

PRELIMINARY NOTES ON THE SEALS FROM ARMENOI*

BY ANGELA TAMVAKI

The main purpose of this paper is to point out some interesting features of a group of seals found in the Late Minoan cemetery at Armenoi, near Rethymnon, in the west of Crete, and to indicate some of the lines along which my future detailed study of the iconography and style of these finds will proceed.

The excavations at the cemetery of Armenoi started in 1970 and are still in progress. Forty-four of the seals found in a number of tombs excavated in the earlier seasons have already been published in CMS V 1 (nos. 241–283). Three more seasons of excavations – 1973, 1976, 1978 – have yielded another fifty-one examples, some of which are in too poor a state of preservation to be studied in any detail. As the tombs which are

* I should like to thank the excavator of Armenoi, Mr. J. Tzedakis, for his kind permission to study the seals from Armenoi and publish a detailed account of them (in progress) and for all his help in my work in the Chania Museum.

Thanks are also due to Professor J.G. Younger, Mr. J.H. Betts and Dr. Ingo Pini, whose valuable suggestions after the reading of my paper in the Marburg conference have drawn my attention to a number of interesting features of these finds, and have necessitated some modifications of statements included in the paper. I am particularly grateful to Professor John Younger for examining the photographs of the Armenoi seals with me and for providing generous information about the style, dates and identification of individual masters. Since all the published seals have been admirably illustrated in CMS V (nos. 241–283) it has been thought unnecessary to reproduce the same photographs here. Nevertheless, a special word of thanks is due to Mr. J. Phillipson who kindly took the photographs and slides used in the preparation of my paper, and its presentation in the conference.

The following special abbreviations are used here:

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Biesantz, Siegelbilder | H. Biesantz, <i>Kretisch-mykenische Siegelbilder</i> (Marburg 1954). |
| CMCG | A. Sakellariou, <i>Les cachets minoens de la collection Giamalakis (Études Crétoises X)</i> Paris 1958. |
| I° ConMic I | <i>Atti e memorie del primo congresso internazionale di Micenologia (Incunabula Graeca Vol. XXV)</i> Roma 1968. |
| CS | V.E.G. Kenna, <i>Cretan Seals</i> (Oxford 1960). |
| Genève, Catalogue | M.L. Vollenweider, <i>Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève, Catalogue raisonné des sceaux cylindres et intailles, vol. I</i> (Genève 1967). |
| GGFR | J. Boardman, <i>Greek Gems and Finger Rings</i> (London 1970). |
| Karo, Schachtgräber | G. Karo, <i>Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai</i> (München 1930). |
| Mallia, Maisons II | J. Deshayes – A. Dessenne, <i>Fouilles exécutées à Mallia: Explorations des maisons et quartiers d'habitation II</i> (1948–1954) Paris 1959. |
| Marinatos – Hirmer | S. Marinatos – M. Hirmer, <i>Crete and Mycenae</i> (London 1960). |
| PM | A. Evans, <i>The Palace of Minos at Knossos, vols. I–IV</i> (London 1921–1935). |
| Zervos, Crète | Ch. Zervos, <i>L'art de la Crète néolithique et minoenne</i> (Paris 1956). |

being discovered and excavated increase from year to year and more seals will be found, it is understandable that no conclusions based on the group of objects discovered so far can be viewed as definitive. Moreover, since my study of the material from the last three seasons of excavation – 1973, 1976, 1978 – is not in an advanced stage, I have decided to base my observations largely on the seals already published in CMS V, and to use the rest of the material as a supplement. For this reason it seems fortunate that the more recent finds do not seem to alter the picture provided by the published examples in any drastic way, because none of the unpublished specimens is unique or unexpected. Nevertheless these finds add some new types, as well as interesting variations to those previously known.

The importance of the seals from Armenoi for the dating of the final phases of the Late Minoan glyptic basically derives from the fact that they are the only group of such objects found in secure LM IIIA and LM IIIB contexts up to now in the west part of the island, and this adds an intrinsic historical significance to them. By this statement I do not imply that such a situation may not change with further exploration and excavations, since it is well-known that West Crete has been explored more systematically only in the last fifteen years or so.

The only find which is in any way comparable in size and importance to the seals from Armenoi from this part of the island is the group of sealings from a recently excavated workshop in Chania, dated to the advanced LM I period, and published by Dr. I. Papapostolou¹. In addition to these, a small number of examples found either accidentally or in the course of excavations in locations within or around Chania have been published in CMS V². With the exception of one³, these finds do not seem to come from secure contexts. Moreover, the significance of our seals for the dating of the final phases of the Late Minoan glyptic is not confined to this part of the island only, because the number of examples found in securely datable contexts in other parts of Crete is small, by comparison to that of the total of known Minoan seals. Since this is the case, the seals from Armenoi may provide a basis for the study of the exact chronological position of a number of finds from uncertain contexts, or others found out of context, as well as of chance finds and examples in private collections in Greece and abroad.

I believe that it is impossible to date a seal by using the evidence either of its context or of its style alone, and that a combination of these two criteria may eventually bring us closer to the truth. I am therefore prepared to share the widely held view that seals could be kept as heirlooms for a number of generations, and be found in contexts datable to a much later period than that of their manufacture. In this connection it may be interesting to note that comparison to known examples from Crete and the Greek Mainland, and attempts to establish the date of the seals under discussion using the evidence of style and context both in combination and individually, have led me to believe that

¹ I.A. Papapostolou, *Τὰ Σφραγίσματα τῶν Χανίων* (Athens 1977).

² CMS V 232–240.

³ *Ibid.* no. 238. The stylistic and iconographic affinities of three seals of unknown provenance now in Rethymnon (CMS V 651–653) are more noteworthy, in view of the proximity of the site of the Armenoi cemetery to this town.

the stylistic date of some of these finds may be considerably earlier than that suggested by their contexts. The themes of three seals from Armenoi (nos. 244. 246. 253) have a special iconographical interest and some good parallels from much earlier periods. Three others (nos. 265. 266. 267) show unclear or worn variations of more elaborate or "palatial" themes. Some of the remaining seals depict animals in isolation or in groups, and others are decorated with linear or abstract patterns, sometimes made with the irregular use of the tubular drill and recalling those of earlier Minoan gems. Such motifs are characteristic of the final phase of the Minoan glyptic⁴.

What should be borne in mind throughout this and any subsequent discussion is that the pottery found in the tombs of the cemetery of Armenoi is generally dated to the LM IIIA and IIIB periods, and that most of the tombs were used for a relatively short time. A number of these tombs contained more than one seal, but this is hardly surprising both because more than one dead were buried in them, and because some of their occupants may have possessed more than one seal, especially if one accepted the view that such objects were not exclusively used as signs of ownership⁵.

The majority of examples belonging to this group are shaped as lentoids, which is by far the most common form for seals of the Late Minoan period⁶. However, more unusual and elaborate forms are not completely missing. Such are three amygdaloids (nos. 268. 273 and an unpublished example of the talismanic type from the 1973 excavations), four metal rings (nos. 266. 267 and two unpublished examples from the 1973 season; another unpublished ring from the 1976 season is too worn for certainty); three cylinders, one of which is a Mitanni import (no. 260, and two unpublished examples from the 1973 and 1978 seasons) and isolated instances of shapes which are characteristic of earlier periods, namely the stepped pyramid, the three-sided and the four-sided prism (nos. 268. 270. 273).

The materials used are largely serpentinite and steatite, while fluorite must have enjoyed some popularity as well, judging from its relatively wide occurrence among the finds from the excavations (CMS V nos. 271. 277. 278 and unpublished examples from Tombs 91. 98. 110. 108. 109. 118. 79. 80. 85 and two from 83). Its extensive use is hardly a surprise, since it was available even at a time when more precious stones may have become scarce. This may well account for its frequency during the final phases of the Late Minoan and the Late Helladic glyptic. Some examples are made of different materials such as ivory (nos. 275. 276 and an unpublished example from Tomb 86), glass paste (two unpublished examples from Tombs 108. 67), jasper (no. 273), sard (no. 263 and the unpublished talismanic seal from Tomb 80), sardonyx (no. 268), conglomerate (nos. 255? 265. 279), lapis lacedaemonius (no. 246), haematite (no. 241), faience (unpublished cylinder from Tomb 108), glass (no. 260), schist (unpublished example from Tomb 84), and metal (nos. 266. 267; two unpublished examples from Tomb 78 and one from Tomb 102). Finally, the material of a number of examples could not be identified with certainty

⁴ GGFR 60 fig. 131.

⁵ On the various uses of seals see J.G. Younger, *Non-Sphragistic Uses of Minoan-Mycenaean Sealstones and Rings*, *Kadmos* 16 (1977) 141-159.

⁶ On the shape of Minoan seals: CS 28-30.

(e.g. nos. 250, 251, 256, 259, 264, 272, 274, 281, 282, 283 and unpublished examples from Tombs 67. 79. 83. 87: serpentine (?); nos. 252. 253. 270 and unpublished examples from Tombs 80. 83: schist (?); unpublished example from Tomb 67: limestone (? unpublished examples from Tombs 104. 107. 108: steatite?).

It seems appropriate to start a brief discussion of the iconography of the seals from Armenoi with no. 246, the only example which clearly stands out by its artistic merit, its material, its size and excellent state of preservation. Its outstanding stylistic qualities clearly identify it as a product of a palatial workshop, showing an unparalleled composition with a man, a lion and a gazelle. Mrs. Sakellariou, in her study of the Mycenaean glyptic, suggests that the character of the scenes where a man and a lion are shown in a peaceful juxtaposition is probably Minoan. In contrast to this, the Mycenaeans seem to have favoured the more militant and elaborate theme of the lion hunt⁷. The standard variation of this theme shows an armed man attacking a lion, but the number of men and animals may increase to two or even more in exceptional cases. For example, two men may be attacking a lion simultaneously⁸, or two groups of a man and a lion may be included in the same scene⁹, while a group of warriors are attacking a lion on the inlaid dagger from Mycenae, Grave IV¹⁰. The scene on no. 246 could be interpreted as an unparalleled variation of the theme of the lion hunt, if it were certain that the artist meant to show the man prostrate under the lion; the animal could then be about to bite or devour him. The position of the gazelle crosswise to the lion is not easily accounted for. It may be a suggestion that the lion has attacked or is about to attack this animal as well, or that the man was hunting it; it may be due to the fact that there was hardly any room for it on the round surface of the seal. An alternative, but not very plausible interpretation would be to consider the scene as referring to an incident from a specific myth or story. The only close parallel for such a composition is found in a chalcedony lentoid bought in the antique market and now in Copenhagen¹¹. The authenticity of this seal had previously been questioned; it is now definitely condemned as a fake¹². A jasper lentoid in New York shows a related composition with a wild boar trampling a hunter¹³. However, a more careful examination seems to preclude the interpretation in question for no. 246, because of the way in which the seal should be viewed¹⁴. The scene includes two different themes, and the meaning of the juxtaposition of the lion in torsion on the one hand, and of the man and the gazelle on the other, and their peculiar positions would be difficult to account for¹⁵. The seal under discussion was found in a niche of the unfinished Tomb 15, together with two others (nos. 244.

⁷ A. Sakellariou, *Μυκηναϊκή Σφραγιδογλυφία* (Athens 1966) 60–62.

⁸ e.g. AGD II, 31 no. 24 pl. 7; CMS I 33.

⁹ RA 1971, 238ff. pl. 4:44; CMS I 280. 307.

¹⁰ Karo, *Schachtgräber* 95 pl. XCIV, 27; Marinatos – Hirmer pls. XXXV (middle). XXXVI.

¹¹ Copenhagen 7137, published in RA 49 (1924) 276–277 fig. 6.

¹² See J.H. Betts' paper Some Early Forgeries: The Sangiorgi Group, in this volume.

¹³ CMS XII 240.

¹⁴ This depends on the way the seal was worn (suggestion acknowledged to Professor John Younger).

¹⁵ For examples of lions with lowered heads in various postures see A. Tamvaki, *The Seals and Sealings from the Citadel House Area: A Study in Mycenaean Glyptic and Iconography*, BSA 69 (1974) 266 notes 111–115.

245) but without any pottery. Therefore it can not be dated by its context. No. 244 shows a scene with religious connotations, which will be discussed later, and no. 245 has curved lines forming a symmetrical cruciform pattern. The palatial style and excellent workmanship of no. 246 point to a date sometime in LM II–III A1.

No. 253, a remarkable example from Tomb 24 shows a woman seated on a rock and touching the muzzle of an attendant lion facing her. She is dressed in the usual flounced garment appropriate to religious scenes. It is impossible to decide whether her bodice leaves her breasts uncovered or not, but comparison with other scenes of the same type suggests that it does. It seems fair to view the scene as a summarized version of the theme of the “Mistress of the Animals”, with one animal instead of two in the usual attendant position. The gesture of the woman emphasizes the affinities of our example to this type. Scenes of this kind usually show a standing female figure with raised arms and wearing a kind of flounced garment, flanked by two animals in attendant position. The religious character of the scene is accentuated by the gesture of the raised arms, and the heraldic scheme, as well as by the presence of some attributes, such as the snake frame, and the double axe on a number of examples. A seated figure is very much the exception, and the animals are usually standing free by the goddess, though in exceptional cases she holds them, thus hinting at a possible resistance. The majority of examples show lions, and the griffins are the second most common species, while bulls and demons, birds and dolphins are shown very rarely. A related type usually interpreted as a variation of the theme of the “Mistress of the Animals” also with one animal, or as the goddess carrying the sacred animal, shows a woman carrying an erect animal supported by her arm and touching her shoulder. The species of the animal is not clearly recognizable, but it is quite likely that the majority of examples represent sheep of caprids. The type is generally dated to the MM III/LMI–LM III A periods. Sakellarakis’ recent and apparently quite plausible interpretation which has been based on a combination of iconographical elements, has changed the status of the woman from the divine to that of a priestess carrying a sacrificial animal in procession towards a construction. A third type of scenes, three examples of which occur on sealings from Ayia Triada, and three others on sealings from Zakro, Knossos and Chania show a seated woman with an animal in front of her. Papapostolou, who has most recently discussed the theme identifies the figure as the Mistress and protectress of the animals, which she appears to be feeding¹⁶. The specific features of the scene under discussion support such an interpretation. No. 253 was found in a LM III A2–B1 context; Tomb 24 has yielded an interesting polychrome larnax with scenes of animal hunt. The theme is palatial, and its style relates it to a seal from Knossos and now in Heracleion, showing a woman with a double axe and a religious implement on her shoulder¹⁷. A similar scene is also found on a LMI sealing from Ayia Triada; the context of the previous example is LM III A1¹⁸. The style of no. 253 points to a date in LMI; it has affinities to that of other scenes of the same type, most of which are dated MM III–LMI.

¹⁶ loc. cit. (note 1), 85–87. For a discussion of the theme and bibliography see also loc. cit. (note 15) 287–288 notes 260–268.

¹⁷ PM I, 434–435 fig. 312 a; PM IV, 344 fig. 287 a.

¹⁸ For the sealing from Ayia Triada see ASAtene 8–9 (1925/26) 130–131 no. 123 fig. 139 pl. XII.

The third exceptional example from this group, no. 244, was found in Tomb 15 together with no. 246 discussed earlier. It shows two votaries or priestesses dressed in long flounced garments and flanking a tree. The composition finds parallels in other examples, including a LMI sealing from Ayia Triada¹⁹, where the tree is above the top of an altar, a contemporary ring from Avgo²⁰ and a steatite lentoid from Mallia, House E, found in a LM IIIB context²¹. Such scenes may be related to the tree cult, but the precise activity of the figures and their relation to the tree can not be established with the same certainty as in other examples showing dances, processions etc. which are related to the vegetation ritual in a much more obvious manner. The theme under discussion is palatial as well, and would be appropriate to a gold ring engraved with a religious scene. On the other hand the style of the seal relates it to a number of examples, some of which are engraved with religious scenes. Its closest stylistic parallels are a seal in Berlin with a representation of a woman and dated MM III²², another from Knossos with a woman (goddess?) holding a sword and dated LM I²³ and a seal in Oxford with two figures "possibly later but recalling the style of the Ayia Triada sealings"²⁴. The style of three seals in the Giamalakis collection²⁵ and that of another three in Oxford²⁶ are also related, but the similarity is not so striking. No. 244 belongs to a class of seals in the "Cretan popular style"²⁷, showing religious scenes with figures distinguished by their angular, linear modelling. Its style points to a date in LM I.

Three talismanic stones found in the course of excavations at Armenoi deserve a special mention as well. The first, no. 273, shows a sepia and a plant in a combination which is quite common and well attested among examples dated from the MM III to the LM II period. Kenna dates the highest frequency of such stones in the MM III–LM I, recognizes a decline in their manufacture in LM II; this continues in LM III A2 and LM IIIB, when the production of such stones stops completely²⁸. The seal under discussion belongs to the "Cut Style", in which the motifs are rendered by straight cuts or grooves, sometimes with the addition of drilled details. This is one of the four LM II–III A1 styles distinguished by Boardman²⁹. Tomb 55, in which no. 273 was found, yielded pottery of the LM III A2 and the LM III B1 periods; its style points to a LM III A1 date.

No. 268, the second talismanic example, is a three-sided prism with interesting representations on all three sides. Two sides show flying fish – a motif occurring on a number

¹⁹ *ibid.*, no. 137 fig. 153 pl. IX.

²⁰ AJA 9 (1905) 280–281 no. 16 fig. 2.

²¹ Mallia Maisons II, 143 no. 2 pl. LII, 8.

²² AGD II, pl. 4 no. 12a.

²³ PM II, 792–793; Zervos, Crète fig. 651 a.

²⁴ GGFR pl. 66 (CS no. 284).

²⁵ CMCG pl. XXVIII nos. 360. 361. 364.

²⁶ CS nos. 282–284.

²⁷ On this style see J.G. Younger, *Towards the Chronology of Aegean Glyptic in the Late Bronze Age*, University of Cincinnati, Ph.D. (1973), (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, 73–24.876) 415ff.

²⁸ On the motif see V.E.G. Kenna, *The Cretan Talismanic Stone in the Late Minoan Age*, SIMA XXIV (Lund 1969) pl. 23 nos. 13–16; on the dating see also *ibid.* 24–25.

²⁹ GGFR 394.

of examples dated to MM III and to different phases of the Late Minoan Period, perhaps with a concentration in MM III–LM I. The most beautiful and naturalistic examples date from this time. Fish are usually shown in flying or swimming motion in isolation or in groups of two, facing the same or different directions, or in the antithetic position³⁰; groups of more than two fish may be shown as well³¹. The relatively large number of amygdaloids engraved with fish may be due to the talismanic significance of the motif, since this shape was favoured for such stones; it could also be due to aesthetic reasons, because the elongated shape of the amygdaloid was most suitable for representations of flying fish.

The third side of this same stone shows the head of an animal, which was originally identified as that of a horse, between two branches; this would be a unique motif among talismanic stones. Representations of horses are rare in the Minoan and Mycenaean glyptic, and they are almost never shown in isolation. Such examples are on the whole early – the Minoan are dated MM III–LM I, e.g. the sealings from Sklavokampos and Ayia Triada³², and the Mycenaean are generally LH I–II. The horse is never found among the LM/LH III examples³³. However, a careful examination of the motif on No. 268a makes its identification as a dog's head, also unparalleled among talismanic stones, more plausible. Representations of dogs are essentially Minoan, while Mainland examples are limited in number and usually copy them. The earlier Minoan representations of dogs occur on sealings from Zakros and Ayia Triada³⁴. A number of sealings from Knossos in Heracleion³⁵ and Oxford³⁶ show a collared bitch, and two seals from Vapheio dated LH II³⁷ are comparable as well. The dog on no. 268a and the fish on nos. 268b. c belong to the "Cut Style"; comparison to the main parallels for the motifs suggests a date in LM I. Tomb 47, where this talismanic example was found had been plundered, and did not contain any pottery which could provide a securely dated context.

The third talismanic example is a beautiful unpublished sard amygdaloid from Tomb 80; it shows four "bundles" in pairs facing opposite directions. This motif appears quite frequently on stones usually dated to the LM I period³⁸. Our example was found in

³⁰ Isolated fish: e.g. CMS I 458–461; CMS VII 229; CMS VIII 50. 73; CMS IV 169. 186. 232; CMS IX 57–60; CMS XII 161. 169; CMS XIII 36. 123.

Two fish facing the same direction: CMS VII 77; CMS I 179; CMS VIII 59; CMS XII 138. 190. 204; CMS IV 211. 212.

Two fish facing opposite directions: CMS XIII 100; CMS IX 72; CMS I 259. 456. 457; CMS V 26.

Antithetic fish: CMS VII 74–76; CMS XII 185. 201; CMS IV 172. 176. 187. 193. 204.

³¹ e.g. CMS I 312. 409. 462; CMS IV 217. 232; CMS V 176. 421. 620; CMS XIII 5. 77. 123; CMS XII 158; CMS IX 73. 74.

³² From Sklavokampos: Ephem 1939–1941, 90 no. 8 pl. 4. From Ayia Triada: ASAtene 8/9 (1925/26) 125 fig. 133a. b.

³³ For a discussion and bibliography: Sakellariou, loc. cit. (note 7) 11–12 notes 33–38.

³⁴ ASAtene 8/9 (1925/26) 109–111 nos. 81. 82. 84. 85 figs. 99–102 (from Ayia Triada); *ibid.* 163 no. 106 fig. 176 (from Zakros).

³⁵ PM II, 765 fig. 493; CS 56 fig. 118.

³⁶ CS 40 S, pl. 17 (GGFR pl. 100); CS nos. 238–240 pl. 10.

³⁷ CMS I 255. 256. Compare some examples of unknown provenance, e.g. Genève, Catalogue pl. 73 no. 87; CMS XII 65.

³⁸ Kenna, loc. cit. (note 28) pl. 12. Compare AJA 68 (1964) pl. 3 nos. 30. 31; CMS IX 59. 73; CMS VI 81–84; CS nos. 222–266; CMS I 251; CMS V 426. 430; CMS VIII 58. 60. 153; CMS XIII 66. 111; CMS XII 159. 169; CMS IV 212.

a LM IIIA or IIIB context, but its style suggests a date in LM I, to which its closest parallels belong.

No. 274 also shows an interesting theme; a bird-woman with a long flounced skirt and a bird's head and wings. The figure may be a goddess or priestess masquerading as a bird; she certainly belongs to a category of semi-human beings or demons, which enjoyed considerable popularity in the repertory of the Minoan and the Mycenaean artists. The "bird woman" sometimes has a human face and body and bird-wings, while at other times she is barely recognizable as a human being, because all her features are bird-like³⁹. The garment in our example is indistinguishable from the bird's body. A close parallel for its style is found in a steatite seal from Crete in the National Archaeological Museum (CMS I 476). The seal was found in Tomb 55 and in a LM III A2-B1 context; it belongs to the "Cretan popular Style"⁴⁰ and should be dated LM I-II on stylistic grounds.

The discovery of two fragmentary metal rings which may have been covered with a gold leaf is also noteworthy. Their surface is very corroded, and the scene is too worn for any conclusions regarding details of style and iconography. On the other hand, their themes are most appropriate to the decoration of rings. The first example, no. 266 from Tomb 43, shows a standing griffin, which is a very popular figure in the Minoan and the Mycenaean iconography. Its representations outnumber those of the sphinx by almost 3:1. It appears very often on seals, sealings and rings. The many compositions in which a griffin is included have been discussed by a number of scholars, and I have given an extensive account of them in an earlier study of the iconography and function of this motif. There are stylistic and iconographic differences between the Minoan and the Mycenaean examples, and it is possible to distinguish some types and combinations which are exclusively the one or the other. For example, the tethered griffin and the griffin carried by a man are Minoan variations. In contrast to this, the griffin led by a priest or shown in conjunction with other men and griffins seem to be essentially Mycenaean variations. Isolated griffins are shown more often seated or crouched or lying down, and rarely standing or galloping. When two griffins are included in a scene, they are usually in the antithetic disposition, flanking a tree or altar or column as guardians, a function shared by the sphinx as well. They can also flank a male or female figure in combinations of the "Master or Mistress of the Animals" type. The griffin is often shown attacking another animal, which is more usually a bovid, and rarely a lion. The griffin may also appear with other animals, or it can be led by a man. Scenes where a griffin is attacked by a man are very rare, and a dead griffin is carried by a man on one example only. Exceptional compositions include griffins drawing a chariot, or shown before a goddess or carried in her hands, or feeding their young. The questions of origin and religious or mythical connotations of the theme need not be discussed here⁴¹.

³⁹ On the bird-woman see CMCG 62-63, and CMS volumes *passim* (for photos).

⁴⁰ *op. cit.* (note 27).

⁴¹ For a recent discussion on the griffin: Tamvaki, *loc. cit.* (note 15) 288-292 notes 269-280.

The scene on the second ring, no. 267, also from Tomb 43, suggests either a representation of a bull attacked by a lion or a part of a bull-leaping scene. As the upper part of the surface is completely worn, it is difficult to decide, but the second interpretation seems more plausible, and finds parallels on two rings from Asine (CMS I 200. 201). A comment on the iconography and interpretation of the bull games would therefore be out of place here, and I have little to add to my earlier discussion of the theme⁴².

The context of Tomb 43, where nos. 266. 267 were found, was LM III B1. Although their poor state of preservation presents us with difficulties in the attempt to establish a stylistic date for them, it seems likely that both rings were manufactured sometime in LM II–III A1.

The theme of the lion attacking a bull enjoyed considerable popularity in the Minoan and Mycenaean iconography⁴³ and a very worn example of this type was found in Tomb 40 at Armenoi in a LM III B1–2 context.

Two unpublished metal rings were found in Tomb 78, in a context dated LM IIIA or B; they preserve the elliptical bezel and part of the ring, but are not very informative. The motifs represented may be interpreted as either stylized fish or plants. Both are unpublished.

The griffin appears on two unpublished seals from Tombs 87 and 101. The figure is shown in the same standing posture on both, with the head retorted in the one example. The context of the first is LM IIIA or B, and that of the second is LM III A2⁴⁴.

The lion appears on five examples from Armenoi, and this matches its popularity in the Minoan and the Mycenaean glyptic, where it is depicted very frequently either in isolation, or in combination with other animals, which it often attacks. Mrs. Sakellariou points out the similarity in the rendering of Minoan and Mycenaean lions, with the exception of a type, which seems to be purely Minoan⁴⁵. One of the representations of lions from Armenoi, no. 264, seems to belong to this type. The animal has its head retorted and scratches its neck, in a position known from representations of lions, as well as of bovids and other animals. Most of such examples are late, but the type may have already existed in LM I. No. 264 was found in Tomb 39 and in a LM III A2–B1 context. The modelling of the lion belongs to the "Cretan popular style"⁴⁶ and this would account for a stylistic date in LM I–II. Its style is comparable to that of an example in the Metaxas collection⁴⁷.

The second example, no. 242, shows a torsional movement of the lion which is sitting on its hindlegs, raises its foreleg and tail, and turns its head backwards. Its style compares with that of two Minoan gems in Oxford⁴⁸ as well as with that of an example of unknown

⁴² *ibid.* 277–282, notes 149–201. For a more recent discussion of the types see J.G. Younger, *AJA* 80 (1976) 125ff.

⁴³ Sakellariou, *loc. cit.* (note 7) 53–57.

⁴⁴ Their style is comparable to that of unpublished examples in Heracleion. Compare also CS pl. 18 nos. 18 P. 23 P.

⁴⁵ Sakellariou, *loc. cit.* (note 7) 4–7, esp. 7.

⁴⁶ On the style: *ibid.* 51–52 and Younger, *loc. cit.* (note 27).

⁴⁷ CMS IV 279.

⁴⁸ CS pl. 14 nos. 369. 373.

provenance in Rethymnon⁴⁹. The lion on no. 242 belongs to the “Cretan popular style”⁵⁰ and should be dated LM I; the context of Tomb 13 where it was found is LM III A2.

The same tomb has yielded another and quite different example of a lion, which belongs to the “Cut Style”⁵¹ and should be dated LM I on stylistic grounds. A number of representations of lions from Crete and the Mainland belong to this style, but I have not yet found very close stylistic parallels for the example under discussion – with the possible exception of an example from Crete in the National Museum⁵².

Unpublished finds include a fragmentary lion with a raised tail in front of a tree, in an example found in a LM III A or B context in Tomb 84, and a lion with a lowered head from the recently excavated Tomb 108.

Groups of two animals of the same species are quite popular in both the Minoan and the Mycenaean glyptic, and two examples of this type have been found in tombs at Armenoi. The composition where two animals are shown the one in front of the other, with the body of the first partly covering that of the second, is the most usual variation. The antithetic position was the favourite stylistic convention for animals meant to be shown next to each other. The second animal is contracted, with only its head and neck shown, and facing the opposite direction in some examples dated LM/LH II–III⁵³.

No. 249 belongs to these late, summarized groups. The scene is clearly attributed to the same artist as no. 243; the elegant and sophisticated modelling of the slender body and legs of the animals support the view that he was working in the tradition of hard stones. The activity of this artist, who belongs to the “Island sanctuaries group” active in LM III A2 – early III B, should be placed in LM III A2⁵⁴; the context of Tomb 19 where the seal was found is LM III B1.

The two animals on the second – unpublished – example from Tomb 102 are ibexes, and show another variation of the type with both animals facing the same direction, and with the body of the one partly covering that of the other. Its style is related to that of a seal from Mycenae⁵⁵ and that of a Minoan seal of unknown provenance⁵⁶.

Bulls occur in isolation on twelve examples from Armenoi, with interesting differences in style and movement. This relatively large number agrees with the popularity of the animal in the Minoan and the Mycenaean glyptic, where it is frequently shown either in isolation or together with animals of the same or different species, and with human beings in peaceful or violent combinations⁵⁷.

The first example, no. 254, shows a bull with exceedingly long horns together with branches and a figure-of-eight shield in the field. The latter may be a hint to the religious significance of the scene, but could also belong to a series of motifs represented in the

⁴⁹ CMS V 651.

⁵⁰ Younger, *loc. cit.* (note 27) 415ff.

⁵¹ GGFR 48. 394.

⁵² CMS I 506.

⁵³ For a discussion of the type: Tamvaki, *loc. cit.* (note 15) 264–266 notes 69–108.

⁵⁴ On this master see John Younger’s paper in the present volume, p. 266ff.

⁵⁵ CMS I 45.

⁵⁶ CMS XIII 7.

⁵⁷ On bulls: Sakellariou, *loc. cit.* (note 7) 7–10. 53–57. 57–60.

field of some LM examples, the relation of which to the main scene is not always clear. No. 254 was found in Tomb 27 and in a LM III A1–2 context; its style points to a date sometime in LM II, and has affinities to that of an example from Tanagra in Thebes, from a LM IIIA–B context⁵⁸.

The bull on no. 280 has a long and prominently curved body – a feature emphasized by the manner in which his head is bent down. Two branches in a characteristic parallel disposition occupy the upper part of the field; an impaled triangle and two arrow-like motifs are under the animal's belly. The modelling clearly belongs to the "Mainland popular style", namely the Mycenaean equivalent of the "Cretan popular style"⁵⁹, examples of which are found in contexts ranging from LH IIIA–III B2/C1 contexts⁶⁰. Its affinities to the Mainland are confirmed by its closest stylistic parallels from Pronnoi in Kephallenia⁶¹, from Kokkolata also in Kephallenia⁶², from Medeon in Delphi⁶³, from Oxyolithos in Chalkis⁶⁴ and from Delos⁶⁵. The style of two examples of unknown provenance is related as well⁶⁶.

The bulls shown on nos. 247. 252. 275. 279. 281. 282 have the head retorted; they could be related to the type of the animal scratching its neck⁶⁷ or to that of the animal wounded by an arrow. The bull on no. 247 has an elongated head with characteristic round eyes and a knob at the end of the muzzle; there is another similar knob on the lower part of the curious object depicted under the animal's belly. The modelling of the elongated body is rather stiff and awkward, with a pronounced curve at the back. The forelegs are unnaturally stretched, while the bending of the back legs is rendered by angles rather than curves. The feet are pointed, and have distinctive heels at the back. There is a branch in front of the bull. The animals on a number of seals from Armenoi – nos. 248. 250. 258. 272 – share these stylistic features in a more or less obvious way, and should probably be attributed to the same master, who was working in the tradition of the "Cretan popular style"⁶⁸. Although the scene on no. 265 is too worn for certainty, it could probably be attributed to the same artist as well. His activity should be placed in the Late Minoan IIIA period. No. 247 was found in Tomb 18 which was plundered and had no context. A number of late seals show similar stylistic tendencies in the modelling of the animals, and it may be possible to attribute more works to the master in question⁶⁹.

The rendering of the bull on no. 252 is rather confused, with several small round drill-marks on the head, legs and feet, and some pronounced cuts on the body. Such features point to a date sometime in LM II–III A1. No. 252 was found in Tomb 24,

⁵⁸ CMS V 683.

⁵⁹ Younger, loc. cit. (note 27) 439ff.

⁶⁰ *ibid.*

⁶¹ CMS V 172.

⁶² *ibid.* nos. 153. 158–161.

⁶³ *ibid.* nos. 337. 417.

⁶⁴ *ibid.* no. 227.

⁶⁵ *ibid.* no. 315.

⁶⁶ CMS VIII 53; CMS IX 177.

⁶⁷ Sakellariou, loc. cit. (note 7) 51–52.

⁶⁸ Younger, loc. cit. (note 27).

⁶⁹ Some unpublished seals in Heracleion may be related to such representations.

which yielded no. 253 discussed earlier, and the polychrome larnax with the scenes of hunt. The context of this tomb is LM III A2–B1.

The bull on no. 275 is rather stiff and simplified, but not to the same extent as the animals on some late seals. Some of the technical differences may be due to the modelling on ivory, but a stylistic date in LM II seems quite secure. The seal came from a plundered tomb: no. 56.

The bull on no. 279 has clearly been wounded by an arrow shown above its rump; there is an unclear linear motif between its forelegs. The animal has a large round eye, three round drillings at the top of the head, and cuts on the body and leg. Such stylistic features point to a date in LM III A1. The seal comes from Tomb 60, the context of which is LM III B2.

No. 281 has the same posture and characteristic round eye, but the modelling of the body is smoother, without exaggerated cuts; the legs have some knobs and the feet are pointed. A branch is shown this time between the legs of the animal, instead of the more usual position in front of the animal, where a series of strokes is shown in this particular case. The representation belongs to the “Cretan popular style”⁷⁰ and should be dated LM I–II. Tomb 64, where it was found, had a LM III A2–III B1 context.

The bull on no. 282 is close to those on nos. 275 and 281; its style is therefore close to the “Cretan popular style”. There are some pronounced horizontal cuts on the animal’s neck, and a branch in front of it. The seal came from the same tomb as no. 281, and its stylistic affinities point to a similar dating.

Isolated animals are often shown on seals from Armenoi. Such animals – especially caprids, bovids, rams and deer – enjoyed considerable popularity in the late phases of the Minoan and the Mycenaean glyptic⁷¹. Stylized plants are usually shown in various positions in the field.

No. 243 from Tomb 13 shows a running horned quadruped with retorted head. Its posture and style are comparable to those of the animals on no. 249. The striking similarities in the modelling favour its attribution to the same artist; it should therefore be dated to LM III A2, which is the date of its context as well.

No. 248 from Tomb 18 shows an ibex with a plant in front of it. Its stylistic peculiarities are the same as those of no. 247, found in the same tomb and discussed earlier. Both are the works of the same master, whose activity is placed in the LM III A period.

No. 250 from Tomb 19 shows a similar motif and is another work of that same artist, who seems to have engraved a number of examples. Its affinities to nos. 247, 248 are less close, but unmistakable. It was found in a LM III B1 context.

The same scene is repeated on no. 272 from Tomb 54, also attributed to the same hand. This seal had no datable context. The confused and awkward rendering of the horned animal on no. 258 from Tomb 32 presents us with difficulties in the attempt to establish its stylistic affinities. Its head and horns are unclear, but the modelling of

⁷⁰ Younger, loc. cit. (note 27).

⁷¹ Tamvaki, loc. cit. (note 15) 261–264 notes 27–67.

its body and legs is very similar to that of nos. 247. 248. 250. The seal was found in a LM III A2–B1 context.

Unpublished examples from Tombs 71. 108. 111 show a horned animal and a plant as well. A closer examination of these stones may prove that all or some were engraved by the same artist as the previously discussed examples.

No. 255 from Tomb 27 shows a curious horned animal with curved horns and legs. The curve of the legs seems to be adapted to the shape of the seal. The two motifs above and below the animal may be stylized representations of the figure-of-eight shield. The bold oblique strokes at the top and bottom of the scene are particularly striking. This representation finds close stylistic parallels in a number of examples e.g. from Kokkola in Kephallenia⁷² from Delphi in Delphi⁷³ and from Pteleon in Volos⁷⁴. The existence of such parallels from the Greek Mainland makes its attribution to the “Mainland popular style” plausible. It should be dated to the LH III A2 period; the date of its context is LM III A1–2.

No. 261 from Tomb 34 belongs to the “Mainland popular style” as well. It shows a sketchy animal with a straight, elongated body and a long neck. A number of seals dated to the final phases of the Mycenaean glyptic show similar simplified animals: e.g. from Mycenae⁷⁵, Prosymna⁷⁶, Pylos⁷⁷, Perati⁷⁸, Athens⁷⁹, Aegina⁸⁰, Argos⁸¹, Metaxata⁸², Krissa⁸³, Medeon⁸⁴, Tanagra⁸⁵, Ayios Ilias⁸⁶, Karpophora⁸⁷, Korakou⁸⁸, Tiryns⁸⁹, Kamini⁹⁰, Kladeos⁹¹, Pteleon⁹², and others of unknown provenance⁹³. The context of Tomb 34 where no. 261 was found is LM III A2–B1.

The rendering of the animal on no. 283 from Tomb 64 is related to that of no. 261, but more naturalistic. The seal belongs to the “Cretan popular style” and should be dated to the LM I–II. Its style shows some affinities to that of examples from Kokko-

⁷² CMS V 150. On the distinctions of styles see Sakellariou, loc. cit. (note 7) 114ff.; Biesantz, Siegelbilder 53ff.; GGFR 393–394; Younger, loc. cit. (note 27).

⁷³ CMS V 321.

⁷⁴ *ibid.* no. 741.

⁷⁵ CMS I 22. 25. 27. 29. 31. 32. 38. 169. 178.

⁷⁶ *ibid.* no. 210.

⁷⁷ *ibid.* no. 295.

⁷⁸ *ibid.* no. 395.

⁷⁹ *ibid.* nos. 399. 400.

⁸⁰ CMS V 8. 9.

⁸¹ *ibid.* no. 34.

⁸² *ibid.* nos. 169. 170.

⁸³ CMS V 320–323.

⁸⁴ *ibid.* nos. 341. 342. 377–379. 384. 401–403.

⁸⁵ *ibid.* no. 670.

⁸⁶ *ibid.* no. 622.

⁸⁷ *ibid.* nos. 442. 443.

⁸⁸ *ibid.* no. 512.

⁸⁹ *ibid.* no. 575.

⁹⁰ *ibid.* no. 601.

⁹¹ *ibid.* nos. 610. 615.

⁹² *ibid.* no. 746.

⁹³ CMS VII 200. 204. 205. 263; CMS VIII 98. 99. 145; CMS IX 172. 175. 201–204.

lata⁹⁴, Chalkis⁹⁵ and Pylos⁹⁶. Its context is LM III A2–B1. No. 283 from Tomb 38 is an unexpected find; it has the shape of a stepped pyramid and this suggests a dating in MM II⁹⁷. I have not yet found any close stylistic parallels for the long-eared animal shown on the seal. It comes from a LM III A2–B1 context.

Representations of animals are also found on unpublished examples from Tombs 80. 107. 119; the one from Tomb 107 shows a running ibex of a type known from a number of Late Minoan seals⁹⁸.

Simple and elaborate compositions of linear and abstract decorative patterns occur on a number of examples from Armenoi, largely made of fluorite (nos. 271. 277. 278 and unpublished examples from Tombs 91. 98. 108. 109. 110. 118. 79. 80. 85 and two from Tomb 83). Such finds are common in Crete and the Mainland at the end of the Bronze Age; they are usually found in IIIA–C contexts⁹⁹. The seals under discussion may belong to the “Mainland popular style” and should be dated to the LM III A1–2 period. Tomb 59, which yielded nos. 277 and 278, has a LM III A2–B1 context.

A few steatite or serpentine seals show regular or irregular curvilinear or rectilinear patterns. No. 245 from Tomb 15 shows a composition of curved lines and dots; identical examples have been found in Tombs 114. 115 (unpublished). Tomb 15 has no datable context, but such seals may belong to the “Mainland popular style”¹⁰⁰. No. 269 from Tomb 47 is engraved on both sides with irregular crossing lines and dots. Such simple motifs based on crossing lines and cruciform shapes are represented on unpublished seals from Tombs 67. 79 and 83 as well. Tomb 47 has no datable context¹⁰¹.

Decorative patterns made of dotted circles are found on no. 259, a lentoid from Tomb 32, and on no. 270, a four-sided prism from Tomb 54. The motif is known from several seals in Heracleion, largely from Knossos and dated LMI–III. Both examples belong to the “Cretan popular style” and should be dated LMI–II. The context of Tomb 32 is LM III A2–B1, and Tomb 54 had no datable context. Dotted circles are found in different combinations on MM examples¹⁰². Abstract patterns showing the irregular use of the tubular drill are characteristic of the final phases of the Minoan and the Mycenaean glyptic¹⁰³.

⁹⁴ CMS V 162.

⁹⁵ *ibid.* no. 228.

⁹⁶ *ibid.* no. 310.

⁹⁷ On the shape of Cretan seals: CS 28–30.

⁹⁸ Compare CMS XII 260; CMS IX 139–141; CMS I 212. 481. 482; CMCG pl. XXII no. 185 b. pl. XXIV nos. 255. 257; Genève, Catalogue pl. 78 no. 203.

⁹⁹ Compare CMS I 229 from Chalkis; CMS V 373–375 from Medeon in Delphi; *ibid.* no. 617 from Kladeos; nos. 735. 739. 742. 743 from Pteleon in Volos.

¹⁰⁰ Younger, *loc. cit.* (note 27) 439ff.

¹⁰¹ Compare CMS I 34. 174. 177 from Mycenae; *ibid.* no. 397. 402 from Athens; CMS V 154. 155 from Kokkolata in Kephallenia; CMS V 618. 622 from Ayios Ilias; *ibid.* no. 574 from Tiryns; CMS IX 197.

¹⁰² Compare CMS V 12 from Aegina; *ibid.* no. 152 from Kokkolata; *ibid.* no. 330 from Krissa; *ibid.* no. 376. 387. 413. 420 from Medeon; *ibid.* no. 448 from Karpophora; *ibid.* nos. 494. 495 from Kea. Also: CMS IV 74. 82–90. 95. 113. 114. 119. 122. 142. 149. 154; CMS VII 25–27. 147. 244. 245; CMS VIII 22. 24. 26–28. 31. 68. 86. 87; CMS IX 288; CMS XII 39. 52. 54. 69. 75–82. 121. 257; CMS XIII 38. 63. 69. 86–88. 92. 93; CMCG pl. XXIII no. 208; CS pl. 15 nos. 392. 393.

¹⁰³ GGFR 60 fig. 131.

The scenes depicted on a number of examples from Armenoi are too worn and unclear for certainty. The surface of no. 251 from Tomb 19 preserves some strokes only; it came from a LM III B1 context. No. 256 – from Tomb 30 and with a LM III A2 context – was originally engraved on both sides, but the motifs are not identifiable any longer. No. 257 – from Tomb 32 and with a LM III A2–B1 context – shows traces of two quadrupeds back to back. The irregular lines on no. 262 from the plundered Tomb 32 can hardly make up an intelligible scene.

A branch and traces of an animal preserved on no. 276 from Tomb 56 suggest that it may be attributed to the same master as nos. 247. 248. 250. 258. 272. 265? The tomb had no datable context. Unpublished examples from Tombs 107 and 108 probably show animals as well; the motifs on three other seals from Tombs 83. 115. 118 are unintelligible.

We may provisionally conclude that while the style of some of the Armenoi seals suggests a considerably earlier date than that of their contexts for their manufacture, the majority of them are dated to the LM II and III periods. The Minoan examples – with the exception of no. 246 – may be the products of a local workshop. However, the possibility that some or all of them may have been imported from other parts of Crete remains open. The seals attributed to the “Mainland popular style” could have been imported or locally made in the Mycenaean fashion; it is difficult to decide without a more meticulous examination of the stones, and close comparisons to their parallels. The Mitanni cylinder¹⁰⁴ is informative in relation to the questions of the trading activities of the inhabitants of Armenoi. It has been possible to identify the hands of two individual masters, and to attribute a number of examples to them. A more detailed study may result in the attribution of additional examples from other places to these same hands.

Although the artists who were responsible for the engraving of the seals may have travelled¹⁰⁵ the possibility that at least the more common and cheaper stones were locally made can not be ruled out. The evidence of the contexts of the tombs suggests that the seals from Armenoi were worn on the wrist or suspended from necklaces; this use is more appropriate to them than any of the others proposed by Younger for the seals of the Bronze Age¹⁰⁶.

The excavations at Armenoi have proven beyond any doubt that the owners of the tombs were the members of a wealthy and prosperous community, judging from some of their contents, particularly the seals, the painted larnakes¹⁰⁷ and the jewellery. Such a situation may not have changed until the end of the LM III B2 – the date of the latest contexts of the tombs. It may be difficult to argue for a progressive impoverishment using the evidence of such contexts. The excavation of a settlement at Armenoi, and possibly that of others in the same area, may provide the missing links and the answers to some of the questions which must remain open for the moment.

¹⁰⁴ On the dating of such cylinders see A.J.B. Wace and E. Porada, A faience cylinder, BSA 52 (1957) 200–204.

¹⁰⁵ See Ch. Kardara, The Itinerant Art, in 1^o ConMic I, 222–227.

¹⁰⁶ Younger, loc. cit. (note 5).

¹⁰⁷ Y. Tzedakis, *Λάρνακες ύστερομινωϊκού νεκροταφείου Ἀρμένων Ῥεθύμνης*, AAA 4 (1971) 216–221

DISKUSSION

I. PINI betont die große Bedeutung des umfangreichen und gut datierbaren Materials von Armenoi für die chronologische Ordnung der ganzen spätminoischen Glyptik. Aus dem Material ergibt sich eine ganze Reihe von Problemen:

1. Läuft der »Cretan Popular Style« wirklich von SM I bis SM IIIB gleichmäßig durch, oder besteht die Möglichkeit, ihn zeitlich in mehrere Gruppen neben- und hintereinander aufzugliedern?

2. Bei einigen Siegeln ist ein festländischer Einfluß festzustellen, wenn nicht einzelne Beispiele direkt vom Festland importiert worden sind, wie z.B. CMS V 255. Auch das Material, ein dunkelroter, relativ weicher Stein, der auf Kreta sonst kaum nachzuweisen ist, spricht hier dafür.

3. Was das Material angeht, bestehen alle in CMS V als Bergkristall publizierten Siegel aus Fluorit, wie Analysen entsprechender Stücke aus westeuropäischen Sammlungen ergeben haben. Fluorit ist ein weiches Material, das mit dem Stichel graviert werden konnte, wie es bei der Mehrzahl der späten Siegel üblich war.

J.G. YOUNGER führt zu einer Frage von A. Tamvaki zum Siegel CMS V 246 aus, daß die Gesamtkomposition sich in zwei vollständig verschiedene Einzelkompositionen aufgliedern läßt. Der Löwe mit umgewandtem Vorderteil ist ein sehr üblicher Typus. Die galoppierende Gazelle oder Antilope tritt ebenfalls sehr häufig auf. Kompositionell gehört sie mit dem Mann zusammen. Es stehen also zwei verschiedene Kompositionen in einem rechten Winkel zueinander. Wie man die Darstellung zu lesen hat, hängt von der Orientierung der Durchbohrung ab¹. In diesen und den wenigen anderen Fällen, bei denen zwei verschiedene Kompositionen in einem rechten Winkel zueinander auf dieselbe Siegelfläche eines Lentoids gesetzt sind, ist die Form des Siegels jeweils vollkommen rund und nicht oval wie normalerweise.

W. SCHIERING weist darauf hin, daß einige Motive der Siegel Parallelen auf den Sarkophagen von Armenoi haben². Ein Vergleich solcher Beispiele mit den Sarkophagen, die innerhalb der Keramikchronologie besser zu datieren sind als die Siegel, könnte vielleicht etwas zur Klärung der Frage beitragen, ob die Siegel zum Teil älter sind als ihre Fundkontexte.

I. PINI meint, es müsse bei dem begrenzten Material von Armenoi möglich sein, Werkstätten zu scheiden. Mit Ausnahme einiger weniger Stücke, wie CMS V 246, die wahrscheinlich aus den zentralen Werkstätten der Paläste stammen oder aber aus deren Umgebung, kommt der Rest – wie auch die Sarkophage – wahrscheinlich aus einer oder mehreren lokalen Werkstätten.

J.G. YOUNGER betont, daß man im Umgang mit dem Wort »Stil« sehr vorsichtig sein sollte. Einer wirklichen Definition des Stils nähert man sich, indem man über Künstler und Werkstätten spricht und diese gruppiert. Dann erst läßt sich Klarheit über die Chronologie und die generelle Stilentwicklung auf Kreta, dem Festland und den ägäischen Inseln gewinnen.

¹ vgl. J.G. Younger, Kadmos 16, 1977, 153ff.

² vgl. z.B. CMS V 254 mit AAA 4, 1971, 219 Abb. 7.

W.-D. NIEMEIER spricht das Problem an, daß der Rahmen, in dem sich die Bezeichnung der Stilgruppen innerhalb der Glyptik bewegt, noch sehr weit gesteckt ist. Youngers »Cretan Popular Group« ist eine chronologisch sehr große Gruppe. Sakellarios Stile A und B sind noch umfangreicher³. Man ist daher für eine chronologische Einordnung noch immer auf die Keramikchronologie angewiesen, die aber ihrerseits zu fein für die Siegel ist. Es gibt z.B. keine SM III A1-Siegel, sondern nur solche, die in einem SM III A1-Kontext gefunden worden sind.

³ A. Sakellariou, *Μυκηναϊκή Σφραγιδογραφία* (1966) 104ff.