of this bowl in the north corner of the Vestibule is not measured or drawn. As such, its position in Figure 3.40 is approximated.
that it must have been deposited in the Vestibule *before* the palace was damaged by fire, i.e., during its primary use life in LH IIIB-IIIC early. As discussed above, the deep bowl is a relatively rare shape at Pylos. Its use, as widely supposed, was for drinking (like the kylix, which the shape eventually replaced) and such pots are often found in combination with kraters.\(^{333}\) As a transitional space, however, the Vestibule is not likely to have been used for drinking. This suggests either that this particular deep bowl served a different purpose or that it was set down in this room in an *ad hoc* manner, perhaps during the course of its transport elsewhere.

The basin (P-136; see Plate 51) was found in pieces on the floor in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room in context *ThR1* (see Figure 3.40).\(^{334}\) Unlike the deep bowl, this vessel was only lightly burnt rather than vitrified to the point of melting. This burning is clearest on the vessel’s rim where scorch marks are present on only one side of large break (see Plate 51a). The lack of burning across this break clearly indicates that the basin was broken *before* the fire occurred. This sequence is corroborated by the absence of burning on other sherds suggesting that these were somehow shielded from the flames. Like the deep bowl, the basin is also a relatively rare shape at the palace, being one of only eighteen published vessels of this type.\(^{335}\) Its use, as suggested by Hruby, was for serving food, as indicated by the discovery of fourteen examples (the largest concentration of basins at the palace) in Pantry Room 18 together with other serving vessels.\(^{336}\)

Because basin P-136 was found isolated on the floor of the Throne Room, however, there is no evidence to corroborate its use as a dining vessel. Instead it might be tentatively compared to other open vessels found on floors in palatial contexts, including the LM

---

\(^{333}\) Recently, Wright 2004, p. 145. See also Borgna 2004, p. 128 for use of the deep bowl as part of drinking sets at LM IIIC Phaistos.

\(^{334}\) As noted in the catalogue, the exact position of this basin in the Throne Room’s SE Quadrant was not recorded by the excavators. As such, its position in Figure 3.40 is approximated.

\(^{335}\) *PN* I, p. 355.

\(^{336}\) Hruby 2006, p. 37. Associated serving vessels included bowls, dippers, and jugs.
III A limestone basin from Knossos (Figure 3.43) found in the “Corridor of the Stone Basin” and restored by Evans to the Antechamber of the Throne Room. This large stone basin has been interpreted by Peter Warren as possibly used for “ritual lustrations” – an reading that could, very hypothetically, also be applied to the smaller ceramic version at Pylos.

The Throne Room Table of Offerings

Megaron Phases: 1, 4

The third functioning object from the palatial period megaron is the table of offerings, C-9 (see Plates 7, 8). Made from a clay core with a plaster coating, this tripod table was found on the floor of the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room, immediately east of its west column (see Figure A1.4) and at the interface of contexts ThR1 and ThY2. Blegen and Rawson (and subsequently many scholars have) argued that this table was an in situ remnant of ritual activity, as indicated by two miniature kylikes found on its surface. A closer inspection of the field records, however, suggests that while the table itself was in situ, the kylikes, or perhaps more accurately, kylix, may have been a later addition.

That the table was in situ is clear from its exterior surfaces, particularly its underside, which is heavily burnt (see Plate 8d). This charring is undoubtedly the product of the same fire that heavily damaged the floor plaster in the Throne Room (Figure 3.44), including that immediately underneath the table (Figure 3.45). The dark marks on the floor resulted from plumes of smoke and/or contact with burning organic materials such as wood (from furniture or the ceiling) or cloth (from coverings or hangings). Charring may have also resulted from the

337 PM III, pp. 25-26, fig. 13.
339 PN I, pp. 89, 91, figs. 271, no. 11 and 272, no. 5. For reiterations see for example Hägg 1981, p. 183 and more recently Wright 1994, p. 57 (making reference not just to two but to “several” miniature kylikes).
floor’s contact with burning substances. Hruby, for example, has suggested that the destructive fire that damaged the final palace at Pylos was fueled by the olive oil stored abundantly on-site.\footnote{Hruby 2006, p. 32.} That oil may have been deliberately poured onto surfaces in order to accelerate the fire, she argues, is suggested by the lids of the oil pithoi in Magazines 23 and 24, some of which had been removed.\footnote{Hruby 2006, p. 32 and fig. 2.8.} As an accelerant, olive oil would have allowed the palace fire to reach the extreme temperatures (over 1100° C) needed to vitrify pottery (e.g., the deep bowl in the Vestibule).\footnote{Hruby 2006, p. 31, citing Galaty 1999 and Hofstra 2000, p. 14.} As the Throne Room is relatively inaccessible from the oil magazines, transporting the flammable substance between these two spaces would have required considerable effort. It is also possible, however, that such transport occurred with some regularity, as indicated by the use of oil in the Throne Room’s libation channel, discussed in Chapter 4.

**Miniature Kylikes or Kylix?**

While it is clear that the plastered table was positioned in the Throne Room before the fire, the same cannot be said for the miniature kylikes (P-72 and P-73; see Plate 33) reportedly found on its surface. This uncertainty is connected in part to my preceding suggestion that there may have only been one miniature kylix associated with this table, rather than the published two. In five separate places in the excavation records only a single kylix is mentioned. First, in his initial account of the discovery of the table on June 9, 1952, Mylonas wrote: “On the edge of it [i.e., the table] was found Vase of Room of Hearth #2.”\footnote{GEM 1952, pp. 45, 68. Intriguingly, Säflund also referred to only one miniature kylix in his subsequent study of the Pylos megaron (1980, p. 241). His citation, however, suggests that this comment was a mistake rather than a challenge to Blegen and Rawson’s published account (*ibid.*, n. 26, citing PN I, p. 91).} The term “Vase of Room of Hearth #2” (also “Vase #2,” for short) was chosen because this vase (i.e., the miniature kylix) was the
second complete vessel found by Mylonas in the Throne Room, the first being the small stirrup jar (P-15) termed “Zb 1 vase” that he excavated in the upper layer of black earth above the hearth.344

A single kylix is also indicated in Mylonas’ plan of the floor level of the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room drawn on June 10 (see Figure A1.18), in the widely-reproduced black and white field photograph (Figure 3.46), and in the similar color slide shown above (see Figure 3.45). At the end of the 1952 excavation season, Vanderpool, who was present when the table was removed (Figure 3.47) and packed for transport to the Chora Museum, also noted the presence of only one vessel. He described the event as follows: “Remove table of offerings by NW column, and pack fragments in wooden crate to be taken to museum. Vase fragments including small votive kylix placed in same crate.”345 Finally, a typed summary of the excavations in the Throne Room (likely compiled by Blegen and Rawson in the mid-1960s) refers again to only one vessel: “Across [the table of offerings] diagonally apparently another pocket in which was Vase #2, a votive cup (P.52.F19.26).”346

The first reference to two miniature kylikes in association with the Throne Room table of offerings occurs in Rawson’s 1953 pottery notebook. Here, she refers to two kylikes (B.52.332 (= P-73) and B.52.333 (= P-72)), calling both of them “Vase #2.”347 Although it is possible that Rawson, during the course of her analysis, discovered that the fragments of Mylonas’ “Vase #2” in fact represented two miniature kylikes, it is unlikely. As seen today, both kylikes are nearly complete and were repaired from large pieces, making it doubtful that anyone (much less an

344 GEM 1952, p. 25
345 GEM 1952, p. 139.
346 Throne Room excavation summary, Cincinnati Pylos Archives, p. 9. I am grateful to the UC Department of Classics Archivist, Jeff Kramer, for alerting me to the existence of this and other excavation summaries from the megaron.
archaeologist with a trained eye) would have misinterpreted them as belonging to one vessel.\footnote{348} It is more likely, I would argue, that Rawson, who was not present during the 1952 excavations, took Mylonas’ field notation, “Vase #2,” to mean that there were two vessels associated with the table and consequently added a second miniature kylix (perhaps included among the “fragments” added to the table’s transport crate by Vanderpool?), to the one actually found on the table. Such a mix-up may also be responsible for the uncertainty concerning the number of miniature kylikes in a late version of the PN I manuscript, in which the written count of “one” kylix was crossed out and changed to “two.”\footnote{349}

If we accept the possibility that there was only one miniature kylix was found on the Throne Room table of offerings, the excavation photograph (see Figures 3.45 and 3.46) indicates clearly that this was kylix P-72, which features a diagonal break across its stem and is missing one handle (both visible traits of the kylix in the photographs). Significantly, these physical characteristics are striking. Compared to other examples of miniature kylikes from the megaron (and other vessels from the suite in general) P-72 is only moderately damaged. Two-thirds of its bowl, one handle, and the upper part of its stem are intact, and the lower part of its stem and foot (entirely preserved) are separated by a clean break. While good preservation is common for small, compact vessels (e.g., conical cups) found during excavations, in the case of miniature kylix P-72 it is unusual given that the physical surface on which it was found was badly damaged. As illustrated in Figure 3.48 (also see Figures 3.45 and 3.46), the table of offerings was found cracked and crushed, and the depression in which the kylix was uncovered (called a “pocket” by the excavators) was quite deep (Figure 3.49). If the plastered clay table was damaged with enough force to cause a depression of such depth to form on its surface, it follows

\footnote{348} These two miniature kylikes are also disparate in color and size, as will be discussed below. \footnote{349} ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive, Box 1, p. 63.
that a kylix located in the depression at the time would have been pulverized, or if placed nearby, would likely have been knocked away. As \textbf{P-72} is relatively intact, therefore, I would suggest that it was placed into the depression \textit{after}, rather than before, the table was damaged.

Further support for this hypothesis comes from the condition of miniature kylix \textbf{P-72}, which is only lightly burnt, and from its form and fabric, which differentiate it from other miniature kylikes recovered in the megaron debris (e.g., \textbf{P-42}, \textbf{P-73}, \textbf{P-117}, and \textbf{P-299}). Miniature kylix \textbf{P-72} is taller than these other examples (Figure 3.50), has more upright high-swung handles, and is formed from an unusual light yellowish-brown (Munsell 7.5YR 5/4) clay. These physical characteristics are more congruent those of miniature kylikes found elsewhere in the palace (e.g., an example from Archive Room 7, Figure 3.51)\footnote{\textit{PN I}, p. 95, fig. 359, no. 1161. In height and shape, miniature kylix \textbf{P-72} is also similar to miniature kylikes from Room 60 (\textit{PN I}, p. 241, fig. 359, no. 641, but these latter examples are more red than yellowish-brown in color.} and suggest that \textbf{P-72} did not originate in the Throne Room but was instead conveyed there, perhaps in its damaged form (i.e., with a missing handle), by later visitors.\footnote{That the handle was damaged at the time the kylix was deposited is indicated by its absence from the collected Throne Room material. While it is possible that it was discarded during sorting, this is unlikely since far smaller pieces of similar miniatures (e.g., \textbf{P-299}) were saved.}

\textit{Rethinking the Function of the Table of Offering}

The hypothesis presented here that there may have been only one kylix on the Pylos table of offerings, and that it was deposited \textit{after} the megaron was damaged by fire, necessitates a re-evaluation of both the table’s function and the megaron’s use life. Looking first at function, as discussed above, the interpretation of the Throne Room table of offerings from Pylos has always been intimately tied to the kylikes reportedly found on its surface. This link is evident in \textit{PN I}, as well as in the subsequent work many scholars including Hägg, Wright, and Muhly, who traces
the origin of such tables to Crete. As Muhly notes, the idea that plastered tripod tables were used for offerings (and hence the birth of the term “offering table”) derives from the discovery of plastered tripod tables in Cretan cult rooms (including those found in the “Shrine Building” at Gournia as well as the “Shrine of the Double Axes” and the House of the Sacrificed Oxen at Knossos) and tombs (e.g., at Pachyammos and Tomb B at Katsambas, and at Knossos at Zapher Papoura (see Figure 3.2) and the Isopata Royal Tomb). In the Cyclades, tall, elaborately painted versions of these tables were found in similar contexts, including the well-known LC I example painted with dolphins swimming in a marinescape found in Room 5 of the West House at Akrotiri (Figure 3.52). On the Greek mainland, tables in ritual contexts have also been identified at Mycenae and include undecorated versions found in the Cult Center “Temple.”

Based on the evidence presented above, there are two feasible options for the palatial (i.e., pre-fire) use of the Pylos table of offerings. On the one hand, the table may have, as its name suggests, received offerings made in small ceramic vessels. This theory assumes that the visitor(s) to the megaron who deposited the kylix post-fire was (were) replicating familiar behaviors from the previous, palatial phase. Such an assumption is not unwarranted given that plaster table fragments were plentiful at Pylos, perhaps suggesting that such tables were used in contexts outside of the megaron. In PN II, Lang published fragmentary eight tables of offerings and my own cursory examination of fragments stored in the Chora Museum adds roughly 65 additional unique examples distributed throughout the palace and in adjacent dump contexts (see more on the use of tripod tables with flame pattern in Chapter 4). Given such a wide

---

353 Muhly 1982, pp. 276-277, with references.
355 PN II, pp. 186-189.
distribution, it is likely that plaster tables were utilized both in and outside of the Pylos Throne Room.

Alternatively, the placement of a miniature kylix on the broken table by a later visitor may represent a “revised” practice. In this case, in order to understand its original function of the table we must consider its other features. While no other objects were found nearby, table’s surface preserves possible traces of what was placed on it. As shown in Plate 7f, close to the center of the table’s floor is a small area (ca. 0.05 m²) of intense burning containing oval voids. At present, residue analysis of the burnt area is pending. Based on its exceptionally dark color, however, it might be suggested that it represents organic remains. Such a material could have been burnt either when the room was ravaged by fire, or previously, when the table was in its palatial use phase. If the latter case is true, it would lend support to Lang’s theory that the plaster table served as a portable hearth.356 Because the area of burnt residue is so small, however, it is unlikely that whatever caused it provided a significant source of heat. Instead, I would argue that the residue is more congruent with a localized in situ burnt offering, perhaps of a small quantity of food (to account for the residue’s mottled appearance) rather than a poured liquid.357

*The “Ruined” Megaron and a Post-Fire Act of Piety*

Megaron Phase: 4

While it is currently impossible to determine, with confidence, the original use of the Pylos table of offerings, if a miniature kylix was indeed placed on its surface after the table was damaged by fire this indicates that the megaron was accessible for a period of time between the conflagration and the collapse of its surrounding architecture. This observation adds a new phase

356 *PN* II, p. 187.
357 The burnt offering in this case differs from Gill’s *trapezomata* interpretation (1974, p. 135) as it supposes that the burning happened on the table rather than beforehand.
to our current picture of the Pylos megaron’s use life, one that falls within the broader context of what I term the “ruined” palace. As argued by Blegen and Rawson, the Palace of Nestor was burnt and destroyed in a single event in late LH IIIB/IIIC early and was not revisited until the seventh century B.C. Recently, however, these conclusions have been refuted by a number of scholars, most notably Hruby and LaFayette, who, in opposition to Blegen and Rawson’s first suggestion, have identified concrete evidence for activity in the palace’s Main Building very soon after it was damaged by fire.

In the eastern part of the palace, LaFayette has identified evidence for the reuse of fire-damaged (but not destroyed) Rooms 21, 22, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 based on the construction of new mudbrick walls and floors. In the west, Hruby has observed localized traces of activity in the form of a small “shrine” constructed at the southeastern end of Room 18. As described by Hruby, the Room 18 shrine consisted of a broken table of offerings around and on which were placed the bowls of broken dippers, presumably used to hold token offerings (Figure 3.53). That this shrine was constructed after the palace had been damaged by fire but before its walls collapsed is indicated, Hruby contends, by a layer of fine yellow earth found underneath the broken table (Figure 3.54). This yellow layer, she hypothesizes, was produced not by collapsing walls but by the accumulation of windblown soils and sediments eroded from the area surrounding the damaged palace and deposited in Room 18 during an initial period of abandonment immediately post-fire. Featuring broken ceramics placed on the surface of a damaged table of offerings, this makeshift shrine serves as a compelling parallel for the

358 PN I, pp. 422-424.
359 Hruby 2006; LaFayette 2011.
361 Hruby 2006, pp. 20, 233-234. For the original publication of the table, see PN I, pp. 120-121.
362 Hruby 2006, pp. 24-25, 36-43, 233. This interpretation was modified by LaFayette, who suggested that the yellow layer in Room 18, being of uniform thickness and containing bits of plaster and pottery, was a man-made post-fire floor rather than the casual agglomeration of windblown particulates (LaFayette 2011, pp. 103-104).
arrangement in the Throne Room, and suggests that the latter, like the former, represents the residue of a small-scale “act of piety” in the ruined palace.

*Contexts ThR3 and ThR4: Intentional Filling and Sub-Floor Leveling*

Megaron Phases: 4, 0, 1

In the same period as this “act of piety,” an “act of reverence” in the ruined megaron at Pylos is suggested by Throne Room context ThR3, a deposit of red earth in the upper part of the throne space that contained the two groups of small finds published as the throne space “treasure.” In *PN* I, Blegen and Rawson described this treasure as “two groups of ornamental jewelry.”\(^{363}\) Described in detail in Appendix 1 of this dissertation, “Group A” consisted of a fragment of an agate pendant, a piece of blue paste (*kyanos*), and a melted gold bead. “Group B” included a silver or bronze ring with a lead bezel, a twisted loop of silver (perhaps belonging to a bracelet), a twisted loop of gold, a large carnelian bead, an amygdaloid bead of banded agate, an amygdaloid bronze bead, a fragment of bone, a small spherical amethyst bead, and half of a clay whorl (see Plates 3a-d, 6a-d).

As discussed above, the excavators were uncertain how to interpret these finds, lamenting, “how and when and why these objects came to be placed [in the throne space] must remain a minor mystery.”\(^{364}\) Since the publication of *PN* I, two theories have been proposed: one by Säflund, who posited that these finds represented “…some scanty remains of what was possibly some cult adornment, perhaps preserved and deposited for the sake of their sanctity.”

---

\(^{363}\) *PN* I, pp. 88, 91-92, p. 273.

\(^{364}\) *PN* I, p. 88.
and a second by Rehak, who suggested that the objects represented the remains of a foundation deposit.\textsuperscript{365}

While both of these interpretations are compelling, it is the latter that initially appears the most plausible. Given Blegen and Rawson’s description of the find spot of the treasure as the “red burned earth [that extended] down to virgin soil at a depth of -0.40 m.” in the throne space\textsuperscript{366}, it is tempting to identify these objects as a dedication placed under the throne at the time it was installed in order to incur divine favor and protection. This explanation, however, is difficult to reconcile with the surrounding stratigraphy. As visible in two unpublished excavation photographs (Figures 3.55 and 3.56) the treasure was located above the bottom of the plaster bedding inside the throne space. The larger collection of artifacts, “Group B” was located to the northeast, in a “nook” along the broken edge of the bedding, while the smaller “Group A” was found close to the center of the red earth at a slightly higher elevation.\textsuperscript{367} In these positions, both artifact groups are simply too high to have served as a foundation deposit, which should have been sealed beneath the bedding.

Furthermore, the shape and condition of the throne space’s plaster bedding (as revealed during the 2012 cleaning project described in Appendix 1) suggest that it was damaged in antiquity. As shown in Figure A1.22, the bedding, which measures ca. 0.09 m. thick, is confined to the extreme northeastern and southwestern portions of the throne space and its interior edges are rough and irregular. For these reasons, the cut does not resemble a regular mortise made to accommodate a tenon or other means of stabilization for a superstructure (likely a stone plinth, see Chapter 4). Instead, the wide, jagged cut appears to be the product of an act of destruction.

\textsuperscript{366} PN I, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{367} A field sketch marking the positions of the two groups (A and B) of the throne space treasure appears in GEM 1952, p. 85.
whereby the central area of what was once a solid layer of plaster was forcibly excised, perhaps by individuals who, having removed the superstructure, were tempted to explore the underlying bedding in search of buried riches (e.g., a true foundation deposit).\footnote{368}

That this damage happened \textit{prior} to the destructive fire in the Throne Room is indicated by the presence of burning on the bedding’s interior edges (Figure 3.57) and by the color variation visible on the walls of the sondage cut by Blegen into the center of the throne space in the area of the earthen “belt.”\footnote{369} As observed during the 2012 cleaning, the walls of the sondage changed in color from red to yellow at a depth of ca. -0.20 m. below the surface of the plaster (Figure 3.58). This change in coloration is significant. On the one hand, it could suggest the presence of two different types of earth deposited in superimposed layers: the red measuring ca. 0.10 m. thick and the yellow ca. 0.20 m. As observed by Michael Galaty, both of these clay colors are represented in Messenia and locally at Pylos – the first (red) being representative of illitic clay and the second (yellow) of kaolinite clay.\footnote{370}

The interface between the two colors in the sondage, however, is not sharp. This suggests that both colors belong \textit{to the same deposit} of kaolinite earth, the upper part of which was thermally altered by fire. Chemically, when the yellow goethite (an iron hydroxide) present in kaolinite clays comes into contact with high heat it undergoes a transformation into red hematite (an iron oxide).\footnote{371} At Pylos, evidence of this color transformation is visible in many of the deposits of collapsed pier-walls and/or mudbrick (noted as being “red”) found throughout the palace, as well as in wall paintings, in which yellow paint (produced from yellow ochre, which

\footnotesize{
\begin{itemize}
\item[368] Alternatively, it is possible that these “exploratory” cuts were not made into a solid block of plaster bedding but around and out from a mortise whose original edges are now obliterated.
\item[369] \textit{PN} I, p. 88; \textit{GEM} 1952, pp. 84, 87.
\item[370] Galaty 2007.
\item[371] Gonzalez et al. 2000; Gialanella et al. 2010. The temperature for this transformation is typically between 250\textdegree and 300\textdegree C.
\end{itemize}
}
contains goethite) turned red after being exposed to fire.\textsuperscript{372} If the red color of the earth in the leveling layer beneath the throne space is the result of heat-induced transformation, this could only have occurred if the upper surface of the layer was \textit{exposed} when the room was damaged by fire. If the plaster bedding (a good insulator) had been \textit{intact}, the heat of the fire would not have been able to reach and chemically transform underlying clay.\textsuperscript{373}

In addition, the 2012 cleaning of the sondage revealed that nearly all of the earth it originally contained was part of a leveling layer that underlay the entire Throne Room. Reaching a depth of -0.40 m., this earth (context \textbf{ThR4}) began just below the plaster bedding and extended, uninterrupted, outward beneath the surrounding plaster floor. The continuation of the earth is clearest along the southeastern edge of the throne space, where a small hole permitted interface between the stratum and the overlying floor to be discerned (Figure 3.59). The shape of the sondage with a little “ear” at one side\textsuperscript{374} further indicates that the earth that Blegen removed was extremely \textit{dense} and \textit{hard} (as befits a leveling layer), while our discovery of two LH I sherds (\textit{P-114} and \textit{P-115}) at the bottom (Figure 3.60) clearly shows that this earth was not “virgin,” as Blegen and Rawson wrote,\textsuperscript{375} but rather contained cultural material.

\textit{Re-Thinking the Throne Space “Treasure”}

Based on these new observations, the identification of the throne space “treasure” in context \textbf{ThR3} as a foundation deposit or other type of deposit made during the original use life of the palace is simply not feasible. Instead of being associated with construction, these objects

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{372} Brecoulaki (pers. comm.).
\item \textsuperscript{373} Furthermore, the surface of the leveling layer must have been \textit{intact} at the time of the fire, permitting the heat to penetrate into its upper portion \textit{only}. If a deeper cut had been made into the throne space prior to the fire, the transformation would have penetrated further.
\item \textsuperscript{374} In my and Zokos’ estimation, this “ear” may represent an attempt to enlarge the sondage that was abandoned once the excavators determined the extreme density of the underlying earth.
\item \textsuperscript{375} \textit{PN I}, p. 88.
\end{itemize}
seem to have accompanied an event that occurred later in the life of the palace, after the plaster in the throne space had been cut and had sustained fire damage. The archaeological evidence suggests a few possible interpretations: 1. The treasure, as part of the pier-wall matrix like many other finds from the room, was deposited during the collapse of the Throne Room’s walls; 2. The treasure was deposited during a disturbance subsequent to the collapse; or 3. The treasure was deposited prior to the collapse. The first interpretation is supported by the reddish color of context ThR3, which it shares with other pier-wall matrix deposits (i.e., contexts ThR1 and ThR2) in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room. The second is indicated by the looseness of some of the red earth in this quadrant (context ThR2), which suggests that context ThR3 was disturbed at some point in the megaron’s history after its walls had fallen in.\textsuperscript{376}

Both of these solutions, however, are frustrated by the condition of the objects that compose the treasure and by their use of rare materials. While many scraps of precious metals were found in the room’s red deposits, the treasure included a nearly complete ring (M-23), a gold bead (*M-25), and large twists of wire. They also included the only examples of precious stones found in the Throne Room: the broken agate pendant (S-5) in Group A, and the carnelian (S-6), agate (S-7), and amethyst (S-8) beads in Group B. It is also difficult to reconcile the preceding explanations with the treasure’s “clustering.” In stark contrast to the isolation of other finds from the Throne Room, the artifacts in the throne space were found grouped together in two discrete deposits (see Figures 3.56 and 3.57). Collectively, this evidence lends support to option three, that the treasure was deposited \textit{deliberately} in the throne space during the period of the ruined palace.

Arguably, the throne space treasure may have been deposited at the same time as the miniature kylix (P-72) was placed on the nearby table of offerings. In both cases, the offered

\textsuperscript{376} GEM 1952, p. 54; \textit{PV} I, p. 88.
items are unusual for the space and also broken, perhaps suggesting that they were each scavenged from the ruined palace before being re-deposited as gifts. Furthermore, treasure Group B was found tucked into a nook, a position that seems, at least superficially, to mirror the placement of the miniature kylix in a recessed “pocket” on the surface of the table of offerings.

The question of why the treasure was deposited is difficult to answer. One solution is that it was an intentional act of reverence and/or respect by a visitor (or visitors) who recognized the throne space as the location of a once-great seat of power. This would explain not only the dedication of the treasure, but also the apparent concomitant deposition of red earth (context ThR3) in which it was found (see Figures 3.56 and 3.57). While such earth may have simply accumulated in the bedding cut prior to the arrival of visitors, it is equally likely that it was intentionally added as a means to conceal the treasure and/or to “repair” the damage to the throne space (i.e., by returning its central section to its original height). Such an act would certainly qualify as a reverential gesture, and would further affirm that the reputation of the throne survived in living memory.

Contexts ThB4, ThB3, ThB5, and VB: The Hearth and Burnt Palatial Period Features

Megaron Phases: 1, 3, 4

---

377 Similar objects recovered by Blegen and Rawson from other rooms in the palace include: a carnelian bead from Room 32 (PN I, p. 159), amethyst beads from Hall 46 (PN I, p. 202), and both amethyst and carnelian beads from the Shaft Grave below Room 97 (PN I, p. 314). That the artifacts in the “treasure” may have alternatively been scavenged from Tholos IV is suggested by extant parallels for the treasure’s amethyst and carnelian beads and bronze ring (PN III, pp. 120-121, 124-126). Notably, this explanation is similar to that proposed by Säflund (1980, p. 241), but without the need to equate the objects with “cult adornment.”

378 It is also possible that this “act of reverence” had religious overtones – making it more similar to the “act of piety” discussed above. However, as the more hypothetical reconstruction of the throne (see Chapter 4) makes this connection less clear, the dedication of the treasure is here classified as an act that was primarily respectful, rather than religious.

379 Alternatively, if the treasure and earth were deposited by the same individuals who ripped out the throne space’s central bedding, this might be considered an act of contrition.
In addition to objects deposited by visitors, possible further evidence for the re-use of the Throne Room during its ruined phase comes from context ThB4, the crust of ashes found overlying the hearth (see Figure A1.19). As described in the summaries above, this deposit contained no sherds or small finds and was concentrated along the hearth’s northeastern edge.\textsuperscript{380} Given these features alone, it is unclear whether the ashes represent an episode of burning associated with the original palatial use of the room or with its subsequent reuse. It is also possible that the burnt material accumulated in both periods, and/or in the course of the fire that separated them. Contexts ThB3 and ThB5, the burnt deposits found on the floors in the SW and NW Quadrants of the Throne Room respectively, are equally ambiguous. Based on the position of the deposits on the floor, it is possible that they represent burnt pieces of furniture. However, given that the room was found emptied of nearly all its large components it seems more likely that the burnt areas represent collapsed wooden elements of the room’s superstructure, which was damaged, but did not fall, during the fire.

In the Vestibule, burnt context VB is even more difficult to interpret. As described above, this deposit was localized in a small cutting in the floor to the immediate northeast of the doorway into the Portico (see Figures A1.24 and A1.25) tentatively interpreted by Blegen and Rawson as a support for the base of a spear stand (δουροδόκη) like that used by Telemachus in the palace of Odysseus.\textsuperscript{381} Based on the available evidence, no further speculation about the identification or use of this feature is currently possible. The ashy character of context VB, however, does suggest that whatever occupied the cutting had a wooden foundation that extended beneath the floor and was burnt during the fire.

\textsuperscript{380} Also see the description of the ashes on the hearth in PN I, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{381} PN I, p. 72.
Contexts ThY2, ThY3, and ThY1: Windblown Sediments

Megaron Phases: 4. 9

The idea that the Throne Room remained accessible for a period of time after being damaged by fire is further supported by the room’s second largest deposit, context ThY2. As Blegen and Rawson described, this deposit, composed of yellow earth, had a “sloping” shape and was localized in the room’s SW Quadrant (see Figure 3.5).382 Field notes and sections further indicate that the deposit was banked up against the room’s NW and SW walls, and that its “slope” angled downward from the west corner to the center of the room, where it abutted the edge of the hearth (see Figure A1.11). In PN I, Blegen and Rawson interpreted this yellow deposit as part of the “dissolved crude brick” that made up the room’s walls.383 I would suggest, however, that it represents a deposit of silt similar to that identified by Hruby underneath the fragmentary table of offerings in the Room 18 shrine. As described by Hruby, windblown silt at the palace consisted of “yellow soil with plaster, sherds, and bits of charcoal” – a description that is appropriate for context ThY2, which contained only a handful of pot sherds and bits of bone and plaster.384

Admittedly, context ThY2 is far thicker than that observed in Room 18, reaching a height of ca. 0.50 m. in the Throne Room’s west corner. This attribute, together with the deposit’s distinctive sloping shape (high in the corner and thinning towards the hearth), suggest that the silt came in not through a doorway (as Hruby proposed for the deposit in Room 18) but instead through a hole in the west corner of the Throne Room’s roof. Currently, the winds blow

382 PN I, p. 89.
383 PN I, p. 89.
384 Hruby 2006, p. 20. As noted above, LaFayette has questioned this interpretation of the yellow debris in Room 18 as windblown silt on account of the latter’s even distribution and inclusions. While I agree with LaFayette’s reasoning in this instance, I believe that in the case of the Throne Room the irregular, sloping shape of the yellow deposit is consistent with Hruby’s interpretation of such deposits as the accumulation of windblown particulates.
aggressively across the Englianos ridge from southeast to northeast in the morning and from northwest to southwest in the afternoon. If such was also the case in antiquity, particulates borne by these strong winds could have fallen through the damaged roof and gradually formed a mound, which, as it grew, spilled into the room’s center.\(^{385}\)

A similar explanation, I would argue, can be proposed for context ThY3, which was contiguous with context ThY2 but located at a slightly higher elevation on top of the hearth (see the intersection of strata y5 and y3 in Figure A1.11). Like the deposit in the SW Quadrant, context ThY3 may have been blown into the Throne Room from above, falling down onto the hearth not through the damaged roof but through the open chimney. As for context ThY1, this too likely represents windblown silt – deposited much later in a pocket amid the debris of the Throne Room’s collapsed pier-walls.

*Contexts ThB2 and ThB1: Chimney Collapse and Room Re-Use*

Megaron Phases: 5, 7

While the preceding evidence indicates that the Pylos Throne Room remained accessible and was visited after it was damaged by fire, there is also evidence for subsequent visits following the collapse of the room’s walls. Specifically, I refer to the black earth with small stones (context ThB1) found immediately underneath the plowed soil in the center of the room, directly above the hearth (see Figure 3.22). In *PN I*, Blegen and Rawson proposed that this deposit represented the remains of the sheathing that originally affixed the chimney pipes to the roof.\(^{386}\) Superficially, this argument works well. As noted by LaFayette, mud with small stones would have been excellent packing material for securing a chimney, while the black color of the

\(^{385}\) Some of this yellow silt could have also come from the erosion and/or collapse of the earthen components of the Throne Room’s walls and/or roof.

\(^{386}\) *PN I*, pp. 81-82.
deposit is consistent with the charring often found around ventilation points in a room that has been consumed by fire.\textsuperscript{387}

It is difficult, however, to support this interpretation with archaeological evidence. In the field notebooks, it is clear that the chimney fragments were nearly all found \textit{below} the level of this upper black stony soil.\textsuperscript{388} As noted in Appendix 1, the fragments (P-14, P-16, P-59, P-85, and P-113) range in depth from -0.40 m. to -0.90 m., while the upper black earth terminates at a depth of only -0.45 m. below the surface. Consequently, context \textbf{ThB1} cannot be associated with the chimney. If the two \textit{were} associated, the fragments should have been found on top of (or at least within) the black earth given the original projection of the chimney \textit{above} the roof, as reconstructed by de Jong (see Figure 3.4) and more recently by LaFayette (see Figure 3.41), who argues for a single, stacked chimney rather than two pipes set side-by-side.\textsuperscript{389} A better candidate for chimney “sheathing,” therefore, is Throne Room context \textbf{ThB2}, a lens containing black burnt earth, small stones, plaster, and likely chimney fragments (included in mixed context \textbf{ThR1/ThB2}), located over the hearth at a depth of ca. -0.40 m. to -0.90 m. (see Figure 3.25).

Given the available evidence, context \textbf{ThB1} is better identified as a deposit associated with post-collapse activity in the Throne Room. Positioned just below the plowed earth and immediately above the red-burned strata, this black layer with small stones has much in common with Dark Age deposits identified elsewhere at the Palace of Nestor. As enumerated by LaFayette, such deposits were found in Rooms 3, 4, 12, 13, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47 and possibly

\textsuperscript{387} LaFayette 2011, pp. 14, n. 46, n. 48. In her discussion of charring, LaFayette refers specifically to rooms that are “postflashover.”

\textsuperscript{388} The one exception to this is the group of chimney fragments (P-59), found at an unknown depth in the black stony earth.

\textsuperscript{389} LaFayette 2001, p. 14, n. 46. LaFayette’s evidence for this arrangement derives from her detailed study of modern smoke-egress patterns and conforms to earlier models presented for chimneys at Mycenae (see Mylonas 1983, p. 111, fig. 87). By contrast, however, a recently published clay house model from Malia preserves two cylindrical chimney pipes set side-by-side in the manner of de Jong’s original arrangement (Driessen 2011, pp. 4-5).
48 of the palace’s Main Building.\textsuperscript{390} What is unusual about the deposit in the Throne Room, however, is that it contains \textit{no} Dark Age sherds. While Blegen and Rawson noted the presence of “Geometric” sherds among the Throne Room’s finds, their pencil numbers indicate that these belonged to the Vestibule and Portico, as discussed above. Furthermore, the texture of context \textbf{ThB1} does not appear to match that of the other Dark Age deposits, many of which the excavators described having a “greasy” or “oily” consistency. The interpretation of this “oily” black soil has long been problematic. Blegen and Rawson originally associated it with the operation of an olive oil press at the palace in the late seventh century B.C.\textsuperscript{391} Nelson and Griebel have since connected the layer to Iron Age activities at the site, and recent anecdotal evidence suggests that the earth was discolored by a modern oil pressing facility.\textsuperscript{392} Lacking any documentation of an oily consistency (as well as any evidence of Dark Age material), context \textbf{ThB1} cannot be confidently linked to such activities.

A clue about the origin of the upper black earth in the Throne Room may lie in its most remarkable (and only datable) find: a small LH IIIB stirrup jar (\textbf{P-15}; see Plate 17) discovered overtop of the northwestern edge of the hearth at a depth of -0.35 m. In the context of the Throne Room (and megaron) deposits, this vessel is unique. It is the only example of a complete vase found \textit{in the fill} as opposed to on the floor and as such must be explained.\textsuperscript{393} On the one hand, it is possible that the vase fell from an upper story. As discussed above, the lack of a balcony in the Throne Room makes this scenario problematic, but it is possible that the vase, like some of the small finds and perhaps a pithos and a krater, may have fallen from the nearby second story

\textsuperscript{390} LaFayette 2011, pp. 325-326, Table 4. In \textit{PN I}, oily deposits were explicitly identified in Rooms 39, 40, 41, and 42 only (pp. 177, 180, 184). The other rooms were added by LaFayette (2011, pp. 324-325, Table 4), who also includes Room 6 in her survey.

\textsuperscript{391} \textit{PN I}, p. 177, referring specifically to the black oily earth in Room 40.

\textsuperscript{392} Griebel and Nelson 2008, pp. 97, 99; Davis and Lynch Forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{393} As noted by Mylonas, the vessel was found whole and broken during its removal from among the tightly packed stones of the black fill (GEM 1952, p. 25).
storeroom postulated by Hofstra above Rooms 28-31. It is also possible that the stirrup jar was contained in the matrix of a pier-wall, although the dearth of other complete vessels in the megaron’s fill argues against this.

Failing these explanations, it is worth considering the idea that the stirrup jar was deposited intentionally over the area of the hearth and that it was functionally linked to the black earth in which it was found. Based on its use as a small storage/pouring vessel, the stirrup jar, perhaps scavenged from the collapsed (or collapsing) palace (like the miniature kylix and treasure deposited in the Throne Room), may have been used to offer a libation while the surrounding black earth may represent the remains of a pyre. Like the dedication of the throne space treasure and the miniature kylix, such an offering must have been made when the social memory of the Throne Room and what it represented was still vivid. This interpretation is extremely hypothetical and lacks additional supporting evidence (i.e., clear indications of sacrifice such as animal bones, votives, etc.). Still, the position of both the stirrup jar and the black deposit over the hearth is striking and difficult to explain otherwise. If true, this interpretation of context ThB1 adds a second new phase of activity to the megaron’s use life, one that falls between the “ruined” palace and the later “collapsed” palace of the Dark Age. This tentative intermediary phase I term the “recently-collapsed” palace.

*Contexts PB and PR: Collapse and Dark Age Activity in the Portico*

Megaron Phases: 6, 8

While Throne Room context ThB1 had no Dark Age sherds, the latter were abundant in Portico Trench T, Extension, stratum p16/b15*/r18/bn2 and strongly suggest that this stratum
(and context PB, to which it belongs) represent Dark Age use.\textsuperscript{394} This conclusion is corroborated by the presence of two nearly complete 8th century vessels: a small DA III krater with a grooved rim (P-340 and P-341; see Plate 107) and a DA III trefoil oinochoe (P-342, P-343, P-344, and P-375; see Plates 107, 108, 116), and by many fragments of S-shaped DA II-III cups. These pottery shapes indicate that activities in context PB included drinking events during which liquids (presumably wine) were mixed, poured, and consumed. Because the total number of vessels is meager, such events must have occurred on a small-scale, matching the picture of Dark Age drinking activities observed elsewhere in the Pylos palace by Davis and Lynch (see above). That the stratum should be associated with the Dark Age is further indicated by the condition of the sherds catalogued as P-330, P-331, and P-337 (see Plates 103, 104, 106), which have on their interior surfaces a distinctive “metallic” or “oily” sheen (see Plates 104a, 104d, 104e, 106b, 106c). The source of this sheen is not known and requires scientific analysis in order to be accurately characterized. Based on the sheen’s macroscopic appearance, however, it is tempting to identify it as the same mystery residue that gave many of the palace’s Dark Age soil deposits their “greasy” consistency.

Middle and Late Helladic ceramics in stratum p16/b15*/r18/bn2 require further explanation. On the one hand, it is possible that they too come from stratum b15 – perhaps having been mixed in during the course of the Dark Age activities that led to the production of context PB. Alternatively, these earlier sherds may come from one (or both) of the other three strata in this mixed group: p16, r18 and bn2. Among these strata, r18 is perhaps the most likely. Based on the field descriptions of this deposit as “ashy,” “sandy,” and mottled red-yellow in places, it appears to have the character of rubble (likely comprised in part from fallen pier-walls)

\textsuperscript{394} In Trench T, South, this conclusion is further supported by the four Dark Age sherds in stratum p15/b14.
from the collapsed palace, making it ideal to contain material from the early-to-palatial date range.

This interpretation also works for the strata contiguous with stratum $r_{18}$ in Trench T, Extension (stratum $r_{17}$), in Trench T (stratum $r_{15}$), and in Trench T, South (stratum $r_{16}$), which together form the “U” shaped context $PR$ (see Figure 3.35). The unusual shape of this deposit suggests that it was formed deliberately. Banked up around the perimeter of the room, the earth has the appearance of having been pushed away from the central area. During this clearing process, early sherds (MH-LH IIIA) from the wall matrix and later sherds (LH IIIB-IIIC early) from the palace’s use life could have been easily mixed together, explaining the wide date range of context $PR$. That this event took place during the Dark Age is not certain but is strongly suggested by the position of context $PB$, with its concentration of DA ceramics, in the cleared center of the Portico (see Figure 3.34).

Interpretation of Contexts $PY$ and $PBN$: Activity in the “Ruined” Portico

Megaron Phases: 4, 5

While contexts $PB$ and $PR$ can be connected with Dark Age activity, the same is not true for the two remaining contexts in the Portico: contexts $PY$ and $PBN$. Based on their physical characteristics, these deposits appear to have been associated with activities that occurred in the room prior to the eleventh century B.C. Context $PY$, located below the red burned earth in Trench T (see Figure 3.36), was described in the field as containing a “good deal of gray ash” and very few artifacts.\(^\text{395}\) This description resembles very closely that of the yellow deposit found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room (context $ThY2$). This latter context, as discussed

\(^{395}\) GEM 1952, p. 99. As noted in Appendix 1, Table 15, only two sherds were found in possible association with the yellow earth, in stratum $p_{14}/r_{15}/y_{6}$.\(^{395}\)
above, I interpret as windblown silt, entering the Throne Room through a hole in its roof during its ruined phase. In the Portico, context PY could have similarly blown in from Court 3 and accumulated along the room’s NW wall (see Figure 3.36) during the same period.

Light brown context PBn also likely belongs to the period of the “ruined” Portico, but has a different origin. In this room, context PBn was found localized in Trenches T, South and T, Extension, where it occupied a position directly overlying the floor (see Figure 3.37). As described above, the deposit was present underneath both the black deposit (context PB) in the center of the room and the red debris (context PR) around its edges.396 The light brown layer was deepest at its northwestern edge in Trench T, South, where it abutted the yellow earth (context PY) and thinned to a height of ca. 0.20 m. at the southeastern edge of Trench T, Extension (see Figure A1.28).397 Context PBn contained only a few artifacts. Two of these were crushed vessels (P-367 and P-368; see Plates 113, 114) found on the floor and heavily burnt, most likely as a result of exposure to the same fire that melted the deep bowl in the Vestibule. At least one of these vessels, an amphora (P-367), was largely complete, suggesting that it, like the deep bowl, may have been a remnant of the palatial period left to perish in the fire.

The paucity of sherds and small finds found in context PBn and the deposit’s unusual light brown color, however, liken it to strata identified by LaFayette as deteriorated post-palatial mudbrick constructions.398 Such strata, found in Pylos Rooms 38-40 and Porch 41, LaFayette argues, derived from mudbrick walls and/or patches designed to seal doorways and/or windows that were installed to create temporary shelters in rooms of fire-damaged palace.399 In the Portico

396 Specific reference to the continuation of the light brown layer beyond the area occupied by the black deposit can be found in GEM 1952, p. 111, where Mylonas describes the deposit as terminating immediately next to the room’s pillaged SW wall.
397 GEM 1952, p. 127.
399 LaFayette 2011, p. 208. LaFayette further mentions that light brown deposits were found in Courts 42 and 47, but she does not explicitly link these to eroded post-fire constructions (2011, pp. 210-211).
of the megaron, such a mudbrick wall would have been beneficial as a means to enclose the fire-
damaged space and to protect it from the elements. That the wall in the Portico of the megaron
was erected (and then eroded) during the latter’s ruined phase is clearly indicated by the
deposition of context **PBn** underneath context **PR**. That it was not erected immediately after the
fire, however, is indicated by its deposition up against the yellow silt in Trench T (context **PY**),
which needed time to accumulate.

**Conclusions**

Above, close studies of excavation records and physical objects from the Pylos megaron
have been used successfully to identify, interpret, and sequence the suite’s stratigraphic contexts
and their contents. These conclusions clarify the character of the earthen deposits found in the
megaron and also set the parameters within which the associated material assemblages can be
used to interpret the structure.

Based on the extant evidence, it is possible to test existing theories about the suite’s
function. Foremost, the interpretations of contexts **ThR1**, **ThR2**, **VR**, and **PR** as the collapsed
matrix of pier-walls (with small amounts of debris from upper stories mixed in) and of contexts
**ThY2**, **ThY3**, and **PY** as accumulations of windblown silt challenge claims that artifacts found
in the megaron represent the residue of *in situ* feasts. As components of collapsed and/or eroded
building material, items found in these contexts (which consist largely of non-mending sherds
and tiny scraps of broken objects) *cannot* be used to understand activities that took place in the
megaron during its palatial use phase in LH IIIB-IIIC early.\(^{400}\) In addition, the few vessels from

\(^{400}\) To clarify, this is not to say with certainty that feasts did not occur in the megaron, but rather that the sherds and
small finds found in the suite’s deposits were not used in this capacity. Because the megaron was largely devoid of
complete objects of any kind it is of course very possible that its rooms were “swept clean” before the fire and/or
that vessels and other accoutrements used in these spaces were stored elsewhere.
the suite that do represent palatial activities, namely the (nearly) complete basin (P-136),
vitrified deep bowl (P-235), and partial amphora (P-367) found on the floors of the Throne
Room, Vestibule, and Portico respectively, are more likely to be objects deposited in an *ad hoc*
manner rather than *in situ* remains of feasts.

There is, however, evidence for dining, or at least drinking, in the Portico of the megaron
some two hundred years after the suite went out of “official” use. In this room, the discovery of
new fragments (P-342, P-343, and P-344) of a nearly complete trefoil oinochoe (P-375), a
substantial portion of a krater with a grooved rim (P-340), and many fragments of likely
mendable flat-bottomed cups in a deposit of black stony earth (context PB), attest to small-scale
wine mixing, serving, and consumption in this room during the DA II-III periods. Such
proceedings are likely the extension of small-scale events noted previously in adjacent Court 3
(and in other open areas of the palace) and are not, as far as the evidence suggests, reflective of
ritual activity.

Objects that *can* be tied to religion include the Throne Room table of offerings (C-9),
which was deposited during the palatial period and which may preserve evidence of intentionally
charred organics on its surface. It is no longer possible, however, to connect the miniature
kylikes (or, as I have suggested, kylix) found on the table with this use phase. Based on
reassessments of the table’s condition and of the physical appearance of the one associated kylix
(P-72), it would appear that the latter object was deposited *after* the palace had been damaged by
fire in the newly-defined period of the “ruined” megaron. For this reason, while it is possible that
the deposition of the miniature kylix represented the perpetuation of religious activities carried
out in the Throne Room previously, it is equally possible that it signaled a deviation from
standard practice.
In addition, subsequent to the period of the ruined megaron, religious activity may be suggested by context **ThB1**. Based on its color and contents, this large area of black stony earth, deposited above the hearth and containing a complete stirrup jar, could represent the remains of a pyre erected after the walls of the megaron collapsed, although this remains very speculative.
CHAPTER 4: BUILT FEATURES

As demonstrated in Chapter 3, the stratigraphy and portable finds from the Pylos megaron provide no evidence for palatial period dining in the suite but confirm the practice of religious activities during both its palatial and post-palatial phases. Further evidence for the use of the suite is offered by its “fixed” components, which, as part of the built environment, shed light specifically on activities that occurred during the palatial phase in LH IIIB-IIIC early. This chapter examines the first of two groups of such components, the built features. These include: the throne space, the libation channel, and the central hearth from the Throne Room, and the sentry stands from the Vestibule and Portico.

Each feature is examined independently (or, in the case of the sentry stands, as a pair) and, as was done in the previous chapter, discussion is divided into four parts. First, the descriptions and interpretations of the feature published in the PN series are reviewed in detail. Second, scholarly interpretations of the feature suggested subsequent to (and based on the data available in) the original publications are discussed. Third, new evidence for the feature’s appearance and/or character is presented, and fourth existing theories about the feature’s function and/or significance are reassessed and new ideas are proposed.

The “Sentry Stands”

Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations

When entering the megaron from the southeast (Figure 4.1), the first built features to be encountered are the so-called “sentry stands.” Two such stands are preserved: one in the Portico and one in the Vestibule. Both stands are discussed in detail in PN I. The example in the Portico (Figure 4.2) was described by Blegen and Rawson as a “raised platform” to the immediate right
of the doorway into the Vestibule. The northwestern edge of the platform abutted the anta of the doorway and an adjacent portion of the Portico’s NW wall. As recorded by the excavators, the upper surface of the stand rests between 0.08 m. and 0.09 m. above the surrounding floor. The stand has a measured length of ca. 0.90 m. and its width ranges between 0.85 m. (at its northwestern edge) and 0.92 m. (at its southeastern edge). These uneven dimensions together with the “awkward” (i.e., slightly north-south rather than northwest-southeast) angle at which the stand projected from the Portico’s wall suggested to the excavators that this version of the stand was a “careless” construction, “belonging obviously to the [palace’s] last phase of occupation.” Further evidence for the stand’s late date derived from a damaged area on its southeastern edge, inside of which the excavators observed part of a low stucco rim rising 0.01 m. above the floor and bearing traces of paint.

The second sentry stand is located in the Vestibule (Figure 4.3). Its position is comparable to that of the example in the Portico – built up against the room’s NW wall to the immediate right of the doorway to the Throne Room. As described by Blegen and Rawson, this stand projects 1.20 m. out from the wall and measures 1.10 m. in northeast-southwest width. Around the stand’s edge the excavators found a low stucco frame 0.09 m. wide. The heights of this frame, as measured from the level of the surrounding floor, are 0.03 m. and 0.04 m. at its southeastern and southwestern edges respectively. The northeastern edge of the frame, by contrast, was found flush with the floor and its northwest edge (up against the anta) measures

401 PN I, p. 68.  
402 PN I, p. 68.  
403 PN I, p. 68.  
404 PN I, p. 68.  
405 PN I, p. 68.  
406 PN I, p. 74.  
407 PN I, p. 74.
0.08 m. tall and 0.095 m. wide. The surface of the stand, Blegen and Rawson described, was “of good quality” stucco with a “uniformly blue color.”

In *PN* I, Blegen and Rawson interpreted these two rectangular features as “posts” or “stands” for sentries – an idea that de Jong also incorporated into his reconstruction of the megaron’s Court (see Figure 1.5). Support for this interpretation derived from the physical location of the features beside doorways – positions which were replicated by similar sunken rectangles in Hall 64 (to the right of the doorway into Hall 65, see Figure 4.4) and in Room 1 (to the left of the doorway to Room 2, and to the right of the doorway into Room 7, see Figure 4.1). In the case of the unusual position of the stand in Room 1 to the left of the doorway, Blegen and Rawson reasoned: “From this stand the sentry could control those entering what may have been a treasury office as well as those going straight on into the palace.”

In his early archaeological reports, Blegen also suggested the possibility that the sentry stands served as bases for “chairs or thrones.” This idea was likely based on analogy with the similarly sized and shaped “throne space” in the Pylos Throne Room (discussed below) and/or with the sunken plaster rectangle against the wall of the “Room of the Throne” at Mycenae (Figure 4.5), which Wace had interpreted previously as the place for a secondary throne. By the time *PN* I was published, however, Blegen had abandoned this idea.

---

408 *PN* I, pp. 74-75.
409 *PN* I, p. 75.
410 *PN* I, pp. 68, 74.
411 *PN* I, pp. 253 (Hall 64) 57 (Room 1). Notably, in his description of the stand in Room 1, Blegen specifically wrote that the stand could have been for “a sentry or an attendant” (my emphasis).
412 *PN* I, p. 93.
413 Blegen 1953, p. 62. That this interpretation was formulated in the field is evident in Blegen’s field notes: “On northerly side we find to right of door leading into Rm with Hearth a raised platform, .05-.06m high, bordered by a slight edge, apparently another place for a throne or seat” (GEM 1952, p. 97). A similar interpretation for the stand in Hall 64 was recorded in Rosemary Hope’s 1953 field notebook, in which she identified a concentrated area of black burned earth found near the feature as the remains of a fallen wooden throne (RH 1953, p. 164).
414 Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 186-188; cf. Tsountas (Tsountas and Manatt 1897, p. 59) and Mylonas (1983, p. 106) who argued that this feature in the “Room of the Throne” at Mycenae was in fact a hearth.
Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies

Following the publication of *PN* I, Blegen and Rawson’s identification of these low plastered features as “sentry stands” was, and continues to be, widely accepted. The appeal of this interpretation can be linked to its apparent universality. Each stand in the palace, it would seem, was positioned in such a way as to restrict or halt access to important spaces. Those in Rooms 4 and 5 blocked access to the Throne Room, that in Hall 64 blocked access to Hall 65 (the main hall of the palace’s Southwest Building, arguably used by a military commander, the *lawagetas*415), and that in Room 1 blocked access to the palace interior and Archives. Indeed, over the years this theory has been modified only slightly by Palaima and Wright, who have reinterpreted the role of the stand in Room 1 in relation to the Archives. This stand, they suggest, was not intended not to protect the “sensitive” materials stored in Room 7 but rather to prevent unwanted visitors from entering the palace’s interior, to which Room 7 was connected.416

Alternative interpretations for the sentry stands, however, have also been proposed. As early as 1955, Ioannis Papadimitriou claimed (perhaps following Blegen) that the stands at Pylos served as bases for thrones, an interpretation he further applied to the raised alabaster slab (Figure 4.6) that he had recently unearthed in the south corner of the portico of the megaron at Mycenae.417 In 1966 and 1983, Mylonas further suggested that the Pylos stands, as well as a raised gypsum slab to the right of the doorway in the vestibule of the megaron at Mycenae (Figure 4.7) (excavated, but apparently not recognized, by Wace) were used to support torch stands, or more specifically, torch bearers.418 In Book 7 of the *Odyssey*, Mylonas recounted,

---

418 Mylonas 1966, p. 53; 1983, p. 105. Ostensibly, the first mention of this elevated stone slab appears in an account by Spyridon Iakovides, who notes that the gypsum slab “to the right of the door leading into the *domos* is higher than the others and its surface is worn. It is reminiscent of similar platforms in the propylon and megaron of the palace at Pylos, which are thought to have been stands for sentries guarding the entrance” (1983, p. 62).
Odysseus visited the palace of Alcinous and spoke “with admiration of the various and wondrous things that met his eyes; among them ‘golden youths’ who ‘stood on well-built pedestals, holding lighted torches in the hand to give light by night to the banqueters in the hall.” Later, in a seminal 1990 article on Mycenaean ceremony and cult, Hägg inferred generally that the stands had “some kind of religious function” – a belief shared by Klaus Kilian.

In 2005, Ulrich Thaler proposed a fourth alternative – that the stands were used to support incense burners. While admitting that this theory was somewhat “less plausible,” than the traditional sentry stand interpretation, Thaler reasoned that his new suggestion would have been an equally effective way of establishing a “perceived distance” between visitors and the ruler in the Throne Room. In both cases, the stands would have served as prominent markers, accentuating the transition between the outer entryway and the central Throne Room via changes in the visual (or olfactory) environment. In the case of human sentries, Thaler further theorized the use of bodies as a complement to the fixed architecture. Together, he argued, man and structure would have worked to create a potent language of exclusion that made the restricted nature of the Throne Room clear to anyone who sought to enter.

Finally, a fifth interpretation for the sentry stands has been offered by Mark Peters, who, as reported by Fox, considers them to be supports for “kraters containing lustral water.”

Part III: New Evidence

---

420 Hägg 1990, pp. 180-181, n. 29, citing a personal communication with Kilian.
423 Thaler 2007, p. 307. Thaler also draws attention to the similarities between the size and shape of the sentry stands and the “throne space” in the Pylos Throne Room. Based on this observation, he tentatively proposes a connection with Hittite texts referring to state rituals in gateways, but ultimately dismisses it based on lack of evidence (ibid.).
424 Fox 2008, p. 135, n. 18, citing a personal communication with Peters.
While Blegen and Rawson’s publication of the sentry stands has provided fertile ground for discussion, a closer examination of the in situ evidence as well as the unpublished excavation records helps to reveal more information about the form of these built features, as well as to suggest alternative explanations of their function.

The Original Appearance of the Sentry Stands

Beginning with form, re-study of the sentry stands themselves offers new insights on their original appearance. Foremost, the raised plaster borders around the edges of the features (clearly visible in the case of the Vestibule stand and glimpsed beneath the solid plaster construction of the Portico stand) suggest that these are not stands in their “finished” form, but rather represent the foundations of stands, which were themselves made of a different material. Based the use of plaster, I would suggest that this material was stone or wood. Stone is suggested by analogy with the plinth occupying the throne space, discussed in detail later in this chapter. Wood, on the other hand, is suggested by the palace’s columns, many of which (located in Courts 4 and 44, in Propylon Rooms 1 and 2, and in Hall 64) were encircled by plaster rings (Figure 4.8). As suggested by Blegen and Rawson and subsequently confirmed by Michael Küpper, the purpose of these column rings (which, like the stands’ plaster borders, measure ca. 0.09 m. wide) was to “prevent moisture from seeping down thus causing the lower

---

425 Although Blegen and Rawson do not specifically state that stands were used as found, this is indicated by their lack of reference in PN I to any added elements, and by de Jong’s rendering in Figure 1.5, which shows the Portico stand as a low feature – nearly flush with the surrounding floor. Presumably, de Jong was attempting to represent this stand in what was believed to be its original low (as opposed to final raised) form. That an additional element has been assumed in modern scholarship, however, is evident in Palaima and Wright’s discussion of the stand in Room 1, which they refer to as a “block” (Palaima and Wright 1985, p. 256).

426 In Hall 64, the discovery of black-burned earth to the northwest of the sentry stand’s northeast corner (RH 1953, p. 164) may further corroborate this suggestion.

427 Blegen 1965, pp. 121-125. Notably, on p. 124, Blegen writes that column rings were found on nine of the palace’s columns, but his list contains only eight examples. The ninth ring is that around the column in the interior of Hall 64, which is not preserved in situ but whose place is clearly marked on the floor (see PN I, p. 251; Nelson 2001, fig. 130).
ends of the pillars to decay. Applied around the bases of the Portico and Vestibule’s wooden stands, the plaster borders would have offered similar protection against water damage, which, in the case of the Portico, may have been a particular concern given the room’s proximity to open-air Court 3.

Waterproofing and the Unusual Shape of the Portico’s Sentry Stand

Waterproofing may also be the explanation behind the final raised all-plaster construction of the sentry stand in the Portico. In this instance, the builders may have been trying to make the Portico stand more durable by replacing its wood with a thick platform of plaster, perhaps in response to a particularly bad episode of water damage. This idea is corroborated by the later addition of other plaster veneers in this room. Close inspection of the upper surface of the stand, for example, shows that its plaster topcoat is the same layer of plaster that was applied to the surface of the stone anta behind it (Figure 4.9a) and, by extension, to the wooden doorframe (now absent) and the adjacent wall (Figure 4.9b). In the last case, the plaster coating was applied overtop of a hard limestone baseboard (discussed further in Chapter 5) which, as Nelson has argued, was also designed to protect the wall. It is also clear from field notes and photographs that the final painted plaster floor in this room (to be discussed in Chapter 5) was raised a

---

428 Blegen 1965, p. 125, n. 74; Küpper 1996, pp. 96-98. For a contrasting view, Nelson (2001, pp. 105-106), who is doubtful of this interpretation based on the presence of a column ring around the base of the interior column in Hall 64. Such a ring, he argued, would not have been threatened by moisture, making it likely that the plaster rings were designed more for decorative effect than for practical purposes. I would counter, however, that adding this plaster ring was an attempt to make all the columns in this room uniform in appearance.

429 A waterproofing explanation makes further sense for the stand in the Portico given that it also contained two wooden columns with plaster base-rings. In the case of the stand in the Vestibule, where weather was likely less of an issue, the use of a plaster border may have been an attempt to match this feature to that in the Portico – creating visual harmony comparable to that in Hall 64 (see previous note).

430 Nelson 2007, p. 19. Nelson does not specify whether he considers this wall to be “interior” and thus susceptible to “accidental abrasions from occupants and moveable items” or “exterior” and threatened by “wind, rain, and sun exposure.” Based the room’s form as a covered porch, I would argue that both interpretations are appropriate.
“centimeter or two” above the adjacent floor in Court 3, creating a low ledge (Figure 4.10). During the plastering of the floor, this ledge may have been intentionally left in place as a way to keep rainwater out of the Portico and divert it instead toward the center of Court 3, which was fitted with a stone drain.

Finally, a fear of water damage may also explain the unusual north-south angle of the Portico sentry stand, which is shown clearly in Figure 4.11. As noted above, Blegen and Rawson attributed this irregularity to slipshod workmanship during the final phase of occupation at the palace. Instead, this angle, which is only slightly off center, may have been a practical modification – designed to deflect rainwater away from the Vestibule while keeping the doorway into this room essentially clear. In terms of phasing, such a modification may have been a preliminary (and perhaps unsuccessful) attempt to protect the entrance prior to the very final phase of the palace, when the decision was made to add another layer of plaster to the Portico’s floor.

**Part IV: Old Theories Reconsidered and New Ideas**

While the above new observations add to our understanding of the sentry stands’ original appearance, they do nothing to resolve the issue of their primary function. There is no positive

---

431 GEM 1952, p. 136
432 *PN I*, p. 63, fig. 44. Notably, Vanderpool originally believed that this ledge was formed by a stone threshold underneath the plaster dividing the Portico and the Court (GEM 1952, p. 136). His hypothesis was later disproved by Rawson, who in 1960 found no evidence of underlying stone, and instead suggested that the disparity in height between the floors was the result of different surface textures caused by weather exposure (MR 1960, p. 158).
433 PN I, p. 68.
434 That the final plaster floor of the Portico was laid after the room’s sentry stand was installed is indicated by the fact that the stand seems to be earlier than even the penultimate floor. As Rawson noted in the field: “The stand was evidently there when this [i.e., the penultimate] pavement was painted as the circles it contains go up to it [i.e., the stand] and not under it” (MR 1961-1962, p. 65).
435 It is assumed that the proposed use of the Portico stand to help keep water out of the megaron was not the feature’s primary purpose.
or negative archaeological evidence for Blegen and Rawson’s “sentry stand” interpretation,\textsuperscript{436} for Thaler’s suggestion of incense burners, or for Peters’ proposal of lustral kraters. This last suggestion, however, can be discarded based on evidence presented in Chapter 3. Peters’ idea, not fully published but conveyed via a personal communication, is almost certainly based on the large pedestalled krater with spiral decoration catalogued as \textit{P-1} (see Plate 88). The find spot of this krater, as published by Blegen and Rawson, was Section C of 1939 Trench I, which cut through the eastern corner of the Throne Room and the central part of the Vestibule (see Figure A1.1).\textsuperscript{437} Ultimately, the excavators assigned the krater to the Throne Room, but it is also possible that it was found in the Vestibule.\textsuperscript{438} In the latter room, it would be tempting to connect the krater to the sentry stand, as well as to draw parallels between this arrangement and the similar krater-stand combination found in Hall 64. As described by Blegen and Rawson: “On the floor beside the sentry stand [in Hall 64] and extending into the adjacent doorway were found many fragments of a pedestalled krater decorated with painted patterns.”\textsuperscript{439} In such positions, the two kraters might be imagined as holding liquid contents used for purification rituals performed by visitors entering Room 65 or the Throne Room.\textsuperscript{440} However, as argued in Chapter 3, the unburnt condition of krater \textit{P-1} suggests that this vessel was \textit{not} in use on the ground floor of the palace during the palatial period, but instead fell into the megaron when the adjacent upper story collapsed.

\textsuperscript{436} Intriguingly, however, in Figure 1.5 de Jong depicts the armed sentry standing not on, but \textit{next to} the Portico stand. While it can’t be proven, this small gesture may betray de Jong’s (or even Blegen and Rawson’s?) discomfort with the feasibility of this feature as the platform for a guard.

\textsuperscript{437} \textit{PN I}, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{438} In \textit{PN I} (p. 91), in their description of this krater, the excavators note that “Section C crossed the Vestibule and the eastern corner of the Throne Room.” Unfortunately, there is no documentation (notes or photographs) in the 1939 excavation records that give any more information about the krater’s find spot.

\textsuperscript{439} \textit{PN I}, p. 253. For the original excavation notes, see in RH/WMcD 1953, pp. 151 and 164. In the case of Room 1, a pedestalled krater was noted as being found in Room 2, close to the doorway (\textit{PN I}, p. 62).

\textsuperscript{440} A notable (but not authoritative) parallel for this usage occurs in Book II of Homer’s \textit{Odyssey}, in which Nestor washes his hands before sacrificing a heifer to Athena at his palace: “\textit{γέρων δ᾽ιππηλάτα Νέστωρ γέρων \ τ᾽οὐλοχύτασ τε κατήρχετο, πολλὰ δ᾽Ἀθήνη εὔχετ᾽ἀπαρχομενος, κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλω}” (\textit{Od}. 2.444-446).
The Sentry Stands as “Lamp Stands”?

While there is no evidence that the stands in the Pylos megaron were used to support human guards, incense burners, or lustral basins, there is some very tentative support for Mylonas’ suggestion that the stands were used for lighting. Rather than statues of “golden youths,” however, the extant evidence is for stone lamps. For this I call attention generally to the numerous fragments of such lighting devices found at the palace and specifically to three fragments found in the vicinity of the megaron. Lamp remains from the palace at large include the nearly-complete limestone example with raised spiral decoration found in Corridor 61 and two joining fragments of a stone lamp bowl from Room 1. In the megaron were found two fragments of stone lamp bowls (S-14 and S-15) unearthed in the Portico (see Plate 7), and a large stone “foot” (Figure 4.12) found in adjacent Court 3. As observed by Hofstra (and confirmed by myself), the two lamp bowls from the Portico were heavily damaged and one of the two, S-14, featured unfinished carved decoration. The foot from Court 3 was found in a “deposit of black earth with small stones” and described by Blegen and Rawson in the following manner:

“Fragment of the foot of a table or lampstand of veined purplish-red stone…, calcined, [with a]…simple molding at bottom; pres. H. 0.17 m., pres. w. 0.10 m., pres. th. 0.15 m.”

Subsequent to the excavators’ inconclusive interpretation, scholars have continued to debate the identification of this unusual find. Most recently, Hofstra has followed Blegen and Rawson in their first assessment, and describes the find in the following way:

441 For the lamp from Corridor 61, see PN I, pp. 242-243, figs. 271, nos. 1a, 1b and 272, nos. 1, 2. For the lamp from Room 1 (the Outer Porch of the Propylon) see PN I, p. 59, fig. 269, no. 12.
442 Hofstra 2000, p. 198.
443 PN I, p. 64, fig. 271, no. 5. The thickness of “0.15 m.” listed above is corrected from Blegen and Rawson’s published “0.05 m.,” a mistake confirmed by the original excavation notes (GEM 1952, p. 134) and firsthand observation.
444 Notably, although Blegen and Rawson’s narrative description of this object is inconclusive, the photo caption for this object reads: “Base of a Stone Lamp” (PN I, pl. 271.5).
“The last piece, of a purplish red stone probably a colored limestone or marble, is clearly not from a lamp, though Warren calls it a IIB or C base fragment. It is a stump of a leg or foot with a spreading base, similar to several others found around the palace, and like them does not appear as finely finished as a complete lamp would be. One of these, of white poros limestone, was found near the tabletop in Court 58, and may have been a stand or table leg.”

Further support for Hofstra’s argument comes from the Pylos Ta tablet series, which includes descriptions of stone table shafts. Despite this evidence, I am inclined for two reasons to agree with Peter Warren’s counter argument (to which Hofstra refers) that the foot belongs to a lamp. First, iconographically, there are discrepancies between this foot and depictions of tables in Pylian representational art. In a wall painting from the Throne Room, for example, two fragment groups (Figure 4.13) that have been assigned to a banqueting scene (see Figures 5.10 and 5.17) depict pairs of figures wearing long robes and seated to either side of tall tables. Each table, rather than being supported by a single leg is propped up by three, evenly-spaced legs with square shafts and no articulated feet. Such tables, which appear to be made of wood based on their brown hue, are more abundant in the Ta series than stone examples and are described as highly decorated, either carved with running spirals (Ta 713 and Ta 715: “e-ne-wo-pe-za qe-qi-no-me-na to-qi-de”), decorated with sea-shells (ibid: “e-ne-wo-pe-za ko-ki-re-ja”), or inlaid with silver (Ta 715: “a-ja-me-no pa-ra-ku-we”).

Second, the stone foot from Court 3 physically resembles very closely the base of a Minoan columnar pedestalled lamp. As described by Warren, such lamps have been found on

446 For recent discussion of the presence of a table with a “marble support/shaft” (po-ro-e-ke) listed in the Pylos Ta tablet series, see Shelmerdine 2012, p. 690.
448 PN II, pp. 80-81, pls. 28, 126. Notably, the tripod design in each of these representations seems to have influenced Blegen and Rawson’s interpretation of the large variegated marble tabletop found in Court 58, which they interpreted as having originally been supported by “three sturdy legs” (PN I, p. 230; cf. Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 339). Currently, the state of the underside of this tabletop, which is coated with modern gypsum, does not permit further examination of this claim, nor of Hofstra’s suggestion that the legs were of a type similar to the foot found in Court 3 (2000, p. 199).
Crete at Hagia Triada, Malia, Palaikastro, Nirou Chani, Vathypetro, and Knossos, on the islands of Kythira and Melos, and on the Greek mainland at Dendra and Mycenae. “Medium-sized” lamps measure between 0.20 m. and 0.35 m. in height, while tall versions measure upwards of 0.35 m. At the top of each pedestalled lamp is a carved bowl with two opposing wick channels and embellishments that often mimicked the decoration on low stone lamps (i.e., carved motifs on the rim and/or pendant handles). The bowl was supported by a columnar shaft, sometimes carved into the form of a plant stalk (as in the case of the famous “Lotus Lamp” from Knossos\(^{450}\)), or ornamented at its center with raised rings. The majority of lamp shafts, however, were plain and nearly every example had a simple disk base.\(^{451}\) This latter feature is visible on the examples from the Royal Villa at Knossos (Figure 4.14), from Mycenae Chamber Tomb 88 (LH II) (Figure 4.15), and from Tomb II at Dendra (LH IIIB).\(^{452}\) With unembellished shafts and gently-flared bases, the lower portions of these pedestalled columnar lamps closely resemble the stone foot from Pylos Court 3.

Based on the above identification, it is possible to suggest that a pedestalled lamp was placed on one of the two stands in the Vestibule or Portico, and to infer that a second lamp (now absent) was placed on the other.\(^{453}\) These suggestions remain extremely tentative, however, because of the foot’s discovery in Court 3’s black stony earth. In this context, which, like the equivalent deposit in the Portico likely represents the residue of Dark Age activities above the floor, the foot cannot be directly connected to either the Vestibule or the Portico or even to the palatial period. However, as it is unclear how the foot became incorporated into this later layer it

\(^{450}\) *PM* II, pp. 521-522, fig. 325.

\(^{451}\) Warren 1969, pp. 57-59. Two pedestalled lamps are also depicted, despite the lack of archaeological evidence, in de Jong’s reconstruction of the Throne Room (see Figure 1.4).

\(^{452}\) Royal Villa: *PM* II.2, p. 405, and fig. 234; Mycenae Chamber Tomb 88: Xenaki-Sakellariou 1985, p. 121, no. 3160; Tomb II at Dendra: Warren 1969, p. 58, with references.

\(^{453}\) It is also possible that a lamp was placed in only one of these two rooms based on the fact that there is archaeological evidence for only one lamp and also no clear evidence that these two (or indeed all four) Pylian stands necessarily functioned in the same way.
remains possible that it was originally associated with the primary use of one of the nearby megaron’s rooms. If we follow this proposed scenario, elevating these slender lamps on podia in the Portico and/or Vestibule would have been an ideal way of protecting them from incidental bumping. Furthermore, in these positions the lamps would have provided a ready source of artificial light in the entryway of the megaron, the strong need for which is discussed below and in Chapter 5.

The “Throne Space”

Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations

A second built feature in the Pylos megaron is the so-called “throne space,” located up against the NE wall of the Throne Room. As described by Blegen and Rawson, this feature consists of a sunken rectangular cut in the floor (Figure 4.16) measuring 1.07 m. in length (from northeast to southwest) by 0.90 m. in width (from northwest to southeast). Like the sentry stands, the throne space is enclosed by a plaster border, which measures 0.04 m. to 0.06 m. wide to the northwest, southwest, and southeast and 0.08 m. wide to the northeast. The frame projects above the floor on all sides except the southeast, where the floor and frame sit at roughly the same level. This irregularity in elevation prompted the excavators to interpret the plaster frame (like that of the Portico sentry stand) as “rough and ready,” and to assign it to the “last phase of the place, which seems to have been a relatively careless age.”

As discussed in Chapter 3, inside the throne space Blegen and Rawson noted the presence of a “bedding of pebbles, clay, and perhaps broken and dissolved brick tamped down hard.”

454 PN I, p. 88.
455 PN I, p. 88.
456 PN I, p. 88.
The central part of the space, they wrote, was filled with “burned red earth,” at the top of which were found two small clusters of jewelry:

“One [group] comprised a fragment of a pendant of banded agate, beautifully worked, a piece of burned and decomposed blue paste or kyanos and a partly melted gold bead; the other group yielded a ring of silver or bronze covered with silver and its bezel of lead, a twisted wire loop of silver (perhaps from a bracelet), a twisted wire loop of gold, a large cylindrical bead of carnelian, an amygdaloid bead of banded agate, an amygdaloid bead of bronze, possibly decorated, a fragment of bone, a small spherical bead of amethyst, and half of a [clay] whorl.”\textsuperscript{457}

While they were unable to determine how, when, or why these objects were deposited, the excavators were confident that the surrounding cutting was the placement for a royal throne. The strongest evidence for their theory came from the feature’s position up against the room’s NE (i.e., right-hand) wall, which mirrored the position of the \textit{in situ} gypsum throne found by Sir Arthur Evans in the Throne Room at Knossos (Figures 4.17 and 4.18) and of the proposed throne in the Megaron at Tiryns identified by Kilian.\textsuperscript{458} The Pylos throne, Blegen and Rawson inferred, would have been slightly larger than the Knossian version and made of perishable material, perhaps exotic wood inlaid with ivory or kyanos. “If there had been any appreciable use of stone or metal,” the excavators reasoned, “some traces of them would surely have survived, unless the entire throne was carried off as booty by the [site’s] conquerors.”\textsuperscript{459}

\textit{Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies}

Following the publication of \textit{PN I}, Blegen and Rawson’s interpretation of the rectangular cutting in the Throne Room as the footing for a throne has been maintained. The term “throne” is regularly used in discussions of the Pylos palace, and some scholars, like McDonald and

\textsuperscript{457} \textit{PN I}, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{458} Blegen 1953, p. 61; \textit{PN I}, pp. 87-88; Blegen 1953, p. 61. See also preliminary associations between the Pylos throne and that at Tiryns in GEM 1952, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{459} \textit{PN I}, p. 87.
Vermeule, have upheld its interpretation as a wooden construction. To quote McDonald’s retelling of Telemachus’ visit to Nestor’s palace in *Progress Into the Past*: “Nestor takes his seat on the wooden throne decorated with costly inlay and a servant brings him a cup of wine.”

In 1995, Rehak took this idea a step further, suggesting that not only the throne, but also the plinth on which it rested was also made of wood.

Debate has arisen, however, over the status and gender of the throne’s occupant. As discussed in Chapter 2, while the throne was identified by Blegen and Rawson as the seat of a male *wanax*, Rehak proposed instead that the throne was occupied by a woman. In support of his theory, Rehak cited the iconography of enthroned figures in glyptic, including the seated goddess represented on the gold ring from the Tiryns Treasure (Figure 4.19) and in wall paintings, such as the “Campstool Fresco” from Knossos (Figure 4.20).

In the latter case, a female figure (termed by Evans “La Parisienne”) oversaw a drinking event attended by pairs of seated men. Based on the similarity between this wall painting and the banqueting scene from the Pylos Throne Room (see Figure 5.10), Rehak inferred the use of the latter space as a location for communal drinking ceremonies attended by male state officials “under the direction of a seated woman, perhaps a priestess or a queen, who led the toasting.”

Recently, Rehak’s idea of an enthroned female has been reiterated in the work of Farmer and Lane, who have also inferred a strong connection between the Pylian Throne Room and drinking ceremonies. Generally, however, attention has refocused on the male *wanax* as the throne’s primary occupant. Studies by Bennet, for example, discussed in Chapter 2, have

---

461 Rehak 1995, p. 101
463 Rehak 1995, pp. 111-112. As noted by Maran and Stavrianopoulou (2007, p. 288), Rehak’s argument closely recalls that of Helga Reusch, who argued that Knossian throne was meant for a priestess performing the role of a female goddess and that the Knossos Throne Room was used for divine epiphany (Reusch 1958, pp. 348-352).
suggested that the Pylian ruler sat upon his throne in order to compose a visual tableau of himself flanked by lions and griffins, while Maran and Stavrianopoulou have proposed that the seated male *wanax* may have performed the role of a female goddess during epiphany rituals enacted as part of Kilian’s *wanax*-ideology.

*Part III: New Evidence*

As in the case of the sentry stands, re-examination of the *in situ* evidence and unpublished field records offers fresh insights into the appearance and function of the throne space. Of particular help are new details observed during the cleaning of the feature in 2012. The details of this project, which completely removed the modern earth and backfill overlying the throne space (see Figure A1.22) are recounted in full in Appendix 1.

*Results of the 2012 Throne Space Cleaning*

While most of the new data generated by the cleaning project shed light on the character of what was below the throne space (discussed in Chapter 3), they also provided some small hints about what originally rested on top of it. These hints come primarily from the surfaces of the feature’s plaster border and bedding. Looking first at the bedding, it is now clear that this material, composed of nodules of lime and tiny bits of painted plaster (Figure 4.22), had a tightly-compressed and relatively level surface (Figure 4.23), suggesting that it was overlaid by something flat and heavy. This information points not to a wooden plinth, as Rehak suggested, but rather one made of stone. This suggestion is further supported by the throne space’s plaster border, which has gently pitted, slightly undulating interior edges (Figures 4.24 and 2.25).464

---

464 Notably, when the interior of the plaster rim was cleaned, it was found to be coated with what looked like red paint. Upon closer inspection by conservator Zokos, however, this was determined to be a layer of red salts of a type
While it might be argued, based on the discussion of the sentry stands above, that the use of a plaster border indicates that the object contained within it was made of wood, the condition of the border’s surface in this case suggests instead that it was positioned up against a slightly rougher material, perhaps a block of hewn limestone.

The reconstruction of a stone (rather than wooden) plinth is also corroborated by two areas of damage along the throne space’s plaster border (Figure 4.26). The first, located on the feature’s southwestern edge, takes the from of a 0.08 m. wide sharply-angled cut while the second, located in the feature’s eastern corner, is an area where the plaster border has been completely excised. Because of the position of these broken areas and the sharp, downward angle of the southwestern cut, it would appear that they were not the result of accidental damage to the border but rather occurred during the forcible removal of the plinth.465 Because a lighter, softer wooden plinth could presumably have been removed with minimal (or no) damage to the plaster border, it follows that plinth must have been made of heavy, sturdy stone and that the cuts reflect attempts to get tools underneath it in order to heave it out of position.

Stone Plinth Comparanda

In addition to the evidence provided by new field data, a stone plinth at Pylos is also supported by comparanda from other Aegean sites. At Knossos, for example, the in situ throne was found to rest on a plinth of solid gypsum (Figure 4.27) measuring 0.77 m. long by 0.62 m. wide – dimensions that are, as Blegen and Rawson noted, very similar to those of the Pylos also found on the wall paintings from the palace, and perhaps leached from the red burnt earth that accumulated in the structure during its destruction.

465 That the cut on the southwest part of the rim was not made in 1960 when the adjacent metal post holding the rope barrier was inserted into the plaster rim is evidenced by the photos taken of this feature during excavation, which show the cut in place (see PN I, fig. 70). It is also conceivable that the plaster in these areas was damaged by falling debris during the collapse of the room’s walls. To my eye, however, the shape of damaged areas is more consistent with tool marks.
throne space. On the Greek mainland, stone blocks used to support a throne were also found by Schliemann in the Megaron at Tiryns. These blocks, made from serpentinite and decorated with a running spiral design, have been reconstructed by Thekla Schultz as the central course of a three-tiered horseshoe-shaped dais belonging to the LH IIIA phase of the Megaron (Figures 4.28 and 4.29). This base is large (measuring 1.85 m. long and 1.36 m. wide) and considerably different in design than the example at Knossos. Its stone construction, however, shows an affinity with the hypothesized Pylos block, as does the plinth’s physical relationship to the surrounding floor. While the plinth from Knossos sat on top of the room’s stone flooring, that from Tiryns, Schultz suggests, may have rested slightly beneath the level of the Megaron’s plaster floor mirroring the position occupied by the Pylos plinth, the bedding of which sits ca. 0.02 m. to 0.03 m. below floor level.

Part IV: Old Theories Reconsidered and New Ideas

Collectively, the above observations and comparisons offer no new evidence for the gender of the occupant of the throne, nor do they prove or disprove that the seat was used by royal administrators and/or for epiphanies. The new evidence for a stone plinth, however, corroborates the basic, widespread assumption that the throne space was in fact the emplacement for a throne. Further support for this identification comes from the throne space “treasure,” discussed in Chapter 3. As I have argued, this treasure, which consists of two groups of damaged and/or fragmentary valuable objects, represents an offering presented by visitors to the “ruined

466 PM IV.2, p. 302, fig. 891; PN I, p. 88.
467 Schultz 1988. These stones, she notes, were not found in situ but rather built into the structure of the LH IIIB Megaron suggesting that they belonged to the base of the throne in the earlier, LH IIIA megaron.
468 Schultz 1988, p. 20.
469 The existence of the stone plinth also proves that the throne space did not serve as a hearth – an interpretation proposed by Tsountas and Mylonas (contra Wace) for the sunken plaster rectangle up against the right-hand wall of the “Room of the Throne” at Mycenae (Mylonas 1983, p. 106; Wace et al. 1921-1923, p. 188).
palace” who were attempting to repair and/or atone for the destructive cut made through the center of throne space’s plaster bedding. In this scenario, while the artifacts themselves do not offer any particular information about the throne, they do provide indirect evidence for its existence. If I am correct that these objects were deposited deliberately in the throne space after it had been damaged, it follows that this location must have been recognized as important and that its defamation was considered something offensive that needed to be acknowledged and/or remedied. This evidence, when considered alongside the sounder testimony of the stone plinth, further argues for a throne.

The Original Appearance of the Pylos Throne

Given that there is now more compelling evidence for identifying the Pylian throne space as the footing for a throne, some speculation is warranted about the original appearance of this important feature.470 Because no traces of a Mycenaean throne survive at any of the mainland palaces, published scholarship and reconstructions tend to imagine the throne at Pylos in the likeness of the in situ gypsum example from Knossos, discussed above. This Cretan throne has a very distinctive form (see Figure 4.18). As described by Evans:

“The back is made in a single piece, sloping slightly back from the level of the base of the seat, so that the upper part was embedded in the plaster. It is of undulating outline, which has been compared to that of an oak-leaf, with a rolled border showing an inner groove. …

The surface of the seat was carefully hollowed out so as to suit the comfort of its occupant. The upper line of its front elevation thus gradually falls away from the centre in two curves adapted for the thighs, and this central rise in turn forms the starting point for a very elegant feature in the design. Its curve is developed downwards on both sides, supplying the inner border of two pilasters, which with their delicate fluting, expanding above in a fan-shaped form, are of true Minoan inspiration. … This appearance, moreover, is enhanced by the crockets, resembling buds of foliage, that shoot out from the pillars on either side ….

470 At Tiryns, Shultz comments that despite her ability to reconstruct a stone pedestal for the throne, she was able to gain no insights about what the throne itself originally looked like (1988, p. 23).
A remarkable feature of the arch itself is the boldly modeled counter-arch below it, [as well as the] … side view of the throne, with its cross-bar in relief …”

Today, a reproduction of this throne is featured prominently in de Jong’s Throne Room watercolor (see Figure 1.4). Occupied by a male figure (presumably the wanax), the throne is here depicted, like the Knossian example, with an undulating “oak-leaf” back, a side cross-bar, and a frontal arch and counter-arch carved into a solid block of white stone. While this reconstruction is plausible, iconographic and textual evidence for Mycenaean chairs suggest that the Pylian throne was more likely to have been made of wood – the same conclusion reached by Blegen and Rawson (despite the evidence of de Jong’s reconstruction) and also assumed by Evans for a second throne located in the Anteroom of the Knossian Throne Room (Figure 4.30). As noted above, Blegen and Rawson based their argument on the absence of physical remains, from which they inferred that the Pylian throne was constructed from a perishable material. More substantial testimony for the appearance of Mycenaean thrones, however, comes from artistic representations and from descriptions recorded in the Pylos Linear B tablets.

Looking first at art, representations of Mycenaean thrones have been identified both on signet rings and in clay models. As observed by Rehak in 1995, prominent examples on signet rings come from Chamber Tombs 68 and 91 at Mycenae. In the first example, a woman sits on a low seat and converses with a standing male figure (Figure 4.31) while in the second, a figure (sex unclear) sits on a high backed chair and holds the leash of a tethered griffin (Figure 4.32). A high-backed chair (similar to a campstool) with crossed legs is also featured in the scene on the

---

471 PM IV, pp. 917-918.
472 PM IV, pp. 904, 917. In addition, Evans also suspected the use of wooden thrones elsewhere at Knossos including: in the Hall of the Double Axes (PM III, pp. 333-358), in the Reception Area of the West Entrance (PM II, pp. 672-678), in the Royal Villa (PM II, pp. 396-413), and in the House of the Chancel Screen (PM II, pp. 391-396).
famous gold ring from the Tiryns Treasure (see Figure 4.19). While each of these representations is slightly different, the consistent separation of the thrones’ legs suggests that the images were based on wooden rather than stone prototypes.

The same observation can be made regarding miniature representations of thrones in clay. Interpreted variously as seats for the dead, votive offerings, depictions of the Great Mother-Goddess, decorative objects, and, most recently by Melissa Vettet, as “tokens…representing the ritual of epiphany,” clay thrones were among the typical small terracotta objects produced by the Mycenaeans from LH IIIA to LH IIIC. Such thrones (which sometimes feature seated figures) were routinely modeled with three separate legs and/or latticed backs that suggest a wooden construction (Figure 4.33).

In the Linear B tablets, descriptions of Mycenaean “thrones” are offered in the Pylos Ta series, which consists of thirteen palm-leaf tablets written by Hand 2 and found Room 7 of the palace Archives. In the Ta series, a total of five or six thrones (to-no) are recorded, each of which is constructed from an exotic wood inlaid with precious materials. The list includes:

Ta 714

1. to-no, we-a-re-jo, a-ja-me-no, ku-wa-no, pa-ra-ku-we-qi, ku-ru-so-ke, o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja
2. a-ja-me-na, ku-ru-so, a-di-ri-ja-pi, se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-qi, ku-ru-so, ku-ru-so-qi, po-ni-ki-pi 1(?)

---

473 Rehak, for one, classed this seat not as a “throne” but as a “Folding Stool or Campstool” (1995, p. 107). Because of its attached back, however, this distinction is unnecessary.
474 Vettet 2011, p. 327. See also pp. 326-327 for a summary of different scholarly interpretations of miniature clay thrones.
475 Mylonas 1956; French 1971, esp. pp. 167-173; Vettet 2011. Other thrones were shown with solid backs. These Olga Krzyzskowska (1996, p. 93) has identified as “possibly reflecting construction in some kind of pliable material, such as willow or cane.”
476 As explained by Shelmerdine (2012, p. 686), whether there are either five or six chairs depends on the reading of a mark at the end of PY Ta 714 line 2 as a “word divider or a number.” She opts for the former identification (resulting in five chairs) while others, including Palaima, opt for the latter (resulting in six chairs). The identification of the materials in each instance is usually assumed to be wood, but there is at least one term, “we-a-re-ja,” in Ta 714, which is ambiguous. As noted by Shelmerdine, the standard translation should be wehaleia, “of rock crystal,” but this material is improbable based on practical considerations (“where would a piece of rock crystal this large come from, and how would it be possible to sit on it?”) as well as its inability to be inlaid, as the description records.
1 chair of x inlaid with blue glass and turquoise? And gold back-pieces
2 inlaid with gold man figures and a gold x head and gold palm trees (1?)
3 and blue glass palm trees
1 footstool inlaid with blue glass and turquoise? And gold and with gold bands

Ta 707
1 to-no , ku-te-ta-jo , ku-ru-sa-pi , o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi , o-ni-ti-ja-pi , ta-ra-nu-qe , a-ja-me-no , e-re-pa-te-jo , *85-de-pi
2 to-no , ku-te-se-jo , e-re-pa-ti-ja-pi , o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi , se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-re , qe-qi-no-me-na , a-di-ri-ja-te-qe , po-ti-pi-qe
3 ta-ra-nu , ku-te-so , a-ja-me-no , e-re-pa-te-jo , *85-de-pi

1 blackwood chair with gold back-pieces decorated with birds and a footstool inlaid with ivory pomegranates
2 blackwood chair with ivory back-pieces carved with a pair of x heads and with a man’s figure and calves
3 blackwood footstool, inlaid with ivory pomegranates

Ta 708
1 to-no , ku-te-se-jo , a-ja-me-no , o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja , e-ra-pa-te
2 to-no , ku-te-se-jo , er-ra-pa-te-ja-pi , o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi , se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi , qe-qi-no-me-na , a-di-ri-ja-pi-qe
3 ta-ra-nu , ku-te-se-jo , a-ja-me-no , e-ra-pa-te-jo , a-di-ri-ja-pi , re-wo-pi-qe

1 blackwood chair inlaid with ivory on back
2 blackwood chair with ivory back-pieces carved with heads and figures of men
3 blackwood footstool inlaid with figures of men and lions in ivory

Typically, these thrones (or “chairs”) have been interpreted as inventoried furniture that was used during a one-time state-sponsored feast accompanying an investiture ceremony. As

---

translated by John Killen, the first line on PY Ta 711 (likely the heading for the entire series\(^{481}\)), “o-wi-de pu₂-ke-qi-ri o-te wa-na-ka te-ke au-ke-wa da-mo-ko-ro,” reads: “Thus X. [pu₂-ke-qi-ri] saw when the king appointed Y. [au-ke-wa] as da-mo-ko-ro.\(^{482}\) According to Rehak, the chairs were set up along with tables in the Throne Room of the megaron (the most exclusive room in the palace and the only one large enough to accommodate all the furniture) in order to seat high ranking members of Pylian society who had come to the palace to dine and be entertained.\(^{483}\)

There is no reason why the descriptions of the chairs listed in the Ta series should not also be considered relevant for understanding the appearance of the Pylian throne. Constructed from lavish, exotic materials, such chairs are perfect models for what we should expect of the palace’s première seat. It is even possible to fit a throne on the throne space’s (proposed) plinth in combination with a footstool. Working from the dimensions of the Knossos throne and of footstool inlays excavated in Archanes Tholos A, Mycenae Chamber Tomb 518, and Dendra Chamber Tomb 8, the size of a Pylian throne might be estimated at 0.33 m. in length by 0.50 m. in width and a footstool at <0.36 m. in length by 0.36 m. in width.\(^{484}\) Together, these two pieces of furniture would have occupied a space roughly 0.69 m. in length by 0.50 m. in width, and would have fit comfortably on the plinth (estimated to measure ca. 1.07 m. in length by 0.90 m. in width) set within the throne space’s plaster frame.\(^{485}\)

\(^{480}\) This idea is contrary to earlier suggestions that the purpose of the Ta tablets was to record the furnishings of a grand room (Ventris 1955, p. 111), a list of objects to be used in gift-exchange, or the contents of a tomb (Palmer 1957).

\(^{481}\) The accepted order of the Ta tablets has been determined by Palaima (2000, p. 236) as: Ta 711, 709, 641, 716, 642, 713, 715, 714, 708, 707, 722, 712, 711.

\(^{482}\) Killen 1998, p. 421. This line differs from Palmer’s reading of “Thus X. saw when king Y. buried the da-mo-ko-ro” (bold mine). More recently, Killen’s translation finds agreement in the work of Davis and Bennet (1999), Palaima (2000), and Stocker and Davis (2004).


\(^{484}\) Sakellarakis (1996) notes that the widths of the excavated footstools from Archanes, Mycenae, and Midea (Dendra) measure between 0.35 m. and 0.36 m. While the lengths of the footstools are not preserved, it is assumed that they would not have been in excess of the widths.

\(^{485}\) The estimated size of the stone plinth reflects the interior dimensions of the throne space’s plaster border.
Based on this evidence, it might even be suggested that one of the chairs listed on the Ta tablets was the throne that rested on the plinth in the Pylos Throne Room. Such a conclusion is implied by Palaima, who hypothesized that the six chairs might have been used by the six authority figures (the wanax, the ra-wa-ke-ta, three telestai representing the da-mo and one representing the worgioneion ka-ma) mentioned in tablet Un 718.\(^{486}\) The best candidate is the chair listed on PY Ta 714, which Shelmerdine has deemed the most “elaborate” example in the series.\(^{487}\) It is also perhaps significant that this chair is the only one listed with a matching footstool. Both chair and footstool are described as inlaid with blue glass, turquoise, and gold suggesting that they were intended to function as a “set” rather than be used independently as has been tentatively suggested by Shelmerdine, and strongly asserted by Palaima.\(^{488}\)

Alternatively, it could be argued that not just one but all five (or six) of the chairs listed on the Pylos Ta series were, at some point in time, the throne that sat on the plinth. The basis for this argument, which is quite tentative, comes from an alternative reading of the temporal clause in the first line of PY Ta 711. As reported by Palaima, there is as yet no scholarly consensus concerning “…whether the inventoried items [in the Ta series] were used for a feasting ceremony on the occasion of this royal "appointment" or … that the individual named au-ke-wa now assumes responsibility for the maintenance of these sacrificial and feasting items in his new position as da-mo-ko-ro.”\(^{489}\)

In general, scholars (including Palaima) have preferred the first option, which has much in common with the reading of other texts (most notably PY Un 2) that record the accoutrements

---

\(^{486}\) Palaima 2004, p. 235.
\(^{487}\) Shelmerdine 2012, p. 686.
\(^{488}\) Shelmerdine 2012, p. 688; Palaima 2000, 2004. Shelmerdine’s argument is based on her observation that “even when inlay material is the same on chair and footstool…the motifs do not correspond.” This is not necessarily true, however, in the case of the chair and footstool on Ta 714 because no motif is listed for the footstool. Palaima, on the other hand, argues for the independent usage of chairs and footstools based on his identification of both as seats for 22 paired diners (see discussion below).
\(^{489}\) Palaima 2004, p. 234.
of grand feasts hosted by the Pylian polity. The second option, however, that the furniture (and other items listed in Ta series) were objects that had recently come under the supervision of da-mo-ko-ro au-ke-wa suggests that all of the chairs and footstools did not necessarily have to be in use at the moment they were recorded. This suggestion is important because it implies that the furniture listed in the Ta tablets could have been, at the time that it was observed, in storage. If this interpretation is correct, it explains some of the peculiarities of the items listed in the Ta series, resolves an outstanding debate concerning the uneven numbers of chairs and footstools, and, returning to the statement above, possibly revises the way in which the chairs and footstools were used.

Looking first at peculiarities, it is notable that among the non-furniture items listed in the Ta series there are at least two objects, listed on PY Ta 641, that are broken. Both objects are tripod cauldrons; one with only a single foot (ti-ri-po, e-me, po-de, o-wo-we) and one that has been “burnt away at the legs, useless” (ti-ri-po, ke-re-si-jo, we-ke, a-pu, ke/ka-u-me-no, ke-ra, no-pe-re). Typically, these broken items are thought to be in use during the da-mo-ko-ro’s initiation feast and their condition simply a marker of their age (e.g., as heirlooms) and/or frequent employment. If these objects were in storage, however, this resolves the issue of

---

490 Palaima 2000; 2004. Also see Shelmerdine 2008, p. 407. Palaima also notes, however, that the condition of this assemblage suggests that it was used “repeatedly on banqueting occasions” (2004, p. 234). It just happens, as a result of recording procedures, that we only have the record of the objects’ most recent usage (2004, p. 234, n. 103).

491 Notably, LaFayette has identified at least one room (Room 30) at Pylos as a possible space for furniture storage based on extra thick deposits of burnt char (LaFayette 2011, p. 165).

492 In addition, the identification of these objects as being together in a storeroom may also help to explain the excessive detail that Shelmerdine (2004, p. 688) has noted is included in the descriptions (she compares the style of Hand 2’s furniture record to a list “made for modern insurance purposes”), as well as the nature of the writing, which Palaima (2000, p. 237) has argued, appears to have been a “spontaneous” process based on oral dictation to judge from certain “textual features” including “erasures, data grouping, layout, and arrangement.” While such features certainly work with a “spontaneous” orally dictated writing style, they also may suggest a more careful, deliberate style of recording. This is particularly true of the erasures, which, one might argue, indicate a degree of reorganization and/or rethinking that would not have had time to occur under ad hoc writing conditions.


their condition more neatly as it is unlikely that such heavily damaged vessels would (or even
could) have been used during an important ceremonial event.

Second, it has been noted that the total number of chairs listed in the Ta series (five or
six) does not match the number of footstools (sixteen – four paired with chairs and twelve others
listed separately on tablets PY Ta 722, 721, and 710). One explanation for this disparity, as
proposed by Palaima, is that the chairs and footstools were not used together but rather
functioned independently as different forms of seating for paired diners at the palace. He writes
that in the Ta series, “there are 11 tables, 6 thronoi, and 16 footstools. I think that each table is
meant to have two ‘sitting’ pieces, thus explaining the 1:2 ratio between the 11 tables and the 22
thrones + footstools.”495 A parallel for this argument, Palaima further argued, is provided by the
Throne Room’s “Men at Table” wall painting (see Figure 4.13), which Lang and others including
McCallum have interpreted as representing pairs of seated male diners.496

Despite the numerical evidence, this argument is problematic. Shelmerdine has rightly
pointed out that iconographic evidence and archaeological remains suggest Mycenaean
footstools were very low to the ground (ranging between 0.06 m. and 0.12 m. tall, depending on
whether they were footed) making it highly unlikely that someone would have sat on one while
at a table, as Palaima suggests.497 If, however, the chairs and footstools listed in the Ta series
were in storage at the time they were recorded, the discrepancy in their numbers becomes
immaterial – reflective simply of the palace’s holdings and not of what was in use at a single
moment in time.

497 Shelmerdine has repeatedly argued that Mycenaean footstools were “for the comfort of feet” and not “suitable for
sitting on” (2008, p. 407; 2012, p. 689). The low heights of Mycenaean footstools are indicated by Linear B
logogram *220 and by the pictorial representations discussed above, and have been calculated from excavated
remains (Shelmerdine 2008, p. 207, n. 39, with references).
The Use of Multiple Thrones?

Finally, identifying the objects listed in the Ta series as items in storage allows us to reconsider the way in which the chairs and footstools were used. While it is possible that the objects were employed simultaneously in order to provide seating for multiple (i.e., five to six) guests, they could have just as easily been used interchangeably by one individual. If made of inlaid wood, the Pylian chairs and footstools would have borne some resemblance to thrones used by the Hittites and Egyptians toward the end of the Late Bronze Age. In the latter cultures, different thrones (or seats) were used under varying circumstances. In Hittite vocabulary, for example, there are terms for both a “royal” throne (GISGU.ZA/GISÚ.A) and a “divine” throne (GISDAG (GIS)halmasuit(t)-)).498 There is also a difference between seats that were used by men and those that were used by women. As discussed by Dorit Symington, men (both human and divine) usually occupied chairs while women (both human and divine) sat on backless stools.499 This division is played out both in the literature and in pictorial representations including glyptic carvings on the sphinx gate at Alaca Hüyük and on the Yagri stele.500 It was also maintained during death, as is described in the Hittite “Death Rituals,” which recorded the events of a royal funeral: “After the funerary pyre has been extinguished, the bones are gathered, wrapped in fine linen and placed on a chair, but if the bones are of a woman, they are put on a stool.”501

In both Old and New Kingdom Egypt, different types of royal thrones are attested. Primary among these are the “block-throne,” with a low backrest used by the pharaoh in primarily religious contexts, and the “lion-throne,” with a high back used by the pharaoh on

499 Symington 1996, p. 117.
500 Symington 1996, p. 117.
secular occasions. As discussed by Klaus Kuhlmann, the block-throne was typically embellished with a simple design of a temple façade (\textit{hwt}) or a united sedge and papyrus plant, symbolizing the religious authority of the ruler and his dominance over both Upper and Lower Egypt (Figure 4.34).\textsuperscript{502} The lion-throne, by contrast, was, as its name implies, decorated with lion protomes and/or feet (usually fashioned as chair legs) as well as subjugated foreigners, and/or sphinxes symbolizing the ruler’s strength, supremacy, and aggression (Figure 4.35).\textsuperscript{503} Foreigners were also represented on footstools and/or on the lion-throne’s raised dais.\textsuperscript{504} Other types of thrones included those with bulls-feet (a likely precursor to the lion-throne) and lightweight folding campstools for outside use.\textsuperscript{505}

That a ruler could have more than one of these thrones at his disposal is suggested by the contents of the Tomb of Tutankhamun, dated to the late fourteenth century B.C., among which Howard Carter found four elaborately carved and inlaid wooden lion thrones: the “Gold Throne,” the “Cedar Throne,” the “Child’s Throne,” and the “Inlaid Ebony Throne” (Figure 4.36) as well as four less ornate “chairs.”\textsuperscript{506} As described by the excavators, the “Gold Throne” was made of wood covered with gold sheeting incised with scenes of the seated king and his standing queen (on the backrest) and winged uraei (on the armrests) surrounded by ornamental bands and hieroglyphs.\textsuperscript{507} The central scene of the king and queen, as well as the throne’s lion’s feet, were embellished with inlays of blue faience, calcite, colored glass (green, red, and blue), and/or gilt

\textsuperscript{502} Kuhlmann 2011, pp. 3, 6.
\textsuperscript{503} Kuhlmann 2011, pp. 3, 6-7.
\textsuperscript{504} Kuhlmann 2011, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{505} Kuhlmann 2011, pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{506} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 25-102. In addition to these thrones and chairs, Carter also found eleven stools and twelve footstools in Tutankhamun’s tomb. Notably, the number of footstools (12) in this tomb, like those listed in the Pylos Ta tablets exceeds the number of seats (eight).
\textsuperscript{507} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 25-56.
silver.\textsuperscript{508} The Cedar Throne was made from cedar carved with a winged sundisk (on the headrail) and a figure of the kneeling god Heh (on the backrest) surrounded by hieroglyphs. The sundisk and feet of the throne, carved in the shape of lion’s legs, were gilded and the claws of the feet were inlaid with ivory.\textsuperscript{509} The throne was paired in the tomb with a cedar footstool trimmed with ebony and decorated with figures of captives.\textsuperscript{510} The Child’s Throne, similar in form to the Cedar Throne but smaller in size and painted white, was decorated with the plants of Lower and Upper Egypt on its grilles. On its head rail was a winged disk and a falcon with crooked wings embellished the openwork backrest. Hieroglyphs appeared on the back of the headrail and in the field around the falcon.\textsuperscript{511}

Finally, the Inlaid Ebony Throne, which resembles a folding stool with an added backrest, is constructed from ebony inlaid with strips, squares (on the backrest), and “spots” (on the seat) of ivory.\textsuperscript{512} Some inlays were stained red and the ivory spots were arrayed in a clover pattern designed to imitate the skin of a feline. The back of the throne was decorated with a gilded vulture in a frame of running spirals, and the throne’s angled feet were carved into the heads of geese inlaid with ivory, gold, and glass.\textsuperscript{513} Based on these thrones’ varying decoration, it has been suggested that they were used in different contexts and/or on different occasions. For example, Marianne Eaton-Krauss, who has studied the furniture from Tutankhamun’s tomb in detail, has proposed that the Gold Throne was used during official feasts while the Inlaid Ebony Throne was reserved for “festive domestic use.”\textsuperscript{514}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{508} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 30-31. Edwards argued that the Cedar Throne was used “in a religious ceremony, probably at his coronation.” Eaton-Krauss disagrees, however, suggesting that the throne was used in the royal palace at Memphis.
\item \textsuperscript{509} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 57-67.
\item \textsuperscript{510} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 128-130.
\item \textsuperscript{511} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 69-74
\item \textsuperscript{512} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 75-91. This throne is also commonly referred to as the “Ecclesiastical Throne.”
\item \textsuperscript{513} Eaton-Krauss 2008, pp. 76-79.
\item \textsuperscript{514} Eaton-Krauss 2008, p. 56.
\end{itemize}
Based on this Hittite and Egyptian evidence, a similar situation might be reconstructed at Pylos wherein each of the five (or six) chairs in the Ta series were used for something, and perhaps by someone, different. The unique combination of materials and motifs may have imbued each chair with special meaning and designated it as the “chair elect” of a particular circumstance or ceremony. One or more chairs could have had a distinctly religious usage while others could have been reserved for more secular affairs. In addition, some chairs could have been used by men while others were reserved for women. As noted above, the latter sex was preferred by Rehak as a result of his examination of seated figures in Aegean iconography. Even more support, however, may derive from the work of Yiannis Sakellarakis, who has demonstrated, using both artistic representations and objects recovered from burial contexts, that footstools were also a female prerogative.515 At Pylos, this is evident in a wall painting group (50 H nws, Figure 4.21) from the Northwest Slope plaster dump depicting the bolstered end of a footstool found in association with parts of the large scale figure (presumably seated) known as the “White Goddess” (49 H nws).516 If, as I have suggested above, it was possible to fit both a throne and a footstool together on the Pylian plinth, it follows that such a combination may have been employed specifically for events requiring a seated woman.

The “Libation Channel”

Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations

515 Sakellarakis 1996, esp. pp. 107-110. Intriguingly, this association between women and footstools bears some resemblance to the use of stools (rather than chairs) by Hittite women. Could it be suggested that Mycenaean footstools, if they functioned as seats as Palaima has suggested (see above), were sat upon by women while thrones/chairs were reserved for men?

Located immediately northwest of the throne space is the third and most unusual of the Pylos megaron’s built features, the so-called “libation channel.” The description of this feature, as offered by Blegen and Rawson, is recounted below.

“Directly beside the throne and sunk into the stucco floor on the king’s right, is a roughly circular basin-like hollow with a diameter of 0.32 m. and a depth of 0.06 m. From it a narrow [V-shaped] channel, 0.04 m. wide at the top and 0.04 m. deep, leads 2.01 m. northwestward in a slightly curving line, not far from the wall, to a similar shallow hollow (0.34 m. in diameter, with a depth of 0.06 m.) at a somewhat lower level.”\[^{517}\]

At the time of its discovery, the libation channel was found to be “uniformly coated with a dark matter” of unknown origin.\[^{518}\] That the feature existed in an earlier version was indicated by a small area of underlying pavement visible at the channel’s northwest end, which Blegen and Rawson argued was “more carefully” crafted in comparison to the “rather clumsily made” final surface.\[^{519}\]

Because this feature was one of a kind, Blegen and Rawson had difficulty with its interpretation. They suggested, however, based on its shape and position in the Throne Room that it was “made to provide a place for the king to pour out libations on ceremonial occasions without having to rise from his throne.”\[^{520}\] Alternatively, they further mused, the channel may have had a more mundane function similar to that proposed by Natan Valmin, who said the feature reminded him of the spittoons or cuspidors used in the palaces of Iron Age Sweden.\[^{521}\]

*Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies*

\[^{517}\] PN I, p. 88.
\[^{518}\] PN I, p. 88.
\[^{519}\] PN I, p. 88.
\[^{520}\] PN I, p. 88.
\[^{521}\] PN I, p. 88.
Despite the tentative nature of Blegen and Rawson’s identification of the feature next to the throne space as a royal “libation channel,” this interpretation dominates the literature. As noted in Chapter 2, among the most substantial remarks were those made by Hägg, who included the channel in a synthetic article about Mycenaean libations and compared it to similar installations at Mycenae. The first of these, located in the south corner of the portico of the megaron, was an alabaster floor slab with a shallow, oval-shaped depression identified by Papadimitriou as a “λεκανή” (see Figure 4.6), while the second consisted of a round depression, runnel, and sunken jar that Wace had associated with the bolster altar of the Tsountas House Shrine (Figure 4.37). The recipient of offerings poured into the Pylian channel is usually presumed to be a deity. Alternative recipients, however, have also been proposed. Carter, for example, has argued that the channel was used to make offerings to ancestors. Thaler, on the other hand, has suggested that offerings were made to, or even together with, the wanax based on his interpretation of the libation channel as a “symmetrical installation.” The only true counter-argument to the “libation channel” theory is that proposed by Vermeule, who suggested that the cutting might be part of the installation for a queen’s loom, “assuming she was as usefully busy as queens in Homer.”

Interpreted as a libation channel, the Pylos feature has been frequently incorporated into discussions of cult practice at the palace. Hägg, for example, has suggested that the feature was used by the ruler to pour libations on behalf of the entire Pylian community – a practice that

---

525 Thaler 2012a, p. 206. Thaler also suggests that a visitor and the wanax could have poured joint libations. Notably, an early hint of Thaler’s idea appears in the work of Säflund who wrote that libations in the channel were “made by (or for?) the occupant of the Throne” (Säflund 1980, p. 241 – my italics).
identified the Throne Room (and megaron as a whole) as a primary locale of official/state cult.\textsuperscript{527} That the channel was meant to receive liquid offerings, he further added, was reinforced by a nearby wall painting of a stone jug (see Figure 5.8).\textsuperscript{528} More specifically, Carter has suggested that liquid was poured during the celebration of a \textit{marażeh}, while Wright has suggested that the channel, which was meant to receive wine, was intended to “honor a deity, to appease the gods, or to seal an oath or pact.”\textsuperscript{529}

That the libation channel had a “ritualistic” character is further affirmed by Gallou in her comparison between this feature and grooves found in the \textit{stomia} of Mycenaean chamber tombs and tholoi (Figure 4.38). While earlier studies of these grooves by Antonios Keramopoullos, Axel Persson, Spyridon Marinatos, George Korres, and Vermeule purported that they were used to facilitate “the smooth running of the burial cart,” Gallou, following ideas by Åke Åkeström, William Cavanagh, and Christopher Mee, has identified them as a way to communicate with the dead, “by means of pouring libations… between the mourners and the deceased after the \textit{stomion} had been blocked.”\textsuperscript{530} The ritual nature of these tomb grooves, Gallou suggests, is reinforced by the comparative evidence of the Pylos libation channel.\textsuperscript{531}

\textbf{Part III: New Evidence}

As in the cases of the sentry stands and the throne space, our understanding of the appearance and function of the libation channel at Pylos is improved by a careful reconsideration of unpublished records from the original excavations. The most useful new data for this study,
however, comes from observations made during a second cleaning project undertaken by myself and conservator Zokos in 2012, during which the modern earth overlying the libation channel was completely removed (Figure 4.39).

Results of the 2012 Libation Channel Cleaning

Cleaning the libation channel clarified aspects of its physical appearance. First, the project confirmed the measurements given by Blegen and Rawson for the dimensions and depths of the V-shaped channel and the two basins. It also confirmed that the basin closer to the throne space currently sits at a higher elevation than the one farther to the northwest. As measured, the difference in height between the floors of the two basins is 0.04 m. – achieved gradually over the ca. 2.00 m. long connecting channel.\textsuperscript{532} Presuming that the heights of the basins have not been dramatically altered by ground subsidence, the feature would have channeled any liquid poured into it away from the throne space, as Blegen and Rawson originally argued, rather than toward it, as suggested recently by Thaler.\textsuperscript{533}

Observations were also made regarding the “dark matter” on the libation channel’s interior. As noted above, in \textit{PN I} Blegen and Rawson referred to this deposit as a uniform coating. During the 2012 cleaning of the feature, however, it became clear that the deposit had clearly defined \textit{limits}. These are clearest in the southeast basin next to the throne space and in the attached part of the channel, where the black residue terminates at a distance of ca. 0.02 m. below from the surface of the room’s floor (Figure 4.40). In the northwest basin, hints of a

\textsuperscript{532} ECE 2012, p. 5. Many thanks are due to Meg Sneeringer, Tyler Haas, and Arthur Stephens, who assisted in the measuring of this feature. The total length of the channel (following its curved line) is 2.08 m. (GEM 1952, p. 87). The straight distance from basin to basin, however, is slightly less, at 2.01 m.

\textsuperscript{533} This does not rule out Thaler’s (2012, p. 206) suggestion that offerings were \textit{also} made in the northwest basin. Liquids poured here, however, would not have moved toward the throne but instead would have remained in place as the offering poured in the second basin made its way away from the throne.
similar demarcation line are visible at the same depth (Figure 4.41).\textsuperscript{534} In this latter case, the edge of the black residue is visible only along the basin’s northwestern edge, where the plaster was not blackened by fire. This same burning extended into a large crack in the basin, into the central section of the channel, and onto the surrounding floor, much of which was coated with a thin layer of stabilizing yellow plaster by conservator Zacharias Kanakis in 1953 (see Figure 4.41).\textsuperscript{535}

These new observations indicate that Blegen and Rawson’s “dark matter” is more accurately the residue of the liquid that at one time filled both basins and passed through the channel. That the residue belonged to a liquid is confirmed by the shape of the residue. In both basins, the upper edge of the residue maintains a consistent depth of -0.02 m., suggesting that it was generated by a type of matter prone to distributing itself evenly when deposited in a confined area.

The dark color of the residue is more difficult to explain. One possibility is that the residue was black by nature – the remnant (or perhaps even the stain?) of a dark liquid that passed through the channel and both basins. A more likely interpretation, however, is that the residue turned black as a result of being burned by (and/or exposed to heat issuing from) the same fire that damaged part of the channel and the surrounding floor. This fire is certainly that which also damaged other parts of the Throne Room and the end of its palatial use life in early LH IIIC. The residue, burnt basins, burnt channel, and burnt floor are all a similar shade of dark grayish-black and in some areas the affected areas are contiguous. Along the northeastern edge

\textsuperscript{534} ECE 2012, p. 4. This account only lists the latter measurement. The first is calculated from photographs taken during the cleaning project.

\textsuperscript{535} CWB 1953, p. 125. As Blegen stated, the plaster was applied for the express purpose of stabilizing the edges of the libation channel. At the same time, Kanakis also applied plaster around the edge of the throne space and around the footings of the Throne Room’s four columns.
of the northwest basin, the burning visibly continues from the floor to the large break in the side of the basin, and down into its interior (see Figure 4.41).

**Part IV: Old Theories Reconsidered and New Ideas**

**The “Libation Channel” as a “Libation Channel”**

Based on this new evidence, Blegen and Rawson’s original identification of the feature to the northwest of the throne in the Pylos megaron as a libation channel appears sound. Although the feature has an unusual form, the difference in elevation between the two basins and the sharp edges of the black residue confirm that it was once filled with liquid. The sharp residue edges, likely fill lines, further suggest that the amount of liquid that was poured into the libation channel was consistent – a set amount perhaps determined by the size of the pouring vessel used for this purpose.\(^{536}\) As suggested by Hägg and others, the form of such a vessel may be indicated by Pylos wall painting 2 M 6, which I reconstruct in Chapter 5 as a jug or jar with one or two high swung handles (see Figure 5.18), modifying the original restoration by de Jong (see Figure 5.8).

**Libation Logistics and the Intended Recipient(s)**

In addition to confirming the use of the libation channel for liquid offerings, the new evidence also eliminates two of the options for the recipient of the libations, as proposed by Carter and Thaler. Thaler’s idea, that the *wanax* was the intended recipient (rather than the initiator) of the offerings, is disproved by the relative heights of the cleaned basins, which show a drop in elevation of -0.04 m. from southeast to northwest.

---

\(^{536}\) Based on the dimensions of the two basins and the levels of the fill lines, that quantity would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 1.7 liters (determined by calculating the volume of two spherical caps – the complete volume of the area with residue in the northwest basin \(V = 4\pi/6 (3 (15^2) + 4^2) = 1446.26 \text{ cm}^3\) and the area occupied by the “reserved” liquid (see explanation below) in the southeast basin \(V = 2\pi/6 (3 (9^2) + 2^2) = 258.53 \text{ cm}^3\).
Carter’s theory, that offerings were dedicated (if indirectly) to the Pylian ancestors, is unlikely due to the physical construction of the libation channel. As discussed recently by Brent Davis, during the Bronze Age libations were differentiated by what liquid was offered and by whether they evaporated into the air or drained into the ground. Typically, the liquids in the former group (usually water or wine) were offered to celestial deities while drained offerings (wine, water, or blood) were given to chthonic deities and/or the dead. The ability of an offering to evaporate or drain was dependent on the form of the libation receptacle, which Davis explains, “indexes the supposed location of the recipient.” Those receptacles that encouraged the upward evaporation of their contents were made of impermeable materials like clay, plaster, stone, and/or metal. They included portable objects such as bowls and libation tables of the types found at peak sanctuaries at Juktas and Kato Syme and on the floor of the Pylos Throne Room (C-9; see Plates 7, 8), as well as fixed installations such as the “λεκανή” excavated by Papadimitriou at Mycenae (see Figure 4.6).

By contrast, receptacles that drained into the earth to reach chthonic deities and the dead were typically constructed from broken or pierced vessels. These vessels were often large in size (e.g., jugs, amphorae, and kraters) and sunken (entirely or partially) into the ground. As cited by Davis, notable Late Bronze Age examples of such vessels have been found in the Cult Center at Mycenae (amphora necks), in an LH IIIB “House Shrine” at Berbati (a perforated krater), and in an LH IIIC “House Shrine” at Asine (an inverted jug with missing bottom). Alternatively, chthonic offerings could also be made directly into the earth without the mediation

---

537 Carter does not state specifically that libations were poured to the ancestors, but this seems to be an implied option based on her discussion (1995, p. 304).
538 Davis 2008. See also Hägg 1990, p. 177.
539 Davis 2008, p. 49.
541 Davis 2008.
of a pierced vessel. Following Davis’ argument, the Pylos libation channel falls into the first category. Coated in plaster, the feature was clearly meant to catch and retain the liquid that was poured into it rather than funnel it downward into the earth. This makes it unlikely that the libation channel was used to make offerings to the Pylian ancestors, as Carter has suggested.

A Split Offering?

While these new data eliminate two options for the recipient of offerings poured into the Pylos libation channel, they also propose a new possibility. As described above, the V-shaped channel was cut to a depth of ca. -0.04 m. below the surface of the Throne Room’s floor, i.e., between 0.02 m. and 0.03 m. above the depths reached by the attached basins.543 These height differences indicate that not all of the liquid poured into the southeast basin would have drained away. Instead, only the liquid that was at and/or above the level of the channel (i.e., more than 0.02-0.03 m. above the bottom of the basin) would have drained, while the rest would have pooled in the basin close to the throne.544 The presence of this reserved liquid in the southeast basin completely changes our perception of the libation channel’s function. Typically believed to convey liquid strictly from one basin to the other, the feature now is shown to divide liquid between the two basins, each of which would have received part of the same offering. The duality of this reconstructed libation is similar to Thaler’s proposal of a symmetrical offering, but in this case the result is achieved by a single, unidirectional libation, rather than a double, multi-directional one.545

543 PN I, p. 88.
544 This action can be compared to what happens when a modern bathroom sink is plugged and filled with water. Water fills the sink until it reaches the level of the auxiliary side drain, at which point the upper (i.e., excess) portion of the liquid is drained away, leaving the rest “in reserve.”
545 Thaler 2012a, p. 206.
Griffin and Lion as Recipients

Who or what was meant to receive this split offering is a difficult question to answer. A deity (as many scholars have suggested) is perhaps the most logical answer – namely Poseidon and/or Potnia to judge from their roles as recipients of liquid offerings in the Pylos Linear B texts.546 A different conclusion, however, is suggested by the Throne Room’s wall paintings. As will be discussed further in Chapter 5, the wall paintings from the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron are erratically preserved. As documented by Lang, almost nothing was found in situ. What was recovered were scores of collapsed fragments, the majority of which were found alongside the room’s NE wall. While many motifs remain enigmatic, one design that can be reconstructed with confidence is a large-scale paired lion and griffin (20 C 6), the fragments of which were found to the northwest of the throne space (see Figure 5.6). As discussed further in Chapter 5, the excavated fragments preserve only parts of the total composition. One fragment group (20c C 6) preserves the griffin’s plumed head while another (20ab C 6) preserves part of its white bent rear leg and hairy underbelly (see Figure 5.7).547 The largest fragment group (20ab C 6) preserves the top of the griffin’s hindquarters, which overlap the forequarters and mane of a tan-colored lion.548 Based on these preserved elements (and parallels from a similar painted composition in Hall 46 (21 C 46)), the two beasts are certainly couchant.549 The griffin, closest to the throne, faces right with its body overlapping the chest of the lion (also facing right) to the northwest.

While the precise proportions of this fragmentary composition are unknown, its large scale suggests that it occupied a considerable portion of the space immediately to the northwest.

547 PN II, pp. 110-111, pls. 53, 54.
548 PN II, pp. 110-111, pls. 53, 54.
549 PN II, pp. 111-114, pls. 54-57, F, P.
of the throne, perhaps, as suggested by McCallum, covering a distance of roughly two meters, as is illustrated in de Jong’s Throne Room reconstruction (see Figure 1.4) and in a new rendering in Figure 4.42. At this size, the two animals on the wall would have been physically aligned with the two basins of the libation channel on the floor, also set two meters apart. Given this alignment between the two animals and the two basins, any liquid poured into the libation channel by a person seated on the throne would appear to pass from the griffin to the lion.

In Mycenaean iconography, griffins and lions are both potent motifs and a direct connection between them and liquid libations is undoubtedly meaningful. The nature of that meaning, I would argue, may have to do with the different spheres of activity represented by the two beasts. As argued by Anne Chapin, the griffin, as a “supernatural” hybrid – half bird and half lion – was inherently associated with the world of the divine. In LH I-II Aegean iconography, the griffin is frequently depicted together with figures identified as deities or priests. This is clearly illustrated in glyptic by the tethered griffin on the ring from Mycenae noted above, and by the examples being led by a priest on a lentoid seal from the Vapheio tholos (Figure 4.43) and accompanying the seated goddess in the well-known wall painting from Xesté 3 at Akrotiri (Figure 4.44). The flying griffin is also frequently depicted alongside deities as evidenced by an example shown with an elevated goddess on a gold ring from Archanes-Phourni (Figure 4.45). In later periods the religious associations of the griffin are strongly suggested by

---

550 McCallum 1987, p. 94.
551 McCallum (1987, p. 137) also entertained the idea that the libation channel and the wall paintings might be related, querying: “If the floor depressions were in fact used for libation rituals, as Blegen has suggested, was there a relationship between this activity and the supernatural character of the griffin and lion?” She refrained from proposing an answer, however, until the “function of the floor depression [became] clarified.”
552 Chapin 2004, p. 56.
553 For a general discussion of griffins with seated divinities, see Säflund 1980, p. 241.
the beasts’ appearance aside the throne at Knossos (see Figure 4.17), which Niemeier and others have argued was used for enacting divine epiphanies. By contrast, lions in Aegean art are more closely connected with human activity and human virtues. As illustrated by scenes in glyptic, lions were regularly depicted in Minoan and early Mycenaean art as fearsome aggressors. In the art of the Shaft Graves, such aggression was often a visual metaphor for the power of the ruling elite, as indicated by parallel compositions of men and lions hunting on a dagger (Figure 4.46) and on a stone stele from Shaft Grave IV (Figure 4.47) at Mycenae, discussed by Nanno Marinatos. As argued by Wright, even the lions in the relieving triangle of the Lion Gate at Mycenae (Figure 4.48) were part of an expression of “natural” (i.e., earthly) power that served to protect the palace (represented by a reverse-tapered column).

Based on these associations, it might be argued that the movement of poured liquid from the griffin to the lion represented a symbolic passing of power (political and/or religious) between the divine and mortal spheres. The human seated on the throne made an offering to the “divine,” who in turn bestowed power and/or favor on the world of man. In this scenario, the liquid that remained in the southeast basin (beneath the griffin) may have been construed as “the god’s portion” (much like the burnt fat and thigh bones in Classical Greek sacrifices) – held in reserve for the deity while remainder flowed onward to the lion and the mortal domain.

---

554 Niemeier 1987; Hägg 1983; Cameron 1987. As noted by Bennet (2007, p. 12, n. 14), there is some suggestion that the griffin was regarded as also having a more “natural” mammalian/avian character in the later Bronze Age, as indicated by depictions on an LH II A cushion seal from Routsi-Myrsinochori, where the beast is shown lactating, and on an LH III C alabastron from Lefkandi, which shows an adult griffin attending to a nest of baby chicks. See additional discussion in Bennet 2004, pp. 97-98, with references.


556 Wright 1994, p. 51, citing the earlier work of Åström and Blomé (1964); Protonatariou-Deîlaki (1965); Mylonas (1966); Kardara (1970); and Shaw (1986). Recently, the identification of the animals decorating the Lion Gate as lions (rather than griffins, as proposed by E. Protonatariou-Deîlaki (1965)) has been confirmed by Nicholas Blackwell (2012; 2014), who has further determined that the animals were posed with their heads turned backward.

557 An instantaneous example of the ancient principle of "do ut des"?
This interpretation is reminiscent of the function of Aegean rhyta. As argued by Eleni Konsolaki-Yiannopoulou, rhyta provide a “liminal zone” through which liquid passes in order to transition between worlds. Offerings, she suggests, move from the realm of man to the spheres of the divine (or of the dead) by passing through the body of the libation vessel. At Pylos, the channel of the libation installation provides similar a mechanism through which liquid might have been seen to travel “between realms.” The main differences, however, are that the realms are reversed (with the liquid moving from the sphere of the divine to the sphere of man), and the mechanism of transferring the liquid (i.e., the channel) is open, rather than closed. While this latter feature may have been necessitated by practical considerations (e.g., the libation channel conveys liquid horizontally rather than vertically), it likely also added to the visual impact of the libation, which would have been visible to spectators as it moved between the two basins.

Alternatively, the griffin and lion painted above the Pylos libation channel may not have been references to the divine and mortal spheres, but rather to different royal houses. As argued by Blegen and Rawson, the popularity of the griffin in Pylian iconography suggests that it may have been “the symbol and ‘totem’ of the royal family.” The lion, by contrast, was, as Alan Wace observed, closely associated with the kings of Mycenae as indicated foremost by the animals’ prominence in the Lion Gate. Together, the two beasts may have represented a merging of the royal lines. In a 2005 discussion of Cretan influence on the Greek mainland, Rutter postulated that the combination of the two animals in the Pylos Throne Room might have been the “intentional melding of originally discrete Knosso-Messenian and Argive royal traits…[that]… perhaps [bore] witness to a dynastic marriage or even an Argive conquest of the

---

558 Konsolaki-Yiannopoulou 2001. For a thorough treatment and catalogue of rhyta found in the Bronze Age Aegean, see Koehl 2006.
559 PN I, p. 79.
Pylian kingdom.”561 If his interpretation is correct, the libation channel too may have been
designed to honor both royal houses, with offerings being poured first into the “local” “Knosso-
Pylian” basin before traveling to the basin associated with the more distant Argive kings.

The Griffin and Lion as Separate Visual Ideas

Regardless of which (if either) of these interpretations of the lion and griffin is correct,
the visual separation of the two animals (as indicated by their association with two different
basins), shows that the Pylos griffin and lion are not redundant icons. The latter view was first
asserted by Blegen and Rawson, who argued that the beasts (together with a proposed second
pair on the other side of the throne) both served figuratively to “protect” the seated king:

“…there can be no doubt that a pair of griffins confronted each other somewhat in the
manner of the composition at Knossos, though here [i.e., at Pylos] the king was not
only protected by these strange hybrids combining the head and wings of an eagle
and the body of a lion but, to make assurance doubly sure, a reinforcing lion, the
most powerful of all beasts, was added on each side.”562

Since PN I was published, this view has been perpetuated in the work of Sara Immerwahr
and McCallum, both of whom argued that the pair served as emblematic “guardians of the
enthroned ruler.”563 As seated icons, the two animals were seen to embody the potential for
ferocity and aggression that was evident in other scenes featuring the beasts’ predatory capacity.
As has been discussed recently by Lyvia Morgan and Marinatos, such scenes for both lions and
griffins were prevalent in Minoan and early Mycenaean art, in which the beasts were portrayed

561 Rutter 2005, pp. 33-34.
562 PN I, p. 79.
563 Immerwahr 1990, pp. 136-137; McCallum 1987, p. 136. See also Mylonas 1966, p. 175. It is perhaps interesting
in this respect that the griffins from Knossos and Pylos are not tethered, perhaps suggesting that they are there by
choice rather than by force. However, it is also possible that these restraints are absent because both of these griffins
lack wings, so there is no fear that they will “fly away.”
as fearsome hunters chasing down and/or devouring their prey of bulls, goats, and deer.\textsuperscript{564}

More recently, the idea that the griffin and the lion belong to the same visual idiom has been explored by Thaler, who has suggested that the animals were keyed into underlying binary oppositions at work in the Throne Room’s mural program. Together, he argues, the griffin and the lion may have represented the idea of \textit{“agrios,”} or \textit{“untamed nature,”} set up in opposition to the idea of \textit{“domus,”} or the \textit{“domesticated or civilized sphere”} represented by the Lyre Player and banqueters at the eastern end of the Throne Room’s NE wall.\textsuperscript{565} Adapted from the work of Ian Hodder on the Greek Neolithic, these structuralist principles were seen by Thaler as central to the character of the Throne Room’s paintings, in which “the sphere of nature is transferred to a deep position within the building and thus enclosed and controlled by the sphere of civilization.”\textsuperscript{566}

While these ideas are compelling, the physical relationship between the griffin, lion, and libation channel, plus the mechanics of libation (now understood to have split liquid offerings between the two basins), makes it more likely that the two animals were meant to symbolize \textit{different} concepts within the Pylian consciousness (e.g., divine and mortal or local and non-local) rather than serve as redundancies of the same idea.

\textsuperscript{564} As summarized by Morgan (2010, p. 316), the Aegean griffin, featuring the beak of a vulture, bent wings, a plumed crest, and spiral decoration, assumed the role of hunter after it had been exported westward from its native Syria, where it played a more protective role in glyptic imagery. In its predatory form, the griffin first appeared in LM I seals, as well on daggers from Shaft Graves Delta and V from Mycenae (where the animals are shown galloping down the blade), in the “Nilotic Landscape” wall painting in West House at Akrotiri, in the famous ivory pyxis from the Athenian Agora (LM II-IIIA), and in the Hunt Scene from Tell el-Dab’a at ancient Avaris. Once completing the transformation from static guardian to active assailant, the griffin was then exported back to the Levant and Egypt, where the beast was adopted as a royal emblem - trampling the king’s enemies during battle (Morgan 2010, p. 317). Similarly, the lion as predator also dates back to Minoan and early stages of Mycenaean art. As observed by Marinatos (2010, pp. 345-346), the lion as hunter appears on seals from Zakros as well as from the Akrotiri Nilotic landscape and in the Hunt Scene from Tell el-Dab’a. In the Shaft Graves, images of hunting lions abound, including on the niello dagger and the stone stele from Shaft Grave IV in Grave Circle A, mentioned above.

\textsuperscript{565} Thaler 2006, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{566} Thaler 2006, p. 102.
Identification of the Libation Liquid

While concrete observations can be made regarding the way in which liquid offerings were made in the Pylos libation channel, the type of liquid that was used is more difficult to infer. A way forward may be offered by the black residue. As discussed above, the black color of this residue is almost certainly the result of its exposure to fire and/or extreme heat. These observations immediately rule out water, which would not have left a residue of any kind. Wine, on the other hand, as suggested by Carter,\textsuperscript{567} is a possibility. Poured over and over into the libation channel, wine could have coated (and/or stained) the basins and channel with organic residue that would have discolored and/or carbonized when heated and/or burned.

One problem with this scenario, however, is its logistics. Were wine to have been poured by a person seated on the throne it would have splashed considerably – the ancient equivalent of sitting at the dinner table and pouring wine into a soup bowl on the floor. Of course, wine could have been poured from a lower height, but this would have required the throne’s occupant either to lean over precariously, or to engage the assistance of another individual, who, when making the offering, would have obstructed the view of the ritual for any persons in attendance. It is for this reason that I propose a third option for the type of liquid poured into the Pylos libation channel: olive oil. High in lipids, oil would have left a thick residue on the feature’s plaster surfaces. As a natural fuel, oil also would have been extremely susceptible to combustion and/or discoloration by fire and/or extreme heat – resulting in darkened residue like that present on the basins and channel.

Although less popular than wine, oil was used as a liquid offering during Mycenaean religious rituals. In the Pylian kingdom, the use of oil in this way is indicated by the Fr tablet series, which records offerings of oil to both humans and to deities. As discussed over fifty years

\textsuperscript{567} Carter 1995, p. 304.
ago by Emmett Bennett and more recently by Shelmerdine, Bendall, and Yiannis Fappas, oil was
offered to deities including Poseidon (Fr 343, 1219, and 1224) and Potnia (Fr 1206, 1231, and
1235).\(^{568}\) Dedications were made at festivals including the re-ke-e-to-ro-te-ri-jo (the “spreading
of the couches”?) and to-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo (the “pulling of the throne”?) and during such months
as pa-ki-na-ni-jo-jo me-no (the “month of pa-ki-ja-a”). The quantities of offered oil were usually
small and the oil itself was often scented with rose or sage.\(^{569}\) That the dedicated oil was
sometimes used during the ceremonies (as opposed to being simply “offered” in a jar or other
vessel) is indicated by tablets Fr 1218, 1215, 1205, which define the oil as “for anointing” (we-
ja-re-pe) as well as by tablet Fr 1225, which describes the oil as an “unguent for clothing” – a
reading that Shelmerdine has connected with the treatment of sacred cloth that was either given
to the deity or draped over a sculpted likeness.\(^{570}\) That the dedication of oil may have been
associated with palatial feasts has been argued by Bendall, who has compared festival names and
lists of personnel on tablets associated with feasts to tablets in the Fr series, and by Fappas, who
proposes that scented oil may have been used to attract deities and/or to perform rituals of
purification.\(^{571}\)

In the Fr tablets, Pylos is not a common location for oil dedications. The most popular
places are ro-u-si-jo (Louso) and pa-ki-ja-na (Pakijana). It is significant, however, that in
addition to deities the wanax is also listed as the recipient (in the Dative) of oil in four (or
possibly five) Fr tablets: Fr 1215, 1220, 1227, 1234(?), and 1235. As discussed by Shelmerdine,

\(^{569}\) Shelmerdine 1985, p. 25. “Cyperus-scented” is also recorded on the tablets, but Shelmerdine counts this plant
among the astringents added to the virgin oil in order to prepare it to receive the more pleasing final scents (ibid., pp.
25-26). Large quantities of oil listed in the Fr series were intended for industrial purposes rather than ritual use
\(^{570}\) Shelmerdine 1985, pp. 124-125.
\(^{571}\) Bendall 1998-1999; Fappas 2008, esp. p. 374. See also Murphy 2010. The theory that oil was used to attract
deities is based on Fappas’ interpretation of PY Un 853 which records oil together with wool. This wool, Fappas
hypothesizes, may have been used to sprinkle scent around the room following the similar practice by the Hittites.
this use of the term *wanax* in the Fr series has prompted considerable debate over whether the figure had a human or divine status.\(^{572}\) While the debate remains unresolved, recent favor has been given to the argument that the *wanax* mentioned in these tablets was a human king.\(^{573}\) Shelmerdine argues:

“Not all of the oil would necessarily have been given to divinities; and the king might figure as a recipient without this implying either that the king himself was thought to be divine or that a separate divinity was meant. On other tablets (e.g. Ta 711) the *wanax* is clearly human; and there is no additional word on the Fr tablets to distinguish this *wanax* from him. Methodologically it seems better to assume that the human king is meant, in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary; and this not even the Fr texts seem to provide.”\(^{574}\)

If the *wanax* in the Fr tablets was indeed a human recipient of oil, the question arises as to why he was afforded this particular privilege. On the one hand, even if not strictly “divine” it is likely that the *wanax* was considered at least marginally “sacred” because of his primary role in religious ceremonies, which, Palaima and Wright have suggested, ensured the “well-being” of the entire community.\(^{575}\) As suggested by Bendall, because of the clear ritual context in which the oil was offered the *wanax* mentioned in the Fr series may have been “operating in some way ‘on behalf of’ the gods.”\(^{576}\) Maran and Stavrianopoulou have taken this idea even further, suggesting that the *wanax* assumed “sacral traits” by merging with the goddess during performed epiphanies, and making her “supernatural power felt through his deeds.”\(^{577}\)

On the other hand, it is possible that the oil was not given to the human *wanax* as a ritual offering but rather provided to him for the purpose of employing it in a ritual. Possible evidence

\(^{572}\) Shelmerdine 1985, pp. 77-78. See, for example, Dietrich 1974; Bennett 1958, p. 26; Palaima 1995; Stavrianopoulou 1995; Bendall 1998-1999, pp. 6-7. Most recently, Susan Lupack has proposed an alternative reading wherein the *wanax* referred to in the Fr series is not the living individual but rather the divinized “original or ancestral *wanax*, that is, the *wanax* who was thought to have founded the institution of the *wanaktes* and who was probably considered the forefather of the *wanax* governing Pylos when the palace was destroyed” (2014, p. 170).


\(^{574}\) Shelmerdine 1985, p. 78.

\(^{575}\) Palaima 1995, p. 131; Wright 1994, p. 57.


\(^{577}\) Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007, p. 290.
for this theory, I suggest, comes from tablet PY Fr 1184, in which an allotment of oil is delivered to an unguent boiler named Eumedes:

**Fr 1184**

1. *ko-ka-ro, a-pe-do-ke, e-ra3-wo, to-so*
2. *e-u-me-de-i*  
OLE + WE 18
3. *pa-ro, i-pe-se-wa, / ka-ra-re-we*  
38

1. Kokalos delivered so much olive oil
2. to Eumedes:  
518.4  
1
3. From Ipsewas oil jars:  
38

In this tablet, Eumedes (in the Dative), Peter van Alfen has argued, received oil specifically for the purpose of infusing it with scent. By grammatical analogy, the *wanax*, like Eumedes, may have been meant to *do something* with his allotment of oil (e.g., pour a libation?) rather than simply receive it as an offering.

*The Central Hearth*

*Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations*

The final built feature of the Pylos megaron to be discussed in this chapter is the central hearth. Located in the Throne Room, the hearth is by far the largest feature in the suite, and, because of its clear parallels, the only feature whose identification can be considered secure. As described by Blegen and Rawson, the hearth, roughly centered in the room, is nearly circular

---

578 Text and translation from Shelmerdine 1985, p. 24. That Eumenes was an unguent-boiler (*a-re-po-zo-o*) is not indicated in this tablet, but in tablets PY Ea 812, Ea 820, and Fg 374, where his name is mentioned together with his profession (Shelmerdine 1985, p. 24; van Alfen 2008, p. 264).

579 That it was Eumenes’ job to convert the oil into an unguent is discussed by van Alfen, who suggests that the 38 jars in line 3 belonging to Ipsewas may have been empty (intended to hold the finished unguent) or full of the raw, unscented oil dispersed to Eumenes by Ipsewas (van Alfen 2008, pp. 263-264).

580 This theory requires that the *wanax* be present to receive the offering (rather than it being offered in his honor, for example). That this was the intended meaning of these particular Fr tablets is suggested by various theories that debate whether “*wanax*” was a title reserved for one individual (i.e., the *wanax* at Pylos), or rather was used more generally for regional officials, who presided over festivals outside of the capital (Hooker 1979, p. 111).
with a diameter of roughly 4.00 m. (Figure 4.49).\textsuperscript{581} The edge of the hearth, roughly 0.20 m. above the floor, is encircled by a wide rim consisting of an outer ledge (0.10 m. to 0.12 m. wide) and an inner raised surface (0.32 m. to 0.36 m. wide). The hearth’s central floor (-0.02 m. to -0.03 m. below the level of the rim) has a diameter of ca. 3.00 m. The floor was coated in rough plaster and described by the excavators as: “blackened all over and…somewhat broken, cracked, and buckled, [displaying] a good many dents, probably made by wreckage that fell from the clerestory” (Figure 4.50).\textsuperscript{582}

In contrast to the rough plaster of the inner floor, the hearth’s rim was found coated with five coats of fine plaster with repeating painted decoration on at least the final three coats (Figure 4.51).\textsuperscript{583} The upper surface is decorated with a pattern of running double (or “in and out”) spirals painted white with a black outline. The triangular fields above and below the running spirals are filled with red and yellow paint and the edges of the hearth’s rim are bordered by thick black bands. On the rim’s outer ledge is a black and white saw-tooth/notched pattern with crudely drawn black dot-rosettes in its interstices.\textsuperscript{584} Finally, around the hearth’s vertical edge is a repeating “flame” pattern (Figure 4.52). On plaster coats 3 and 5, black flames were rendered on a white ground. On coat 4, the colors were inverted: white flames on a black ground. On coats 4 and 5, the flames bend to the left while on coat 3 they bend to the right (see Figure 4.51).\textsuperscript{585}

In \textit{PN I}, Blegen and Rawson noted a strong connection between this hearth and that found by Tsountas in the megaron at Mycenae (Figure 4.53).\textsuperscript{586} As described by Winifred Lamb, the hearth at Mycenae preserved ten layers of painted plaster, all of which overlaid a “ring of

\textsuperscript{581} \textit{PN I}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{582} \textit{PN I}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{583} \textit{PN I}, pp. 85-87; Blegen 1953, p. 61. While traces of all five plaster coats are extant, only coats 3, 4, and 5 have clearly visible decoration, as seen in a large break in the hearth’s northwestern edge.
\textsuperscript{584} \textit{PN I}, p. 86. For field sketches of the saw-tooth, flame, and spiral designs, see GEM 1952, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{585} \textit{PN I}, pp. 86-87. On the outermost coat, Vanderpool noted the presence of red “outlines” (i.e., sketches) underneath the black flames (\textit{ibid.}, p. 86).
\textsuperscript{586} Tsountas 1886, p. 67.
The decorations on this hearth were very similar to those noted at Pylos, including: a “wave pattern” (close to the Pylian “flame” pattern) on the vertical edge, a “wave” (close to the Pylian saw-tooth) design on the narrow outer ledge, and a running spiral around the horizontal surface of the upper rim (Figure 4.55). The only substantial difference between the two hearths, as noted by Blegen and Rawson, was the occasional inclusion of dot rosettes (on plaster coats 3 and 6) between the “waves” around the vertical edge of the hearth at Mycenae – details that were not observed at Pylos.

The Pylos central hearth, Blegen and Rawson argued, was multifunctional. On account of its grand size, the feature was described as “ceremonial” but undoubtedly also “served also for heating the apartment in the winter, and it could well have been used even for roasting a whole ox for a banquet.” A side effect of the hearth, the excavators added, was to enliven the room’s atmosphere: “In its original state the Throne Room must have been a bright and cheerful apartment, especially in the light of a great fire blazing on the hearth.” In PN II, Lang added her opinion that the hearth shared a “common function” with the site’s tables of offerings. The tables and hearth, she observed, were similar in construction (plaster over a clay core) and each featured the flame motif as part of its decoration.

As for the meaning of the flame, however, Lang argued there was nothing inherently numinous about the motif despite the fact that its repetition in a variety of contexts had prompted some scholars “to see in it a mark of universal, hence sacred significance.” This reaction was largely in response to the work of Lamb, who, following Evans, drew a connection between what

---

589 PN I, p. 87; Wace et al. 1921-1923, pl. XLI.
590 PN I, p. 78.
591 PN I, p. 78.
592 PN II, p. 187.
593 PN II, p. 144.
she referred to as the “wave and star” decoration around the fixed hearth at Mycenae and the
same design found on MM III tables of offerings from the West Court Kouloures at Knossos (see
Figure 3.1). She explained: “The resemblance between these [tripod offering tables] and the
Mycenae hearth suggests that the latter should itself be regarded as a large immovable altar or
table of offering rather than as a hearth for purely domestic uses.” The repetition of the wave
design on all ten of the Mycenae hearth’s plaster coats, Lamb further proposed, corroborated her
argument that the motif had “religious associations.”

Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies

Following the publication of PN I and PN II, scholarly opinions about the function of the
central hearth of the Pylos megaron have varied considerably. As discussed in Chapter 2, in the
1980s Blegen and Rawson’s assertion that the hearth was “ceremonial” was supported by
Säflund and Hägg. Judging from the thousands of kylikes found at Pylos and the images of
dining and animal procession in the megaron’s wall paintings, Säflund contended that the palace
had once been the site of large-scale banquets during which bulls were sacrificed on the central
hearth, which was, like cult statues in Classical Greek temples, “literally and figuratively the
focus of the whole establishment.” In 1987, this view was countered by McCallum on the
basis of both iconographic and practical considerations. First, having re-evaluated the Pylos

594 Wace et al. 1921-1923, p. 241; PM I, p. 551. Evan’s initial theory, which proposed simply that the notched plume
design was a shared iconographic element between the two types of hearths (portable and fixed), was subsequently
refined in PM IV, pp. 178-181, where he, following Lamb, identified a religious connection between the two uses of
the motif.
595 Wace et al. 1921-1923, p. 241. See the echo of this idea in Müller 1930 (pp. 197-198) and more recently in
Castleden 2005 (p. 157). The connection between the fixed hearth at Mycenae and the portable tables at Knossos,
Evans articulated, was that the latter served as the direct antecedent of the former: “In the earlier period at least, the
decorators of the palace at Mycenae were craftsmen from the great insular seat of the Minoan civilization, and their
acclimatized successors, as in this instance, faithfully preserved its tradition” (PM I, p. 551).
hearths for burnt sacrifice, see Jameson 1958, p. 223.
megaron’s wall paintings in toto, she concluded that the images of dining, animal procession, and animal slaughter on the walls were not meant to be taken as a literal reflection of activities that took place in the megaron, but rather designed to illustrate components of a religious festival performed out of doors.\(^{599}\) That such events took place outside, she contended, was indicated by the inclusion of buildings and landscape elements in the paintings as well as the fact that it would have been physically impractical (or more likely, impossible) to maneuver a live bull into the Pylos Throne Room.\(^ {600}\)

In 1990, in an article dedicated to the study of Mycenaean palatial hearths, de Pierpont revived the ideas that the Pylos hearth was used for more practical needs. Echoing the suggestion by Blegen and Rawson, he argued that the great hearths at Pylos and the other Mycenaean citadels were well suited for heating the palatial apartments, particularly during the cold winter months when portable braziers would have been less effective.\(^ {601}\) In addition, de Pierpont claimed, the central hearth would have provided light (although the fire would not have been lit explicitly for this purpose) and served as a cooking surface.\(^ {602}\) While the hearth itself bore no traces of its use as a “feu de cuisine,” de Pierpont contended that “Des traces de vaisselle indiquent que l’on [i.e., the inhabitants of the Mycenaean palaces] sans doute mange dans la grande sale.”\(^ {603}\) This claim he further supported with evidence from the Homeric epics, in which hearths were used for roasting meat.\(^ {604}\)

De Pierpont also suggested that the hearth served as the center of domestic activity in the Mycenaean palace. Much like hearths in more modest structures of the Bronze Age, the

\(^{599}\) McCallum 1987.  
\(^{600}\) McCallum 1987, pp. 120, 139-140.  
\(^{601}\) De Pierpont 1990, p. 257.  
\(^{602}\) De Pierpont 1990, p. 258.  
\(^{603}\) De Pierpont 1990, p. 258.  
\(^{604}\) De Pierpont 1990, p. 258.
monumental hearth in its central location would have attracted casual visitors, who could have sat nearby while they relaxed or performed everyday tasks.\textsuperscript{605} That the hearth also served in an official capacity, de Pierpont inferred from the interpretation of the Throne Room as a royal reception hall. Elaborately decorated, the hearth, he mused, would have provided a backdrop for political interchanges as well as ceremonies.\textsuperscript{606} In this capacity, however, the feature did not serve as “un veritable accessoire de culte.” Like Lang, de Pierpont contended that the flames around the edges of palatial hearths were not \textit{a priori} sacred motifs and, moreover, the elaborate decoration (and large size) of hearths could easily be attributed to the feature’s palatial setting:

\begin{quote}
“La dimension et le décor de ces larges ἐσχάραι semblent être en fait plus des conséquences de leur localisation que d’une fonction particulière. Ces foyers sont en effet ceux d’un palais, et leur allure est proportionnelle à l’importance et à la magnificence de la salle dont ils occupent le centre.”\textsuperscript{607}
\end{quote}

The lack of physical evidence (e.g., \textit{ex votos}) for formalized ritual activities, de Pierpont further claimed, indicated that these hearths were, at most, of “un caractère secondaire et accessoire.”\textsuperscript{608}

While de Pierpont cast doubt on the importance of the Pylos hearth as a locale for ritual activity, a new defense of this idea was proposed by Wright in the mid-1990s. The \textit{wanax}, Wright contended, was both physically and symbolically tied to the great hearth, with which the royal throne was directly aligned. The nature of this bond, which formed the basis of what Wright termed “hearth-\textit{wanax} ideology,” was primarily religious. The great hearth, located “at the centre of the physical sphere of Mycenaean society” was the site of rituals conducted by the \textit{wanax}, which ensured the prosperity of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{609} As Wright explained: “[the \textit{wanax}]…may have been the guardian of the hearth, and in so far as the hearth represents the

\begin{footnotes}
\item De Pierpont 1990, p. 258.
\item De Pierpont 1990, p. 259. He cites, for example, the example of oath-taking near hearths in the \textit{Odyssey}. Similar ideas about the role of hearths in domestic cult in Mycenaean Greece as inferred primarily from literary evidence appear in the work of Louis Deroy (1950, esp. pp. 38-42).
\item De Pierpont 1990, p. 261, and summary at end of volume; \textit{PN} II, p. 144.
\item Wright 1994, p. 57, building on earlier ideas about “\textit{wanax} ideology” proposed by Kilian (1988), see Chapter 2.
\end{footnotes}
household, as the guardian of the family, protector of the household, and guarantor of its future.” At Pylos, further evidence for the sacred character of the megaron’s hearth, Wright argued, included its physical association with “religious paraphernalia” (including the table of offerings and the libation channel) and its flame decoration, which, he argued, “reinforce[d] the notion of the sacred fire which [the hearth] contained.

In the twenty-first century, the role of the hearth continues to be debated. In 2010, Farmer reasserted the idea that the hearth was the most central and important feature in the Mycenaean megaron, preferring (as Mylonas, Blegen, and Vanderpool did during the 1952 excavation season at Pylos) to employ the term “Hearth Room” rather than “Throne Room.” Nelson, however, has refocused attention on the physical character of the hearth and the logistics of its use. Based on his intensive study of the architecture of the Pylos Throne Room, Nelson reasoned that the size of that fire on the hearth must have been considerably smaller than its ca. 3.00 m. interior diameter would allow. A full blaze, he cautioned, would “not only have overheated the room quite quickly but would have endangered anything near it, including the wooden columns.”

Part III: New Evidence

Unlike in the case of the sentry stands, the throne space, and the libation channel, examination of field notes and the in situ hearth itself has produced no new information regarding the feature’s physical appearance or construction. It is still possible, however, to
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610 Wright 1994, p. 57.
611 Wright 1994, p. 57.
612 Farmer 2011; 2012; GEM 1952, passim.
614 Anecdotally, we learn that Mylonas interpreted the hearth as a raised dais or altar when he first began to uncover it, but quickly changed his mind once the full feature had been exposed (GEM 1952, pp. 21, 25, 37).
evaluate existing theories about the hearth’s significance and function by taking a fresh look at familiar data, most notably the painted patterns, parts of which were cleaned by Zokos under the auspices of HARP in 2010 (Figures 4.56 and 4.57).

The Significance of Repeated Motifs

As noted by Blegen and Rawson, the two most prominent motifs on the Pylos hearth, the running spiral and the flame (Figure 4.58), were repeated on at least three of the hearth’s five coats of plaster.615 Because re-plastering allows for decoration to be changed easily, it is significant that the motifs on the hearth were consistently refreshed – a conclusion also reached by Lamb for the hearth at Mycenae.616 At Pylos, the only other paintings in which such repetition is clearly evident are the imitation stone dadoes. As described by Lang, the three layers of superimposed plaster on the lower portions of the western anta that separates the outer and inner porches of the Propylon (Rooms 1 and 2) each preserve painted imitations of cut stone slabs rendered with broad arcs of blue, pink, and red color overlaid by thin black lines indicating veining (Figure 4.59).617

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the painted dadoes and the painted hearth. Whereas the dadoes were meant to be representations of a material (i.e., stone) whose depiction on the wall was dictated by architectural convention, the same is not true for the design of hearth’s flames and/or spirals. Both the motifs and their repetition, therefore, must be significant. As noted above, some attempt to assess this significance was made by Lamb, who identified a religious connection between the “wave and star” decoration on the hearth at Mycenae and that on Knossian tables of offering. The transfer of this decoration from the older

615 PN I, pp. 85-87.
616 Wace 1921-1923, p. 241. Lamb ascribed this significance to “conservative taste or religious associations” (ibid.).
617 PN II, pp. 170-171 (cat. nos. 2 D 1; 3 D 1; and 7 D 2).
Cretan tables to the later Mycenaean hearth, Lamb argued, was indicative of a parallel transfer of function – the hearth serving as a large, fixed version of the smaller, portable altars.618

While it is true that motifs can, through their repeated use in consistent contexts and/or with consistent visual associations, become loaded symbols that imply the transfer of meaning, in this particular case it is unlikely because the connection between the decoration on Minoan offering tables and that on Mycenaean fixed hearths is tenuous. While Evans and Lamb identified the wave design on the portable tables from Knossos and the fixed hearth from Mycenae as comparable, closer inspection reveals an important difference: on the tables, the motif is pendant, with the tips of the dark curved elements pointing downward (see Figure 3.1), while on the hearth the design is flipped, with the tips of the dark curved elements rising up from the floor (see Figures 4.55 and 4.58).619 While this change in the orientation of the motif may seem minor, I would argue that it is meaningful – representing an intentional departure from iconography developed in the period between MM III and LM/LH IIIA.

The Development of the Wave/Flame Motif

As illustrated by its use on plastered offering tables found in the Knossian West Court Kouloures (discussed above), the pendant version of the wave design in Aegean art first appeared on Crete in MM III. In the same period, the motif, which Evans called a “notched plume,” also appeared on the wings of griffins and sphinxes, including examples found in two Knossian wall paintings (Figures 4.60 and 4.61).620 In LM IA, the notched plume continued to be
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619 The only exceptions to this rule are the pendant wave designs on plaster coat 2A on the Mycenae hearth (see Figure 4.55) and on plaster coat four of the Pylos hearth (see Figure 4.58), both of which will be discussed below.
620 PM I, pp. 548-549, figs. 399b, 400. See also discussion of this motif by Carole d’Albiac (1995, p. 64) and Morgan (2010, p. 311). For a slightly earlier example of a griffin with notched plume wing patterns in Near Eastern wall paintings, see the MM II/III example from Kabri (Niemeier and Niemeier 2000, p. 779, fig. 13).
used as a wing pattern, both in wall painting and also in glyptic. Examples of the former can be
found at Agia Irini on Kea (on a griffin from House A (Figure 4.62)), at Akrotiri (on the griffin
from the West House Nilotic Scene (Figure 4.63) as well as on the large example seated behind
the goddess in Xesté 3 (see Figure 4.44)), and perhaps at Phylakopi (on a griffin decorating the
robes of a female figure). Further afield, this recognizably “Minoan” design element also
entered the artistic repertoire in Egypt, as illustrated by the griffin depicted on a ceremonial axe
(Figure 4.64) from the reign of Ahmose I.

In LM IB, the notched plume motif, still pendant, became popular on decorated pottery,
where, for example, it was employed as band design on a cup rhyton from Knossos (Figures
4.65) and in association with molded snakes (the basis of Evan’s alternative term for the motif,
“adder mark”). In the later Late Bronze Age, the association between the pendant notched
plume and griffin wings persisted on Crete, where it appeared on the LM IIIA Hagia Triada
sarcophagus (Figure 4.66). At this time, the motif also spread to the Greek mainland, where it
was applied to the wings of early Mycenaean representations of griffins including that on the LH
II lentoid seal from Vapheio (see Figure 4.43) and arguably on the LH IIIA flattened gold signet
bead from Tholos IV at Pylos (Figure 4.67).

In each of the above representations, dating from MM III to LM/LH IIIA, the design and
orientation of the notched plume/adder mark is the same: pendant curved elements, often
punctuated by small dot rosettes in their interstices. This is true of the motif when it appeared on
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621 Knossos: *PM I*, pp. 548-550, figs. 400 and 399b; Akrotiri: Doumas 1992, pls. 32 and 128; Morgan 1988, pp. 49-
54, fig. 186; Agia Irini: Davis 2007, pp. 148-149, fig. 17.1 J; Phylakopi: D’Albiac 1995, p. 64.
622 *PM I*, pp. 550-551; Morgan 2010, p. 308.
623 *PM IV*, pp. 183-184, fig. 145a. On the Knossos cup-rython, see recently Koehl 2006, p. 226, fig. 44, pl. 55
(“Type IV,” no. 1247). For the use of the adder mark on LM IB pottery, see also Popham 1967, p. 340, fig. 2.13.
624 In this example, the rosettes are drawn as simple red blobs, which D’Albiac (1995, p. 68) has argued represents
the “memory of the true Minoan notched plume pattern.”
625 For discussion of the Pylian bead, see *PN III*, pp. 113-114. As the excavators note, the marks on this griffin’s
wings are simply small dots, which they suggest may indicate multi-colored features (*PN III*, p. 114). It is also
likely, however, that these dots were simplified versions of the pendant notched plume.
the wings of griffins *and* when it was used as a decorative band on pottery and tables of offering.\textsuperscript{626} It is for this reason that the rising version of the motif present on fixed Mycenaean hearths seems unusual. Rather than follow more than three hundred years of tradition, at some point in LH IIIA the motif underwent a reorientation that signaled a “break” from the pre-existing iconographic canon. While the pendant notched plume/adder mark had become a fixture in Minoan art, the rising version of the motif (i.e., the wave/flame) made its first appearance on Mycenaean palatial hearths, to which it remained attached throughout the remainder of the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{627} In this new context, the change in the motif’s physical form suggests that its meaning was being re-cast. Originally understood as a stylized representation of animal anatomy (feathers or scales), the design was transformed into a representation of fire – the upward springing curved elements representing flames – in order to reference, as Wright argued, the “contents” of the hearth.\textsuperscript{628}

*Part IV: Old Theories Reconsidered and New Ideas*

Based on this evidence, there is *no* direct link between the notched plume/adder mark on MM III tables of offering from Knossos and the wave/flame pattern on LH III Mycenaean

\textsuperscript{626} It is also drawn in this manner on the hem of the kilt worn by the male figure in the LH II/IIIA Cupbearer Fresco from Knossos (*PM* II, pl. XII).

\textsuperscript{627} At Mycenae, we may even have evidence of the first decision to flip the design to suit this new context. As shown in Figure 4.55, while the first rendering of a flame-like design on its outer vertical face (face “A”) of the hearth (on plaster coat 2) featured pendant “teeth,” on coat 3 these were teeth flipped to rising flames, which became the standard motif repeated on subsequent coats 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The vertical rim decoration on plaster coats 1 and 10, as noted by Lamb (*Wace et al. 1921-1923*, pp. 242-243), was not visible/preserved. I would guess, however, that coat 10 was almost certainly decorated with rising (rather than pendant) flames. Also, in the layers of plaster on the Pylos hearth, there is one coat (coat 4) in which the flame design is inverted – becoming pendant rather than rising. Rather than a reversion back to the older “notched plume,” I believe that in this case the design is an attempt to randomize the flame pattern *after* it has become well-established as the standard “hearth decoration in order to instill it with new energy, similar to what was done by switching the direction of the flame motif on plaster coats 3 and 5.

\textsuperscript{628} Wright 1994, p. 57. At Pylos, this association with fire is made even more clear by the absence of rosettes between the flames (present on the hearth at Mycenae), lessening the motif’s likeness to a griffin wing or decorative band. This relationship is similar to that created by Classical *metasympotic* vases, which feature painted scenes that reflect the vessels’ functions.
palatial hearths. There is no reason, therefore, to derive the function of the latter from the former, as was done by Lamb and Evans. There is reason, however, to infer shared meaning between the fixed hearths and contemporary Mycenaean tables of offering, which also feature the rising flame motif.

*Fixed Hearths and Portable Tables of Offering*

From Pylos, Lang published six examples of fragmentary tables of offerings with the flame pattern: 1 T nw, 2 T 17, 3 T 23, 4 T 23, 7 T sw, and 8 T ne (Figure 4.68). Of these six tables, the last three feature the flame pattern around their exterior vertical edges. In addition, my own survey of the contents of the storage drawers in Apotheke 1 of the Chora Museum uncovered an additional fourteen fragments of tables of offerings with flame pattern. Four of the new fragments feature rising flames on their vertical edges (Figure 4.69), while twelve have flames on their horizontal rims.

Compared to other Aegean sites, Pylos has an unusual preponderance of tables with this decorative design. At LH III Mycenae, for example, only one fragmentary table (from the Ramp House, Figure 4.70) has been identified with this design while others (examples of which are shown in Figure 4.71) are decorated with wavy bands, a design also found on a table from Tiryns.
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629PN II, pp. 186-189.
630 These fragments are HARP numbers: WP151.008-MNe, WP147.070-SW, WP147.048-SW, WP147.49-SW, WP205.078, WP068.046-31, WP207.270, WP208.202, WP208.202, WP201.267, WP206.076, WP207.271, WP207.272, and WP207.272. To this group it may be possible to add six more fragments: WP062.054-23, WP195.206, WP205.086, WP208.197, WP202.134, and WP204.134, although their surfaces are too deteriorated to be certain of their decoration.
631 Fragments with flames on their upright edges are HARP numbers: WP151.008-MNe, WP147.070-SW, WP068.046-31, and WP201.267. Those fragments with flames on their rims are HARP numbers: WP151.008-MNe, WP147.048-SW, WP147.049-SW, WP205.078, WP068.046-31, WP207.270, WP208.202, WP208.202, WP201.267, WP207.271, WP207.272, and WP207.272.
(Figure 4.72) and on earlier examples from Crete (e.g., at Nirou Chani).\textsuperscript{632} While the concentration of tables with flame pattern at Pylos may simply be a product of differential preservation, it could alternatively suggest a strong connection at this site between tables of offerings and the central hearth.\textsuperscript{633} On account of the hearth’s size and fixed position in a central room, it may have served as the decorative inspiration for the smaller portable tables. In studies of Aegean art, it has been frequently argued that elements from “major” works of art were excerpted for use on “minor” objects – a classic example being the transfer of patterns and figural elements from wall paintings to ceramics, as originally observed by Evans.\textsuperscript{634} This is not to say that tables with flame decoration from Pylos served as “portable hearths.” While such an interpretation for the Pylos tables is tempting on account of their poor condition (nearly all of the tables are represented by only their rims) the absence of burning on the preserved floor of a published table with flame decoration (1 T nw) argues against this explanation (see Figure 4.68).\textsuperscript{635}

Instead, I would suggest that the portable tables with flame decoration at Pylos were used to make small dedications to the same deities venerated on the central hearth. By painting the tables with flame motifs, the Pylian artists, it would seem, captured the essence of the monumental hearth in “miniature” and allowed its power to circulate (physically and metaphorically) outside of the Throne Room and to be venerated in other, perhaps more intimate, settings. On account of their small size, these tables could have been set up nearly anywhere in

\textsuperscript{632} Mycenae: Lamb and Wace: 1919/1920-1920/1921, p. 119, pl. X, no. ii; Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 224-226, fig. 42, and pls. XXXVIIa-c; Tiryns: Rodenwaldt 1912, p. 63, fig. 25; Nirou Chani: Xanthoudides 1922, fig. 12. As noted by Wace et al., one of the tables from the Mycenae “Shrine” also featured a boar’s tusk helmet on one of its legs (1921-1923, p. 225). For a synthetic account of these and other Mycenaean tables of offering, see Polychronakou-Sgouritsa 1982.

\textsuperscript{633} As Lang originally suspected (PN II, p. 187).

\textsuperscript{634} PM II, pp. 447-448. Also see Betancourt 1985, pp. 142-143, who refers to this phenomenon as “anecdotal” borrowing.

\textsuperscript{635} PN II, p. 187, pl. 114. This is the only table of offerings from Pylos found with part of its floor intact.
the palace (or its environs) and received token offerings in imitation of the larger dedications offered by the wanax on the central hearth. In this scenario, other individuals at the palace would, in a way, “perform” the role of the wanax (or other enthroned figure) by replicating his (or her?) ritual actions at the hearth on a smaller scale, perhaps as a means to effect personal rather than communal outcomes.

It is also possible that the tables were used to reverence the wanax. This theory, which is far more speculative, builds on the idea, at the core of Wright’s “hearth-wanax ideology,” that the central hearth and the enthroned figure in the megaron were indelibly linked. The hearth, as the physical and ideological heart of the palace, Wright has suggested, served as a metaphor for the enthroned, who maintained the health and security of the Mycenaean community through the performance of hearth-based rituals. On its own, therefore, the great hearth could have served as proxy for the wanax, and its miniature copies as a means for his authority to travel beyond the Throne Room and to be felt and reverenced by private individuals.

The Spiral as a Form of Kinesthetic Address

In addition to the flame pattern, the running spiral design also sheds new light on use of the Pylos hearth. Like the flames, the spiral, which decorated the upper rim of the hearth, was refreshed over and over and as such was likely conceived by the Pylians as more than simply decorative. In the Aegean, the spiral, like the “notched plume,” has often been ascribed a
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636 This argument is perhaps corroborated by the absence of flame (or any other) decoration on the table of offerings found in the Throne Room, suggesting that decorated tables were utilized elsewhere in the palace.

637 This suggestion gains further support from the debated idea, discussed above, that the wanax may have been, and/or played the role of, a divine figure.

638 The role of the spiral pattern on the Pylos hearth was not discussed by Lang, but judging from her comments about spirals in the palace’s wall paintings, her general attitude was that the design served strictly as decoration (PN II, pp. 145-146).
special significance.\textsuperscript{639} In recent discourse, the motif has been tied to royal power. Stefan Hiller, for example, has proposed that the spiral on the hearth at Pylos served as a “royal emblem” because of its place of prominence in the megaron.\textsuperscript{640} Additional evidence, Hiller argued, came from Tiryns, where the spiral motif was also used to embellish the stone podium for the LH IIIA throne (see Figure 4.28).\textsuperscript{641} As he explains, “the spiral is integrated with the structure that supports the throne. By framing the king’s seat, it demarcates an area of ‘distance’ and dignity and symbolically enhances the statement of extreme nobility and highest sovereignty.”\textsuperscript{642} Hiller’s arguments are intriguing and are potentially further confirmed by the use of the spiral motif on the hearth and associated “chimney piece” (11 M 46) from Hall 46 (Figures 4.73 and 4.74), a room also believed by Blegen and Rawson, and more recently McCallum, to have had royal associations.\textsuperscript{643}

It is also possible, however that the spiral, like the flame, was closely connected to the hearth itself, and specifically to how it was meant to be experienced by the ancient viewer. While the flame pattern reinforced the hearth’s function as a setting for fire, the running spirals, which curl both backwards and forwards in perpetual motion, would have enlivened the visual experience of the live leaping flames. The coils’ dynamic movement may have also enticed the viewer to circle around the hearth. In art historical studies, it has been often argued that the movement of a spectator in a given space is directed by means of visual cues built into the surrounding architecture and decoration. The term for this interaction, as defined by John R. Clarke, is “kinesthetic address” (or “spectator address”). According to Clarke, kinesthetic

\textsuperscript{639} Cf. the opinion of Georgina Muskett, who has identified the spiral, in use in Greece since the late Neolithic period, as an example of an “aesthetic primitive”... “seemingly without an underlying symbolic meaning” (2005, pp. 10-11). For further exploration of this idea in Mycenaean figural art, see Muskett 2007.
\textsuperscript{640} Hiller 2005, p. 264, offering the same interpretation for the similar hearth at Mycenae.
\textsuperscript{641} Hiller 2005, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{642} Hiller 2005, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{643} PN I, pp. 197-202, fig. 149; McCallum 1987, p. 105.
address (or “spectator address”) is the “power of the image to confront and affect (direct) the viewer...it is concerned with aspects of human perception: the actual physiology of seeing, the identification of the subject represented, and the psychology of following pattern (that is, human reaction to design directions).” Typically, this idea has been applied to the art and architecture of historical periods and, for “low-lying” decoration, to the study of mosaic floors. Working with mosaics from Hadrianic bath complexes at Ostia, Clarke, for example has demonstrated how black and white figural mosaics (Figures 4.75 and 4.76) were instrumental to how a visitor would have experienced different rooms – the changing orientations of the figures encouraging him to move “continuously around” in order to emulate their varying motions and positions.

At Pylos, the running spiral decoration on the hearth may have had a similar kinesthetic effect. Moving both left and right simultaneously, the design, on its own, does not have a clear directional thrust. However, when considered in combination with the sharp, intentional diagonal in the room’s floor decoration (discussed in Chapter 5), the spirals would have provided a strong secondary cue to the viewer. Whereas the diagonal grid lines would have instructed the visitor to move first to the right, toward the throne, the spirals would have encouraged him to “double back” toward the entrance and make his way clockwise around the Throne Room’s perimeter. This reconstruction complements the model proposed by Thaler, who has compellingly argued for clockwise movement in the Pylos Throne Room. As one piece of evidence, Thaler cited the rightward march of a group of male figures in wall painting fragment group 45 H 6 (Figure 4.77) restored by Lang to the room’s SE wall. While Thaler argued that this fragment reflected the direction of visitors’ movement, he had trouble identifying it as an instructional “sign-post” (a
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644 Clarke 1979, p. 20.
645 Clarke 1979, p. 29.
term borrowed from McCallum) on account of its position on the wall behind the visitor as he entered the room. By having the visitor walk first toward the throne and then turn back, as I have suggested, however, he would have had a greater chance of seeing this painting, enticing him to be actively “moved along” by its figures.

As a result of this clockwise motion, the visitor would have experienced the Throne Room from a variety of perspectives. Perhaps most important among these, as identified by Thaler, was that acquired from a position in front of the room’s SW wall directly opposite the throne. As Thaler explains, this position was important because it provided the visitor with a structured visual icon that combined the enthroned wanax with the adjacent pair (or, as Thaler argues, pairs) of lion(s) and griffin(s) (Figure 4.78). Whether this point marked the end of the visitor’s perambulations, or whether he continued (as Thaler hypothesized was possible for privileged guests) to the far side of the Throne Room, the visitor’s eventual return to the doorway would have been facilitated again by the perpetual motion of the hearth’s spirals, which would have pulled him back just as easily as they had pushed him forward.

The Flame and Spiral Together

While the above analyses provide strong evidence that the flames and spiral pattern served separate symbolic functions and visual objectives, the potent combination of the two motifs together warrants further discussion. In Aegean Bronze Age iconography, one of the only
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647 McCallum 1987, pp. 70-71 and passim.
648 Thaler 2012a, p. 196.
649 Thaler 2012b, p. 121. For discussion of the construction of visual icons in Aegean art see Crowley 1992. The debate concerning whether there was a single lion and griffin to the right of the throne or whether the throne was flanked by pairs of these beasts remains unresolved. Thaler, following Blegen and Rawson (PN I, p. 79) and Lang (PN II, p. 194-195), has argued for two pairs, while McCallum (1987, pp. 99-101) has argued for only one. The resolution of this question must await the re-study of the wall painting fragments from the Throne Room by the members of HARP. Given the evidence of the functional link between the lion and griffin and the libation channel discussed above, however, I currently favor McCallum’s reconstruction (see discussion in Chapter 5).
other places where approximations of the two motifs appear side-by-side is in the early (MM III – LM/LH IIIA) representation of the griffin, which routinely features pendant “notched plumes” along its feathered wings’ (discussed above) as well as spiral decoration on its chest and/or its wings’ upper edges (see Figures 4.43, 4.44, 4.45, 4.63, and 4.67). While I have argued that the pendant “notched plume” is fundamentally different from the rising flame pattern, and that the latter represents an deliberate change to the iconographic canon by the mainland Mycenaean who sought to link the hearth’s decoration with its function, the overall visual effect of this triangular motif combined with the spiral, may, I think, have been evocative of the decoration of a griffin for a savvy viewer familiar with its early representations.

This hypothesis, which taps into the difficult issue of artist intention vs. viewer reception in the consumption of ancient art, raises the question of whether such a side effect may have been desirable (or even premeditated) at Pylos given that the wall paintings near the hearth featured prominent griffin imagery. At present, this connection is diminished by the extant fragments of this (these) griffin(s), which include no evidence of either spiral decoration or wings (see Figure 5.7). Griffins from the Throne Room at Knossos, however, do preserve spirals (specifically, J-spirals) on their chests (Figure 4.79). They may also, as Elizabeth Shank has argued based on the evidence of a newly identified wall painting fragment, have had wings (Figure 4.80). If the appearance of the Pylos Throne Room griffins was modeled on these Knossian examples (as has been frequently suggested), the duplication of the spiral and inverted “notched plume” on the nearby hearth may have signified this feature’s connection to

...
the beast, and by extension to the world of the divine and/or to the Pylian royal family which it may have represented.

*The Hearth as a Source of Light*

While restudy of the decoration of the Pylos hearth helps to elucidate its possible religio-kinesthetic roles, a closer look at the feature’s architectural setting further suggests that it served as a regular source of light. Of those functions ascribed to Mycenaean palatial hearths, illumination is rarely discussed. Perhaps considered a more “obvious” use, lighting is routinely overlooked in favor of the hearth’s more unusual and/or specialized roles. At Pylos, the lack of serious consideration of this use has also undoubtedly been influenced by Blegen and Rawson’s claim that the Throne Room was a “bright and cheerful apartment,” as a result of light coming in through the windows of a (reconstructed) second story clerestory and lantern (see Figure 3.4).\(^{654}\) This mental impression is reified in de Jong’s famous watercolor, which shows the entire Throne Room bathed in a bright, saturated light (see Figure 1.4).

This impression of a bright, airy Throne Room, however, is challenged by the work of LaFayette, who has concluded that the room was likely a windowless space. Evidence for LaFayette’s theory derives from the physics of fires, which suffer from severe backdraft if not properly ventilated. Airflow in a chimney, she states, can be positively or negatively affected by open doors or windows depending on the direction of the wind. As such, the windows proposed by Blegen and Rawson (and reconstructed by de Jong) just below the palace’s roofline, LaFayette theorizes, “would not have aided ventilation but instead would have disrupted the

\(^{654}\) *PN* I, pp. 34, 78, fig. 418.
pressure in the room and caused the smoke [from a fire on the central hearth] to swirl down."

Based on this evidence, she proposes a revised reconstruction of the Throne Room with no clerestory and no lantern, and thus no windows (see Figure 3.41).

If LaFayette is correct in her decision to remove the Throne Room’s windows (and I believe that she is), the room would have been protected from smoke-dispersing wind but would also have been denied a strong source of natural light. While a small amount of light would have entered the space via the chimney in the ceiling, it is unlikely that much if any sustained light reached the room this way, or through the doorways of the connecting Vestibule and Portico, which separated the Throne Room from open air Court 3 by more than 10.00 m. While the thresholds between these rooms preserve no evidence of cut doorjambs, Blegen and Rawson suggested that their doorways could be closed by hanging curtains – an inference made for these same doorways in the Tiryns megaron many years earlier. The main source of light in the Pylos Throne Room, then, would have been its hearth, perhaps combined with stone lamps similar to those that de Jong includes (albeit without firm archaeological evidence) in his reconstruction (see Figure 1.4).

This reconstruction of a dark Throne Room that depended on man-made light for illumination is an intriguing piece of evidence for reconstructing the use of the suite as a whole. Superficially, the idea of a dark room links well with Homer’s description of the megaron as “σκιόεις” (“shadowy”) and with Dietrich’s proposed etymology of the term “µέγαρον” from the
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655 LaFayette 2011, pp. 18-19. A clerestory was also proposed by Dörpfeld for the Megaron at Tiryns (Schliemann 1885, pp. 217-222) and suggested as an option by Wace at Mycenae, although he preferred an arrangement with windows (in the hall’s east and south walls) that would have “let in less rain and more light.” (Wace et al. 1921-1923, pp. 326-327).
656 As mentioned in Chapter 2, LaFayette also reconstructs one nested, rather than two separate, chimneys in the Throne Room’s roof which she argues would have aided the egress of smoke from the space.
657 PN I, pp. 38, 72; Schliemann 1885, p. 216.
658 See also Vermeule’s discussion of the use of lamps (and tripod hearths) to light the dark megaron at Pylos (1972, p. 168).
Hebrew word “me’ara” (meaning “cave”) discussed in Chapter 2.\textsuperscript{659} As there is at present no archaeological reason to link the Pylos Throne Room with ritual activities derived from primitive fertility and/or vegetation cults, however, it may be better to consider this murky environment as a mutable “blank canvas” on/in which palace officials could have constructed a range of different atmospheres. Lamps could be lit when desired, and on the hearth officials could have cultivated anything from a blaze that made the room bright and inviting to low burning embers that rendered it dark and mysterious.

In archaeological literature, discussion of the power of illumination in dark spaces has a long history, particularly in reference to Paleolithic cave complexes where it has been argued that ancient visitors were arrested by the “animating” effect of flames on parietal art.\textsuperscript{660} In studies of prehistoric Greece, the concept of lighting was explored over a hundred years ago by Evans in connection with the so-called “Pillar Crypts” in the Knossian palace and surrounding buildings.\textsuperscript{661} Pillar Crypts, he argued, were darkened basement rooms (Figure 4.81) used for ritual activities centered around stone pillars, often carved with double axes, that received food and drink offerings.\textsuperscript{662} The rooms themselves were lit only by artificial light, such as that cast by stone lamps, a broken example of which was found in the basement of the South East House (Figure 4.82).\textsuperscript{663} These lamps, it can be presumed, Evans believed helped to create an atmosphere of mystery and to heighten sensory experience in these special spaces.\textsuperscript{664} While recent research by Kostandinos Christakis suggests that such basement rooms may have been

\textsuperscript{659} E.g. \textit{Od.} 1.365; Dietrich 1973, pp. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{660} See recently work by Marc Azéma (2010) and by Azéma and Florent Rivère (2012).
\textsuperscript{661} E.g., Evans 1901; \textit{PM I}, pp. 144-146 (Monolithic Pillar Basement); 400-404 (North Pillar Crypt); 427-430 (South East House); \textit{PM II}, pp. 383-386 (South House); \textit{PM II}, pp. 406-408 (Royal Villa); 525-527 (Little Palace); \textit{PM IV}, pp. 3-5 (Southwest Pillar Crypt); \textit{PM IV}, pp. 970-973 (Temple Tomb).
\textsuperscript{662} E.g., Evans 1901, p. 12, fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{663} \textit{PM I}, pp. 345, 427-430, fig. 249.
\textsuperscript{664} \textit{PM II}, p. 323-324. See also a reference to the need for artificial light in the Pillar Crypt of the Royal Villa in \textit{PM II}, p. 408.
meant for storage, other studies have continued to investigate the importance of illumination in more securely “ritual” spaces.\textsuperscript{665} Vance Watrous, for example, has suggested the importance of lamps in activities at Psychro cave (perhaps comparable to the use of torches in the later Eleusinian mysteries),\textsuperscript{666} while Lucy Goodison has studied the revelatory effects of sunlight entering the typically “dark and mysterious” Throne Room at Knossos at specific times of year.\textsuperscript{667} In the Pylos Throne Room, the manipulation of firelight in an otherwise dark space could have provided a similarly enhanced visual experience for visitors. The flickering flames, for example, may have animated the paintings on the room’s walls (like in Paleolithic caves) and/or helped to illuminate the figure seated on the throne.\textsuperscript{668} When viewed across a blazing hearth, this same figure could have alternatively been obscured, perhaps, as Thaler has argued, with the aid of “Hitzeflimmern” (heat haze).\textsuperscript{669}

The level of light in the Throne Room may have also helped to differentiate it from other spaces. Varying degrees of illumination, for example, may have helped to “stage” a visitor’s movement through the megaron, perhaps accentuating the feeling of anticipation as he transitioned from the outdoor court to the inner Throne Room.\textsuperscript{670} At Tiryns, the interplay of light and dark in the palace has been discussed by Maran, who has suggested that visitors \textit{en route} to the throne room were exposed to “opposite aesthetical experiences… [including] narrow vs.

\textsuperscript{665} Christakis 2003, esp. pp. 157, 159 (the South House); 2004, esp. p. 305 (the East and West Pillar Crypts near the West Magazines).
\textsuperscript{666} Watrous 1996, pp. 20, 22. See also work by Loeta Tyree (2013), who mentions the dark atmosphere at Psychro and in other Minoan “Ritual Caves.” For discussion of torches in the Eleusinian Mysteries see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{668} The idea that hearth fire would have animated wall paintings has also been expressed by Farmer and Lane (2012, p. 8).
\textsuperscript{670} Notably, the concept of “staging” is also thought to have been effected via the use of light in Paleolithic caves (Zorich 2014).
wide and dark vs. light.”\textsuperscript{671} Maran argued: “During daylight, the experience of walking this way [i.e., toward the throne room] must have been characterized by the alternation between hypaethral parts lightened by the brightness of the sun and the darkness of the roofed parts.”\textsuperscript{672} Recently, this same effect in Near Eastern palaces has been studied by Augusta McMahon, who demonstrates the dramatic visual effects of moving in and out of lit spaces at Neo-Assyrian Khorsabad.\textsuperscript{673} At Pylos, a similar result may have been achieved not just on the approach to, but also within, the megaron via the visual contrast of a lit hearth in the Throne Room and the dim glow of lamps (which I have argued were positioned on the sentry stands). Such varied illumination within the megaron would have heightened the visitor’s experience through this central space, and may have contributed to the construction of what Thaler termed “perceived distance” between the Throne Room and the outer court.\textsuperscript{674}

**Conclusions**

Collectively, the preceding discussions shed new light on the four built features of the Pylos megaron: the sentry stands, the throne space, the libation channel, and the central hearth. For each feature, new observations about its physical character and new conclusions about its use permit theories about the suite’s overall function to be affirmed and/or refined. In terms of religion, aspects of the condition and construction of the libation channel confirm that it was an installation designed to received poured offerings. Based on the color and shape of the interior residue, it is proposed that olive oil was offered, perhaps by the *wanax* to whom oil may have been allotted for this purpose. That libations would have drained away from the throne (as

---

\textsuperscript{671} Maran 2006b, p. 83. See also earlier work done by Müller (1930). Thaler alludes to this phenomenon at Pylos in his comment that visitors to the Throne Room may have been affected by “areas of light and shade” (2006, p. 206).

\textsuperscript{672} Maran 2006b, p. 83.

\textsuperscript{673} McMahon 2013, esp. pp. 172-174.

\textsuperscript{674} Thaler 2005, p. 234.
originally argued by Blegen and Rawson) rather than toward it (as has been more recently proposed) is suggested by a re-assessment of the basins’ elevations, which also demonstrate that part of the poured liquid would have been held “in reserve” to the southeast. This phenomenon would have resulted in a split offering, perhaps intended to connect directly to the large-scale representations of the griffin and lion painted on the wall above the libation channel. These two animals, long believed to represent a unified idea, may now be understood as two separate entities, perhaps signifying the realms of the divine and of man or two royal houses.

In addition to the libation channel, evidence for ritual activity in the megaron is also suggested by the rising flame decoration on the central hearth. This mainland design, which it is argued developed independently from proposed Minoan prototypes, had a close iconographic connection with Pylian tables of offering indicating a possible functional link. The latter, it is proposed, took their decoration from the former and may have been used to make personal offerings to the same gods and/or individuals honored at the fixed hearth.

The decoration of the hearth also points to use of the Throne Room for the reception of visitors. Based on its perpetual, multi-directional movement, the running spiral may have been designed as a form of kinesthetic address, instructing visitors to move left and right within the space in order to gain various views of the throne. That there was a throne is verified by the condition of the bedding plaster found in the rectangular cutting against the room’s NE wall which is inferred to have supported a stone plinth. A new interpretation of the Pylos Ta tablet series and comparative evidence for throne use in Bronze Age Anatolia and Egypt further suggest that this plinth may have supported interchangeable wooden thrones, one or more of which could have been used for explicitly ritual events.
Finally, that the megaron was designed to receive visitors *and* serve as a place for religious rituals is suggested by new interpretations of its lighting. Based on recent re-assessments of the Throne Room’s superstructure, it is argued that this room was essentially a dark space in which the fire on the hearth was actively manipulated to create a range of sensory environments. The tenor of such environments, it is further suggested, may have also been affected by the judicious positioning of stone lamps, one or more of which may have stood on the so-called “sentry stands” in the megaron’s Vestibule and Portico. On these stands, the lamps would have added light to the Throne Room’s approach and helped to dramatize the visitor’s overall megaron experience while also providing murky backdrops for religious practices.
CHAPTER 5: PAINTED SURFACE DECORATION

This fifth and final data chapter examines the second fixed\textsuperscript{675} palatial period component of the Pylos megaron: painted surface decoration. As indicated by abundant finds of both collapsed and\textit{ in situ} painted plaster (the first category discussed to a limited extent in Chapter 3), all three rooms of the suite were once lavishly embellished. This chapter investigates this painted material in two parts, the first dealing with wall paintings and the second with floor paintings. As has been done in the previous two chapters, each discussion is divided into four sections. First, the descriptions and interpretations published in the \textit{PN} series are reviewed. Second, scholarly interpretations suggested subsequent to (and therefore based on the data available in) the original publications are discussed. Concerning the third and fourth components, which present new evidence for the paintings’ appearance and/or character and re-assess old and present new ideas about their function, some changes are made. For the floor paintings, these discussions follow the standard approach laid out in Chapters 3 and 4. For the wall paintings, however, rather than present new evidence (which, as will be explained below, is still forthcoming) I instead discuss how current interpretations of collapsed fragments can be substantiated and/or disproved by evidence presented in Chapters 3 and 4, and present a few preliminary assessments of \textit{in situ} material.

Wall Paintings

Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations

\textsuperscript{675}As suggested by Thaler (2006, p. 195), the compound adjective “unstable fixed” is more appropriate for wall paintings on account of the fact that they can be (and certainly were) removed and/or refreshed. For the purposes of this discussion, however, I refer to the final program of paintings that was \textit{in place} (hence, “fixed”) during the suite’s palatial period.
In the PN series, details about the appearance and distribution of the megaron’s wall paintings were published by Lang in PN II. Most information comes from her room-by-room “Palace Survey,” in which she provides an overview of both in situ and collapsed fragments.

In Situ Wall Paintings

The in situ fragments in the Pylos megaron, Lang notes, were extremely scant. In the Vestibule, only traces of backing plaster (measuring between 0.025 m. and 0.04 m. thick) were found on the room’s NW and SE walls. In the Portico, in situ wall plaster was present on top of stone revetment lining the bases of all three walls. In PN I, Blegen and Rawson described this revetment as a veneer of limestone slabs ca. 0.26-0.27 m. tall and 0.045 m. thick that functioned like a modern baseboard (Figure 5.1). When it was first installed, the excavators surmised, the baseboard was part of an alternating sequence of exposed stone and timber that covered the lower portion of the Portico’s walls. At a later date, the surface of the stone was coated with a layer of plaster, which at the time of excavation retained some “traces of painted arcs and vertical lines,” which, the excavators surmised, “follow[ed] the customary pattern [of an arc dado].”

Although plastered stone was unique to the Portico, evidence for baseboard-level decoration was also found in the megaron’s Throne Room. Here, amidst copious traces of backing plaster, Lang identified on the northern section of the SE wall part of an in situ painted
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676 PN II, pp. 192-196.
677 PN II, p. 192. For discussion of the discovery of this backing plaster see GEM 1952, p. 120. The walls at the northeastern end of the Vestibule, Lang recorded, retained no evidence of in situ wall painting at all.
678 PN II, p. 192.
679 PN I, p. 65. See also PN II, p. 192.
681 PN I, p. 65. This observation conflicts with Lang’s statement that “no surface” was preserved on the plaster covering the limestone baseboard (PN II, p. 192). I have opted to follow Blegen and Rawson’s interpretation based on the documentation of these painted lines in Rawson’s 1960 field notebook, discussed below.
“imitation stone baseboard” (9 D 6) marked by a black horizontal line ca. 0.26-0.27 m. above the
floor. Above this baseboard, which preserved no traces of color, Lang documented the
presence of an unusual linear element: a “heavy horizontal line (black) curving up at both
ends…[from which]…spring many thin black vertical lines” (Figure 5.2). The meaning of this
decorative element puzzled Lang, but its position low on the wall and the resemblance of its thin
vertical lines to stone veining led her to suggest, tentatively, that it too belonged to the painted
dado.

Collapsed Fragments

Whereas in situ material in the Pylos megaron was scarce, collapsed paintings were found
in abundance. In the southeastern part of the Portico were found a number of fragments of
“Arc Dado” (imitation panels of cut stone) rendered in blue, black, red, white, and yellow, as
well as fragments depicting wooden beams, painted red with black grain lines. Also recovered
were a few small fragments with “animal markings” that Lang postulated came from the rubble
matrix of the room’s walls.
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682 PN II, p. 194. Notably, this is the same height as the stone baseboard in the Portico. Lang described the
distribution of backing plaster in the Throne Room as appearing “in some places.” This is clarified by Blegen’s
comments in his 1953 field notebook, which record the study (and removal) of in situ material on the Room’s NE
and NW walls by Kanakis (CWB 1953, pp. 97-99, 112-113 (the NE wall), 101-102 (the SE wall)). In one of these
accounts, traces of color are also identified (CWB 1953, p. 99 (the NE wall)). In 1961, additional observations of
backing plaster on the Throne Room’s SW wall were recorded by Rawson (MR 1961-1962, pp. 55-56). The “low
dado” on the SE wall was first observed in 1960 by Rawson, who argued that it extended to the portion of the SE
wall south of the doorway as evidenced by a “band of dark paint on a narrow strip ca. 0.04 m. high,” giving the

683 PN II, p. 172 and pl. 97 (9 D 6).
684 PN II, p. 172.
685 PN II, pp. 192-196.
686 PN II, p. 192.
687 PN II, p. 192.
In the Vestibule, many more collapsed wall painting fragments was uncovered, the majority of which were found near the northern part of the room’s NW wall. The main subject was men moving to the left. Some fragments (5a-f H 5), Lang identified as belonging to an isolated group of four males wearing short kilts and carrying objects including a “table or frame” resting on a white pillow (Figure 5.3). Other fragments were fit together into a larger scene. These included a group of twelve men wearing long white robes (12 H 5 and 14 H 5) or robes decorated with various patterns in brown paint including dots (fragments 9 H 5 and 10 H 5), dot rosettes (8 H 5), arrows/“psi’s” (7 H 5), and possibly lion’s mane markings (11 H 5 and 9 H 5). Two figures were also shown wearing shawls (13 H 5). Lang interpreted this scene as part of a procession, replete with carried objects (possibly a tray or a basket in the case of the figure in fragment 9 H 5). She also speculated that the procession might have involved paired individuals who were “similarly dressed but of different scale,” perhaps indicative of a “man and boy or [a] priest and acolyte.”

Associated with these processing male figures, Lang identified a man in a long white garment walking above a checkerboard band (14 H 5) and part of a female figure (15 H 5) wearing a flounced skirt. The feet of the woman, Lang observed, were positioned on a border of alternating brown and white bands similar to the kind associated with a rosette frieze (12 F 5)
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688 PN II, p. 192. Also see account of the excavation of this area in GEM 1952, pp. 99, 101, and 120. Notably, all of the wall painting fragments were found at a height of 0.20 m. and greater above the room’s floor (GEM 1952, p. 101).
689 PN II, p. 193, pl. N. Notably, Lang’s limited speculation about the details of this group was because the fragments were heavily burnt, causing discoloration and the considerable loss of added details (ibid., p. 65).
690 PN II, pp. 192-193. The discovery of one of the fragments of a figure wearing a long robe with dot rosettes is documented in GEM 1952, p. 99, and illustrated in Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.44.
691 PN II, p. 193.
692 PN II, p. 193.
693 PN II, p. 193.
and simulated wood-graining in the same room. Also pictured on the Vestibule’s fragments was the large (ca. 0.22 m. tall) head of a bull (18 C 5), facing left. Dismissing the disparity between the large size of the animal and the smaller size of the men, Lang assigned bull to the scene of processing figures and composed the following scene, which was sketched by de Jong (Figure 5.4):

“Here the bull is going the same direction as the men, and if kilted and robed men were walking on two different levels it would look like a goodly crowd following and preceding the bull. Since all the figures found here at the right end of the Vestibule (as one enters) are proceeding from right to left, it is likely that the artist was here representing a procession to the Throne Room: the long-robed men perhaps serve a religious function; those in kilts bring equipment; an occasional and privileged female, whether priestess or member of the royal family, attends; and the bull comes as both sacrifice and dinner.”

Also found in the Vestibule was a small fragment featuring an architectural façade (6 A 5) (Figure 5.5) that Lang assigned to wall-fill.

The Throne Room contained the greatest quantity of collapsed wall painting fragments, most of which were found in front of the room’s NE wall. As described by Lang, these fragments, which were likely deposited when the NE wall collapsed into the room (see above), were collected by the excavators in “groups” (or “quadrants”) numbered from one to four from northwest to southeast (Figure 5.6). The first group, collected near the room’s north corner, contained fragments with no preserved surface. The second group contained fragments depicting the forequarters of a tan-colored lion together with part of the forequarters and plumed
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694 PN II, p. 193.
695 PN II, p. 193, pl. 119. Regarding the disparity between the size of the animal and the men, Lang noted that the difference in the Pylian Vestibule painting was no different than that in the Taureador Fresco from Knossos (ibid.).
696 PN II, p. 193. As noted by Lang, de Jong’s drawing of the procession scene does not include the “pairing effect” of figures noted above, “largely because it [the drawing] was devised to test the zone-changing possibilities” (ibid., n. 2). The pairing effect was illustrated, however, in de Jong’s watercolor paintings of the original fragments (PN II, pls. 119, 120).
697 PN II, p. 193.
698 PN II, pp. 194-195. This collection strategy is also discussed by McCallum (1987, pp. 87-89).
699 PN II, p. 194.
head of a white griffin (20 C 6) (Figure 5.7), part of a running spiral frieze, and the variegated handle of a painted stone vase (2 M 6) (Figure 5.8).\textsuperscript{700} The third group included fragments with part of the body of the same stone vase (2 M 6), some “small hairy bits probably from a lion,” and a number of fragments of a black, white, and yellow dado (10 D 6).\textsuperscript{701} The fourth and final group, excavated in the Throne Room’s east corner, contained fragments of a robed male lyre-player seated on top of a rocky outcrop in the company of a crested bird with outstretched wings (43 H 6) (Figure 5.9).\textsuperscript{702} Found together with these figures was a fragment (44b H 6) depicting part of a long-robed male figure seated to the left of a table (a theme also represented on fragment 44a H 6, found in front of the Throne Room’s SE wall, which depicts a pair of long-robed figures, at least one seated, to either side of a three-legged table), the shoulder of a dappled bull (19 C 6), and part of a wavy white and red vertical border (1 M 6).\textsuperscript{703}

Based on the motifs and positions of these fragments, Lang restored them as components of a single large scene, parts of which were sketched by de Jong (Figure 5.10). The lion and griffin fragments, she postulated, were part of a heraldic composition with two animals positioned to either side of the central throne, as shown in a preliminary (now outmoded) reconstruction by de Jong (Figure 5.11).\textsuperscript{704} The animals’ heraldic position, Lang noted, as well as details of the griffins’ appearance including their lack of wings, their white bodies drawn in black outline, the use of cursive “t’s” on their necks, and the decoration of their backs with leaf-markings and of their bellies with ingrowing hairs, mirrored that of griffins from the Throne Room at Knossos (see Figure 4.79).\textsuperscript{705} Based on the popularity of this beast in Pylian

\textsuperscript{700} PN II, p. 194.  
\textsuperscript{701} PN II, p. 194.  
\textsuperscript{702} PN II, p. 194.  
\textsuperscript{703} PN II, p. 194.  
\textsuperscript{704} PN II, pp. 99, 101, n. 56. Also see reference to this antithetic scheme in PN I, p. 79.  
\textsuperscript{705} PN II, pp. 101-102. Such differences include the direction of the cursive “t’s,” the position of the leaf-markings, the direction and density of the “ingrowing hairs,” and the shape of the eye. Lang also noted that the Knossian
iconography, Blegen and Rawson further suggested that the griffin may have been “the symbol and ‘totem’ of the royal family” at Pylos which, along with the painted lions, served symbolically to protect the figure of the enthroned king.\(^{706}\)

The fragments found in the fourth group, collected the southeastern end of the Throne Room’s NE wall, Lang reconstructed as a narrative scene in which the lyre-player (possibly Apollo or Homer’s Thamyris, as suggested by Blegen and Rawson) provided music for pairs of seated diners as well as the large bull, which was “charmed” by the bard’s song.\(^{707}\) The stone vase, however, puzzled Lang, who suggested that it might have been positioned next to the throne (in a blank panel of the painted stone dado) where it could serve as a reference to the king’s “libation equipment,” or else directly over the throne, between the heraldic lions and griffins.\(^{708}\) The running spiral frieze Lang envisioned as a border extending across the upper part of the wall.\(^{709}\)

While the abundance of fragments allowed Lang to identify motifs and scenes from the Throne Room’s NE wall with some confidence, the dearth of such finds from the remainder of the room forced her to be more speculative when discussing the decoration of the remaining three walls. On the southern portion of the SE wall, Lang restored a fallen fragment, 45 H 6 (see Figure 4.77), which preserved the arms and torsos of two men moving to the right and dressed in white clothes with diagonal stripes of lavender, brown, and perhaps pale green.\(^{710}\) In size, the men were comparable to the left-facing figures in the Vestibule, leading Lang to suggest that
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\(^{706}\) PN I, p. 79.

\(^{707}\) PN II, pp. 194-195; PN I, p. 79.

\(^{708}\) PN II, pp. 179, 195. The latter position, above the throne, Lang connected tentatively to the derivation of the king’s wealth from the “pottery trade.” This makes little sense, however, as the painted vase is “made” from stone.

\(^{709}\) PN II, p. 195.

\(^{710}\) PN II, p. 81. The color “brown” is mentioned on PN I, p. 81 whereas “pale green” is listed on p. 195. For the rarity of green in the Mycenaean palette and its special employment in the Throne Room at Pylos, see Brecoulaki 2014, pp. 12-13.
fragment 45 H 6 was the continuation of this procession, which seemed “to be making its way toward the Throne Room.”

Wall painting fragments found in front of the Throne Room’s NW wall Lang identified as belonging to large-scale animals, perhaps a “different sort of lion-griffin combination.” Some fragments, she observed, preserved bits of red skin with “black-outlined white leaves” and “ingrowing hairs” while others gave the impression of a black-outlined beast with feathers. Based on these elements as well as a fragment (1 N 6) believed to be the hair of a life-size figure blowing in front of jagged rocks, Lang proposed that we should “perhaps imagine [on this wall] a sort of Master of Animals against a rocky background and flanked by beasts,” surmounted by another running spiral frieze.

Finally, small, brightly painted fragments found near the Throne Room’s SW wall, Lang argued, came not from the wall’s surface but from its interior rubble matrix. Among these fragments, she noted, were pieces depicting part of a necklace on a red neck (3 M 6), part of a black running spiral (15 F 6), and part of a “Chain Leaf Pattern” (7 M 19) (Figure 5.12), which she interpreted as belonging to a dado, a flounced drapery, or a griffin wing. Because this last fragment joined with a fragment from Room 19, Lang suggested that the Throne Room’s SW wall collapsed outward (i.e., to the southwest), paralleling the collapse of the room’s NE wall.

What may have been on the Throne Room’s SE wall at the time of the destruction, Lang proposed, was a “large-scale pastoral-sylvan scene” represented by a sizable fragment with a finished edge depicting the hindquarters of a deer flanked by long-stemmed papyrus plants (36 C

---

711 PN II, p. 51.
712 PN II, p. 196.
713 PN II, pp. 195-196. Lang assigned no catalogue numbers to the beast fragments.
714 PN II, p. 196.
715 PN II, pp. 180, 195 (for the interpretation of fragment 7 M 19). For the recent reinterpretation of this fragment as showing part of the suckered tentacles of a large-scale argonaut, see Egan and Brecoulaki Forthcoming.
716 PN II, p. 195.
17 (Figure 5.13) and perhaps by a painting of a double-vessel on a rocky ground (6 M 16) (Figure 5.14). The iconography of these fragments, which were found in Rooms 17 and 16 respectively, Lang argued, was better-suited to the central part of the palace, and the pieces may have fallen from the Throne Room into “side chambers” during the collapse of the former’s SW wall.

Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies

Since the publication of PN II, no attempts have been made to re-study the in situ paintings from the Pylos megaron. Many scholars, however, have confirmed and/or revised Lang’s (as well as Blegen and Rawson’s) reconstructions and interpretations of the collapsed material. As indicated by the nature of her conclusions summarized above, Lang, working together with de Jong, sought primarily to reconstruct the murals rather than to try to extract extensive “meaning” from their themes and motifs. Exceptions occur only in the case of the lion(s) and griffin(s) from the Throne Room’s NE wall. In this case, Lang argued that the beasts were “symbolic,” while Blegen and Rawson inferred not only that they protected (metaphorically) the figure of the enthroned king, but also that the griffin may have been the totem of the Pylian royal family.

Following these early arguments, substantial revisions have been made to the identification and reconstruction of individual fragments and scenes from the megaron, and the functions of some of its paintings have been re-considered. Typically, compositions have been viewed in one of three ways: as potent symbols, as participatory backdrops and/or focalizing

---

717 PN II, pp. 195, 198.
718 PN II, p. 119. Lang stressed, however, that this interpretation was tentative based on the problematic appearance of a fragment (36 C 17) with a finished edge in the center of a wall.
719 PN II, p. 102; PN I, p. 79.
devices completed by the presence of human actors, and as representations of real-life activities, some of which are thought to have been practiced in the rooms in which the paintings were displayed.

Wall Paintings as Potent Symbols

The first idea, that the megaron’s paintings were symbolically-charged, has been frequently applied to the Throne Room lion(s) and griffin(s). Following the idea proposed by Blegen and Rawson, many scholars have argued that these beasts served as symbolic protectors of an enthroned figure. In 1987, McCallum contended that the beasts served as “symbolic guardians of the throne’s occupant.”720 As evidence, she cited the incredible power exhibited in Aegean art by these animals, which “were consistently shown as the fiercest beasts in hunt and attack scenes.”721 That the relationship between the beasts and the throne’s occupant was peaceful, she further argued, was suggested by associations between lions and griffins and human figures in glyptic. In many scenes, the depiction of the griffins on leashes, she suggested, clearly showed their subordination, in one case to a seated male figure (see Figure 4.32), who could have represented an “enthroned ruler.”722 These and other scenes, McCallum further argued, also frequently showed animals only to one side of seated figures, prompting her to suggest (in combination with the lack of physical evidence) that the lion and griffin were positioned only to the left of the throne (Figure 5.15), rather than being heraldically disposed.723

720 McCallum 1987, p. 133. Also see pp. 108, 112-113, 136, 138. For the same argument presented earlier, see McDonald’s reference to the Throne Room’s “protecting griffins and lions” (1967, p. 341).

721 McCallum 1987, pp. 133-134, citing examples from seals (CMS I, nos. 36, 103, 278, 286 (lions attacking) and CMS V:2, nos. 642, 675 (griffins attacking)). Also see references to militant (vs. pacific) griffins in Bennet 2007, p. 17. This theory is also influenced by the use of griffins in Egyptian iconography, where they are shown from the Fifth Dynasty onward “exclusively as the destroyer of the king’s enemies” (Frankfort 1936-1937, p. 110).

722 McCallum 1987, p. 134, with examples.

723 McCallum 1987, pp. 99-101. McCallum’s conclusions build on the earlier work of Reusch (1958, pp. 338-339) and Mirié (1979, pp. 47-49), both of whom also argued for a single pair of animals at Pylos and Knossos. Cameron
The Pylos lion(s) and griffin(s) have also been viewed as projections of the character of the person seated on the throne. McCallum, for example, suggested (in combination with her above “protection” theory) that the powerful beasts may have been reflections of the ruler’s physical strength. Säflund, on the other hand, argued that the griffin(s) was (were) references to the ruler’s “sacred character” based on associations between these animals and divine persons or symbols in Aegean iconography. That the beasts represented the lineage of the enthroned figure has been proposed by Rutter, who, as noted in Chapter 2, suggested that the lion and griffin might represent a blended royal symbol. If the griffin was the totem of Pylos (as Blegen and Rawson concluded) and the lion the symbol of Mycenae (as suggested by Immerwahr), the unification of these two animals in the Pylian Throne Room, Rutter inferred, might “bear witness to a dynastic marriage or perhaps even an Argive conquest of the Pylian kingdom.”

Finally, Thaler has argued that the lion(s) and griffin(s) were meant to symbolize underlying binary oppositions at work in the Throne Room’s mural program. As mentioned in Chapter 4, he suggests that animals may have represented the idea of “agrios” (or “untamed nature”) set up in opposition to the idea of “domus” (or the “domesticated or civilized sphere”) represented by the lyre-player and banqueters at the other end of the NE wall. These structuralist principles, identified by Hodder for the Neolithic, were seen by Thaler as central to...
the character of the Pylian paintings, which placed the “untamed” world toward the rear of the megaron, separated from its entrance by depictions of civilizing activities such as dining.\footnote{228}{Thaler 2006, p. 102, citing Hodder 1990.}

\textit{Wall Paintings as Participatory Backdrops and Focalizing Devices}

In addition to their static roles as symbolic protectors and/or icons, the wall paintings of the lion(s) and griffin(s) have also been assigned an active function as “participatory backdrops.” As discussed in Chapter 2, Bennet, who, like Blegen, Rawson, and Lang, argued for two pairs of antithetic beasts,\footnote{229}{This “traditional” antithetic reconstruction is also favored by Immerwahr 1990, p. 136; Rehak 1995, p. 109; Bennet 2001; Shank 2007, p. 161; and Thaler 2012a, p. 203, fig. 6.} has contended the griffins and lions formed part of a scene into which the human \textit{wanax} was inserted. As Bennet explains: “The fact that the Wanax is apparently not actually depicted on the wall is interesting and suggests that the composition only worked when he was physically on this seat, his authority enhanced by the ‘focalising’ griffins and felines to either side.”\footnote{230}{Bennet 2001, p. 34.} This live performance, which Helga Reusch had envisioned earlier with a female priestess in the Throne Room at Knossos, was, in Bennet’s view, a “first person iconography of power,” that created a direct link between the person of the \textit{wanax} and the themes and messages in the surrounding scenes.\footnote{231}{Bennet 2007, pp. 12-13; Reusch 1958.} In other words, these concepts were not connected with the “idea” of the \textit{wanax} (as they would have been were he represented with paint) but with the actual living person.

Also concerning the lions and griffins as “focalizing” devices, Thaler has suggested that the entire \textit{wanax}-lion(s)-griffin(s) combination was designed to be viewed as an isolated visual icon. As Thaler illustrates through a reconstruction (see Figure 4.78) discussed in Chapter 4, when the NE wall was viewed from across the hearth, the columns would have become the
borders of a visual frame that enclosed the throne and flanking beasts. This powerful image, Thaler further suggests, strongly implied that the southwestern part of the Throne Room was the intended goal of perambulations in the space, serving as the “point from which visitors formally greeted and entered into interaction with the enthroned ruler.”

Wall Paintings as Representations of Real Activities

Finally, the collapsed wall paintings of the Pylos megaron have been interpreted as representations of real activities, some of which are argued to have taken place within the suite itself. One example is the painted stone jug (2 M 6) (see Figure 5.8). As mentioned in Chapter 2, Hägg suggested (building on a suggestion by Lang) that the vessel may have “served as an indication of the ritual [i.e., a libation] to be performed here.” He also proposed that the painted rendition of this jug was a means of perpetuating this ritual practice by always being “on hand.” Hägg also connected the Vestibule’s wall paintings (see Figure 5.4) to real life processions that he proposed actually made their way through the megaron. Specifically, Hägg suggested that the scene served as a “sign-post” (a term also used by McCallum) set up for the purpose of directing the flow of people through the Vestibule and into the Throne Room. Some years earlier, the seed of this idea had been suggested by Säflund, who proclaimed that the Vestibule scene showed a procession making its way toward the central “sacrificial” hearth.

Contra Hägg, McCallum argued that there is not enough evidence to confirm a link.

---

733 Thaler 2012b, p. 122. See Thaler’s discussion of how visitors reached this vantage point, and my alternative proposal in Chapter 4.
735 Hägg 1985, p. 211. See also Rehak 1995, p. 111.
736 Hägg 1985, p. 216; McCallum 1987, pp. 70-71 and passim The first use of the term “sign-post,” McCallum notes, appeared in the work of Cameron, who used it in his discussion of the wall painting program at Knossos (McCallum 1987, p. 119).
737 Säflund 1980, pp. 241, 244.
between the painted jug (2 M 6) and the libation channel.\textsuperscript{738} As part of her argument, McCallum expressed concern about the shape of the vessel as reconstructed by de Jong (see Figure 5.8), which although vaguely reminiscent of a LH IIIA ceramic beaked jug (\textit{FS 145}) or a globular stone rhyton, had an odd combination of a globular body with a handle attached at the base of the neck that caused her to doubt that it was a copy of a real vessel.\textsuperscript{739}

McCallum also suggested that while the Vestibule scene may have “memorialize[d] an important sacrificial procession,” the real life presentation and sacrifice of the bull would have taken place outside.\textsuperscript{740} As she explains, an outdoor setting is suggested by details of the Vestibule’s painting including landscape elements such as “pendant rockwork,” a rocky “hillock,” and grasses and flowers, and also by the white undulating border and the unusual location of a built altar with a trussed bull “well above the ground line” – all elements that she incorporated into her revised reconstruction (Figure 5.16).\textsuperscript{741} Compounding this evidence, McCallum reasoned that “physically maneuvering a live bull through these rooms and their doorway would have been quite difficult, especially without damaging the painted plaster floors.”\textsuperscript{742} Those activities that could have transpired in the megaron, McCallum conceded, included the presentation of offerings/gifts (as depicted in the hands of the men in the Vestibule procession scene) and possibly the roasting of the bull, as previously proposed by Blegen and Rawson and by Säflund (see discussion in Chapter 4).\textsuperscript{743}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{738} McCallum 1987, p. 137.
\textsuperscript{739} McCallum 1987, p. 93.
\textsuperscript{740} McCallum 1987, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{741} McCallum 1987, pp. 88-89, 94-96, 118, 132, 139-140. The vegetation, composed of “grasses of plant fronds, and stylized reddish “flowers” was catalogued by McCallum as “6NE(Q4): N:15,” while the “pendant rockwork” was catalogued as “5NE:N:4.” The “trussed bull,” whose presence is now doubted (see below), is catalogued as “6NE(Q3?):C:9.”
\textsuperscript{742} McCallum 1987, p. 120. McCallum’s concern with damage to the floor, however, has been questioned by Palaima (1995, p. 133, n. 47), who warns that “we should be cautious about applying our modern sensibilities to such matters.”
\textsuperscript{743} McCallum 1987, pp. 120-121; \textit{PN I}, p. 78; Säflund 1980, p. 241. Also see Jameson 1958, p. 223.
\end{footnotesize}
Collectively, the megaron’s wall paintings, McCallum argued, were part of a connected visual narrative illustrating the components of a state-sponsored festival. She proposed that the design program began with the Vestibule procession, showing men of different social rank and/or occupation (e.g., porters, soldiers, and/or priests, as indicated by their dress and accoutrements) bearing offerings and leading a bull (Figure 5.17), and culminated in the Throne Room, where the same bull was trussed for sacrifice and pairs of men engaged in drinking or toasting “celebrating the sacrifice” while listening to the lyre player (see Figure 5.16). This narrative, McCallum contended, also reflected actual circulation patterns in the megaron. As she observed, “the Vestibule procession moved left, in the direction of the entrance to Room 6; once inside Room 6, one would probably have turned right, toward the (NE) throne wall on which the sacrifices and banquet scenes were painted.”

In recent years, while some details of McCallum’s reconstruction have been questioned, her interpretation of the megaron’s “Bard at the Banquet” scene as depicting outdoor events has garnered much scholarly support. As discussed in Chapter 2, based on the iconographic details observed by McCallum, scholars have suggested that the “Men at Table” were dining (or more likely, just drinking) al fresco, perhaps in one of the palace’s open courts (Courts 63, 58, and/or 3). During such events, Bennet further argued, the role of lyre players

---

744 McCallum 1987, pp. 77-87, 91-92, 114-115, 117-118, 130, 132. Concerning the Vestibule procession scene, McCallum further notes that Lang’s proposed “pairing” of large and small scale male figures wearing similar garments is only possible in the case of fragment 13 H 5. This arrangement is not, therefore, common, and may have served instead to indicate these figures’ particular roles “perhaps with the smaller figure subservient to the larger” (ibid., p. 116). Concerning the “Bard and the Banquet” scene, McCallum connects the bird accompanying the lyre-player to the griffin on the other side of the throne (in fragment 20 C 6) on account of the former’s “composite nature… and flight in the direction of the lion and griffin pair” (1987, pp. 129-130).
745 McCallum 1987, p. 124. Also see p. 138.
746 Debate over McCallum’s reconstruction currently focuses on the trussed bull, the presence of which has been disproved by new fragment joins (see Brecoulaki et al., 2006).
747 Palaima 1995, p. 133, n. 47; Davis and Bennet 1999, p. 110; Stocker and Davis 2004, p. 191, n. 59. Also see Säflund 1980, pp. 238-239. Most arguments have favored feasting in Court 63 outside the Southwest Building (see Säflund 1980, pp. 238-239; Shelmerdine 1998, pp. 84, 87-89; 1999, Davis and Bennet 1999, p. 110; Whitelaw 2001, p. 138; Palaima 2004, p. 232), but more recent studies by Bendall and Thaler have proposed a hierarchy of dining in...
like the one depicted in the Throne Room scene would have been not only to entertain but also to “make specific” or “quicken” the painted wall paintings, which would have been visible to diners (e.g., the paintings in Hall 64 as seen from Court 63) during feasts. The bard pictured in fragment group 43 H 6, Bennet conjectured, likely sang of the king’s exploits, his tales represented by the flying bird that served as the physical manifestation of the poet’s “winged words.”

Additional Comments on Isolated Fragments

In addition to revisions and re-interpretations of better-preserved compositions, a few changes have also been proposed for wall painting fragments from the Pylos megaron with poor preservation and/or indeterminate context. Concerning the fragments found near the Throne Room’s SW wall, for example, McCallum has argued that the “Deer in Papyrus” fragment (36 C 17) (see Figure 5.13) fell from a second story rather than collapsed from inside the Throne Room. As evidence, she refers to the fragment’s “clean right edge, indicating that it was located either on the left side of a corner, or more probably against a doorway” which makes its inclusion on the central portion of the Throne Room’s SW wall unlikely.

To the contrary, in 2014 it was suggested by myself and Hariclia Brecoulaki that fragment group 7 M 19, also found split between the Throne Room and the adjacent pantries, may have come from the Throne Room’s SW wall. This idea, which will soon be published, is based on the re-interpretation of this fragment group as part of the representation of a large-scale multiple courts including Court 63 as well as Court 58 (Bendall 2004, see discussion in Chapter 3) and Court 3 (Thaler 2005, p. 332; 2006, p. 98).

748 Bennet 2007, p. 16.
749 Bennet 2007, pp. 17-18. For alternative interpretations of this bird see Rehak (1995, p. 110), who argued that it was a baby griffin, and Carter (1995, p. 296), who identifies it as a deity.
750 McCallum 1987, p. 105.
argonaut, which we speculate may have been positioned in the Throne Room where it served as an allusion to the naval prowess of the wanax.\textsuperscript{751}

Regarding the Throne Room’s NW wall, McCallum has suggested that the fragments with animal markings were more diverse than Lang observed, indicating that the larger scene could have included several differently patterned animals on the model of the dogs from Hall 64 or the “combination of white and purple griffins, tan lions and lionesses, and white bull with dark dappling in Room 46 (21-27 C 46).”\textsuperscript{752} As for fragment 1 N 6 (“Rocks and Hair”), McCallum dismissed Lang’s interpretation of the black “spikes” as the representation of a man’s hair, rightly reasoning that they “would create a coiffure unknown in Aegean iconography.”\textsuperscript{753} McCallum did, however, suggest that this composition, as well as that represented by fragment 6 M 16 with “billowing rocks” were likely depictions of outdoor environments, creating a “visual unity” with the scenes on the Throne room’s other walls and in the outer Vestibule.\textsuperscript{754}

Finally, as discussed in Chapter 4, Thaler has upheld Lang’s suggestion that fragment 45 H 6 belonged to the SE wall of the Throne Room, and that it served as the continuation of the procession scene painted on the NW wall of the Vestibule.\textsuperscript{755} As noted, however, he has further argued that the fragment, with its figures moving to the right, was meant to reflect the clockwise

\textsuperscript{751} Egan and Brecoulaki Forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{752} McCallum 1987, p. 106. While she was unable to find the fragments described (but not catalogued) by Lang in the Chora Museum apotheke, McCallum did discover some fragments depicting the body and perhaps the bent leg of an animal, which she catalogued as: “6NW:C:17” and “6NW:C:18.”
\textsuperscript{753} McCallum 1987, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{754} McCallum 1987, pp. 139-140. McCallum also saw evidence for this visual unity in the “complementary relationship” between the lion and griffin pair on the NE wall of the Throne Room and large-scale animals she reconstructs on the NW wall (ibid., p. 139).
\textsuperscript{755} An idea not supported by McCallum (1987, p. 138).
movement of visitors in the Throne Room, contra McCallum’s reconstruction of a rightward progression toward the “Bard at the Banquet” scene.\textsuperscript{756}

Part III: New Evidence

While previous studies of the wall paintings from the Pylos megaron have shed much light on their appearance and interpretations, there is still considerable room for discussion. As once estimated by Rehak, even the extensive examinations of the paintings by Lang and McCallum have reconstructed at best only 5% of the decoration of any one wall in the Throne Room.\textsuperscript{757} Most of this deficiency (also evident in the other two rooms of the megaron) can be attributed to the deleterious effects of fire, collapse, and erosion on the palace’s wall paintings over the past three millennia.\textsuperscript{758} Some lacunae, however, can also be ascribed to omissions in Lang’s (and also McCallum’s) catalogues. While Lang attempted to study all the available material from this suite, the sheer quantity of fragments and their often poor preservation meant that only a selection of paintings made it into the final publication. McCallum, faced with the same difficulties, focused her analysis on resolving certain issues of reconstruction and thematic cohesion within the suite, for which she made yet another “selection” from the extant evidence.\textsuperscript{759}

Currently, a comprehensive program of conservation and technical and iconographic investigation of the wall paintings from the Palace of Nestor is underway. Because this study, undertaken by the members of HARP, is certain to produce fresh, innovative, and above all,

\textsuperscript{756} Thaler 2012a, pp. 194-196; 2012c, p. 121. That the figures in 45 H 6 were meant to “coordinate” with circulation patterns in the Throne Room, however, is also suggested by McCallum, (1987, p. 139) but without any clear explanation of how this was meant to happen.
\textsuperscript{757} Rehak 1995, p. 109. The estimate of 5% is that given for the NE Wall (the decoration of which was by far the best preserved) based on a measured reconstruction by John Younger (1995, foldout).
\textsuperscript{758} See discussion of this also in McCallum 1987, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{759} McCallum specifically states (1987, p. 2) that her catalogue of 51 unpublished wall painting fragments from Pylos represent “frescoes that are relevant to the investigation.”
more accurate readings of the megaron’s wall paintings, I will not attempt a full re-evaluation of these murals in this dissertation. Instead, in order to help guide future studies, I will evaluate the preceding interpretations of the collapsed wall paintings against the new evidence and conclusions presented in Chapters 3 and 4. I will also offer some preliminary interpretations of two groups of in situ wall paintings, which, despite being in poor condition, leave no doubt as to their original positions on the rooms’ walls.

Wall Painting Fragments in Light of Other Evidence

Looking first at the collapsed material, the evidence presented in Chapters 3 and 4 permits three ongoing debates about the Throne Room’s wall paintings to be resolved. First, in terms of the lion and griffin painting, the physical relationship between this mural and the libation channel (reconstructed in Figure 4.42) corroborates McCallum’s reconstruction of only a single pair of these animals to the left of the throne contra Blegen and Rawson’s (and many other scholars’) proposed reconstruction of a heraldic arrangement. Since the paintings and the channel appear to have been directly connected, the griffin and lion, I would argue, are best understood as a unique composition within the room rather than an image that is duplicated elsewhere.

Second, regarding the proposal that the “Bard at the Banquet” scene represents an event taking place inside the Throne Room, the evidence of the stratigraphy and small finds corroborates the suggestion this is not the case. In Chapter 3 it is demonstrated conclusively that there is no evidence in the Throne Room for vessels employed for in situ palatial dining. Instead, nearly all fragments of such vessels (both ceramic sherds and metal scraps) recovered in the
room appear to have belonged to the matrix of the surrounding pier-walls, preventing their use as direct evidence for indoor activities in the suite.\textsuperscript{760}

Third and last, the evidence presented in Chapter 4 that the libation channel did in fact receive liquid offerings supports Hägg’s identification of the painted stone vase (2 M 6) as the representation of a vessel associated with this feature, \textit{contra} McCallum, who argued that there wasn’t enough evidence to prove a connection. An association between these two features is further bolstered by revising de Jong’s reconstruction of the jug (see Figure 5.8), which McCallum identified as unusual.\textsuperscript{761} Because the two fragment groups composing 2 M 6 do not join, there is no reason why they must remain in the positions assigned to them by de Jong. If the smaller fragment is moved higher, \textit{above} the neck, for example, so that the handle curves up rather than down, it would attach at or near the vessel’s rim rather than to its lower neck. Two possible reconstructions of the jug in 2 M 6 following this suggestion are shown in Figure 5.18. In its new forms, the jug more closely resembles LH III representations of stone libation vessels in other media (including that on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus (Figure 5.19) and the ewers carried by figures in the wall-painted procession scenes from Thebes (Figure 5.20), Tiryns (Figure 5.21), and Mycenae (Figure 5.22)), increasing the likelihood of its association with the Pylos libation channel.

\textit{Reconstructions of In Situ Wall Decoration}

\textsuperscript{760} Such was certainly the fate also for many of the isolated wall painting fragments from the suite (theorized for some pieces already by Lang, see above), but this will remain unclear until the fragments are cleaned and can be matched confidently to those pieces catalogued (in Appendix 1) as found among the other collapsed material.

\textsuperscript{761} McCallum 1987, p. 93.
In addition to these interpretations of the collapsed wall paintings, some comments can be made about the original appearance and function of two areas of in situ mural decoration, one from the Throne Room and one from the Portico.

*The Black Line Composition in the Throne Room*

The first of these two paintings is 9 D 6, which Lang described as a thick black line with thin upward-springing lines positioned on the SE wall of the Throne Room (see Figure 5.2).\(^{762}\) Recently cleaned by Zokos (Figure 5.23), the thick line measures roughly 0.25 m. in length, sits between 0.04 m. and 0.07 m. above the line of the lower “dado,” and, as preserved, begins roughly 0.75 m. in (i.e., northeast) from the restored northern corner of the room’s doorway. From this line, which rises gently from left to right and curves up at the ends, spring no fewer than thirty thin black vertical lines, each spaced roughly 0.01 m. apart. The lines are painted directly on the white plaster of the wall, and no other colors are extant.

Based on this evidence, it is unlikely that this painting is, as Lang concluded, part of a dado.\(^{763}\) First, the curved shape of the thick black line is incongruous with the straight lower borders that are used for every other painted stone dado at Pylos. This is illustrated by the well-preserved “Arc Dadoes” found in Rooms 1, 3, and 64, which are bounded below by straight horizontal lines (Figure 5.24).\(^{764}\) Second, the vertical upward-springing lines on the SE wall composition bear little resemblance to other Pylian depictions of stone veining. In nearly all examples of painted stone at the Palace of Nestor, vein lines are rendered in small clusters typically composed of three (or in some cases two) lines. This is evidenced again in the Arc

\(^{762}\) *PN* II, p. 172, pl. 97.
\(^{763}\) *PN* II, p. 172.
\(^{764}\) *PN* II, pp. 169-172.
Dadoes, as well in the depiction of the stone vase 2 M 6 (see Figure 5.8) and in painted representations of stone in the megaron’s gridded floor decoration (see discussion below).\footnote{230}

For these reasons, I would suggest that the *in situ* “thick black line with thin upward-springing lines” represents the curved underbelly of a couchant animal, as per the second option suggested (and then rejected) by Lang, who noted that the upward springing lines were vaguely reminiscent of “ingrowing hairs.”\footnote{\textsc{PN} II, p. 172.} What led Lang to reject this idea was that the thin lines were vertical rather than diagonal – the latter being customary in other painted depictions of animals’ bellies.\footnote{\textsc{PN} II, p. 172.} This reservation, I would argue, is outweighed by the exact match between the syntactical relationship of the thin lines and the thick line (the former springing up for a short distance from the latter) in the *in situ* painting and in other representations the torsos of couchant beasts. This is clearest on the hunting dogs (38 C 64) from Hall 64 (Figure 5.25), on spotted fauna from Hall 46 (21e C 46) (Figure 5.26), and on the griffin from the Throne Room (20 C 6) (see Figure 5.7b).\footnote{\textsc{PN} II, pp. 110-114 (20 C 6 and 21e C 46), 119-121 (38 C 64).}

Finally, the rise and fall of the thick line is strongly reminiscent of the curvature of the belly and chest of painted couchant animals. In each of the parallels just mentioned, the line of the lower body drops down to form the animal’s chest, then rises to make the arc of its belly beneath its hind legs. Based on this model, the shape of the *in situ* thick line (clearly visible in Figure 5.8), which arcs upward from left to right, suggests that this couchant animal faced to the left, away from the Throne Room’s door and toward the room’s NE wall and the throne.

\footnote{A possible exception to this is the stone dado that appears beneath the Nautilus Frieze (4 F nws), in which the vein lines are vertical. However, they are farther apart than the *in situ* examples and have a generally thicker, wavier appearance. That such vein lines can also show internal variation (another characteristic not evident on the Throne Room’s SE wall) is indicated by the alternately thick and thin lines on Variegated Dado fragments 13 D 44a and 13 D 44b (\textsc{PN} II, p. 173, pl. 98) and by the alternately wavy and straight lines on Variegated Dado fragment 14 D nws (\textsc{PN} II, pp. 173-174, pl. 100).}

\footnote{\textsc{PN} II, p. 173.}

\footnote{\textsc{PN} II, p. 172.}
The Painted Baseboards in the Portico

While wall painting 9 D 6 was probably not part of a painted dado, secure in situ evidence for such decoration was found in the megaron’s Portico. As described above, rectangular panels of cut limestone were placed along the bases of the Portico’s three walls forming a continuous stone “baseboard” around the room. This baseboard, Blegen and Rawson argued, was originally meant to be seen in its raw state before being covered over in a later phase by plaster (Figure 5.27) painted to look like stone (an act which I equated with waterproofing in Chapter 4). New evidence gleaned from excavation notebooks, however, may suggest otherwise. In 1960, during her careful study of the revetment on the NE wall of the Portico, Rawson noted the presence of “spots of what seem to be dark paint directly on the stone.” If these spots in fact represent paint, this suggests that the stone baseboards were not always (or perhaps were never?) meant to be displayed “as is” but were modified, like the plaster that later covered them, with painted details.

Unfortunately, these details can not be ascertained with certainty. Rawson’s account is brief and in their present worn state the stone panels themselves offer no further information. Based on the appearance of other dados at Pylos, however, it is possible that the painted design on the baseboards was imitation veining, similar to that identified by Blegen and Rawson on the coats of plaster subsequently applied to the stone’s surface. The purpose of modifying the raw limestone, I would suggest, was to enhance the stone’s natural appearance (a solid gray color) by
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769 PN I, p. 65. See also Nelson 2007, p. 19.
770 PN I, p. 65.
771 MR 1960, p. 42.
772 PN I, p. 65.
giving it brighter, bolder features in an attempt to match the baseboards to the painted plaster dadoes found in other rooms of the palace.

While it may seem odd to paint real stone to look like fake stone, a parallel for such “alterations” comes from another stone artifact from Pylos: the large circular tabletop of limestone conglomerate found in Court 58.\(^{773}\) This tabletop (Figure 5.28a), more than half of which is preserved, bears inlaid decoration which Blegen and Rawson described as “small white or reddish circular stone disks… [arranged in] “double," triple, and quintuple clusters…distributed over the table in a hit or miss fashion with no recognizable design or order.”\(^{774}\) Recently, the logic of the inlay’s distribution has been worked out by Hofstra, who during her intensive study of the palace’s small finds observed that the inlays were “preferentially” placed in areas where the stone is light gray (Figure 5.28b).\(^{775}\) While Hofstra argued that this placement was “for greater contrast,” I would suggest instead that it was meant to make the conglomerate, with its red, white, and gray inclusions, more uniform in overall appearance and thus more similar to simulated, rather than real, representations of stone.

For both the baseboards and the tabletop, this modification of real stone to make it resemble fake stone is intriguing. As one possibility, this may have been intended to correct a perceived flaw in the stone’s ability to represent itself effectively and by doing so make the material more legible to the ancient viewer. In the case of the Portico’s baseboard, although it was made of actual stone, its gray color and lack of surface patterning would have made less of a visual impact than the bright colors and heavy veining on the painted plaster dadoes found

\(^{773}\) PN I, p. 230. Blegen and Rawson identified the material of this table as variegated marble, but Hofstra (2000, p. 194) states that it is more likely limestone conglomerate.

\(^{774}\) PN I, p. 230, fig. 271, no. 4. The idea that the inlays are erratically arrayed has been reiterated by Shelmerdine (2012, p. 692).

\(^{775}\) Hofstra 2000, p. 194. This conclusion was arrived at independently in 2010 by Christos Bokoros (pers. comm.), and has since been confirmed by my own firsthand observation of the table.
elsewhere in the palace. Similarly, in the case of the tabletop, the erratic coloration of the natural stone may have been somehow less visually convincing than a regularized, repeating surface design of the type that had come to represent “stone” in the site’s artistic vocabulary.\textsuperscript{776} Together, these conclusions shed light on a new aspect of Pylian aesthetics\textsuperscript{777} wherein the value of simulated materials could be prized above the real thing – an unusual preference which, as I will show below, is also evident in the megaron’s floor paintings.

\textit{Floor Paintings}

\textit{Part I: PN Descriptions and Interpretations}

While the bulk of discussion of the wall paintings from the Pylos megaron appear in \textit{PN} II, the floors are addressed in \textit{PN} I. As described by Blegen and Rawson, the plaster floors of the three rooms of the Pylos megaron were vividly painted with grid patterns containing a bright array of geometric and figural designs. The lines of each grid, the excavators noted, were painted red and outlined by pairs of “incised” lines set 0.056 m. to 0.065 m. apart.\textsuperscript{778} The plaster of the floors was laid in successive layers that remain visible in floor breaks and within the profiles of the cuts for the columns in the suite’s Throne Room. These separate plaster events, Blegen and

\textsuperscript{776} Alternatively, it is also possible that the conglomerate used for the table was simply thought to be of “inferior” quality, and the inlays were added as a way to simulate a higher-end material. One such material that comes to mind is the more uniform conglomerate found in the Argolid and used selectively for important monuments and architectural elements (e.g., thresholds, jambs, lintels and column bases) at Mycenae and Tiryns (see discussions in Wright 1994, pp. 51, 54; 2006b, pp. 58-59).

\textsuperscript{777} Whether this table top was locally produced or imported is unclear. Either way, it is likely that the inlays were added at Pylos, as indicated by a fragment of stone revetment found northwest of the Main Building at Pylos that bears circular mortise cuts on its upper and lower edges that match the diameter to the table’s inlays (see discussion of this revetment by Hofstra (2000, p. 216, fig. 30), who argues that the revetment is for furniture, and more recently by Nelson (2007, p. 21, fig. 3.9), who argues that the revetment functioned as exterior wall decoration).

\textsuperscript{778} \textit{PN} I, p. 83. Problems with the term “incised” are discussed below.
Rawson concluded, each represented a discrete floor surface – the periodic remedy for the “rough treatment” that these floors received during their frequent use.\textsuperscript{779}

The Floor of the Portico

In the outermost room of the megaron, the Portico, traces of the gridded floor decoration were found well-preserved (Figure 5.29). As noted by Blegen and Rawson, three vertical (i.e., northwest to southeast) columns and nine horizontal (i.e., southwest to northeast) rows divided the floor into a total of twenty-seven squares. Twenty-four of these squares measured 1.28 m. per side, while three squares, located alongside the SW Wall, were smaller – with a horizontal length of only 0.425 m.\textsuperscript{780}

Although some squares were badly damaged, de Jong, undertaking a careful examination of the floor in 1963, detected traces of paint in fourteen squares that appeared to correspond to one of five designs:\textsuperscript{781}

1. “Four groups of concentric arcs, radiating from each corner, with a central unit formed by two concentric diamond-shaped figures” (squares A2, A9, B4, C3)\textsuperscript{782}

2. “Closely spaced parallel zigzags” (squares A4, A8, B1, B2, B9)

3. “Numerous small single dotted circles scattered thickly, but without perceptible order” (squares A3, A7)

4. “Net- or scale-pattern” (squares A6, B2, B7)

5. “Transverse parallel bands” (square A1)

\textsuperscript{779} PN I, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{780} PN I, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{781} PN I, pp. 26, 69. Also see Blegen and Lang 1964, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{782} The use of alphanumeric codes for the grid squares in the Portico is not found in the published literature but is added here (and in Figure 5.29) for the sake of clarity and consistency with the Throne Room descriptions below. Like the Throne Room, the vertical columns are labeled with numbers (1-3) and the horizontal rows are labeled with letters (A-I).
The style of these repeating patterns, Blegen and Rawson observed, was whimsical, with each example being “made freely, with variations in details, in color, [and] in orientation.”783

In addition to those squares with abstract designs, one square, C9, was identified as containing a pair of “odd looking” fish with broad heads and splayed tails. The design was painted into a narrow rectangle (0.16-0.20 m. tall) at the northwestern edge of the square and marked off by a pair of “incised” lines.784 Blegen and Rawson were puzzled by the presence of these fish. Believing them to be incongruous both thematically and stylistically with the rest of the Portico floor’s decoration, the excavators assigned this design to an earlier floor level, the first in a series of three.785 The second layer, Blegen and Rawson posited, was represented by the gridded floor with the designs described above, and the third and final layer by isolated bits of plaster found near the room’s SW wall that bore “some traces of red color” on their surface.786

The Floor of the Vestibule

Immediately to the northwest of the Portico, the Vestibule of the megaron also retained evidence of gridded floor decoration (see Figure 5.29). Although many squares were damaged and/or heavily encrusted with lime, Blegen and Rawson recorded that de Jong was able to discern a grid of forty squares arranged in four vertical (i.e., northwest to southeast) columns and ten horizontal (i.e., southwest to northeast) rows.787 Overall, the painted decoration was poorly
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783 PN I, p. 70.
784 PN I, p. 70. My own observation of these lines shows that they are spaced ca. 0.05 m. apart, like the surrounding lines of the large grid.
785 PN I, p. 70.
786 PN I, pp. 68-69.
787 PN I, p. 74. The dimensions of the floor squares in the Pylos Vestibule are not given by Blegen and Rawson but were measured by the author to be roughly 1.10 m. per side, the same measurement recorded by the excavators for the squares of the floor grid in the Throne Room.
preserved and only eight squares, all located around the perimeter of the room, had recognizable decoration. These patterns included:  

1. “Irregular rows of single circles...each enclosing a central dot” (squares A10, D5, D9)  
2. “Four groups of concentric arcs, radiating from the corners of the square” (squares A3, A9)  
3. “Net- or scale-pattern” (squares A1, D2)  
4. “Two groups of concentric arcs radiating from opposite corners” (square D1)  

Although the floor surface was found to be uneven and cracked, all of these designs were assigned by Blegen and Rawson to the same, final coat of plaster.  

In addition to painted designs, the Vestibule’s floor, like that in the Portico, featured incised lines within some of its grid squares. As noted by Blegen and Rawson, these lines appeared in squares C5 and C10, neither of which retained any trace of painted decoration. Unlike the Portico examples, however, these lines were arranged perpendicularly to one another, dividing each grid square into “small squares or bands.”  

The Floor of the Throne Room  

In the Pylos megaron, the most elaborate floor decoration is found in the Throne Room (Figure 5.30). As described by Blegen and Rawson, this decoration came from the final layer of between two and four coats of plaster – visible in the profiles of the room’s column cuts. The final plaster floor was divided into 100 whole squares and twelve partial squares, each of which
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788 PN I, p. 74. As with the Portico, the use of alphanumeric codes for the grid squares in the Vestibule is not found in the published literature has been added for the sake of clarity and consistency with the megaron’s other floors.  
789 PN I, p. 74.  
790 PN I, p. 74.  
791 PN I, pp. 80, 82.
was assigned a unique alphanumeric code based on its position in the grid.\textsuperscript{792} The columns of squares extending from northwest to southeast were numbered sequentially from one to ten, while the twelve rows extending from southwest to northeast were lettered in order from A to L. In the northwestern half of the room, the grid was laid out perpendicularly, with each square measuring 1.08 m. per side.\textsuperscript{793} At the southeastern end of the room the grid shifted to a diagonal, resulting in forty trapezoidal squares near the doorway that were unevenly sized.\textsuperscript{794} This “curious irregularity” was interpreted by Blegen and Rawson as a mistake – a “miscalculation” made by floor painters whose quality of work had “fallen off appreciably at the end of Mycenaean III B.”\textsuperscript{795} As the excavators argued, when guidelines were strung across the floor from southwest to northeast,

“…the transverse line drawn from the seventh point on the southwestern wall was carried only to the southerly edge of the hearth and not to the northeastern wall, while, to make matters worse, the next transverse line was laid out from the eighth point on the southwest to the seventh point on the northeast; and all the succeeding lines followed approximately the same parallel divergence from the perpendicular.”\textsuperscript{796}

Throughout the Throne Room, Blegen and Rawson noted that the surface of the plaster floor was “badly smoked and blackened from the effects of the fire.”\textsuperscript{797} Some areas, however, particularly those around the central hearth, in front of the “throne space,” in the doorway to the

\textsuperscript{792} These “partial” squares include those cut by the circle of the hearth as well as the square largely occupied by the throne space.
\textsuperscript{793} \textit{PN} I, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{794} \textit{PN} I, p. 83. As shown in de Jong’s reconstruction (see Figure 5.30), each of these irregular squares gradually increased in height from southwest to northeast. While the lines of the southeast-northwest rows changed to diagonal in this lower part of the grid, the lines of the columns maintained their original spacing resulting in squares with different heights but consistent widths.
\textsuperscript{795} \textit{PN} I, p. 83. Blegen and Rawson also noted an idea proposed by Bert Hodge Hill, who “suggested that the floor-painters may have made the change on their own initiative when they found that they could not stretch a string straight across the room to connect the eighth points on the two sides, since it would have encountered the two solid southeastern columns which supported the balcony and the clerestory” (\textit{ibid.}). This idea, however, does not make sense given that the artisans were able to string lines through the two southwest and the two northeast columns without difficulty, a fact also noted by Ethel Hirsch (1977, p. 34, n. 101).
\textsuperscript{796} \textit{PN} I, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{797} \textit{PN} I, p. 82. Mention of this blackened condition of the floor during its excavation appears in GEM 1952, p. 21.
Vestibule, and alongside each of the room’s four walls fared better than others (see Figure 3.44). Within these areas, de Jong was able to identify painted patterns in the interiors of seventy-five squares. This decoration, as described by Blegen and Rawson, consisted predominantly of repeating geometric patterns taking one of ten forms:

1. “Parallel [straight or wavy] lines in a diagonal...”
2. “...or transverse arrangement”
3. “Multiple parallel chevrons”
4. “Single circles scattered about close together in no recognizable order”
5. “Crosshatching”
6. “Concentric arcs: sometimes in two groups, touching back to back, extending directly across the square...”
7. “...but more often in four groups radiating from the four corners with a diamond-shaped central lozenge”
8. “Parallel zigzags”
9. “Large or small scale pattern”
10. “Wavy net motif”

In general, these patterns were scattered erratically across the floor, with some preference (noted by Blegen and Rawson in five or six instances) for the so-called “knight’s move” in chess.

In addition to the geometric designs, one square, F8, located two squares out from the throne space (which occupies most of square F10), was decorated with the figural motif of a red-brown octopus featuring distinctive “large eyes and symmetrical curving tentacles” (Figure

798 PN I, p. 82. The areas of greatest damage included a strip 2.75 m. wide at a distance of 0.65 m. out from the Throne Room’s NW Wall and an area closer toward the hearth that was “cracked and buckled” by falling debris and the roots of modern olive trees (ibid.).
799 PN I, p. 84.
800 PN I, p. 84.
Furthermore, in nine of the Throne Room’s floor squares (F1, G1, J5, K4, K6, K7, K8, L9, and L10) (Figures 5.32 and 5.33), Blegen and Rawson identified small grids of incised lines similar to those observed in the Vestibule. As before, Blegen and Rawson were unable to identify the purpose of these “mini-grids” with certainty. Based on the positions of the squares in arguably prominent parts of the Throne Room, however, including its extreme eastern corner, the area in front of the entrance from the Vestibule, and the space directly opposite the throne, the excavators suggested that the mini-grids may have designated places for court officials to stand on important “occasions of state.”

Part II: Subsequent Scholarly Studies

Since the publication of PN I, only a few scholars have sought to confirm, refute, or add to Blegen and Rawson’s (and de Jong’s) reconstructions and interpretations of the floor’s decoration. The most extensive re-examination has been undertaken by Ethel Hirsch, who studied the floors for her doctoral dissertation. In the main publication that resulted from her study: *Painted Decoration on the Floors of Bronze Age Structures on Crete and the Greek Mainland* (1977), and an article, “Another Look at Minoan and Mycenaean Interrelationships in Floor Decoration” (1980), Hirsch argued that the painted floors of the palace at Pylos, as well as those at Mycenae and Tiryns, were meant to simulate Minoan-style stone pavements.

In her work, Hirsch attempted to refute the widely held opinion that Mycenaean gridded and painted floors were meant to represent pieced carpets. In the late nineteenth century, the
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801 PN I, p. 84. The discovery of this naturalistic motif is recorded in GEM 1952, p. 132.
802 PN I, p. 84.
803 PN I, pp. 84-85. Specifically, squares F1 and G1 are directly opposite the throne, squares J5, K4, K6, K7, and K8 are near the doorway to the Vestibule, and squares L9 and L10 are in the extreme eastern corner of the room.
805 Hirsch’s conclusions were anticipated to some extent by the work of Winifred Lamb who re-studied and re-drew the floor designs in the court of the megaron at Mycenae, and concluded that there were a number of similarities.
first proponent of this idea was Dörpfeld, who in 1885 described lines that he found in the Tiryns megaron as reminiscent of a “carpet pattern” (Figure 5.34). Although it is unclear whether Dörpfeld meant to say that the lines simulated an actual carpet or whether he was simply referring to an overall decorative effect, the idea that Mycenaean gridded floor decoration represented carpets stuck and was subsequently adopted by Rudolf Hackl, who re-examined the Tiryns floors in 1909. In the large megaron, Hackl found evidence of a painted grid filled with marine motifs (octopuses and paired dolphins) and an interlocking linear design he termed “Schuppen,” (commonly translated as “tricurved arch” on account of its affinity with FM 62:15) (Figures 5.35). This linear design (Figure 5.36), Hackl contended, while originally designed to imitate rocky terrain with flowers, had become an explicitly textile motif by LH III as indicated by its appearance in painted depictions of clothing. Marine motifs such as dolphins and octopuses (Figure 5.37), Hackl further argued, also possessed a textile quality on account of their appearance in the so-called “Curtain Fresco” (excavated by Tsountas at Mycenae), which featured bands of argonauts alongside more traditional textile patterns including the “Rautenmuster” (concentric rhomboids). Following this early work at Tiryns, the floors of the Throne Room, Vestibule, and Court at Mycenae were likewise deemed representative of carpets by Gerhart Rodenwaldt, who reassessed these features in 1919 after their initial discovery by Tsountas in 1886.
In her publications, Hirsch supported her interpretation of Mycenaean painted floors as representations of stone pavements using two pieces of evidence. First were the visual similarities between the red grid lines in the floor paintings at Pylos (as well as at Mycenae and Tiryns) and the red-painted grout surrounding the stone floor slabs in Late Minoan palaces and/or elite residences on Crete at Phaistos, Knossos, Hagia Triada, Archanes, and Zakros. Second were the close parallels between the floors’ linear patterns and representations of different types of cut stone in Aegean Bronze Age wall and vase painting. In her studies, Hirsch focused on the floors’ geometric patterns, which she divided into eight discrete categories (Figure 5.38). These were:

1. “tricurved arch enclosing a pattern”
2. “circles”
3. “ridges/scales”
4. “zigzags”
5. “scattered irregular shapes”
6. “wavy parallel lines”
7. “two concentric arcs”
8. “four concentric arcs”

The tricurved arch, Hirsch argued (following Hackl), represented a stylized version of a rocky landscape with occasional floral fillers. It may have also been a shorthand version of conglomerate, she suggested, as evidenced by similar patterns in the Pylos painted wall dadoes. The “circles,” Hirsch contended, were very similar to FM 76:2 and with enclosing white dots could be identified as an imitation of liparite, a stone known from imported vessels

---

813 Hirsch 1977a, p. 25.
and replicated with paint on MM I and II Knossian ceramics.\textsuperscript{814} Such circles, Hirsch further argued, may have also been used to depict a composite design of small pebbles, as indicated by the pattern on two fragments belonging to the Pylos “Variegated Dado” (Figure 5.39)\textsuperscript{815} The ridges, like the tricurved arches, Hirsch associated with representations of rocky landscapes and also “mineral imitations” based the presence of parallel wavy lines (also identified by Hackl at Tiryns).\textsuperscript{816} The zigzag pattern, similar to FM 61:5, Hirsch argued was used to represent alabaster and marble as evidenced by the examples from the painted floors at Mycenae identified by Lamb.\textsuperscript{817} The scattered irregular shapes, Hirsch observed, were reminiscent of amorphous blobs painted on MM III vessels from Crete interpreted as “granulated rock-work.”\textsuperscript{818} Wavy parallel lines, she argued, showed great similarity to the bands used to depict stone vases in LH III wall paintings from both Knossos and Pylos, while the concentric patterns found parallels in painted stone dadoes from these sites as well as Tiryns.\textsuperscript{819}

While Hirsch attempted to be comprehensive in her study of Aegean floor paintings, she elected to omit the floor patterns from the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron because she felt that the published accounts were unreliable. The reasons for her lack of confidence, as clearly stated in 1977, were twofold. First, Hirsch argued that the watercolor reconstruction of the floor produced by de Jong (see Figure 5.30) was patently inaccurate because of an apparent discrepancy between the painted version of the decoration in square E7 and the appearance of the same decoration in a published photograph (Figure 5.40).\textsuperscript{820} As noted by Blegen and Rawson,

\begin{quote}
“…the difficulty of removing the adhesive accretions of lime coating the floor has…gravely obstructed the observation and recognition of many details. Thus in a photograph…the eye of
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{814} Hirsch 1977a, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{815} Hirsch 1977a, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{816} Hirsch 1977a, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{817} Hirsch 1977a, pp. 25-26. Hirsch also mentions the possibility that the zigzag pattern was meant to indicate wood.
\textsuperscript{818} Hirsch 1977a, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{819} Hirsch 1977a, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{820} Hirsch 1977a, p. 34.
the camera seems to have seen minor elements which do not exactly agree with the reconstruction in the water color.”

Second, Hirsch claimed that there was no “textual support” for the Throne Room’s floor decoration because Blegen and Rawson chose to describe the motifs *en masse* in list form rather than enumerating them square-by-square as they had done for the Vestibule and Portico.\(^\text{822}\)

In addition to Hirsch’s extensive analysis, individual aspects of the Pylos floors have also been examined. For example, the idea that the diagonal orientation of the southeastern half of the Throne Room’s grid was a mistake has been echoed frequently, perhaps most notably by Rutter, who proposed that this “eyesore” was the result of a “rush job” during a hurried attempt to get the Pylos megaron “up and running” at the beginning of LH IIIB.\(^\text{823}\) Thaler too has affirmed that the diagonal was a mistake, but has suggested that it may, as an unintended consequence, have caused visitors to the Throne Room to glance rightward, in the direction of the throne, before beginning their clockwise circuit of the room.\(^\text{824}\)

Observations have also been made regarding the appearance and role played by the lone octopus in square F8 (see Figures 5.30 and 5.31). In 1977, Hirsch recorded more about the animal’s physical appearance, noting that:

> “the eyes have been painted in the center of the head. The tentacles are draped around the body like loose curls of hair and the shape of the body is pointed. The siphons present in other versions are not drawn. The presentation is entirely symmetrical.”\(^\text{825}\)

As for why the motif was included in the floor’s “stone” decoration, Hirsch argued that while it
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\(^{821}\) PN I, p. 84, n. 32.

\(^{822}\) Hirsch 1977a, pp. 32, 34.

\(^{823}\) Rutter 2005, pp. 31, 34. Also see Hirsch 1977a, p. 34; Petrakis 2011, pp. 189, 191.

\(^{824}\) Thaler 2012a, p. 200: “Ebenso ließe sich erwägen oder zumindest spekulieren, daß die eigentümliche Rasterabweichung im pylischen Megaronboden südöstlich des Herdes der Blicklenkung gedient haben könnte, in diesem Falle der Lenkung zuvor angesprochenen flüchtigen Seitenblicke vor Erreichen der Position dem Thron gegenüber…” This idea, however, he felt to be impossible to prove based on the wide acceptance of the idea that the diagonal was the result of poor construction: “…es dürfte allerdings kaum möglich sein, ein zwingendes Argument ins Feld zu führen, diese Annahme gegenüber z.B. der Vermutung von “Pfusch am Bau” zu bevorzugen” (ibid.).

\(^{825}\) Hirsch 1977a, p. 34.
may have simply been a product of artistic convention (inserted into the floor painting as per current trends in Mycenaean floor painting because of the “flexibility” of the floor plaster, which “invited an innovative response” to its decorative program) it was more likely that the octopus at Pylos had “an emblematic or iconographic nature,” as indicated by its position “directly before [the throne], facing in that direction.”

That the Pylos octopus may have had a connection to the divine was suggested previously in 1980 by Säflund, who argued that the creature was an “abbreviation for the sea” and, due to its association with the throne, may have served as “an allusion to the power of the deity for whose representation or impersonation the Throne was intended.” In 1995, Hiller proposed that the animal’s depiction on the floor (i.e., on a horizontal surface) was a reference to its real-life sea habitat. Its ability also to survive on land for a few hours, however, he argued was suggestive of the octopus’ “daemonic” character, making it an effective marine counterpart to the Mycenaean terrestrial lion and griffin.

In 2011, Hirsch’s and Hiller’s interpretations of the octopus as emblematic and/or daemonic were reiterated by Vasilis Petrakis and by Ina Berg, who connected the octopus to “the power of the sea and [thus to] the power of the Mycenaean king.” Alternatively, Berg, building on ideas presented previously by Watrous, also suggested that the octopus may have served “as a symbol of death or the journey into an afterlife” on account of its frequent appearance on Postpalatial Cretan larnakes. As additional evidence, she noted the animal’s
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829 Petrakis 2011, p. 192; Berg 2011, p. 131.
830 Berg 2011, p. 131; Watrous 1991. For more recent discussion of the connection between octopuses and death, see the work of Lucia Alberti, who also tentatively connects the animal painted on the floors in Pylos Rooms 49 and 50 to the royal perfume industry (Alberti 2013, p. 75).
ability to re-grow its arms, making it an appropriate symbol for life after death.\textsuperscript{831}

\textit{Part III: New Evidence}

As in the cases of the stratigraphy, finds, and built features of the Pylos megaron, our current understanding of the character of the decorated floors at Pylos is improved by reconsideration of the published accounts, study of unpublished excavation records, and firsthand observations. Using this evidence, it is possible to gain a better understanding of the patterns on the floors and the extent to which de Jong’s reconstructions of them are reliable, to identify the prototypes of the various motifs, and to recognize the technical aids used in their production.

\textit{Patterns on the Floor of the Throne Room}

New evidence for the megaron’s floor decoration comes from early notes and sketches preserved in the Pylos field notebooks. In the Throne Room, Vanderpool recorded details about floor square L7, which he described as decorated with circles with a diameter of 0.06-0.08 m. “not regularly disposed, although they seem to fall more or less into rows.”\textsuperscript{832} The form of the circles, which he drew both as found and enlarged (Figure 5.41), consisted of rings of red and white color around a central white dot.\textsuperscript{833} In square L8, Vanderpool noted and sketched wavy red, white, and dark(?) blue lines, while in squares L9 and L10 he observed the presence of incised squares, in the latter case on top of a rose ground with white painted designs.\textsuperscript{834} In square

\textsuperscript{831} Berg 2011, p. 131, with references. See also Berg 2013, pp. 15-16.
\textsuperscript{832} GEM 1952, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{833} GEM 1952, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{834} GEM 1952, p. 123. “Red wiggly lines” were also observed on the floor alongside the Throne Room’s NE wall by Blegen on July 1 (CWB 1952, p. 96).
F8, Vanderpool made the first field notes regarding the octopus, which he described as having a “brownish” color, “probably intended to be life-like; turned yellowish brown in places.”

Each of these decorations and many more were also included in a 1:50 field plan of the Throne Room’s floor, drawn by Demetrios Theocharis in July of 1952 (Figure 5.42). This unpublished plan, tucked into the back pocket of Mylonas’ 1952 field notebook, is labeled with the same alphanumeric system found in PN I. The squares themselves are annotated with English descriptions of their decoration and/or sketches (both complete and partial). In some of the squares, there are small check marks indicated in the plan’s legend as denoting those squares where very little or no original surface was preserved and/or visible in 1952. Most of these squares are otherwise blank, but eight of them (A9, B8, B9, D7, E9, F4, J2, and L5) contain light sketches of a complete motif and the initials “PdJ” in the lower corner. Examples of these squares can be seen in Figure 5.43. These details seem to indicate revised interpretations of the squares’ decorative patterns by de Jong in 1953, the year he joined the excavation and undertook a systematic investigation of the Throne Room’s floor under the protection of a portable wooden shelter (Figure 5.44) over a period of at least eight days.

A similar conclusion can be inferred for 16 squares (A10, D6, E8, F3, F9, G3, G4, I1, I6, I7, I8, I10, J5, J6, K8, and K9) marked with the phrase: “no trace of color” over which a complete motif has been drawn and the initials “PdJ” added. Lastly, a completed motif and the
initials “PdJ” appear in nine squares (I2, I3, I4, J1, J7, J8, K1, K2, K4, and K7) that also contain incomplete patterns and/or short written descriptions. Examples of these annotations can be seen in Figure 5.45. These squares likely represent instances in which traces of decoration were sketched and/or noted in 1952, but were not “deciphered” until de Jong’s intensive study the following year.

Field Drawing vs. Final Reconstruction

When this field drawing of the Throne Room’s painted floor is compared to de Jong’s published reconstruction, a number of similarities and differences become apparent. Starting with the latter, it is immediately clear that the degree of detail employed in each representation of the floor is markedly different. The field drawing is more “suggestive,” while the watercolor is finely rendered. In each square of the latter, de Jong outlined areas of preserved surface in pencil and filled them in with darker paint than he used in the surrounding, restored areas. These differences, impossible to see in the black and white reproduction published in PN I (see Figure 5.30), are clearly visible in the original watercolor, which is on display in the Chora Museum (Figure 5.46). For clarity, areas of in situ painted surface are highlighted in blue in Figure 5.47. Differences between the two renderings are likely a product of their disparate functions. Theocharis’ drawing in Mylonas’ notebook was a field sketch, designed to record an “impression” of the decoration for on-site reference, while de Jong’s painting was a final reconstruction, intended as an “as-accurate-as-possible” restoration of the floor’s decoration for scholarly circulation.

Close Similarities
Similarities between the two renderings of the Throne Room’s floor are also apparent. First, there is a very close match between the number of decorated squares in each representation. Seventy-four squares are marked as decorated in the field sketch, while 75 decorated squares appear in de Jong’s painting. The additional square in the painting is H5, a partial square cut by the hearth and marked only with the phrase: “no trace of color” in the field drawing (see Figure 5.45). Because of the small size of this square on the sketch, it is likely that it was simply overlooked during the 1953 annotation process. Second, all 34 squares marked “PdJ” in the field sketch have decorations similar in color (described) and/or shape to the designs depicted in the final painting.

Strong Similarities

There are also, however, 31 squares (A1, A4, A5, A6, A8, B1, B10, C4, C10, D1, D3, D4, E4, E7, F1, G1, H1, H4, H6, H7, J10, K5, K6, K7, K10, L1, L2, L3, L4, L8, and L10) in the field drawing not marked with “PdJ” in which the sketches and/or brief written descriptions in the field drawing show some similarity to de Jong’s final rendering. In three of these squares (H6, I3, and L2), these similarities are general – existing only between the colors referenced in the 1952 field sketch descriptions and those used in de Jong’s reconstruction. In 10 squares (A1, B1, C4, D1, F1, G1, H7, K5, K6, and K7), the similarities are slightly stronger, existing between the written descriptions of the motifs in the 1952 sketch and their final painted forms. In the case of square K7, its description, “Traces of painted decoration at one point which carries across squares; gently curving lines, red and dark against pink ground,” appears in Vanderpool’s field notes (GEM 1952, p. 124) rather than on the field plan.

839 The most robust similarities appear in 16 squares (A4, A5, A8, B10, C10, D3, D4, E4, E7, H4, J10, K10, L1, L3, L4, and L8) in which the drawn forms of motifs (or of their component elements,
often accompanied by written descriptions) in the field sketch are akin to the patterns painted by de Jong.\(^{840}\)

Included in this last group are squares with comparable decorations in the two renderings, but with details rendered on a different scale, with a different orientation, or with different spacing. The first disparity is true for six squares (A4, A8, B10, D3, L3, and K10), which feature a zigzag pattern drawn larger in the field sketch than in de Jong’s painting. Squares C10, D4, J10, L1, and L4 feature different orientations, with parallel bands of wavy lines at noticeably different angles in the two renditions. Such is also the case for the “network of curvilinear shapes” in square E4 that was oriented from southwest to northeast in 1952 and from west to east by de Jong. The third and final group, designs with different spacing, is represented by the scale-pattern in square E7, the square cited by Hirsch as evidence of de Jong’s artistic “inaccuracy.”

As noted above, Hirsch’s distrust of the rendering in this square derives from a footnote in \textit{PN I} in which Blegen and Rawson commented that a published photograph showed “minor elements which do not exactly agree with the reconstruction in [de Jong’s] water color.”\(^{841}\) In this particular photograph (see Figure 5.40), the motif in square E7 is represented by the upper curves of two adjacent (but not touching) arcs, each with an underlying arc of dots. This design, half of which is rendered identically in the 1952 field sketch (see Figure 5.43) does not seem to me to be at all incongruous with the repeating scale pattern reconstructed by de Jong. While it is true that the spacing of the original and painted renditions is different, the actual form of the

\(^{840}\) In one case, square D5, the drawing does not appear in the square itself, but is indicated by a reference to another square (L7) in which the decoration is rendered. It should also be noted that this list does not include square H1, which contains a sketch that is very similar to the “speckled” pattern painted by de Jong. This square is omitted because although the two representations are similar, the description in the sketched square: “wavy lines?” is contradictory to the sketched drawing, suggesting that there was a low level of confidence about its original appearance.

\(^{841}\) Hirsch 1977a, p. 34; \textit{PN I}, p. 84, n. 32.
motif (curved arcs with underlying arcs of dots) is unchanged, reducing the magnitude of de Jong’s “inaccuracy” and rendering the two versions as demonstrably similar.\textsuperscript{842}

\textit{Exact Matches and Evidence for Reliable Patterns in de Jong’s Watercolor}

While the above sketched squares show some similarity with de Jong’s final painting, there are 10 squares (A2, A3, A6, A7, D5, E5, E6, F7, F8, and L7) in the field plan in which the motifs match those in the watercolor almost exactly.\textsuperscript{843} These squares provide the best evidence for reliable representations of floor patterns in de Jong’s painting. Because de Jong did not hesitate to revise the field drawing when he deemed it necessary, the fact that these motifs, observed by two different individuals working in two different years, remained unchanged makes it more likely that they were considered accurate representations of what was in fact preserved on the floor.

To these “exact” matches, I would also assign “high probable accuracy” to those 16 squares mentioned above in which the drawn forms of motifs in the 1952 field plan are similar to the renderings produced by de Jong. While not replicating the sketched designs exactly, de Jong’s paintings of these squares maintain a close formal similarity with the earlier drawings – the dominant unifying characteristic in the “exact” matches. For example, the shape of the larger zigzag motif in squares A4, A8, B10, and K10 of the field plan can be detected within the overall pattern created by de Jong’s smaller zigzags. Similarly, the diagonal orientation of the wavy lines in squares C10, D4, J10, L1, and L4 of the field plan approximates the angle of the concentric arc patterns reconstructed by de Jong. In each of these cases, the discrepancies between the field

\textsuperscript{842} It is also perhaps relevant that this square is not marked “PdJ” in the field sketch, indicating that it was clearly visible from the time it was investigated and not subject to later “misinterpretation” by de Jong.

\textsuperscript{843} The presence of a circle pattern in square L7 is further confirmed by a description of the square in Vanderpool’s field notes (GEM 1952, pp. 106-107). For a drawing of the same square, see Figure 5.41.
plan and de Jong’s drawings might be attributed to the visibility of the designs, which were likely cleaner in 1953 than in 1952.844

Squares G1, C4, L9, and L10 in de Jong’s painting should also be considered reliable. In square G1, the decorative elements, although not drawn in the 1952 field sketch, are described in specific terms (i.e., “chevrons” rather than “parallel lines,” etc.) that match de Jong’s representation of the motif. As for squares C4 and L9, these are shown by de Jong as preserving substantial parts of their original painted surfaces (see Figure 5.47), which contain diagnostic components of their decorative designs. Finally, I add square L10 because its scale decoration was confirmed firsthand during a cleaning effort in 2012 (see below).

Reliable Patterns: Synthesis

Based on the above evidence, 64 squares in de Jong’s painted reconstruction of the Throne Room’s floor can be considered reliable. These squares (i.e., A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10, B8, B9, B10, C4, C10, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, F3, F4, F7, F8, F9, G1, G3, G4, H4, I1, I2, I3, I4, I6, I7, I8, I10, J1, J2, J5, J6, J7, J8, J10, K1, K2, K4, K7, K8, K9, K10, L1, L3, L4, L5, L7, L8, L9, and L10) include 34 squares marked “PdJ” and 30 squares not marked “PdJ” in the field sketch, each of which, being remarkably similar to their rendering in de Jong’s watercolor, support the latter’s accuracy.

844 In his 1953 field notes, Blegen recorded that three women washed the Throne Room’s floor (CWB 1953, p. 95). Such discrepancies are also likely a product of the different functions of the two men’s drawings, discussed above, which may also explain the occasional situations in which the location of a design within a square (e.g., in B10, D3, E4, J10, K2, and L4) as drawn in the field plan does not correspond to the areas of preserved surface indicated by de Jong. In this case, it is likely that the form of the design was simply sketched in the field, leaving it to de Jong to render it in its correct position in the final painting.
In this group, all 10\textsuperscript{845} of the decorative patterns (both abstract and figural) identified by Blegen and Rawson are present and can therefore be assigned with confidence to the floor of the Throne Room.\textsuperscript{846} These patterns and the floor squares in which they appear are:

1. “Parallel wavy lines or bands running transversely...” (Throne Room squares F7 and I8)
2. “…or diagonally” (Throne Room squares A3, E5, and E8)
3. “Parallel zigzags” (Throne Room squares A4, A8, B10, D3, G1, K10, and L3)
4. “Single circles scattered about close together in no recognizable order” (Throne Room squares D5 and L7)
5. “Crosshatching” (Throne Room square K2)
6. “Concentric arcs: sometimes in two groups, touching back to back, extending directly across the square...” (Throne Room squares A6, A7, A10, B8, C10, D6, and J7)
7. “...but more often in four groups radiating from the four corners with a diamond-shaped central lozenge” (Throne Room squares A2, B9, D4, D7, E6?, E9, F3, F4, G4, I1, I3, I4, I6, I7, J2, J6, J10, K1, K9, L1, L4 and L8)\textsuperscript{847}
8. “Large or small scale pattern” (Throne Room squares A5, A9, C4, E4, E7, F9, H4, J1, J8, K7, L9 and L10)
9. “Wavy net motif” (Throne Room squares G3, I2, I10, J5, K4, K8, and L5)
10. “Octopus” (Throne Room square F8)

\textsuperscript{845} More correctly, there were 11 patterns listed originally, but as discussed earlier two designs (the “parallel zigzag” and the “multiple parallel chevrons”) were redundant so they have been combined as one pattern for this count. From an artistic perspective, there is no formal distinction between these two patterns and as such this double listing is likely accidental – attributable to variations in the terminology used for recording during excavation. Of the two options, the preferable term is “parallel zigzag” because it expresses the total form of the design and not just its compositional elements.

\textsuperscript{846} Those motifs from the Throne Room that cannot be verified are: the exaggerated transverse wavy lines (in square I8), transverse parallel lines (in square B1), the “hollow” net pattern (in squares K5 and L2), and the “speckled” pattern (in square H1) not discussed by Blegen and Rawson or Hirsch.

\textsuperscript{847} This group includes two unusual squares: square E6, which may have had two or four sets of arcs, and square K1, which has four sets of arcs that radiate from the sides (rather than the corners) of the square.
Looking closely at de Jong’s original watercolor (see Figure 5.45), many details of these patterns’ coloration and form are apparent. First, each design was painted using thin red, white, and black lines overtop of light red, white, blue-gray, and yellow backgrounds.\textsuperscript{848} The forms of each motif are also notable. The circles of the circle pattern, for example, are composed of concentric black, white, and red rings surrounding a central white dot.\textsuperscript{849} The arcs of the concentric arc patterns are rendered using three different line textures: wavy (squares A6, B9, C10, D4, D6, D7, E6, E9, F4, G4, I1, I3, I7, J2, J7, J10, K1, L1, and L8), smooth (squares A2 and A7), and scalloped (squares A10, B8, F3, I4, I6, J6, K9, and L4).

In the case of design 8, “large or small scale patterns,” three distinct designs are extant. The first, appearing in squares A5, A9, C4, E7, F9, H4, J8, and L10, is a traditional scale pattern composed of staggered rows of stacked black, white, and red arches. Below each arch is an arch of white dots surmounting a filler element of the type classified by Maria Shaw as a “schematized derivative of the foliate plant motif.”\textsuperscript{850} The second scale design, preserved in square E4, is a variation on the first pattern. Instead of orthogonal rows, the scales in this case are arrayed diagonally, and lack filler motifs. The third and final scale design is represented in squares J1, K7, and L9. Rather than having a rounded edge, these scales are tricurved. Like the other two variations they have a triple (black, white, and red) outline, but instead of a floral filler motif they feature small clusters of alternating wavy and straight lines.

More detail can also be added to the “wavy net” and “crosshatching” motifs. The first design, appearing in squares G3, I2, I10, J5, K4, K8, and L5, takes the form of what Shaw has

\textsuperscript{848} This tricolor combination is also included in the descriptions in the 1952 field plan of the Throne Room’s floor. In particular, see squares A2, A3, A4, A7, A8, D4, F7, G1, G7, H4, L4, and L8, all listed as including lines drawn in red, white and “dark” (i.e., black) paint.

\textsuperscript{849} A description and drawing of this particular design, as it appears in square L7, appears in GEM 1952, p. 107. In the case of square D5, the central white dot of the pattern is also enclosed by a small red ring.

\textsuperscript{850} Shaw 2000, p. 55, discussing a similar motif on one of the kilts worn by the offering bearers in the Knossos Procession Fresco.
called an “interlocked curvilinear quatrefoil” design. The pattern is composed of squares with rounded edges and incurving sides (i.e., quatrefoils) double outlined in red and black on a yellow background. The quatrefoils are aligned in diagonal rows so that each “interlocks” with the ones surrounding it, creating an expanding network design (also called rapport - see below). The interiors of the quatrefoils are embellished by five circles (one (red) at each corner and one (red surrounding a white dot) at its center) and their exteriors are framed by undulating white lines. Finally, the “crosshatching” pattern, found in square K2, consists of a simple expanding grid design created by wavy intersecting diagonal red lines against a yellow background. The interior of each wavy grid square (more properly, a lozenge) contains two concentric lozenges formed from black and white wavy lines.

Patterns on the Floors of the Vestibule and Portico

Unlike the Throne Room, no full plans of the painted floors of the Vestibule or Portico are preserved in the Pylos field notebooks. There are, however, sketches and written descriptions of individual (and groups of) squares that help to indicate places where de Jong’s watercolor reconstructions (see Figure 5.29) can be considered reliable. In 1961, for example, Rawson noted the presence of red, white, and black paint on the floor of the Vestibule, alongside the room’s NW and SE walls. In square A3, she observed the presence of “dark squiggly lines” on a red ground.

---

851 Shaw 2000, p. 58, referring to a similar pattern (Pattern “E”) on one of the kilts worn by an offering bearer in the Knossos Procession Fresco. As noted by Hirsch (1980, p. 458, n. 42) there has been considerable discussion over the correct term for this decoration. While the term “irregular amoeba-like motive” may be appropriate for a similar design in Room 50 (PN I, p. 214), the Throne Room pattern is more formalized and requires a term that conveys its regularity as well as its shape.
The floor of the Portico, Rawson noted, was heavily damaged, but still “well preserved” alongside the room’s NE and NW walls.\textsuperscript{854} Along the NE wall, she observed and sketched the following designs: “Wiggly lines in white, black, and dark red” in square A9 (Figure 5.48) and “chevrons made of wiggly lines, white alternating with dark red on a light red ground,” in square B9.\textsuperscript{855} In square C9, Rawson noted that the decoration was “very much damaged and appear[ed] to be in an entirely different style, black lines on creamy white, circles and wiggly lines. Piet identified these as funny fish such as were in Room 75.”\textsuperscript{856}

Along the Portico’s NW wall, Rawson noted the presence of “multiple chevrons with white dots between” on a light red background in square A8.\textsuperscript{857} She also observed that this square was “divided up into little rectangles running NE-SW and divided by paired lines.”\textsuperscript{858} Square A7 Rawson described as “painted with circles” with alternating rings in black, white and red with a central white dot.\textsuperscript{859} Square A4, she noted, preserved “multiple [maroon] chevrons of wiggly red and white lines” on a red ground, while square A3 featured a design of loosely aligned “large red circles [0.07-0.08 m. in diameter] apparently on a white background.”\textsuperscript{860} Squares A2 and A1, Rawson observed, were composed of “concentric arcs of white and dark wiggly lines” on backgrounds of light red.\textsuperscript{861}

In 1962, Rawson observed a “net pattern with white dots and little chevrons between the semi-circles” in square B3, a “diagonal scallop line” in square B4, and “chevrons of wiggly red and white lines” in square B9.\textsuperscript{855} She also noted that square B8 featured “chevrons of white alternating with dark red” on a light red background, while square B6 was decorated with “wiggly lines in white, black, and dark red” and “chevrons of wiggly lines, white alternating with dark red on a light red ground.”\textsuperscript{856} Square B7 was described as “painted with circles” with alternating rings in black, white and red with a central white dot.\textsuperscript{859} Square B4, she noted, preserved “multiple [maroon] chevrons of wiggly red and white lines” on a red ground, while square B3 featured a design of loosely aligned “large red circles [0.07-0.08 m. in diameter] apparently on a white background.”\textsuperscript{860} Squares B2 and B1, Rawson observed, were composed of “concentric arcs of white and dark wiggly lines” on backgrounds of light red.\textsuperscript{861}

\textsuperscript{854} MR 1961-1962, p. 63. \\
\textsuperscript{855} MR 1961-1962, p. 64. This is the only mention of patterns detected on the floor of the Vestibule during the excavations. In 1963, the floor was cleaned prior to the arrival de Jong, who “laid out [his] plan” in the same year (CWB 1963, pp. 63-90). \\
\textsuperscript{856} MR 1961-1962, p. 64. \\
\textsuperscript{857} MR 1961-1962, p. 65. \\
\textsuperscript{858} MR 1961-1962, p. 65. \\
\textsuperscript{859} MR 1961-1962, p. 65. \\
\textsuperscript{861} MR 1961-1962, p. 67.
lines” in square B2. Along the SW wall, she noted “little red running scallops changing
direction in the middle of the strip” in squares A1 and B1, which she sketched, along with other
patterns (including parallel wavy lines in the corners of squares C3 and B4) in a 1:20 plan of the
southwestern half of the Portico’s floor (Figure 5.49). In 1963, Blegen noted that the floor of
the Portico was reexamined and recognizable designs were drawn by Hero Athanasiades. The
only design mentioned by name was that in square B7, which Blegen remarked “may be an
octopus.”

To these field notes and sketches can be added my own firsthand observations of the
floor designs in the Vestibule and Portico. In 2012, under the auspices of HARP, light sweeping
of the north corner of the Vestibule’s floor revealed clear evidence of the circle pattern in square
A10. No paint was preserved, but parts of the rings of 11 circles were clearly visible incised into
the surface of the plaster (Figure 5.50). In the Portico, additional sweeping uncovered a series
of parallel red and black scalloped lines at the southwestern edge of square A1 (Figure 5.51).

Field Notes vs. Final Reconstruction

When the above notes, sketches, and firsthand observations of the floors of the Vestibule
and Portico are compared to de Jong’s published reconstructions, many similarities and
differences emerge. As was the case for the Throne Room’s floor, far more detail is included in
de Jong’s paintings than exists in the field records. This is most certainly due again to the
different roles played by the preliminary and final renderings. Concerning the numbers of

---

864 CWB 1963, pp. 29-39. This information is contrary to the published account in PN I which records that
Athanasiades was responsible only for drawing thresholds and jamb-bases. It is likely that her floor drawings (which
were done in May, prior to de Jong’s arrival at Pylos in July) were intended to aid de Jong’s work, as seems to have
been the case also for her ceramic illustrations done during the same year (PN I, p. 26).
865 CWB 1963, p. 38.
866 See more about this incised technique below.
squares with recorded decoration, there is more of a mismatch than was evident for the Throne Room. In the field descriptions and sketches of the Portico’s floor, 15 squares are noted as decorated compared to the 16 shown in de Jong’s painting. The additional square in the painting is A6, in which de Jong shows a scrap of a scale design abutting the room’s sentry stand. In the Vestibule, however, the numbers are less compatible. In this room, specific information about visible motifs comes only from two squares (A3 and A10), as compared to de Jong’s eight decorated squares. It is significant, however, that Rawson did note the presence of paint alongside the room’s NW and SE walls, where the additional squares painted by de Jong were located.

Among the 17 floor squares discussed in the field notes, 15 (Vestibule squares A3 and A10; Portico squares A1, A2, A3, A4, A7, A8, A9, B2, B3, B4, B9, C3, and C9) have decorations shown or described as being similar to de Jong’s watercolor. In five squares (Portico square A1; Vestibule squares A7, A8, A9, and B9) there are general similarities between the written descriptions of the motifs in the field notes and the designs painted by de Jong. Stronger similarities, however, exist for six squares (Portico squares A2, A4, B2, B3, B4, and C3) in which the drawn forms of motifs (or of their component elements) in Rawson’s 1962 field sketch (see Figure 5.49) are akin to the patterns painted by de Jong. In one case, square D5, the drawing does not appear in the square itself, but is indicated by a reference to another square, L7, in which the decoration is rendered. It should also be noted that this list does not include square H1, which contains a sketch that is very similar to the “speckled” pattern painted by de Jong. This square is omitted because although the two representations are similar, the description in the sketched square: “wavy lines?” is contradictory to the sketched drawing, suggesting that there was a low level of confidence about its original appearance.
**Reliable Patterns on the Floors of the Vestibule and Portico**

As in the case of the Throne Room, the squares from de Jong’s painting that demonstrate exact or close formal correspondences with the squares in the field sketches should be considered the most reliable. Independently drawn by two different individuals in two different years, these motifs have the greatest chance of matching closely the designs appearing on the floors. To this list I would add Vestibule square A10, the circle decoration of which I observed firsthand. Finally, I would also add Vestibule squares A1, A3, A9, D2, and D9 and Portico squares A7, A8, A9, B7, and B9, which retain substantial portions of their original surface (see Figure 5.29) and diagnostic elements of their reconstructed designs.

**Reliable Patterns; Synthesis**

Based on the preceding evidence, 19 squares in de Jong’s painted reconstructions of the floors of the Vestibule and Portico can be considered reliable. As noted, de Jong’s depictions of these squares (Vestibule: A1, A3, A9, A10, D2, and D9; Portico: A1, A2, A3, A4, A7, A8, A9, B2, B3, B4, B7, B9, and C3) show remarkable similarity to both field sketches and patterns that I observed firsthand. For the Vestibule, three of the four geometric patterns identified by Blegen and Rawson are present. These patterns and the squares in which they appear are:

1. “Irregular rows of single circles...each enclosing a central dot” (Vestibule squares A10 and D9)
2. “Four groups of concentric arcs, radiating from the corners of the square” (Vestibule squares A3 and A9)
3. “Net- or scale-pattern” (Vestibule squares A1 and D2)

For the Portico, all five of the geometric patterns identified by Blegen and Rawson are present:

---

868 The motif from the Vestibule that cannot be verified is: “two groups of concentric arcs radiating from opposite corners.”
1. “Four groups of concentric arcs, radiating from each corner, with a central unit formed by two concentric diamond-shaped figures” (Portico squares A2, A9, B4, and C3)

2. “Closely spaced parallel zigzags” (Portico squares A4, A8, B2, and B9)

3. “Numerous small single dotted circles scattered thickly, but without perceptible order” (Portico squares A3 and A7)

4. “Net- or scale-pattern” (Portico squares B3 and B7)

5. “Transverse parallel bands” (Portico square A1)

As with the Throne Room, artistic details for these patterns are visible in de Jong’s reconstructions. While I was unable to consult the original paintings of the Vestibule and Portico, color slides stored in the University of Cincinnati Pylos Excavation Archive show that the floor patterns were rendered using thin red, white, and black lines overtop washes of light red, white, or blue-gray (Figure 5.52). In the case of the concentric arcs and transverse bands, the painted lines used to construct the designs were wavy (Vestibule squares A3 and A9; Portico squares A2, A9, and C3) or “scalloped” (Portico squares A1 and B4), while those used to depict the zigzags, circles, and net/scale patterns were smooth.869

The Problem with the “Fish”

Among the floor decorations from the Vestibule and Portico not deemed reliable, one deserves additional scrutiny: the “fish” in Portico square C9. As noted above, these “odd looking” fish were reconstructed by de Jong in a narrow frame against the room’s NE wall (Figure 5.53 and see Figure 5.29). These figural decorations caused Blegen and Rawson difficulty on account of their apparent incongruity with the surrounding geometric designs. I would argue, however, based on the evidence presented in Rawson’s 1961 field notes, that the

869 As is the case of the Throne Room floor, many of these details are not visible in the published black and white version of de Jong’s paintings (see Figure 5.29), but are clear in the original watercolor.
design in square C9 was not fish but part of a larger geometric pattern. As quoted above, Rawson found the traces of painting in square C9 difficult to interpret. Before de Jong offered his assistance she was only able to identify “black lines on creamy white, circles and wiggly lines.” While circles are present in fish painted elsewhere in the palace (specifically on the floor of Room 50 where a curved element forms the orbit of at least one fish’s eye, Figure 5.54), “wiggly lines” are not, suggesting that what Rawson saw was something other than fish.

Evidence that the “fish” may have been part of a geometric pattern comes from the paired incised lines inside square C9. As noted above, these lines were interpreted as the southwestern border of the narrow rectangular field that the “fish” occupied. While only this one pair of unusual border lines was published in *PN* I, two additional pairs are mentioned in Rawson’s 1961 field notebook, located in square A8. As Rawson notes, these paired lines divided this square into “little rectangles running NE-SW [i.e., parallel to the room’s NW Wall].” Today, the surface of square A8 is much eroded, but two sets of interior paired lines are still visible, each spaced ca. 0.05 m. apart and positioned parallel to the NW wall (Figure 5.55). The first pair sit at distances of 0.24 m. and 0.29 m. out from the wall and the second pair at distances of 0.52 m. and 0.57 m.

In these positions, the paired lines in square A8 are identical to those in square C9, which are still partly visible today (Figure 5.56). The paired lines, spaced 0.05 m. apart, divide both squares’ central decorative fields into long thin rectangles. In square A8, the design is not figural nor it is bounded by the interior incised lines. Instead, the design is geometric (parallel zigzags) and extends across the lines, suggesting that the same may have been true for the motif in square C9.

---

870 MR 1961-1962, p. 64.
C9. One option for the latter’s pattern is interlocked curvilinear quatrefoils based on Rawson’s field description of “circles and wiggly lines.”

The Sequence of Floor Layers in the Portico

As a result of this re-identification of the “fish” in Portico square C9 as part of a geometric pattern, new conclusions can be drawn about the sequence of painted floors in this room. As argued by Blegen and Rawson, the painted fish belonged to an early floor level on account of their incongruity with the surrounding floor designs. With this element of “discord” alleviated, however, it is now possible to see this part of the floor as belonging to the same layer as the surrounding squares, particularly given the analogous use of incised interior lines in square A8. This conclusion is further supported by the level of the floor in square C9, which does not appear to rest at a lower elevation than the floor in adjacent square B9. If we consider that the average thickness of a plaster floor layer in the Portico was likely between 0.01 and 0.02 m. (as indicated by a break in the floor in the north corner of the adjacent Vestibule (Figure 5.57)), we would expect a square that was earlier than its neighbors to be appreciably lower, which is not the case.

That this decorated floor was the penultimate plaster floor in the Portico, as the excavators claimed, however, is verifiable. The best evidence comes from an excavation photograph published in PN I (Figure 5.58), which clearly shows sections of the final, eroded topcoat in place. Today, a single piece of this topcoat is preserved in Portico square A1 (Figure 5.59). Intriguingly, the piece preserves what appears to be a section of an incised line

---

872 The role of these pairs of lines in both squares as production techniques will be discussed below.
873 The majority of these fragments were removed in 1962 in order to expose the underlying decorated layer (MR 1961-1962, p. 168). That the fragment in Portico square A1 was left in place is indicated in a plan of the floor’s southwestern decoration, drawn by Rawson after the topcoat was removed (MR 1961-1962, p. 169).
along its southeastern edge, suggesting that the final floor may have been decorated, like the penultimate floor, with a grid pattern.\textsuperscript{874} That this final floor was one of the very last plastering events in the Portico (and perhaps in the megaron at large) is indicated by the relative phasing of the plaster coats on the sentry stand, baseboards, and walls, all of which appear to pre-date the laying of this floor surface (see Chapter 4).

\textit{Prototypes of the Painted Floor Motifs in the Megaron}

In addition to shedding light on which floor designs are most reliable in de Jong’s reconstructions, restudy of the megaron’s floors also enables a closer look at the possible origins of these painted patterns. Based on the evidence presented above, when all three rooms of the suite are considered, 10 different floor motifs can be securely identified in the Pylos megaron. These are:

1. Transverse parallel lines
2. Diagonal parallel lines
3. Parallel zigzags
4. Circles
5. Crosshatching
6. Two Concentric Arcs
7. Four Concentric Arcs
8. Scales (including the Tricurved Arch)
9. Interlocked Curvilinear Quatrefoils
10. Octopus

\textsuperscript{874} That the color palettes for each floor layer may have also been congruent is suggested by Rawson’s discovery of “red color” on the topcoat, although this could alternatively be salts of the kind observed on the interior of the plaster border surrounding the throne space (see Chapter 4).
stylistically, these motifs fall into five groups: 1. Patterns that utilize curved or straight parallel lines or arcs; 2. Circle patterns; 3. Parallel zigzags; 4. Rapport patterns, and 5. Marine motifs. For the first four groups, a close study of comparanda allows the materials simulated by these floor patterns to be deciphered. For this analysis, I have restricted the dataset in three ways. First, I consider only comparanda dating to the Late Bronze Age. Although certain motifs had their origins much deeper in the past, it is likely that the meanings ascribed to these particular designs at the time of their production were more current, and should therefore be examined through an appropriately chronologically-focused lens. Second, I examine only those representations where the designs appear in contexts that make their nature identifiable. For example, in order to be considered, decorative patterns must be part of the depiction of something recognizable (e.g., a dado, a piece of cloth, etc.) rather than appearing in a manner that could be construed as purely ornamental (e.g., a band frieze or an all-over background pattern). By focusing on contextualized examples, it is possible to acquire a clear idea of what the ancient artist viewed as a design’s “correct” or “proper” usage, allowing for more productive speculation about its meaning in other situations. Finally, I look only at comparanda that appear on painted plaster. While the same patterns were certainly imitated in a wide variety of artistic

875 Good examples of these ornamental patterns are Lang’s “Wall Paper Friezes,” in which motifs (e.g., running spirals, argonauts, etc.) are repeated for decorative effect and/or emblematic purposes without clear reference to a particular “parent material.” Notably, this study also excludes the patterns in painted floors from other Mycenaean palaces (namely Tiryns and Mycenae) as sources of comparanda. Even though it is likely (as shown by this study) that such floors were not simply “ornamental,” the information these other examples offer is redundant to the Pylian examples and any arguments they provide are, therefore, circular. One might make the argument that the Pylos floor designs themselves are strictly “ornamental” and not meant to be interpreted as having particularized meaning. This idea cannot be ruled out, but is shown here to be unlikely.
media, in this dissertation I have elected to focus on painted plaster in an attempt to understand more closely the styles of depiction that exist within this particular material.876

Parallel Line/Arc Patterns

The most popular motifs on the floors of the Pylos megaron are parallel lines and arcs. As suggested already by Hirsch and Lang, these designs bear a strong resemblance to depictions of veined stone in Late Bronze Age Aegean wall paintings. The best sources of comparison are painted imitation stone dadoes. At Pylos itself, a striking similarity is visible between the floor designs with concentric arcs and the so-called “Arc Dado” design on the lower portions of many of the palace’s walls. The “Arc Dado” motif, found in Rooms 1, 2, 3, and Hall 64 (see Figure 5.24), was defined by Lang as consisting of individual painted “panels” marked off by vertical red lines very similar to the red grid lines between the squares on the megaron’s floors.877 The decoration of these painted panels (represented by wall painting fragment groups 1 D 64; 4 D 1; 7 D 2; and 8 D 3)878 was composed of concentric arcs of color (red, white, blue, and yellow) on top of which were added groups of three thin black or red lines (rendered as smooth, wavy, scalloped, or filled semi-circles) radiating inward from the panel’s lower left and upper right-hand corners.879 Although the floor designs are something of an inversion of this design (multi-colored lines against a solid background rather than single colored lines against a multi-colored background), the overall combination of colors and patterns and the repetitive use of groups of three lines produced an almost identical effect in both cases.

876 Of those materials not considered, the most profitable comparisons might be made between the floor designs and similar motifs appearing on painted pottery. This is both because the two media are known to have frequently shared motifs (see especially: PM II, pp. 447-448; Morgan 1984; Walberg 1986; Immerwahr 1990b; Blakolmer 1999; Marthari 1998; 2000; Vlachopoulos 2000; Marcar 2004; Egan 2012; Hatzaki 2013b) and because it is likely that the same artisans were active in both media (see Morgan 1984; Walberg 1986; Boulotis 2000; Egan 2012).
878 PN II, pp. 169-172.
Outside of Pylos, comparable examples of Late Bronze Age Arc Dadoes are best known from Crete, where they were positioned along the base of the left wall of the West Porch at Knossos (LM II-IIIA) (Figure 5.60). Parallels for the straight wavy lines on squares of the megaron’s floors can be found at Knossos in the dadoes located beneath the Throne Room Griffin Fresco (see Figures 4.79 and 4.80) and under the hoof of a bull in the Anteroom of the Throne Room, and at Tiryns in a pair of dado panels found on the acropolis (Figure 5.61).

Clusters of parallel wavy lines like those in the Pylos floor squares also appear in wall-painted depictions of stone objects. Most common are examples of stone vessels. These include the neck and handle of the jug (2 M 6) from the Pylos Throne Room (decorated with groups of three wavy parallel lines painted overtop of colored bands crossing the vessel’s neck and body in different directions (see Figure 5.8)), and a “variegated vase” carried by a male figure in Group B of the LH II-IIIA Procession Fresco from Knossos (Figure 5.62).

Finally, clusters of parallel wavy lines appear in Late Bronze Age wall paintings of natural rock formations. The clearest examples come from the Northwest Slope plaster dump at Pylos and include the so-called “Bluebird Frieze” (9 F nws) (Figure 5.63), in which groups of multi-colored “cucumber” rocks project from the upper and lower borders of the scene, and fragments of a rocky landscape (3 N nws and 10 N nws), in which the same rocks spring upward

880 PM II, p. 674; PM IV, pp. 893-896. Earlier (LC I) parallels also appear at Knossos (the so-called MM III “Marbled Fresco” from the Domestic Quarter) and in the West House at Akrotiri, situated along the “Lower Zone” of Room 5 and beneath painted ikria and flower vases in Room 4 (PM I, p. 356, fig. 255; Doumas 1992, pp. 49-51, 86-91, 96-97).

881 PN II, pp. 166-167 (13 D 44; 14 D nws); PM IV, p. 893, fig. 872; Hackl 1912, pp. 23-29. Notably, it could be argued that this decoration of wavy parallel lines is also characteristic of textile designs at Pylos, such as appear on the skirts of the large-scale ladies and on the head coverings of the large-scale men from the NWS dump. While the shape of the lines is similar, the routine use of single lines and a uniformly colored ground strongly differentiates these patterns from those that represent stone.
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from the earth.\textsuperscript{883} Painted rock formations found inside the Pylos palace include those shown beneath the feet of a quadruped (7a D 20), beneath a checkerboard and built façade (5 A 20), and pendant from the upper frame of the Hunting Dog Frieze in Hall 64 (38 C 64) (see Figure 5.25). In each of these paintings, the rocks are rendered as rounded blobs of solid color (blue, yellow, red, and/or white) outlined and veined with parallel wavy black lines. Collectively, the rocks in these scenes mirror the appearance of the stone represented in the palace’s painted dadoes and vase 2 M 6, likely indicating that they represent the “raw material” from which these stone objects were fashioned.

In addition to depictions in wall painting, clear parallels are visible between the parallel arc/line designs on the megaron’s floors and painted representations of stone on three dimensional plastered objects from Pylos. These include the so-called “altar” in Court 92 (26 D 92) and the northeast face of the bench in Room 10 (4 M 10) (Figure 5.64), both of which are decorated with colored bands overlaid by black veining.\textsuperscript{884}

\textit{Circle Patterns}

Like the motifs composed of parallel lines and arcs, the circle pattern on the floors of the Pylos megaron can be strongly linked to painted depictions of stone. In 1977 and 1980, Hirsch compelling compared this decorative pattern to painted representations of conglomerate or

\textsuperscript{883} PN II, pp. 151-152, pls. 83, 117, J, R (“Bluebird Frieze”), p. 129, pls. 72, 117, H, Q (“Olive Branches”), p. 127, pls. 68, 69, H, Q (“Multi-Colored Rocks”). For a recent study that combines these two fragment groups into a coherent scene, and which introduces the term “cucumber” rocks, see Chapin 2005. Miniature representations of such rocks can also be found in Pylos wall painting fragment group 4 M ne (“Miniature Jagged Rocks,” PN II, pp. 128-128, pls. 79, H).

\textsuperscript{884} PN II, p. 178, pl. 107 (“Altar”); p. 179, pl. 109 (“Bench”). Probable veining is also evident on one of the site’s plastered table of offerings (1 T nw) the floor of which was painted with pairs of black and red “double S-curved lines” likely meant to simulate stone, see Figure 4.68.
liparite, a dark stone with large white circular inclusions. At Pylos, the design can be specifically linked to depictions of “black circled white dots” in two fragments of the “Variegated Dado” (14 D nws) (see Figure 5.39) identified by Lang as stylized representations of conglomerate that, having lost any realistic resemblance to cut stone, were employed for their “purely decorative effect.” Notably, the scattered placement of the circles in most of the megaron’s floor squares (e.g., Throne Room square D5, Vestibule square D9, and Portico squares A3 and A7, see Figures 5.29 and 5.46)) mirrors the erratic deposition of small stones in conglomerate.

Parallel Zigzag

Like the parallel arc/line and circle designs, the parallel zigzag motif has often been associated by scholars with stone. Hirsch for example, has cited parallels between this pattern and that included among the decorated floor squares in the court of the megaron at Mycenae, which previous scholars had argued replicated veined slabs of cut alabaster or marble (Figure 5.65). Apart from these floor decorations (which as noted above are redundant comparanda), parallels for the use of zigzags to depict stone appear in the LC I dadoes painted on west wall of Room 4 of the West House at Akrotiri. In this composition, one of the panels is decorated with large stacked chevrons roughly resembling parallel zigzags.

885 Hirsch 1977a, p. 25; 1980, p. 458. As noted earlier, the comparison with liparite is made on account of the large white dot in the center of the circles, which imitates the appearance of the stone as known on imported vessels and local Minoan ceramic copies (PM I, pp. 178-179, figs. 127e, 127f). Also see fragment of painted dado with imitation liparite in Cameron 1975, pl. 147c.
886 PN II, pp. 33-34, 166.
887 Some squares, e.g., Throne Room squares K6 and L7 and Vestibule square A10, show the circles not “scattered,” but aligned neatly in rows (see Figures 5.41, 5.49, and 5.50). Superficially, this arrangement gives the design a different appearance, but is probably meant as a regularized version of the typical scattered pattern.
888 Hirsch 1977a, p. 25, citing PM IV, p. 895, n.1; Rodenwaldt 1919; and discussions by Lamb in Wace et al. 1921-1923.
889 Doumas 1992, pp. 87, 90.
In addition to stone, scholars have also suggested an affinity between the zigzag pattern and painted depictions of wood and water. Hirsch, for example, briefly mentions both of these options, citing parallels in early Minoan ceramics and in Egyptian representations of the Nile in wall paintings and reliefs.\(^890\) At Pylos, wood is further indicated by a zigzag motif on a recently restored painting of a ship from Hall 64.\(^891\)

As a fourth option, contextualized comparanda for painted zigzags also indicate that the design was used to represent textiles. At Pylos, this is demonstrated by wall painting fragment group 50 H nws, depicting the lower part of a skirt worn by the large-scale female figure (tentatively identified as a “priestess”) discussed earlier (see Figure 4.21).\(^892\) In this context, the textile quality of the zigzag design is emphasized by its association with bands of “tooth ornament.”\(^893\) The latter pattern, composed of stacked barred bands of black on blue and red on yellow, has been identified by Elizabeth Barber as a common woven border design (heading band) produced using a belt-weave.\(^894\) In Aegean wall painting, it is frequently found along the hems of women’s garments including the priestess’ skirt just mentioned, as well as the skirt worn by a female figure in the Knossos Procession Fresco (Figure 5.66), and dresses worn by women in the Große Frauenprozession from Tiryns (Figure 5.67). The pattern also appears as border element on the *polos* worn by the Pylian “White Goddess” (49 H nws), and as part of the frame of the floating “Taureador Fresco” from Knossos (Figure 5.68), which may be an imitation of a hanging textile.\(^895\)

---

\(^{890}\) Hirsch 1977a, p. 25.  
\(^{891}\) Brecoulaki et al. Forthcoming.  
\(^{892}\) \textit{PN II}, p. 85, pl. 31, D, N (“Priestess’ feet’’).  
\(^{893}\) \textit{PN II}, pp. 34, 160-162.  
\(^{894}\) Barber 1991, pp. 325-328.  
Rapport Patterns

Of all the classes of motifs found on the floor of the Pylos megaron, rapport patterns have been given the least amount of scholarly attention. The term “rapport pattern,” as defined by Shaw, refers to an “a composition constructed along diagonal lines, which are drawn or implied by the orientation of the component motifs that are systematically arranged at regular distances.”896 Four of the megaron’s floor decorations fall into this category: scales, interlocked curvilinear quatrefoils, and crosshatching. In previous literature, only one of these motifs has been discussed in any detail. This is the scale design (both arched and tricurved) that Lang compared to the highly stylized “stone patterns” that she identified in the Variegated Dadoes from Stoa 44 (13 D 44, with a tricurved arch) and the Northwest Slope plaster dump (14 D nws, with a scale pattern, see Figure 5.39).897

Following this treatment by Lang, no studies of the Pylos rapport floor motifs have been attempted. To some extent, this lacuna is likely attributable to Hirsch’s distrust of de Jong’s watercolor, which, as noted earlier, prompted her to omit the Pylos Throne Room from her otherwise comprehensive analysis of Mycenaean painted floors. As a result of this decision, Hirsch refrained from any discussion of the Pylos variants of the tricurved arch, interlocked curvilinear quatrefoils, and/or crosshatching, which may also have deterred other scholars from examining these motifs in any detail. Hirsch’s comments on the scale pattern, which she did examine on account of its appearance on the floors of the Vestibule and Portico, were brief; she identified the motif as an imitation of a “rocky landscape” or “mineral” based on preliminary conclusions reached by Hackl about similar motifs at Tiryns (see above).898 A re-study of available comparanda, however, shows clearly that this class of motif is one of the most

896 Shaw 2000, p. 53.
898 Hirsch 1977, p. 25, with references.
recognizable within the Aegean iconographic repertoire and can, in nearly all cases, be closely tied to depictions of textiles.

Crosshatching

Among the rapport patterns, crosshatching is the least well represented – being extant in only one square (K2) on the floor of the Throne Room. The design, as indicated in de Jong’s watercolor, is composed of crisscrossed wavy red lines forming a regular diagonal grid filled with concentric wavy lozenges. In Aegean painting, other examples of crosshatching with this particular filler design have not been found. Somewhat similar to the Pylos floor painting, however, are the diagonal crosshatching designs found on the elaborately painted ceiling of the Eighteenth Dynasty Theban tomb of Senenmut (TT71), high steward during the reign of Hatshepsut (Figure 5.69). In this painting, found in the tomb’s mortuary chapel and thought to be a painted rendition of a textile canopy, the interiors of the painted grid are alternately embellished with flowers and concentric lozenges, the latter being very similar to the examples from the Pylos floor.899

Interlocked Curvilinear Quatrefoils

Equally reminiscent of textiles is the interlocked curvilinear quatrefoil design. As depicted by de Jong, this pattern is present in Aegean wall painting, where it makes its earliest appearance on the skirt of the so-called LM IA “goddess” from Room 14 at Hagia Triada (Figure

899 Egyptian painted tomb ceilings are discussed in detail by Barber (1991 pp. 340-351). Generally, simpler ceiling designs including checkers, zigzags, and lozenges are thought to be “Egyptian,” replicating the effect of woven mats, whereas those with more intricate patterns, often including curved and figural elements, are believed to be of Aegean origin. For discussion of one of the earliest examples of a Minoan ceiling design in an Egyptian tomb context (the Middle Kingdom Tomb of Hepzefa), see Shaw 1970.
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In this example, the lobes of the quatrefoils are much more attenuated and more closely interlocked (i.e., they touch) than at Pylos, but, as noted by Shaw, the overall effect of the designs at both sites is similar.

Even closer to the Pylos pattern is the interlocked curvilinear quatrefoil design on the kilt worn by one of the offering bearers in the Knossian Procession Fresco (Figure 5.71). In this example, the quatrefoils do not touch each other, closely matching (as Shaw has also noted), the arrangement on the Pylos Throne Room’s floor. The lobes of these Knossian quatrefoils are also oriented horizontally and vertically (rather than diagonally, as in the case in the Hagia Triada pattern), and feature dot rosettes at their centers and outer lobes – the same positions held by the circles in the Pylos design.

Also similar to the Pylos pattern is the more conventional interlocked cross motif that appears on a number of wall painting fragments without provenance from Knossos and, in a better state of preservation, on a fragment of a kilt (?) from Mycenae. In this last example, the design, like the Pylos quatrefoil, features circles (or, in this case dots) at the center and in the four lobes of each cross. The close association between the cross and the quatrefoil is illustrated even more clearly by another pattern from the kilts in the Procession Fresco (Figure 5.72) in which the quatrefoil and cross are combined – the former being in each instance surrounded by the latter to create a double interlocked composition.

900 Shaw 2000, p. 58.
901 Shaw 2000, p. 56.
902 Shaw 2000, p. 58, discussing “Pattern E.”
903 Cameron 1975, pl. 182 B and 189 C. The regular occurrence of dots (or rosettes) at the ends of the lobes and at the center of quatrefoil motifs makes one wonder if they are not derived from clusters of four connected running spirals such as appear on the skirt of the seated goddess (or priestess) from Pseira (see Shaw 1998, col. pl. B), which, when the spiral element is removed, has a roughly cruciform shape with internal circles (the former “eyes” of the spirals and the open center) that is very similar to the design of the curvilinear quatrefoil.
904 Cameron 1975, pl. 182 B and 189 C; Rodenwaldt 1919, pl. 9.
905 Shaw 2000, p. 57, “Pattern D.”
Scales

Like the interlocked curvilinear quatrefoil, the scale patterns on the Pylos Throne Room floor have close parallels in Aegean wall painting. Looking first at the tricurved arch scale design, shape of design is very similar to that appearing on the sleeves of the bodices worn by the Ladies in Blue (Figure 5.73) and on a kilt worn by a “processional youth of the Cupbearer Class” identified by Cameron from Knossos. It is also nearly identical to the design on Pylos wall painting fragment 18 M ne (“Papyrus Net,” Figure 5.74). This composition, Shaw has argued, most likely belonged to a female dress, or, less plausibly, to the cloth covering of large-scale ship’s ikrion.

Similarly, the smooth scale design has very clear parallels in wall-painted depictions of textiles. As noted by Shaw, the motif occurs on the dress worn by the LM IA kneeling woman from Hagia Triada and on a kilt worn by one of the three men walking to the right in the Knossos Procession Fresco (Figure 5.75). The latter scale pattern is nearly identical to that reproduced on the Pylos floors, perhaps suggesting that it was copied directly from the Knossian prototype.

Marine Motifs

While the preceding four groups of motifs painted on the floors of the Pylos megaron were clearly intended to imitate materials from which the individual squares were “made,” the same is less apparent for the fifth and final group: marine motifs. This group is composed solely

---

906 For the last, see Cameron 1975, p. 9, fig. B.
907 See discussion of this fragment in PN II, p. 186.
908 Shaw 2010, p. 320.
909 Shaw 2000, pp. 53, 56 (“Pattern B”), with references. The design is also present on fragments found under the floor of the Corridor of the Procession at Knossos believed to belong to garments dated by Evans to MM III (PM II, p. 680, fig. 430c).
910 This close correspondence was also observed by Shaw (2000, p. 56).
of the octopus in Throne Room floor square F8.  

While it could be argued that the octopus was meant to represent a stone inlay in the floor (on the model of inlays of precious materials in contemporary Mycenaean furniture) its appearance is more similar to a motif excerpted from ceramics. As noted by Hirsch, the cephalopod drawn by de Jong is entirely symmetrical. This feature, combined with the “combed out” arrangement of its arms causes the octopus on the floor to resemble representations of this animal on large, Palace Style jars dated to LH IIA. As illustrated by Furumark (FS 21) (and clearly visible on a large LH IIA jar from tholos 2 at nearby Routsi-Myrsinochori (Figure 5.76)), such octopuses are shown upright, with their eyes in the lower part of their bodies and their arms curling out and up – the inverse of LH IIB/III representations in which the animal is flipped vertically so that their arms extend up and down from the top of their bodies, almost like hair. If the octopus on the LH IIIB Throne Room floor was excerpted from the LH IIA iconographic repertoire, its orientation is northeast-southwest, i.e., facing out/away from the throne rather than towards it.

New Observations Regarding Production Technique

In addition to the re-identification of the prototypes and/or origins of the megaron’s floor motifs, new observations can also be made regarding the artistic techniques that were used to produce these elaborate designs.

Use of the Compass

911 I do not include de Jong’s “fish” from Portico square C9 because these are more likely part of a geometric pattern (see above).
912 Hirsch 1977, p. 34.
913 For discussion of the vase from Routsi-Myrsinochori, see Kalogeropoulos 1998a, pp. 145-146. For illustrations of the evolution of the octopus motif between LH II and LH III see Furumark 1972, fig. 48.
914 Notably, this observation about the orientation of the octopus floor motif at Pylos and its connection to LH II vases has also been noted by Amanda Boucher (pers. comm.). At Tiryns, the connection has also been drawn by Thaler (2012a, pp. 199-200) and is discussed in more detail below.
Starting in the Vestibule, as mentioned above, my examination of floor square A10 in the room’s north corner revealed clear evidence for 11 circles incised in its plaster surface (see Figure 5.50). Each of these circles measures 0.08 m. in diameter. They are spaced between 0.03 m. and 0.06 m. apart and are loosely arranged in three rows. The circles are perfectly round and one well-preserved example retains a small depression (0.005 m. wide) at its center (Figure 5.77). From this evidence, it is clear that these circles were drawn with a compass, the small depression in the last example marking the placement point for a pivot arm.

Judging from their form and position on the floor, these incised circles functioned as cartoons that were traced over with paint in order to create the outer rings of the circles in this square’s design. Elsewhere at Pylos, similar compass-drawn cartoons appear in the palace’s wall paintings. The best examples are in a “beam-end” frieze from Room 45 (Figure 5.78). As described by Lang, “the circles of the beam-ends [ca. 0.32 m. in diameter] were impressed with a compass point and then filled in with paint…. The painting was done with a brush ca. 0.01 wide, with which the outline (just inside the impressed line) was carefully drawn all around…. A compass was also used to draw the outline of the wheel of the chariot from the Battle Scene reconstructed in Hall 64 (26 H 64). Intriguingly, the chariot wheel measures 0.085 m. in diameter, only 0.005 m. larger than the floor circles, perhaps suggesting that compasses used by Pylian artists may have come in a range of standard sizes.

Use of Field Breaks and Artists’ Grids

In addition to the use of the compass, other production techniques revealed by the preceding close analysis of the Pylos painted floors are incised field breaks and artists’ grids.

915 These inscribed circles are mentioned neither in the site’s publications nor in the excavator’s field notebooks.
916 PNI, p. 11. Also see PN II, pp. 153-154.
917 PN II, p. 73, pls. 18, 123 (“Battle Scene V: Chariot”).
Looking first at Portico floor squares A8 and C9, as described above, both of these squares contained pairs of incised lines that subdivided their interiors into thin rectangles. It is further apparent from Rawson’s 1961 field notebook that the lines in square A8 had no traces of red paint. These details together indicate that the incised lines in this square, and by extension those in square C9, were different from the paired lines that formed the large floor grid. The purpose of these interior incised lines, I would argue, was as field breaks. By dividing the interiors (fields) of the two squares into small rectangles, the ancient painter would have been able to produce the design in smaller sections, allowing him to render the overall patterns (the parallel zigzags in square A8 and the unidentified geometric patterns in square C9) more evenly.

Additional incised lines were also found in the interiors of floor squares in the Vestibule and Throne Room. As mentioned earlier, Blegen and Rawson observed that two squares from the Vestibule (C5 and C10) and nine squares from the Throne Room (F1, G1, J5, K4, K6, K7, K8, L9, and L10) were crisscrossed by incised lines that divided each square’s field into a small grid. These “mini-grids,” I contend, were artists’ grids – orthogonal networks of guidelines used, like the field breaks just discussed, to assist in the accurate rendering of painted patterns in these squares.

Support for this argument comes from de Jong’s watercolor of the Throne Room’s floor. Although the black and white reproduction in PN I (see Figure 5.30) shows no trace of the mini-grids, they are clearly visible in the original painting on display in the Chora Museum (see Figure 5.46). In this painting, the nine squares listed by Blegen and Rawson each contain
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919 PN I, pp. 74, 84.
920 For a more concise and formal presentation of this interpretation (and the below discussion) of the Pylos “mini-grids” as artists’ grids, see Egan Forthcoming b.
921 Notably, Blegen and Rawson explicitly state that these mini-grids “have been omitted in the water color” (PN I, p. 84). Inspection of the original painting, however, reveals without a doubt that the grid lines are present, just that they remain in pencil rather than having been inked or painted.
pencil lines taking the form of a grid (Figure 5.79). That these pencil lines represent the ancient incised mini-grids and not modern guidelines used by de Jong is proved by photographic evidence and firsthand observation of three of the floor’s gridded squares whose reconstruction is considered secure (see above): G1, L9, and L10.\footnote{That de Jong used pencil grids to aid his work is known from his paintings of objects from the Athenian Agora (Hooton 2007, p. 38).}

In Throne Room square G1, located against the room’s SW wall, an unpublished excavation photo taken in 1952 (see Figure 5.33) shows a rectangular mini-grid composed of twenty horizontal rows, the same number rendered by de Jong in his painting. The evidence of this photograph was confirmed when part of the protective earth was brushed away from this square during the 2012 HARP season (Figure 5.80).\footnote{The similarity between the photograph and the floor itself is further verified by the dimensions of the cells of the grid, which I measured as between 0.05 and 0.06 m in height. When the total northwest-southeast width of this square (estimated to be 1.055 m. – Blegen and Rawson’s 1.08 m. minus the “short row” 0.025 m. tall along the northwest edge of the square) is divided by these measurements, the number of rows comes out to between 17.6 and 22.8, (1.055 ÷ .05 = 22.8 and 1.055 ÷ .06 = 17.6), the average of which is 20 – the number of rows visible in the 1952 field photograph.}

In the same year, Zokos and I more completely removed the earth overlying the west corner of the floor using soft sponges, scalpels, and de-ionized water. Our efforts uncovered roughly two-thirds of floor square L10 including its interior grid lines, spaced roughly 0.17 m. apart.\footnote{This distance, which I took in 2012, is the lower end of the span recorded by Vanderpool for the size of these mini-squares: 0.16 m. to 0.20 m. (GEM 1952, p. 123).} These lines formed a grid of 8x6 (Figure 5.81) – the same dimensions as the pencil grid in de Jong’s watercolor.\footnote{The presence of a pencil grid of 8x6 also illustrates the greater reliability of de Jong’s work as a “finished product” as compared to the 1952 field sketch. In the latter, the artist’s grid in square L10 is rendered as 9x7. Other discrepancies include: squares F1 (7x7 (painting) vs. 7x8 (field sketch)); G1 (20x5.5 vs. 16x3); K6 (7x8 vs. 8x8); K7 (7x7 vs. 8x9); K8 (6x6 vs. “partial”); and L9 (8x6 vs. 9x7). As noted earlier, these differences should be attributed to the different functions of the two drawings: the first as an impressionistic field sketch and the second as a polished reconstruction.}

To the southwest of square L10, a small section of square L9 was likewise cleaned, revealing parts of three grid lines set roughly 0.18 m. apart and slightly offset from the lines in square L10 in a manner identical to that represented in pencil in de Jong’s painting (see Figure 5.81).
Since de Jong’s pencil lines can be confidently identified as accurate representations of the mini-grids inside Throne Room squares G1, L10, and L9, we can use his reconstruction to understand the grids’ relationship to the accompanying decorative motifs, included in Figure 5.79. In square G1, a series of parallel zigzags are formed by connecting diagonally opposed points positioned along the horizontal pencil lines. The points are spaced evenly between the five vertical lines, giving each turn of the zigzag a fixed height of two rows and an approximate width of one column. In square L9, there is a network of tricurved arches each with a width of two columns and a height of one row. Each arch is bisected symmetrically by a vertical pencil line. Finally, in square L10, decorated with a scale pattern, each of the scales painted by de Jong is roughly one column wide and one row tall. The ends of each scale are anchored on or near the horizontal pencil lines, while their interiors are alternately separated or bisected by vertical pencil lines. In this square, the presence of a scale motif was further confirmed during the 2012 cleaning, which revealed traces of painted curved lines and dots (Figure 5.82).

In addition, during this same cleaning project it became clear that one of the vertical (i.e., NW-SE) lines of the artist’s grid in square L10 had been redrawn roughly three centimeters to the southwest in order to correct a spacing error (see Figure 5.81). The same phenomenon is also visible at the far edge of the square, where a line, this time forming part of the large floor grid, was moved roughly one centimeter to the northeast (see Figure 5.81). It was also clear that the artists’ grid in this square was produced using snapped string. Evidence for this conclusion comes from the “incised” lines, one of which (second out from the NE wall) features the twists characteristic of a string impression (Figure 5.83). Furthermore, this line, as well as no fewer than six others in this same square, are broken into short segments or “dashes” measuring
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926 Notably, this “corrected line” is also that noted above that was produced (in part, if not entirely) using a string impression.
between 0.01 m. and 0.03 m. long (Figure 5.84). These dashes likely represent areas where the floor was slightly uneven, causing the snapped string to strike the plaster surface at punctuated intervals. Such dashes (measuring on average 0.01 m. in length) are also visible in the artist’s grid in square L9, suggesting that this grid was also produced with lengths of snapped string.927

Collectively, these observations about squares G1, L9, and L10 clearly show that the mini-grids on the floor of the Pylos Throne Room were artists’ grids. Using the squares of the mini-grid, geometric designs were broken down into a series of repeating components which were simpler to paint and, when assembled, fit together to produce a final overall pattern that was correctly proportioned and evenly-spaced. This same explanation almost certainly holds true for those incised Throne Room squares whose reconstructions are less reliable, namely: F1, J5, K4, K6, K7, and K8 (see Figure 5.79). To judge from de Jong’s painting, the tricurved arches in squares F1 (pencil grid = 7x7) and K7 (pencil grid = 7x7) are rendered in the same manner as that seen in square L9. Each tricurved arch measures one pencil row tall and two pencil columns wide. The ends of each arch are anchored along one of the horizontal (in square K7, where the design is oriented vertically as in square L9) or vertical (in square F1, in which the design is rendered horizontally) pencil lines, and each arch is bisected by a vertical (in K7) or horizontal (in F1) pencil line.

In the case of squares J5, K4, and K8, decorated with curvilinear quatrefoil designs, a similar use of the pencil lines as orthogonal guidelines is visible. In squares J5 (pencil grid = 8x8) and K4 (pencil grid = 7x8), the central circle and the four circles situated in the “lobes” of each quatrefoil occupy their own grid squares. In square K8 (pencil grid = 6x6), however, the design is a bit different, with the circles being positioned closer to the edges of the grid squares,

927 The grid line in question is the first one out from, and parallel with, the SE wall.
making it possible (as indicated in de Jong’s reconstruction) that each square contained more than one circle.928

Finally, in Throne Room square K6 (pencil grid = 7x8) we find the only example of the use of the artist’s grid to organize a non-interlocked pattern. As discussed above, each square of this square’s mini-grid contains a circle design formed from concentric solid and dotted rings enclosing a large white central dot. The orthogonal organization of these circles is very different from what was described by Blegen and Rawson. In their words, the arrangement of the circles on the floor of the Pylos Throne Room was erratic, with circles “scattered about close together in no recognizable order.”929 In square K6, however, this is clearly not the case.

Notably, local comparanda for this “aligned” circle pattern may exist. One example may appear in Throne Room square L7, which Vanderpool indicated in a field sketch (see Figure 5.41) included at least seven circles arranged in loose rows.930 In the Vestibule, further evidence comes from square A10, which, as noted above, was recently found to contain 11 compass-drawn circles roughly aligned in three rows (see Figure 5.50).931 Finally, regular rows of circles may also have been present in square A3 in the Portico, as indicated by a description in Rawson’s 1962 field notebook.932

Elsewhere in the megaron, artists’ grids appear in Vestibule floor squares C5 and C10, which Blegen and Rawson noted were incised with interior lines.933 Like the Throne Room, the

---

928 In this case very little painted surface was preserved, making it much more difficult to ascertain the precise relationship of the decoration in square K8 to the incised grid.
929 *PN* I, p. 84.
930 This alignment in square L7 is also indicated in Vanderpool’s description of the circles, which he noted “not regularly disposed, although they seem to fall more or less into rows” (GEM 1952, pp. 106-107).
931 That Blegen and Rawson were also aware of these rows in square A10 is suggested in *PN* I, in which they described the decoration in this square (as well as that in Vestibule square D9) as composed of “seven or eight irregular rows of single circles” (*PN* I, p. 74, italics mine).
933 *PN* I, p. 74.
best evidence for the character of these grids comes from de Jong’s reconstructions. Photographs of these paintings in the University of Cincinnati Pylos Excavation Archive clearly show de Jong’s pencil lines, which indicate that square C5 had an interior incised grid of 8x9, and square C10 a grid of 7x7 (Figure 5.85). In addition, eleven parallel pencil lines are also visible in Portico square B6. While de Jong did not discern any decoration accompanying these mini-grids in the Vestibule or Portico, analogy with the examples in the Throne Room (which are alike in both size and shape) strongly suggests that the Vestibule mini-grids also functioned as artists’ grids, the example in the Portico being either unfinished, or a variation on the standard crisscrossed design.

Evidence for Artist Organization and Possible Origins of the Artist’s Grid Technique

In addition to shedding light on the mechanics of executing individual floor designs, the artists’ grids on the floors of the Pylos megaron may also shed light on the organization of the artists who produced the overall program. Looking at the distribution of artists’ grids in the Throne Room, it is striking that despite the fact that 32 squares were found (or thought) to contain zigzag, scale/tricurved arch, interlocked curvilinear quatrefoil, and circle patterns, only nine examples feature artists’ grids. One explanation for this disparity is that more squares were originally gridded, but that the lines eroded away before the floor was excavated 1952. This possibility is suggested by the “partial” nature of the mini-grid found in Throne Room square K7, which is noted in both Theocharis’ field plan (see Figure 5.42) and in Vanderpool’s field notes as missing its southeastern half.934

There are also two Throne Room squares (I8 and I10) in the field plan and three squares (G3, L2, and L3) in de Jong’s painting that are gridded but not mentioned in Blegen and

934 GEM 1952, pp. 122, 124.
Rawson’s published account. What these grid lines mean is difficult to tell. In de Jong’s case, they may be examples of his own (modern) drawing grids, which, as noted above, have been observed in his illustrations produced for the Athenian Agora.\footnote{Hooton 2007, p. 38.} This is a likely solution for squares G3 and L2, since the pencil lines in these squares are very lightly drawn in comparison with those from the nine published gridded squares. In the case of de Jong square L3, however, and field plan squares I8 and I10, these pencil lines are darker and may represent additional artists’ grids \textit{not} recorded by Blegen and Rawson, demonstrating that use of the technique was originally less restricted than it now appears.\footnote{This is perhaps particularly true for the northwestern part of the Throne Room floor, which, as Blegen and Rawson note and as de Jong’s painting shows, was very badly damaged and preserved little (if any) actual surface.}

Alternatively, it is possible that the decision to employ the artist’s grid at Pylos was intentionally \textit{selective} – representing the efforts of one or two individuals, working, as the locations of the squares indicate, exclusively in the southeastern half of the Throne Room. Given the large size of the room, it seems probable that after the main grid was laid out, artists, likely working as part of a team, would have been spread out with individuals (or small groups) assigned to decorate different parts of the floor.\footnote{This idea of teams at Pylos has been addressed already by Rutter, who has suggested that the Megaron’s floor painters were local rather than “on loan” from elsewhere (e.g., the Argolid) (Rutter 2005, pp. 32-33, n. 55).} In the Bronze Age Aegean, teams of this sort have been proposed for production of wall paintings, which likely involved collaborations between master painters and apprentices.\footnote{Cameron 1975, pp. 306-373; Hollinshead 1989; Boulotis 2000; Davis 2000, cf. Walberg 1981 and Cherry 1992, who have argued against our ability to identify individual hands and/or artistic workshops for the Bronze Age on account of a lack of concrete evidence for how craft production was organized.} At Pylos, therefore, if the decision to use artists’ grids was not simply a matter of painterly style, a situation could be imagined in which the added lines were employed by novices still gaining confidence in their craft and requiring assistance to render patterns evenly.
Support for this suggestion may come from comparanda in Egyptian wall paintings. Based on trends in the usage of the *painted* artist’s grid (i.e., *sinopia*) during the Eighteenth Dynasty, Gay Robins has argued that, “The grid was a technical aid available to artists who could choose how to make use of it. One can imagine that grids were helpful in training apprentice draughtsmen, but successful artists did not need them in order to produce acceptably proportioned figures.”939 Support for Robins’ theory, Betsy Bryan has suggested, can be found in the Tomb of Suemniwet (Theban Tomb 92), the north wall of which shows concurrent use and non-use of the grid (Figure 5.86), which she believes represents the work of apprentice and master painters respectively.940

Such a connection with wall paintings is also relevant given the techniques used to produce the artists’ grids at Pylos. At present, these grids are the only observed examples of the use of this technique on an Aegean floor. Given their rarity, the grids naturally raise questions about how the Pylian artists came to adopt them. One option is that the technique was invented “on the spot.” Technically speaking, the method is not difficult and might even be considered intuitive, suggesting that its execution would not have required conscious reference to a pre-existing model. It is equally if not more likely, however, that the idea was borrowed from wall painting. As noted above, traces of twists and “dashes” in the lines of the grid in Throne Room floor square L10 suggest that the grids were produce using snapped string. This technique, Shaw has observed, is also characteristic of artists’ grids used on Crete, where the device was frequently employed to help render large-scale textile patterns. The best known examples come from Pseira (LM IA: on a sleeve of the female figure in Panel A), from Hagia Triada (LM IA: on the dresses of two women, including the so-called “goddess”) and, most abundantly, from

939 Robins 2001, p. 64.
Knossos (LM I: on the sleeves of the “Ladies in Blue” and LM II-IIIA: on the kilts of the male figures in the Procession Fresco). The technique is also found in a wall painting fragment from Pylos itself, the so-called “Papyrus Net” composition (18 M ne) mentioned earlier (see Figure 5.74). In each of these wall paintings, the artists’ grids were used, like the megaron floor examples, to divide the paintable surface into small, manageable areas that facilitated the even rendering of complex decorative patterns.

The Issue of Prototypes and Artistic Transmission

If the Pylian floor painters did borrow the artist’s grid technique from wall painting, the question of how they came into contact with prototypes to copy must be considered. The most straightforward solution is that these floor painters were also the palace’s wall painters, who simply “copied their own work” and transferred the technique from one medium to the other. Generally speaking, it is highly likely that the wall painters were also responsible for floor decoration given that the two media required similar skills (and therefore training) to produce. The difficulty with this scenario, however, is that the only wall painting from Pylos where the artist’s grid is present, the “Papyrus Net” fragment (18 M ne), comes from an unstratified deposit northeast of the palace. In this context, it is unclear whether this composition was on the walls of the palace at the time of its collapse, or whether it, like many wall paintings on the site’s perimeter, belonged to an earlier phase of construction and had since been discarded and/or incorporated into the pier-wall matrix of the LH IIIB edifice. Because of the highly fragmentary state of the composition, the latter scenario seems more likely. This would suggest that all known
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942 PN II, p. 186, pls. 113, R; Shaw 2010.
943 The suggestion that wall painters were also floor painters has been made by Hirsch as a means to explain the sophistication of the decorated floors of the Tiryns Megaron (Hirsch 1980, n. 48).
944 PN II, p. 220.
wall paintings with artists’ grids, both from the Greek mainland and from Crete, date to a period before the “palatial” construction phase at Pylos, perhaps, as suggested by the Cretan examples, at the latest to LH IIIA.

If true, the Pylian floor painters must have derived inspiration from elsewhere. As one option, the method could have been learned via pattern books, which many scholars claim circulated throughout the Aegean during the Bronze Age and which, as Rodenwaldt once suggested, likely included information pertinent to the production of certain complex floor designs.\textsuperscript{945} Such an option is particularly enticing given that many of the Pylian floor motifs appear to be stylistically early. Most notable in this case are the scale pattern, which, as noted earlier, reproduces almost identically a pattern rendered on a kilt worn by a figure in the LM II-IIIA Procession Fresco from Knossos, and possibly even the octopus, which may imitate an LH IIA ceramic motif.

The possibility should also be entertained, however, that the artists’ grids on the final floors of the megaron were copied from one or more of the suite’s earlier floors. The incised line discovered on the eroded topcoat of the floor in the Pylos Portico, for example, suggests that grids, as a style of floor decoration, may have been maintained through at least two floor renewals. If this was part of a longer tradition, such designs may have extended through multiple floor layers in the megaron, making it possible that some of the earlier grid squares were, like the final examples discussed here, also incised with artists’ grids. In this case, the LH IIIB floor painters would not have needed any prior knowledge of (or experience with) this technique but

\textsuperscript{945} Rodenwaldt 1919, p. 99, arguing that the painter responsible for producing the arched scale design on the floor of the court of the megaron at Mycenae followed a template that included/made use of a grid. Generally, evidence for such pattern books can be seen in a variety of repeated images and scenes that crop up at different Aegean sites. One well-known example from the Mycenaean period is the “boar hunt,” which appears in nearly identical form at Tiryns and Orchomenos (Chapin 2010, p. 231). For discussion of the use of such books among Egyptian artisans, see Schäfer 1974, p. 62.
could have mechanically reproduced it based on *ad hoc* observation, continuing a habit established by the painters of the previous floors extending back to a time when the papyrus-net composition (and/or others like it still undiscovered) was either on the walls of the palace (where it could be observed and copied) or still in living memory.

**Part IV: Old Theories Reconsidered and New Ideas**

Using the preceding new observations regarding the decorative and technical character of the floors of the Pylos megaron, it is possible to evaluate existing theories about these plaster surfaces and to propose new ideas about their functional role within the palace.

**De Jong’s Reliability**

First, Hirsch’s skepticism about the “reliability” of the motifs decorating the floors of the Throne Room in de Jong’s published reconstruction can be dismissed. As shown above, there is clear evidence that preliminary identifications of motifs in 64 squares made in different years and by different individuals are congruent with the depictions in the final watercolor. This includes the motif in Throne Room square E7, which I have shown was similarly represented in a field plan, in excavation photos, and in de Jong’s painting.

Furthermore, Hirsch’s additional claim that there was no “textual support” for the Throne Room’s floor decoration because Blegen and Rawson chose to present the decoration in a list rather than square-by-square\(^ {946}\) can be refuted. Rather than because of a lack of confidence, Blegen and Rawson likely refrained from describing every square with preserved decoration on the floor of the Throne Room individually simply because there were 75 of them – a huge number when compared to the eight and 15 squares with surviving decoration in the Vestibule.

\(^{946}\) Hirsch 1977, pp. 32, 34.
and Portico respectively. Similarly small numbers are also evident for floor designs elsewhere in the palace that Blegen and Rawson described “square-by-square.” Corridor 49, for example, retains evidence of painted designs in only 10 of its squares, while in Room 50, decoration is preserved in only 16 squares.\textsuperscript{947} It would seem, therefore, that the Throne Room list was simply a form of shorthand – designed to present information in a more efficient, but \textit{no less factual}, format.

\textit{Artists’ Grids as Evidence for Careful Planning and Execution}

Second, the identification of the incised mini-grids in Throne Room floor squares F1, G1, J5, K4, K6, K7, K8, L9, and L10 as artists’ grids clearly shows that Blegen and Rawson’s suggestion that these marked places for court officials to stand on important “occasions of state” is incorrect.\textsuperscript{948} As technical aids, these grids serve as indications of how the floor decoration was \textit{produced}, not how it was used. The artists’ grids also show that the painted floor in the Throne Room was not, as the excavators, Rutter, and others have argued, a slipshod construction. As discussed earlier, the latter argument is based on the irregular alignment of the Throne Room’s grid, which shifts from orthogonal to diagonal at its southeastern end. This shift, Blegen and Rawson argued, was the result of a mistake when the guidelines for the floor grid were strung – a “miscalculation” made by artisans whose quality of work had “fallen off appreciably at the end of Mycenaean III B.”\textsuperscript{949} This claim is countered, however, by the artists’ grids, which show clearly that accuracy and precision were priorities for the Pylian painters, some of whom took additional time and devoted the energy necessary to render motifs evenly.

\textsuperscript{947} \textit{PN I}, p. 214, fig. 163.
\textsuperscript{948} \textit{PN I}, pp. 84-85.
\textsuperscript{949} \textit{PN I}, p. 83.
Furthermore, because the artists’ grids were impressed while the plaster was still damp and malleable, it is likely that their locations were worked out carefully ahead of time.\textsuperscript{950} This is also suggested by the varying dimensions of the grids, which show clearly that they were designed for specific patterns rather than reproduced in a perfunctory manner. This is particularly clear in the case of square G1, impressed with an elongated rectangular grid which was likely “custom-made” to accommodate the square’s zigzag pattern.\textsuperscript{951} Based on this evidence, it appears that not only did the artist have to know that a square would be gridded, he also had to know, in advance, what type of decoration it would contain.

Even more illustrative of the careful execution of the floors of the Pylos Throne Room is the presence of corrected mistakes in both the artist’s grid and in the overall floor grid in square L10. These corrections clearly show that the artisans responsible the floor’s production were in the habit of correcting even small mistakes.\textsuperscript{952} A major error, therefore, such as drawing a diagonal rather than an orthogonal line across the whole of the room, could hardly have remained

\textsuperscript{950} The precise length of time during which the plaster would remain in a state suitable for impression by string (or a blunt instrument) is unknown. While replication experiments by Cameron in 1976 demonstrated that plaster with a moderate (67\%) lime content could have remained “malleable” for a period of approximately fifteen days (Cameron 1977, p. 166), subsequent experiments by Chryssikopoulou et al. have indicated that there was a smaller “window” in which the plaster was workable. The \textit{buon fresco} technique was most successful when paint was applied between two and 10 hours after the final coat of plaster was laid (2000, pp. 126-127). For a summary of the results of both experiments see Jones 2005, pp. 220-222. At Pylos, the question of whether the paint on the floors was applied when the plaster was still wet remains unresolved. While for many scholars, string-impressions are a certain indication of the \textit{fresco} technique (e.g., Brysbaert 2008, p. 18), at Pylos recent work by Brecoulaki et al. (2012) has uncovered evidence for the use of organic binders (including egg and tragacanth gum) in a number of paintings, suggesting that the \textit{a secco} technique was also employed. While nothing can be said with certainty before analytical tests are performed, based other parallels with wall paintings I would suggest that the Pylos floors may have been produced using a combination of \textit{fresco} and \textit{secco} painting techniques – a style that has also been identified for painted floors (with at least one string impression) in the Great Palace at Amarna, Egypt dating to the late fourteenth century B.C. (Weatherhead 2007, pp. 365-368).

\textsuperscript{951} See Shaw (2000, p. 59) for discussion of the use of differently sized grids for different patterns in depictions of textiles in Cretan wall painting including one example with an “exceptional” rectangular grid (Pattern “A”) (ibid., p. 53).

\textsuperscript{952} There is also some slight evidence that one of the diagonal grid lines themselves was “corrected” during its production, further suggesting that their slanted form was intentional rather than accidental. The line in question forms the bottom of row H to the northeast of the hearth and appears to have been re-drawn ca. 0.01 m. to the southeast. Because, however, the line is only visible for a short distance (it has not been cleaned), it is difficult to tell whether this constitutes a full correction or just a slight adjustment of the end of the string.
uncorrected. For this reason, I would suggest that the diagonal slant of the floor grid at the southeastern end of the Pylos Throne Room was not accidental but intentional, designed to engage the attention of a visitor as he entered the room and to both draw his gaze and direct his steps toward the throne positioned against the room’s NE wall.

*Intentionality and “Kinesthetic Address”*

As mentioned earlier, the potential “active” role of the diagonal in the Pylos Throne Room’s floor grid has been suggested by Thaler, who tentatively proposed that this element (a mistake) might have incidentally encouraged visitors to take fleeting glances (“flüchtigen Seitenblicke”) towards the throne before they made their clockwise journey around the room.953 While this argument is intriguing, the prominence of the floor’s diagonal and its position underfoot leads me to conclude that it was meant not only to draw the eye but also to compel the visitor to approach the throne.

As discussed in Chapter 4 in connection with the decoration of the megaron’s central hearth, the idea of kinetic responses to directions encoded in ancient visual media has been investigated by Clarke, who coined the term “kinesthetic address” in his investigations of such responses to Roman floor mosaics. To reiterate, in Clarke’s view, kinesthetic address is the “power of the image to confront and affect (direct) the viewer…it is concerned with aspects of human perception: the actual physiology of seeing, the identification of the subject represented, and the psychology of following pattern (that is, human reaction to design directions).”954 Using floors from bath complexes at Ostia, Clarke demonstrated how the poses and positions of figures...
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953 Thaler 2012a, p. 200. This idea, however, he felt to be virtually impossible to prove based on the wide acceptance of the idea that the diagonal was the result of poor construction: “…es dürfte allerdings kaum möglich sein, ein zwingendes Argument ins Feld zu führen, diese Annahme gegenüber z.B. der Vermutung von “Pfusch am Bau” zu bevorzugen” (*ibid.*).

954 Clarke 1979, p. 20.
in floor mosaics could influence the way that a visitor moved through a space by prompting him to follow their gestures and positions. More recently, this idea has been explored in a study by Rebecca Molholt, who has inferred similar ambulatory effects produced by labyrinth mosaics in bathhouses in Roman North Africa, which encouraged a viewer to move across them and become “actively engaged in the narrative unfolding underfoot.”

In the case of the Pylos floor, the sharp diagonal orientation of the floor could have served the same purpose, commanding the viewer’s attention and directing him to walk along its “path” toward the throne. This interpretation is corroborated by the physical position of the slanted design near the doorway. In this location, the diagonal would have been the first feature of the Throne Room to be physically encountered by a visitor, who may have been able to see it from a distance. If the doorways of the megaron were open and lighting was sufficient, a projected view-shed (Figure 5.87) suggests that the impact of the design may have been felt in advance – preparing the visitor to move in a particular way once he reached his end goal. This “preview” of the Throne Room’s floor grid, which was on a noticeably different orientation from the grids in the preceding Portico and Vestibule, would have piqued the viewer’s interest as he ventured deeper into the megaron, causing him to be more attentive to, and thus more responsive toward, its design directions. The diagonal intentionally incorporated into the design of the Throne Room’s floor in this way becomes a “sign-post” similar to that identified by Hägg and
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955 Clarke 1979, p. 29.
956 Molholt 2011, p. 288.
957 In concept, such movement agrees with Klaus Killian’s idea that the enthroned wanax was the focus of the design program of Mycenaean palaces and that the architecture and decoration of such structures were forms of purposeful and skillfully executed royal propaganda, indicative of a “wanax-ideology” (Kilian 1988). The idea that the visitor was meant to approach the throne directly was also proposed by Lucinda McCallum (1987, pp. 123-124), but because of the perceived importance of the seated figure and the connected program of the megaron’s wall paintings and not because of any kinesthetic cues in the floor decoration.
958 As discussed earlier in this chapter, the extant decorated floor in the Portico is not the final but rather the penultimate floor in this room. However, as the final plaster layer appears to have been a very late installation, it is very likely that the decorated floor was used in concert with the visible (i.e., final) decorated floors in the Vestibule and Throne Room.
McCallum for the wall paintings in the Vestibule, which were meant, by way of the movement of their figures, to direct visitors to make their way into the Throne Room.\textsuperscript{959}

Motifs as Evidence for Emblems and Hybrid Construction

In addition to evidence for careful construction and kinesthetic design, the new evidence presented above also permits revision of previous interpretations of the patterns preserved on the megaron’s floors. First, concerning the octopus, if it is, as the LH IIA ceramic parallels suggest, oriented to face \textit{out from} the throne, this contradicts Hirsch’s statement that the motif faced toward it.\textsuperscript{960} This revised position suggests that the motif was not meant as a daemonic or protective entity, which should face \textit{toward} the entity that it guards. Instead, the “flipped” octopus may have served as a “projection” of the occupant of the throne and his abilities, as suggested by Säflund.\textsuperscript{961} One possibility is that the octopus symbolized the ruler’s (or the Pylian state’s) naval prowess and authority, also evidenced by the site’s wall paintings (including scenes with ships and argonauts) and its Linear B records, which document the site’s close connection to the god Poseidon.\textsuperscript{962}

The Floors of the Megaron as Intentional Hybrids

It is also clear, based on the review of comparanda above, that current interpretations of the megaron’s floor decorations as representing homogenous textile or stone surfaces are not convincing. Instead, it appears that not one, but \textit{two} (or possibly more) different materials are

\textsuperscript{959} Hägg 1985, p. 216; McCallum 1987, pp. 70-71.
\textsuperscript{960} Hirsch 1977, p. 32. This suggestion may also help to corroborate Hirsch’s suggestion that the floor decoration on the Mycenaean floors was executed by vase painters (Hirsch 1980, p. 459).
\textsuperscript{961} Säflund 1990, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{962} Brecoulaki et al. Forthcoming; Egan and Brecoulaki Forthcoming. For references to Poseidon, see tablets PY Ta 316, PY Un 6, and PY Un 718 (discussed in Palaima 2004). Also see Ventris and Chadwick 1976, p. 96 and Lindgren’s (1973, p. 155) discussion of sacrifices of Poseidon as one of the key functions of the Pylian \textit{wanax}. 
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represented. On the one hand, cut stone is indicated by the parallel lines/arcs and circle patterns, while the rapport patterns appear to represent textiles. The zigzag on the other hand, is more ambiguous, finding parallels in representations of stone, textiles, and, perhaps, wood. What emerges from this evidence is that the floors of the Pylos megaron are neither the strict replication of stone slabs nor of a “wall-to-wall” woven carpet. Instead, they seem to represent a hybrid surface preserving the formal qualities of multiple materials.963

Other Painted Hybrids at Pylos

While this conclusion may seem fanciful, it is corroborated by painted material hybrids evident elsewhere at the Palace of Nestor. The clearest example can be found on the plaster bench (4 M 10) in Room 10, mentioned earlier. While the short, northeastern face of this bench was painted to imitate veined stone, its long, southeastern face was painted to resemble a wooden bench with carved wooden legs and struts (Figure 5.88).964 In addition, I would also argue that the so-called “Variegated Dado” is an example of a material hybrid. As discussed above, this type of dado, fragments of which were found in Room 44 of the palace (13 D 44, Figure 5.89) and in the Northwest Slope plaster dump plaster dump (14 D nws, see Figure 5.39), is composed of panels featuring different decorative patterns that Lang contended were meant to represent stone following the model of the so-called “Arc Dadoes.”965 While some of these patterns including wavy parallel bands, small circles with white centers, and the so-called “Easter eggs” certainly have the hallmarks of stone imitation, others are clearly more textile in design. This is true of the cross-hatching pattern (present in both 13 D 44 and 14 D nws) as well as in the more
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963 Intriguingly, this effect of a hybrid surface is also evidenced in pottery on MM III Vapheio cups with ripple decoration, which Hatzaki has compellingly argued were meant to imitate metal (via the vessels’ shape) and stone (via vessels’ decoration) simultaneously (2013a, pp. 42-43).
964 See discussion in PN II, p. 179.
965 See discussion of these dadoes in PN II, pp. 173-174.
complex tricurved arch design (present in 13 D 44), both of which have parallels on the Pylos megaron’s floors. Further support for the identification of this dado as a hybrid also comes from the lines used to divide its painted surface into panels. Unlike the vertical red stripes used in the Arc Dado, the panels of the Variegated Dado are divided either by diagonal black lines (13 D 44) or by parallel wavy “zone changing” lines (14 D nws), producing an overall effect that is demonstrably different from traditional representations of stone revetment.

On both walls and floors, such blended materials, I would argue, were not whimsical artistic expressions but functional choices – selected as a means to impart visual messages of magnificence and innovation to the ancient viewer. Rather than slavishly replicating a realistic surface treatment constructed from, or covered with, a single material, the Pylian artisans utilized the full potential of the adaptable plaster medium to produce surfaces and structures that were physically impossible and, in turn, visually exciting. In the case of the megaron’s floors it is this fundamental malleability of the plaster medium that has been overlooked by scholars, who have routinely viewed the floor decoration as derivative – a strict imitation of a “real world” prototype. Even Hirsch, who credited the “flexible” plaster medium for the innovative inclusion of emblematic sea creatures in the floor grids at Tiryns and Pylos, fell victim to this narrow viewpoint in her eagerness to make sense of the floors as a homogeneous type of canvas.966 Furthermore, Hirsch attempted to bolster her argument that the floors were meant to replicate stone by citing the grid squares’ “wall-to-wall” layout (seemingly “precision cut” to accommodate built features), as well as the logic that it would not have been expedient to place a carpet near a fire-burning hearth.967 As works in plaster, however, painted floors are neither

stone nor carpet, and their interpretations therefore need not be restricted by expectations about what would have been appropriate and/or feasible for either of these real-life materials.

The Visual Impact of the Pylian Floors

Instead of strict copies, the floors of the Pylos megaron were an intentionally creative form of mimesis. Following the ideas of art historian Ernst Gombrich, who studied the effects of mimicry in the decorative arts ranging from painted depictions of textiles in Egyptian wall painting to parquet floors done in linoleum in his 1979 work, *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art*, I would argue that the Pylos floors were not designed to fool the eye into believing that the simulated materials were “real,” but rather were intended as a true “liberation from literalness” – a “feat of the imagination” designed to delight and impress the viewer.968

This visual impact is the product of two variables: first, the plurality of materials represented on the floor and second, the erratic placement of squares with different patterns throughout the grids. Although Blegen and Rawson noted that the same patterns were often positioned one square over and two squares up from one another (corresponding to the “Knight’s Move” in chess), this occurs only eight times in the Throne Room and twice in the Portico and can hardly be called a regular scheme.969 Instead, the floor designs, as shown in de Jong’s painting (see Figure 5.46), were arranged haphazardly, with the same patterns positioned in different parts of the floors and facing different directions. While the multiple orientations of
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969 See Throne Room Squares: A10 and B8; D4 and F3; D4 and E6; D7 and F9; E7 and F9; G3 and I2; J2 and L1; K7 and L9. Portico Squares: A6 and B8; A8 and B6. Notably, this count is based on the preserved decorations on the floor – the number could increase if the decoration in every square was known. The pitfalls of relying on the “knight’s move” as a key for understanding Mycenaean floor decoration have also been discussed by Hirsch, who has critiqued Lamb’s revision of Rodenwaldt’s reconstruction of the painted floor of the court at Mycenae (Hirsch 1977b).
patterns could be attributed to the production process (that is, the direction of a motif was
determined by where the artist was standing when he painted it), it is equally likely that they
were part of the floor’s intended design and were meant, like the decorative patterns themselves,
to attract and stimulate the viewer’s eye.

As argued by Gombrich, surface patterns with straightforward repeating designs are by
nature simpler to perceive and mentally process. Such visual monotony, however, also results in
a certain mental “boredom.” Using the example of a flagstone pavement (Figure 5.90a)
Gombrich writes, “We look at the grid and take it in at a glance as soon as we have grasped the
underlying rule that all the flagstones are identical. … When the expected happens in our field of
vision we cease to attend and the arrangement sinks below the threshold of our awareness.”970 In
the same vein, however, designs that are overly complex like a “crazy pavement” (Figure 5.90b)
are visually overwhelming: “If monotony makes it difficult to attend, a surfeit of novelty will
overload the system and cause us to give up.”971 By playing with pattern and direction within the
strict confines of a grid, therefore, the Pylian painters made the megaron’s floors sufficiently
complex so as to force the ancient viewer to engage with the designs, but not so complex that he
might become overwhelmed.

In practical terms, this mental engagement would have translated into additional time
spent viewing the floors, enabling the viewer to absorb and respond to the unique details of their
design including both the variable materials and also the kinesthetic thrust of the diagonal in the
Throne Room. This proposed visual entrancement connects also to ideas proposed by Alfred
Gell, who has explored the potential of complex patterns to “entrap” the viewer by creating a

970 Gombrich 1979, pp. 8-9.
971 Gombrich 1979, p. 9.
web of imagery that is visually unsolvable. In an ancient context, this idea has been applied recently to geometric Roman floor mosaics by Ellen Swift. The point of such intricate mosaics, like that in the *Domus dei Pesci* at Ostia (Figure 5.91), she proposes, may have been to help structure patron-client power relationships by creating an environment in which the latter figure was subordinated by his incomplete comprehension of the decoration in the former figure’s *domus*. In the case of the Pylian floors, a similar effect might be imagined. While the designs were not sufficiently complex, I would contend, to cause the visitor to become completely subjugated, their erratic array combined with the effect of multiple simulated materials may have left him in a state of awe toward the *wanax*, by whose power, it might appear, this “incredible” (or “supernatural”?) design was possible.

Intriguingly, this dynamic, hybrid design on the floors of the Pylos megaron is the exact *opposite* of contemporary floor designs in the megaras of Mycenaean palaces in the Argolid, which were demonstrably more “monotonous,” to use Gombrich’s term. At Mycenae, the painted squares of the floor grids seem to have imitated only stone, while those at Tiryns appear to have copied only textiles. At Mycenae, stone is indicated by the nature of the decorative patterns on the floors of the Vestibule of the megaron (Figure 5.92), which preserved squares with repeating zigzag designs, and on its adjacent court, which Hirsch has most recently proved included squares with irregularly arranged circles, wavy lines, concentric arcs, ridges (scalloped lines), and zigzags (see Figure 5.65). On both floors’ designs, no rapport patterns are represented. That the zigzags represent stone (and not another material) is suggested in this case by actual gypsum slabs set along borders of the Vestibule and also along the edges of the floor of
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972 Gell 1998, pp. 73-83.
973 Swift 2009.
974 Swift 2009, pp. 96-100.
975 Rodenwaldt 1919, p. 89; Hirsch 1977b.
the Throne Room, the center portion of which is preserved by only a small scrap of decoration adjacent to the hearth. In the Vestibule (and likely in the Throne Room), these slabs seem to be a direct reference to the material represented on the adjacent painted plaster.

At Tiryns, the situation is markedly different. Here, as discussed above, the floor patterns in the megaron were very limited, consisting of only three designs: the tricurved arch (“Schuppen”), pairs of dolphins, and octopuses laid out in a regular checkerboard pattern separated by elaborate bands of connected rosettes framed by tooth ornament (see Figures 5.35-5.37). The tricurved arch, as originally noted by Hackl (and confirmed by the above analysis of the Pylian floors), has strong parallels in painted depictions of textiles, while the rosette border is matched exactly in painted depictions of clothing, most notably on the border of a bodice worn by a woman in the Große Frauenprozession (Figure 5.93). As for the octopus, while this motif does not have a clear connection to textiles, its strict arrangement in a checkerboard, cum rapport, on the Tiryns floor (recently reconstructed by Thaler, Figure 5.94), mirroring the disposition of the tricurved arches, gives it a demonstrable textile quality.

Conclusions

Through close examination of field records, published illustrations, and firsthand examination of in situ material, this chapter has re-examined elements of the surface decoration of the Pylos megaron. As a result, re-assessments of some in situ and fragmentary wall paintings are put forward, and extensive comments are made concerning the suite’s floor decoration.

976 Despite this poor preservation, elaborate reconstructions of the painted portion of this floor have been attempted (e.g., Mylonas 1983, pp. 102-103, fig. 8).
977 A direct relationship between the actual cut gypsum and painted floor designs in the Vestibule and Throne Room of Mycenae has also been noted by Hirsch (1980, p. 456).
978 The same elements also appear together alongside the figural panels on the long sides of the LH IIIA Hagia Triada sarcophagus. See illustration in Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 2008, p. 141, fig. 9.
Concerning the issue of the megaron’s function, some refinement of existing theories is possible using this new information. First, concerning religion, the revised reconstruction of wall painting fragment group 2 M 6 (the painted stone jug) from the Throne Room as a more canonical libation vessel increases the possibility that it was meant to represent the ritual action performed in the libation channel, as determined in Chapter 4. In addition, the construction of impossible hybrid surfaces using combinations of floor patterns imitating both stone and textiles in the megaron may have also contributed to the “supernatural” character of its rooms at large.

Concerning the floors’ decorations, it is suggested that these were designed specifically to aid the reception of visitors to the space. As discussed, the reinterpretation of the diagonal orientation of the floor grid in the Throne Room as a form of kinesthetic address reflects a direct attempt to indicate, in a fixed way, how visitors to the room should move within it. While such instruction may have been unnecessary for some visitors who understood prescribed patterns of circulation, it may have been key to the experiences of new arrivals, for whom such patterns were a mystery. In this way, the floor decoration may speak to the range of individuals who would have entered the Pylos Throne Room, perhaps expanding the picture from small elite groups, as usually assumed, to a larger slice of Mycenaean society.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

For more than half a century, the megaron of the Palace of Nestor at Pylos has captured the scholarly imagination. Well-preserved and excavated with a high level of precision, the suite was brought to the forefront of studies of Mycenaean palaces by Blegen and Rawson in 1966 with the publication of the first volume of *The Palace of Nestor* and has remained a topic of discussion and debate to the present day. As part of such discussions, frequent attempts have been made to interpret the megaron and in particular to understand how it was used. To this end, scholars have utilized a combination of epic narratives and archaeological evidence to infer that the Pylos suite (and in particular its Throne Room) in the palatial period from LH IIIB to LH IIIC early functioned primarily in one or more of three ways: as a place for dining, as a royal reception hall, and/or as a setting for religious rituals.

Given their prevalence in published literature, these three interpretations are now fundamental to our impression of the Pylos megaron and have been used extensively in the formulation of larger theories regarding the use of the Mycenaean palace as a whole. While these interpretations are compelling, it has been impossible to assess their accuracy on account of lacunae in the site’s final publications, which, while impressive, for practical reasons were forced to prioritize the presentation of some discoveries over others.

In this dissertation, I have returned to the original excavation records and physical artifacts, built features, and painted plaster surfaces of the Pylos megaron in order to piece together a more complete account against which current theories can be evaluated and from which new ideas can be generated. As a result of my stratigraphical analyses, it is now clear that objects recovered in the megaron do not represent the remains of palatial feasts. This is demonstrated predominantly by the suite’s deposits of red earth, which I argue represent the
collapsed rubble matrix of pier-walls. As a result, the majority of finds (highly fragmentary and largely early in date) that come from these deposits are more accurately understood as remnants of vessels and other objects used during earlier periods of occupation on the Epano Englianos hill, and which were subsequently recycled as building material for the LH IIIB palatial edifice.

By contrast, my close interrogation of the megaron’s built features and painted surface decoration corroborates claims that the suite was used for religious rituals and for the reception of visitors between LH IIIB and LH IIIC early. Religious activities are indicated by new investigations of the Throne Room’s central hearth, table of offerings, and sunken libation channel, which it is argued was directly linked to painted representations of the griffin and lion restored by Lang and others to the adjacent NE wall. Based on a study of the physical character of the channel, it is further demonstrated that only part of the liquid (arguably olive oil) poured into the feature would have drained away – the rest being held in reserve in the basin closest to the throne. This split offering adds a new dimension to our understanding of the mechanics of cult practice in the suite and also implies that the griffin and lion were separate (rather than redundant) visual icons – representative of divine and mortal spheres or perhaps of different royal houses.

In addition, religious practices are also inferred indirectly from environmental components of the suite and/or its furniture. Building on recent reevaluations of the Throne Room’s architectural form, it is here suggested that the room was not “bright and cheerful” but dark, serving as a blank canvas against which artificial light cast from the hearth and lamps (potentially placed on the “sentry stands” in the Vestibule and Portico) was actively manipulated in order to create a range of sensory environments, some of which were undoubtedly designed for the performance of religious rites. Complementing this use of light to create a temporary
religious tenor in the megaron is my suggestion that the stone plinth in the Throne Room was meant to support not one, but multiple, interchangeable wooden thrones. This scenario, which is based on comparanda from Anatolia and Egypt and a new reading of the Pylos Ta tablet series, and which inserts more flexibility in our current impression of the suite’s furniture, suggests that one or more of these thrones was likely designated for religious use.

Evidence that the megaron was used for the reception of visitors is closely connected to the suite’s built environment. In addition to the evidence for variable lighting (which was also likely a way to dramatize the visitor’s experience in the megaron), that the megaron was designed with visitors in mind is strongly indicated by its painted decoration, which included kinesthetic elements. It is suggested, for example, that the running spirals on the upper rim of the central hearth may have been intended to propel visitors physically around the room. Curling backwards and forwards in perpetual motion, this design element may have directed the viewer to move both left and right around the room’s perimeter in order to achieve multiple viewsheds within the space.

In addition to the hearth, the painted floors of the megaron are also demonstrated to have offered behavioral cues. Evidence for these comes from the diagonal incorporated into the southeastern half of the gridded floor decoration in the Throne Room. This irregularity, long believed to be a mistake, is here argued to have been an intentional design element added for the purpose of instructing visitors to the Throne Room to move to the right, towards the throne positioned against the room’s NE wall, upon their initial entry. The intentionality of the diagonal is indicated by artists’ grids newly identified in some of the floor’s squares. Such drafting aids, which on their own illustrate the careful planning and execution of the floor’s decoration, also preserve evidence of corrected mistakes, indicating that the Pylian artists were in the habit of
fixing rather than ignoring their design errors. Furthermore, that the megaron’s floors were laid out with visitors in mind is indicated by their painted motifs, which are argued to simulate impossible surfaces of textile and stone. These visual hybrids, it is suggested, combined with the erratic placement of repeating designs within the suite’s rooms, was meant to arrest the viewer’s gaze and, in the case of the Throne Room, draw his attention to the kinesthetic diagonal.

Collectively, the preceding new conclusions help significantly to clarify and refine current interpretations of the use of the Pylos megaron from LH IIIB to LH IIIC early. In addition to these conclusions, however, many observations not directly relevant to the question of function add important new dimensions to our understanding of the suite. Most basic among these is the identification of production techniques and types of artifacts not previously known to have been associated with the megaron and/or with Pylos in general. Artists’ grids represent the first examples of this drafting technique identified on an Aegean Bronze Age floor, and only the second instance of its occurrence in any form on the Greek mainland. This study has further revealed an extremely varied pottery assemblage, with sherds dating from the Middle Helladic to the Hellenistic/Roman periods, and a number of probable imports from the Argolid, Central Greece, and Kythera, some of which preserve evidence of distinctive and unusual construction styles. Especially notable ceramic finds include fragments of a Mycenaean wheel-made bovid, the first of this type of artifact to be identified in Messenia, and fragments of Mycenaean deep bowls, a ceramic type notoriously elusive in the Pylos palace.

Of even greater significance are new conclusions regarding the lifespan of the megaron, which is here shown to comprise three, or even four, separate use-phases. Following the construction and palatial use of the suite from LH IIIB to LH IIIC early, stratigraphical and artifactual evidence points to the megaron’s re-use in a “ruined” state immediately following its
damage by fire. During this period, when the walls and superstructure of the megaron were still standing, it is suggested that windblown yellow silt accumulated in parts of the suite and that one small-scale “act of piety” and one localized “act of reverence” took place within the Throne Room. The first of these was the deposition of a single miniature kylix on the in situ table of offerings, while the second was the placement of two small collections of scavenged objects (published by the excavators as the throne space “treasure”) in a damaged section of the bedding for the throne. In the same ruined phase, a low mudbrick wall was erected across the opening to the Portico, protecting the suite from the adjacent open-air Court. Once the walls of the megaron had collapsed, a second period of re-use ensued in the Portico, which was converted into an area for small-scale wine consumption between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C. In the Throne Room, dark earth and a single Mycenaean stirrup jar were also deposited overtop of the collapsed wall debris, perhaps indicating a concurrent (or alternatively much earlier) religious event.

Finally, the collected evidence showcases ways in which the Pylos megaron was different from contemporary and architecturally very similar megara at Mycenae and Tiryns. In addition to anomalous features such as the libation channel, the decoration of the Pylos megaron offers a number of unusual twists on common themes. The clearest example of this is its floor decoration, which was meant to evoke a hybrid construction not evident in the palaces of the Argolid. That such a decision may have been symptomatic of expressly Pylian aesthetics is further indicated by the use of hybrid constructions in the palace’s wall paintings and by the proposed local predilection for simulated rather than authentic materials, as evidenced by the possible use of paint directly on the stone baseboards in the Portico. In the case of the decorated floors, working a diagonal into an otherwise orthogonal grid plan may further indicate that the Pylians were more
concerned with visitor reception than their Argive neighbors – taking extra care to articulate visually how this important space should be experienced.

Building on the strong foundation laid by Blegen and Rawson, the evidence and interpretations of the Pylos megaron presented in this dissertation give further clarity to one of the most widely discussed and undoubtedly important structures in southwest Messenia and indeed all of Late Bronze Age Greece. By integrating published and unpublished data, it has been possible to test and refine existing theories of the suite’s function as well as to shed valuable new light on the structure’s physical character and lifespan. This information not only provides fresh perspectives on this most familiar structure, but also, it is hoped, will serve as a new foundation on which future studies of the Palace of Nestor, both as a local entity and as a player on a wider Mycenaean stage, can build.
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APPENDIX 1:  
EXCAVATION HISTORY OF THE MEGARON, IDENTIFICATION OF STRATA,  
AND CATALOGUE OF POTTERY AND SMALL FINDS

Preliminary Excavation of the Megaron (1939)  
Timeline and Method

Excavation of the megaron of the Palace of Nestor began on April 4, 1939 when Carl Blegen, working in collaboration with the director of the National Museum in Athens, Konstantinos Kourouniotis, cut the first of seven exploratory trenches across the site.979 The trench, named “Trench I” (Figure A1.1), measured 70.00 m. long by 2.00 m. wide, and was divided into 10.00 m. stretches labeled “Sections A-G.”980 At the southern end (“Section A”) of the trench, the famous palace Archives (Rooms 7 and 8) were unearthed, and additional walls and/or plastered floors were found in Sections B, C, D, E, and F.981 Although unknown at the time, Sections B and C passed through the center of the megaron’s Portico (Room 4) and Vestibule (Room 5) and Sections D and E clipped the east corner of its Throne Room (Room 6). In each of these sections, the earth was removed in 0.10 m. passes.982 The ceramic finds from each pass in each section were collected separately, but stored as large units. All sherds found in Section C from a depth of -0.45 m. to -1.10 m. (floor level), for example, were kept together.983 Metal finds, on the contrary, were given special attention in the field notes, and were collected and stored separately.984 Excavation in the megaron continued until May 8, 1939 when Trench I was backfilled.985

979 WAM 1939, p. 9; Kourouniotis and Blegen 1939, p. 561; PN1, pp. 5-6.  
980 WAM 1939, pp. 9, 47. In addition, at the southernmost end of Trench I was a short stretch labeled in a field plan as “Section S” (ibid., p. 47).  
981 WAM 1939, p. 47.  
982 WAM 1939, p. 11, et passim; Kourouniotis and Blegen 1939, p. 561.  
983 WAM 1939, p. 22. In PN1 (p. 6), Blegen and Rawson erroneously state that the excavation of Trench I concluded on May 10. This date is rather that by which all the exploratory trenches had been backfilled.  
984 See for example the bronze fragments (including M-1) from Section C (WAM 1939, pp. 11, 21).  
985 WAM 1939, p. 116.
Trench I, Sections B, C, and D: Stratigraphy

Plan: see Figure A1.1
Relationship matrices: Figure A1.2

The stratigraphy in Sections B, C, and D of 1939 Trench I was not well documented in the field. Only two deposits were noted specifically by field director William A. McDonald: a “disturbed” plowed layer (p0) and a thicker layer of “debris” collected beneath it.986 In their 1939 AJA publication, Kourouniotis and Blegen mentioned the additional presence of “black carbonized rubbish and ashes” and “fine dry red-burnt earth, presumably the disintegrated debris of crude bricks” in their exploratory trenches.987 In Sections C and D, the plowed layers were noted to contain stones.988 Because of the lack of specificity about the character of the fill, with the exception of the plowed earth the finds below are assigned to general layers rather than specific (i.e., alpha-numeric) strata.

Trench I, Sections B, C, and D: Finds

**STRATUM p0:**
Depth: surface to -0.10 m.

**POTTERY**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Baskets of sherds” from the “disturbed ploughed area” in Sections B, C, and D (WMcD 1939, p. 9).

**LAYERS OF BURIED DEBRIS:**
Depth: -0.10 to -1.10 m.

**Section C:**
From -0.10 to -0.45 (layers 2-5):

**POTTERY**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Baskets” of sherds (WMcD 1939, p. 11).

---

986 WAM 1939, p. 10, *et passim.*
987 Kourouniotis and Blegen 1939, p. 561.
988 WAM 1939, p. 9.
At -0.45 m.:

**METAL**

Associated, Not Catalogued:

“2 small fragments of bronze” (WMcD 1939, p. 11).

From -0.45 to -1.10 m. (floor) (field layers 6+):

**POTTERY**

Associated, Not Catalogued:

“Sherds” (WMcD 1939, p. 21).

Depth unknown (in the Vestibule or Throne Room):

**POTTERY**

Catalogued:

*P-1: Pedestaled krater (MRT 63; FS 9) PLATE 88

Found in Section C of Trench I. Precise find spot unknown.

Ca. 16 joined fragments representing roughly 1/3 of the total vessel.

Fine fabric (Group undetermined). Full profile preserved: Pedestal base, concave to convex
piriform-conical body, and thick everted rim. Exterior decorated with a deep rim band above a
running spiral (FM 46) on the shoulder. The belly is crossed by three parallel horizontal bands
and the lower body and base are monochrome. Dark paint.

Date: LH IIIB2

Publ. *PN I*, p. 91, pl. 346, no. 1.

Cf. Mountjoy 1999, fig. 119, nos. 103-104; 1986, fig. 156.1.

At -0.70 m. (in the Vestibule):

**METAL**

Catalogued:

*M-1: Open bronze vessel PLATE 1


Found in the NE Quadrant of the Vestibule, 3.50 m. from the south end, at a depth of -0.70 m.

Everted rim of with attached convex body and possible handle stub. H. 0.05 m., W. 0.055 m. D.
est. 0.13. Rim decorated with horizontal rows of beads, partly concealed by irregular bits of
fused metal. All surfaces badly corroded.

Field Ref. WMcd 1939, p. 21, with sketch.

Publ. *PN I*, p. 76, fig. 274, no. 2; Hofstra 2000, pp. 102-103, 307, fig. 9 (mislabeled as MX
3753).

At -0.75 m.:
METAL

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Several fragments of bronze” (WMcD 1939, p. 22).

Section D:
From -0.10 to -0.40 (field layers 2-4):

POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Baskets” of sherds (WMcD 1939, p. 11).

Excavation of the Throne Room (1952)

Timeline and Method:

After a hiatus of thirteen years, systematic excavations in the megaron of the Palace of Nestor began on May 31, 1952, when George E. Mylonas cut a guide trench, named Trench Z, from southwest to northeast across the central part of the palace (see Figure A1.1). In this trench, measuring 50.00 m. long and 1.50 m. wide, Mylonas exposed parts of what would later be identified as Court 88, Pantry Rooms 18 and 19, Corridor 25, Oil Magazine 31, entry areas 29-30, and by a stroke of luck, a complete cross section of the Throne Room (Room 6) of the megaron, located primarily in Trench Z’s third and fourth five-meter stretches. The earth in both stretches was removed in artificial passes of 0.20 m. and the finds from each pass were collected separately. Important artifacts were noted together with a measurement of their

---

989 GEM 1952, p. 1; PN 1, p. 7.
990 GEM 1952, pp. 3, 5. Blegen 1953, p. 60. Initially, in 1952 Mylonas was engaged in the investigation of a large structure to the southwest, where in 1939 McDonald had unearthed a pair of large stone antae (at the juncture of Hall 64 and Room 67) that Blegen believed belonged to the palace’s megaron (CWB 1939, p. 57; WAM 1939, p. 59). Despite McDonald’s protestations (WAM 1939, p. 69), Blegen published his theory in the winter issue of the 1939 American Journal of Archaeology: “Behind the supposed portico two immense squared stone blocks, more than 8m apart, might well be the bases of antae flanking the entrance to a stately megaron-like hall” (Kourouniotis and Blegen 1939, p. 561). This theory, however, was disproved by Mylonas’s work in this area (in Trench Y), as well as by the excavation of Trench Z.
depths and their position relative to surface level and the edges of the trench. On June 3, near the bottom of Trench Z, Mylonas uncovered the southeastern edge of the Throne Room’s central hearth (Figure A1.3). Although he did not recognize the feature immediately, its clear “importance” prompted him to expand his excavations to the northwest and southeast. On June 4, Mylonas opened two new trenches perpendicular to Trench Z at its 13.50 m. mark. One trench, extending to the northwest, was designated “Trench Zb” while the other, extending to the southeast, he named “Trench Zc” (Figure A1.4). Both trenches measured 1.50 m. wide. In Trench Zb, a full cross-section of the central hearth emerged, prompting Mylonas to expand his excavation area yet again.

Around the hearth, Mylonas opened the four quadrants separated by Trenches Z, Zb, and Zc which he designated, moving clockwise from the room’s western corner: the SW Quadrant, the NW Quadrant, the NE Quadrant, and the SE Quadrant (Figure A1.5). The opening of the quadrants was staggered, but work occurred in all four areas simultaneously. The first quadrant of the room to be opened was the SW Quadrant, which Mylonas excavated from June 6 to June 20. He excavated in the NW Quadrant from June 10 to June 17 (and then again from June 24

---

992 GEM 1952, p. 11, *et passim.*
993 GEM 1952, pp. 19, 21. “There can be no doubt that we have an important structure. Its importance increases if we consider that on either side of it we have walls only on the 8.60m L and then on the 19.8m L, almost at the very end of the 4th 5 meter stretch. Then the structure seems to be in a huge room with a space of 11 m. approximately and it seems to occupy the center of that span.”
995 GEM 1952, p. 35.
996 In his field notebook, Mylonas preferred the terms “segment” and “section” to describe the excavated quadrants of the Throne Room, while the term “quarter” was used to describe the excavated quadrants in the megaron’s Vestibule. In order to avoid confusion with stratigraphical sections and with areas of the site designated as “quarters” (e.g., the “Queen’s Quarters”) the term “quadrant,” which is employed in *PN I*, is used here for both rooms.
to June 25), in the SE Quadrant from June 14 to June 19, and in the NE Quadrant from June 16 to June 21.  

In each of these quadrants, Mylonas employed the same excavation strategy. Starting over the hearth, he worked outward toward the edges of the room, removing the earth in “layers.” Finds from each layer were collected separately, and discoveries of particular note were recorded in the field notebook together with measurements of their depths below surface level and their horizontal distances relative to known features. At the perimeter of each quadrant, Mylonas left small earthen “guards” (Figure A1.6), which he removed either at a slower rate and/or after the central parts of the quadrants had been dug out. The combination of these two tactics, the first presumably employed to expedite the excavation of the hearth, and the second likely intended both to protect previously excavated areas and/or the room’s walls and to facilitate the drawing of stratigraphical sections, meant that the Throne Room (or the “Hearth Room,” as it was termed initially by Mylonas) was exposed unevenly, often resulting in a clearer picture of what was happening in the center of the room days, or even weeks, before its outer edges (and walls) were exposed. In all quadrants, the lowest levels of earth were preserved until the upper deposits had been completely removed, presumably in order to prevent unnecessary wear and tear on the plaster floors (see Figure 3.47).

_Trench Z: Stratigraphy_

998 GEM 1952, pp. 49-68, 82-86 (the NW Quarter); pp. 62-74 (the SE Quarter); and pp. 65-78 (the NE Quarter). The SW and NW Quarters were slightly larger than the SE and NE Quarters and thus more time consuming to excavate.  
999 GEM 1952, p. 39, _et passim_.  
1000 GEM 1952, p. 39, _et passim_.  
1001 GEM 1952, p. 45, _et passim_. While the vast majority of references to these guards situate them alongside the guide trenches (Z, Zb, and Zc), there is one attestation of a guard that was left in front of the Hearth Room’s SE wall (GEM 1952, p. 57). This, along with records of earth left in front of walls suggests this type of “guard” was used more often than the text suggests. The thickness of these guards is not recorded. Based on discoveries contained within them, however, their width might be estimated at ca. 0.50 m.  
1002 The term “Hearth Room” is first used on June 6 (GEM 1952, p. 37).
Plan: Figure A1.7  
Relationship matrices: see Figure A1.2

The sequence of the megaron’s stratigraphy was first documented at the southwestern end of Trench Z (i.e., in the “3rd 5 meter stretch”), which Mylonas described both in his field notes and with a section drawing of the trench’s northwest baulk (Figure A1.8). At this end of the trench, the following sequence is attested: On top was a stratum of plowed earth (p1) (Th. 0.15-0.20 m.), above a thick stratum of brick-red earth (r1) (Th. ca. 0.80 m.).\(^{1003}\) This red earth contained many large stones (including one calcined block) and part of a lens of yellow earth (y1) (Th. ca. 0.50 m.), and rested on a narrow strip (Th. ca. 0.10 m.) of black-burned earth (b1).\(^{1004}\) In the central part of the trench, in the area over the hearth, a larger deposit of black burned earth (b2) (Th. 0.15-0.20 m.) with abundant fallen and burnt small stones appeared directly underneath the plowed stratum.\(^{1005}\) Underneath this black stratum, the continuation of the red stratum (r1) contained a thin deposit of plaster. Below the red earth was a stratum (Th. ca. 0.40 m.) of hard-packed yellow earth, which covered the surface of the hearth (y5) and extended to the immediate southwest (y2).\(^{1006}\)

In the northeastern part of Trench Z (in the “4th and 5th five meter stretches”), the strata are less well documented. They were partly excavated in 1939 as part of Trench I, Section C and no profiles were drawn.\(^{1007}\) Mylonas’ 1952 field notes indicate, however, that the hearth was overlaid by surface brown plowed earth (p2) (Th. ca. 0.15 m.), below which was a stratum of

---

\(^{1003}\) GEM 1952, p. 9 and section drawing on p. 36.  
\(^{1004}\) GEM 1952, pp. 1, 5, 11, 19, 21, 36.  
\(^{1005}\) GEM 1952, pp. 9, 16, 36.  
\(^{1006}\) The depths of the red and yellow earth are determined from the section drawing (GEM, p. 36), which shows the red stony earth cut by a thick layer of plaster, and two superimposed layers of yellow earth with a total thickness of ca. 0.40 m. The section does not show the deposits resting at floor level to the southwest of the hearth.  
\(^{1007}\) GEM 1952, pp. 9, 11, 16.
black burned earth (b3) (Th. ca. 0.15 m.).\textsuperscript{1008} Below this was a thick stratum of brick-red earth with stones (r2) (Figure A1.9), which extended to the Throne Room’s NE wall.\textsuperscript{1009}

*Trench Z: Finds*

**STRATUM p1 (3\textsuperscript{rd} five meter stretch)**
DEPTH: surface to -0.20 m.

**POTTERY**

Associated, Not-Catalogued:
“Crude ware” (GEM 1952, p. 5).

**STRATUM p2 (4\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} five meter stretch)**
DEPTH: surface to -0.20 m.

1952 SHERD LOTS: 25

**POTTERY**

Catalogued:

**P-2:** Small kylix(kes), cup(s), or dipper(s) (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)

PLATE 10
1952 Sherd Lot 25.
Five, non-joining everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-3:** Standard kylix or dipper (*MRT 29c or 25*)

PLATE 11
1952 Sherd Lot 25.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**STRATUM r1/STRATUM b2\textsuperscript{1010}**
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.40 m.

1952 SHERD LOTS: 15, 30

\textsuperscript{1008} GEM 1952, pp. 11, 19.
\textsuperscript{1009} GEM 1952, p. 31. Mylonas gives no details about the thickness of the red earth, nor any information about its relationship with the black earth. Based on Mylonas’ observations about the surrounding trenches, however, I would suggest that the black earth was localized in the area of the hearth, and that it was enclosed to the northeast and underlain by the red soil, which continued down to floor level.
\textsuperscript{1010} The finds listed below, I suggest, do not belong to stratum y1, which also occupies Trench Z at a depth of -0.20 to -0.40 m. This is because this layer is only noted in a drawn section, and not in Mylonas’ field notes for Trench Z.
From -0.20 m. to -0.30 m.:

**PLASTER**

Associated, Not-Catalogued:

**POTTERY**

Catalogued:

**P-4**: Semi-globular cup or goblet? PLATE 12
1952 Sherd Lot 15.
Everted rim sherd. D. est. 0.16 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior rim bands. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint.
Date: LH I-II

**P-5**: Shallow angular bowl or small angular kylix or (*MRT 4 or 27; FS 295 or 267*) PLATE 12
1952 Sherd Lot 15.
Everted rim sherd with attached concave-to-flaring upper body. D. est. 0.12 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-6**: Standard kylix (*MRT 29c*) PLATE 12
1952 Sherd Lot 15.
Rounded rim sherd. D. est. 0.19 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Undecorated. Fabric color is between pink and orange.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-7**: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a, 12, 18-19, or 23*) PLATE 13
1952 Sherd Lot 15.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.12 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

Associated, Not-Catalogued:

From -0.20 m. to -0.40 m.:

**PLASTER**

Associated, Not-Catalogued:

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-8:** Kylix (FS 257-258?)

1952 Sherd Lot 30.
Lower stem and attached upper part of a shallow-domed foot. Stem has very slight bulge just below upper edge. Max. D. 0.016 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Stem decorated with three horizontal bands, two thick and one thin. 7.5YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint. Underside of base reserved.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB

Associated, Not-Catalogued:

“Few fragments kylix” (1952 Sherd Lot 30: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

STRATUM r1

DEPTH: -0.20 m. to floor

1952 SHERD LOTS: 2

From -0.20 m. to -0.40 m.:

WOOD

Catalogued:

**W-1:** Carbonized Wood

Found at the 18.00 m. mark along Trench Z at a depth of -0.36 m. (i.e., 0.75 m. above the floor). Piece of burnt wooden beam. Pres. L. 0.42 m., W. 0.14 m., H. 0.10 m. Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #62,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati. Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 11, 19.

From -0.40 m. to -0.60 m.:

STONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Quartz found in a pile at the 12.50 m. mark along Trench Z, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found together with the “boar’s tusk” (B-1) (GEM 1952, p. 11).

BONE

Catalogued:

**B-1:** Boar (?) canine

CM Room 2, Case 19.
Found at the 12.50 m. mark along Trench Z, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found together with the quartz associated with this stratum. Nearly complete. L. 0.06 m., W. 0.01 m. Very white. Enamel cracked and completely missing from proximal end. Identified in the field and in publication as a “boar’s tusk.”
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 11.
Publ. PN I, p. 91, fig. 270.

Associated, Not Catalogued:

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“One piece of plaster with color” (1952 Sherd Lot 2: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

CLAY

Catalogued:
*C-I: Linear B tablet PY La 626
NM.
Found at the 10.50 m. mark along Trench Z, at a depth of -0.60 m. Small fragment of a palm leaf tablet. Writing on both obverse and reverse. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 5.”
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 43; position marked on plan, p. 10.

POTTERY

Associated, Not-Catalogued:
“No complete or practically complete vase. Practically nothing worth preserving” (1952 Sherd Lot 2: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

From -0.60 m. to -0.80 m.:

METAL

Associated, Not-Catalogued:
Two pieces of “burned copper” [likely bronze] located at the 14.00 m. mark along Trench Z, 0.25 m. from the trench’s east edge, at a depth of -0.62 m. (GEM 1952, p. 16).

From -0.40 m. to -1.07 m. (just above the floor):
POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:

*P-9: Pithos

Found 10.40 m. from the southwest edge of Trench Z, between ca. -0.40 m. and -1.07 m. (just above the floor).

Fragments of a large pithos with a broad, horizontal rim. Many pieces heavily coated with white lime. First fragment initially identified in the field as an upright, in situ plastered stone slab. Date: Indeterminate

Field ref. GEM 1952, pp. 19, 21, 77. Rim fragment shown in Pylos excavation photograph P.52.28.

Publ. PN I, p. 89.

Thought by Mylonas to belong to the same vessel as the “thick rounded rim of a pithos” found at a depth of -0.40 m. in stratum b5 (see below) (GEM 1952, p. 31).

STRATUM r2

DEPTH: -0.20 m. to floor

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 26, 27, 28 |
|
| From -0.20 m. to -0.40 m.: |

POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:


From -0.40 m. to -0.60 m.:

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:

“Painted plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 27: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-10: Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 35?)

1952 Sherd Lot 27.

Convex body sherd, likely from lower shoulder.

Fine fabric, 10YR 6/1 (gray). Exterior decorated with part of a running/group spiral design (similar to FM 46/47) and two horizontal bands. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces heavily burnt.

Date: LH IIIA2?

May go with: P-40, and two joining sherds from Room 18 (P-376).

P-11a: Standard kylix(kes) or large dipper(s) (MRT 29c or 25)
1952 Sherd Lot 27.
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Fine fabric, 2.5YR 8/3 (pale yellow). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-11b:** Standard/large kylix(kes) (*MRT 29c-g*)
1952 Sherd Lot 27.
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Fine fabric, 2.5YR 8/3 (pale yellow). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-12:** Cup?
1952 Sherd Lot 27.
Carinated incurring body sherd. D. at carination est. 0.14 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Interior coated with 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) monochrome slip. Trace of same paint on exterior.
Date: Indeterminate

*Associated, Not-Catalogued:*
“Few flat ring of pithoi” (1952 Sherd Lot 27: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

**From -0.60 m. to -0.90 m.:**

**BONE**

*Associated, Not-Catalogued:*

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not-Catalogued:*

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*
**P-13:** Beak-spouted jug (*FS 143-145*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 28.
Convex shoulder sherd from just below neck.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Shallow ridge and groove at the base of the neck. Thin profile. Exterior decorated with stemmed or running spirals (*FM 46 or FM 51*). 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint, with crazing. Only decorated sherd in this lot.
Date: LH IIA?

Associated, Not-Catalogued:
“Crude plain ware, kylix” (1952 Sherd Lot 28: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

STRATUM r1/STRATUM r2
DEPTH: -0.40 m. to -0.50 m. (area “of raised hearth”)

1952 SHERD LOTS: 1

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-14: Chimney fragments PLATE 14
1952 Sherd Lot 1.
Fragments from less than one half of each of two cylindrical clay chimney fragments. D. est. 0.652-0.665 m., max. pres. H. 0.53 m., Th. wall 0.021-0.035 m.
Interior surface heavily blackened/burnt.
Identified in the description of Sherd Lot 1 as fragments of “tile.”
Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. Photographed with other fragments as P.52.61.
Publ. PN I, pp. 81, n. 30, figs. 271, no. 2; 272, nos. 6-7.
Cf. PN I, p. 200, figs. 271, no. 3; 272, nos. 8-9 (from Hall 46); McDonald and Wilkie 1992, p. 547, pl. 9-76 (P3872) from Nichoria.
Belongs to the same chimney system as: P-16, P-59, P-85, and P-113.

Associated, Not-Catalogued:
“Small lot of sherds…One piece of kylix with painted band decoration – red color apparently from goblet approaching stem” (1952 Sherd Lot 1: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder, p. 4).

STRATUM b3
DEPTH: -0.15 m. to -0.30 m.
No finds recorded.

STRATUM y1
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.70 m.
No finds recorded.

STRATUM y2
DEPTH: -0.50 m. to -0.90 m. (floor)
No finds recorded.

**STRATUM b1**  
**DEPTH:** -1.00 m. to -1.20 m. (floor)  
No finds recorded.

*Trench Zb: Stratigraphy*

Plan: see Figure A1.7  
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.2

In Trench Zb, the stratigraphy was very similar to that unearthed by Mylonas in the central part of Trench Z. On top was a stratum of brown plowed earth (p3) (Th. ca. 0.20 m.).\(^{1011}\) This earth rested on a stratum of soft black burnt earth (b4) (Th. 0.20-0.28 m.) with many small stones extending northwest out from Trench Z to a distance of ca. 4.00 m. (Figure A1.10).\(^{1012}\) Underneath this black-burned earth, at the intersection of Trench Zb and Trench Z, was a deposit of plaster over a stratum (Th. ca. 0.30 m.) of brick red earth (r3) with a few small stones (Figures A1.11 and A1.12).\(^{1013}\) Below this red deposit was a stratum (Th. ca. 0.20 m.) of hard-packed yellow earth covering the surface of the hearth (y5) and adjacent floor (y3).

To the northwest, in the zone ca. 1.00 m. to 4.00 m. distant from Trench Z, the black earth (b4) in Trench Zb directly overlay the yellow earth (y3), which reached down to the floor and was noted to contain many “bits of plaster” and a few stones.\(^{1014}\) Northwest of the 4.00 m. mark, the same yellow earth (y3) appeared directly underneath the plowed stratum.\(^{1015}\)

---

\(^{1011}\) GEM 1952, p. 25.  
\(^{1012}\) GEM 1952, pp. 25, 26, 27. Notably, Mylonas drew attention to the size of the stones in this black earth, which were smaller than those found in the red-brick fill of Trench Z (*ibid.*, p. 27). Also, the profile of Trench Zb on p. 46 suggests that the black-burned earth reached a maximum distance of 5.00 m. to the northwest. A comparison with the profile on p. 38, however, suggests that this distance is that reached by the stones in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room (discussed below) rather than in Trench Zb.  
\(^{1013}\) GEM 1952, pp. 35, 46.  
\(^{1014}\) GEM 1952, pp. 25, 27, 35. While the stratigraphical drawings on p. 35 only show the overlay of the black and yellow earth between the 1.00 and 3.00 m. mark from Trench Z, comparison with the accompanying description...
Trench Zb: Finds

STRATUM p3
DEPTH: surface to -0.20 m.
No finds recorded.

STRATUM b4
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.50 m.

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-15: Very small, globular stirrup jar (FS 171 or 173) PLATE 17
Found in black debris directly over the hearth, wedged in among small stones, 3.00 m. out from Trench Z, at a depth of -0.35 m.
Nearly complete. Missing false spout, and one piece near the base. Handles and true spout broken. Globular body with raised concave base. Pres. H. 0.07 m., D. base 0.03 m., D. shoulder 0.08 m. Found intact. Subsequently broken during excavation (when stones around it were removed) and repaired.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with rings around the stumps of the missing handles and loops connecting the false and real spout. Shoulder with very worn curved multiple stems (FM 19) above a thick horizontal band. Traces of additional bands visible on lower body, but too poorly preserved to count. 10YR 2/2 (very dark brown) paint. Termed “Zb 1 Vase” during excavation. Catalogued by Rawson as pot 52.334.
Date: LH IIIB
Publ. PN I, p. 91.
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, pp. 77-79, fig. 93.1-2; p. 106, fig. 129.4; Mountjoy 1999, p. 341, nos. 81 (for decoration), 82 (for shape).

P-16: Chimney fragments PLATE 14
Found in black debris above the hearth, immediately below the small stones, between 0.30 m. and 1.40 m. northeast of Trench Z, at a depth of -0.42 m.. Located close to the interface between the black-burned stratum b4 and the underlying red stratum r3.
Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 27, 29, 35. Photographed with other fragments as P.52.61.

(which records that the drawn stratigraphy is that over the “ends and center” of the hearth, not at the limits of the black deposit), the section drawing on p. 46, and the notes taken on p. 29 indicate that these two deposits were adjacent up to the 4.00 m. mark.

GEM 1952, pp. 25, 26, 29, 46.
Belongs to same the chimney system as: **P-14, P-59, P-85, and P-113.**

**STRATUM y3**
**DEPTH:** -0.30 m. to -0.70 m. (floor)

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 5 |

**BONE**
*Associated, Not-Catalogued:*
“A few bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 5, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**WOOD**
*Catalogued:*
**W-2:** Carbonized Wood
Found 4.50 m. out from Trench Z and 0.17 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.40 m. Described in the field as being charred but retaining a “very bright black hue” that might indicate “some special variety” of wood. Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #55” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 25.

**PLASTER**
*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
Fragment of painted wall plaster found 5.40 m. northeast of Trench Z and 0.52 m. from the east edge of Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.56 m. “Ground white color, towards edge a piece of a broad red line and by it traces of yellow. Since the red line curves at the top, it is apparent that it does not form a “ground line” but part of a decorative element, perhaps spiral” (GEM 1952, p. 29).

**POTTERY**
*Catalogued:*
**P-17:** Large jar?
1952 Sherd Lot 5.
Square and undercut rim sherd. D. est. 0.22 m.
Date: MH III-LH I

**P-18:** Palace style jar (**MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24**)?
1952 Sherd Lot 5.
Convex body sherd.

---

Publ. *PN* I, pp. 81, n. 30, figs. 271, no. 2; 272, nos. 6-7.
Cf. *PN* I, p. 200, figs. 271, no. 3; 272 nos. 8-9 (from Hall 46); McDonald and Wilkie 1992, p. 547, pl. 9-76 (P3872) from Nichoria.
Belongs to same the chimney system as: **P-14, P-59, P-85, and P-113.**
Semi-coarse fabric, 5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with part of a horizontal band and a dotted festoon with pendent crocuses (FM 38). 10YR 2/1 (black) paint. Cretan import?  
Date: LH IIA  

**P-19:** Handleless/conical	extsuperscript{1016} cup (MRT 11; FS 204)  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.  
Ca. ½ of a slightly raised base with attached convex lower body. Clear string-cut marks on underside of base. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m.  
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1  

**P-20:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.  
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early  

**P-21:** Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g)  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.  
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early  

**P-22:** Shallow angular bowl (MRT 4; FS 295)  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.  
Everted rim sherd with attached complete “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.20 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early  

**P-23:** Large kylix (MRT 29f-g)  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.  
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body and start of a vertical strap handle attached just below the lip. D. est. 0.24 m.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated in a streaky 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) monochrome slip that continues onto the interior of the rim. Remainder of interior surface likely originally monochrome.  
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIC early?  

**P-24:** Small jar/jug  
PLATE 19

---

\textsuperscript{1016} The term “handleless cup” was coined by Blegen at Korakou (1921, p. 43) and is still preferred by many scholars for the mainland version of this shape (see French and Tomlinson 1999, p. 259). However, recent observations about the particular version of this cup at Pylos by Salvatore Vitale (pers. communication, July 2014) suggests that it has great affinities with the Cretan “conical cup,” and thus the dual term “handleless/conical” is used here.
1952 Sherd Lot 5.
Convex shoulder sherd, very thin wall.
Date: Myc.

**P-25:** Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a horizontal band. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-26:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate  
1952 Sherd Lot 5.
Part of a large vertical strap handle. W. 0.04 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). Exterior incised with two parallel vertical lines. Lower edge is sharply curved, suggesting it may have been punched through the vessel’s wall. Very unusual shape and decoration.
Date: Indeterminate.

**Associated, Not-Catalogued:**
“Sherds” not kept (1952 Sherd Lot 5, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**Trench Zc: Stratigraphy**

Plan: see Figure A1.7  
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.2

In Throne Room Trench Zc, as in Trenches Z and Zb, two strata were found directly underneath the plowed earth (p4). At the intersection with Trench Z and stretching to the southeast for a distance of 0.65 m. was a stratum of black-burned earth (b5), ca. 0.20 m. thick.\(^{1017}\) Farther southeast, the plowed soil was underlaid by brick-red earth (r4) as indicated by elevations in Mylonas’ notebook (Figure A1.13).\(^{1018}\) This red earth continued down to the floor and also undercut the black earth adjacent to Trench Z. In the central part of Trench Zb, a

---

\(^{1017}\) The thickness of this deposit is estimated from the thicknesses of strata b3 and b4, in Trench Zb.  
\(^{1018}\) GEM 1952, pp. 29, 34.
concentration of fallen large stones fused with plaster was uncovered in the red stratum (Figure A1.14). This deposit of stones began ca. 1.00 m. out from Trench Z and stretched southeast for 3.50 m. It crossed the full width of the trench, and extended into the room’s NE and SE Quadrants to achieve a total width of ca. 3.00 m.1019

*Trench Zc: Finds*

**STRATUM p4**
DEPTH: surface to -0.20 m.
No finds recorded.

**STRATUM b5**
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.40 m.

POTTERY
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Bottom of a jar” and a “thick rounded rim of a pithos” found at a depth of -0.40 m. (GEM 1952, pp. 29, 31). Thought by Mylonas to belong to the same pithos as the plaster-coated example (*P-9*) discovered in Trench Z, in stratum r1 (see above) (GEM 1952, p. 31).

**STRATUM b5/STRATUM r4**
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to -0.60 m.

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 13 |

BONE
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“3 [fragments of] bone” (1952 Sherd Lot 13, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

CLAY
Catalogued:
*C-2*: Linear B tablet PY La 635
_NM._
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Found at a depth of -0.40 m. in the SW Quadrant. Coordinates unknown.

1019 GEM 1952, p. 75. The origin of these stones, Mylonas suggested, was the Throne Room’s SE wall (*ibid.*, pp. 75, 77).
One end of a palm leaf tablet. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 14.” Associated in the field with *C-3. Stylus-Hand: S632-Ciii.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 79.

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-27:** Tall alabastron (FS 141) PLATE 20
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Horizontal rim sherd. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: LH IIA
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, p. 23, fig. 18.1.

**P-28:** Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 30 or 19?) PLATE 21
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with a pendant scale pattern (FM 70) with no filler motifs. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint. One of two decorated sherds in this lot.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
Cf. PN I, fig. 377 nos. 406-407 from Oil Magazine 32; Mountjoy 1986, fig. 40.2.
From same vessel as: **P-190, P-250, P-269,** and **P-282.** May also go with: **P-124, P-251, P-257,** and/or **P-372.**

**P-29:** Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 34) PLATE 21
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Horizontal/very slightly sloping rim sherd with attached upper part of a concave neck. D. est. rim 0.15 m.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior preserves very faint traces of a horizontal band at the juncture of the rim and neck. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces burnt.
Date: LH IIIA2?
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, p. 70, fig. 79.1; 1999, p. 334, no. 61.
Joins to: **P-125.** May also go with: **P-126+P-371.**

**P-30:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23) PLATE 21
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/0 (white). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
**P-31:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-32:** Standard kylix or dipper (*MRT 29c or 25*)
1952 Sherd Lot 13.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**STRATUM r4**
**DEPTH:** -0.50 m. to floor (from 1939 Trench I to the SE Wall)

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 14 |

**STONE**

*Catalogued:*
*S-1:* Piece of obsidian
Mus. No. *CM* 2238.
“1 piece of obsidian (worked, bowl?).”
Field ref: 1952 Sherd Lot 14, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5.
Publ. Hofstra 2000, p. 267, table 5.3 (MX 2238).

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Fragment of [a] stone handle(?)” (1952 Sherd Lot 14, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*
**P-33:** Shallow cup?
1952 Sherd Lot 14.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.15 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with an uneven rim band and slight traces of body decoration. Interior shows signs of a shallow rim band. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIA or LH IIIA?
May go with: **P-268**.

**P-34:** Krater (*MRT 63; FS 7*)
1952 Sherd Lot 14.
Base of a wide vertical strap handle.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with diagonal bars flanked by vertical edge bands. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIIA1

**P-35:** Deep bowl, Group A (*MRT 60; FS 284*)
1952 Sherd Lot 14.
Lipless, slightly flaring rim sherd with attached upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with shallow rim band above part of a running (?) spiral (*FM 46?).* Shallow interior rim band. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint.
Date: LH IIIB
Cf. McDonald 1972, fig. 50b.

**P-36:** Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 14.
Flaring lower body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with streaky 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) monochrome slip with a reserved band.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Fragments of plain, worthless ware” (1952 Sherd Lot 14, ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive box 5, Folder 3, p. 5.)

---

**SW Quadrant of the Throne Room: Stratigraphy**

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: Figure A1.15

After excavation was underway in Trenches Zb and Zc, work began in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room on June 6, 1952. In this quadrant, in the area of the hearth Mylonas uncovered a stratum of soft black earth with loose stones (*b6*) (Th. ca. 0.30 m.) underneath ca. 0.20 m. of plowed brown earth (*p5*). The black earth extended 4.70 m. northwest from Trench Z and 4.20 m. southwest of Trench Zb (Figure A1.16).1020 This black earth was edged by brick-red earth (*r5*), which formed a narrow ring along the former’s northwestern edge and also extended

---

1020 GEM 1952, p. 39.
to the SW wall in the area alongside Trench Z. In this area and beneath the black earth, the red earth (r5) continued down to floor level where it formed a very hard, sometimes yellowish deposit. Large stones were found in this reddish-yellow earth in the quadrant’s southeastern half and alongside the room’s SW wall (Figure A1.17).

To the east, over the hearth, the red earth (r5) was underlain by a thin (Th. ca. 0.10 m.) stratum of black burned earth (b7) with a plaster lens. To the northwest of the hearth, underneath the red earth (r5), and extending toward the room’s NW wall, was a stratum of hard-packed yellow earth (y4) (Th. ca. 0.70 m.). This yellow stratum was concentrated in the western corner of the SW Quadrant (abutting the room’s NW and SW walls), where it extended all the way down to the floor (Figure A1.18). Toward the center of the room, the yellow stratum thinned (Th. ca. 0.15 m.) and sloped sharply downward to cover the surface of the central hearth (y5), where it mixed with a coating of burnt material (Figure A1.19).

**SW Quadrant of the Throne Room: Finds**

**STRATUM p5/STRATUM b6/STRATUM r5**  
**DEPTH:** surface to -0.40 m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1952 SHERD LOTS: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*  
“Piece of plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 10: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

---

1021 GEM 1952, pp. 39, 41, 43. An exact depth for the red fill is not given by Mylonas, but based on the depths of the associated finds it is at least 0.10 m. thick and is likely somewhere close to 0.30 m. Excavation of the portion of the SW wall in the SW Quadrant is further recorded on GEM 1952, p. 54.

1022 GEM 1952, pp. 45, 53.

1023 The layer of black burned earth is shown only in the section drawing on GEM 1952, p. 46 (see Figure A1.10). The relatively thin yellow layer on the floor joins with the much thicker deposit of the same material to the northwest.

1024 GEM 1952, p. 45. This burnt stratum, which was photographed but not discussed in the field notebook in connection with the SW quadrant specifically, is not given a unique stratum number but is instead associated with the more substantial “crust of ashes” (stratum r9) discovered in the NW Quadrant (see below).
POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-37: Jug (MRT 40)?
1952 Sherd Lot 10.
Very slightly everted rim sherd with attached upper part of a concave neck and start of a vertical loop handle. D. est. 0.22 m.
Fine to semi-coarse fabric, 2.5YR 4/0 (dark gray). Undecorated. Vitrified and heavily blackened on all surfaces. Large crack at the juncture of the handle and rim. Exterior handle surface heavily damaged/deteriorated. Perhaps a waster?
Date: LH IIIB?
Cf. PN I, pp. 378-379, pl. 369, no. 802.

Associated: Not Catalogued:

“One spout of a spouted bowl” (1952 Sherd Lot 10: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

STRATUM r5
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to -0.70 m. (floor)

1952 SHERD LOTS: 8, 9, 11, 17

From -0.30 m. to -0.35 m.:

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“A piece of fresco” found 1.68 m. from Trench Z and 3.40 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of - 0.30 m. “Small piece white-yellowish ground with part of a red band and a bit of black color. Also other small pieces of plaster scattered but plain. A bit with plain pale blue color” (GEM 1952, p. 39; position marked on plan, p. 38).

From -0.35 m. to -0.55 m.:

METAL

Catalogued:
M-2: Fragment of decorated gold sheet.
CM Room 2, Case 19.
Found 2.55 m. from the edge of Trench Z, 1.70 m. from Trench Zb, and 0.80 m. from the southeast edge of the table of offerings (C-9).
Tiny piece of gold sheet with a “reel” pattern along one edge. Identified in the field as “Gold No. 3.”
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 45.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as one of two small fragments of gold with “traces of decoration” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Tiny piece of gold, No. 2” found 0.62 m. from Trench Z and 2.00 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.51 m.” (GEM 1952, p. 43).

“Very many small [fragments] of bronze” found scattered in a “strip” 1.00 m. from Trench Z and 1.00-4.00 m. from Trench Zb (GEM 1952, pp. 41, 43).

BONE
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Few bones” (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

PLASTER
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Pieces of plaster painted red found near tablet [*C-5], 5cm from it” (GEM 1952, p. 39).

CLAY
Catalogued:
*C-3: Linear B tablet PY Ae 634
NM.
Found in Sherd Lot 10.¹⁰²⁵
Small fragment of a palm leaf tablet, found at a depth of -0.40 m. Coordinates unknown. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 13.” Associated in the field with *C-2. Stylus-Hand: S626-H13.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 78.

*C-4: Linear B tablet PY La 622
NM.
Found in the red fill 0.60 m. from the edge of Trench Z and 3.30 m. from the edge of Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.52 m.
Large fragment of a palm leaf tablet. Writing on both obverse and reverse. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 1.” Stylus-Hand: S622-H13.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 39; position marked on plan, p. 38.

¹⁰²⁵ Not grouped with other material from Sherd Lot 10 (stratum p5/b6/r5) because excavation notes place this tablet fragment in a more secure stratum, i.e., -0.40 m. below the surface.
*C-5: Linear B tablet PY La 623

NM.

Found in the red fill 1.90 m. from Trench Z and 2.70 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.40 m. One end of a palm leaf tablet. Writing on both obverse and reverse. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 2.” Stylus-Hand: S626-H13. From same tablet as *C-7.

Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 39; position marked on plan, p. 38.

*C-6: Linear B tablet PY La 624

NM.

Found 1.20 m. from Trench Z and 1.90 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.42 m. One end of a palm leaf tablet. Pres. L. 0.038 m., pres. W. 0.028 m. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 3.” Stylus-Hand: S622-H13.

Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 41; position marked on plan, p. 38.

*C-7: Linear B tablet PY La 625

NM.

Found in the red fill 1.60 m. from Trench Z and 2.60 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.50 m. One end of a palm leaf tablet. Pres. L. 0.05 m., pres. W. 0.032 m. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 4.” Stylus-Hand: S626-H13. From the same tablet as *C-5.

Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 41; position marked on plan, p. 38.

*C-8: Linear B tablet PY Xa 627

NM.

Found in the guard alongside Trench Zb, 0.43 m. from Trench Z and 3.00 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.52 m. Small fragment of a palm leaf fragment. Broken on both ends. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 6.” Stylus-Hand: S622-H13.

Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 45; position marked on plan, p. 38.
POTTERY

*Catalogued:*

**P-38:** Palace style jar (*MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24*)
1952 Sherd Lot 9.
Convex body sherd. Th. 0.01 m.
Coarse fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10 YR 8/2 (very pale brown) exterior slip and decorated with part of the arm of a “Type B” octopus (*FM 21.1*) with hollow suckers. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint. Only decorated sherd in this lot.
Date: LH IIA

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Good many fragments [of] plain [pottery], kylix predominated” (1952 Sherd Lot 9: (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

*From -0.40 m. to -0.70 m.:*

POTTERY

*Catalogued:*

**P-39:** Shallow cup (*FS 218*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.16 m.
Date: LH IIA or LH IIIA?

**P-40:** Large piriform jar (*MRT 53, FS 35*)
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Convex body sherd, likely from lower shoulder.
Fine fabric, 10YR 6/1 (gray). Exterior decorated with part of a running/group spiral design (similar to *FM 46 and/or 47*) and two horizontal bands. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces heavily burnt.
Date: LH IIIA2?
May go with: **P-9**, and two joining sherds from Room 18 (**P-376**).

**P-41:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Slightly incurving, lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Undecorated. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-42:** Miniature kylix (*MRT 26*)
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Base, stem, and most of convex bowl preserved. Lipless, slightly incurving rim. Flat base with clear string-cut marks. Lightly burnt on upper surface. D. rim 0.055 m., D. base 0.034 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-43: Large kylix (MRT 29e) PLATE 26
1952 Sherd Lot 2.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.22 m. Complete vertical strap handle attached at rim and just above carination. Handle set at an angle.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-44: Small kylix(kes), cup(s), or dipper(s) (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23) PLATE 10
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-45: Shallow angular bowl (MRT 4; FS 295) PLATE 19
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Everted rim sherd with attached carinated upper body and roughly ½ of a “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.20 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-46: Jug (MRT 36; FS 105?) PLATE 26
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Gently flared, rounded rim with attached concave neck. D. est. 0.08 m.
Fine fabric (Group 1). Undecorated.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-47: Indeterminate PLATE 26
1952 Sherd Lot 17.
Part of a strap handle (?) with very square section.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 5/1 (gray). Undecorated. All surfaces burnt and heavily concreted with salts.
Date: Indeterminate

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“A sherd bearing incised crude pattern” found 3.00 m. along Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.67 m. (GEM 1952, p. 51).

From -0.60 m. to -0.70 m.:

METAL

360
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Small piece of thin gold found (No. 1). Our first gold” found ca. 0.90 m. from Trench Z and 2.00 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.65 m. (GEM 1952, p. 41).

STONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Fragments of quartz found “at the 3rd m of length from Z in the “guard” and 67cm from surface level” (GEM 1952, p. 51).

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“A bit of plaster, dark gray-almost burnt black, that seems to be from a molding” found in the guard in the 13th meter of length along Trench Z, at a depth of -0.67 m. (GEM 1952, p. 51).

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-48: Double bowl (FS 325)? PLATE 27
1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Tall everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Date: MH III?

P-49: Handleless/conical cup (MRT 11; FS 204) PLATE 18
1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Ca. 1/3 of a flat base with attached convex lower body. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m.
Date: LH IIa-IIIB1

P-50: Spouted bowl (MRT 7; FS 253) PLATE 27
1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Complete U-shaped bridge spout with attached convex upper body. L. 0.03 m., W. 0.014 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB

P-51: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)? PLATE 28
1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. inestimable.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-52: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a, 12, 18-19, or 23) PLATE 13
1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.12 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-53:** Standard kylix (*MRT 29c*)

1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Very fine, rolled rim sherd with attached flared upper body. D. est. 0.15 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-54:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate

1952 Sherd Lot 11.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**From directly above the floor:**

**BONE**

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“4 pieces of bone” (Sherd Lot 8: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**WOOD**

Catalogued:
**W-3:** Burnt wood
Found on the floor of the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room, close to the edge of Trench Z.
Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #54,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinati.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 53.

**POTTERY**

Catalogued:
**P-55:** Scoop or brazier?
1952 Sherd Lot 8.
Roughly ½ of a flattened horizontal handle with rectangular section. Pres. L. 0.06 m. Roughly ½ of a circular perforation preserved at broken end. Placement of hole towards the middle of the handle is unusual.
Date: MH?

**P-56:** Kylix, monochrome (*FS 264*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 8.
Thick, everted rim sherd with small portion of convex body attached. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: LH II A2-IIIC early

**P-57**: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT* 29a, 12, 18, or 23)  
1952 Sherd Lot 8.
Everted rim sherd with attached lower convex body. D. est. 0.105 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-58**: Closed vessel – shape indeterminate  
1952 Sherd Lot 8.
Slightly convex shoulder sherd.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with two parallel horizontal bands.  
5YR 3/2 (dark reddish brown) paint.  
Date: Myc.

**STRATUM b6/STRATUM r5/STRATUM b7**  
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to -0.75 m. (in the guard against Trench Zb)

1952 SHERD LOTS: 6

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“2 pieces of bone” (Sherd Lot 6: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**POTTERY**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Relatively few fragments non-descript-undecorated ware. Kylix main shape” (Sherd Lot 6: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

“1 [fragment of a] handle with a hole of a ‘portable brazier’?” (Sherd Lot 6: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**STRATUM r5/STRATUM b7**  
DEPTH: -0.40 m to -0.75 m.

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*
**P-59**: Chimney fragments  
*CM* Apotheke 2, on floor. Mus. Nos. 1145, 1146.
Found above the hearth in the stony black-burned earth as well as in a “gap” without stones located between the 11.40 m. and 12.50 m. mark along Trench Z. Coarse fabric (Munsell not taken). Undecorated. Irregular linear impressions on outer surface. Interior surface heavily blackened/burnt. Identified in the field as fragments of “tile.”

Date: LH IIIB

Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 46, 49. Photographed with other fragments as P.52.61.

Publ. PN I, pp. 81, n. 30, figs. 271, no. 2; 272, nos. 6-7.

Cf. PN I, p. 200, figs. 271, no. 3; 272, nos. 8-9 (from Hall 46); Nichoria II, p. 547, pl. 9-76 (P3872).

Belongs to the same chimney system as: P-14, P-16, P-85, and P-113.

**STRATUM v4**

**DEPTH:** -0.25 m. to floor

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 3, 7, 32 |

**From -0.25 m. to -0.45 m.:**

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-60:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)

1952 Sherd Lot 32.

Complete flat base with attached convex lower body. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m.


Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-61:** Very small kylix, cup, or dipper

1952 Sherd Lot 32.

Everted rim with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.09 m. Diameter is 0.01 m. smaller than the smallest examples of kylikes, cups, and dippers catalogued by Rawson from the palace.

Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Undecorated.

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-62:** Large bowl?

1952 Sherd Lot 32.

Thick, rolled rim with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.


Date: Indeterminate – Myc?

**From -0.35 m. to -0.55 m.:**

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“Few bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 7: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).
PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“1 piece of painted plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 7: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

POTTERY

Catalogued: PLATE 30

P-63: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/2 (light gray). Exterior decorated with horizontal bands. 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) and 10YR 8/1 (white) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH I

P-64: Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a curl enclosing a dot. Possibly the sucker of an octopus? 10YR 2/1 (black) paint, with crazing.
Date: LH II-IIIA?

P-65: Standard kylix, monochrome (MRT 29c; FS 264)
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.16 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) to 7.5YR 8/4 (pink). Exterior and interior coated with 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIA2
Cf. Mountjoy 1999, pp. 333 (fig. 112.59, from Nichoria), 337.

P-66: Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g)
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-67: Spouted bowl (MRT 10?)
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Nearly complete large U-shaped spout, in two pieces. Pres. L. 0.05 m., W. 0.034 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-68: Stirrup jar (MRT 65e; FS 164?)
1952 Sherd Lot 7.
Concave body sherd, from near neck.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with two vertical, parallel curved stripes (FM 67) attached to a horizontal band. 2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIC early
Cf. PN I, fig. 391, no. 595; Mountjoy 1999 p. 346, fig. 345.97.

**P-69:** Pithos
1952 Sherd Lot 7.1026
Concave body sherd, from near neck. Th. ca. 0.015 m.
Date: Indeterminate
Cf. McDonald and Wilkie 1992, pp. 115, 187, fig. 3-65 (P2699K, P2700K, P2701K); PN I, p. 92, fig. 381 (pithos from Room 7).

**Associated, Not Catalogued:**
“Bowl with flat base and straight sides with rim flattened and beveled” (1952 Sherd Lot 7: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**From -0.25 to floor (cleaning alongside the Throne Room’s NW wall):**

**BONE**

**Associated, Not Catalogued:**
“2 pieces of bones” (Sherd Lot 3: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**PLASTER**

**Associated, Not Catalogued:**
“3 [fragments] of plaster with painting” (Sherd Lot 3: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).

**POTTERY**

**Catalogued:**

**P-70:** Kylix
1952 Sherd Lot 3.
Three joining fragments of the lower bowl and upper portion of the stem. D. stem 0.018 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/0 (white). Undecorated. Lower bowl slumped – from over firing? Small nick near the top of the stem. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-71:** Standard/large kylix(kes) (MRT 29c-g)
1952 Sherd Lot 3.

---

1026 No pencil number preserved, but “7” can be reconstructed based on the identification of this sherd as a “piece of pithos with ‘thumb pattern,’” (ASCSA Pylos papers, Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**STRATUM v4/STRATUM r5**
**DEPTH: -0.25 m. to floor**

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 24, 33, 39 |

**From -0.70 m. to floor:**

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*
*M-3*: Small fragment of gold.

CM. Location unknown; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.

“Fragt. of gold (No. 14)” from the earth on the floor surrounding the western column base
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 68.

Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as one of two nondescript fragments of gold from the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**CLAY**

*Catalogued:*
*C-9*: Table of offerings

CM Room 2, freestanding pedestal. Mus. Inv. 5203.
Found on the floor of the Throne Room, 1.30 m. from the edge of Trench Zb. Top discovered at a depth of -0.78 m.

Roughly ¾ complete. Circular table with recessed floor and three low, rounded feet. Badly broken - restored with plaster fills. D. (restored) 0.58 m., H. (restored) 0.20 m., W. rim 0.06 m.
Very hard white plaster (undecorated) overtop a clay core. All surfaces burnt, with heavy blackening on the outer edge of the rim, the feet, and underneath the table on one side. The upper floor is mildly discolored save an area towards its center that is heavily burnt with a series of small (ca. 0.01 m. long) light-colored oval “ghosts.” Referred to in the field as “Circular Arrangement A.”

Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 45, 68, 69, 71, 76, 139. Plans showing the table’s find spot appear on pp. 50, 70, 72; a measured section is found on p. 76.

Publ. Blegen 1953, p. 61, pl. 35, fig. 10; PN I, pp. 88-89, 91, pls. 271, no. 11; 272, no. 5.

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*
*P-72*: Miniature kylix (*MRT 26*)

CM Room 2, Case 19. Mus. Inv. B.52.333.1140.
Found on in a “pocket” on the surface of the table of offerings (C-9) with D. 0.11-0.13 m. and a depth of 0.08 m. 
Nearly complete. Missing part of bowl and one high swung handle. Full profile extant. Broken through stem – repaired. Gently flared body, lipless, rounded rim. Flat, string-cut base. D. bowl 0.75 m., D. base 0.45 m., H. (without handles) 0.06 m., H. (with handles) 0.09 m. Fine fabric, 7.5YR 5/4 (light yellowish brown). Undecorated. Exterior of the bowl and handle show slight traces of burning. Referred to in the field as both “Vase of Room of Hearth #2” and “Pot 2 from Table of Offerings A.”

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
Publ. Blegen 1953, pl. 35 fig. 10; PN I, pp. 88-89, 91, fig. 271, no. 11; 272, no. 5.

**P-73:** Miniature kylix (MRT 26)  
**PLATE 33**
Nearly complete. Missing part of bowl and bit of base. Two high swung handles. Full profile extant. Broken in five places – restored. Gently flared body, lipless, rounded rim. Flat, string-cut base. D. bowl 0.05 m., D. base 0.35 m.; H. (without handles) 0.03 m., H. (with handles) 0.06 m. Fine fabric, 10YR 5/2 (grayish brown). Undecorated. Traces of burning on upper surface of the base and on the stem. Referred to in the field as “Pot 2 from Table of Offerings A.”

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
Publ. PN I, p. 91.

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“Base of a pithos found wedged between stones” located between the table of offerings and the hearth (GEM 1952, p. 59; position marked on plan, p. 50).

**From -0.25 to floor (cleaning alongside the Throne Room’s SW wall):**

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

**M-4:** Gold bead  
**PLATE 1**
CM Room 2, Case 19.
Found 0.70 m. from the SW wall, 0.04 m. from the edge of Trench Z, at a depth of -0.61 m. Identified in the field as “Gold No. 7.”
Spherical gold bead. D. 0.003 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 60. 
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the gold “bead” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

*M-5:* Sheet of gold
CM. Location unknown; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.

---

1027 That this description is identical to that of **P-74** is notable and will be discussed in further detail below.
“One [fragment] of a thin sheet [of gold] that seems to bear a worked pattern (No. 8),” found in the red fill 2.40 m. from Trench Z and 0.20 m. from the SW wall, at a depth of -0.70 m. (ca. 0.25 m. above the floor). Found together with M-6.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 62.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as one of two small fragments of gold with decoration from the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**M-6:** Silver vessel with gold overlay?

*CM* Room 2, Case 19; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.
Found in the red fill 2.40 m. from Trench Z and 0.20 m. from the SW wall, at a depth of -0.70 m. (ca. 0.25 m. above the floor). Identified in the field as “Gold No. 9.” Found together with *M-5.*
Piece of gold rolled over silver.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 62.
Publ. PN I, p. 90, fig. 273, no. 13 (identified as the piece of gold “rolled over silver found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**STONE**

*Catalogued:*

*S-2:* Mycenaean “button”

*CM* Room 2, Case 19.
Found near the corner of the SW and NW walls, ca. 0.20 m. above the floor.
Nearly complete conulus of shanked type. Tan stone. Large chips out of base and scratches on all surfaces. D. est. 0.015 m., D. shank 0.007 m., H. 0.009 m. Identified in the field as “Steatite button No. 1.”
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 65.
Publ. PN I, p. 91, fig. 270 (identified as the steatite “shanked button” from the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room).
Cf. Iakovides 1977 (“Mycenaean button” Type 4).

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“2 bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 24: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“Many bits of coarse plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 39: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

**CLAY**

*Catalogued:*

*C-10:* Parts of Linear B tablets PY La 622 and PY La 638
NM.
Found in Sherd Lot 39.
From the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room. Coordinates unknown.
Two quasi-joining fragments of a palm leaf tablet. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in
the field as “Tablet (group) No. 17.” Stylus-Hand: S622-H13 for both. Tablet L638 was
originally labeled as “Xa 638” until a quasi-join with L622 was established by Bennet.
Date: LH IIIA
Field ref. 1952 Sherd Lot 39: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7.
Publ. PN I, p. 91.
Skelton 2010.

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-74: Bowl
1952 Sherd Lot 24.
Convex shoulder sherd with lower part of an everted rim. D. shoulder 0.15 m.
Ware.” All surfaces burnt.
Date: MH I-II
Cf. McDonald and Wilkie 1992, pp. 83, 126 fig. 3-1a (P2025).

P-75: Handleless/conical cup (MRT 11; FS 204)
1952 Sherd Lot 24.
Ca. ½ of a slightly raised base with attached convex lower body. Clear string-cut marks on
underside of base. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m.
Date: LH IIa-IIIB1

P-76: Small kylix(kes), cup(s), or dipper(s) (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)
1952 Sherd Lot 24.
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-
0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-77: Small jug (FS 120 or 121?)
1952 Sherd Lot 24.
Convex body sherd, from shoulder.
Fine, very hard fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in 10YR 7/4 (very pale
brown) slip, and decorated with four parallel curved lines beneath a horizontal band. Very
lustrous 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint. Argive import?
Date: LH IIIB
NB: This find contradicts Mylonas’ comment (1952 Sherd Lot 24: ASCSA Pylos Excavation
Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6) that there is “not a single painted” sherd in this lot.
P-78: Small Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 33.  
Convex body sherd, very thin.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with two thin horizontal bands.  
7.5YR 5/4 (brown) paint. Only decorated sherd in this lot.  
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?  

P-79: Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 39.  
Convex body sherd.  
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior decorated with a horizontal band. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.  
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?  

P-80: Small jar/jug  
1952 Sherd Lot 24.  
Convex body sherd with base of a flared rim.  
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?  

P-81: Cup or bowl?  
1952 Sherd Lot 33.  
Convex body sherd, from lower body.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) to 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Exterior and interior coated with 2.5YR 5/6 (red) monochrome slip. Could be a monochrome deep bowl.  
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?  

P-82: Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 39.  
Convex body sherd.  
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Exterior retains traces of 2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint.  
Date: Indeterminate.  

Associated, Not Catalogued:  

UNKNOWN STRATA IN THE SW QUADRANT  
Depth: unknown  

METAL  

Catalogued:  
*M-7: Fragment of gold  
One nondescript “small fragment of gold” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room.  
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (1 of the 2 listed nondescript pieces of gold from the SW Quadrant).
*M-8: Fragments of silver
“Three thin bent and fused fragments” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (all of the listed pieces of silver from the SW Quadrant).

*M-9: Fragments of bronze
“76 fragments: nearly all nondescript, some thin and some thick flat pieces, some twisted and fused; three possibly from blade with rivet holes” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (all of the listed pieces of bronze from the SW Quadrant).

STONE

*STOCK: Catalogued:

*S-3: Flint blade
“Small light tan blade with serrated edge, l. 0.023 m., w. 0.014 m.” found in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 91.

NW Quadrant of the Throne Room: Stratigraphy

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.15

The second quadrant of the Throne Room to be excavated was the NW Quadrant, opened on June 10, 1952. As recorded in Mylonas’ field notebook, under ca. 0.20 m. of plowed earth (p6) were again found two discrete strata of earth. Adjacent to Trench Z, and extending northwest for a distance of ca. 2.00 m., was a stratum of brick-red earth (r6) reaching to the floor and appearing yellowish in places.1028 Beyond the 2.00 m. mark, the deposit under the plowed earth was black-burned, containing small stones (b8) and ranging in thickness from 0.25 m. to 0.45 m. from northwest to southeast.1029

1028 GEM 1952, p. 49.
Northwest of this black stratum, the deposit was again brick red earth (r6, continued) and contained many small stones.1030 Below both the red and black strata (r6 and b8), was a second stratum of red earth (r7). This stratum, Mylonas noted, was exceptionally “loose” (a sharp contrast to both the firm strata above it and to the generally hard-packed strata in the Throne Room’s SW Quadrant), and may have represented a late disturbance.1031 This loose red earth contained scattered stones and a large “rectangle of plaster” (fused together with stones and a few artifacts) with a concrete-like consistency (Figure A1.20).1032 Measuring ca. 1.20 x 1.80 m. in width and length, the rectangle was found 2.80 m. from Trench Z, 3.05 m. from Trench Zb, occupying a space between ca. -0.60 to -0.80 m. below the surface.1033

Below this rectangle, as well as to its northeast, the red earth (r6) was extremely hard — composed, in Mylonas’ words, of “crumbled poros stones” fire-fused with earth.1034 In the south corner of the NW Quadrant, the black stratum (b8) was underlain by a stratum of hard yellow earth (y5) ca. 0.15 m. thick.1035 Below this stratum, the surface of the hearth itself was coated with a hard “crust” of charcoal and ashes (b9) while the floor to the north was coated with a thin “burnt stratum” (b10).1036

On his last day on site, Mylonas’s renewed excavations in the NW Quadrant revealed a rectangular cut at the mid-point along the NE wall that he identified as the “placing for the

---

1030 It is unclear from the excavation records whether this red deposit to the northwest of stratum b8 is the continuation of stratum r6 or part of stratum r7 (see below). Stratum r6 is preferred because the description of the stratigraphy in the guard alongside Trench Zb (GEM 1952, p. 59) does not explicitly characterize the red earth as “loose.”
1031 GEM 1952, p. 54; PN I, p. 88
1032 GEM 1952, pp. 57-58, 60, 62-63.
1033 GEM 1952, p. 54. Also see the plan on p. 48, which was used to determine the upper depth of the “rectangle of plaster” (the upper part of the plaster is shown together with the piece of silver (M-17) at -0.61 m.). The lower depth (ca. -0.80 m.) was determined by the elevation (-0.76 m.) of the fragment of gold (M-18) found in the rectangle’s matrix.
1035 GEM 1952, p. 59. Thickness of this layer determined from the profile drawing on GEM 1952, p. 46 (see Figure A1.10).
1036 GEM 1952, pp. 60, 63.
The floor of the cutting, which measured 0.93 m. x 0.91 m., Mylonas described as partly “covered with pebbles” with a red “earth belt” running through its center (Figure A1.21). In the “belt” were found the two groups of artifacts, later published as the throne space “treasure.”

On June 26, Blegen temporarily took over excavations in the megaron and continued to investigate the throne cutting by digging a “small pit” to investigate its interior. The sondage, in which he reached a depth of -0.40 m., Blegen described as filled with “red-burned earth.”

This same sondage, which was not photographed during excavation, was cleaned in 2012 by myself and conservator Zokos from July 10-14, under the auspices of HARP (Figure A1.22). While cleaning we determined that “burned-red earth” described by Blegen was composed of two separate deposits. The upper deposit reached a depth of -0.10 m. below the plaster rim of the cutting and consisted of a localized loose dark red earth (th1). The lower deposit reached from -0.10 m. to -0.40 m. below the rim and consisted of an extremely compact, lighter red earth (th2), that visibly extended out from the cutting to the southeast.

**NW Quadrant of the Throne Room: Finds**

**STRATUM p6/STRATUM b8/STRATUM r6**
**DEPTH:** surface to -0.35 m.

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 31 |

**PLASTER**

---

1037 GEM 1952, p. 83.
1038 GEM 1952, p. 84.
1039 GEM 1952, p. 84; PN I, pp. 91-92.
1040 GEM 1952, p. 87. CWB 1952, p. 71 noted: “EDB, ITH, LM, and GM lv. for Ath. via Tripoli at 3:30pm. I take over responsibility for Megaron area.” Notably, this departure is not noted in Mylonas’ field notebook (which continued to be used for the megaron’s excavation) but is indicated by an abrupt change in handwriting.
1041 GEM 1952, p. 87.
1042 ECE 2012, pp. 1-3.
1043 ECE 2012, pp. 1-3.
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“1 [fragment of] painted plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 31: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-83: Handleless/conical cups (MRT 11; FS 204)
1952 Sherd Lot 31.
Two flat base fragments, one complete, one roughly ½ preserved, both with attached convex lower bodies. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m. Two separate vessels. Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

STRATUM b8
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.45 m. / -0.65 m.

METAL

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“2 pieces of bronze from the spout of a bronze vase,” and “pieces of silver…[one with] a cylindrical shape” found 4.00 m. from Trench Z and 0.50 m. from Trench Zb, in the black deposit overlying the floor (GEM 1952, p. 60).

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Fragments of plaster with color and bits of flooring with a black shiny finish” found in the black fill of the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room (GEM 1952, p. 60).

STRATUM r6
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to -0.30 m.

CLAY

Catalogued:
*C-11: Linear B tablet PY La 628
NM.
Found in the red/yellow fill 1.30 m. from the edge of Trench Z and 2.65 m. from the edge of Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.20 m. Small fragment of a palm leaf fragment, L. 0.03 m., W. 0.02 m. Light red to bright orange color. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 7.” Stylus-Hand: S628-Ciii.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 49; position marked on plan, p. 48.
STRATUM r6/STRATUM r7
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to -1.10 m. (floor)

1952 SHERD LOTS: 16, 23

From -0.30 m. to -0.60 m.:

METAL

Catalogued:
M-10: Fragment of gilt silver PLATE 1
CM Room 2, Case 19; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. CM 2786. Found in stones and red fill 1.75 from the edge of Trench Z and 2.80 m. from the edge of Zb, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found together with *M-11.
Small flat fragment (L = ca. 0.015 m.) of silver with thin gold covering. Identified in the field as “Gold No. 5.” Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 58.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the fragment of “gold leaf attached to a flat piece of silver” from the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

*M-11: Melted piece of gold
CM. Location unknown; storage box in CM Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. CM 2786. “A [fragment] of melted gold (No. 4)” found in the red stony fill 1.75 m. from the edge of Trench Z and 2.80 m. from the edge of Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found together with *M-10.
GEM 1952, p. 58.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the “melted” piece of gold from the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

M-12: Silver vessel? PLATE 2
CM Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. NM 7761.
Found below the stones of the black stratum 3.10 m. from Trench Z and 2.00 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.58 m.
Flat fragment of silver with slightly everted shape. Heavily blackened. Possibly belongs to the rim of a vessel? D. not taken.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 53.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as one of two small pieces of silver, without gold attached, from the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Piece of silver” found 6.00 m. from Trench Z 1.60 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.60 m. (GEM 1952, p. 58).

“Small fragments of bronze” scattered throughout the red fill in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room (GEM 1952, p. 60).
STONE

Catalogued:
*S-4: Fragments of quartz
“Fragments of quartz, two of which seem to have worked surfaces…a couple of reworked stones of quartz as well” found in the red fill.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 60.
Publ. PN I, p. 90, fig. 270 (identified as the “eleven pieces [of quartz], some probably worked” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Plaster bearing some color, but no clear design” (GEM 1952, p. 58).

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-84: Bovid figure PLATES 36, 37, 38
1952 Sherd Lot 16.
Ca. ¼ of the rear end of a bovid with a wheel-made cylindrical body. D. 0.17 m. Fine fabric, relatively hard-fired, with 2.5YR 8/3 (light yellow) exterior and a 5YR 7/4 (pink) interior. Exterior decorated with a plastic wavy band representing the animal’s tail, flanked by two small (D. 0.007 m.) circular perforations used for ventilation during firing. Broken edges extremely worn. No painted decoration preserved. Identified in the field as a “curious top or bottom with perforation.”
Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 3.
Date: LH IIIA
Joins to: P-369, from Court 3. Likely from the same figure as: P-370, from Room 72.

P-85: Chimney fragments PLATE 14
Found immediately below the black earth, 0.60 m. to 5.00 m. from the edge of Trench Z and 0.20 m. from the edge of Trench Zh, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found black side down.
Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 59. Photographed with other fragments as P.52.61.
Publ. PN I, pp. 81, n. 30, figs. 271, no. 2; 272, nos. 6-7.
Cf. PN I, p. 200, figs. 271, no. 3; 272, nos. 8-9 (from Hall 46); McDonald and Wilkie 1992, p. 547, pl. 9-76 (P3872) from Nichoria.
Belongs to the same chimney system as: P-14, P-16, P-59, and P-113.

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“3 pieces of pithos” (1952 Sherd Lot 16: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).
“Crude ware” (1952 Sherd Lot 16: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

From -0.40 m. to -0.70 m. (among stones):

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

**M-13:** Bronze loop handle

*CM Room 2, Case 19.*

Found 1.02 m. from Trench Z and 3.15 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.46 m. Roughly \( \frac{1}{4} \) of a ring of bronze. L. ca. 0.05 m. Corroded. Identified in the field as being too small for a bracelet – perhaps a handle?

Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 49, 51; position marked on plan, p. 48.

Publ. *PN I*, p. 90 (identified as the “fragment of a sturdy round loop handle” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**M-14:** Bronze nail

*CM Room 2, Case 19.*

Found 1.30 m. from Trench Z and 2.74 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.46 m. Complete bronze nail. L. 0.052 m., W. 0.005 m. Square section, flat head. Corroded.

Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 51; position marked on plan, p. 48.

Publ. *PN I*, p. 90 (identified as the “heavy nail” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“Few bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 23: Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“One colored plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 23: Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-86:** Feeding bottle

*1952 Sherd Lot 23.*

Complete tubular spout and attached convex wall of a feeding bottle. L. 0.035 m., D. 0.015 m. Spout is somewhat unusual: very gently flared at tip, and base is punched through the wall of the vessel’s body. Stance suggests spout is closer to horizontal than vertical.

Soft, orange fabric, 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Exterior preserves possible traces of 10YR 8/4 (pale brown) slip. Identified in the field as having a “queer” shape.

Date: MH?

Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, pp. 3, 6.

---

1044 Pencil number not preserved on sherd, but confidently assigned to Sherd Lot 23 based on description.
**P-87:** Vapheio cup, Type III (*FS 224*)
Sherd Lot 23.
Flat, gently beveled base with attached cylindrical lower body. D. est. 0.07 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with self-same slip.
Exterior decorated with ripple (*FM 78*) decoration. Lowest part of body preserves ripples that were subsequently covered by a painted horizontal band. 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint. Underside reserved.
Date: LH I-IIA
Cf. *PN* III, fig. 249, no. 19.

**P-88:** Kylix
1952 Sherd Lot 23.
Base of a vertical strap handle with attached wall. W. 0.03 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-89:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)
1952 Sherd Lot 23.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-90:** Standard/large kylix(kes) (*MRT 29c-g*)
1952 Sherd Lot 23.
Two non-joining everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-91:** Very large angular bowl (*MRT 4/5; FS 295*)
1952 Sherd Lot 23.
Everted rim sherd with attached concave-to-flaring upper body. Ca. ¼ of a flattened “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle set just below rim. D. est. 0.30 m. Diameter exceeds that recorded by Rawson as typical for angular “bowls” (*PN* I, pp. 356-357), but profile matches this shape.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-92:** Deep bowl (*MRT 60; FS 284*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 23.
Convex body sherd with odd tubular attachment for a horizontal loop handle.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior preserves traces of 2.5YR 3/6 (dark red) paint just above the handle.
Date: LH IIIB?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.
**Just above floor:**

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

**M-15:** Tiny gold speck

*CM* Room 3, under Case 40. Mus. Inv. 7773.

Found on top of a piece of plaster, 0.05 m. above the floor in the area of the throne space.

Identified in the field as “Gold No. 19.”

Tiny flat piece of gold.

Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 86.

Publ. *PN* I, p. 90 (identified as the fragment of gold found “above place of the throne” from on or near the floor in the Throne Room).

**STRATUM r7**

**DEPTH:** -0.50 m. to -0.70 m.

**1952 SHERD LOTS:** 18, 20

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

*M-16:* Fragment of gold

*CM.* Location unknown; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.

“Another [fragment] of gold (No. 6),” found 3.50 m. from the edge of Trench Z and 1.20m from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.70 m.

Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 58).

Publ. *PN* I, p. 90 (identified as the “shapeless” fragment of gold from the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**M-17:** Fragment of silver


Found below the stones of the black burned stratum 3.50 m. from Trench Z and 1.40 m. from Trench Zb, at depth of -0.61 m.

Flat fragment of silver with slightly everted shape. Possibly belongs to the rim of a vessel.

Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 53; position marked on plan, p. 48.

Publ. *PN* I, p. 90 (identified as one of two small pieces of silver, without gold attached, from the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“One piece of bone, looks human” (Sherd Lot 20: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).
POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-93:** Rim-handled jar
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Convex body sherd. Traces of burning on the interior and exterior.
Date: MH I-II
Cf. *Nichoria* II, p. 803, pl. 3-16 (e.g., 2315); p. 822, pl. 3-36 (e.g., 2663).

**P-94:** Small piriform jar (*FS 28?*)
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Ca. ¼ of a flat, splaying base with attached narrow base. D. est. 0.04 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior has traces of slip (color indeterminate). Underside reserved.
Date: LH IIB

**P-95:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Complete profile with ca. 1/5 of a flat base with attached convex lower body and lipless rim. D. rim est. 0.10 m., D. base est. 0.045 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-96:** Standard/large kylix (*MRT 29c-g*)
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. Top of rim preserves attachment for a vertical strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-97:** Very small, globular stirrup jar (*FS 171 or 173?*)
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Complete raised concave base with attached flared lower body. D. 0.03 m.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB

**P-98:** Deep bowl, monochrome (*MRT 60; FS 284?*)
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Flaring, lipless rim sherd with attached plain vertical upper body. D. est. 0.12 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Interior and exterior coated with streaky 2.5YR 4/8 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIC early?
May go with: P-99.
P-99: Deep bowl, monochrome (MRT 60; FS 284)?
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Convex body sherd. D. max. est. 0.095 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/4 (very pale brown) to 7.5YR 8/4 (pink). Interior coated with 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip and marked by what may be ancient diagonal scrape marks. Exterior likely originally also monochrome.
Date: LH IIIC early?
May go with: P-98.

P-100: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Two joining fragments of a convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown), with a greenish hue. Exterior decorated with five parallel, horizontal bands. Paint very faded.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-101: Cup or bowl
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Convex body sherd. Thin wall.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Interior and exterior coated with 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) monochrome slip.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-102: Cup or bowl
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Very slightly convex body sherd. Th. 0.005 m.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-103: Handmade miniature cup or bowl
1952 Sherd Lot 20.
Two joining everted rim sherds with attached upper half of a globular body. D. est. 0.05 m.
Attachment for a horizontal loop handle preserved at one edge. Traces of burning on both the interior and exterior.
Date: Indeterminate

From ca. -0.60 m. to -0.80 m. (in the “rectangle of plaster”):

METAL

Catalogued:
M-18: Fragment of decorated gold foil
CM Room 2, Case 19.
Found in the rectangle of plaster, 5.00 m. from Trench Z and 3.30 m. from Trench Zb, at a depth of -0.76 m. Gold No. 10.
Small piece of gold foil with a repoussé tricurved arch pattern. L. 0.02 m., W. 0.01 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 63.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the fragment of gold with “repoussé net pattern” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**M-19:** 3 lumps of bronze
*CM* Apotheke 1, Drawer 143.
Three lumps of corroded bronze: one green and very thin, possibly from a vessel, one heavily blackened, and one grayish.
Field Ref. Tag reading: “Plaster dump from Room of Hearth, July 16, 1952.”

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
“3 [fragments] of painted plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 18: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

“Slabs” of unpainted plaster (GEM 1952, p. 57).

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-104:** Rim-handled jar
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Convex shoulder sherd.
Date: MH I-II
Cf. *Nichoria* II, p. 803, pl. 3-16 (e.g., 2315); p. 822. pl. 3-36 (e.g., 2663).

**P-105:** Rim-handled cooking jar?
*CM* Apotheke 1, Drawer 143.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 4/2 (dark brown). “Adriatic Ware.” Exterior incised deeply with horizontal and diagonal lines. All surfaces heavily burnt.
Date: MH I-II
Field Ref. Tag reading: “Plaster dump from Room of Hearth, July 16, 1952.”

**P-106:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT* 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early (pref: LH IIIA)

**P-107:** Standard/large kylix (*MRT* 29c-g)
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early (pref: LH IIIA)

P-108: Kylix (FS 258B?)
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Ca. 1/5 of a domed foot. D. est. 0.085 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Upper surface of the foot decorated with two horizontal bands. 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint. Underside reserved. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB (pref: LH IIIA)
Cf. Mountjoy 1999, fig. 141, no. 12.

P-109: Shape indeterminate
CM Apotheke 1, Drawer 143.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). Exterior decorated with a single curved line. 7.5YR 2/4 (very dark brown) paint.
Field Ref. Tag reading: “Plaster dump from Room of Hearth, July 16, 1952.”
Date: Myc.

P-110: Krater?
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Slightly convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior and interior coated with a streaky monochrome slip ranging in color from 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) to 2.5YR 4/6 (red).
Date: Indeterminate

P-111: Shallow cup or bowl?
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Incurving rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.12 m.
Date: Indeterminate

P-112: Open vessel – shape indeterminate.
1952 Sherd Lot 18.
Convex body sherd with carination.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 10YR 5/3 (brown) monochrome slip. All surfaces coated with white lime accretions.
Date: Indeterminate

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“2 pieces [of] pithoi” (Sherd Lot 18: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

“One leg of a legged vase” (Sherd Lot 18: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).
STRATUM y5
DEPTH: -0.70 m. to -0.90 m.
No finds recorded.

STRATUM b9
DEPTH: surface of the hearth (ca. -0.90 m.)

WOOD

Catalogued:
W-4: Carbonized Wood
Found on the floor of the hearth. Initially thought to be charcoal and ashes. Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #61,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 60.

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-113: Chimney fragments
Found over the center of the hearth during the cleaning of the “crust” of ashes along its northwestern edge.
Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 63. Photographed with other fragments as P.52.61.
Publ. PN I, pp. 81, n. 30, figs. 271, no. 2; 272, nos. 6-7.
Cf. PN I, p. 200, figs. 271, no. 3; 272, nos. 8-9 (from Hall 46); McDonald and Wilkie 1992, p. 547, pl. 9-76 (P3872) from Nichoria.
Belongs to the same chimney system as: P-14, P-16, P-59, and P-85.

STRATUM b10
DEPTH: ca. -1.05 m. (just above, on, and just below the surface of the floor)

METAL

Catalogued:
*M-20: Drop of gold
CM. Location unknown; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.
Found on the floor by the northeastern edge of the hearth. Identified in the field as “Gold No. 16.”
“Drop of melted gold.”
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 69.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the “melted drop” of gold found “near edge of hearth” on or just above the Throne Room floor).
WOOD

Catalogued:

**W-5:** Burnt column fragment
Found inside the floor cutting for the base of the column in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room. Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #57,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 71.

**STRATUM th1**
**DEPTH:** inside the “throne space,” just below floor level at -1.10 m.

“Treasure Group A”:

METAL

Catalogued:

**M-21:** Gold bead
*PLATE 3*
*NM* Room 4, Case 9. Mus. No. 7763.
Roughly oval shaped bead; melted and misshapen. L. ca. 0.01 m. Identified in the field as “A3.”
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 84; position marked on plan, p. 85.
Publ. *PN I*, p. 91, fig. 273, no. 8.

STONE

Catalogued:

**S-5:** Agate pendant
*PLATE 6*
Part of a pendant of banded brown and white agate with partial suspension hole. Scalloped outer edge. H. 0.041 m., W. 0.043 m. Identified in the field as “A1.”
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 84; position marked on plan, p. 85.
Publ. *PN I*, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 9.

KYANOS

Catalogued:

**K-1:** Fragments of Kyanos
*PLATE 7*
One small and many tiny bits of blue paste. Identified in the field as “A2.” Initially thought to be burnt lapis.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 84, position marked on plan, p. 85.
Publ. *PN I*, p. 91.

“Treasure Group B”:

METAL
Catalogued:

**M-22**: Twisted gold wire

*NM* Room 4, Case 9. Mus. No. 7766.
Small piece of twisted gold wire coiled into a loose loop. L. 0.031 m., W. 0.003 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 7.

**M-23**: Finger ring

*NM* Room 4, Case 9. Mus. Nos. *NM* 7764 (ring) and 7770 (bezel).
Ring of silver-coated bronze with a lead bezel. Badly corroded. No motifs visible on bezel. L. 0.025 m.; W. 0.016 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 92, fig. 273 nos. 4-5.

**M-24**: Twisted silver wire

Small piece of twisted silver wire coiled at one end. Burnt. L. 0.044 m., W. 0.003 m. Identified in the field as part of a bracelet.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 6.

*M-25*: Bronze bead

*NM* (not on display). Mus. No. 7769.
Amygdaloid bead of bronze. Rough, greenish surface. L. 0.017 m., W. 0.001 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 2.

**M-26**: Fragment of bronze

Tiny bit of oxidized bronze. Flat.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.

**STONE**

Catalogued:

**S-6**: Carnelian bead

*NM* Room 4, Case 9. Mus. No. 7767.
Stout cylindrical bead of bright red carnelian. H. 0.012 m., W. 0.019 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 3.

**S-7**: Agate bead

Amygdaloid bead of banded brown and white agate. L. 0.022 m., W. 0.011 m. Misidentified in the field as “lentoid” in shape.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
S-8: Amethyst (?) bead
NM Room 4, Case 9. Mus. No. 7771.
Small spherical bead of a dark purplish stone. D. 0.005 m.
Publ. PN I, p. 92, fig. 273, no. 11.

CLAY

Catalogued:
*C-12: Clay whorl
Current location unknown.
“Half a whorl” from Treasure B.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 85.
Publ. PN I, p. 92.

STRATUM th2
DEPTH: ca. -0.35 m. below the rim of the “Throne Space”

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-114: Jar/jug
Excavated in 2012. Found in the earth packing underneath the Throne Space.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 2.5YR 6/6 (light red). Exterior coated with a 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with three wide horizontal lines. 2.5YR N/4 (black) matt paint. Interior and exterior lightly coated with salts.
Date: LH I
Field Ref. ECE 2012, pp. 3, 6.
Cf. McDonald 1972, p. 258 and pl. 48c.
Likely from the same vessel as: P-115.

P-115: Jar/jug
Excavated in 2012. Found in the earth packing underneath the Throne Space.
Convex body sherd.
Date: LH I
Field Ref. ECE 2012, pp. 3, 6.
Likely from the same vessel as: P-114.

P-116: Cooking pot?
Excavated in 2012. Found in the earth packing underneath the Throne Space.
Convex body sherd.
Coarse fabric, with 2.5YR 5/6 (red) along exterior. All surfaces heavily burnt through to core.
Field Ref. ECE 2012, pp. 3, 6.
Date: Indeterminate
UNKNOWN STRATA IN THE NW QUADRANT
Depth: unknown

METAL

Catalogued:
*M-27: Fragment of silver with gold
One small piece of silver “with a scrap of gold attached” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (1 of the 3 listed pieces of silver from the NW Quadrant).

*M-28: Fragments of bronze
Four joining fragments of a horizontally grooved vessel neck, two joining pieces of a circular object, and 18 nondescript fragments of bronze, all “damaged by fire and fused” found in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (24 of the 26 listed fragments of bronze from the NW Quadrant).

POTTERY

P-117: Miniature kylix (MRT 26) PLATE 46
Found against the northwest end of the NE Wall; elevation unknown.
Nearly complete. Base, stem, and most of a bowl with convex body and two high-swung handles, partly restored. Lipless rim and flat, string-cut base. D. rim 0.05 m., D. base 0.035 m., H. (no handles) 0.04 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
Publ. PN I, p. 91.

NW/SW Quadrants of the Throne Room: Finds

STRATUM r6/STRATUM v3/STRATUM v4
Depth: unknown; cleaning alongside the Throne Room’s NW wall.

1952 SHERD LOTS: 4

STONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:
POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-118:** Handleless/conical cups (*MRT* 11; *FS* 204) PLATE 25
1952 Sherd Lot 4.
Two non-joining, slightly incurving, lipless rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-119:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT* 11; *FS* 204) PLATE 47
1952 Sherd Lot 4.
Lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.10 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-120:** Dipper (*MRT* 21) PLATE 46
1952 Sherd Lot 4.
Roughly 2/3 of the bowl of a small dipper with attached base of everted rim. D. est. 0.09 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-121:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT* 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23) PLATE 10
1952 Sherd Lot 4.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-122:** Standard kylix (*MRT* 29c) PLATE 11
1952 Sherd Lot 4.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

---

**SE Quadrant of the Throne Room: Stratigraphy**

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.15

The third quadrant of the Throne Room, the SE Quadrant, was opened on June 14, 1952.\(^{1045}\) On the first day of excavation, Mylonas recorded that the upper plowed stratum (*p7*)

\(^{1045}\) GEM 1952, p. 63.
was ca. 0.20-0.25 m. thick.\textsuperscript{1046} Below this was found again two earthen strata: in the north corner (i.e., close to the hearth) in an area measuring 0.90 m. by 1.20 m., was a stratum of black burned earth (\textit{b11}) with loose stones, reaching a depth of ca. -0.45 m.\textsuperscript{1047} In the remainder of the quadrant, the plowed earth was underlain by a stratum of brick-red earth (\textit{r8}), assumed to be decomposed mud-brick, that extended down to the floor both in this area and underneath the adjacent black earth.\textsuperscript{1048} Close to the border of Trench Ze, the red earth contained a large pile of fallen large stones.\textsuperscript{1049}

\textit{SE Quadrant of the Throne Room: Finds}

\textbf{STRATUM p7}
DEPTH: surface to -0.25 m.
No finds recorded.

\textbf{STRATUM b11}
DEPTH: -0.25 m. to -0.45 m.
No finds recorded.

\textbf{STRATUM r8}
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to floor

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
1952 SHERD LOTS: 19, 21, 61
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{footnotesize}

From -0.30 m. to -0.70 m.:

\textbf{METAL}

\textit{Catalogued:}

\textbf{M-29:} Piece of gold
\textit{CM} Room 2, Case 19; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.
Found 0.45 m. from Trench Z and 0.85 m. from the SW wall, at a depth of -0.70 m. Identified in the field as “Gold No. 15.”
Small piece of gold with a leaf shape.

\textsuperscript{1046} GEM 1952, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{1047} GEM 1952, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{1048} GEM 1952, pp. 65, 73-74.
\textsuperscript{1049} GEM 1952, pp. 73-74.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 68.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the “thickish leaf-shaped” fragment of gold found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room).

*M-30: Fragment of gold
CM. Location unknown; storage box in Room 3, under Case 30.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as one of “three small bits” of gold found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room).

M-31: Bronze dagger?
Found at the edge of the black burned stratum (b10), 0.90 m. from Trench Z and 1.10m from Trench Zc, at a depth of -0.45 m.
Badly corroded piece of flat bronze, slightly tapered. L. 0.085 m., W. 0.045 m. Identified in the field as part of a sword.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 65.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as “one large fairly thick fragment [of bronze] probably of a weapon or a knife” found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room).

Associated, Not Catalogued:

CLAY

Catalogued:
*C-13: Linear B tablet PY La 630
NM.
Found immediately below the plowed layer,$^{1050}$ 2.00 m. from Trench Z and 0.30 m. from Trench Zc, at a depth of ca. -0.27 m.
Fragment of a palm leaf tablet, measuring 0.06 m. x 0.036 m. Writing on obverse and reverse. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 9.” Stylus-Hand: S626-H13.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 65.

*C-14: Linear B tablet PY La 631
NM.
Found 0.50 m. northwest of PY La 630.
Fragment of a palm leaf tablet, measuring 0.025 m. x 0.05 m. Writing on obverse and reverse. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 10.” Stylus-Hand: S622-H13.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 65.

$^{1050}$ The term “surface” is used here (GEM 1952, p. 65). However, based on the context of Mylonas’ description, this appears to mean the “surface of the red layer” rather than the surface of the entire deposit.
*C-15: Linear B tablet PY Xa 633

NM.

Found 1.10 m. from Trench Z and 0.75 m. from Trench Zc, at a depth of -0.63 m.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 68.

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-123:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 19.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a curled line that may belong to a spiral or to the arm of an argonaut (*FM 22?*). 7.5YR 3/4 (dark brown) paint, with crazing.
Date: LH II-III A?

**P-124:** Large piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 30?*)
1952 Sherd Lot 19.
Concave neck sherd with attached beginning of shoulder. Juncture between neck and body defined by a raised ring.
Date: LH IIIB-III A1
Perhaps from same vessel as: **P-251, P-257**, and/or **P-372**. Also may go with: **P-28, P-190, P-250, P-269**, and/or **P-282**.

**P-125:** Large piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 34*)
1952 Sherd Lot 19.\(^{1051}\)
Horizontal/very slightly sloping rim sherd with attached upper part of a concave neck. D. est. rim 0.15 m.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior preserves traces of a horizontal band below the rim. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces burnt.
Date: LH III A2
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, fig. 79.1; 1999, p. 334.61.
Joins to: **P-29**. May also go with: **P-126+P-371**.

---

\(^{1051}\) Note: there is no underscore indicating whether the pencil number here is “19” or “61.” In my opinion, “19” is more likely because it matches the orientation of the sherd.
**P-126:** Large piriform jar?  
1952 Sherd Lot 19.  
Convex body sherd.  
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray). Exterior decorated with a thick horizontal band flanked by two thin lines. 10YR 5/1 (gray) paint. All surfaces burnt.  
Date: LH IIIA2?  
Joins to: **P-371**, from Room 18. May also go with: **P-29**+**P-125**.

**P-127:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper  
(MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)  
1952 Sherd Lot 19.  
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-128:** Jar/jug  
1952 Sherd Lot 19.  
Convex body sherd.  
Date: Myc.  
Perhaps from the same vessel as: **P-243**.

**P-129:** Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 19.  
Convex body sherd with pronounced interior wheel ridges.  
Date: Indeterminate

**Associated, Not Catalogued:**  
“One handle with hole of a portable brazier” (1952 Sherd Lot 19: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

“Part of a pithos…covered inside and out by lime plaster,” found ca. -0.75 m. below the surface. Likely goes with similar fragments found in Trench Zc and in the NE Quadrant and presumed to belong to a “basin that must have fallen from above and from a second floor arrangement” (GEM 1952, p. 73).

**From -0.70 m. to -0.90 m.:**

**POTTERY**

---

1052 Note: there is no underscore indicating whether the pencil number here is “19” or “61.” In my opinion, “19” is more likely because it matches the orientation of the sherd.  
1053 Note: there is no underscore indicating whether the pencil number here is “19” or “61.” In my opinion, “19” is more likely because it matches the orientation of the sherd.
**P-130:** Large shallow bowl?

1952 Sherd Lot 61.\(^{1054}\)

Sharply everted rim sherd. D. est. 0.42 m.
Date: MH?

**P-131:** Standard kylix(kes) or dipper(s) (MRT 29c or 25)

1952 Sherd Lot 61.\(^{1055}\)

Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Frags of large pithos” (1952 Sherd Lot 61: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 9).

**From -0.90 m. to floor:**

**METAL**

**Catalogued:**

*M-32:* Tiny fragment of gold
“Tiny [fragment] of gold, #17” found 1.00 m. northwest of the doorway to the Throne Room.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 78.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the fragment of gold found on or near the floor “just inside the doorway” to the Throne Room).

*M-33:* Fragment of gold
“On floor level, [fragment] of gold #18” found near the opening of the doorway into the Vestibule.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 79.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (identified as the fragment of gold found on or near the floor “in the doorway” to the Throne Room).

*M-34:* Fragment of gold
One fragment of gold listed as having been found near and/or on the floor adjacent to the “south column base” in the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90, fig. 270.

---

\(^{1054}\) Note: there is no underscore indicating whether the pencil number here is “19” or “61.” In my opinion, “61” is more likely because it matches the orientation of the sherd.

\(^{1055}\) Note: there is no underscore indicating whether the pencil number here is “19” or “61.” In my opinion, “61” is more likely because it matches the orientation of the sherd.
BONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:

POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-132: Rim-handled cooking jar
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Convex body sherd.
Coarse fabric, 7.5YR 6/6 (reddish yellow). “Adriatic Ware.” Exterior deeply incised with stacked chevrons that may be part of a larger zigzag pattern. Interior surface blackened.
Date: MH I-II
Cf. Nichoria II, p. 803, pl. 3-16, P2314.

P-133: Krater (MRT 63; FS 7) PLATE 50
1952 Sherd Lot 21
Tall everted rim sherd. D. est. 0.35 m.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 8/2 (white). Exterior decorated with a wide rim band above a large, carelessly drawn spiral. Wide interior rim band. 5YR 2/1 (black) paint. Dark line at the bottom of the rim band suggests this may be a local attempt at Mainland Polychrome?
Date: LH I
Cf. Vessel sherds in PN III figs. 141 and 142 found underneath Hall 65; profile and spiral (without tail) match Mountjoy 1999 p. 330, no. 44 from Nichoria; 1986, fig. 71.4.

P-134: Piriform jar or krater (MRT 52 or FS 7)? PLATE 50
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Ca. 1/6 of a torus disk base. D. est. 0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior decorated above the foot with a thick horizontal band. 10YR 5/1 (gray) paint. Underside reserved. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIIA?

P-135: Small cup or dipper (MRT 12-13, 18 or 23) PLATE 49
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Everted rim sherd. Very hard-fired. D. est. in range 0.12-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-136: Basin (MRT 1) PLATE 51
CM Room 2, Case 19, Mus. Inv. 1152.
1952 Sherd Lot 21.1056
Found on the floor.

---

1056 No pencil number observed on these sherds, but shape and find spot match description of “a good many fragts of a large bowl” given in the description of Sherd Lot 21.

**P-137:** Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with ghosts of a spiral pattern. 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint, with crazing.
Date: Myc.

**P-138:** Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Convex body sherd (on left).
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-139:** Cup or bowl?
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Convex body sherd, close to the start of the base.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with two parallel horizontal bands. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-140:** Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 21.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate

**UNKNOWN STRATA IN THE SE QUADRANT**

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

*M-35:* Fragments of gold
Two “small bits” of gold found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room. Publ. PN I, p. 90 (2 of the 4 listed fragments of gold from the SE Quadrant).

*M-36:* Fragments of silver
“Eleven thin pieces [of silver], eight of them probably from rim and handle of a cup, one possible a rivet head” found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 74 (one cup fragment mentioned, found alongside the SE wall of the Throne Room).
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (all of the listed fragments of silver from the SE Quadrant).

*M-37: Fragments of bronze
52 “chunks, scraps and thin pieces” of fused, nondescript bronze found in the SE Quadrant of the Throne Room.
Publ. PN I, p. 90 (52 of the 53 listed fragments of bronze from the SE Quadrant).

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Fragments of silver” found alongside the SE wall of the Throne Room (GEM 1952, p. 74).

NE Quadrant of the Throne Room: Stratigraphy

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.15

The fourth and final quadrant of the Throne Room, the NE Quadrant, was opened on June 16, 1952.1057 As in the SE Quadrant, Mylonas observed the presence of two different strata underneath the ca. 0.30 m. of plowed earth (p8). In a small area, extending 0.90 m. out from Trench Z and 0.75 m. out from Trench Zb (i.e., in the western corner of the quadrant, close to the hearth), the earth under the plowed zone was black-burned with small stones (b12). Further eastward the brick-red earth with large stones appeared, “solid and hard,” immediately under the plowed earth (r9) (Figure A1.23).1058 As seen in the SE Quadrant, this red earth undercut the black earth, and continued down to the floor throughout the trench.1059

NE Quadrant of the Throne Room: Finds

STRATUM p8
DEPTH: surface to -0.30 m.
No finds recorded.

1057 GEM 1952, p. 65.
1058 GEM 1952, pp. 65, 67-68.
1059 GEM 1952, pp. 73, 75.
**STRATUM b12**
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to ca. -0.50 m.
No finds recorded.

**STRATUM r9**
DEPTH: -0.30 m. to floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1952 SHERD LOTS: 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From -0.30 m. to -0.80 m.:

**METAL**

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Small piece of what “seems to be silver” found at the just under the plowed soil, 1.00 m. from Trench Z and 0.52 m. from Trench Zc, at a depth of -0.30 m. (GEM 1952, p. 65).

**BONE**

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“One little bone” (1952 Sherd Lot 12: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5).

**CLAY**

Catalogued:

*C-16:* Linear B tablet PY Ae 629

*NM.*

Found in the red fill 1.20 m. from Trench Z and 0.90 m. from Trench Zc, at a depth of -0.05 m. below the plowed stratum.

Small fragment of a palm leaf tablet measuring 0.043 x 0.023 m. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 8.” Stylus-Hand: S626-H13.

Date: LH IIIA

Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 65.


*C-17:* Linear B tablet PY La 632

*NM.*

Found in the red fill 1.10 m. from Trench Z and 0.62 m. from Trench Zc, at a depth of -0.47 m.

Small fragment of a palm leaf tablet measuring 0.038 x 0.018 m. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 11.”

Date: LH IIIA

Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 67.

POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-141: Palace style jar (MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24) PLATE 52
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a horizontal band and fat stacked zigzags (FM 61). 10YR 2/1 (black) paint. Cretan import?
Date: LH II A
Likely from the same vessel as: P-166+P-231 and P-183.

P-142: Kylix, monochrome (FS 264) PLATE 53
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Everted rim sherd with attached carinated upper body. D. est. 0.15 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Exterior and interior coated with 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip. Only decorated sherd in this lot.
Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 5.
Date: LH IIIA 2
Cf. Mountjoy 1999, fig. 114.77.

P-143: Handleless/conical cup (MRT 11; FS 204) PLATE 25
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Slightly incurving, lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

P-144: Standard kylix or dipper (MRT 29c or 25) PLATE 11
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-145: Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g) PLATE 15
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-146: Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g) PLATE 52
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Everted rim sherd with attached complete vertical strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.16-0.25 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/4 (very pale brown). Interior and exterior coated with 2.5Y 8/3 (yellow) slip.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
P-147: Tripod vessel (*MRT 69,70; FS 320*)
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Complete flat leg of a tripod vessel with attached convex lower body. H. 0.09 m.
Coarse fabric, 5YR 6/6 (reddish yellow), with a reduced core. Exterior possibly coated with
10YR 7/4 (very pale brown) slip.
Date: Myc.

P-148: Small jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Ca. 1/5 of a ring base. D. est. 0.05 m.
Date: Myc.

P-149: Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Convex body sherd with carination marking beginning of neck or rim.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a horizontal band above a
small circle. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Myc.

P-150: Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with two horizontal bands. 2.5YR
5/6 (red) paint.
Date: Myc.

P-151: Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 12.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 5YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior decorated with uneven, intersecting thick and
thin horizontal bands. 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. Irregularity of lines suggests a late date. All
surfaces burnt. Exterior surface pitted.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

Just above and on the floor:

STONE

Catalogued:
S-9: Mycenaean “button”
CM Room 2, Case 19. Mus. Inv. 2238.
Found near the base of the eastern column, on floor.
Nearly complete conulus of shanked type. Dark gray stone (steatite?) with small chips on base
and scratches on all surfaces. D. 0.018 m., D. shank 0.005 m., H. 0.012 m. Identified in the field
as “Steatite button No. 2,” of “sombrero” type.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 74.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 91, fig. 270 (identified as the steatite “shanked button” found in the NE Quadrant of the Throne Room).

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“[M]any frags of fallen plaster [alongside the end of the NE wall]” (GEM 1952, p. 96).

**STRATUM b12/STRATUM r9**

**DEPTH:** -0.30 m. to floor (cleaning the east corner of the Throne Room)

**1952 SHERD LOTS: 22**

**BONE**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“2 pieces of bone” (1952 Sherd Lot 22: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“[M]any frags of plaster with traces of fresco. We collect all we can. They lie face down or sloping for a distance of ca. 4m from SE corner of room for the most part ca. 70-80cm above floor “(GEM 1952, p. 92).

“[M]any frags of fallen plaster, some with traces of color. We are collecting and packing up all. 3 or 4 boxes filled. Pieces wrapped in cotton or paper” (GEM 1952, p. 93).

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-152:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT* 11; *FS* 204)

1952 Sherd Lot 22.

Ca. ½ of a slightly raised base with attached convex lower body. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m. Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Undecorated. One area lightly burnt.

Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-153:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT* 11; *FS* 204) PLATE 25

1952 Sherd Lot 22.

Slightly incurving, lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.

Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Undecorated. All surfaces lightly burnt.

Date: LH IIA-IIIB1
P-154: Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)
1952 Sherd Lot 22.
Lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.10 m.
Date: LH IIAB1

P-155: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)
1952 Sherd Lot 22.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIC early

P-156: Standard/large kylix (*MRT 29c-g*)
1952 Sherd Lot 22.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body and complete vertical strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.16-0.25 m.
Date: LH IIIC early

P-157: Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 22.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a thick vertical line. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Other examples of “a good many [fragments of] crude ware of no interest” (1952 Sherd Lot 22: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6).

**UNKNOWN STRATA IN THE NE QUADRANT**

*Depth: unknown*

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

*M-38: Pieces of bronze*
Seven fragments of bronze, “one large thick flat bent piece; six thin bent pieces” found in the NE Quadrant.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 91 (all listed fragments of bronze from the NE Quadrant).

---

1060 This find contradicts Mylonas’ comment (1952 Sherd Lot 22: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 6) that there is “not a single painted sherd” in this lot.
STONE

Catalogued:
*S-10: Piece of quartz
One “chunk” of quartz found in the NE Quadrant.
Publ. PN I, p. 91.

SE/NE Quadrants of the Throne Room: Finds

STRATUM r8/STRATUM r9
DEPTH: floor level alongside the SE Wall

1952 SHERD LOTS: 34

BONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“5 fragments of bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 34: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-158: Handleless/conical cup (MRT 11; FS 204) PLATE 25
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
Slightly incurving, lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Undecorated. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

P-159: Small kylix (MRT 29a?) PLATE 21
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
3 joining everted rim sherds with attached convex upper body. Attachment for a vertical strap handle preserved on rim. D. est. 0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/0 (white). Undecorated. All surfaces burnt.
Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
Likely from the same vessel as: P-160.

P-160: Small kylix (MRT 29a?) PLATE 21
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
2 joining everted rim sherds with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/0 (white). Undecorated. All surfaces burnt.
Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
Likely from the same vessel as: P-159.
P-161: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-162: Standard kylix or dipper (*MRT 29c or 25*)
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-163: Deep bowl?
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
Flaring rim sherd with attached plain vertical neck. D. est. 0.12 m.
Date: LH IIIB-IIIC early?

P-164: Open vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 34.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 7/2 (light gray). Exterior decorated with part of a spiral (*FM 46, 47 or 49?*). 10YR 3/2 (very dark brown) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: Myc.

STRATUM r8/STRATUM r9/STRATUM r4
DEPTH: all levels in the doorway to the Throne Room

1952 SHERD LOTS: 40

BONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:

WOOD

Catalogued:
W-6: Burnt wood
“Thick layer of carbon” on the western doorjamb of the door between the Throne Room and the Vestibule. Likely belonged to the wooden framework of the door. Small sample saved as “Charcoal and Wood Sample #56,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati. Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 113.
POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-165**: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a 2.5Y 8/3 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with three parallel horizontal bands. 10YR 5/4 (yellowish brown) paint. A thin dark line is present inside the central band. Dark line may suggest that this is a local attempt at Mainland Polychrome?
Date: LH I

**P-166**: Palace style jar (*MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24*)
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Convex body sherd.
Date: LH IIA
Joins to: **P-231**. Likely also from the same vessel as: **P-141** and **P-183**.

**P-167**: Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Complete profile with a slightly incurving, lipless rim, convex body (with slight bulge near rim), and very thick string-cut base with pale core. D. rim est. 0.103 m.; D. base est. 0.045 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Interior coated with 10YR 8/4 (very pale brown) slip, with a line of “drips” up one side. Large crack in the base – likely a discard.
Date: LH II-III B1
Field Ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7.

**P-168**: Stirrup jar?
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Very slightly convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Exterior is coated with 10YR 8/4 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with five fine horizontal lines sandwiched between two thick horizontal bands. 5YR 4/4 (reddish brown) paint. Buff slip conceals the pinkish color of the fired clay.
Date: LH IIIB?

**P-169**: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Convex body sherd with possible base of a neck.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a light slip and decorated with part of the curled tentacle of an argonaut (*FM 22*)?. 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint.
Date: Myc.

**P-170**: Cup?
1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Everted rim sherd. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-171:** Plate

1952 Sherd Lot 40.
Squared rim sherd. D. est. 0.35 m.
Date: Hellenistic/Roman

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*


*Throne Room Finds with Unknown Contexts*

Included among the catalogued artifacts found in the Pylos Throne Room are those that retain no clear indication of their find spots. Such artifacts include objects on display in the Chora Museum as well as objects stored in its apothekes. The latter category mostly comprises ceramic sherds that are stored in bags labeled “Throne Room,” but which lack pencil numbers to tie them to specific, stratigraphically defined, collection lots. These sherds likely originally had such pencil numbers, but which have worn from previous handling. On account of their formal characteristics, some of these objects can be matched, tentatively, to finds (both *Catalogued* with an asterisk, and *Associated, Not Catalogued*) listed above. When indicated, such correspondences are noted in the descriptions of the relevant finds below.

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

**M-39:** Fragments of gold

*CM* Room 2, Case 19.
Labeled as coming generally from the “Throne Room.”
11 fragments of different shapes and sizes. One with a raised vertical “rib” design below a horizontal band.
Likely includes many or all of the three catalogued, un-stratified fragments of gold (*M-7 and *M-35) from the SW and SE Quadrants, and/or the associated fragments of gold from the SW Quadrant, stratum r5. Could also match those catalogued fragments of gold evidenced only by their storage boxes (*M-3, *M-5, *M-11, *M-16, *M-20, and *M-30).

*M-40: Fragment of gold
One fragment of gold listed as having been found near and/or on the floor in the Throne Room. Likely corresponds to one or more of the fragments of gold associated with M-39 and/or to one of the three catalogued, un-stratified fragments (*M-7 and *M-35), from the Southwest and SE Quadrants.

*M-41: Fragments of gold
CM Room 3, under Case 30.
Two empty storage boxes labeled as containing fragments of gold Nos. 2879 and 52-5 from the Throne Room but without any further identifying characteristics. Likely includes two of the many fragments of gold associated with M-39, of the three catalogued un-stratified, fragments (*M-7 and *M-35), from the SW and SE Quadrants, and/or of the associated fragments from the SW Quadrant, stratum r5.

*M-42: Fragments of silver
CM Room 3, under Case 30.
Labeled as coming generally from the “Throne Room.” 17 thin fragments of silver, some flaring rim pieces. D. not taken.
Likely includes all 15 catalogued, un-stratified fragments of silver (*M-8, *M-27, and *M-36), from the NW, SW, and SE Quadrants, and/or the associated fragments of silver from strata b8 and r6/r7 in the NW Quadrant; and stratum r9 in the NE Quadrant.

*M-43: Fragments of bronze
CM Room 2, Case 19. Mus. No. CM 2233.
Labeled as coming generally from the “Throne Room.” 162 fragments of different sizes and shapes, including curved loop handles, a flat strap handle fragment with incised spiral decoration, a molded floral element (an acanthus leaf?), and a curved fragment with floral patterns, possibly from the neck of a bronze piriform jar (LH IIB-III A?).
Likely includes many or all of the 161 catalogued, un-stratified fragments of bronze (*M-9, *M-28, *M-37, and *M-38), from the SW, NW, SE, and NE Quadrants, catalogued bronze lumps (M-19) from the “rectangle of plaster” in the NW Quadrant, and/or the associated fragments of bronze from 1939 Trench I; stratum r1 in Trench Z; stratum r5 in the SW Quadrant; strata b8 and r6/r7 in the NW Quadrant; and stratum r8 in the SE Quadrant.

The reason that the “*Catalogued” and the “associated” fragments of gold from the SW Quadrant are not equated is that the quantities do not match. There is only one “*Catalogued” fragment, while there are two “Associated” “fragments, making it impossible to tell how they might correspond.
STONE

Catalogued:

S-11: Fragments of quartz
CM Room 2, Case 19. Mus. Inv. 2238.
Labeled as coming generally from the “Throne Room.”
Twelve fragments (one missing) of different shapes and sizes, some likely worked.
Publ. PN I, p. 270.
Likely corresponds to all or most the eleven fragments of quartz catalogued from stratum r6/r8 in the NW Quadrant, the single catalogued, un-stratified “chunk” of quartz from the NE Quadrant, and/or the associated quartz fragments from stratum r1 in Trench Z, and stratum r5 in the SW Quadrant.

BONE

Catalogued:

B-2: Fragment of bone
Labeled as coming generally from the “Megaron.” Identified in the field as “painted.” Saved as “Bones and Teeth #1,” in the Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati.
May correspond to one of the many associated bones from Strata r1 and r2 in Trench Z; stratum y3 in Trench Zb; stratum b5/r4 in Trench Zc; strata r5, b6/r5/b7, y4, and y4/y5 in the SW Quadrant; Strata r6/r7 and r7 from the NW Quadrant; Stratum r8 from the SE Quadrant; strata r9 and b12/r9 from the NE Quadrant; and/or strata r8/r9 and r8/r9/r4 from the SE/NE Quadrants.

POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-172: Strainer?
Convex shoulder sherd.
Coarse fabric, 10YR 5/2 (grayish brown). “Adriatic Ware.” Exterior decorated with parallel horizontal incised lines and pointillé.
Date: MH I-II
Cf. Nichoria II, p. 798, pl. 3-11 (e.g. P2246); Howell P2245-2246, p. 53.

P-173: Rim-handled cooking jar
Convex shoulder sherd.
Coarse fabric, 10YR 5/2 (grayish brown). “Adriatic Ware,” with a red core and black surfaces.
Exterior deeply incised with a stacked zigzag pattern. Pencil number present but illegible.
Date: MH I-II
Alternatively a medium/deep bowl: Nichoria II, p. 797, pls. 3-9 (e.g., P2213)?

P-174: Bowl
Convex shoulder sherd.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. D. body est. 0.30 m. Exterior incised deeply with 7 parallel horizontal lines, crossed by 1 vertically incised line. Fabric far finer than that of standard “Adriatic Ware” – perhaps imported “Black Minyan” ware?

Date: MH I-II

**P-175:** Bowl
Part of a vertical strap handle.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware”
Date: MH
May go with: **P-176, P-177, P-178,** and/or **P-179.**

**P-176:** Bowl
Gently flaring rim sherd. D. est. 0.18 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware.”
Date: MH
May go with: **P-175, P-177, P-178,** and/or **P-179.**

**P-177:** Bowl
Ca. ¼ of a flat raised base. D. est. 0.09 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware.”
Date: MH
May go with: **P-175, P-176, P-178,** and/or **P-179.**

**P-178:** Bowl
Part of a vertical strap handle.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware.”
Date: MH
May go with: **P-175, P-176, P-177,** and/or **P-179.**

**P-179:** Bowl(s)?
Five non-joining convex body sherds with carination.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), with black-burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware.”
Date: MH
May go with: **P-175, P-176, P-177,** and/or **P-178.**

**P-180:** Jar/jug
Convex body sherd with the start a neck.
Date: LH I?
P-181: Tripod vessel (*FS 320?) PLATE 61
Complete pointed leg of a tripod, slightly flattened. L. 0.07 m., max. W. 0.05 m.
Kytheran import?
Date: LH I-II
May correspond to the “tripod leg” listed in the either the description of 1952 Sherd Lot 18 (from the “rectangle of plaster” in stratum r7 in the NW Quadrant) or of 1952 Sherd Lot 40 (stratum r8/r9/r4, in the doorway) (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, pp. 5, 7).

P-182: Vapheio cup, Type III (*FS 224) PLATE 62
Lipless, flaring rim sherd. D. est. 0.095 m.
Date: LH I-IIA
Cf. *PN III, fig. 249, no. 19.

P-183: Palace style jar (*MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24)? PLATE 62
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with parallel lines that likely represent part of a fat zigzag (*FM 61) design. 10YR 3/2 (dark grayish brown) paint. Cretan import?
Date: LH IIA
Likely from the same vessel as: P-141 and P-166+P-231.

P-184: Pear rhyton (*FS 20) PLATE 62
Very slightly convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 2.5Y 8/3 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with 1 (or perhaps 2? parallel horizontal lines above a double-axe motif (*FM 35) with adjacent tiny dots. 2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint. Buff slip conceals the pinkish color of the clay.
Date: LH IIA
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, fig. 16.3.

P-185: Shallow cup (*FS 218)? PLATE 63
Two joining sherds forming an everted rim with attached complete vertical strap handle. D. est. 0.17 m. Handle very delicate and thin.
Date: LH IIA or LH IIIA1?

P-186: Shallow cup (*FS 218)? PLATE 63
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 8/4 (pink). Exterior decorated with an uneven exterior rim band. 5YR 4/6 (yellowish red) paint. Interior decorated with traces of a 5YR 2.5/1 (black) rim band.
Date: LH IIA or LH IIIA1?

P-187: Jar/jug? PLATE 63
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a curved horizontal band and two dots. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint. Two pencil numbers present (15 and 7) – unclear to which context the sherd belongs.
Date: LH II?

**P-188:** Handleless/conical cups (*MRT 11; FS 204*)  
**PLATE 25**
Two non-joining, slightly incurving, lipless rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-189:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)  
**PLATE 56**
Complete profile with a lipless rim, concave body, and flat string-cut base. D. rim est. 0.095 m; D. base est. 0.04 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-190:** Large piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 30 or 19*)  
**PLATE 21**
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with a pendant scale pattern (*FM 70*) with no filler motifs. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.  
Pencil number present but illegible.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
Cf. *PN* I, figs. 377 nos. 406 and 407 from Oil Magazine 32; Mountjoy 1986, fig. 40.2.  
From same vessel as: **P-28, P-250, P-269,** and **P-282.** May also go with: **P-124, P-251, P-257,** and/or **P-372.**

**P-191:** Squat alabastron  
**PLATE 64**
Strongly convex shoulder sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip, preserving ghosts of two parallel horizontal bands.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB1?

**P-192:** Dipper (*MRT 23-25*)  
**PLATE 64**
½ of a high swung vertical strap handle. L. pres. 0.10 m.  
Date: Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-193:** Small kylix(ks), cup(s), or dipper(s) (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)  
**PLATE 10**
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
P-194: Standard kylix or dipper (MRT 29c or 25)  PLATE 11
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m. Pencil number present but illegible.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-195: Standard/large kylix(kes) (MRT 29c-g)  PLATE 15
Five non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-196: Standard/large kylix(kes) (MRT 29c-g)  PLATE 52
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds with attached tops of vertical strap handles. D. est. in range: 0.16-0.25 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-197: Shallow angular bowl (MRT 4; FS 295)  PLATE 19
Small piece of a “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-198: Spouted bowl (MRT 10?)  PLATE 64
Two joining fragments of the central part of a large trough spout.
May correspond to “one spout of spouted bowl” from 1952 Sherd Lot 10 (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 4).
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-199: Larnax (FS 1)  PLATE 65
Fragment of a bracket-shaped rim.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 6/4 (light yellowish brown), with silver mica. Undecorated. Interior preserves evenly-spaced raised bumps indicative of coil-joint strengthening where this rim joined to the upper wall of the larnax.
Kytheran import?
Date: LH IIIA?

P-200: Brazier (MRT 67)?  PLATE 65
Complete terminal end of a thick cylindrical handle. D. 0.04 m. Pierced by a hole, D. 0.015 m.
Coarse fabric, 5YR 5/4 (reddish brown), with a large reduced core. Undecorated.
May correspond to “one handle with hole of a portable brazier?” listed in the description of 1952 Sherd Lot 19 (from stratum r8) (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, pp. 5).
Date: Myc.
P-201: Griddle
Fragment of the cooking surface of a griddle. Upper surface perforated with small, circular holes that extend ca. 2/3 of the way into the profile. No signs of burning – unused?
Date: Myc.
Cf. PN I, fig. 348, no. 12.

P-202: Jar/jug
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 8/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/4 (pale brown) slip and decorated with two horizontal bands. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-203: Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-204: Open vessel – shape indeterminate
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Interior retains traces of 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

P-205: Small jar/jug?
Convex body sherd with base of an everted rim.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Exterior retains traces of 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: Indeterminate.

P-206: Small cup/bowl
Incurving rim sherd with attached globular body and complete horizontal loop handle anchored just below the rim. D. 0.10 m. Handmade?
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 6/6 (reddish yellow). Exterior and interior coated with a tan slip.
Date: Indeterminate

P-207: Jar/jug
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate

P-208: Open vessel - shape indeterminate
Two non-joining, very thin convex sherds, apparently from an incurved rim.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/8 (reddish yellow). Interiors retain traces of 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: Indeterminate

**P-209:** Shape indeterminate
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate.

**P-210:** Indeterminate
Part of a wide vertical strap handle. W. 0.04 m.
Date: Indeterminate

*Excavation of the Vestibule (1952 and 1960)*

*Timeline and Method:*

Excavations in the Vestibule of the megaron of the Palace of Nestor began on June 20, 1952, some three weeks after work commenced in the Throne Room. Initially, digging was overseen by Mylonas, who discovered the doorway to the Vestibule (which he called the “Prodomos,” following Homeric terminology popular among Greek archaeologists) after removing the large concentration of stones from in front of the Throne Room’s SE wall (see Figure A1.16).\(^{1062}\) In order to examine the doorway and assess what lay beyond it, Mylonas extended Trench Zc to the southeast and opened a new trench, “Trench Q,” measuring 1.00. m wide and positioned parallel to Trench Z (see Figure A1.5).\(^{1063}\) In Trench Q, Mylonas immediately encountered another burnt red deposit with large stones underneath the plowed earth that prompted him to expand his excavation.\(^{1064}\)

On June 23, Mylonas divided the area surrounding Trench Q into quadrants, following the strategy he had employed in the Throne Room.\(^{1065}\) From Mylonas’ field notes, however, it is

---

\(^{1062}\) GEM 1952, p. 75.
\(^{1063}\) GEM 1952, p. 77. Trench Zc was extended until it intersected with 1939 Trench I.
\(^{1064}\) GEM 1952, p. 79.
\(^{1065}\) GEM 1952, p. 79.
clear that the directional terms (Northwest, Southwest, Northeast, Southeast) by which he designated the quadrants of the Hearth Room were not applied in the same way in the Vestibule. Although the two rooms were identically quartered, the names of the Vestibule’s quadrants were shifted one position counterclockwise: what was the SW Quadrant in the Hearth Room became the SE Quadrant in the Vestibule, the SE Quadrant became the NE Quadrant, the NE Quadrant became the NW Quadrant, and the NW Quadrant became the SW Quadrant (see Figure A1.4). These new names reflect an artificial North-South (rather than the true Northeast-Southwest) alignment of the palace, and were likely a tactic instituted by Blegen in order to simplify recording in the field.

Work began in the NW Quadrant of the Vestibule on June 23 and progressed into the NE and SW Quadrants on June 24 and June 25 respectively. On June 26, Blegen continued removing earth from the Vestibule following Mylonas’ departure, beginning with the deposits in the SW Quadrant and progressing into the SE Quadrant the next day. The remaining earth in the Vestibule was cleared by Eugene Vanderpool, who assumed direction of the megaron excavations from July 3 to July 18.

---

1066 Evidence for this shift comes from Mylonas’ discussion of the excavation of the party wall shared by the Vestibule and the Hearth Room on June 23. In his field notebook, the headings “Northwest Section” and “Southwest Section” (which would have been expected based on the divisions he had used in the Hearth Room) were crossed out and replaced by the headings “Northwest Section” and “Northeast Section,” reflecting a new directional alignment. In PN I, these ordinals are replaced by the terms “North Quarter” (for the Northeast Section), “East Quarter” (for the Southeast Section), “South Quarter” (for the Southwest Section), and “West Quarter” (for the Northwest Section). Again, for clarity, the terms used during excavation are maintained here, but with the use of “quadrant” rather than “quarter” or “section.”

1067 Prior to excavations in the Vestibule, Blegen referred to Mylonas’ “Southwest Section” in the Throne Room as the “Northwest Section” in his field notebook entry for June 6 (1952, p. 23), illustrating key differences in the directional terms used on site. While Mylonas used directions that were true to the compass points, Blegen appears to have preferred more “practical” directions based on an artificial North-South alignment of the megaron’s central axis. This change can be likened to the modern practice of using “notebook north” rather than “true north” during excavation.

1068 GEM 1952, pp. 82, 84, 88.

Eight years later, in 1960, excavations were renewed briefly in the Vestibule by Rawson, who probed beneath the room’s plaster floor in the area immediately northwest of the northeastern doorjamb of the doorway into the Portico. Against the face of the jamb she uncovered a small hole cut into the pavement, at the base of which were a few small stones (at a depth of ca. -0.23 m.) above a row of slightly larger stones, one of which stood vertically at the northern end of the hole (Figures A1.24 and A1.25). The position and burnt condition of these stones led Rawson to infer initially that the hole formed “an arrangement for some kind of post for the door,” and later that it served as the base for a spear stand like that described by Homer from the palace of Odysseus.\(^{1070}\)

*Vestibule: Stratigraphy*

Plan: see Figure A1.7  
Relationship matrix: Figure A1.26

As mentioned, in Trench Q, Mylonas encountered a stratum of plowed earth (p\(^9\)) directly overtop of a red burnt deposit with large stones (r\(^{10}\)).\(^{1071}\) In the four quadrants of the Vestibule, Mylonas removed the earth in passes, with the deposits alongside the room’s walls being left for last.\(^{1072}\) The deposits found in the NW and NE Quadrants were of two varieties: on the surface (reaching an average depth of -0.25 m.) was a stratum of brown plowed earth (p\(^{10}\) and p\(^{11}\)), familiar from the Throne Room, and below was a red stony fill (r\(^{11}\) and r\(^{12}\)), described by Mylonas as “not as brick-red as in R[oo]m of Hearth and burned, but not as intensely.”\(^{1073}\) At a depth of -0.85 m., a stratum of large stones was found embedded in the lower part of the red fill that stretched across both the NW and the NE Quadrants. In the SW and SE Quadrants, the same

\(^{1070}\) MR 1960 Volume I, p. 185; *PN* 1, p. 72, referencing *Od*. 1, 127.  
\(^{1071}\) GEM 1952, p. 79.  
\(^{1072}\) GEM 1952, p. 79.  
\(^{1073}\) GEM 1952, pp. 79, 82.
layer of surface soil (p12 and p13) was encountered, beneath which were found additional layers of red fill (r13 and r14), in the SW and SE respectively.\textsuperscript{1074} As noted by Blegen, the fill in the SE Quadrant was “hard” and represented “disintegrated [burnt] crude-brick.”\textsuperscript{1075} Finally below the level of the floor, in the “post hole” discovered by Rawson was a deposit of “hard-packed gray earth containing flecks of lime” (b13).

\textit{Trench Q: Finds}

\textbf{STRATUM p9 and STRATUM r10}

\textbf{DEPTH:} surface to -0.80 m.

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
1952 SHERD LOTS: 35, 36  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{From surface to -0.50 m., SW half of trench:}\textsuperscript{1076}

\textbf{SHELL}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}


\textbf{POTTERY}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}

“A good many fragments of plain ware. Few with painted pattern. One with plastic band under rim (black)” (1952 Sherd Lot 35: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7; ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, unnumbered page).

\textbf{From surface to -0.80 m., SW half of trench:}

\textbf{POTTERY}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}

“A good many fragment of plain ware. 1 lug of large pithos. One from pithos with incised pattern. One leg of a legged pot” (1952 Sherd Lot 36: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

\textbf{From all levels, NE half of trench:}

\textsuperscript{1074} GEM 1952, pp. 88, 89.  
\textsuperscript{1075} GEM 1952, p. 91. Likely, this was the noted texture (and accepted interpretation) of the red layer in the other quadrants of the Vestibule as well.  
\textsuperscript{1076} Written in the field records as “NW” half, but more correctly the “SW” half.
POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Lug [of a] large pithos; pithos with pinched pattern; tripod leg” (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, unnumbered page).

NW Quadrant of the Vestibule: Finds

**STRATUM p10**
DEPTH: surface to -0.20 m.

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 37 |

METAL

Catalogued:
*M-44:* Pieces of bronze
PLATE 4
CM Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. 3461.
Three thin fragments of bronze, found in the surface soil of the NW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 86.

*M-45:* Pieces of bronze
“Eight nondescript fragments [of bronze] in surface soil” in the NW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

**STRATUM r11**
DEPTH: -0.30 m to floor

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 38, 41, 43, 46, 48 |

From -0.30 m. to -0.60 m.:

METAL

Catalogued:
*M-46:* Fragments of bronze
PLATE 46
Five small thin fragments of bronze found at a depth of -0.30 m. to -0.60 m. in the NW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 82.

From -0.30 m. to -0.70 m.:

BONE

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“1 bit of bone” (1952 Sherd Lot 41: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).
**PLASTER**

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*


**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-211:** Bowl?

1952 Sherd Lot 41.
Convex shoulder sherd with base of a rim.
Fine fabric, 2.5YR 5/8 (red), with a reduced core. Exterior burnished and painted with two pairs of diagonal lines (one pair thick, the other thin) angled to form a chevron. Above is a horizontal band. 7.5YR 3/1 (dark gray) matt paint.
Date: MH I-II
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-212:** Jar/jug?

1952 Sherd Lot 41.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 2.5YR 8/2 (white), with a greenish hue. Exterior decorated with four thick horizontal bands. 2.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint, very crisp.
Date: LH IIB?
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, fig. 47.1
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-213:** Stirrup jar?

1952 Sherd Lot 41.
Convex shoulder sherd.
Date: LH IIIA2
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-214:** Handleless/conical cup (*MRT 11; FS 204*)

1952 Sherd Lot 41.
Ca. 1/3 of a slightly raised base with attached convex lower body. D. est. in range: 0.035-0.050 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1

**P-215:** Standard/large kylix (*MRT 29c-g*)

1952 Sherd Lot 41.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-216:** Kylix  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Ca. ¼ of the shallow-domed base of a kylix. D. 0.07 m.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early  
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-217:** Stirrup jar  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Convex shoulder sherd.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with five thin horizontal lines sandwiched between two thicker lines. 5YR 5/4 (reddish brown) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB  
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-218:** Spouted bowl (*MRT* 7; *FS* 253)  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Fragment of a U-shaped bridge spout with attached everted rim.  
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB  
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-219:** Jar/jug?  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Convex body sherd.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with traces of three horizontal lines. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint.  
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?  

**P-220:** Krater?  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Lower part of a vertical strap handle.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 6/1 (gray). Undecorated. All surfaces burnt and coated with salts.  
Date: Indeterminate  
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-221:** Large bowl/krater?  
1952 Sherd Lot 41.  
Convex body sherd with a slight carination.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky monochrome slip ranging between 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) and 2.5YR 4/6 (red).
Date: Indeterminate
Cf. \textit{PN I}, fig. 347, no. 618.

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“At least 10 plain unpainted kylikes” (1952 Sherd Lot 41: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

\textbf{From -0.50 m. to -0.80 m.:}

\textbf{STONE}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“Flat conical piece of stone: diameter 7.8cm” (1952 Sherd Lot 38: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

\textbf{WOOD}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“One piece of carbon, Q II 43” (1952 Sherd Lot 38: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

\textbf{PLASTER}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“4 piece[s] of painted plaster” found in the western corner of the Vestibule (1952 Sherd Lot 38: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7; GEM 1952, p. 88).

\textbf{POTTERY}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“Fragments of plain ware mostly, few painted” (1952 Sherd Lot 38: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 7).

\textbf{At -0.85 m.:}

\textbf{WOOD}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
Fragments of carbonized wood collected in the NW Quadrant of the Vestibule, southwest of the doorway to the Throne Room, at a depth of -0.85 m. (GEM 1952, p. 82).

\textbf{From -0.90 m. to the floor:}

\textbf{BONE}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}
“4 bones” (1952 Sherd Lot 43: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).
PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“A bit of painted plaster (light ground, dark line)” in “very bad condition” found alongside the Room’s NW wall, not far above the floor (GEM 1952, p. 117).

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-222:** Squat jug (*FS 87*)
1952 Sherd Lot 43.
Flaring rim sherd with attached concave neck. D. est. 0.08 m.
Date: LH I-II
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-223:** Squat alabastron
1952 Sherd Lot 43.
Convex shoulder sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a very worn pendant design (*FM 38*) with dotted festoons. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-224:** Carinated conical cup (*FS 230*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 43.
Convex body sherd, sharply carinated.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with three horizontal lines. 10YR 4/3 (dark brown) paint.
Date: LH IIIA1?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-225:** Kylix, monochrome (*FS 264*)
1952 Sherd Lot 43.
Thick, everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.13 m.
Date: LH IIIA2

**P-226:** Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 43.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in 2.5R 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with part of a horizontal band. Very lustrous 2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint. Argive import?
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-227:** Standard/large kylix (*MRT 29c-g*)
- 1952 Sherd Lot 43.
- Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. A complete vertical strap handle stretches from the rim to the body.
- Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-228:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
- 1952 Sherd Lot 43.
- Convex shoulder sherd with base of neck at upper edge.
- Date: Post-DA?

NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*
- “Many pithos fragments” (1952 Sherd Lot 43: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).
- “Several fragments of shallow bowls with pinched-out horizontal handles” (1952 Sherd Lot 43: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

**STRATUM p10/STRATUM r11**
**DEPTH:** surface to -0.50 m.

*POTTERY*

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

**Cleaning alongside the NW wall:**

*POTTERY*

**Catalogued:**

**P-229:** Vapheio cup, Type III (*FS 224*)
- Lipless rim sherd with attached flaring body. D. est. 0.13 m.
- Interior and exterior rim bands. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray paint). Interior not slipped.
- Date: LH I
- Cf. *PN III*, fig. 249, no. 19.

NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.
**P-230:** Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 48.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a curved element (possibly the frond of a “Palm I” (FM 14) or a lily (FM 9))? 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint.
Date: LH I-II
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-231:** Palace Style jar (MRT 54a-b; FS 15/24)  
PLATE 56
1952 Sherd Lot 48.
Convex body sherd.
10YR 4/2 (dark graying brown) paint. All surfaces burnt. Cretan import?
Date: LH II A
Joins to P-166. Likely also from the same vessel as: P-183 and P-141.

**P-232:** Standard kylix, monochrome  
PLATE 74
1952 Sherd Lot 48.
Fragment of the lower part of a stem with the start of a base for a foot with a high, conical dome.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown), very hard. Exterior and interior coated with streaky 2.5YR 3/2 (dusky red) monochrome slip. Slip continues underneath the foot. Argive import?
Date: LH IIIA2
From the same vessel as: P-246.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-233a:** Jar/jug?  
PLATE 74
1952 Sherd Lot 48.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 5YR 6/2 (pinkish gray). Exterior coated in 2.5Y 8/3 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with two horizontal lines. 5YR 4/2 (dark reddish gray) paint. Paint may be matt, but difficult to tell under salts. All surfaces burnt.
Date: Indeterminate
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-233b:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate  
PLATE 75
1952 Sherd lot 48.
Flat base sherd.
Fine fabric 10YR 7/1 (light gray) surface. All surfaces vitrified. Interior heavily cracked; exterior blackened, rough, and bubbly.
Date: Indeterminate
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Cleaning alongside the NE wall:

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-234:** Large tankard/mug (*FS 225*)
Plain vertical body sherd with raised midrib.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a horizontal band overtop of the midrib. Above is part of a spiral contained within a panel. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIIA1
Field ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, unnumbered page ("tankard with raised rib, spiral decoration")
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76 (sherd of "a tankard with a spiraliform design"); "tankard with raised rib, spiral decoration" (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. unnumbered page)).

Associated, Not Catalogued:

"Piece of rim of large coarse lid; Handleless cup, with flat base; 1 kylix stem; 9 painted sherds kept" (ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. unnumbered page).

NE Quadrant of the Vestibule: Finds

**STRATUM p11**

DEPTH: surface to -0.25 m.
No finds recorded.

**STRATUM r12**

DEPTH: -0.25 m. to -1.10 m. (floor)

SHERD LOTS: None

At -0.45 m.:

CLAY

Catalogued:

*C-18:* Linear B tablet PY Eb 636
*NM.*
Found at 2.00 m. from Trench Zc and 1.50 m. from the party wall between the Throne Room and the Vestibule, at a depth of -0.45 m. Found almost directly above the east corner of the Sentry Stand.
Small fragment of a palm leaf tablet. Identified in the field as “Tablet No. 15.” Scribe S149-H41. Fired 2.5Y N/5 (gray). Only tablet from the Eb series to be found outside of the palace Archives in Rooms 7 and 8 and only tablet from the megaron to be fired gray rather than red-orange.
Date: LH IIIA
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 82.

From ca. -0.45 m. to ca. -0.85 m.:

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Much fallen plaster some with painted decoration. Several large and small ones seem to give part of a garment with dot rosettes” (GEM 1952, p. 99; Pylos excavation photo P.52.44).


“Frag[ments] of painted stucco” including: “a sizeable piece, some 0.30 x 0.30 lies more or less vertically near N wall of Prodomos but clearly fallen. Very bad condition. Main mass of plaster broken into many pieces, roots in cracks. Painted coating. Thin, with the tendency to flake off from main mass. … Colors: at left, buff ground with light brown lines; at right a pale red. Another frag with dot rosettes. Fallen plaster ends ca. 0.20-0.30 above floor” (GEM 1952, p. 101).

From ca. -0.85 m. to ca. -1.10 m. (floor):

METAL

Catalogued:
*M-47: Fragment of silver
“One thin bent piece” found 0.10 m. above the floor.
PN I, p. 75, fig. 268a.

*M-48: Bronze arrow point
CM Room 3, Case 30; storage box under same case. Mus. Nos. CM 2794 and NM 7793. Found 2.50 m. from the northern doorjamb of the door between the Throne Room and the Vestibule, at a depth of -1.10 m. (almost on the floor).
Tanged bronze arrowpoint with rounded shank. L. 0.052 m., max. W. 0.015 m.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 84.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 274, no. 7 (identified as the bronze “arrow or javelin point” found in the NE Quadrant of the Vestibule); Hofstra 2000, pp. 97, 305, fig. 7 (MX 2794).

*M-49: Fragments of bronze
“Three thin flat fragments and two tiny bits [of bronze], 0.10 m. to 0.15 m. above floor” found in the NE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

*M-50: Fragments of bronze
“Three thin flat pieces [of bronze], 0.25 m. m. above floor” found in the NE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

**IVORY**

*Catalogued:*

*I-1: Fragments of ivory*

“Two flat pieces of ivory or bone, 0.10 m. above floor” in the NE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-235: Deep bowl, Group A (MRT 60; FS 284)**

Found fused to the floor in the north corner of the room (the “northeast” corner in *PN* I, p. 76). Nearly complete but vitrified bowl of fine fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Rim and one horizontal loop handle melted down along the vessel’s sides. Second loop handle preserved separately. Ring base. H. preserved 0.05 m., D. base 0.06 m., D. at preserved height 0.12 m. Exterior decorated with a thin rim band, a running spiral on the shoulder, two belly bands, and a single band above the base. Interior heavily burnt, but with traces of paint at the base of the bowl. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint. Underside reserved. Incorrectly published as having three handles.
Date: LH IIIB
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 120; ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, unnumbered page.
Cf. McDonald 1972, fig. 50b.

**SW Quadrant of the Vestibule: Finds**

**STRATUM p12**

**DEPTH: surface to ca. -0.25 m.**

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 44 |

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*

**P-236: Bowl**

1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Thick, everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.19 m.
Date: MH
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.
**P-237**: Beak-spouted jug (*FS 141* or *143*)
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Part of a vertical strap handle with a central rib.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Outer surface decorated with worn diagonal lines. Interior surface monochrome. 2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint/slip.
Date: LH IIA
Cf. *PN III*, fig. 130.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-238**: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/2 (light gray). Exterior decorated with a spiral composed of very thin, relatively evenly spaced lines and a large central dot (*FM 46*). 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIA
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-239**: Piriform jar (*FS 22* or *23?*)
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Horizontal rim sherd with attached slightly concave neck. D. est. 0.10 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIA?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-240**: Flask (*FS 188-189*)
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Convex belly sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a worn spiral with a large central dot. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint. Interior preserves diagnostic circular wheel-marks.
Date: LH IIIA2
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-241**: Shallow angular bowl (*MRT 4; FS 295*)
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Everted rim sherd with attached start of a “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.20 m.
Fine fabric (Group 1). Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-242**: Deep bowl, Group B (*MRT 60; FS 284*)?
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric (Group indeterminate). Exterior decorated with a very close-set running spiral (*FM 46)? Monochrome interior. 10 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint/slip. Could also be from a Group A deep bowl, with monochrome interior. All surfaces heavily burnt.
Date: LH IIIB2 or LH IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-243:** Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Myc.
Perhaps from the same vessel as: **P-128**.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

**P-244:** Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 44.
Convex body sherd from the lower part of a closed vessel.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). Exterior preserves traces of horizontal lines. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Myc.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Fragments “of [a] large pithos. Legs of cooking pots. Lots of kylikes” (1952 Sherd Lot 44: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

**STRATUM p12/STRATUM r13**
In the southwestern corner of the quadrant:

**POTTERY**

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Small lot. Frags of fused pots” (1952 Sherd Lot 47: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

**STRATUM r13**
**DEPTH:** ca. -0.25 m. to floor

1952 SHERD LOTS: 47, 50

**METAL**

Catalogued:
**M-51:** Splinters of gold
PLATE 4
CM Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. 7777.
Found just above the floor.
Three tiny bits of gold sheet/leaf.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 99.
Publ. PN I, p. 75 (identified as “three tiny splinters [of gold]” found in the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule).

*M-52: Fragment of gold plate
“Fragment of thin [gold] plate, 0.35 m. above the floor” in the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 75.

*M-53: Fragments of bronze
“Seven thin flat tiny pieces, 0.40 m. above floor” of the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 75.

M-54: Large lump of bronze and iron
Found in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule on the floor 0.25 m. above the floor.
Large fragment, ca. 0.08 m. x 0.05 m., of fused sheets of bronze and iron.
Identified in the field and published as only bronze.
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 88.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a (identified as the “large shapeless lump [of bronze], apparently from a round thin flat objects that had been folded over” found in the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule.

IVORY

Catalogued:
*I-2: Fragment of burnt ivory
“Small burnt fragment [of ivory], 0.30 m. above floor” found in the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 76.

In the southwestern half of the quadrant, on floor and just above:

KYANOS

Catalogued:
*K-2: Bits of kyanos
CM Room 3, under Case 20. Mus. Inv. 2240.
Found ca. 0.20 m. above the floor.
Ca. 6 small, amorphous pieces of blue paste/frit.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a (identified as the “bits of kyanos” found ca. 0.20 m. above the floor in the SW Quadrant of the Vestibule).

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Bits of plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 50: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).
POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-245: Handleless/conical cup (MRT 11; FS 204)  PLATE 25
1952 Sherd Lot 50.
Slightly incurving, lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIB1
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-246: Standard kylix, monochrome  PLATE 79
1952 Sherd Lot 50.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.18 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 6/4 (light reddish brown), very hard. Exterior and interior coated with 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) monochrome slip. Argive import?
Date: LH IIIA2
From the same vessel as: P-232.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-247: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)  PLATE 15
1952 Sherd Lot 50.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-248: Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g)  PLATE 10
1952 Sherd Lot 50.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-249: Closed vessel – shape indeterminate  PLATE 80
1952 Sherd Lot 50.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

Associated, Not Catalogued:

“Coarse pithoi and the like” (1952 Sherd Lot 50: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).
SE Quadrant of the Vestibule: Finds

**STRATUM p13**
DEPTH: surface to ca. -0.25 m.

METAL

*Catalogued:*

*M-55:* Fragments of bronze

“Nine small thin flat pieces [of bronze] from surface soil” in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

**STRATUM r14**
DEPTH: ca. -0.25 m. to floor

**1952 SHERD LOTS: 45**

METAL

*Catalogued:*

*M-56:* Gold brooch?

Found 0.30 m. above the floor, near the SE wall.
Small gold brooch (?) in the shape of a ewer. H. 0.048 m., max. W. 0.023 m., W. at neck 0.011 m. Vessel has an ovoid body, high neck, and angled beak spout. Fluted decoration with blue (kyanos?) inlay.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, p. 94.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 75, fig. 273, no. 20 (identified as the “brooch in form of a ewer” found in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule).

*M-57:* Fragment of bronze

“Large thin curved piece, possibly from a blade” found 0.75 m. above floor in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 94-95.
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

*M-58:* Fragment of bronze

“One thin flat bent piece” found near the lower part of the SE wall in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Field Ref. GEM 1952, pp. 94-95
Publ. *PN* I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*

“Tiny splinters of gold” found near the center of the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule (GEM 1952, p. 99).

433
STONE

Catalogued:
*S-12: Pieces of quartz
“Three pieces of quartz, near bottom of southeast wall” found in the SE Quadrant of the
Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-250: Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 30 or 19) PLATE 21
1952 Pottery Lot 45.
Two non-joining, convex body sherds. From a single vessel.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and
decorated with a pendant scale pattern (FM 70) with no filler motifs. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray)
paint.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
Cf. PN I, fig. 377 nos. 406-407 from Oil Magazine 32; Mountjoy 1986, fig. 40.2.
From same vessel as: P-28, P-190, P-269, and P-282. May also go with: P-124, P-251, P-257,
and/or P-372.
NB: Pen number on sherds says Room 6, but pencil lot numbers are for Room 5.

P-251: Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 30 or 19)? PLATE 80
1952 Sherd Lot 45.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). Exterior coated with 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and
decorated with two horizontal lines (one thick and one thin) and a scalloped line that might be
the edge of a scale pattern (FM 70)? 10YR 3/3 (dark brown) paint.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
Perhaps from same vessel as: P-124, P-257, and/or P-372. Also may go with: P-28, P-190, P-
250, P-269, and/or P-282.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-252: Kylix? PLATE 80
1952 Sherd Lot 45.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown), very hard. Exterior coated with 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow)
slip and decorated with part of a running (?) spiral (FM 46). 2.5YR 5/6 (red) lustrous paint.
Argive import?
Date: LH IIIA-IIIB
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 5.

P-253: Standard/large kylix (MRT 29c-g) PLATE 15
1952 Sherd Lot 45.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Coarse[wares]” (1952 Sherd Lot 45: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

STRATUM r13/STRATUM r14
DEPTH: -0.20 m. to floor (defining the doorway between the Vestibule and the Portico)

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 49 |

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Few pieces of plaster” (1952 Sherd Lot 49: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:

STRATUM b13
DEPTH: floor surface to -0.23 m. below the floor
No finds recorded.

UNKNOWN STRATA IN THE SE QUADRANT
DEPTH: unknown.

IVORY

Catalogued:
*I-3: Pieces of ivory
“One fragment [of ivory] burned black and a piece of ivory or bone” found in the SE Quadrant of the Vestibule.
Publ. PN I, p. 76, fig. 268a.

Vestibule Finds with Unknown Contexts

As in the Throne Room, in the Vestibule there are various artifacts associated with the room that preserve no clear indication of their original find spots. As in the case of the Throne
Room, such artifacts are on display and in storage in apothekes and some can be matched with finds listed under the heading “Associated, Not Catalogued,” above.

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

**M-59:** Fragments of gold

Three fragments, two thin and flat and one hollow “drop.”
Labeled as coming generally from the “Vestibule.”
May include the catalogued, un-stratified thin piece of gold “plate” (*M-52*) from stratum **r13** in the SW Quadrant.

**M-60:** Fragments of silver

*CM* Room 3, under Case 30.
Labeled as coming generally from the “Portico and Vestibule.”
Five thin pieces of silver, 3 with ridging, possibly belonging to vessel rims.
May include the single piece of catalogued silver (*M-47*) from stratum **r12** in the NE Quadrant.

**M-61:** Fragments of bronze and iron

Labeled as coming generally from the “Vestibule.”
Ca. 4 small pieces, mostly flat. All heavily corroded.
May include up to four of the catalogued fragments of bronze from strata **p13** and **r14** in the SE Quadrant (*M-55, M-57, and M-58*); stratum **r12** in the NE Quadrant (*M-49 and M-50*); stratum **p10** in the NW Quadrant (*M-45*); and/or stratum **r13** in the SW Quadrant (*M-53*).

**M-62:** Fragments of bronze

Labeled as coming generally from the “Vestibule.”
Ca. 25 pieces of bronze sheet.
Amorphous and badly corroded pieces of thin bronze sheet.
Likely includes many of the catalogued fragments of bronze from strata **p13** and **r14** in the SE Quadrant (*M-55, M-57, and M-58*); stratum **r12** in the NE Quadrant (*M-49 and M-50*); stratum **p10** in the NW Quadrant (*M-45*); and/or stratum **r13** in the SW Quadrant (*M-53*).

**IVORY**

*Catalogued:*

**I-4:** Fragments of ivory

Ca. 6 fragments of ivory (or bone). 4 blackened, 2 grayish white. Largest blackened fragment has a rectangular shape, and appears to have been worked, perhaps as furniture inlay?
Likely includes one or more of the catalogued fragments of ivory from stratum **r12** in the NE Quadrant (*I-1*) and from stratum **r13** in the SW Quadrant (*I-2*), and/or the catalogued, un-stratified fragments (*I-3*) from the SE Quadrant.
POTTERY

Catalogued:

P-254: Belly-handled amphora (*FS 58*)
Ca. ½ of a horizontal loop handle and small bit of attached convex body.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a ring and ca. three splashes.
2.5YR 4/6 (red) paint.
Date: MH III-LH I
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 196, no. 1 (from Tholos IV) and RN 420.

P-255: Squat jug (*FS 87*)
Flaring rim sherd with attached concave neck.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white). D. est. 0.06 m. Exterior decorated with a thin horizontal line at the base of the neck. 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint. Small trace of an indeterminate motif preserved on the upper body.
Date: LH I-II

P-256: Alabastron?
Tall everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body.
Date: LH IIA-IIIA?

P-257: Large piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 30 or 19*)
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior decorated with a thick horizontal band, flanked by two thin lines and the upper part of a scale pattern. 10YR 4/2 (dark grayish brown) paint.
Date: LH IIIB-IIIA1
Perhaps from same vessel as: P-124, P-257, and/or P-372. Also may go with: P-28, P-190, P-250, P-269, and/or P-282.

P-258: Large tankard/mug (*FS 225*)?
Plain vertical body sherd.
Fine fabric (Group 1). Exterior decorated with a vertical line adjacent to part of a spiral. 10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint.
Date: LH IIIA1

P-259: Shallow cup or bowl?
Convex body sherd, dramatically thickened at one end.
Fine fabric, 10YR 6/3 (pale brown). Exterior decorated with parts of three concentric circles, 2 thin and one thicker. 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint.
Date: LH IIIA?

P-260: Stirrup jar?
Convex shoulder sherd.
Date: LH IIIA2-LH IIIB1

**P-261:** Large stirrup jar
Convex body sherd.
Date: LH IIIB

**P-262:** Large stirrup jar
Thick (ca. 0.01 m.) convex body sherd.
Coarse fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). “Oatmeal ware.” Exterior coated with 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with three parallel horizontal bands. 10YR 5/2 (grayish brown) paint. Interior, un-slipped clay surface has “star-shaped” cracks.
Date: LH IIIB

**P-263:** Jar/jug
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/1 (light gray). Exterior decorated with five (?) horizontal bands, 1 thick and four thin. 10YR 4/2 (dark grayish brown) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: Myc.

**P-264:** Small jug?
Convex body sherd, very thin.
Date: Myc.

**P-265:** Jar/jug
Convex shoulder sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a foliate band (*FM 64*) above a thin horizontal line and thicker band. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint, very well preserved.
Date: MG-LG

*Excavation of the Portico (1952)*

*Timeline and Method:*

Excavations in the megaron’s Portico commenced on June 28, 1952. While hunting for the Vestibule’s southern doorway, Blegen opened a new trench, Trench T, directly on top and
south of the Vestibule’s SE wall. In size, Trench T measured roughly 11.00 m. long and 1.00 m. wide (Figure A1.27). After roughly a week, Blegen handed over excavation of the Portico to Eugene Vanderpool on July 3, and slight changes were again made to the directional designations employed on site. Starting on July 3, not just the quadrants but also the walls of the megaron were labeled according to the new alignment scheme (described above) that Mylonas developed for the excavation of the Vestibule. This meant that the walls originally labeled: “northwest, southwest, northeast, and southeast” were subsequently referred to as the “north, south, east, and west” walls respectively. For the sake of clarity, the more accurate terms “northwest, southwest, northeast, and southeast walls” are preserved here.

In contrast to the practices of Mylonas and Blegen in the Throne Room and Vestibule, Vanderpool did not divide the area around Trench T into quadrants, but rather explored the trench as a complete unit, moving from the center out to the edges, before systematically opening new trenches to the southeast and northeast (see Figure A1.27). The first of these new trenches, opened on July 4, was “Trench T, South.” Located southeast of and parallel to Trench T, the new trench measured 1.50 m. wide and ca. 4.00 m. long. On July 7, Vanderpool opened another trench to the southeast that he termed: “Trench T, Extension.” This trench ran alongside the southeastern edge of Trench T, South and also included a “dog leg” between the room’s NE wall and the northeastern edges of Trenches T and T, South. At its southern edge, Trench T, Extension measured 1.50 m. wide. Work in all three of these trenches concluded on July 18.

---

1077 GEM 1952, pp. 94-95.
1078 In addition to work in the Portico and Vestibule, Vanderpool also resumed work in the Throne Room, where he documented a number of the painted hearth and floor decorations. The results of this work (which did not produce any notable discoveries in terms of stratigraphy or finds) are presented in Chapter 4.
1079 GEM 1952, p. 105.
1080 GEM 1952, p. 118.
1081 GEM 1952, p. 118.
when the Portico, as well as the other rooms of the megaron, were backfilled at the end of the 1952 campaign.\textsuperscript{1082}

\textit{Trench T: Stratigraphy}

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.26

In Trench T, Blegen immediately came down on a deposit with a different character than that observed in the Throne Room and Vestibule. After removing the upper layer of plowed soil (Th. ca. 0.20 m.) (p\textsuperscript{14}), the earth became hard, with reddish-yellow color, and an unusual dry ashy and sandy” texture (r\textsuperscript{15}), reaching a depth of -0.85 m.\textsuperscript{1083} Below this level, the earth turned yellowish with gray ash (y\textsuperscript{6}).\textsuperscript{1084} In front of northern spur of the room’s NW wall, parts of the dry ashy red debris became softer and darker, which Vanderpool interpreted as marking the line of a pillaged wall.\textsuperscript{1085}

\textit{Trench T: Finds}

\textbf{STRATUM p\textsuperscript{14}/STRATUM r\textsuperscript{15}}

\textbf{DEPTH}: surface to -0.60 m.

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 51, 57, 58 |

\textbf{POTTERY}

\textit{Associated, Not Catalogued:}

\textbf{STRATUM p\textsuperscript{14}/STRATUM r\textsuperscript{15}/STRATUM y\textsuperscript{6}}

\textbf{ALL DEPTHS}: Cleaning of the eastern portion of the NW wall

\textsuperscript{1082} GEM 1952, p. 141.
\textsuperscript{1083} GEM 1952, pp. 97, 99.
\textsuperscript{1084} GEM 1952, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{1085} GEM 1952, p. 101.
PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Some small bits of plaster with traces of painted decoration” (GEM 1952, p. 95).

“Many small frags of plaster, red paint” 1952 Sherd Lot 57: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 9).

POTTERY

Associated, Not Catalogued:

STRATUM p14/STRATUM r15/STRATUM y6
ALL DEPTHS: Cleaning of the western portion of the NW wall

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-266: Standard kylix or dipper (MRT 29c or 25) PLATE 11
1952 Sherd Lot 58.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.15-0.17 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-267: Kylix PLATE 85
1952 Sherd Lot 58.
Complete domed foot and lower stem. D. foot 0.052 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

STRATUM r15/STRATUM y6
DEPTH: -0.60 m. to -1.20 m.

1952 SHERD LOTS: 52

METAL

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Small frag. of bronze” found at a depth of -0.60 m. in the center of Trench T (GEM 1952, p. 97).

PLASTER

Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Plaster frags” (1952 Sherd Lot 52: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

POTTERY

**Associated, Not Catalogued:**
“Large lot [of sherds], more than half coarse. Nondescript. Much burning. Kylikes, handleless cups” (1952 Sherd Lot 52: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 8).

Trench T, South: Stratigraphy

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.26

In Trench T, South, the stratigraphy was even more unusual than it had been in Trench T. Immediately below the plowed layer \( (p15) \), Vanderpool uncovered a stratum of black stony earth \( (b14) \) localized “in a large depression as much as -0.50m deep near the center of the trench but petering out towards the ends and also towards the N[orth].”\(^{1086}\) Beneath this black debris was a layer of “firm light brown” earth \( (bn1) \) that reached down to the floor.\(^{1087}\) Surrounding the black earth to the northeast, northwest, and southwest and underlying the light brown earth to the northwest was a layer of ashy “rubble” \( (r16) \), which Vanderpool interpreted as a robbing trench for the SW wall of the room.\(^{1088}\) Around the perimeter of the trench, the ashy rubble layer appeared directly underneath the plowed earth.

Trench T, South: Finds

**STRATUM p15/STRATUM b14**

**DEPTH:** surface to -0.50 m. (“upper fill” in the east end of the trench)

| 1952 SHERD lots: 53, 54 |

POTTERY

\(^{1086}\) GEM 1952, p. 105; Portico excavation summary, Cincinnati Pylos Archives, p. 2.
\(^{1087}\) GEM 1952, p. 105.
\(^{1088}\) GEM 1952, p. 111.
Catalogued:

**P-268:** Shallow Cup (*FS 218?)*)

1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex body. D. est. 0.11 m.
10YR 3/2 (very dark grayish brown) paint.
Date: LH IIA?
May go with: *P-33.*
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-269:** Piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 17*)

1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Body sherd with lower part of a slightly concave neck and upper part of a convex body. D. neck 0.09 m.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray). Neck exterior coated with (10YR 4/1 dark gray) monochrome slip and edged by a raised ring. Body exterior decorated with the upper part of a pendent scale (*FM 70*) pattern in the same paint. Interior rim band with uneven edge reaching to base of neck. All surfaces lightly burnt.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
From same vessel as: *P-28, P-190, P-250,* and *P-282.* May also go with: *P-124, P-251, P-257,* and/or *P-372.*
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-270:** Standard/large kylix (*MRT 29c-g*)

1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.18-0.26 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-271:** Deep bowl?

1952 Sherd Lot 53.
2/3 complete ring base with convex underside and raised button on interior. D. 0.058 m.
Date: LH IIIB-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-272:** Flat-bottomed cup

1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.12 m.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (*Nichoria* III, pp. 80, 100-101, 150-151, 174).
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-273**: Deep bowl/krateriskos
1952 Sherd Lot 53.
High conical foot sherd. D. 0.07 m.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. DA II-III Type B deep bowl with exterior incisions and interior button (*Nichoria* III, pp. 160, 191 (P1122)).
Joins to: **P-326**.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-274**: Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Gently flared rim sherd with attached carinated body. D. 0.12 m.
Date: DA III
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA III “Shape 2” s-profile cup (e.g., *Nichoria* III p. 174, P1509).
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-275**: Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.10 m.
Date: DA III
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA III “Shape 2” s-profile cup (e.g., *Nichoria* III p. 174, P1509).
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-276**: Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 53.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**STRATUM p15/STRATUM b14/STRATUM r16**
**DEPTH**: surface to -0.50 m. ("upper fill" in the west end of the trench)
POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-277:** Shallow Cup (FS 219) PLATE 88
1952 Sherd Lot 54.
Convex lower body sherd with tiny bit of ring base.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown), very hard-fired. Exterior coated in 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with concentric circles below a papyrus pattern (FM 11) with twin stems. Trace of paint preserved on resting surface of ring base. Very lustrous 2.5YR 3/6 (dark red) paint. Argive import?
Date: LH IIIA
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-278:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a, 12, 18-19, or 23) PLATE 13
1952 Sherd Lot 54.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.12 m.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Undecorated. Lightly burnt at one corner.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**STRATUM bn1**
DEPTH: -0.50 m. to floor ( “lower fill” in the east end of the trench)

| 1952 SHERD LOTS: 55, 56 |

---

POTTERY

Catalogued:

**P-279:** Piriform jar? PLATE 89
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated in 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and painted with a thin ripple pattern (FM 78) contained by a thin horizontal register line. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint. Buff slip conceals the pink color of clay fabric.
Date: LH I-IIA
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-280:** Alabastron? PLATE 89
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd.
Date: LH IIA

**P-281:** Small jar/jug PLATE 89
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Nearly complete torus base. D. est. 0.05 m.
Date: LH IIA-IIIA
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-282:** Large piriform jar (*MRT 53; FS 30 or 19*)
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in a 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with a pendant scale pattern (*FM 70*) with no filler motifs. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1
Cf. *PN I*, fig. 377 nos. 406-407 from Oil Magazine 32; Mountjoy 1986, fig. 40.2.
From same vessel as: **P-28**, **P-190**, **P-250**, and **P-269**. May also go with: **P-124**, **P-251**, **P-257**, and/or **P-372**.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-283:** Krater (*FS 7*)
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Part of a vertical strap handle.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a ladder design with horizontal bars. 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: LH IIIA
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.
Cf. Mountjoy 1986, p. 61, fig. 70 (with diagonal barred ladder).

**P-284:** Small cup or dipper (*MRT 12-13, 18 or 23*)
PLATE 49
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Everted rim sherd. Very hard-fired. D. est. in range 0.12-0.13 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-285:** Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd with thickened edge.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior coated in 2.5Y 8/2 (pale yellow) slip and decorated with five thin horizontal bands below a solid painted area. 10YR 5/4 (yellowish brown) paint. All surfaces burnt.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB1?
Likely from the same vessel as: **P-298**.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-286:** Carinated skyphos with biconical body
PLATE 90
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd with base of attachment for a horizontal loop handle.
Date: DA III
Cf. PN I pl. 374, no. 617; Coulson 1986 p. 68, no. 359.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-287:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a horizontal band. 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-288:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
PLATE 91
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-289:** Large bowl/krater
PLATE 71
1952 Sherd Lot 55.
Four non-joining, convex body sherds. Likely from a single vessel.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/4 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky monochrome slip ranging from 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) to 2.5YR 4/6 (red).
Date: Indeterminate
Cf. PN I, fig. 347, no. 618.
NB: Pen number on sherds says Room 6, but pencil lot numbers are for Room 4.

Associated, Not Catalogued:

**STRATUM bn1/STRATUM r16**
DEPTH: -0.50 to floor (“lower fill” in the west end of the trench)

**POTTERY**

Associated, Not Catalogued:
Trench T, Extension: Stratigraphy

Plan: see Figure A1.7
Relationship matrix: see Figure A1.26

In Trench T, Extension, immediately underneath the plowed soil (p16) (Th. 0.10-0.15 m.) Vanderpool uncovered a deep stratum of black stony earth (b15) identical to that found in Trench T, South. This black deposit sloped sharply downward from northwest to southeast, reaching in a height of ca. 0.20 m. above the floor at the trench’s southeastern edge (Figure A1.28). Below the black layer was a deposit of firm light brown (bn2) resting on the floor.1089 Along the sides of the black earth and under the plowed earth were deposits of ash and rubble (r17 and r18). These deposits were banked up near the Portico’s NE and SW walls, and had a maximum depth of ca. -0.80 m. and widths between 1.00 m. and 2.00 m.1090

Trench T, Extension: Finds

STRATUM p16
DEPTH: surface to -0.15 m.
No finds recorded.

From the east end of the trench:

STRATUM p16/STRATUM b15*/STRATUM r18/STRATUM bn2
DEPTH: surface to floor (black stony + ash/red rubble + light brown) but chiefly black stony (STRATUM b15) = ca. -0.15 m. to -1.00 m.

1952 SHERD LOTS: 59

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-290: Kantharos
1952 Sherd Lot 59.

PLATE 91

1089 GEM 1952, p. 121. The color of this earth is not given on this page. It is described here as “light brown” based on Vanderpool’s description of the adjacent deposit in Trench T, South (GEM 1952, p. 105) and on Blegen and Rawson’s description of the entire Portico deposit (i.e., “firm light-brown”) in PN1, p. 70. Notably, the color of the stratum is described as “light yellow” in the profile of Trench T, Extension drawn on GEM p. 127 (see Figure A1.25).
1090 GEM 1952, p. 126, and section drawing on p. 127.
Lower part of a vertical strap handle with attached convex body. Carination at preserved upper edge of handle.
Date: MH I-II

**P-291:** Open vessel – shape indeterminate

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 3/0 (very dark gray), with red core and burnished surfaces. “MH Burnished Ware.” Very dark and hard fired. Perhaps imported “Black Minyan” ware?
Date: MH

**P-292:** Squat jug

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex shoulder sherd, from just below rim. Very thin wall.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a horizontal band and a running spiral (*FM 46.54*) motif. 7.5YR 3/2 (dark brown) paint.
Date: LH I-II

**P-293:** Vapheio cup, Type III (*FS 224*)

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Flaring rim sherd. D. inestimable.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a rim band (Th. 0.012 m.) and ripple lines (*FM 78*). Interior coated with 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a rim band. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint.
Date: LH I-II
Cf. *PN III*, fig. 249, no. 19.

**P-294:** Goblet

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Exterior and interior coated with 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIB
May go with: **P-377**, from Court 3.

**P-295:** Jar/jug

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining convex shoulder sherds from near base of neck. 1 vessel.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/2 (white). Juncture of shoulder and neck ringed by two deep horizontal grooves making three raised ridges.
Date: LH IIB-IIIA1?

**P-296:** Jar/jug

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex shoulder sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/2 (pinkish white). Exterior coated in 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with three parallel horizontal bands of equal thickness. 2.5YR 4/8 (red) paint.
Date: LH IIA-IIIA1?

P-297: Tiny cup/mug (FS 225)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two joining sherds of a plain vertical rim. D. est. 0.08 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a rim band above parts of two parallel horizontal bands. Interior rim band. 10YR 2/2 (very dark brown) paint.
Date: LH IIIA1?

P-298: Jar/jug
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex lower body sherd. Th. 0.009 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with a wide solid area (horizontal band?) above thin horizontal lines. 7.5YR 2/0 (black) paint.
Date: LH IIIA2-IIIB1?
 Likely from the same vessel as: P-285.

P-299: Miniature kylix (MRT 26)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Lipless rim sherd with attached convex upper body and base of a vertical strap handle. D. est. 0.07 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-300: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-301: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

P-302: Small kylix, cup, or dipper (MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23)
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/1 (white), with a greenish hue. Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
**P-303:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Gently everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-304:** Standard kylix (*MRT 29c*)

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd. D. est. 0.18 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-305:** Standard kylix (*MRT 29c*)

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.16 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/4 (pink). Undecorated
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-306:** Kylix

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Small fragment of a slightly convex disk foot. D. est. 0.06 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-307:** Kylix

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Small fragment of a slightly convex disk foot. D. est. 0.06 m.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray), with a greenish hue. Undecorated.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-308:** Kylix

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Small fragment of a slightly convex disk foot. D. est. 0.07 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-309:** Kylikes/cups

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Three non-joining fragments of vertical strap handles with attached bits of convex bowl.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-310:** Kylix/cup or bowl

1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. inestimable.

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-311:** Kylix(kes), cup(s), or bowl(s) PLATE 97
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining, everted rim sherds. D. inestimable.

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-312:** Shallow angular bowl (*MRT 4; FS 295*)? PLATE 97
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly convex base sherd with attached flaring lower body. D. 0.07 m.

Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-313:** Late Palace Style jar/pithos (*MRT 54a*) PLATES 97, 117
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd, Th. ca. 0.025 m.
Interior fabric shows evenly spaced ovoid depressions indicative of coil-joint strengthening.
Exterior and interior coated with 5Y 7/3 (pale yellow) slip; exterior painted with a zigzag design (*FM 61*) with fringe. Kytheran import?

Date: LH IIIB
Likely goes with: **P-378**.

**P-314:** Piriform jar (*FS 39*)? PLATE 98
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex shoulder sherd.

Date: LH IIIB?

**P-315:** Deep bowl, Group B (*MRT 60; FS 284*) PLATE 98
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two joining sherds constituting a gently flaring rim with attached concave to convex upper body preserving ca. ½ of the attachment for one end of a horizontal loop handle. D. est. 0.24 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with a 0.03 m. rim band. Around the handle is a splash and below the rim band is the start of a diagonal line – perhaps part of a running spiral (*FS 46*)? 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Interior coated with 2.5YR 5/8 (red) monochrome slip.

Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: **P-317, P-318+P-374** (from Court 3), **P-319, P-320**, and/or **P-322**.

**P-316:** Deep bowl, Group B (*MRT 60; FS 284*) PLATE 98
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Gently flaring rim sherd with attached slightly concave upper body and scrap of attachment for a horizontal loop handle. D. est. 0.18 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with a 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with a 0.035 m. deep rim band and start of a handle splash. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Interior originally monochrome but slip now worn away.
Date: LH IIIB2
Joins to: P-373, from Court 3. Likely from same vessel as: P-321.

**P-317:** Deep bowl(s), Group B (MRT 60; FS 284)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining, gently flaring rim sherds, with attached slightly concave upper bodies. D. est. 0.18 m.
Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-318+P-374 (from Court 3), P-319, P-320, and/or P-322. If does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (also LH IIIB2).

**P-318:** Deep bowl, Group B (MRT 60; FS 284)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly convex body sherd, from just below rim.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with a 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with a deep rim band. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Interior coated in 2.5YR 6/8 (dark red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIB2
Joins to: P-374, from Court 3. Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-317, P-319, P-320, and/or P-322. If does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (also LH IIIB2).

**P-319:** Deep bowl, Group B (MRT 60; FS 284)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly concave body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with a 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with the lower edge of a rim band. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Interior coated in very worn 2.5YR 6/8 (dark red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-317, P-318+P-374 (from Court 3), P-320, and/or P-322. If does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (also LH IIIB2).

**P-320:** Deep bowl(s), Group B (MRT 60; FS 284)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining, concave lower body sherds.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exteriors coated with a 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and interiors coated with worn 2.5YR 5/8 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-317, P-318+P-374 (from Court 3), P-319, and/or P-322. Could alternatively be a Group A deep bowl with monochrome interior (LH IIIC early). Or, if does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (also LH IIIB2).

**P-321:** Deep bowl, Group B (*MRT 60; FS 284*)? PLATE 100
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining, concave body sherds. 1 vessel.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exteriors coated with 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and painted with curved lines of a running spiral (FM 46)? decoration. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Interiors preserve traces of 2.5YR 5/8 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: P-316+P-373 (from Court 3). Could alternatively be a Group A deep bowl with monochrome interior (LH IIIC early).

**P-322:** Deep bowl, Group B (*MRT 60; FS 284*)? PLATE 100
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Date: LH IIIB2
Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-317, P-318+P-374 (from Court 3), P-319, and/or P-320. Could alternatively be a Group A deep bowl with monochrome interior (LH IIIC early). Or, if does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (LH IIIB2).

**P-323:** Deep bowl, monochrome (*MRT 60; FS 284*) PLATE 100
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Gently flaring rim with attached concave to convex upper body.
Date: LH IIIB-IIIC early

**P-324a:** Cup/kylix? PLATE 101
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.11 m. Very thin wall.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/2 (pinkish white). Exterior coated in 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with a 0.02 m. rim band. 2.5YR 4/8 (red) paint. Possible interior rim band indicated by continuation of slip.
Date: Myc.

**P-324b:** Cup/kylix? PLATE 101
Gently everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). D. est. 0.10 m.
Exterior and interior coated with 2.5YR 4/6 (red) monochrome slip.
Date: Myc.

**P-325:** Cup/kylix?  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Sharply everted rim sherd. D. inestimable.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown). Undecorated.  
Date: Myc.

**P-326:** Deep bowl/krateriskos  
PLATES 87, 102  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Two joining sherds constituting a base with attached high conical foot (full profile). D. 0.07 m.  
Date: DA II-III  
Cf. DA II-III Type B deep bowl with exterior incisions and interior button (*Nichoria* III, pp. 191 and 160 (P1122)).  
Joins to: **P-273**.

**P-327:** Skyphos  
PLATE 103  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Complete horizontal loop handle with small bit of convex body attached at one end.  
Date: DA II-III  
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 617.

**P-328:** Flat-bottomed cup(s) or skyphos(i)?  
PLATE 103  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Two non-joining, everted rims with attached convex upper bodies. D. inestimable.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors and interiors coated with 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip.  
Date: DA II-III  
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (*Nichoria* III, pp. 80, 100-101, 150-151, 174).

**P-329:** Flat-bottomed cup(s)  
PLATE 103  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Six non-joining, gently everted rim sherds with attached convex upper bodies. D. not taken.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors and interiors coated with streaky 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip.  
Date: DA II-III  
Cf. *PN* I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (*Nichoria* III, pp. 80, 100-101, 150-151, 174).

**P-330:** Flat-bottomed cup(s)  
PLATE 103
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Three gently everted rim sherds, two joining. D. est. 0.07 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 10YR 4/1
(dark gray) monochrome slip. Interior slip has a metallic/oily sheen.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. PN I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (Nichoria III, pp. 80,
100-101, 150-151, 174).

P-331: Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Complete slightly concave base with attached convex lower body. Clear wheel marks on interior.
D. 0.045 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 10YR 4/1
(dark gray) monochrome slip. Underside reserved but with drips of slip. Interior slip has a
metallic/oily sheen.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. PN I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (Nichoria III, pp. 80,
100-101, 150-151, 174).

P-332: Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly concave base sherd with attached convex lower body. D. est. 0.055 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 7.4YR 3/0 (very dark
gray) monochrome slip. Underside reserved.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. PN I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (Nichoria III, pp. 80,
100-101, 150-151, 174).

P-333: Flat-bottomed cups
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Three non-joining, slightly concave base sherds with attached convex lower bodies. D. est. 0.045
m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors and interiors coated with streaky 10YR 4/1
(dark gray) monochrome slip. Undersides reserved but with drips of slip.
Date: DA II-III
Cf. PN I, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA II and III s-profile cups (Nichoria III, pp. 80,
100-101, 150-151, 174).

P-334: Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Three fragments, two joining, of vertical strap handles. W. ca. 0.015 m. Elliptical cross-section.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors and interiors coated with streaky 10YR 4/1
(dark gray) monochrome slip. Shallowly grooved exteriors. Short (L. est. 0.01 m.), irregular
diagonal “nick” on the lower exteriors – perhaps accidental, or perhaps primitive potters’ marks?
Date: DA II-III
Cf. *PN I*, fig. 347, nos. 616, 982 (for grooving); DA II or III s-profile cup handle “Type A” (*Nichoria* III, pp. 80, 100-101, 150-151, 174).

**P-335:** Flat-bottomed cup

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Two joining fragments constituting a complete vertical strap handle. Squared cross-section.

Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip.

Date: DA II-III

Cf. *PN I*, fig. 347, nos. 615, 982; DA II or III s-profile cup handle “Type B” (*Nichoria* III, pp. 80, 100-101, 150-151, 174).

**P-336:** Flat-bottomed cup(s)?

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Eighteen convex body sherds with attached convex lower bodies, two joining.

Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip.

Date: DA II-III

**P-337:** Flat-bottomed cup(s)?

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Eight non-joining, convex body sherds.

Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors and interiors coated with streaky 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip. Interior slip has a metallic/oily sheen.

Date: DA II-III

**P-338:** Flat-bottomed cup?

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Convex body sherd.

Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior and interior coated in streaky 10YR 3/1 (very dark gray) slip.

Date: DA II-III

**P-339:** Carinated skyphos with biconical body

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Convex body sherd with attached start of a horizontal loop handle.


Date: DA III

Cf. *PN I* pl. 374, no. 617; Coulson 1986 p. 68, no. 359.

**P-340:** Krater

1952 Sherd Lot 59.

Nine everted rim sherds, four and two joining, with attached upper convex body and start of a horizontal loop handle. 1 vessel. D. est. 0.22 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/6 (reddish yellow). Exterior and interior coated with streaky 7.4YR 3/0 (very dark gray) monochrome slip. Exterior incised with three horizontal grooves just below the rim.
Date: DA III
May go with: P-341.

P-341: Krater(s)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Twelve non-joining, convex body sherds, one with start of a horizontal loop handle.
Date: DA III
Cf. DA III Type B krater (Nichoria III, p. 165, no. 1520).
May go with: P-340.

P-342: Oinochoe
PLATES 107, 108
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining trefoil rim sherds. From a single vessel.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray), with a greenish hue. Exteriors and interiors coated with streaky 2.5YR 4/0 (dark gray) monochrome slip. Two grooves below lips of rims.
Date: DA III
Cf. PN I pl. 374, no. 827 (from Court 3); Coulson 1986 p. 68, no. 359; Nichoria III, p. 175 (P1531) and pl. 3-136 (DA III oinochoe “Shape 2”); McDonald 1969-1971, pl. 50j, no. NP72.
Joins to: P-375, from Court 3. From the same vessel as: P-343 and P-344.

P-343: Oinochoe
PLATE 108
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Slightly concave neck sherd.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray), with a greenish hue. Exterior coated with streaky 2.5YR 4/0 (dark gray) monochrome slip. Juncture between the body and the neck marked by three horizontal grooves.
Date: DA III
Cf. PN I pl. 374, no. 827 (from Court 3); Coulson 1986 p. 68, no. 359; Nichoria III, p. 175 (P1531) and pl. 3-136 (DA III oinochoe “Shape 2”); McDonald 1969-1971, pl. 50, no. NP72.
Joins to: P-375, from Court 3. From the same vessel as: P-342 and P-344.

P-344: Oinochoe
PLATE 108
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Seven convex body sherds. 1 vessel.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray), with a greenish hue. Exteriors coated with streaky 2.5YR 4/0 (dark gray) monochrome slip.
Date: DA III
Cf. PN I pl. 374, no. 827 (from Court 3); Coulson 1986 p. 68, no. 359; Nichoria III, p. 175 (P1531) and pl. 3-136 (DA III oinochoe “Shape 2”); McDonald 1969-1971, pl. 50j, no. NP72.
From the same vessel as: P-342+P-375+P-343, and P-344.
**P-345:** Flat-bottomed cup
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Very thin everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. 0.06 m.
Date: DA III
Cf. *PN I*, fig. 347, no. 616 (from Court 42); DA III s-profile cups (Nichoria III, pp. 100-101, 174).

**P-346:** Jar(s)/jug(s) (all sherds)
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Six non-joining, convex body sherds.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exteriors coated with streaky 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) monochrome slip, very worn on some sherds.
Date: DA?

**P-347:** Jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Slip very dark and worn in a stripe pattern.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-348:** Small jar/jug?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with parts of two parallel horizontal bands. 10YR 2/1 (black) paint.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-349:** Small cup(s)?
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Two non-joining, flat base sherds. D. est. 0.04 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink), very soft and powdery. Undecorated.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-350:** Open vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Incurving rim sherd. D. inestimable.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-351:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-352**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink), very soft and powdery. Undecorated.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-353**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Ca. 1/5 of the ring of a ring base. D. est. 0.06 m.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-354**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink), very soft and powdery. Undecorated.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-355**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 10YR 7/3 (very pale brown). Undecorated.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-356**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-357**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Convex body sherd.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?

**P-358**: Shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 59.
Very small fragment of a vertical strap handle.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior incised with two thin vertical lines.
Date: Indeterminate
**P-359:** Shape indeterminate  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Convex body sherd.  
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior incised with two thin horizontal lines.  
Date: Indeterminate

**P-360:** Shape indeterminate  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Convex body sherd.  
Date: Indeterminate

**P-361:** Shape indeterminate  
1952 Sherd Lot 59.  
Convex body sherd.  
Date: Indeterminate

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*  
“Frags of huge pithoi” (1952 Sherd Lot 59: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 3, p. 9).

**From the eastern “dog leg” of the trench:**

**STRATUM p16/r18**  
ALL DEPTHS.  
PLASTER

*Associated, Not Catalogued:*  

**From the west end of the trench:**

**STRATUM p16/STRATUM b15*/ STRATUM r17/ STRATUM bn2**  
DEPTH: surface to floor (plowed earth + black stony + ash/red rubble + light brown) but chiefly black stony (STRATUM b15) = ca. -0.15 m. to -1.00 m.\(^{1091}\)

---

**1952 SHERD LOTS: 60**

**POTTERY**

*Catalogued:*  
**P-362:** Jar?

---

\(^{1091}\) That this lot contains pottery chiefly from the stratum of black stony earth (Stratum b14) is indicated on the label of the storage bag.
1952 Sherd Lot 60.
Convex body sherd.
Date: MH?
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-363:** Shallow angular bowl (*MRT 4; FS 295*)
1952 Sherd Lot 60.
Nearly complete “pinched-out” horizontal strap handle.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**P-364:** Small kylix, cup, or dipper (*MRT 29a-b, 30a, 12-13, 18-19, or 23*)
1952 Sherd Lot 60.
Everted rim sherd with attached convex upper body. D. est. in range: 0.10-0.14 m.
Date: LH IIIA-IIIC early

**P-365:** Closed vessel – shape indeterminate
1952 Sherd Lot 60.
Convex body sherd.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Exterior decorated with parts of two parallel horizontal bands. 2.5YR 5/6 (red) paint.
Date: Myc.
NB: Pen number on sherd says Room 6, but pencil lot number is for Room 4.

**STRATUM bn2**
**DEPTH:** ca. -1.00 m. to -1.10 m. (floor)

**STONE**
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“2 obsidian blades” found in the firm light brown stratum above the floor (GEM 1952, p. 125).

**PLASTER**
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Frag[ment] of painted plaster [with] checkers” found in the firm light brown stratum above the floor (GEM 1952, p. 125).

**CLAY**
Associated, Not Catalogued:
“Fragment of [a Linear B] tablet (end only, from a long narrow one: ends of two horizontal lines, but no letters)” found in the firm light brown stratum above the floor (GEM 1952, p. 125).
POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-366: Jar?
Found in the floor deposit in Trench T, Extension.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 8/2 (pinkish white), very hard. Exterior coated in 10YR 8/3 (very pale brown) slip and decorated with an ogival canopy (FM 13.1) with dotted lines. Paint very crisp.
Argive import?
Date: LH IIA
Field ref: 1952 Sherd Lot 65: ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. 13
(identified as the “LH II sherd...from the yellow earth on the floor in front of Prodomos”).
Cf. Peristeria Tholos Tomb 2 Palace Style jar (Lolos 1987, figs. 438, 439, and 442)

P-367: Amphora (MRT 45; FS 69?)
Stored together with tags from Rooms 48 and 5.
Found on the floor in Trench T, Extension, 4.00 m. from the NW wall of the Portico and 1.75 m. from its SW wall – near the Portico’s west column base. Found together with P-368.
17 fragments, constituting a complete rounded, gently flared rim (D. 0.11 m.) with attached concave neck and convex upper shoulder. Upper portion of a thick vertical strap handle attached just below the rim. Second handle missing, but attachment visible on the opposing side of the neck.
Semi-coarse (?) fabric, 10YR 5/1 (light gray).
Date: LH IIIB?
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 126 (b/w photo P.52.53 FIG.); ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. 7.

P-368: Coarse vessel
Stored together with tags from Rooms 48 and 5.
Found on the floor in Trench T, Extension, 4.00 m. from the NW wall of the Portico and 1.75 m. from its SW wall – near the Portico’s west column base. Found together with P-367.
Ca. 80 fragments, some joining, including a rounded rim sherd, flat base, and parts of two vertical loop handles.
Semi-coarse fabric, 10YR 5/1 (light gray). All fragments badly burnt and/or vitrified.
Date: Indeterminate – Myc.?
Field ref. GEM 1952, p. 126 (b/w photo P.52.53 FIG.); ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. 7.
Publ. PN I, p. 71.

Portico Finds with Unknown Contexts:

As in the Throne Room and Vestibule, in the Portico there are artifacts associated with the room that preserve no clear indication of their original find spot. In the case of the Portico,
however, such objects are more limited, and many are attested in the final publication. Only one can be matched with objects described under the heading “Associated, Not Catalogued,” above.

**METAL**

*Catalogued:*

* **M-63**: Fragments of silver
  “Five thin fragments [of silver].”
  Described as coming generally from the Portico.
  Publ. *PN I*, p. 70.

* **M-64**: Bronze knife
  Mus. Nos. *CM* 2801 and *NM* 7796.
  “L. 0.218 m., l. tang 0.043 m., max. w. 0.027 m., w. tang 0.018 m., broken in two pieces but well preserved; slightly curved tapering blade, blunt end; one rivet hole centered at junction of blade and tang, another about midway up tang and two more side by side near end of tang; the latter terminated in two prongs or projections which have crumbled away.”
  Publ. *PN I*, p. 70, fig. 274, no. 5; Hofstra 2000, p. 90 (MX 2801).

* **M-65**: Bronze knife
  *PLATE 5*
  *CM* Room 3, under Case 30. Mus. Inv. 7796.
  Two joined fragments of a knife blade from area “P.2.” L. pres. 0.12 m. Two rivets preserved in place at handle end. All surfaces heavily corroded.
  Publ. *PN I*, p. 71 (identified as “two [fragments of bronze] from a knife” found in the Portico).

* **M-66**: Fragments of bronze
  Thirty-six pieces of bronze, “mostly shapeless, some larger, twisted and bent, some thin and flat; one bit of thin bronze wire; one piece from rim, flat on top and 0.0035 m. wide, of a very small vessel;…one piece with rivet hole, the other with end of rivet.”
  Publ. *PN I*, p. 71 (36 of the 38 listed fragments of bronze from the Portico); Hofstra 2000, p. 92 (citing a segment of the round shaft of a needle - may be the “thin bit of bronze wire”?). Likely includes the associated fragment of bronze from stratum *r15* in Trench T.

**STONE**

*Catalogued:*

**S-13**: Stone lamp or vessel
*PLATE 6*
  Convex body fragment of a vessel, made from porphyritic andesite, with a preserved section of a circular hole. L. pres. 0.06 m., W. pres. 0.045 m., Th. wall 0.015 m. D. hole 0.022 m. Possible traces of burning on exterior. Likely imported from Egypt, perhaps by way of Crete, where the hole was added to make the shape more “Minoan.” Two fragments of the same vase found in Court 3 (*PN I*, p. 71, fig. 268c) and in 1939 Trench I (Hofstra 2000, p. 202).
  Date: Indeterminate.
S-14: Stone lamp
CM Room 3, under Case 22. Mus. Inv. 2229a.
Squared edge of a disk-shaped lamp bowl. Pale gray talc, identified as schist on the excavation tag. Th. ca. 0.045 m., D. est. 0.22 m. Warren 1969 Type 24 II A1. Outer edge of the disk decorated with a few “S” shaped grooves. Decoration unfinished. Label on storage box refers to a bowl found “South of the Portico” suggesting the find might alternatively come from Court 3. Published erroneously as belonging to the same lamp as S-15.
Date: Indeterminate.
Publ. PN I, p. 71, fig. 269, no. 8; Warren 1969, p. 276; Hofstra 2000, pp. 197-198.

S-15: Stone lamp
CM Room 3, under Case 22. Mus. Inv. 2229b.
Beveled edge of an “ashtray” shaped lamp bowl with part of a pendent handle. Pinkish stone. D. est. 0.16 m.
Outer edge of the disk decorated with horizontal grooves. Label on storage box refers to a bowl found “South of the Portico” suggesting the find might alternatively come from Court 3. Published erroneously as belonging to the same lamp as S-14.
Date: Indeterminate.

IVORY

Catalogued:
*I-5: Fragments of ivory
“Seven bits” of ivory.
Publ. PN I, p. 71.

KYANOS

Catalogued:
*K-3: Fragment of kyanos
“Fragment of kyanos.”
Publ. PN I, p. 71.

Finds Not from the Megaron but with Direct Connections to Finds Listed Above

POTTERY

Catalogued:
P-369: Bovid figure
PLATES 36, 37, 38
Found in the “black earth” in Court 3.
Two joined fragments constituting ca. ½ of the rear end and part of the attached side (flank) of a bovid with a wheel-made cylindrical body. D. 0.17 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown). Relatively hard-fired, with distinctive 2.5YR 8/3 (light yellow) exterior and a 5YR 7/4 (pink) interior. Rear exterior is decorated with a cluster of four
vertical wavy lines, joined at the top. Side preserves (moving forward from the rear) parts of two concentric arcs and a vertical wavy line. 7.5YR 6/4 (light brown) paint. At break in rear is part of a small (D. 0.007 m.) circular perforation used for ventilation during firing. Identified in the field as part of an odd tankard.

Date: LH IIIA
Field ref. ASCSA Pylos Excavation Archive Box 5, Folder 2, p. 5 (identified as the “flat bottom like tankard only probably not as handles set way down near bottom. Painted with curving lines on bottom and side”).

Joins to: P-369, from Court 3. Likely from the same figure as: P-370, from Room 72.

**P-370:** Bovid figure

Found in Room 72 among the sherds collected from the surface to -0.40 m.
Complete large horn. H. 0.078 m., max. D. (at base) 0.022 m.
Fine fabric, 10YR 8/2 (very pale brown), relatively hard fired. Exterior is decorated with four vertical, slightly curved lines: one on the back, and one on the outer face of the horn, and two on its interior face. The interior is hollow, and perhaps once held a stick used to attach the horn to the bovid’s head.

Date: LH IIIA

Likely from the same figure as: P-84 and P-369.

**P-371:** Piriform Jar

Found in Room 18.
Convex body sherd.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray) Exterior decorated with a thick horizontal band flanked by two thin lines. 10YR 5/1 (gray) paint. All surfaces lightly burnt.

Date: LH IIA2?
Joins to: P-126. May also go with: P-29+P-125.

**P-372:** Large piriform jar (MRT 53; FS 30?)

Found in Court 3.
Concave neck sherd with attached beginning of shoulder. Juncture between neck and body defined by a raised ring.

Date: LH IIB-III A1
Perhaps from same vessel as: P-124, P-251, and/or P-257. Also may go with: P-28, P-190, P-250, P-269, and/or P-282.

**P-373:** Deep bowl (Group B) (MRT 60; FS 284)

Found in Court 3.
Two joining fragments of a gently flaring rim with attached slightly concave upper body. D. est. 0.18 m.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior coated with a 5YR 8/1 (white) slip and decorated with a
0.035 m. deep rim band. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint. Monochrome interior.
Date: LH IIIB2
Joins to: P-316, from Court 3. Likely from same vessel as: P-321.

P-374: Deep bowl, Group B (MRT 60; FS 284)?
Found in Court 3.
Slightly convex body sherd, from just below rim.
Fine fabric, 7.5YR 7/4 (pink). Exterior preserves traces of a deep rim band. 2.5YR 5/8 (red) paint.
Interior coated in 2.5YR 6/8 (dark red) monochrome slip.
Date: LH IIIB2
Joins to: P-318. Likely from the same vessel as: P-315, P-317, P-319, P-320, and/or P-322. If does not go with P-315 (with spiral decoration), could be a “deep band deep bowl” (also LH IIIB2).

P-375: Oinochoe
1952 Sherd Lot 62.
From in the black stony earth in Court 3, Trench T4.
Nearly complete, with full profile. Trefoil rim, tall neck, and globular body with two deep grooves on the upper shoulder. Single vertical strap handle from rim to shoulder. Base missing.
Fine fabric, 2.5Y 7/2 (light gray), with a greenish hue. Exterior and rim interior coated with streaky 2.5YR 4/0 (dark gray) monochrome slip.
Date: DA III
Publ. PN I, p. 64; pl. 347, no. 827.
Cf. Nichoria III, p. 175 (P1531) and pl. 3-136 (DA III oinochoe “Shape 2”); McDonald 1969-1971, pl. 50j, no. NP72.
Joins to: P-342 and P-343. From the same vessel as: P-344.

P-376: Large piriform jar (MRT 53, FS 35)
Found in Room 18.
Two joining convex body sherds.
Fine fabric, 10YR 6/1 (gray). Exterior decorated with parts of two spirals in a running/group spiral design (similar to FM 46 and/or 47). 10YR 4/1 (dark gray) paint. All surfaces burnt.
Date: LH IIIA2?

P-377: Goblet
Found in Court 3.
Lower bowl and upper part of the stem.
Date: LH IIB
May go with: P-294.

P-378: Late Palace Style jar (MRT 54a)
Found in Room 38.
Semi-coarse fabric, 5YR 5/4 (light brown). Exterior and interior coated with 5Y 7/3 (pale yellow) slip; exterior painted with six-petal-shaped motifs, octopus, palm trees, and a zigzag design (FM 61) with fringe. Kytheran import?
Date: LH IIIB
Publ. PN I, p. 172, fig. 344; Kalogeropoulous 1998, p. 524, cat. no. 3.
Likely goes with: P-313.
APPENDIX 2: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table 5: Megaron Artifacts in Context

1939 Trench I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk. (sections B, C, D)</td>
<td>p0 Surf. to -0.10</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.10 to -1.10</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.45 to -1.10</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Pottery (nearly complete krater)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Throne Room Artifacts in Context

1939 Trench I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Buried debris (section D)</td>
<td>-0.10 to -0.40</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p2</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThB1</td>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.30</td>
<td>Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>Plaster, Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>Stone, Bone, Plaster, Clay (Linear B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.80</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -1.07 (floor)</td>
<td>Pottery (pithos fragments only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>Plaster, Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.90</td>
<td>Bone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1092 Tables 1-4 are found in Chapter 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r1/r2</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b3</td>
<td>-0.15  to -0.30</td>
<td>Pottery (incl. chimney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-0.20  to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y2</td>
<td>-0.50  to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>-1.00  to -1.20 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench Zb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p3</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p3</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b4</td>
<td>-0.20  to -0.50</td>
<td>Pottery (complete stirrup jar, chimney fragments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y3</td>
<td>-0.30  to -0.70 (floor)</td>
<td>Bone, Wood, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench Zc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p4</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p4</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b5</td>
<td>-0.20  to -0.40</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>b5/r4</td>
<td>-0.30  to -0.60</td>
<td>Bone, Clay (Linear B), Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r4</td>
<td>-0.50  to floor</td>
<td>Stone, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW Quadrant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p5/b6/r5</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.30  to -0.35</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.35  to -0.55</td>
<td>Metal, Bone, Plaster, Clay (Linear B), Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.40  to -0.70</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.60  to -0.70</td>
<td>Metal, Stone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
<td>Bone, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1/ThB2</td>
<td>b6/r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.75 (in Zb guard)</td>
<td>Bone, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThB2</td>
<td>r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.40  to -0.75</td>
<td>Pottery (chimney fragments only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.25  to -0.45</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.35  to -0.55</td>
<td>Bone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NW Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b8</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.45/-0.65</td>
<td>Metal, Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r6</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.30</td>
<td>Clay (Linear B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThR2</td>
<td>r6/r7</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>Metal, Stone, Clay (mudbrick), Plaster, Pottery (incl. chimney fragments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r6/r7</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.70</td>
<td>Metal, Bone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r6/r7</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
<td>Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR2</td>
<td>r7</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.70</td>
<td>Metal, Bone, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r7     (incl. the “rectangle of plaster”)</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.80</td>
<td>Metal, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y5</td>
<td>-0.70 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB4</td>
<td>b9</td>
<td>-0.90 (hearth surface)</td>
<td>Wood, Pottery (chimney only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB5</td>
<td>b10</td>
<td>-1.05 (on floor)</td>
<td>Metal, Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR3</td>
<td>th1</td>
<td>-1.10 m (inside throne space)</td>
<td>Metal, Stone, Kyano, Clay (all from “Treasure” Groups A and B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR4</td>
<td>th2</td>
<td>-0.35 below rim of throne space</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unkl</td>
<td>Metal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NW/SW Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Cleaning alongside NW wall</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThY2</td>
<td>r6/y3/y4</td>
<td>NW wall</td>
<td>Pottery, Stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p7</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b11</td>
<td>-0.25 to -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>Metal, Clay (Linear B), Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p8</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b12</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>b12/r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to floor (cleaning in E corner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SE/NE Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8/r9</td>
<td>Floor alongside SE Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r8/r9/r4</td>
<td>Doorway to Throne Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unknown Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Vestibule Artifacts in Context

**1939 Trench I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>At -0.70</td>
<td>Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At -0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench Q**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL/VR</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50 (SW half)</td>
<td>Shell, Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.80 (SW half)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>All levels (NE half)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NW Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>p10</th>
<th>Surf. to -0.20</th>
<th>Metal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPL/VR</td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NW wall</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NE wall</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>Bone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.80</td>
<td>Stone, Wood, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>At -0.85</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.90 to floor</td>
<td>Bone, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>p11</th>
<th>Surf. to -0.25</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>Clay (Linear B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.45 to -0.85</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.85 to -1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>Metal, Ivory, Pottery (melted deep bowl fused to floor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>p12</th>
<th>Surf. to -0.25</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPL/VR</td>
<td>p12/r13</td>
<td>SW corner, all depths</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor</td>
<td>Metal, Ivory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>SW half, on floor and just above</td>
<td>Kyanos, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>p13</th>
<th>Surf. to -0.25</th>
<th>Metal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r14</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor</td>
<td>Metal, Stone, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r13/r14</td>
<td>-0.20 to floor in doorway to Portico</td>
<td>Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>b13</td>
<td>Floor surf. to -0.23 m</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Ivory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal, Ivory, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Portico Artifacts in Context**

**Trench T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR</td>
<td>p14/r15</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR/Py</td>
<td>p14/r15/y6</td>
<td>(cleaning E portion of NW wall)</td>
<td>Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p14/r15/y6</td>
<td>(cleaning W portion of NW wall)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR/Py</td>
<td>r15/y6</td>
<td>-0.60 to 1.20</td>
<td>Metal, Plaster, Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench T, South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PB</td>
<td>p15/b14</td>
<td>Surf to -0.50 (east end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PB/PR</td>
<td>p15/b14/r16</td>
<td>Surf to -0.50 (west end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>bn1</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor (east end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn/PR</td>
<td>bn1/r16</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor (west end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench T, Extension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>ARTIFACT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PB/PR</td>
<td>p16, b15*, r18, bn2 (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (east end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p16, b15*, r17, bn2 (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (west end)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR</td>
<td>p16/r18</td>
<td>Dog leg</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>bn2</td>
<td>-1.00 to -1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>Stone, Plaster, Clay (Linear B), Pottery (ca. 2 complete smashed vesels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unknown Location**

| Unk.         | Unk.    | Unk.      | Metal, Ivory, Stone, Kyanos |
### Table 9: 1939 Sherd Counts and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>EOP</th>
<th>Palatial</th>
<th>Myc.</th>
<th>Post-Palatial</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Trench I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>p0 (sections B, C, D)</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.10 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.45 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>p0 (sections B, C, D)</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.10 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>2 (br) (-0.45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.45 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: 1939 Small Finds Counts

#### 1939 Trench I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>p0 (sections B, C, D)</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.10 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>2 (br) (-0.45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>-0.45 to 1.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried debris (section C)</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly complete Krater
Table 11: Throne Room Sherd Counts and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>EOP</th>
<th>Palatial</th>
<th>Myc.</th>
<th>Post-Palatial</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>LH I-III A</td>
<td>LH II/IIIA - IIIB early</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIIC early</td>
<td>Myc. DA</td>
<td>Post-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Trench I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Buried debris (Section D)</td>
<td>-0.10 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p2</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThB1</td>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -1.07 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1/r2</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (incl. chimney frags)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b3</td>
<td>-0.15 to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y2</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>-1.00 to -1.20 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1093 In this and all subsequent sherd charts, uncertainties about dating indicated by “?”s in the catalogue presented in Appendix 1 are maintained. Colored rows represent “clean” (as opposed to mixed) contexts. Dots in a row represent deposits that are entirely less than .20 m. above the floor; Close-set dots indicate deposits on or just above the floor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>LH I-IIIA</th>
<th>LH II/IIIA-IIIC early</th>
<th>LH IIIB-IIIC early</th>
<th>Myc.</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Post-DA</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench Zb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p3</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b4</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>chimney frags; nearly complete stirrup jar at -0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y3</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70 (floor)</td>
<td>1 (MH-LH I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Ze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p4</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b5</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>b5/r4</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r4</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL/ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>p5/b6/r5</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.35 to -0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.70</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>Directly above floor</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1/ThB2</td>
<td>b6/r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.75 (in Zb guard)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThB2</td>
<td>r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>chimney only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.25 to -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.35 to -0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor (by NW wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTX.</td>
<td>STRAT.</td>
<td>DEPTH (m)</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>LH I-IIIA</td>
<td>LH II/IIIA-IIIC early</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC early</td>
<td>Myc.</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Post-DA</td>
<td>Indeter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2/ThR1</td>
<td>y4/r5</td>
<td>-0.70 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (assoc. w/table of offerings)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4/r5</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor (by SW wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NW Quadrant**

| ThPL/ThB1/ThR1 | p6/b8/r6 | Surf. to -0.35 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| ThB1 | b8 | -0.20 to -0.45/-0.65 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThR1 | r6 | -0.20 to -0.30 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThR1/ThR2 | r6/r7 | -0.30 to -0.60 | 1 (bovid) | chimney only | - | - | - | 3+ |
|         | r6/r7 | -0.40 to -0.70 | 1? | 1 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - |
|         | r6/r7 | Just above floor | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThR2 | r7 | -0.50 to -0.70 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 5 |
|         | r7 (incl. “rectangle of plaster”) | -0.60 to -0.80 | 2 | - | 3 | - | 1 | - | 6 |
| ThY2 | y5 | -0.70 to -0.90 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThB4 | b9 | -0.90 (on hearth surface) | - | - | - | chimney only | - | - | - |
| ThB5 | b10 | -1.05 (on floor) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThR3 | th1 | -1.10 (inside throne space; Treasure Groups A and B) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ThR4 | th2 | -0.35 (below rim of throne space) | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Unk. | Unk. | Unk. | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |

**NW/SW Quadrants**

<p>| ThR1/ThY2 | r6/y3/y4 | Cleaning alongside NW wall | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>LH I-IIIA</th>
<th>LH II/IIIA-IIIC early</th>
<th>LH IIIB-IIIC early</th>
<th>Myc.</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Post-DA</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p7</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b11</td>
<td>-0.25 to -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r8</td>
<td>-0.70 to -0.90</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r8</td>
<td>-0.90 to floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>whole basin only (on floor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p8</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b12</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>b12/r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to floor (cleaning in E corner)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE/NE Quadrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8/r9</td>
<td>On floor alongside SE wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r8/r9/r4</td>
<td>Doorway to Throne Room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Throne Room Small Finds Counts

1939 Trench I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Buried debris (Section D)</td>
<td>-0.10 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trench Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ThPL</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p2</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ThB1</td>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1/b2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-0.36)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (qrtz) (-0.45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (tooth) (-0.45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Lin B) (-0.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.80</td>
<td>2 (br) (-0.62)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>-0.40 to -1.07 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r1/r2</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b3</td>
<td>-0.15 to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td>y1</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y2</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>-1.00 to -1.20 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

480
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench Zb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p3</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b4</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y3</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (-0.40)</td>
<td>1 (-0.56)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench Zc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p4</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b5</td>
<td>-0.20 to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ ThR1</td>
<td>b5/r4</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (Lin B) (-0.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r4</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1 obs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL/ ThB1/ ThR1</td>
<td>p5/b6/r5</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1+ (-0.30)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.35 to -0.55</td>
<td>2 (g); + (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6 (Lin B) (-0.40 to -0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>-0.60 to -0.70</td>
<td>1 (g) (-0.65); + (qrtz) (-0.67)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (-0.67)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r5</td>
<td>Directly above floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (on floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ ThR1/ ThB2</td>
<td>b6/r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1/ ThB2</td>
<td>r5/b7</td>
<td>-0.40 to -0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.25 to -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.35 to -0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor (by NW wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

481
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThY2/ThR1</td>
<td>y4/r5</td>
<td>-0.70 to  (on floor)</td>
<td>(on floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Table of off.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y4/r5</td>
<td>-0.25 to (by SW wall)</td>
<td>(-0.61);</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Lin B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(g); 3 (s); 1 (flint blade)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NW Quadrant**

| ThPl1/ThB1/ThR1 | p6/b8/r6 | Surf. to - 0.35 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| ThB1           | b8       | -0.20 to -0.45/-0.65 | + (s); 2 (br) | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - |
| ThR1           | r6       | -0.20 to -0.30 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | (Lin B) |

| ThR1/ThR2     | r6/r7    | -0.30 to -0.60 | 1 (g) (-0.45); 1 (g/s) (-0.45); 2 (s) (-0.58 and -0.60); + (qrtz) | - | - | - | - | - | + | - |
|               | r6/r7    | -0.40 to -0.70 | 2 (br) (-0.46) | - | - | + | - | - | - | 1 | - |
|               | r6/r7    | Just above floor | 1 (g) (+0.05 above floor) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| ThR2          | r7       | -0.50 to -0.70 | 1 (g) (-0.70); 1(s) (-0.61) | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
|               | r7 (incl. “rectangle of plaster”) | -0.60 to -0.80 | 1 (g) (-0.76); 3 (br) | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - |

<p>| ThY2          | y5       | -0.70 to -0.90 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThB4</td>
<td>b9</td>
<td>-0.90 (hearth surface)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB5</td>
<td>b10</td>
<td>-1.05 (on floor)</td>
<td>1 (g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (from column cutting)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR3</td>
<td>th1</td>
<td>-1.10 (inside throne space)</td>
<td>2 (g); 1 (s); 1 (s/br); 2 (br)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1/2 a whorl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR4</td>
<td>th2</td>
<td>-0.35 (below rim of throne space)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (g/s); + (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NW/SW Quadrants

| ThR1/ThY2 | r6/y3/y4 | Cleaning alongside NW wall | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

SE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ThPL</th>
<th>p7</th>
<th>Surf. to</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b11</td>
<td>-0.25 to -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>2 (g) (-0.70 and unk.); 1 (br)+ (incl. dagger frag) (-0.45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (Lin B) (-0.27, unk., and -0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.70 to -0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.90 to floor</td>
<td>3 (g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>2 (g); 11+ (s); 52 (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTX.</td>
<td>STRAT.</td>
<td>DEPTH (m)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Kyanos</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPL</td>
<td>p8</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1</td>
<td>b12</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.80</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lin B)</td>
<td>(ca. -0.35 and -0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r9</td>
<td>Just above the floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (button) (on floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB1/ThR1</td>
<td>b12/r9</td>
<td>-0.30 to floor (cleaning in E corner)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3-4 boxes (0.70 to 0.80 above floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>7 (br)</td>
<td>1 (qrtz)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE/NE Quadrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>r8/r9</td>
<td>On floor alongside SE wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r8/r9/r4</td>
<td>Doorway to the Throne Room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (in W door-jamb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>14+ (g); 17 (s); 162 (br)</td>
<td>12 (qrtz)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13: Vestibule Sherd Counts and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>EOP</th>
<th>Palatial</th>
<th>Myc.</th>
<th>Post-Palatial</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939 Trench I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Buried debris (Section C)</td>
<td>At -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At -0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL/ VR</td>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50 (SW half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.80 (SW half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>All levels (NE half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>At -0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.90 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL/ VR</td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NW Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NE Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p11</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.45 to -0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.85 to -1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTX.</td>
<td>STRAT.</td>
<td>DEPTH (m)</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>LH I-III</td>
<td>LH II/IIIA-IIIB</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC early</td>
<td>Myc.</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p12</td>
<td>Surf to -0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL/VR</td>
<td>p12/r13</td>
<td>SW corner, all depths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>SW half, on floor and just above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p13</td>
<td>Surf to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r14</td>
<td>-0.25 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r13/r14</td>
<td>-0.20 to floor (in doorway to Portico)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>b13</td>
<td>Floor surf. to -0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>1 (MH-LH I)</td>
<td>5?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Vestibule Small Finds Counts

### 1939 Trench I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Buried debris (Section C)</td>
<td>At -0.70</td>
<td>1 (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At -0.75</td>
<td>+ (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench Q

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL/VR</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50 (SW half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.80 (SW half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p9/r10</td>
<td>All levels (NE half)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NW Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p10</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.20</td>
<td>11 (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NW Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p10/r11</td>
<td>Cleaning alongside NE Wall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.60</td>
<td>3 (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.30 to -0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r11</td>
<td>At -0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (-0.85)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r11</td>
<td>-0.90 to floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPL</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p11</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTX.</td>
<td>STRAT.</td>
<td>DEPTH (m)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Kyanos</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>At -0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.45 to</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r12</td>
<td>-0.85 to</td>
<td>4 (g)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>(+0.10 above floor);</td>
<td>(+0.35 above floor);</td>
<td>(+0.30 above floor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (br);</td>
<td>1 (br/r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>near bottom of SE wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. +0.35 above floor);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surf to -0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p12</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL/ VR</td>
<td>p12/r13</td>
<td>SW corner, all depths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>-0.25 to</td>
<td>4 (g)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>(incl. +0.35 above floor);</td>
<td>(+0.30 above floor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (br);</td>
<td>1 (br/r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>near bottom of SE wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. +0.35 above floor);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surf. to -0.25</td>
<td>9 (br)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>p13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>1+ (g)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>(incl. ewer brooch at +0.30 above floor);</td>
<td>(qrtz) (near bottom of SE wall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (br) (incl. +0.75 above floor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r13</td>
<td>-0.20 to</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>in doorway to Portico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>b13</td>
<td>Floor to -0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(one perhaps bone?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unknown Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>3 (g); 5 (s); 25 (br); 4 (br/ir)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Portico Sherd Counts and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>LH I-IHIA</th>
<th>LH II/IIIA-III C early</th>
<th>LH IIIB-IIIC early</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Post-DA</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trench T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR</td>
<td>p14/r15</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR/ PY</td>
<td>p14/r15/ y6</td>
<td>(cleaning E portion of NW Wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR/ PY</td>
<td>p14/r15/ y6</td>
<td>(cleaning W portion of NW Wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR/PY</td>
<td>r15/y6</td>
<td>-0.60 to -1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Trench T, South |
| PPL/PB | p15/b14 | Surf. to -0.50 (east end) | - | 2? | 1 | 1 | - | 4 | - | 1 |
| PPL/PB/ PR | p15/b14/ r16 | Surf to -0.50 (west end) | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| PBn | bn1 | -0.50 to floor (east end) | - | 5 | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | 6+ |
| PR/PBn | r16/bn1 | -0.50 to floor (west end) | - | - | 1+ | - | - | - | - | + |
### Trench T, Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>LH I-IIIA</th>
<th>LH II/IIIA-IIC early</th>
<th>LH IIIB-IIC early</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Post-DA</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>p16</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>b15*/</td>
<td>r18/bn2 (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (east end)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>p16/r18</td>
<td>“Dog leg”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>b15*/</td>
<td>r17/bn2, (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (west end)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBN</td>
<td>bn2</td>
<td>-1.00 to -1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Crushed amphora (on floor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unknown Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>LH I-IIIA</th>
<th>LH II/IIIA-IIC early</th>
<th>LH IIIB-IIC early</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Post-DA</th>
<th>Indeter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16: Portico Small Finds Counts

**Trench T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>p14/r15</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>r15/y6</td>
<td>(cleaning E portion of NW Wall)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR/PY</td>
<td>r15/y6</td>
<td>-0.60 to -1.20 (br) (-0.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench T, South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNTX.</th>
<th>STRAT.</th>
<th>DEPTH (m)</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Kyanos</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Plaster</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>p15/b14</td>
<td>Surf. to -0.50 (east end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/</td>
<td>r15/b14/r16</td>
<td>Surf to -0.50 (west end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTX.</td>
<td>STRAT.</td>
<td>DEPTH (m)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Kyanos</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>bn1</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor (east end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn/PR</td>
<td>r16/bn1</td>
<td>-0.50 to floor (west end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trench T, Extension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPL</th>
<th>p16</th>
<th>Surf. to -0.15</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR</td>
<td>p16, b15*</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (east end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR</td>
<td>r18, bn2, (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR/PR/PBn</td>
<td>p16, b15*, r17, bn2, (*mostly b15)</td>
<td>-0.15 to -1.00 (west end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/PR/PBn</td>
<td>p16, b15*, r18, bn2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>bn2</td>
<td>-1.00 to -1.10 (floor)</td>
<td>2 (obs. blades)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unknown Location**

| Unk. | Unk. | Unk. | 5 (s); 39 (br); (incl. 3 knife frags) | 3 (lamp frags) | 7 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |

Table 17: Summary of Interpretations of New Megaron Contexts

**NEW CONTEXT** | **INTERPRETATION**
--- | ---
ThPL | Layer of chestnut brown, plowed earth overlying the entire Throne Room.
ThB1 | Upper deposit of black earth with small stones overtop of the hearth. Produced soon after the collapse of the megaron’s walls (in the period of the “recently-collapsed” palace), perhaps as the result of the construction of a pyre.
ThB2 | Mid-level deposit of black earth with small stones and plaster. Localized overtop of the hearth and representing collapsed chimney sheathing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThB3</td>
<td>Localized deposit of charred organic material on the floor in the Throne Room’s SW Quadrant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB4</td>
<td>Localized crust of charred organic material on the surface of the hearth. Resulting from the use of the hearth in either the palatial period or in the phase of the ruined megaron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB5</td>
<td>Localized deposit of charred organic material on the floor in the Throne Room’s NW Quadrant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR1</td>
<td>Deep deposit of collapsed wall matrix with red-burned color, found overtop of the hearth and on floors in the Throne Room’s NW, NE, and SE Quadrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR2</td>
<td>Localized deposit of loose reddish earth contained within context ThR1 in the NW Quadrant of the Throne Room. Contained a “rectangle of plaster” identified as part of a collapsed pier-wall. Disturbed prior to the deposition of context ThB1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR3</td>
<td>Deposit of red earth in the upper part of the throne space. Deposited in the period of the “ruined” Throne Room together with the throne space “treasure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThR4</td>
<td>Deposit of reddish earth in the lower part of the throne space. Part of the leveling layer underneath the entire Throne Room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY1</td>
<td>Small lens of yellow windblown sediment collected in a pocket in the upper collapse of the Throne Room’s SW Quadrant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY2</td>
<td>Deep deposit of windblown yellow sediment banked up against the Throne Room’s NW and SW walls and sloped onto the floor in the SW Quadrant. Deposited in the “ruined” Throne Room through a hole in the roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY3</td>
<td>Thin deposit of windblown yellow sediment deposited onto the crust of ashes on the surface of the hearth through the open chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>Layer of chestnut brown, plowed earth overlying the entire Vestibule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Thick deposit of collapsed wall matrix with red-burned color, covering the entire Vestibule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Localized ashy debris inside a hole in the Vestibule’s floor. Function and production date unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>Layer of chestnut brown, plowed earth overlying the entire Portico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Thick deposit of collapsed wall matrix with reddish-yellow color and sandy consistency. Pushed up against the three walls of the Portico during the Dark Age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>Deposit of windblown sediment on the floor of the Portico alongside the room’s NW wall. Deposited into the “ruined” Portico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Deposit of black stony earth in the center of the Portico and extending out into Court 3. Produced during the Dark Age during the course of small-scale, non-ritualized drinking activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBn</td>
<td>A sloping layer of firm light-brown earth overlying the floor in the center and southeastern part of the Portico. Represents eroded mudbrick walls built in the period of the “ruined” palace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Sequence of Events in the Megaron and New Contexts’ Deposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>EVENTS AND ASSOCIATED CONTEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0     | Pre-Megaron        | Pre-LH IIIB activities on the Epano Englianos ridge.  
• Production and destruction of MH-LH IIIA cultural material including that found in context ThB4.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 1     | Palatial Megaron   | Construction of the megaron in early LH IIIB and use until LH IIIC early.  
• Leveling context ThR4 is deposited and/or manipulated.  
• Fires on the hearth may produce the crust of ashes (context ThB4) on its surface.  
• Activities at the end of the palatial period result in the deposition of the table of offerings, and possibly of the krater, deep bowl, and amphora found on the suite’s floors. |
| 2     | Abandonment/Looting| Abandonment and looting of the megaron in early LH IIIC.  
• Objects of value are removed from the megaron including the throne and the stone plinth on which it rested.  
• The deep bowl, and amphora are either left in situ from the previous phase or deposited and abandoned during this period. |
| 3     | Fire Damage        | Damage of the megaron by fire.  
• Floors are burnt, as are objects resting on them.  
• Organic materials burn in the fire, resulting in contexts ThB3, ThB5, and VB. |
| 4     | “Ruined” Megaron   | Accumulation of silt and re-use of the fire-damaged but still standing and accessible megaron.  
• Windblown yellow silt (context ThY2) accumulates in the SW Quadrant of the Throne Room via a hole in the western corner of the roof and on top of the hearth via the open chimney (context ThY3).  
• The Throne Room is re-visited and offerings are made including the throne space “treasure” (deposited together with context ThR3) and the miniature kylix found on the table of offerings.  
• The hearth may be reused, resulting in context ThB4.  
• In the Portico, silt (context PY) accumulates against the room’s NW wall.  
• After context PY is deposited, a mudbrick wall (context PBn) is constructed across the opening to the Portico. |
| 5     | Eroding/Collapsing Megaron | Erosion and preliminary collapse of the megaron.  
• The mudbrick wall in the Portico erodes and forms a deposit of light brown earth on top of the room’s floor (context PBn).  
• The Throne Room may begin to collapse, starting with chimney sheathing (context ThB2), which falls on top of the silt accumulated on the hearth. |

1094 Phases highlighted in blue represent periods of deliberate ancient use of the Pylos megaron as a standing, ruined, and/or collapsed structure. Phase 7, which is a probable but not certain use-phase, is marked with a lighter hue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6 | Collapsing Megaron | Major collapse of the megaron.  
- The pier-walls of the megaron erode and fall, resulting in the deposition of contexts **ThR1, ThR2, VR, and PR**.  
- The collapse of the Throne Room's NE wall may cause the collapse of parts of the palace's second story, resulting in the addition of palatial period material to contexts **ThR1, ThR2, VR, and PR**. |
| 7 | Recently Collapsed Megaron | Disturbance in, and possible activity overtop of, the Throne Room.  
- Part of the Throne Room's NW Quadrant is dug up and re-deposited, resulting in the loose earth in context **ThR2**.  
- After this occurs, a pyre is perhaps built over the hearth, resulting in the formation of context **ThB1**. |
| 8 | Dark Age Activity | Re-use of the Portico in the DA II-III periods.  
- Fallen palace debris (context **PR**) in the Portico is pushed up against the room’s walls.  
- Drinking activities commence on top of context **PBN** in the cleared central space, resulting in the formation of black context **PB**.  
Possible activity overtop of the Throne Room  
- Possible deposition of context **ThB1** (if not connected to Phase 7). |
| 9 | Dark Age and/or Pre-Modern Disturbance | Deposition of more silt and anomalous objects.  
- Over the Throne Room, more windblown yellow silt (context **ThY1**) is deposited onto the surface of its collapsed walls.  
- Post-DA processes (anthropogenic or natural) result in the unintentional movement of a small number of objects into the megaron including a sherd from the Hellenistic/Roman periods and a Linear B tablet fragment prior to the deposition of the modern plowed earth. |
| 10 | Modern Period | Modern plowing.  
- Chestnut brown plowed earth contexts **ThPL, VPL, and PPL** are deposited/formed over the entire megaron. |
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Figure 5.21: Wall painting fragment from a procession scene from Tiryns depicting the top of a libation vessel. Rodenwaldt 1912, pl. X, no. 2.
Figure 5.22: Wall painting fragment from a procession scene at Mycenae depicting the top of a libation vessel. Krtisele-Providi 1982, p. 51, pl. 7b (no. B-25).

Figure 5.23: Cleaned eastern section of the SE wall of the Pylos Throne Room, showing location of painting 9 D 6. Photo by A. Zokos.

Figure 5.24: Section of Pylos wall painting group 1 D 64 (“Arc Dado”) from Hall 64. PN II, pl. K.
Figure 5.25: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting groups 38-39 C 64 (“Red Dogs” and “Spotted Dog and Red Bitch”) from Hall 64. P. de Jong. PN II, pl. P.

Figure 5.26: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting group 21 C 46 (“Griffin and Lion”) from Hall 46. P. de Jong. PN II, pl. P.

Figure 5.27: Detail of the plaster coating on the limestone baseboard in the Pylos Portico, looking northwest. Photo by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.28: Stone table top from Pylos Room 58 (a), and detail showing preferential drilling in gray areas (b). Photos by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.29: Reconstruction of the decorated floors in the Portico and Vestibule of the Pylos megaron. P. de Jong. PN I, fig. 56, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.30: Reconstruction of the decorated floor in the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron. P. de Jong. *PN* I, fig. 73.
Figure 5.31: Detail of the octopus found in square F8 of the Pylos Throne Room. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.F14.

Figure 5.32: Detail of an incised “mini-grid” in a square of the Pylos Throne Room’s decorated floor. *PN I*, fig. 69.
Figure 5.33: Detail of the incised “mini-grid” in square G1 of the Pylos Throne Room’s decorated floor. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.F19.36.

Figure 5.34: Gridded lines observed on the floor of the Tiyrm megaron in 1884. Dörpfeld 1885a, p. 226, fig. 116.
Figure 5.35: Reconstruction of the decorated floors in the megaron at Tiryns. Rodenwaldt 1912, pl. XIX.
Figure 5.36: Details of the tricurved arch motif in squares of the floor decoration in the megaron at Tiryns. Rodenwaldt 1912, pl. XXI, no. 1.

Figure 5.37: Details of the octopus and dolphin motifs in squares of the floor decoration in the megaron at Tiryns. Rodenwaldt, pl. XXI, nos. 3-4.
Figure 5.38: Summary of linear patterns used to decorate Mycenaean painted floors. E. S. Hirsch. Hirsch 1980, p. 458, ill. 3.

Figure 5.39: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting fragment group 14 D nws (“Variegated Dado”). P. de Jong. PN II, pl. Q.

Figures 5.40 and 5.41: Detail of the painted decoration in Pylos Throne Room floor square E7. PN I, fig. 72; and field sketch of Pylos Throne Room floor square L7. GEM 1952, p. 107.
Figure 5.42: Field plan of the floor decoration in the Pylos Throne Room. D. Theocharis, with additions by P. de Jong. GEM 1952, back pocket.
Figure 5.43: Detail of the upper half of the field plan of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room. D. Theocharis, with additions by P. de Jong. GEM 1952, back pocket.

Figure 5.44: De Jong studying the patterns on the floor of the Pylos Throne Room under a portable canopy, looking north. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide 53-57.
Figure 5.45: Detail of the lower left corner of the field plan of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room. D. Theocharis, with additions by P. de Jong. GEM 1952, back pocket.
Figure 5.46: Watercolor reconstruction of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room. P. de Jong. Photo by C. Mauzy. Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.47: Watercolor reconstruction of the floor of the Pylos Throne Room with areas of preserved painted surface highlighted. P. de Jong. Photo by C. Mauzy. Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.48: Field sketch of the decoration of Pylos Portico floor square A9, with concentric arc decoration. MR 1961-1962, p. 64.

Figure 5.49: Field sketch of the decoration on the southwestern half of the floor of the Pylos Portico. MR 1961-1962, p. 169.
Figure 5.50: Detail of Pylos Vestibule floor square A10, with circle pattern. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.51: Details of Pylos Portico floor square A1, with scalloped line decoration. Photos by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.52: Watercolor reconstruction of the decorated floors of the Pylos Portico and Vestibule. P. de Jong. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide (no number), modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.53: Detail of the reconstruction of floor paintings at the northeast end the Pylos Portico. P. de Jong. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, 1963-1964 photograph.
Figure 5.54: Detail of painted floor squares from Pylos Room 50, showing reconstructed fish design. *PN* I, fig. 166.

Figure 5.55: Pylos Portico floor square A8 with marked locations of incised diving lines, looking northwest. Photo by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.56: Incised dividing lines in Pylos Portico floor square C9. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.57: Break in the floor in the north corner of the Pylos Vestibule, showing the thickness of the plaster. Photo by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.58: West corner of the Pylos Portico, showing floor plaster layers. *PN* I, fig. 53.

Figure 5.59: Fragment of the final layer of floor plaster preserved in Pylos Portico square A1. Photo by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.60: LM II imitation dado with bull hoof from the West Porch, Knossos. *PM IV*, p. 894, fig. 873.

Figure 5.61: Fragments of painted dado from Tiryns. Demakopoulou 1988, p. 186, no. 158.
Figure 5.62: Fragment of a variegated stone vase from a procession fresco from Knossos. *PM II*, p. 724, fig. 451.

Figure 5.63: Pylos wall painting fragment group 9 F nws (“Bluebird Frieze”). *PN II*, pl. J.
Figure 5.64: Detail of the short end of the plastered bench (4 M 10) in Pylos Room 10, showing stone veining. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide (no number).

Figure 5.65: Painted decoration on the floors of the court of the megaron at Mycenae as reconstructed by Lamb (a) and Rodenwaldt (b). Hirsch 1977, pl. 6, figs. 13, 14.
Figure 5.66: Detail of the decoration along the hem of a skirt worn by a female figure in the Knossos Procession Fresco. PM II, p. 729, fig 456a.

Figure 5.67: Reconstructed female figure from the Tiryns Große Frauenprozession. Rodenwaldt 1912, p. 8.
Figure 5.68: Reconstructed central panel of the Taureador Frescoes from the Court of the Stone Spout, Knossos. Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 2005, pp. 194-195.

Figure 5.69: Renderings of sections from the painted ceiling of the tomb of Senenmut (TT71). N. de Garis Davies. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Acc. No. 31.6.37.
Figure 5.70: Line drawing of the decoration on the skirt worn by the dancing woman in a wall painting from Hagia Triada. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 56, fig. 3.

Figure 5.71: Line drawing and reconstruction of “Pattern E” from the Procession Fresco at Knossos. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 58, figs. 1E and col. pl. 2E.
Figure 5.72: Line drawing and reconstruction of “Pattern E” from the Procession Fresco at Knossos. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 58, figs. 1E and col. pl. 2D.

Figure 5.73: Reconstruction of the LM I “Ladies in Blue” fresco from the Northeast Portico, Knossos. Dimopoulou-Rethemiotaki 2005, pp. 304-305.
Figure 5.74: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting fragment 18 M ne ("Papyrus Net"). P. de Jong. Published in PN II, pl. R. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, P. de Jong watercolor Inv. No. 266.

Figure 5.75: Line drawing and reconstruction of “Pattern B” from the Procession Fresco at Knossos. M. C. Shaw and M. C. Nelson. Shaw 2000, p. 54, fig. 1B and col. pl. 2B.
Figure 5.76: LH IIA Palace Style jar from Routsi-Myrsinochori. Kalogeropoulos 1998a, pl. 41a.

Figure 5.77: Detail of a circle from Pylos Vestibule floor square A10, showing compass pivot point. Photo by E. C. Egan.
Figure 5.78: Reconstruction of Pylos wall painting group 14 F 45 (“Beam-End Frieze”). P. de Jong. *PN II*, p. 137.

Figure 5.79: Throne Room floor squares F1, G1, J5, K4, K6, K7, K8, L9, and L10 with enhanced pencil lines marking the locations of incised “mini-grids.” Egan Forthcoming *b*, fig. 3, using elements from Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c.
Figure 5.80: Detail of the artist’s grid in Pylos Throne Room floor square G1 with elongated rectangular fields lightly cleaned. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.81: Pylos Throne Room floor squares L9 (below) and L10 (above) after cleaning (a), and with artist’s grid enhanced (b), looking northeast. Egan Forthcoming b, fig. 5.
Figure 5.82: Detail of Pylos Throne Room floor square L10, showing traces of a painted scale pattern. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure 5.83: Detail of the artist’s grid in Pylos Throne Room floor square L10, showing twists in one of the lines. Egan Forthcoming b, fig. 8.
Figure 5.84: Detail of the artist’s grid in Pylos Throne Room floor square L10, showing dashes in the lines. Egan Forthcoming b, fig. 9.

Figure 5.85: Reconstruction of the floor paintings in the Pylos Vestibule and Portico, with “incised” lines enhanced. Egan Forthcoming b, fig. 6.
Figure 5.86: Tomb of Suemniwet (TT 92), front room, north wall Zone 1, with grid (a) and Zones 3-4, without grid (b). Bryan 2001, col. pls. 21.2, 22.1.

Figure 5.87: Reconstructed view into the Throne Room of the Pylos megaron from the Vestibule, looking northwest. E. A. Markin and E. C. Egan, using elements from Papadopoulos 2007, p. 4, fig. 2c.
Figure 5.88: View of the two faces of the plastered bench (4 M 10) in Pylos Room 10. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide (no number).

Figure 5.89: Pylos wall painting fragment group 13 D 44 ("Variegated Dado"). PN II, pl. 98.
Figure 5.90: A flagstone pavement (a) and a crazy pavement (b). Gombrich 1979, p. 8, figs. 8, 7.

Figure 5.91: Floor mosaics in the Domus dei Pesci with geometric decoration. Swift 2009, p. 95, fig. 2.24 (detail).
Figure 5.92: Line drawing of preserved floor decoration in the vestibule of the megaron at Mycenae. Rodenwaldt 1919, p. 90, fig. 3.

Figure 5.93: Detail of a woman from the Tiryns Große Frauenprozession. Rodenwaldt 1912, pl. 9.
Figure 5.94: Reconstruction of the floor decoration in the megaron at Tiryns with a complete, rather than partial, design system. Thaler 2012a, p. 201, fig. 5b.
Figure A1.1: Plan of the Palace of Nestor showing the locations of 1939 Trench I (in brown) and 1952 Trench Z (in green) by E. C. Egan, overlaid onto key plan by J. Travlos. *PN II*, pl. 143
Figure A1.2: Relationship matrices for Pylos Trench I (a), Trench Z (b), Trench Zb (c), and Trench Zc (d). E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.3: The Pylos hearth as found on June 5, 1952, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.6.

Figure A1.4: Field plan of the Pylos Throne Room showing the locations of Trenches Z, Zb, and Zc. GEM 1952, p. 72.
Figure A1.5: Plan of the trenches in the Pylos megaron by E. C. Egan, overlaid onto state plan by M. C. Nelson. Nelson 2001, fig. 15.

Figure A1.6: Excavation the Pylos hearth showing a “guard” left at the intersection of Trenches Z and Zb. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.8.
Figure A1.7: Plan showing locations of trenches and strata in the Pylos megaron by E. C. Egan, overlaid onto state plan by M. C. Nelson. Nelson 2001, fig. 15.
Figure A1.8: Field sketch of the northwest profile of the southwestern half of Pylos Trench Z. GEM 1952, p. 36, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.9: Excavation of the “4th 5 m. stretch” of Pylos Trench Z, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.3, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.10: Field sketch showing the positions of deposits found over the hearth in Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 26, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.11: Field sketch of the southwest profile of Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 46, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.12: Elevations of deposits in Pylos Trench Zb. GEM 1952, p. 35, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.13: Elevations of deposits in Pylos Trench Zc. GEM 1952, p. 34, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.14: Excavation of the end of Pylos Trench Zc in the doorway of the Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.26, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.15: Relationship matrices for the SW Quadrant (a), NW Quadrant (b), SE Quadrant (c), and the NE Quadrant (d) of the Pylos Throne Room. E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.16: Field sketch of the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room after the removal of the plowed earth. GEM 1952, p. 38, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.17: Excavation of the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.9, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.18: Field sketch strata just above the floor in the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room. GEM 1952, p. 50.
Figure A1.19: Removal of earth overlying the hearth in the SW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking northeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide 52.

Figure A1.20: Field sketch of the NW Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, after the removal of stratum b8 and the top part of stratum r6. GEM 1952, p. 48, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.21: The Pylos throne space and libation channel, after excavation. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, color slide 52-26.
Figure A1.22: The Pylos throne space after cleaning in 2012, showing interior sondage. Photo by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.23: Excavation of the NE Quadrant of the Pylos Throne Room, looking southeast. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph P.52.15, modified by E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.24: Field sketch of the hole in the floor of the Pylos Vestibule near the door to the Portico. MR 1960, p. 135, modified by E. C. Egan.

Figure A1.25: Cutting in the floor of the Pylos Vestibule, looking northwest. Pylos Excavation Archive, University of Cincinnati, photograph F55B P.60.IV.
Figure A1.26: Relationship matrices for Trench T (a), Trench T, South (b), and Trench T, Extension (c) in the Pylos Portico. E. C. Egan.
Figure A1.27: Field sketch of the location of trenches in the Pylos Portico. GEM 1952, p. 118.

Figure A1.28: Southeast profile of Pylos Trench T, Extension. GEM 1952, p. 127.
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