Costis Davaras, emeritus professor of the University of Athens and former ephor of the 24th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in Crete, Greece, was presented with his Festschrift entitled, Phillistor: Studies in Honor of Costis Davaras, edited by Eleni Mantzourani and Philip Betancourt, on June 16, 2012, at the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete. Many friends and colleagues attended the celebration, which was organized and hosted by Tom Brogan and the entire Study Center staff. The evening included speeches by several of Davaras’ former colleagues and students, including Eleni Mantzourani, Philip Betancourt, Christos Doumas, Giorgios Vavouranakis, Yiannis Papadatos, Alexandra Karetso, Athanasia Kanta, Metaxia Tsipopoulou, Vili Apostolakou, Chryssa Sophianou, and Jeff Soles. In particular, Doumas regaled the audience with island-hopping tales of his and Costis’ adventures together in the Cyclades as young archaeologists. The party was catered by Jad Alyounis whose team prepared a vegetarian dinner of Far Eastern dishes inspired by Davaras’ love of the tenets of Buddhism. Over 75 people attended the party, during which the honored guest and his wife, Dione, were overwhelmed with the outpouring of affection.
Many years ago when I was a postgraduate student, I first met Costis Davaras in the Archaeological Museum of Hagios Nikolaos. I will never forget this short meeting when a tall, polite, and sweet man, serious but not serious-looking, and the Ephor of Antiquities, answered my questions. He was quite an official civil servant but more approachable than others I had already met.

Many years later we met again in the halls of the School of Philosophy of the University of Athens when he was elected an Associate Professor of Minoan Archaeology. We actually shared the same teaching course and so we came into more frequent contact. It was then my turn to welcome him into his new environment and in a way to “instruct” him of the new rules to which he had to adjust. Indeed, university work and life is rather different from being an Ephorate of Antiquities, and, as Costis confessed himself, it was then that he discovered “paradise.” He was undoubtedly older, but the initial image of him in my memory had not altered much. He was still handsome by nature and a decent, attractive man with a characteristic politeness, a special sense of humor, and a disarming innocence, all of which were quite disproportionate to the experience and maturity of his age. I believe that during these common years in the university our mere acquaintance grew into a real friendship.

The latter became stronger, strangely enough, after his retirement from the university and his return to Crete. Costis showed his esteem to me by entrusting me with the publication of the material from his excavations at Azokeramos and Makrygialos, for which I am deeply thankful. Whenever he and his wife Dioni came to Athens, we met as good friends, having lunch or dinner and sharing our mutual concerns about the university, exchanging archaeological news, catching up on personal events, and discussing our thoughts about the future of our beloved Greece. Costis is, among other things, a great storyteller. I have learned a lot about the archaeological past of Crete and Greece as a whole from him, especially about a crucial period of Greek history, namely the 1950’s through the 1970’s.

Costis is remembered by his colleagues at the Faculty of History and Archaeology of the University of Athens as a most generous person, with a substantial amount of care for all of them, especially the younger academics. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the main characteristic of Costis’s character, which has always impressed me every time I had the pleasure of seeing him, is his absolute and constant modesty. In many instances I have felt that he underestimated his contribution to Greek archaeology.

The making and presentation of the Philistor volume is the least we could do for this homo universalis, a person made up of “rare materials” and incompatible for the era of globalization in which we live. I am very happy that I have contributed my share. The lines of the Greek poet Giorgos Seferis are dedicated to him:

«Εἴτε βραδιάζει εἴτε φέγγει μένει λευκό το γιασμένο»

My caring thoughts, wishes, and love will always be there for Costis Davaras.
Personnel at the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete are helping to coordinate a number of interdisciplinary efforts to shed light on the ancient Aegean. One of them has involved the collaboration between analyses of several types to understand what was being stored in the small hilltop refuge site at Aphrodite’s Kephali, a tiny site in the Isthmus of Ierapetra in eastern Crete. The archaeological site, consisting of a small building and a large courtyard where people or animals could gather in times of danger, was surrounded by a defensive wall and well stocked with clay storage jars. It dates to Early Minoan IA, at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. Among other issues, the team is trying to answer questions like, “Where did these jars come from, and what did they hold?”

The origins of the pottery have been addressed with ceramic petrography. Analyses by petrographer Eleni Nodarou have shown that the clay containers came from many parts of east central and eastern Crete. Vases decorated with red linear decoration, called the Hagios Onouphrios Style, came from several workshops including one or more on the south coast. Vases containing small fragments of the rock called granodiorite came from the north coast.

Analysis by gas chromatography by chemist Andrew Koh has revealed that many of the vases held wine and olive oil. These liquids could be consumed as food, but they were also good preservatives for fruits and vegetables and meat. Foods saturated with oil or wine or vinegar may only leave traces of the liquids.

What other foods might be stored? Fortunately, when the site was cleaned for restoration by Vili Apostolakou (who was director of the 24th Ephorate until her retirement in 2011) to prepare the site’s stone walls for consolidation for the future, the soil was saved and water sieved. This technique provided microscopic fragments of cereal materials. Analysis of the residue shows that several fruits were accidentally burned when food remains were thrown into the hearths. Almonds, figs, olives, and grapes have all been identified by archaeobotanist Evi Margaritis.

Thanks to this scientific work and a little added imagination, we can reconstruct part of the picture of these early residents of Crete who lived about 5,000 years ago when times were dangerous. They engaged in trade that imported agricultural products from both the north and the south coasts. They also felt that a well-provisioned fort might be needed if enemies approached, so they stocked their walled refuge with a good supply of the crops that would have grown well on the low hills of eastern Crete. They must have prospered because by the next period, Early Minoan IB, the refuge was no longer needed.

Comparisons of EM I pottery from Aphrodite’s Kephali with pottery from other EM I sites.
According to Richard Seager, who first excavated on the island of Mochlos in 1908, Greek and Roman remains on the island “played sad havoc with the earlier remains… in places completely destroying them” (Seager 1909, p. 276). Ironically, he proceeded to remove these levels without keeping or reporting any evidence from Mochlos’ historical periods. The modern excavations by Jeffrey Soles and Costis Davaras, which began in 1989, confirmed the presence of post-Bronze Age remains on the island, presenting for the first time sound evidence for later Greek presence on Mochlos.

The earliest of the historical remains are located on the summit of the island where the excavations unearthed architectural remains and pottery from the 7th and the late 5th centuries B.C., documenting small scale habitation. I have recently argued that the 7th century B.C. remains belonged to a small building with a pi-shaped hearth. In it was found a Corinthian trefoil-mouth oinochoe of the Transitional Period (625–610 B.C.) decorated with sphinxes, lions, sirens, and an eagle (Vogeikoff-Brogan 2012). The occupation on the summit has been connected with a number of early 7th century B.C. offerings found inside a Mycenaean tomb on the mainland coast of Mochlos (Soles 2008, 177–179). These offerings have been interpreted as acts of an ancestor cult, and they represent an attempt to lay claim on surrounding territory by the inhabitants of a new polis located somewhere near Mochlos. The building on the summit might have acted as a gathering place of the inhabitants of the new polis, who by participating in ritual drinking or feasting confirmed their glorious ancestry (Vogeikoff-Brogan 2012).

The most extensive historical period of occupation, however, was found on the south slope of the island directly on top of the Minoan and Mycenaean remains. With two periods of abandonment, one in the second quarter of the 1st century B.C. and the other in the last quarter of the same century, Mochlos probably was settled in the late 2nd century, during the period of
Hierapytnta’s greatest territorial expansion. The excavations have documented a fortification wall that encircled the island on its north, east, and south, as well as remains of houses and industrial installations that were located on the south slope of the island.

The next publication in the Mochlos series, Mochlos III. Mochlos After the Bronze Age The Late Hellenistic Settlement The Beam-Press Complex, examines in detail the best preserved building of this period. Excavated in 1991–1992, the Beam-Press Complex is a building of eight rooms, two of them (Rooms 1 and 6) containing processing facilities (Soles and Davaras 1996, fig. 28). The name of the building derives from a beam-press found in Room 6 with evidence for processing olives (Figure 1). The study of the pottery places the abandonment of the complex in the second quarter of the 1st century B.C., and it is tempting to associate it with the wide unrest that led to the Roman conquest of Crete in 67 B.C. The Hellenistic settlement at Mochlos continued its existence for another forty or so years, with most of the buildings (the ones that continued to be used in the second half of the century) showing extensive traces of remodeling.

Examining in detail the architectural, artifactual, organic, and non-organic remains of the Beam-Press Complex, with the contribution of several experts (Marie-Claude Boileau, Tristan Carter, Evi Margariti, Demetra Mylona, Eleni Nodarou, and David S. Reese, to name a few), Mochlos III sheds light on the material culture of eastern Crete in the Hellenistic period, otherwise only known through historical, epigraphic, and survey studies, and adds a new dimension to our Knossos-centric view of the period. Finally, the study makes further contributions to the political and economic history of Crete. The settlement at Mochlos is viewed as an essential part of Hierapytnta’s territorial expansion in the second half of the 2nd century B.C., as she expanded on the north and south coasts of Crete. It is suggested that Mochlos served as Hierapytnta’s anchorage on the north coast in order to collect harbor fees and to facilitate trade. The petrographic analysis of a number of transport amphoras found at the Beam-Press Complex has shown that they were made in Hierapytnta. This supports arguments for commercial specialization and trade in wine in East Crete in the late 2nd and early 1st centuries B.C., suggesting that Hierapytnta, during the period of her largest expansion and growth, had moved beyond a subsistence economy and was trading her wine for commercial profit. Along the same line, the existence of the press in Room 6 suggests processing of oil on some considerable scale, also beyond the needs of a small-scale household economy.

Additional digging on the island of Mochlos in the past decade has uncovered more remains of the Late Hellenistic/Early Roman occupation, which are expected to contribute further to our understanding of this period in East Crete. In the summer of 2005, for example, the excavations unearthed more architectural remains, including a dining complex with a kitchen and a dining room with a hearth, Eastern Sigillata A plates, the remains of a brazier, and a coin of P. Canidius Crassus minted in 41–37 B.C. (Soles and Davaras 2005, fig. 2).
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INSTAP Study Center for East Crete
Summer 2012 Lectures

Our first lecture in the summer of 2012 was presented on June 8, 2011 by Dr. Eleni Nodarou. The lecture was entitled “Archaeological and Archaeometric Approaches to the Study of Prepalatial Pottery from Central and East Crete” and was followed by a response from Prof. James Muhly and Prof. Tristan Carter.

On Friday July 6, 2012, Prof. Claire Palyvou and Dr. Eleutheria Tsakanika presented “Interpreting Minoan Architecture on Site.”
The 2012 Richard Seager Doctoral Fellowship awarded by the Friends of the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete gave me the opportunity to spend June and July of 2012 working at the Center on the completion of my PhD dissertation. I plan to submit my text, titled “The ‘Postpalatial’ Period in Far Eastern Crete: The Case of Zakros,” to the University of Athens by the end of the year. During my research time, I was able to concentrate on the study of the architecture, stratigraphy, and finds from the Minoan settlement of Kato Zakros during the Late Minoan (LM) II and LM III periods.

The extensive destruction horizon documented in the Minoan Palace and the surrounding settlement of Kato Zakros is dated to the end of LM IB period, namely the mid-15th century B.C., a period called Zakros V according to the system of relative chronology proposed by Lefteris Platon for Zakros (Platon 2010: 513; Platon 2011). The following period, Zakros VI, constitutes the subject of this short contribution. From the very first excavation seasons at Zakros, it became clear that some of the houses on Hagios Antonios hill (southwest of the Palace) were at least partly reoccupied. Nikolaos Platon dated this reoccupation in the mature LM IIIA2 period (Platon 1961: 217; Platon 1962: 151), but the current re-examination of the stratigraphic evidence along with the pottery study showed that this period extends further in space and time than originally thought. In what follows, I will argue that on the basis of the pottery evidence this period can be further subdivided into two sub-phases (Zakros VIa and VIb), dated to LM II/III A1 and LM IIIA2 respectively, and therefore following the pattern seen in other East Cretan sites. Reoccupation was evidenced in six buildings, namely Houses Α (Alpha), Β (Beta), Δ (Delta), and Ε (Epsilon) on Hagios Antonios Hill southwest of the Palace, House Ν on the low hill northwest of the Palace, and the “Building of the Shrine Deposits” on the terraces just north of the Palace (Figure 1). Scattered deposits of LM IIIA pottery not associated with architecture derive from various loci on the northwest hill and also from the so-called Zakros “Pits,” excavated by D.G. Hogarth in the early 20th century. The presence of these pottery assemblages along with the new evidence from the ongoing study indicate that the reoccupation of the 14th century B.C. may not be confined just to the six aforementioned houses and that future study may provide further evidence.

Although the study of the LM III stratigraphy has been impeded by natural factors such as heavy erosion and disturbance from modern agriculture, some interesting observations were made about the nature and the architecture of the settlement after the end of the LM IB period. The LM III settlement differs from the earlier Neopalatial town in several respects: a) it occupies a smaller area and is less densely populated, b) there does not seem to be any house construction during the LM III period and, therefore, the town planning remains more or less unaltered, c) all the houses were one-storied buildings, which constitutes a common feature of the LM III settlements (Hayden 1990; Hallager 1997: 184–185; Soles 2008: 8), d) reoccupation is limited to some parts of the Neopalatial building complexes, and it is possible that two LM III houses occupy the space of one earlier House, E. The LM III builders re-used pre-existing walls in many instances, mainly from house facades or the outer courses of older (and thus stronger) walls, f) there is a pattern of reuse of the Neopalatial buildings: the basement rooms were thoroughly cleaned, and a new entrance was opened on the division wall forming a two room structure, and g) there is extensive reuse of ashlar masonry deriving from the ruins of the Palace.

The re-consideration of the reoccupation period in Zakros is also important in chronological terms for the larger picture of the settlement history in the area. During the last decades, the excavators of other important East Cretan sites like Palaikastro and Mochlos defined an early reoccupation period which in terms of relative chronology correlates with LM II and/or LM III A1. The distinctive feature of this sub-phase is the limited presence of LM II pottery (imported from Knossos) along with some local pottery types (Brogan et al. 2002: 103–104; MacGillivray 1997: 195). Now this period of early reoccupation is attested also in the assemblages from Zakros.
A “closed” stratum of the early reoccupation (Zakros VIa) is found in the western part of House Δ (rooms N, O, E, H) on a floor raised at 0.50 m., on top of a distinctive layer of burnt soil 0.20–0.30 m thick overlying the LM IB floor (Platon 1963: 163). From this deposit (room) derives a Knossian ephyraean goblet in a buff clay (Figure 2a) with exact parallels from the Knossos Unexplored Mansion (Popham 1984: pl. 57b) and the “Gypsum” House unearthed during the excavation for the extension of the Knossos Stratigraphical Museum (Warren 1982-83: 65, fig. 10). Additionally, fragments of at least two solidly black-slipped deep cups (Figure 2c) find parallels in the LM II deep cups from the Unexplored Mansion (Popham 1984: pls. 79a, 81 upper row), and Mochlos (Smith 2010: fig. 5 IIB 131, dated in LM IIIA1). There is also a ledge-rim cup with double axe motif (Figure 2d) and the upper part of a bridge-spouted jug (Figure 2e), both dated to LM IIIA1 (for the shape of the cup: Popham 1997: 381, fig. 3. For the bridge-spouted jug: Smith 2010: 71, fig. 35 IIB.613). Finally, from the same level comes an unusual pulled-rim bowl with horizontal handles (Figure 2b), for which an LM II date would be more appropriate (Popham 1984: pls. 52, 53).

A second closed destruction layer designates the late reoccupation period (Zakros VIb); it was uncovered in a two-room structure, reoccupying two rooms of the “Building of the Shrine Deposits.” The pottery assemblage includes typical LM IIIA2 shapes along with some vases dating in the transitional period to LM IIIB1, namely two monochrome deep bowls (Figure 3a-b). According to some scholars, these bowls belong to the beginning of the LM IIIB period (Kanta 1980: 285; Smith 2010: 52–53, fig. 16 IIIB 466). The Zakros specimens have not yet fully developed the shape of the characteristic LM IIIB type (FS 284), with raised or ring-shaped bases. There is also an amphoroid krater with octopus decoration (Figure 3c), which would usually be placed in the beginning of the LM IIIB period (Kanta 1980: 275). Additionally, the upper part of a large hemispherical cup or bowl was found (Figure 3d), with comparanda for both shape and decoration in the LM IIIA2 and LM IIIB1 periods (Hatzaki 2007: 235–236, fig. 6.26 no. 2).

To summarize, the reoccupation of the late 15th and 14th centuries B.C. in Zakros can be divided into two sub-phases, an early and a late, (Zakros VIa and VIb), corresponding to the LM II/IIIA1 and LM IIIA2 periods respectively, according to the
Evans-Mackenzie chronological system. The short break in occupation after the destruction at the end of the Neopalatial period may have not lasted more than 30–40 years, as argued for Mochlos (Soles 2008: 5). What becomes evident, though, is that the reoccupation following the destruction is not a short and hasty re-use of space, but rather, an organized activity placing Zakros in the network of the Postpalatial settlements of East Crete.
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The A R E N E W E D E X H I B I T I O N A T T H E
A R C H A E O L O G I C A L M U S E U M O F S I T E I A

By Chrysa Sofianou and Klio Zervaki

The Archaeological Museum of Siteia, like all the local museums of Greece constructed in the 1980’s, employed an object-oriented display program. Over the years, the need for re-evaluating the exhibition was expressed. The idea matured into a necessity to upgrade the existing objectives of the exhibition, and to bring them into accordance with modern museological data. Thus, it became imperative to restructure and enrich the exhibition in order to a) highlight the many significant finds that have emerged from recent excavations in the area of Siteia, and b) provide comprehensive information to the visitor, creating both a pleasant museum experience, and setting the foundation for educational programs and other activities.

A combined approach was adopted for the purposes of the “re-exhibition.” A concept-oriented model organizing the archaeological material was blended with the traditional object-oriented approach, which organically connects the thematic and chronological sections, and at the same time encourages the development of notional correlations attractive to the museum visitor. In brief, the underlying concept of the re-exhibition of the Archaeological Museum of Siteia can be expressed as Siteia from Prehistoric to Roman times through the excavated remains.”

Each display section follows the chronological and developmental progress of the civilization in the area of Siteia and the wider region, integrated and presented within time periods in individual thematic sections and subsections. The Prehistoric sections utilize the dating system developed by Nikolaos Platon in 1966 and published in Archaeologia Mundi. His chronology is based on the development of architectural complexes frequently
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called palaces in Aegean Bronze Age periods (such as the Prepalatial period, the Protopalatial period, etc.). This gave us the opportunity to display the changes and evolution of the urban environment throughout these specific phases.

The opportunity to realize a renewal of the Siteia Museum exhibit was due, in part, to the large project of expansion and re-exhibition taking place in the Archaeological Museum of Hagios Nikolaos. The old display cases from the Hagios Nikolaos Museum were transported to the Siteia Museum and were adapted to fit the needs of the new museological and museographical study of the museum. The process of renewing the exhibition in the Archaeological Museum of Siteia is not yet complete. The creation of informational signs and the labeling of objects are in progress and should be finished in the coming months. Many archaeologists who play an active role in the archaeology of Eastern Crete have been involved in the project, and we would like to thank especially Dr. M. Tsipopoulou (Ministry of Culture), Professor P.P. Betancourt (Temple University), Professor J. Soles (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), Dr. T. Brogan (INSTAP Study Center for East Crete), Professor L.H. Sackett and Dr. J.A. MacGillivray (British Archaeological School), Drs. D. Vivier and A. Tsigarida (Belgian Archaeological School), and Professors L. Platon and Y. Papadatos (Department of Archaeology, University of Athens).
PETROGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF THE PREPALATIAL POTTERY FROM LIVARI, EAST CRETE

By Eleni Nodarou

The site of Livari lies on a small coastal plain at the southeasternmost edge of Crete, at a few km east of Goudouras. Rescue excavations undertaken by the 24th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities under the direction of Chryssa Sofianou with the collaboration of Yiannis Papadatos from the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Athens revealed a Minoan cemetery comprising a tholos tomb and a rock shelter of the Prepalatial period (EM IB–III), and a Neopalatial (LM IA) House Tomb. The Prepalatial pottery constitutes the majority of the ceramic assemblage, and all the major wares are represented: dark burnished, dark gray burnished, red slipped and burnished, dark-on-light painted, white-on-dark, and Vasilike ware to name just the main ones. As expected in the case of a cemetery the broad array of wares was associated with an equally broad range of macroscopic fabrics, some of them used for more than one ware. Within this context, the aim of petrographic analysis was to explore the full range of ceramic products used in the cemetery, investigate the nature and character of the fabrics on the basis of their mineralogical composition, and ultimately be able to infer the provenance of the pottery. The technological study was complemented with scanning electron microscopy (SEM). The analysis resulted in the establishment of several petrographic groups, some comprising many samples and associated with specific wares and/or dates, others with only a couple of samples, and occasionally some loners representing either imports or variants of the main fabric groups. In what follows, the main petrographic groups and some interesting imports of the earlier Prepalatial period (EM IB–IIA) are presented.

Fabric group 1: Coarse to semi-coarse calcite-tempered (Figure 1)

This is a characteristic fabric of the earlier Prepalatial period, consisting of angular fragments of calcite added in the clay mix as temper by the potter. It is encountered in many sites along the north coast, from Nopigia in the west, Poros, Gournes, and Pyrgos in central Crete, to Hagia Photia and Kephala Petras in East Crete (Nodarou 2011; 2012; Day et al. 2012; Galanaki 2006; Wilson et al. 2008; Papadatos et al. in press). Although the mineralogy is not diagnostic of origin, the range of calcite-tempered recipes encountered in the assemblage is indicative of the use of more than one raw material and techniques of manufacture. The most characteristic variant is the one using grog as a tempering agent in the same clay mix in which calcite has already been added in that effect (Figure 2). At Livari, the calcite-tempered is the main fabric used for the dark burnished ware and the shape repertoire comprises mainly pyxides, lids, bowls, and chalices—i.e., shapes belonging to the so-called

Figure 1. Calcite-tempered fabric. Note large void in the center of field indicating tempering with organic matter (x25).

Figure 2. Fabric tempered with calcite and grog (x25).
Kampos group with parallels from Hagia Photia and the Cyclades. Their date is EM IB.

Fabric group 2: Semi-coarse with sedimentary, metamorphic, and igneous rock fragments (Figure 3)

This is the most abundant group of the assemblage. The mineralogical composition is fairly homogeneous in most samples comprising rounded fragments of fine grained sandstones, few metamorphics, volcanics (mainly basalt), rare micritic limestone, and chert. There are also characteristic clay pellets indicative of a fairly consistent manner of clay manipulation. The rock and mineral suite indicates an origin from the ophiolite series and the flysch mélange of the south coast, but there cannot be any more precise provenance assignment. There are flysch outcrops at only 2 km north of Livari, but the entire south coast is dominated by this series. The vessels represented are all dark-on-light painted closed vessels, mostly jugs of EM I–IIA date. The fact that the dark-on-light painted constitutes one of the two most frequent wares of the assemblage (ca. 34%) may suggest a broadly local production. This fabric was first identified at Kommos (Myer and Betancourt 1990, 9–10) and since then described at many instances (see Betancourt 2008). At Hagia Photia it is also connected with dark-on-light painted pottery (Day et al. 2012).

Fabric group 3: Fine gray (Figure 4)

This fabric group is characterized by a fine gray firing matrix. There are rare coarse non-plastic inclusions consisting of volcanic rocks (mainly basalt), sandstone, micrite, metamorphics, chert, and quartz. The fine fraction includes frequent small quartz fragments unevenly distributed in the clay matrix. The vessels represented include mainly goblets, lids, and alabastra, all in the dark gray burnished ware and dated to the EM I–IIA period.

This fabric seems to represent a fairly consistent recipe for the dark gray burnished ware, which constitutes the second largest type of the assemblage. The presence of the volcanic rocks points to an origin from the ophiolite series and the flysch mélange of the south coast for the tempering material as was the case for fabric group 2. Although a more secure provenance assignment is not feasible, the proximity of the site to flysch sources and Neogene marls as well as the frequency of this ware in the assemblage (ca. 40%) point towards a broadly local production. Among the imports it is worth mentioning a group of dark-on-light painted jugs of EM I–IIA date in a semi-coarse fabric with fine grained metamorphic and rare igneous rock fragments (Figure 5). The rock and mineral suite points towards a flysch environment whereas the vessels find parallels in the Koumaza...
assemblage. It is likely, therefore, that the entire group originates from the Mesara.

There are also a few EM II A dark-on-light painted vessels (a jug and a bowl) in the characteristic grano-diorite fabric of the Mirabello area (Figure 6) indicating that the cemetery at Livari was also linked with the north coast, most likely via the Ierapetra isthmus.

To summarize, the petrographic analysis of the earlier Prepalatial pottery from Livari confirmed the variability in fabrics detected through macroscopic observation and demonstrated a) that specific fabrics are connected with specific wares, b) that although the two main wares of the assemblage—i.e., dark-on-light painted and dark gray burnished, are manufactured with different recipes (Fabric groups 2 and 3 respectively), the raw materials used for their manufacture are connected to the same geological environment of the south coast, and c) that at the cemetery there are imports from the north coast (Mirabello area) and south central Crete (Mesara).

The calcite-tempered fabric (Fabric group 1) occurs commonly on the north coast of Crete in assemblages of the Kamos group. As in the cases of Gournes and Petras, however, the variant with calcite and grog links this fabric with the Cretan manufacturing traditions rather than the Cycladic ones (Nodarou 2012). For the south coast related fabrics, although the specific origin cannot be assigned, they seem to represent the local component of the assemblage. It is only through the excavation of the nearby settlement and comparison with a domestic assemblage that the issue of the origin of the pottery will be further investigated. Finally, the imports identified in the cemetery assemblage indicate that the site of Livari, which at present seems remote and fairly inaccessible, was probably located on more than one route, connecting the north and the south coast as well as the south eastern and the south central parts of the island.
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The Friends of the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete

need your donations for

The 2013 Richard Seager Fellowship

The Richard Seager Doctoral Fellowship was started in 2009. Our goal has been to enable a doctoral candidate to use the Study Center’s resources to help bring his or her dissertation closer to completion. Since then, three awards have been granted, resulting in numerous articles, one finished dissertation, and another that will be submitted in December of this year. With your help we can reach our goal of $4,000 and provide this fellowship to a qualified candidate in 2013. If you would like to help fund the 2013 fellowship, please make a check payable to the INSTAP Study Center for East Crete and send it to the address printed below. All donations are tax deductible to the full extent of the law.

Please send checks to:

Friends of the INSTAP Study Center
2133 Arch Street, Suite 300
Philadelphia, PA 19103 USA

If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth Shank:
(215) 496-9914 or elizabethshank@hotmail.com

We also welcome any cash donations for specific laboratories or our library, including book donations to the library. For library donations please contact Sophia Makri at sofia_makri85@hotmail.com.

If you would like your donation to be applied to a specific laboratory or the library, just tell us in the “memo” portion of your check.

Entrance to the Study Center. (Photograph by Elizabeth Shank)
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