

This pdf is a digital offprint of your contribution in E. Alram-Stern, F. Blakolmer, S. Deger-Jalkotzy, R. Laffineur & J. Weilhartner (eds), *Metaphysis. Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Aegaeum 39), ISBN 978-90-429-3366-8.

The copyright on this publication belongs to Peeters Publishers.

As author you are licensed to make printed copies of the pdf or to send the unaltered pdf file to up to 50 relations. You may not publish this pdf on the World Wide Web – including websites such as academia.edu and open-access repositories – until three years after publication. Please ensure that anyone receiving an offprint from you observes these rules as well.

If you wish to publish your article immediately on open-access sites, please contact the publisher with regard to the payment of the article processing fee.

For queries about offprints, copyright and republication of your article, please contact the publisher via peeters@peeters-leuven.be

AEGAEUM 39
Annales liégeoises et PASpiennes d'archéologie égéenne

METAPHYSIS

RITUAL, MYTH AND SYMBOLISM IN THE AEGEAN BRONZE AGE

**Proceedings of the 15th International Aegean Conference, Vienna,
Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology,
Aegean and Anatolia Department, Austrian Academy of Sciences
and Institute of Classical Archaeology, University of Vienna,
22-25 April 2014**

Edited by Eva ALRAM-STERN, Fritz BLAKOLMER, Sigrid DEGER-JALKOTZY,
Robert LAFFINEUR and Jörg WEILHARTNER

PEETERS
LEUVEN - LIEGE
2016

CONTENTS

Obituaries	ix
Preface	xiii
Abbreviations	xv

KEYNOTE LECTURE

Nanno MARINATOS	
<i>Myth, Ritual, Symbolism and the Solar Goddess in Thera</i>	3

A. FIGURINES

Eva ALRAM-STERN	
<i>Men with Caps: Chalcolithic Figurines from Aegina-Kolonna and their Ritual Use</i>	15
Florence GAIGNEROT-DRIESSEN	
<i>The Lady of the House: Trying to Define the Meaning and Role of Ritual Figures with Upraised Arms in Late Minoan III Crete</i>	21
Reinhard JUNG and Marco PACCIARELLI	
<i>A Minoan Statuette from Punta di Zambrone in Southern Calabria (Italy)</i>	29
Melissa VETTERS	
<i>All the Same yet not Identical? Mycenaean Terracotta Figurines in Context</i>	37
Eleni KONSOLAKI-YANNOPOULOU	
<i>The Symbolic Significance of the Terracottas from the Mycenaean Sanctuary at Ayios Konstantinos, Methana</i>	49

B. HYBRID AND MYTHICAL CREATURES

Fritz BLAKOLMER	
<i>Hierarchy and Symbolism of Animals and Mythical Creatures in the Aegean Bronze Age: A Statistical and Contextual Approach</i>	61
Karen Polinger FOSTER	
<i>Animal Hybrids, Masks, and Masques in Aegean Ritual</i>	69
Maria ANASTASIADOU	
<i>Wings, Heads, Tails: Small Puzzles at LM I Zakros</i>	77

C. SYMBOLISM

Janice L. CROWLEY	
<i>In the Air Here or from the World Beyond? Enigmatic Symbols of the Late Bronze Age Aegean</i>	89
Marianna NIKOLAIDOU	
<i>Materialised Myth and Ritualised Realities: Religious Symbolism on Minoan Pottery</i>	97
Helène WHITTAKER	
<i>Horns and Axes</i>	109

Olga KRZYSZKOWSKA	
<i>Warding off Evil: Apotropaic Practice and Imagery in Minoan Crete</i>	115
Emilia BANOU and Brent DAVIS	
<i>The Symbolism of the Scorpion in Minoan Religion: A Cosmological Approach on the Basis of Votive Offerings from the Peak Sanctuary at Ayios Yeoryios Sto Vouno, Kythera</i>	123
Nancy R. THOMAS	
<i>“Hair Stars” and “Sun Disks” on Bulls and Lions. A Reality Check on Movements of Aegean Symbolic Motifs to Egypt, with Special Reference to the Palace at Malkata</i>	129
Malcolm H. WIENER	
<i>Aegean Warfare at the Opening of the Late Bronze Age in Image and Reality</i>	139
D. SPACE / LANDSCAPE	
Santo PRIVITERA	
<i>The Tomb, the House, and the Double Axes: Late Minoan IIIA2 Hagia Triada as a Ritual and ‘Mythical’ Place</i>	149
Sam CROOKS, Caroline J. TULLY and Louise A. HITCHCOCK	
<i>Numinous Tree and Stone: Re-Animating the Minoan Landscape</i>	157
Barbara MONTECCHI	
<i>The Labyrinth: Building, Myth, and Symbol</i>	165
Birgitta EDER	
<i>Ideology in Space: Mycenaean Symbols in Action</i>	175
Lyvia MORGAN	
<i>The Transformative Power of Mural Art: Ritual Space, Symbolism, and the Mythic Imagination</i>	187
E. FUNERALS	
Luca GIRELLA	
<i>Aspects of Ritual and Changes in Funerary Practices Between MM II and LM I on Crete</i>	201
Anna Lucia D’AGATA and Sara DE ANGELIS	
<i>Funerals of Late Minoan III Crete: Ritual Acts, Special Vessels and Political Affiliations in the 14th and 13th Centuries BC</i>	213
Ann-Louise SCHALLIN	
<i>The Liminal Zone – The Evidence from the Late Bronze Age Dendra Cemetery</i>	223
Mary K. DABNEY	
<i>Mycenaean Funerary Processions as Shared Ritual Experiences</i>	229
Michael LINDBLOM and Gunnel EKROTH	
<i>Heroes, Ancestors or Just any Old Bones? Contextualizing the Consecration of Human Remains from the Mycenaean Shaft Graves at Lerna in the Argolid</i>	235
F. RELIGION / DEITIES	
Jeffrey S. SOLES	
<i>Hero, Goddess, Priestess: New Evidence for Minoan Religion and Social Organization</i>	247

Ute GÜNKEL-MASCHEK	
<i>Establishing the Minoan ‘Enthroned Goddess’ in the Neopalatial Period: Images, Architecture, and Elitist Ambition</i>	255
Veronika DUBCOVÁ	
<i>Divine Power from Abroad. Some New Thoughts about the Foreign Influences on the Aegean Bronze Age Religious Iconography</i>	263
Cynthia W. SHELMEERDINE	
<i>Poseidon, pa-ki-ja-na and Horse-Taming Nestor</i>	275
Irene SERRANO LAGUNA	
di-u-ja	285
G. SANCTUARIES	
Mercourios GEORGIADIS	
<i>Metaphysical Beliefs and Leska</i>	295
Wolf-Dietrich NIEMEIER	
<i>Ritual in the Mycenaean Sanctuary at Abai (Kalapodi)</i>	303
Olga PSYCHOYOS and Yannis KARATZIKOS	
<i>The Mycenaean Sanctuary at Prophitis Ilias on Mount Arachnaio within the Religious Context of the 2nd Millennium B.C.</i>	311
H. RITUALS / OFFERINGS	
Barbara HOREJS and Alfred GALIK	
<i>Hunting the Beast. A Reconstructed Ritual in an EBA Metal Production Centre in Western Anatolia</i>	323
Philip P. BETANCOURT, Thomas M. BROGAN and Vili APOSTOLAKOU	
<i>Rituals at Pefka</i>	329
Alessandro SANAVIA and Judith WEINGARTEN	
<i>The Transformation of Tritons: Some Decorated Middle Minoan Triton Shells and an Anatolian Counterpart</i>	335
Artemis KARNAVA	
<i>On Sacred Vocabulary and Religious Dedications: The Minoan ‘Libation Formula’</i>	345
Monica NILSSON	
<i>Minoan Stairs as Ritual Scenes. The Monumental Staircases of Phaistos “66” and Knossos “Theatral Area” under the Magnifying Glass</i>	357
Bernice R. JONES	
<i>A New Reading of the Fresco Program and the Ritual in Xeste 3, Thera</i>	365
Andreas G. VLACHOPOULOS	
<i>Images of Physis or Perceptions of Metaphysis? Some Thoughts on the Iconography of the Xeste 3 Building at Akrotiri, Thera</i>	375
Fanouria DAKORONIA	
<i>Sacrifice on Board</i>	387

Jörg WEILHARTNER	
<i>Textual Evidence for Burnt Animal Sacrifice and Other Rituals Involving the Use of Fire in Mycenaean Greece</i>	393
Chrysanthi GALLOU	
<i>Mycenaean Skulls: “ἀμηννά κάπηνα” or Social Actors in Late Helladic Metaphysics and Society?</i>	405
Assaf YASUR-LANDAU	
<i>The Baetyl and the Stele: Contact and Tradition in Levantine and Aegean Cult</i>	415
I. MYTH / HEROES / ANCESTORS	
Magda PIENIAŻEK and Carolyn C. ASLAN	
<i>Heroic Past, Memory and Ritual at Troy</i>	423
John G. YOUNGER	
<i>Identifying Myth in Minoan Art</i>	433
Joanne M.A. MURPHY	
<i>The Power of the Ancestors at Pylos</i>	439
Elisabetta BORGNA and Andreas G. VORDOS	
<i>Construction of Memory and the Making of a Ritual Landscape: the Role of Gods and Ancestors at the Trapeza of Aigion, Achaea, at the LBA-ELA Transition</i>	447
Anne P. CHAPIN	
<i>Mycenaean Mythologies in the Making: the Frescoes of Pylos Hall 64 and the Mycenae Megaron</i>	459
J. METAPHYSIS	
Robert B. KOEHL	
<i>The Ambiguity of the Minoan Mind</i>	469
Thomas G. PALAIMA	
<i>The Metaphysical Mind in Mycenaean Times and in Homer</i>	479
Alan PEATFIELD	
<i>A Metaphysical History of Minoan Religion</i>	485
POSTERS	
Eva ALRAM-STERN	
<i>A New Mycenaean Female Figure from Kynos, Locris</i>	497
Katrin BERNHARDT	
<i>Absent Mycenaeans? On Mycenaean Figurines and their Imitations on Crete in LM IIIA–IIIB</i>	501
Tina BOLOTI	
<i>A “Knot”-Bearing (?) Minoan Genius from Pylos. Contribution to the Cloth/Clothing Offering Imagery of the Aegean Late Bronze Age</i>	505
Dora CONSTANTINIDIS	
<i>Proximity Analysis of Metaphysical Aegean Ritual Spaces During the Bronze Age</i>	511

Stefanos GIMATZIDIS	
<i>The Tree of Life: The Materiality of a Ritual Symbol in Space and Time</i>	515
Louise A. HITCHCOCK, Aren M. MAEIR and Amit DAGAN	
<i>Entangling Aegean Ritual in Philistine Culture</i>	519
Petros KOUNOUKLAS	
<i>Griffin at Kynos. How, Why, and When?</i>	527
Tobias KRAPF	
<i>Symbolic Value and Magical Power: Examples of Prehistoric Objects Reused in Later Contexts in Euboea</i>	531
Susan LUPACK	
<i>pu-ro, pa-ki-ja-ne, and the Worship of an Ancestral Wanax</i>	537
Madelaine MILLER	
<i>The Boat – A Sacred Border-Crosser in Between Land and the Sea</i>	543
Sylvie MÜLLER CELKA	
<i>Caring for the Dead in Minoan Crete: a Reassessment of the Evidence from Anemospilia</i>	547
Marcia NUGENT	
<i>Portals to the Other: Stepping through a Botanic Door</i>	557
Marco PIETROVITO	
<i>Beyond the Earthly Shell: the Minoan Pitcher Bearers. Anthropomorphic Rhyta of the Pre- and Protopalatial Periods (Differentiating the Sacred from the Divine)</i>	563
Jörg RAMBACH	
<i>Early Helladic Romanos/Messenia: Filling a Well</i>	567
Caroline THURSTON	
<i>New Approaches to Mycenaean Figurines in LH IIIC</i>	571
Michaela ZAVADIL	
<i>Souvenirs from Afar – Star Disk Pendants Reconsidered</i>	575
ENDNOTE	
Joseph MARAN	
<i>Towards an Anthropology of Religion in Minoan and Mycenaean Greece</i>	581
TO CONCLUDE ...	
Thomas G. PALAIMA	
<i>WI Fc 2014: When is an Inscribed Cigar Just a Cigar?</i>	595

ALL THE SAME YET NOT IDENTICAL? MYCENAEAN TERRACOTTA FIGURINES IN CONTEXT

to the memory of Robin Hägg*

At first glance Mycenaean figurines of the palatial period are a very homogeneous and widely spread class of artifacts on the Greek mainland. Due to their non-utilitarian nature and their presence in a variety of contexts they have often been taken as archetypical archaeological remains for reconstructing Mycenaean religious rituals.¹ A necessary precondition for the reconstruction of prehistoric religions is that religion is at least partly materialized and expressed in repetitive and formalized ritual acts that leave patterned material remains and form a body of cohesive social performances.² In this respect, recent approaches to Mycenaean religion have mostly embraced concepts that aim at reconstructing the impact of religious performances on social relationships.³ However, different social and political spheres in the practice of religion have often been conceptualized in a rather static and monothetic way. Based on such an understanding certain recurrent find patterns were either ascribed to an official, i.e. elite and palace-based, or to a popular cult.⁴

Focusing on new material styles and spatial distributions, the formation of a canonical Mycenaean religion was seen to have originated partly in idiosyncratic transformations of Minoan religious expressions and partly in hard-to-grasp indigenous Helladic components.⁵ A development of Mycenaean religion has been broadly sketched from an incipient stage in the Shaft Grave period, where Minoan religious symbols were used in a rather emblematic manner, towards more integrated performative and ostentatious ways of religious ceremonies in the palatial period that were seen to

* The following is greatly indebted to the influential contributions of Robin Hägg, who was the first and foremost to draw attention to the question, how ritual practices shaped social distinctions in the Mycenaean period, even if I disagree with his model of official and popular cults.

¹ G. ALBERS, "Figures and Figurines in Mycenaean Sanctuaries: patterns of find distributions and contexts," in A.-L. SCHALLIN and P. PAKKANEN (eds.), *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines* (2009) 85-98; K. KILIAN, "Patterns in the Cult Activity in the Mycenaean Argolid: Haghia Triada (Klenies), the Prophitis Elias Cave (Haghios Hadrianos) and the Citadel of Tiryns," in R. HÄGG and G. NORDQUIST (eds.), *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid* (1990) 185-196; K. KILIAN, "Mykenische Heiligtümer der Peloponnes," in H. FRONING, T. HÖLSCHER, and H. MIELSCH (eds.), *Kotinos. Festschrift für Erika Simon* (1992) 10-25; J. WRIGHT, "The spatial configuration of belief. The archaeology of Mycenaean religion," in S. ALCOCK and R. OSBORNE (eds.), *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (1994) 66-67 tab. 3.1, 68-72.

² C. BELL, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (1992) esp. 7, 89, 107, 114. Ritualization as a strategic mode of practice characterizes concrete and specific ritual acts in technologically advanced societies. By engaging non-institutionalized subjects in the configuration of the social it thus produces a ritualized social body; see also B. DÜCKER, "Ritualisierung," in C. BROSIUS, A. MICHAELS, and P. SCHRODE (eds.), *Ritual und Ritualdynamik – Schlüsselbegriffe, Theorien, Diskussionen* (2013) 151-158.

³ J. WRIGHT, "The archaeological correlates of religion: case studies in the Aegean," in *POLITEIA*, 341-348. On rituals, ritualization and their impact on social structures see A. BÜTTNER, M. MATTHEIS, and K. SOBKOWIAK, "Macht und Herrschaft", in C. BROSIUS, A. MICHAELS, and P. SCHRODE (eds.), *Ritual und Ritualdynamik – Schlüsselbegriffe, Theorien, Diskussionen* (2013) 69-76.

⁴ R. HÄGG, "Official and Popular Cults in Mycenaean Greece," in R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS (eds.), *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age* (1981) 35-39.

⁵ R. HÄGG, "Degrees and Character of the Minoan Influence on the Mainland," in R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS (eds.), *The Minoan Thalassocracy. Myth and Reality* (1984) 119-122; R. HÄGG, "Mycenaean Religion: The Helladic and the Minoan Components," in A. MORPURGO-DAVIES and Y. DUHOUX (eds.), *Linear B: A 1984 survey* (1985) 203-225; H. WHITTAKER, "Religion and Power – the Nature of Minoan Influence on Early Mycenaean Religion," *OpAth* 27 (2002) 151-157.

reinforce certain social distinctions, mainly between the palace and the populace.⁶ Most researchers also emphasize that this body of religious ceremonies was transformed into more diverse ritual acts with the demise of the palaces on the Greek mainland, in order to fit the needs of less hierarchically organized post-palatial societies.⁷ All these approaches touched upon questions such as how and where religious ceremonies may have been instrumentalized to confer power or prestige onto individuals or specific social groups, yet they seldom investigated idiosyncrasies in regional and temporal patterns.⁸ More importantly, Mycenaean terracotta figurines and figures have generally been treated as passive and static markers of ritual performances of different social strata.⁹ This paper discusses to what extent coherent ritual practices with terracotta figurines can be determined in the Mycenaean period. It presents some thoughts on how terracotta figurines and figures may actually have shaped ritual performances and thus ritualized¹⁰ the social body and also investigates, where and when similar or divergent ritual practices were enacted by the use of figurines. Paraphrasing the title – did different Mycenaean figurine classes afford the same rituals or were they enacted differently?

How it all started...

After a gap in the material evidence for most of the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2100/2050 – 1700/1675 BCE) and the Early Mycenaean or Shaft Grave period, miniature, i.e. ca. palm-sized, three-dimensional images of terracotta, re-appear on the Greek mainland just prior to the Mycenaean palatial period (ca. 1400 – 1200 BCE). The origin of the phenomenon is contested but seems to be closely related to the formation of mainland palatial elites and the proliferation of new religious practices, which were partly adapted from Minoan Neopalatial elites, but were amalgamated with new types of materials, and were inserted into traditional mainland arenas of social display, such as the funerary realm.

The earliest types of Mycenaean terracotta figurines seem to be part of a ‘Mycenaean package’¹¹ and may be indicative of the ‘Mycenaeanization’ of large parts of the early Late Helladic [LH] Greek mainland and the Cycladic islands.¹² To bolster the claim that the terracottas formed an active part in

⁶ R. HÄGG, “State and Religion in Mycenaean Greece,” in *POLITEIA*, 387-390.

⁷ J. MARAN, “Political and Religious Aspects on the Upper Citadel of Tiryns. The Case of Building T,” in *POTNIA*, 117.

⁸ But see W. CAVANAGH, “Innovation, Conservatism and Variation in Mycenaean Funerary Ritual,” in K. BRANIGAN (ed.), *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age* (1998) esp. 109-110, 112-113.

⁹ For a detailed critique of Hägg’s model of ‘official’ and ‘popular’ cults see M. VETTERS, “Eingrenzen, Abgrenzen, Ausgrenzen – Interpretationsansätze mykenischer Figurinen im Siedlungskontext,” in T. DOPPLER, B. RAMMINGER, and D. SCHIMMELPFENNIG (eds.), *Grenzen und Grenzräume? Beispiele aus Neolithikum und Bronzezeit (Fokus Jungsteinzeit. Berichte der AG Neolithikum 2, 2011)* 282-284; M. VETTERS, “Private and communal ritual in postpalatial Tiryns,” in S. BOCHER and P. PAKKANEN (eds.), *Cult material. Ritual and cult in the archaeological study of early Greek religion* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 21, forthcoming); WRIGHT (*supra* n. 1), 72-76. The archaeological contexts cannot easily be correlated with the postulated artefactual markers for the distinct cult levels, because large wheel-made figures appear in open-air sanctuaries for instance. Moreover, small handmade terracotta figurines can in no way be connected to Middle Helladic, popular cults – terracotta figurines are absent from the austere Middle Helladic material culture. Additionally, the terms of ‘official’ and ‘popular’ cults imply a codified set of religious behavior and conduct and usually a monotheistic book religion – and it is questionable, whether ritual practices even during the roughly two centuries of the palatial period formed such a codified religious system.

¹⁰ The process of ritualization is opposed to codified ritual traditions and ritualism, which is defined as formalized ritual processes or sequences in institutionally legitimized religious contexts, see DÜCKER (*supra* n. 2) 152-153.

¹¹ VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 9) 278-280 with further references.

¹² K. PASTERNAK, *Mycenaean Terracotta Figures and Figurines Beyond the Mainland: An Index of ‘Mycenaeanization’*, MA thesis Tufts University (2007) (UMI 1442531 microform) Accessed 2014-12-31 <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304803837>; VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 9) 278-280 and 284-286 for a critique of Pasternak’s concept of all palatial figurines found in the Eastern and Central Mediterranean as indicators

the generation of Mycenaean Lebenswelten, the beginnings of LBA coroplastic images on the Greek mainland are shortly discussed: Pictorial representations in clay and metal in the rather austere Middle Helladic [MH] material remains on the Greek mainland are rare, especially three-dimensional models of human and animal forms.¹³ In contrast, Minoan Crete has a continuous record of small-scale three-dimensional representations featuring in ritual contexts mostly within peak sanctuaries but also in the domestic sphere.¹⁴ Human and animal terracotta figurines are ubiquitous on Crete during the Minoan Old Palace period and in the subsequent Neopalatial period: vast numbers of terracotta figurines occur in Middle Minoan [MM] III – Late Minoan [LM] I peak sanctuaries.¹⁵ Although Minoan handmade clay figurines in the shape of males, females, human body parts, various but mostly domestic animals, and miniature terracotta offering tables are frequently attested, they are seldom found in domestic contexts and even less as burial gifts in tombs.¹⁶ Elite votive dedications in the form of metal statuettes of male and female adorants are also scarce outside Cretan peak and cave sanctuaries.¹⁷

At the end of the MH period and beginning of the LBA a few imports of Minoan anthropomorphic figurines in clay are attested in the southwestern Peloponnese. The process of reception, amalgamation and transformation of Minoan coroplastic prototypes into distinctive Mycenaean terracottas can best be observed in Laconia. Laconia constitutes the Peloponnesian region most clearly influenced by Minoan Crete in the early Mycenaean period and is thereby set apart from other regions during the 15th and even early 14th centuries BCE. At Ayios Stephanos, for instance, two fragments of Middle Minoan terracotta figurines comprising a fragmentary seated male figurine and a fragment of a female hat or base stem from MH III contexts¹⁸, a local Minoanizing head fragment derives from a LH IIA context¹⁹ and a bird askos²⁰ was discovered in the LH IIB-III A:1 infant burial in cist Beta 28. Also in Laconia, two Minoan human lead figurines (unique because the choice of metal on Crete is bronze) were found in the LH IIB-LH III A:1 tholos of Kampos, and a Minoan male bronze statuette in Pavlopetri.²¹ In the debris directly above Mansion I of the Menelaion near Sparta, another Minoan female terracotta figurine came to light in a context with a terminus ante or ad quem of LH III A:1²², associated with a unique and probably imported Minoan architectural terracotta model.²³ Neighboring Messenia also presents evidence of Minoan terracotta sculpture in the

of ‘Mycenaeans abroad’.

- ¹³ Exceptions are the cattle *rhyta* from the west cemetery in Eleusis tomb Επ2, G.E. MYLONAS, *Το δυτικό νεκροταφείον της Ελευσίνος. Τόμος Γ: Πίνακες* (1975) pls. 37β, 38α-β, 39.
- ¹⁴ G. RETHEMIOTAKIS, *Ανθρωπομορφική πηλοπλαστική στην Κρήτη από τη νεοανακτορική έως την υπομινωϊκή περίοδο* (1998) 15-16.
- ¹⁵ A. PEATFIELD, “Minoan Religion for Ordinary People,” in *Πεπραγμένα Η Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου, Ηράκλειο, 9 - 14 September 1996, Τόμος Α3: Προϊστορική και Αρχαία Ελληνική Περίοδος* (2000) 9-17; M. ZEIMBEKI, “The organization of votive production and distribution in the peak sanctuaries of state society Crete: a perspective offered by the Juktas clay animal figures,” in G. CADOGAN, E. HATZAKI, and A. VASILAKIS (eds.), *Knossos: Palace, City, State* (2004) 351-361.
- ¹⁶ E. FRENCH, “The Development of Mycenaean Terracotta Figurines,” *BSA* 66 (1971) 105.
- ¹⁷ E. SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKIS, *Die bronzenen Menschenfiguren auf Kreta und in der Ägäis* (1995) 138.
- ¹⁸ E. FRENCH, “Terracotta Minoan and Mycenaean Figurines, 1959-77, including those from Asteri,” in W.D. TAYLOUR and R. JANKO (eds.), *Ayios Stephanos. Excavations at a Bronze Age and Medieval Settlement in Southern Laconia* (2008) 455 nos. 7092-7093 pl. 54, 7092.7093.
- ¹⁹ FRENCH 2008 (*supra* n. 18) 454-455 no. 7086 pl. 54, 7086.
- ²⁰ Probably constituting the earliest terracotta bird *askos* on the Greek mainland, FRENCH 2008 (*supra* n. 18) 453 no. 3289 pl. 40; TAYLOUR and JANKO (eds.) (*supra* n. 18) fig. 2.5 pl. 21, a-b.
- ²¹ SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 17) 8, 83-83 nos. 144-145 for the Kampos figurines, SAPOUNA-SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 17) 85 no. 146, 135 for the Pavlopetri statuette. Recently, a head of a male bronze figurine was found in a fill north of the Cyclopean Terrace in Iklaina, Messenia, cf. V. PETRAKIS, “Το έργον της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας κατά το 2011,” *Ergon* (2012) 28.
- ²² H.W. CATLING, *Sparta: Menelaion I. The Bronze Age, 2 vols. (volume 1: Text, volume 2: Figures and Plates)* (2009) 2: pl. 119, a-c.
- ²³ CATLING (*supra* n. 22) 1: 276 fig. 24; for another female Minoan figurine purportedly from Sparta cf. G. RETHEMIOTAKIS, *Μινωϊκά πήλινα ειδώλια* (2001) 16-17 fig. 22, α-β.

form of a Minoan female figurine found in Tholos 2 of Peristeria, dated to LH IIA.²⁴ However, the northernmost Minoan terracotta is so far the unique female figurine wearing a vessel on her head, found in the warrior grave of Staphylos on the Northern Sporadic island of Skopelos in a LH IIB-LH IIIA:1 context.²⁵ The tomb's furnishings comprised inter alia a richly gilded sword, a double axe, a dagger, a javelin point, and a bronze amphora. Two inhumations are reported: one of a male, the other, based on the associated figurine and jewelry finds, presumably of a female.

Cretan or Minoanizing zoomorphic three-dimensional representations are even rarer than female figurines: Apart from the bird askos in Ayios Stephanos, a massive, hand-made terracotta bull comes from a LH I-II burial context in Argos²⁶ and two hand-made fragments of hollow cattle figures from LH II contexts in Nichoria.²⁷ The use of coroplastic representation as burial gifts on the Greek mainland stands in marked contrast to the most frequent deposition locale of figurines on Crete²⁸—Minoan peak sanctuaries.²⁹ The contexts of the few Minoan coroplastic examples on the Greek mainland indicate that anthropomorphic images appear first in contexts that can be associated with an emerging Helladic palatial elite.

By LH IIB, just before the appearance of the generic Mycenaean palatial megara and thus during the formative stages of the hierarchical, proto-state Mycenaean palatial societies, the first Mycenaean figurines start to appear that are distinguishable from Minoan terracottas by a number of features: Females³⁰ prevail in the corpus, but obviously a female figurine per se does not indicate gender-specific burial gifts: One of the earliest Mycenaean naturalistic figurines was found at the chest of a male inhumation in burial pit 2 of the Grave Circle at Pylos with a chert arrow head, a bronze dagger and mirror as well as scale pans, a bronze bowl and a pin with an ivory head, a glass bead and a plain askos as further burial gifts.³¹ In general, the earliest closed find contexts are burials that often show considerable architectural or other material investment. Early palatial domestic contexts also featured figurines³², but well-preserved settlement deposits of the crucial phase between LH IIB and LH IIIA:1 are scarcely attested.³³ Certain motifs occur on the mainland, but are not evidenced on

²⁴ FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 109.

²⁵ N. PLATON, “Ο τάφος του Σταφίλου και ο μινωϊκός αποικισμός της Πεπαρεθού,” *CretChron* 3 (1949) 551 pl. II; VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 9) 280, 288 n. 4.

²⁶ M.A. GUGGISBERG, *Frühgriechische Tierkeramik. Zur Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Tiergefäße und der hohlen Tierfiguren in der späten Bronze- und frühen Eisenzeit (ca. 1600-700 v. Chr.)* (1996) 272 with n. 1294, 273 fig. 20.

²⁷ GUGGISBERG (*supra* n. 26) 61-62 nos. 186-187 pl. 12, 6-7; perhaps also GUGGISBERG 1996, 61 nos. 188-189 pl. 12, 8. Additionally, a Minoanizing bull figure was recently found in a destruction context probably dating to LH IIA in Building A of Ayios Vasilios, Laconia, cf. V. PETRAKIS, “Το έργον της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας κατά το 2010,” *Ergon* (2011) 36 fig. 28.

²⁸ Terracottas as burial gifts only start to appear in Minoan burials by LM II-III A:1 in cemeteries, which are either partly influenced by Mycenaean burial customs, or where the adjoining settlement exhibits some mainland influence, e.g. Mavrospilio, Ayia Triada and Chania.

²⁹ Typical Minoan peak sanctuaries are missing on the Greek mainland, as the open-air sanctuary on the Kynortion hill in Epidauros can at best be characterized as an idiosyncratic Mycenaean peak sanctuary, HÄGG 1984 (*supra* n. 5) 120.

³⁰ First of the naturalistic type, FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 109-112, esp. 110 fig. 2; for a distribution map of the type see I. WEBER-HIDEN, “Mykenische Figurinen. Eine Analyse ihrer Verteilungsmuster,” in F. BLAKOLMER, C. REINHOLDT, J. WEILHARTNER, and G. NIGHTINGALE (eds.), *Österreichische Forschungen zur Ägäischen Bronzezeit 2009. Akten der Tagung vom 6. bis 7. März 2009 am Fachbereich Altertumswissenschaften der Universität Salzburg* (2011) 324 fig. 3.

³¹ I.N. TZONOU-HERBST, “Η Πολυσημία των Μυκηναϊκών Ειδωλίων,” in A. VLACHOPOULOS and K. BIRTACHA (eds.), *Αργοναύτης. Τιμητικός Τόμος για τον καθηγητή Χρίστο Ντούμα από τους μαθητές του στο Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών (1980-2000)* (2003) 649, 651 fig. 3; VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 9) 279-280.

³² The Atreus Bothros in Mycenae, which features ca. 106 figurine fragments, is a secondary context of early figurine types. The refuse in this *bothros* stems from habitation layers but does not provide clues to the primary functions of the terracottas; on figurine disposal see I.N. TZONOU-HERBST, “Trashing the sacred: the use-life of Mycenaean figurines,” in A.-L. SCHALLIN and P. PAKKANEN (eds.), *Encounters with Mycenaean figure and figurines* (2009) 161-175.

³³ Yet see the early domestic context of the Megaron room in Nichoria that contained figurine fragments,

contemporary Crete, such as the *kourotrophos* (a female nursing a child)³⁴ and enthroned figurines.³⁵ The latter two are idiosyncratic mainland types that are already established and wide-spread by LH IIIA:1.³⁶ The same applies to the first truly Mycenaean type of female terracottas, Proto-Phi figurines³⁷, but this type even appears as far west as the Aeolian island of Lipari³⁸ and as far east as Tell Ta'anek in Israel.³⁹

The inexpensive terracotta figurines may therefore be interpreted as very effective transport media of new religious beliefs on the Greek mainland: These three-dimensional models made those new concepts 'easy to grasp'⁴⁰ and may thus not have depended on a centrally monitored distribution process. The geographical spread of early Mycenaean terracottas and their subsequent penetration into lower social strata may have been generated precisely by these innate properties – an interpretation, which endows them with an agency of their own to promote their horizontal as well as vertical distribution.

Such an interpretation works well for female figurines, because it implies that by holding the terracottas new religious ideas either of new female deities or new ritual roles of women⁴¹ were

infra n. 72. Further early finds of terracotta figurines in domestic contexts are to be expected for Ayios Vasilios in Laconia (*supra* n. 27) and Iklaina in Messenia, cf. PETRAKIS 2011 (*supra* n. 21) 28 fig. 17.

³⁴ S.L. BUDIN, *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age. Reconsidering Fertility, Maternity, and Gender in the Ancient World* (2011) 299-314, 325, esp. 305-309 with earlier bibliography; earliest examples stem from burial contexts in Aidonia in the Korinthia (a naturalistic *kourotrophos* and another naturalistic Mycenaean figurine from chamber tomb 6 with associated pottery dated to LH IIB) and Magoula Galatas in Troizenia (a naturalistic *kourotrophos* from Tholos A, dated to LH IIB – LH IIIA:1) and probably from a tomb in the vicinity of Palaioiopolis/Kastri on Kythera.

³⁵ M. VETTERS, "Seats of power? Making the most of miniatures – the role of terracotta throne models in disseminating Mycenaean religious ideology," in W. GAUSS, M. LINDBLOM, R.A. SMITH, and J.C. WRIGHT (eds.), *Our Cups Are Full: Pottery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age. Papers Presented to Jeremy B. Rutter On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (2011) esp. 322-324. The seated male figurine from Ayios Stephanos, see *supra* n. 18, is a rare example of Minoan seated terracotta figurines. Notably, the *kourotrophoi* from Aidonia and Kythera are stylistically closely comparable – *kourotrophoi* are attested as far north as the tholos of Kazanaki close to Dimini, dated probably to LH IIIA:1, where two female, three male and two infant/adolescence burials with evidence for secondary cremation of disarticulated bones were excavated, V. ADRYMI-SISMANI, "Mycenaean Northern Borders Revisited – New Evidence from Thessaly," in M.L. GALATY and W.A. PARKINSON (eds.), *Rethinking Mycenaean Palaces II* (2007) 170-171.

³⁶ For the rapid geographical spread of enthroned figurines from the Mycenaean core zone in the Argolid and Corinthia to Achaia see the LH IIIA:1 enthroned Proto-Phi figurines from Tumulus A at Portes in Achaia, A.G. VLACHOPOULOS (ed.), *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ – Πελοπόννησος* (2012) 2012, 304-305 fig. 597, and in the tholos of Petroto, L. PAPAZOGLOU-MANIOUDAKI, "Ο θολωτός τάφος του Πετρωτού Πατρών, Τα πρώτα στοιχεία της έρευνας," in N. KYPARISSI-APOSTOLIKA and M. PAPA-KONSTANTINOU (eds.), *Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου, Β' Διεθνές Διεπιστημονικό Συμπόσιο, 26-30 Σεπτεμβρίου, Λαμία 1999* (2003) 437-438 fig. 17; VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 9) 280.

³⁷ FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 112-116; M. VETTERS, *Die spätbronzezeitlichen Terrakotta-Figurinen aus Tiryns. Überlegungen zu religiös motiviertem Ritualverhalten in mykenischer Zeit anhand von Kontextanalysen ausgewählter Siedlungsbefunde, PhD thesis University of Heidelberg* (2009) chap. III.1.2.

³⁸ A Proto-Phi fragment was excavated in the settlement of Lipari in a domestic context roughly contemporaneous with LH IIIA, cf. W. TAYLOUR, *Mycenaean Pottery in Italy and Adjacent Areas* (1958) 43 pl. 8, 3; FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 116.

³⁹ For the Proto-Phi figurine from the settlement of Tell Ta'anek in Israel, dated to LH IIIA on typological grounds, see A. LEONARD, *An Index to the Late Bronze Age: Aegean Pottery from Syria-Palestine* (1994) 137 no. 2173.

⁴⁰ See the discussion by D.W. BAILEY, *Prehistoric Figurines. Representation and Corporeality in the Neolithic* (2005) 26-44 on the intimacy between a person handling a terracotta and the figurine, which is provoked by the miniaturization and three-dimensionality of such objects and the 'paradoxon of multiple scales'.

⁴¹ The predominance of females in the corpus of Mycenaean religious imagery may indirectly be attributed to Minoan Crete; see J. MARAN, "Lost in Translation: the Emergence of Mycenaean Culture as a Phenomenon of Globalization," in T.C. WILKINSON, S. SHERRATT, and J. BENNET (eds.), *Interweaving Worlds. Systemic Interactions in Eurasia, 7th to 1st Millennium BC, Papers from a conference in memory of*

conferred to the person/s handling them. It does, however, not very well explain the slightly later appearance of small handmade animals (and also furniture models and group figurines). Compared to the anthropomorphic figurines, less attention has generally been paid to the first examples of zoomorphic terracottas on the mainland; they seem to lack in LH IIB contexts and only appear at the start of LH IIIA:1, e.g. in Cist VI of Prosymna tomb XXIX.⁴² The first Mycenaean animal terracottas are painted in contrast to unpainted Minoan precursors, a phenomenon also observable in Early Helladic [EH] zoomorphic figurines, which the LH examples resemble. Yet the hiatus of more than five centuries between EH and LH animal terracottas militates against an interpretation of this phenomenon as a mainland tradition. At present, no succinct functional interpretation of the role of animal figurines exists, but zoomorphic terracottas may have acted from their inception as substitutes for sacrifice. The question remains, however, whether burnt sacrifice did already exist as a ritual practice in the 14th century BCE Mycenaean world. If not, votives in the form of miniature cattle⁴³ may have functioned as charms of protection for cattle livestock. Bovids served as traction beasts in agriculture and as a source of considerable portions of meat; their conspicuous consumption or sacrifice conferred prestige onto their owners. A bovid terracotta votive may thus have acted in two ways – symbolizing the wealth of the dedicant and ensuring supernatural protection of one's socio-cultural status and well-being.⁴⁴ The roughly contemporary start of Mycenaean throne and bed models and group figurines such as chariots, also poses the question, whether these representations may have enacted or embodied specific concepts or even abbreviated ritual performances – a hypothesis which would supersede their rather static interpretation as emblematic religious paraphernalia or elite items.

All the same anywhere?

After the initial spread of Mycenaean terracotta figurines they are widely attested on the Greek mainland by LH IIIA:2 and mostly conform to standardized types. Although the stylistic and iconographic homogeneity of the terracottas is one of their most significant features, it is often overlooked that rare or singular types are also attested, often at the largest Mycenaean centers. Unusual anthropomorphic figurines comprise inter alia 'breadmakers'⁴⁵, triple groups of two female figurines with a child on shoulder⁴⁶, a flute player and another unusual human figurine with outstretched arms⁴⁷, bull-riders⁴⁸, and – at the end of the palatial period – a seated Late Psi-figurine on a horse.⁴⁹ The motif of other fragments of uncanonical female figurines⁵⁰ and of the head of an

Professor Andrew Sherratt. *What Would a Bronze Age World System Look Like? World Systems approaches to Europe and western Asia 4th to 1st millennia BC* (2011) 282-284 on the externally projected or perceived corporate images of social roles of Minoan Neopalatial society versus internally existent conceptions of society.

⁴² C.W. BLEGEN, *Prosymna. The Late Helladic Settlement Preceding the Argive Heraeum* (1937) II: fig. 155 no. 419; FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 152.

⁴³ Bovids are the dominant species in early and later Mycenaean palatial contexts.

⁴⁴ For a discussion (although regarding EIA animal figurines) see E. WALCEK AVERETT, *Dedications in Clay: Terracotta Figurines in Early Iron Age Greece (c. 1100-700 BCE)*, PhD thesis University of Missouri-Columbia (2007) 121-125. <http://hdl.handle.net/10355/4755> (accessed 2014-12-30).

⁴⁵ C.W. BLEGEN, "A Mycenaean Breadmaker," *ASAtene n.s.*, 8-10, 1946-1948 (1950) 13-16 with an example of unknown provenience, but the type is also attested at Mycenae and Tsoungiza.

⁴⁶ N. POLYCHRONAKOU-SKOURITSA, "Τρίμορφα μυκηναϊκά ειδώλια," *AAA* 19 (1986) 153-158; N. POLYCHRONAKOU-SKOURITSA, "Δύο νέα τρίμορφα μυκηναϊκά ειδώλια," *AAA* 32-34 (1999-2001) 141-148.

⁴⁷ E. KARDAMAKI, "A new group of figures and rare figurines from a Mycenaean workshop installation at Kontopigado, Alimos (Athens)," *AM* 2015 (forthcoming) figs. 6-7.

⁴⁸ E. KONSOLAKI-GIANNOPOULOU, "Τα μυκηναϊκά ειδώλια από τον Άγιο Κωνσταντίνο Μεθάνων," in E. KONSOLAKI-GIANNOPOULOU (ed.), *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΟΣ. Πρακτικά 1ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας του Αργολοαργονικού, Πόρος 26-29 Ιουνίου 1998* (2003) 377-378, 390-391 figs. 9-12.

⁴⁹ G. MYLONAS, "Seated and Multiple Mycenaean figurines in the National Museum Athens," in S.S. WEINBERG (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East. Studies presented to Hetty Goldman on the occasion of her 75th birthday* (1965) 112-113, 119 pl. XIV, 4.

⁵⁰ A. TAMVAKI, "Some unusual Mycenaean terracottas from the Citadel House area, 1954-69," *BSA* 68

unusual anthropomorphic figurine⁵¹ cannot be ascertained due to their fragmentary state; the same counts for a possibly entwined pair of males.⁵² Notably, the amount of singletons or rarely attested motifs appears to be higher at the time of the greatest homogeneity in the standard types than in the succeeding postpalatial period with its pronounced regional differences.⁵³ Examples of rare or ‘deviant’ types of large wheel-made anthropomorphic figures can also be pointed out in the corpus: large monochrome type B-figures, so far only attested in the LH IIIB:1 Cult Center of Mycenae⁵⁴, type A-figure fragments with an unusual gesture or head attire, e.g. the hand of a wheel-made human figure holding a kylix, or the head of a wheel-made female figure with plaits or a snake wound around the polos⁵⁵, the head fragment of a probably armed figure⁵⁶, or a male ityphallic figure.⁵⁷ The largest single-site corpus of Mycenaean coroplastic representations stems from the eponymous site of Mycenae: not surprisingly, this corpus features several rare types, e.g. the coiled terracotta snakes only attested in the ‘Temple’ of the Cult Center in the citadel⁵⁸; or the fragment of another unusual crouching animal figurine, perhaps a feline, also from the citadel of Mycenae.⁵⁹ A bed model with an applied item or person and an illegible (pictorial?) decoration on the under- or back-side comes from a later ritual bothros in Tiryns.⁶⁰ A rare model of a palanquin was also found in Tiryns.⁶¹ Two unique tripod models with animal figurines on top are part of the coroplastic assemblage of the sanctuary at Ayios Konstantinos on Methana.⁶² All these uncanonical examples have one thing in common: they are – like the standardized types – not part of narrative scenes but abbreviated and isolated motifs and many appear to resort to palatial iconography or represent elite items.

Returning to the prolific types of Mycenaean figurines, regional differences can be noted even in the standardized material remains of the palatial period: By the end of LH IIIB:2 numbers of figurines in settlement deposits of palatial sites in the Argolid run to the hundreds, whereas the Palace of Pylos features only a fraction of this amount, which indicates that figurine numbers are not commensurate. This provides a first hint that religious rituals are not codified and that regional differences are apparently stronger even at the end of the palatial period than one may assume on the basis of the standardized types of Mycenaean terracotta figurines. These differences in the geographical spread of specific types merit more detailed study. Canonical Tau-figurines, for example, seem to be restricted not only chronologically to the LH IIIB period but also geographically: Although Tau-figurines are

(1973) fig. 5, 20. 21. 23. 25.

⁵¹ TAMVAKI (*supra* n. 50) fig. 6, 27.

⁵² H. HUGHES-BROCK, “Minor sculpture and other modelling in terracotta and terracotta figures catalogue (TC),” in H.W. CATLING, *Sparta: Menelaion I. The Bronze Age, 2 vols. (volume 1: Text, volume 2: Figures and Plates)* (2009) 659 no. 2134, 918 pl. 10, 116-118.

⁵³ The identification of rare types in the postpalatial period may be biased by the fact that numbers of terracottas in the core zones of the palatial period are much higher than in LH IIIC.

⁵⁴ A.D. MOORE and W.D. TAYLOUR, *The Temple Complex* (Well Built Mycenae: The Helleno-British Excavations Within the Citadel of Mycenae, 1959–69, Fasc. 10, 1999) 47-50 pls. 13-22a.

⁵⁵ Both from the Amyklaion in Laconia: K. DEMAPOPOULOU, *To Μυκηναϊκό ιερό στο Αμυκλαίο και η ΎΕ ΙΙΙΓ περίοδος στη Λακωνία PhD thesis University of Athens* (1982) 54-56 pls. 25-26.

⁵⁶ KARDAMAKI (*supra* n. 47) figs. 9-10 from Alimos in Athens.

⁵⁷ Found in the so-called Epichosis of Tiryns, C. RENFREW (ed.), *The Archaeology of Cult. The Sanctuary at Phylakopi* (1985) 223, 224 fig. 6, 10 pl. 37 e-h; VETTERS 2009 (*supra* n. 37) chap. V.4.4.; M. VETTERS, “Die spätbronzezeitlichen Terrakotta-Figurinen aus Tiryns – Überlegungen zu religiös motiviertem Ritualverhalten in mykenischer Zeit anhand von Kontextanalysen ausgewählter Siedlungsbefunde – Zusammenfassung der Dissertation,” *Archäologisches Nachrichtenblatt* 17, 2012.1 (2012) 35.

⁵⁸ MOORE and TAYLOUR (*supra* n. 54) 104-107 pls. 23-25.

⁵⁹ TAMVAKI (*supra* n. 50) 227 fig. 12.

⁶⁰ KILIAN (*supra* n. 1) 193, 195 fig. 9, 4; see also bed model with two applied figurines in the collection of the Budapest museum, R.A. HIGGINS, *Greek Terracottas* (1967) 14 with fig.

⁶¹ K. DEMAPOPOULOU, “Πήλινο ομοίωμα φορείου της Μυκηναϊκής εποχής απο την Τίρυνθα,” in D. ZEPOS, N. PLATON, G. SAKELLARAKIS, J. TRAVLOS, and M. CHATZIDAKIS (eds.), *Φύλια έπη εις τον Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάν, Τόμος Γ* (1989) 25-33 pl. 4; see also FRENCH (*supra* n. 16) 173.

⁶² KONSOLAKI-GIANNOPOULOU (*supra* n. 48) 382, 402-403 figs. 33-34.

found as far north as Magnesia⁶³, they are most abundant in the Argolid⁶⁴ but are missing in Messenia, on Crete⁶⁵, and in the Levant.⁶⁶

Urban versus rural differences in the type variety of Mycenaean figurines seem to exist even within one region: Comparing attested types in the settlement contexts of the Lower Citadel in Tiryns with the figurine assemblage from the road sanctuary at Ayia Triada/Klenies/Ayios Vassilios (at the important crossroads between the Argolid and Corinthia) reveals that Ayia Triada features almost exclusively female figurines. Furthermore, the disproportionately large number of LH IIIA-B stem fragments from female figurines – with torsos and heads mostly missing in this assemblage – may hint at intentional breakage and selective deposition of different figurine parts.⁶⁷ Intentional type selection has so far only been noted as a phenomenon of shrine or settlement sanctuary assemblages. A type selection in sanctuaries is evidenced, for instance, in the Aphaia open-air sanctuary on Aegina with the notable amount of 13 kourotrophoi but also other female figurines, or in the assemblage of Room A in Ayios Konstantinos on Methana with its ca. 150 animal, skeuomorphic and composite (male) figurines but no female terracottas⁶⁸, and, last but not least, in the unique monochrome type-B figures found in the Temple of the Cult Center in Mycenae.⁶⁹ Such choices in the types of figurines in sanctuary contexts seems to reflect votive behavior that addressed characteristic traits of one or more specific deities: a predilection for specific figurine types was apparently tailored to individual aspects of the venerated deity/ies, but does not permit, in reverse conclusion, to assign certain types or motifs of terracottas to specific deities exclusively.

Protecting hearths and entrances?

Most figurines in settlements do not stem from sealed floors. Problems inherent in the depositional histories of multi-phase settlements led to the pessimistic view that the original place of the figurines' installation and thus their primary functions are inextricable. This is true to some extent.⁷⁰ However, recurrent installations or depositions of figurines as components of or embedded into domestic rituals have been reconstructed thanks to find patterns in closed contexts with floor deposits, which had incurred a sudden destruction and thus offer the best chances to represent former activity areas. Klaus Kilian was the first to recognize that figurines were habitually set up at hearths and entrances.⁷¹ Such protective rituals are evidenced probably from the start of figurine use in settlements, since a Phi-A head was found next to the hearth in Room 1 – the main room – of the so-called LH III

⁶³ G. HOURMOUZADIS, P. ASIMAKOPOULOU-ATZAKA, and A.M. KITSOS (eds.), *Magnesia – the story of a civilization* (1982) 86-87 fig. 56.

⁶⁴ WEBER-HIDEN (*supra* n. 30) 322.

⁶⁵ RETHEMIOTAKIS (*supra* n. 14) 98.

⁶⁶ VETTERS (*supra* n. 57) 33-34.

⁶⁷ For the site see KILIAN (*supra* n. 1) 185-190 but esp. figs. 1-3.

⁶⁸ KONSOLAKI-GIANNPOULOU (*supra* n. 48).

⁶⁹ MOORE and TAYLOUR (*supra* n. 54). The Cult Center clearly evidences type selection of wheel-made figures: three large wheel-made figures of type A, 19 monochrome type B-figures, one anthropomorphic vessel and 17 snake terracottas in the Temple (and only two female figurines of types earlier than the shrine's construction) as well as only one female figure in Room 32 and – instead of terracotta images – the ivory male head and lion in Room 31. Differences in the contemporaneous assemblages of the House of the Frescoes and the Temple demonstrate that the veneration of distinct deities with specific cult locales, as known from the Linear B testimonies, are discernible in the archaeological remains; here, however, we have to dispense with the exact identity of the venerated deity/ies so far.

⁷⁰ But see M. VETTERS, "From passive objects and discard patterns to enacted rituals? Contextualizing Mycenaean terracotta figurines – a 'practice' approach," in A. MULLER (ed.), *Actes du Colloque de Lille 'Figurines en contexte', Lille, décembre 2011 et Actes de la réunion 'Silent Participants', Philadelphie, janvier 2012* (forthcoming) for a methodological consideration how to integrate discarded figurine fragments in debris layers into contextual analyses.

⁷¹ E.g. KILIAN (*supra* n. 1) 14, 21.

A:1 Megaron in Nichoria.⁷² So far, published data from the palatial period indicate that mainly female figurines are set up at hearths, but also animals, which are more frequently in the postpalatial period⁷³, and even throne models⁷⁴ are attested. The protective function of figurines at hearths is rather difficult to reconcile with these non-human classes of terracottas – their role or what they stand for seems to be more context-specific than hitherto noted and demands further study.

Liminal spaces were also accorded special treatment, because figurines were often installed at entrances: An example with a specific selection of types stems from a LH IIIB Middle building in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns. Two oxcart and three bovids cluster around one of the entrances to the main room. Although fragments of female figurines are predominant in the building's assemblage, exclusively animals and oxcart-groups are associated with the entrances of the northeastern and eastern rooms. A selection of either female or animal figurines is further noted in certain rooms or areas of the Lower Citadel during the next major chronological phase, LH IIIB Developed – Final.⁷⁵

Turning from settlement deposits to the funerary evidence, figurines constitute selective grave goods and only occur in a portion of all burials: for instance, figurines were only found in 22 tombs of the 53 excavated chamber tombs of the Prosymna necropolis at the later site of the Argive Heraion. These 22 multiple burial chambers contained an absolute minimum of 239 individuals but only 121 figurines, and in one instance 16 anthropomorphic figurines derived from a single chamber tomb. Although no clear pattern has yet emerged, numerous chamber tombs in LH IIIA-B necropoleis feature just one single type of figurines or select classes such as anthropomorphic⁷⁶ or zoomorphic terracottas⁷⁷, which merit further investigations of potential rules that may have governed such choices.⁷⁸

The same protection of liminal spaces as in the domestic sphere can also be observed in tombs, usually close to or at the stomion: for instance a Phi-figurine in the northeast corner of the dromos at the stomion of the LH IIIA:2 chamber tomb of Barnavos at Nemea⁷⁹, or a Phi-figurine underneath the

⁷² H. HUGHES-BROCK, "Terracotta Figurines and Vessel Fragments," in W.A. McDONALD and N.C. WILKIE (eds.), *The Bronze Age Occupation. Excavations at Nichoria in Southwest Greece II* (1992) 629-630, 655 no. 2068, 672 fig. 10-10, 2068. Notably, the head was found together with another very fragmentary terracotta (no. 2147), cf. HUGHES BROCK 1992 (*supra*), 660 no. 2147, 671 fig. 10-9, 2147, that – rather than belonging to a throne, type B – probably represents the fragmentary reins of a chariot model.

⁷³ VETTERS forthcoming (*supra* n. 9).

⁷⁴ VETTERS 2011 (*supra* n. 35) 325 fig. 4.

⁷⁵ For detailed data see VETTERS (*supra* n. 70).

⁷⁶ E.g. three Phi B-figurines, one at the infant's cranium and two at the pelvis of the deceased woman, in tomb θπ 15 of the west cemetery in Eleusis, MYLONAS (*supra* n. 13) 52 pl. 131, 50-52; Tsountas' Tomb 80 in Mycenae with six Phi B-figurines, one *kourotrophos* and a Proto-Psi-figurine, XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU (*supra* n. 42) 223 pls. 105-16; Prosymna chamber tomb XXXIII with 16 Phi-figurines scattered along the chamber's east side (dated to LH IIIA:2-B:1) and a Phi B-figurine under the *stomion* wall, BLEGEN (*supra* n. 42) I 109, II 52 fig. 231, 54 fig. 234.

⁷⁷ For example Prosymna chamber tomb XXII with two juvenile inhumations found at the north and south side of the chamber in combination with four bovids and a chariot model each, BLEGEN (*supra* n. 42) I 65-68, 231, 233, 240, 241, 365-366, plan 8, II 25 fig. 129-130, 26 fig. 131-133, 27 fig. 134-135, 150 fig. 617, 151 fig. 618.

A clearly patterned selection of figurine classes is not evident in Prosymna, but most of the tombs with figurines as burial gifts demonstrate a preference for either anthropomorphic or zoomorphic terracottas: 15 tombs contained 63 female figurines, nine tombs 51 animal figurines and four tombs seven skeuomorphic (i.e. the class of inanimate objects such as throne and bed models) and group terracottas; female and animal terracottas co-occurred only in three tombs. Four tombs contained animal and skeuomorphic/composite figurines together and only one tomb (chamber tomb XVIII) featured all three classes – anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and skeuomorphic/composite terracottas.

⁷⁸ See U. THALER and M. VETTERS, "All the King's Horses," in A. VLACHOPOULOS (ed.), *PAINTBRUSHES. Wall-painting and vase-painting of the 2nd millennium BC in dialogue* (forthcoming) for chariot models in children's burials as items conferring prestige rather than simple toys, as stated by BLEGEN (*supra* n. 42) 256.

⁷⁹ J. WRIGHT, E. PAPPI, S. TRIANTAPHYLLOU, M.K. DABNEY, P. KARKANAS, G.

stones of the stomion wall of Tomb XXXIII in Prosymna⁸⁰, or in Tsountas' Tomb 79 at Mycenae with a triple Phi-group underneath the stones of the stomion wall but also a boat model and a double-headed animal inside the chamber.⁸¹

Differences of figurine deposition in burial contexts of the palatial period are, for instance, evident in Attica: Children are predominately inhumed in niches of the dromoi and generally accompanied by female figurines and only once by an animal figurine⁸² in the chamber tomb necropolis of Alyki Glyphada (with more than 13 chamber tombs of the palatial period).⁸³ The Fouresi chamber tomb necropolis of Glyka Nera contains exclusively female figurines but these are burial gifts in five out of six graves.⁸⁴ To summarize these examples from Attica, animal figurines are almost never used as burial gifts. Although some bones have decayed, it seems that female figurines were the predominant choice and accompanied inhumations of infants to adolescents. Moreover, children were mostly buried in niches of dromoi, whereas the skeletons of children were generally inhumed inside the chamber tombs in the Argive Prosymna necropolis. Therefore, Attica appears to be the region, where the deposition of terracottas in the funerary sector was most clearly governed by specific rules apparently related to age and prescribing specific locales for the burials of infant and adolescent members of the communities.

Diverse endings and new beginnings

After the demise of the palatial society figurines in the Argolid gradually diminish in settlement and burial contexts, and the contextual studies of settlement strata in Tiryns indicate that animal figurines subsequently replace the once dominant female figurines in domestic context⁸⁵ foreshadowing a development in EIA communal cult places. Certain types which have strong links to palatial ideology

KOTZAMANI, and A. LIVARDA, "Nemea Valley Archaeological Project, Excavations at Barnavos: Final Report," *Hesperia* 77 (2008) 621, 624 no. 30 fig. 16.

⁸⁰ *Supra* n. 76.

⁸¹ A. XENAKI-SAKELLARIOU, *Οι θαλαμωτοί τάφοι των Μυκηνών. Ανασκαφής Χρ. Τσούντα (1887-1898)* (1985) 220, 222 Π3230 (triple Phi-group), Π3099 (boat model), Π3093 (double-headed animal) pl. 104.

⁸² N. KYPARISSIS, "Μυκηναϊκοί τάφοι εις Βουρβάτσι," *ArchDelt* (Παράρτημα, 1927-28) 66 reports female and animal figurines from the cemetery of Vourvatsi.

⁸³ I. PAPADIMITRIOU, "Μυκηναϊκή τάφοι εις Αλυκής Γλυφάδας," *PraktArchEt* 1954 (1957) 72-88; I. PAPADIMITRIOU, "Μυκηναϊκή τάφοι εις Αλυκής Γλυφάδας," *PraktArchEt* 1955 (1960) 78-99. Two Psi- and one Phi-figurine were associated with a child skeleton in chamber tomb 1 of Alyki Glyphada, chamber tomb 3 featured six inhumations, two of which were children and one enthroned figurine, a type A-throne model, four Psi-figurines but no animals, chamber tomb 6 also contained a child burial with a triple Phi-figurine and a bird-shaped *askos* as well as a Tau-figurine in the *dromos* fill; chamber tomb 8 had two niches in the *dromos*, the northern one accommodated two inhumations (one of a child) and a Psi-figurine on its west side; niche A3 of chamber tomb Alpha contained four Phi-figurines and the only animal figurine from the cemetery as well as glass relief- and rock crystal beads, three serpentinite *conuli* and fragments of a child's cranium. Inside chamber tomb Alpha two Phi-figurines were found at the southeast wall of the chamber as well as one enthroned figurine and a type A throne-model. The largest niche of chamber tomb F featured four crania of children on the east side associated with one Phi-figurine and two feeding bottles and also two large pits with niches that contained juveniles, whereas infants and adolescents were generally buried in the niches of *dromoi*.

⁸⁴ E. KAKAVOGIANNIS, "Μυκηναϊκό Νεκροταφείο στο Λόφο Φούρεσι του Δήμου των Γλυκών Νερών Αττικής," *ArchAnAth* 32-34 (1999-2001) 55-70. Burial 6 is a pit burial in front of the *dromos* of chamber tomb 1; this LH IIIB grave did not contain bones but the fragment of type A throne model and a Psi-figurine with hollow stem. The niche (tomb 2a) in the *dromos* of chamber tomb 2 contained one early Phi B-, one hollow Psi- and one Psi-/Late Psi-A-figurine; pit burial 3, dated to LH IIIA:2, two early Phi B-figurines, pit burial 4 three Phi-figurines in different sizes. In chamber tomb 1 six burials with two Phi- and two triple figurines as well as two unusual Phi-*'kourotophoi'* were excavated.

⁸⁵ For a detailed study of figurines postpalatial domestic contexts inside and outside the citadel of Tiryns see VETTERS (*supra* n. 9).

and elites, such as throne models⁸⁶ and chariots⁸⁷, are not produced anymore. However, a curation of typologically earlier figurines and figures is so far best evidenced within cult contexts of the postpalatial period. The phenomenon also pertains to one of best known wheel-made figures – the Lady of Phylakopi. The assemblages in Phylakopi finally lead to a last observation: the pairing of identical or similar figures in postpalatial shrines⁸⁸ and the re-use of figures' parts. A reuse of broken, single heads of anthropomorphic figures in Mycenaean sanctuaries is probably not a singular phenomenon, but seems to be more common in the LH IIIC period. The recycling of fragments as pars pro toto is for instance evident in Asine.⁸⁹ Although the assemblage found in Room 32 of the LH IIIC Late House G at Asine is generally well preserved, no further body parts of the so-called Lord of Asine are extant in this context. Furthermore, the small handmade figurines seem to closely mimic each other.

Wheel-made bovids are apparently more common in postpalatial than in palatial sanctuaries. Fragments of such figures are conspicuously absent in the Cult Center of Mycenae⁹⁰; a singular bovid with pictorial decoration was found in front of the LH IIIC Early shrine Room 117 in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns⁹¹, and another one in the courtyard of the subsequent LH IIIC Advanced shrine Room 110.⁹² At least one bovid figure is attested in the LH IIIC phase of the sanctuary on Ayia Irini/Kea.⁹³ Most numerous are the nine bovids in the LH IIIC Middle sanctuary deposits of Phylakopi⁹⁴, but bovid figures are also attested from the hypaethral sanctuaries of Amyklai⁹⁵ and

⁸⁶ VETTERS (*supra* n. 35).

⁸⁷ Only in Phylakopi on Melos a centuries-old chariot model was set up in the sanctuary until the LH IIIC Middle destruction at the end of phase 2b, although some parts had already broken off and were swept out with the rubbish into the courtyard, see THALER and VETTERS (*supra* n. 78).

⁸⁸ Pairing of female figures and bovid figures in the sanctuary of Phylakopi on Melos: E. FRENCH, "Horses for Courses: Differentiation in the use of figures and figurines," in E. KONSOLAKI-GIANNPOULOU (ed.), *ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΟΣ. Πρακτικά 1ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας του Αργολορρινικού, Πόρος 26-29 Ιουνίου 1998* (2003) 312, 315-316 figs. 4-5.

⁸⁹ The so-called Lord of Asine (more probably a female figure or a sphinx; C. LAVIOSA, "Il lord di Asine è una 'sfinge'?", in *Atti e memorie del primo congresso internazionale di Micenologia: Roma 27 Settembre – 3 Ottobre 1967* (1968) 87-90) in Room 32 of the LH IIIC Late House G, which was associated with other cult equipment but no further fragments of the figure, R. HÄGG, "The house sanctuary at Asine revisited," in R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS (eds.), *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age* (1981) 92 fig. 2, 1, 93; for a smaller head fragment of a wheel-made figurine associated with the rear bench of LH IIIC Late Room 110a in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns see K.-G. HINZEN, M. VETTERS, T. KALYTTA, S.K. REAMER, and U. DAMM-MEINHARDT, "Testing the Response of Mycenaean Terracotta Figures and Vessels to Earthquake Ground Motions," *Geoarchaeology* 30 (2015) 15-16; VETTERS (*supra* n. 9); for a potentially reused head in Room A of the LH IIIC Middle sanctuary on Phylakopi/Melos see RENFREW (*supra* n. 57) 217 fig. 6.5, 221-222 SF 2672, 378. A special case is the reused Late Cycladic I/LM I head of a statue in the Late Geometric shrine of the sanctuary of Ayia Irini on Kea, which is the only clear example of a LBA large coroplastic figure reused in the EIA as a cult image, see M.E. CASKEY, "Ayia Irini, Kea: the terracotta statues and the cult in the temple," in R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS (eds.), *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age* (1981) 129-130, 131 fig. 7. A recycling of the head already in the LH IIIC period can neither be proven nor disproved, as ample cult paraphernalia and an LH IIIC occupation fill attest, CASKEY (*supra*) 130.

⁹⁰ For a single fragment that may represent a fish *rhyton* instead of a hollow bovid figure see FRENCH 2003 (*supra* n. 88) 315 fig. 3. For a recently identified fragment of a bovid figure from the *megaron* of the Pylian palace see E. EAGAN, "A Bull Among the China? A Fragmentary Wheel-made Figure from the Palace of Nestor," *Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, 5-8 January, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania* (2012).

⁹¹ KILIAN (*supra* n. 1) pl. 3, 2.

⁹² KILIAN (*supra* n. 1) pl. 3, 1.

⁹³ CASKEY (*supra* n. 89) 132.

⁹⁴ RENFREW (*supra* n. 57) 236.

⁹⁵ DEMAKOPOULOU (*supra* n. 55) 57-63 pls. 27-39; Amyklai features at least as many bovid figures as Phylakopi.

Kalapodi.⁹⁶ Even if too simplistic an interpretation for all cases, substituting a bull for sacrifice by a bovid figure may also have been due to the more limited resources of postpalatial individuals or communities in comparison to palace-sponsored sacrificial ceremonies and feasts in the LH IIIB period: Libations of red wine being poured out from these vessels would indeed provide a simulacrum of a sacrificed bull.

While female figurines were predominant in the palatial period, with numbers of the most widely attested Late Psi-figurines then progressively diminishing in LH IIIC, small hand-made animal figurines are, like the bovid figures, the class of Mycenaean terracottas that continues into the EIA. Based on detailed case studies in Tiryns, their numbers increase in comparison to the female figurines and they represent the dominant or even exclusive class of figurines in domestic contexts by the end of the LBA.⁹⁷ I have argued elsewhere⁹⁸ that in all three phases of the postpalatial settlement sanctuary in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns – Room 117, Room 110 und Room 110a – exclusively female figurines were used as votives in or around the structure. Large wheel-made female figures were apparently set up on the rear bench of the shrines based on the evidence of the LH IIIC Middle/Advanced settlement sanctuary, i.e. Room 110 that ended in a conflagration. It was leveled and built over by Room 110a shortly afterwards, thus preserving the inventory of shrine Room 110 quasi in situ: Three large wheel-made female figures – two of them a pair of large Psi-figures⁹⁹ – were found on the floor in front of the bench.¹⁰⁰ During the last phase of the settlement sanctuary, i.e. LH IIIC Late Room 110a (at the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 11th century BCE), the number of female figurines that were set up as votives declined noticeably. Once again a large wheel-made figure is present in Room 110a. Additionally, the head of a smaller figure that had already been installed in the previous phase (in Room 110 as joining fragments prove) was now reused as *pars pro toto*. The humble number of votives and the reuse of an already damaged figure in the area of the settlement sanctuary, as well as the total disappearance of Psi-figurines in all contexts by the EIA, provide evidence for a transformation in rituals, in which imagery and practices originating in the palatial period gradually disappear.

The study of the figurines' distributions, changes in motifs and idiosyncratic contextual associations still offers much scope for further analyses: the ritualization of the social body, changes in ritual performances and specific ritual practices that are conditioned by but also actively shape social cohesiveness or distinctions, have only been sketched here. In these discourses figurines are all but passive: they comprise very much both, physical materialization and metaphysical concepts in the Mycenaean world.

Melissa VETTERS

⁹⁶ W.-D. NIEMEIER, "Kalapodi (Abai)," *AA 2012/1 Beiheft* (2013) 95 fig. 10.

⁹⁷ VETTERS (*supra* n. 9).

⁹⁸ VETTERS (*supra* n. 66], 36; VETTERS (*supra* n. 9).

⁹⁹ With one of them, VETTERS (*supra* n. 9) fig. 11, showing extensive wear on the stem that demonstrates that the figure was repeatedly being handled and probably carried around in processions – a practice that harks back to palatial traditions.

¹⁰⁰ For a new assessment of the context see HINZEN (*supra* n. 89).