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Introduction

Crete of the early first millennium B.C. is a flourishing field of study. This was most forcefully confirmed in 2006, which commenced with a conference on ‘Crete of the Geometric and Archaic period’, hosted by the German Institute in Athens, and closed with a similar one, represented by the volume at hand, on the island’s ‘Dark Age’, held in the Italian School of Archaeology at Athens. Interestingly, the latter actually occurred exactly eleven years after another conference on largely the same subject, organised in London by the British School at Athens and titled ‘Post-Minoan Crete’. It is notable that, although all three mostly cover the island’s 12th to 6th centuries, they called the period by different names. I personally hold, however, that the last two names (Dark Age, Post-Minoan) carry pejorative connotations that do no justice to the flourish of the island’s culture at the time, while the first excludes – if taken literally – the period before the application of Geometric ornaments on ceramics. I therefore prefer to call the period in question the Early Iron Age.

A conference discussing cultural identity and ethnicity is particularly fitting to the context.

* I am delighted to contribute to a conference that celebrates the centenary of excavations at Priniás. This is because not only I greatly admire the setting of the Patella, but also hold that publication will eventually establish Priniás as the type-site for Crete of the end of the second and the early first millennium B.C. The paper draws from my unpublished PhD thesis (Kotsonas 2005), which discusses a large corpus of clay vases from Eleutherna, dating to the 9th-6th century B.C. I am deeply grateful to Professor N.C. Stampolidis for inviting me to study this material and to Dr. I.S. Lemos for supervising my work, which was generously funded by the J.E. Costopoulos Foundation, the University of Edinburgh and the N.P. Goulandris Foundation. I owe much of my acquaintance with Cypriot prototypes of Creto-Cypriot ceramics to a study-trip in Cyprus, funded by the Council for British Research in the Levant, as well as to a visit in the Stratigraphic Museum at Knossos, which was greatly facilitated by the curator, Dr. D. Evely. I am also thankful to Professor J.N. Coldstream for his criticism on the relevant section of my thesis, as well as to Dr. M. Caskey and Professor N. Kourou for their important comments and criticism on the oral presentation of this paper. Professor Kourou is also to be thanked for providing a copy of Coldstream forthcoming. Thanks are also due to Professor Stampolidis for his comments and suggestions. The bibliography cited stops at 2006. I also explore the issue of foreign potters/painters (referred to simply as ‘potters’ in the rest of this article) working in Early Iron Age Crete in A. Kotsonas, The Archaeology of tomb A1K1 of Orthi Petra in Eleutherna: The Early Iron Age Pottery, Athens, 2008, pp. 65-78.

1 The conference, held in 27-29 January 2006, was called Crete in the Geometric and Archaic Period; its proceedings are to be published as Kreta in der geometrischen und archaischen Zeit. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen, W.-D. Niemeier, I. Kaiser and O. Pilz (eds.).

2 The conference, held in 9-12 November 2006, was called Identità culturale, etnicità, processi di formazione a Creta fra Dark Age e Arcaismo.

3 Cavanagh - Curtis 1998. The conference was held in London, in 10-11 November 1995. Although the volume published was subtitled Proceedings of the First Colloquium on Post-Minoan Crete, no second colloquium was held thereafter.

4 All remaining dates are B.C.

5 For problems with the term ‘Dark Age’ see Dickinson 2006, pp. 1-9. For roughly similar problems with the term ‘Post-Minoan’ see Whittley 1998, p. 611.

of Early Iron Age Crete. The theme has preoccupied literary references to the island, since Homer’s description of Crete as the home of diverse people. In fact, the presence of foreigners, particularly Phoenicians, on Crete was accepted in scholarship before archaeology had furnished any corroborative evidence at all, in a period that is viewed by some as the heyday of anti-Semitism in Classical studies. This is most peculiar given that Crete has yielded no written documents providing information on foreigners, particularly craftsmen, residing on the island during the Early Iron Age. Such documents do exist for the Near East and — to a much lesser extent — the Aegean of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age, but pose their own problems of interpretation and have led to contradicting views. Some scholars maintain that craftsmen would only travel in response to requests of high-ranking individuals or communities, while others accept that they were also free to travel on their own volition. Nevertheless, it is not always easy to distinguish between forced and deliberate craftsmen mobility. In the light of the limited quantity, as well as the questionable quality and applicability of the written testimonies available, the present discussion is largely limited to the relevant archaeological finds.

The earliest argument for the association between foreign styles and the presence of foreigners in Early Iron Age Crete is found in the monograph on the finds from the Idaean Cave that was published by Halbherr and Orsi in 1888. They connected the manufacture of the bronze vessels found in the cave with resident Phoenicians. The conclusion of the two scholars is hardly acknowledged in recent literature, which credits Kunze or Dunbabin with the earliest discussion of the issue. Later, in the mid-20th century, discussions regarding the presence of foreigners in Early Iron Age Crete became very common. Arguments for Phoenician and North Syrian craftsmen manufacturing ivories and gold jewellery, as well as for Near Eastern traders and non-specialists, were raised. By acknowledging the possibility that foreign bronze-workers, goldsmiths and ivory-workers were active in Crete of the period, scholars actually identify the island (especially the central part of it) as the most cosmopolitan Aegean region in terms of artefact production.

Against such a background, one is surprised to realize that the relevant discussion largely overlooks the case of pottery. Only in 1984 did potters join the list of foreign craftsmen allegedly working in Early Iron Age Crete. In the last fifteen years that arguments for foreign potters working in Crete of the period have multiplied. Nonetheless, the relevant suggestions have hitherto remained independent of each other and attract little or no attention in relevant scholarship. They are, for example, hardly mentioned in two recent reviews of ceramic correspondences.

15 Admittedly, however, they considered those Phoenicians not as newly arrived immigrants, but as descendants of people from the Near East that settled in the island before the arrival of the Dorians. Cf. Curtius 1868, pp. 70-71.
16 As done, for example, in Hoffman 1997, pp. 162, 164; Muhly 2005, p. 685.
20 Coldstream 1984 (the second case discussed in the present paper).
21 Kourou 1994, pp. 278-279 and Kourou 2004, p. 81 (the third case of the present paper); Coldstream 2000 (my first case); Stamolidis 2004a, p. 246, number 275 (my fourth case). The last reference is to a catalogue entry that summarises a view of mine explored at length in my unpublished PhD thesis (Kotsonas 2005, pp. 76-77, 86-92), where all cases of foreign potters residing in Early Iron Age Crete are discussed (Kotsonas 2005, pp. 76-81).
between Greeks and non-Greeks in the Early Iron Age Mediterranean. Moreover, potters hardly figure in Hoffman’s important monograph on immigrant craftsmen in Early Iron Age Crete, or other publications on the connections between Crete and the Aegean or the Eastern Mediterranean. Similarly, a publication that furnishes evidence for the mobility of Cretan potters within the island has received no attention. Overlooking or underestimating the evidence of pottery is, however, highly questionable, given that this is the most well-represented and copiously published class of material remains in the Aegean of the period.

Another bias that affects much of the relevant scholarship regards its persistent focus on foreigners, craftsmen and other, that came to Crete from the Near East, rather than the Aegean. The volume and variety of cultural interactions manifested between the island and the rest of the southern Aegean has received no attention. Aegean ceramic styles in particular proved influential to the pottery of some Cretan sites or sub-regions. For example, Knossian Early Protogeometric - Middle Protogeometric pottery is much indebted to Attic Protogeometric and Knossian Middle Geometric displays an overwhelming influence from the Attic Geometric style. Further, the Late Geometric pottery of Khania heavily draws from Corinthian and Argive Late Geometric, while East Cretan Late Geometric pottery owes much to concurrent Cycladic styles. I therefore see particular merit in introducing a discussion on potters that migrated to Early Iron Age Crete from both the Near East and the Aegean. In treating the issue, I do not wish to dive into art-historical questions, but explore inquiries regarding artefact production, dissemination and consumption. This will in turn – and on a different, future occasion – allow for a reconstruction of economic and social mechanisms and shed important light in the society and culture of the Aegean in the Early Iron Age.

**Mobility of potters: evidence and interpretations**

Craftsmen mobility is agreed to form an important interpretative tool in studies of processes of transmission of material traits. Unfortunately, however, its archaeological correlates largely remain unexplored by ethnoarchaeology. Similarly, there is little correspondence between scholarship on the mobility of potters in the Classical Greek world and relevant reviews on traditional Aegean pottery making. Studies proposing the mobility of potters in ancient Greece often face more shortcomings. They, for example, hardly assess the argument for the arrival of such individuals against the diachronic permeability of the local ceramic tradition(s) to foreign styles. Should those tradition(s), however, display a long history of copying and borrowing from abroad, the argument for foreign potters is considerably weakened and alternative

---

22 Boardman 2004; Coldstream 2006. Coldstream only mentions the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black on Red. Hoffman 1997. Although clearly aware of Coldstream’s suggestion for an immigrant potter (Coldstream 1984, p. 137), Hoffman only cares to repeat – not discuss – it in a footnote (Hoffman 1997, p. 178, footnote 98). This is most disappointing for a monograph on immigrants in Early Iron Age Crete.
23 Hoffman 1997. Fortunately, its archaeological correlates largely remain unexplored by ethnoarchaeology. Similarly, there is little correspondence between scholarship on the mobility of potters in the Classical Greek world and relevant reviews on traditional Aegean pottery making. Studies proposing the mobility of potters in ancient Greece often face more shortcomings. They, for example, hardly assess the argument for the arrival of such individuals against the diachronic permeability of the local ceramic tradition(s) to foreign styles. Should those tradition(s), however, display a long history of copying and borrowing from abroad, the argument for foreign potters is considerably weakened and alternative
interpretations come forward.\textsuperscript{36} Scholars have further rightly criticised the occasional treatment of the mobility of potters as an all-embracing concept of convenience applied to a range of ‘difficult’ cases of stylistic dissemination.\textsuperscript{37} The concept is questionable when applied largely in response to unsuccessful attempts to chart routes of artistic transmission by other, more popular means, like actual imports.\textsuperscript{38} Such an attitude is explicit in Dunbabin’s interpretation of the so-called ‘Idaean cave type shields’, which was published half a century ago.\textsuperscript{39} It also pervades, however, recent scholarship, including studies concerned with Aegean ceramics of the Early Iron Age. It is, for example, apparent in the way the concept is questionable when applied largely in response to unsuccessful attempts to chart routes of artistic transmission by other, more popular means, like actual imports.\textsuperscript{38} Such an attitude is explicit in Dunbabin’s interpretation of the so-called ‘Idaean cave type shields’, which was published half a century ago.\textsuperscript{39} It also pervades, however, recent scholarship, including studies concerned with Aegean ceramics of the Early Iron Age. It is, for example, apparent in the way the arguments for the immigration of Naxian potters to Knossos around 700 (see below)\textsuperscript{40} and the involvement of Cypriot potters in the production of Cypriot type, Black on Red pottery in 8th century Cos\textsuperscript{41} are phrased.

On these grounds, I emphasise that arguments for the mobility of potters should rely on positive – rather than negative – evidence. Those arguments should also take into account wider archaeological and social anthropological debates,\textsuperscript{42} problems inherent in straightforwardly equating objects, particularly pots, with people\textsuperscript{43} and complexities involved in inferring ethnicity from artistic style.\textsuperscript{44} The relevant discussions have demonstrated that ethnic identity cannot persuasively be determined solely on the basis of artefact style and are increasingly emphasizing that identifications of such identity or, at least, cultural training should rely on assessments of the artefact’s production techniques.\textsuperscript{45} In fact, it has lately been argued – with reference to pottery – that ‘technical details of craft-practice are surely no less indicative of ethnic identity than the standard characteristics of language, armour and dress cited in a variety of circumstances by ancient authors’.\textsuperscript{46}

There is, I uphold, particular merit in adopting a methodological approach that lays emphasis on technical aspects. Correspondences in technique are a way out of never-ending debates over the interpretation of stylistic resemblance and are further acknowledged a key importance in the identification of the work of foreign craftsmen.\textsuperscript{47} My emphasis on technical aspects is obviously not to discard stylistic and wider archaeological analyses, but to advertise a way to overcome their ambiguities and limitations. The latter clearly emerge in two recent publications by Boardman\textsuperscript{48} and Coldstream,\textsuperscript{49} who – independently of each other – pursue such analyses on largely the same cases of ceramic correspondences in the Early Iron Age Mediterranean, but come up with markedly different conclusions.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} MORGAN 1999, pp. 224, 228-229 (with reference to Mileus).
\item \textsuperscript{37} See the contribution of Franciosi, which largely refers to potters, in the discussion recorded in CÉBILLAC-GERVASONI 1982, pp. 195-196.
\item \textsuperscript{38} HOFFMAN 1997, pp. 8, 153-155.
\item \textsuperscript{39} DUNBABIN 1957, pp. 40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{40} KOUROU 1994, pp. 278-279.
\item \textsuperscript{41} BOUROUGIANNIS 2000, p. 19.
\item \textsuperscript{42} See the commendable discussion in HOFFMAN 1997 for the mobility of craftsmen other than potters.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Modern scholars rightly challenge former assumptions on ‘pots and people’ and produce more sophisticated interpretations on the dissemination of ceramics. On the other hand, the criticism is occasionally taken to extremes, as suggested in: RIDGWAY 2004, pp. 24-26; BOARDMAN 2004, pp. 149-150; DICKINSON 2006, pp. 200-201.
\item \textsuperscript{44} HOFFMAN 1997, pp. 10-14; HALL 1997, pp. 111-142 (see the debate over this monograph in CAt 8.2, 1998, pp. 265-283, as well as Ancient West and East 4.2, 2005, pp. 409-459); JONES S. 1997, pp. 106-127; DAVID-KRAMMER 2001, pp. 189-224.
\item \textsuperscript{45} HOFFMAN 1997, pp. 16-17; DAVID-KRAMMER 2001, pp. 145-157.
\item \textsuperscript{46} RIDGWAY 2004, p. 26.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Arguments based on the transmission of techniques are not altogether missing from early scholarly works that do not engage in archaeological theory (references are collected in HOFFMAN 1997, p. 17). This is particularly so in the case of the appearance of re-appearance of some production techniques, particularly in metalworking, in the Aegean of the Early Iron Age, which is often attributed to person-to-person contact between a foreign master and a local pupil.
\item \textsuperscript{48} BOARDMAN 2004.
\item \textsuperscript{49} COLDSTREAM 2006.
\item \textsuperscript{50} The limitations of the two analyses prove most pronounced in the case of the Phoenician Red slip plates produced in Pithekoussai. Coldstream finds it ‘hard to resist
The limitations embedded in assessments that rely solely on style and the broader archaeological background are also illustrated in the case of a Late Archaic ceramic workshop on the island of Thasos. The workshop was originally supposed to have been run by Parian potters, on the grounds of the Cycladic style of some of its output and the testimonies for the Parian colonisation of Thasos. Boardman claims ‘there seems nothing decisive’ over the orientation of Thasos. In later discussions, however, the potters are no longer identified as Parians, probably due to a reappraisal of the secondary differences between the Cycladic prototypes and the Thasian products, the chronological gap between the establishment of the Parian colony and the foundation of the workshop, as well as the evidence that the majority of the pottery produced concurrently in the same installation imitated Attic styles. This last evidence suggests that the workshop’s styles say more about local demand and the potter’s skill to comply with it, rather than about the origins of the staff employed. In any case, these few examples, drawn from recent scholarship, suggest that, notwithstanding the need for assessing all classes of evidence available and treating each case on it merits, discussions of the mobility of potters, urgently require consistent methodological approaches that lay emphasis on ceramic technique and technology.

According to the approach pursued here, secure identifications of potters working away from home should rely on evidence suggesting transmission of technical skills (fabric, firing techniques, surface treatment) and tools (kilns, potter’s wheel, brushes) of some sophistication. This has most satisfactorily been achieved in the case of Miletus of the early second millennium, where large numbers of locally produced copies of Minoan pottery (largely including domestic wares) were found together with kilns and a potter’s wheel of distinctively Minoan type. The case of Miletus is, however, exceptional and archaeologists, especially of the Early Iron Age, normally only rely on scrutiny of the actual material for drawing invaluable hints on technical aspects. As early as 1959, Boardman offered an exemplary application of this method with reference to some Greek style, late 8th century skyphoi found at Al Mina. Beside the style, Boardman studied the fabric, slip and paints of those vases, as well as use of the potter’s tools to argue for the presence of Greek potters at the site. This range of technical aspects, I argue, should receive particular attention in any relevant discussion. This perhaps sounds as self-evident, but is commonly – if only surprisingly – underrated in some treatments of the material discussed below.

Information on ceramic technique and technique and technology also draws largely from archaeological science. True, scientific analyses are largely still developing and databases are only slowly growing. Further, only relatively recently has any consensus over the suitability of techniques for particular tasks been reached and have laboratories been systematically relating their outputs and the outputs of different techniques. Applications of archaeological science on Cretan Early Iron Age pottery are rare (considerably rarer than on Bronze Age) and only


involve chemical analyses of pottery from Knossos and – to a lesser extent – Knossos and East Crete, as well as petrographic analyses of pottery from Eleutherna, Knossos and Sybrita. A project employing gas chromatography for the identification of the contents of vases found in the cemetery of Eleutherna is also in preparation and will eventually throw important light on the contents of unguent vases, like the Cretan copies of Cypriot Black on Red discussed below. Ideally, vases like those of the first two cases described below should be included in a project that would combine gas chromatography with petrography and other provenance studies. Appraisals like the present one would also benefit by the application of methods like Mössbauer spectroscopy, which shed light upon largely benefit by the application of methods like Mössbauer spectroscopy, which shed light upon firing techniques. This method has, for example, suggested the immigration of Euboean potters to the Euboean colony of Pithekoussai by establishing that the firing techniques of Euboean style pottery produced at the site, as well as in the Etruscan site of Veii were similar to those regularly found on pottery from Lefkandi and other sites in the homeland. It has further credited those potters with the production of some Corinthian style pottery at Pithekoussai. On the other hand, Corinthianizing ceramics produced at the site have also been attributed to immigrant Corinthian potters on the basis of style. Nevertheless, the slip that is applied on them does not conform with Corinthian potting traditions and the attribution finds no solid support in scientific analyses.

To sum up, the identification of craftsmen mobility on the basis of finished products is an issue that involves important methodological complexities and one or more interpretative steps removed from the physical evidence. Traditional approaches relying on style and the wider historical context face particular limitations and often furnish highly debatable results. On the other hand, the methodology advertised here draws from such approaches, but lays particular emphasis on determining the transmission of techniques on the basis of artefact analysis and the applications of archaeological science.

**Foreign potters in early Iron Age Crete**

The following analysis treats in a rough chronological sequence four possible cases of foreign craftsmen engaged in ceramic production in Early Iron Age Crete. These regard groups of vases of diverse shape and decoration, produced in various locations of the island. Two more cases can currently not be properly assessed since they have only been raised with reference to individual vases. One of them regards an imitation of Cypriot Bichrome oinochoai produced in Knossos.
The case of a Cypriot potter active in East Crete

The case regards the production of a homogeneous class of Cretan small, slow-pouring juglets, which are made in coarse red micaceous fabric and date from around 1000 to 800 (fig. 1).\(^78\) Vases of this class regularly carry incised vertical ribs (fig. 1a), or less commonly, grooves (fig. 1b) on the body. A few vessels of other shapes show similar fabric and carry ribs on the body are also associated with that class and the ensemble has been identified as a ware.\(^79\) Coldstream demonstrated that the Cretan juglets copy Cypriot Black Slip examples of the Early Iron Age (fig. 2), which in turn, follow earlier Cypriot Base Ring prototypes of the Late Bronze Age (fig. 3).\(^80\) The ribs on the body of the earliest, Cypriot Base Ring vases are taken to imitate the capsule of *papaver somniferum* and advertise their content, which was liquid opium.\(^81\)

Coldstream argued that the Cretan vases were produced by an immigrant Cypriot potter working in East Crete.\(^82\) I have elsewhere questioned both the involvement of a Cypriot potter and the localization of production in East Crete on the basis of evidence on the production and dissemination of the ware.\(^83\) I here avoid repeating myself and only return to the issue of the foreign potter. Coldstream identified the involvement of the potter in the substitution of ribs for grooves (fig. 1), which was aimed at reviving a more accurate depiction of the poppy capsule and advertise the contents of the vase, which was supposedly opium.\(^84\) Nevertheless, our understanding of the relative sequence of those vases is unsatisfactory, as Coldstream himself has demonstrated. True, a couple of vases with grooves have securely been dated to the early 10th century.\(^85\) A third example with grooves, however, dates no earlier than the late 9th century.\(^86\) This date applies to most of the vases that display ribs, but up to three examples may be as early as the 10th century.\(^87\) To conclude, no clear-cut change from grooves to ribs can currently be demonstrated. Furthermore, the role of the Cypriot potter is questionable. Cypriot potters had abandoned ribs in favour of grooves roughly half a century before the appearance of the earliest Cretan pieces.\(^88\) Furthermore, had Cretans wished to advertise the content assumed (opium), they could have thought of ribs without the aid of foreign potters. Lastly, the wide, temporal and spatial distribution of the Cretan ware\(^89\) argues against the decisive role of any single potter of whatever origins.

Technical aspects further challenge the involvement of a Cypriot potter. The production of the Cretan class in coarse fabric is unmatched on the concurrent Cypriot Black Slip prototypes (fig. 2). Moreover, the Cretan examples, exclud-

---

76 Coldstream 1984, p. 137.
77 Stampolidis 2004a, p. 247, number 376. The reference is to a catalogue entry that summarises a view of mine explored at length in my unpublished PhD thesis (Kotsonas 2005, pp. 77-78, 99-102, 119), where two more vases associated with the amphora in question, are discussed.
79 Kotsonas forthcoming a. The article cites all relevant scholarship in detail; add now Karageorghis 2006, pp. 81-82 (note that Karageorghis offers an implausibly early date for some west Cretan flasks).
80 See footnote 78.
81 Coldstream 1979, pp. 258-259.
83 Kotsonas forthcoming a.
Fig. 1. a-b. - Cretan copies of Cypriot Black Slip juglets (Reproduced from STAMPOLIDIS - KARETSOU 1998, pp. 160, 162, nn. 124, 129. Courtesy of Professor N.C. Stampolidis).

Fig. 2. - Cypriot Black Slip juglet of the Early Iron Age (Reproduced from STAMPOLIDIS - KARETSOU 1998, p. 147, n. 98. Courtesy of Professor N.C. Stampolidis).

Fig. 3. - Cypriot Base Ring juglets of the Late Bronze Age (Reproduced from STAMPOLIDIS - KARETSOU 1998, n. 111. Courtesy of Professor N.C. Stampolidis).

Fig. 4. - Cypriot Black on Red lekythia imported to Knossos: Knossos North Cemetery nn. 285.45 and 285.49 (Courtesy of the British School at Athens).

Fig. 5. - Knossian close copies of Cypriot Black on Red lekythia: Knossos North Cemetery nn. 218.6 and 218.41 (Courtesy of the British School at Athens).
ing a single piece that is probably the earliest, do not reproduce the black slip, which gave the Cypriot examples in question their name. Lastly, the Cretan vases do not reproduce the bucchero technique of the Cypriot Late Bronze Age examples (fig. 3).

Had a Cypriot potter produced the Cretan vases, he would not have completely abandoned the techniques to which he was accustomed. I therefore conclude that it is highly unlikely that a foreign, Cypriot potter would change his cultural training to such an extent and towards such a direction. The Cretan examples could therefore not have been produced by a Cypriot craftsmen.

Actual Cypriot imports could have generated the Cretan ware. Admittedly, no Cypriot Black Slip import has hitherto been identified in Crete. The discovery, however, of the closest Cretan copy of that Cypriot ware in a context dating to a period (circa 1000) that has hitherto produced relatively limited finds throughout Crete underlines the hazards of excavation. On the other hand, an earlier Cypriot Base Ring, handmade vessel of similar shape has been located in a 14th century context at Kommos. This vase is typical of its class in being made in coarse fabric and carrying ribs. One should, however, avoid readily attributing the production of the Cretan Early Iron Age series to Cypriot Base Ring imports in the light of the chronological gap that stands in between. Besides, juglets of the latter class are handmade and carry a round mouth, as opposed to the Cretan wheel-made vases that are equipped with a trefoil lip. The two classes do share the coarse fabric for the Cretan vases do not reproduce the bucchero importation of the ware included lekythia (fig. 4) and oinochoai, while local production involved lekythia, aryballoi and oinochoai. Interestingly, some Cretan, mostly Knossian, vessels often imitate not only the shape and decoration, but also the fine fabric and polished surface of the Cypriot prototypes. It is therefore no surprise that Payne, who first studied some of the Cretan copies, was much confused and considered them

qualities of the main local fabric and the central position the site occupies in the distribution of vases assigned to the Cretan ware.

In conclusion, the suggestion for the involvement of a Cypriot potter in the production of the Cretan ware in question is considered doubtful. It remains highly unlikely that such a potter would change his output to the extent supposed. The production of the Cretan ware was perhaps stimulated by imports, even if the latter are currently missing. This, however, cannot easily be reconciled with the fact that the Cretan vases draw from both Late Bronze (Base Ring) and Early Iron (Black Slip) Age Cypriot prototypes. Despite the relevant uncertainties, one can confidently resist the assumed involvement of a Cypriot potter.

The case of one or more Cypriot potters working in Knossos

In the last decades of the late 9th century, Crete witnessed the introduction of a second ware from Cyprus, the Black on Red. The importation of the ware included lekythia (fig. 4) and oinochoai, while local production involved lekythia, aryballoi and oinochoai. Interestingly, some Cretan, mostly Knossian, vessels often imitate not only the shape and decoration, but also the fine fabric and polished surface of the Cypriot prototypes. It is therefore no surprise that Payne, who first studied some of the Cretan copies, was much confused and considered them

90 Tegou 2001, pp. 129, 143, number 6; found in a tomb at Pantanassa, dating to around 1000.
91 Coldstream 1979, p. 258; Coldstream 2000, pp. 464-466.
93 Rutter - Van de Moortel 2006, pp. 528, 586, 657, number 56e/10.
94 Kotsonas forthcoming a.
95 Coldstream 1984, p. 132; Coldstream 2001, p. 42. For further references see below.
98 Coldstream 1984, p. 132; Coldstream 1996, p. 353, type Cii; Tsipopoulou 1985, p. 44. The reference to prototypes is to be treated with caution. Coldstream has prudently clarified – with reference to lekythia – that the fabric, technique and decoration of Cypriot imports found in Knossos is not entirely uniform (Coldstream 1984, p. 131).
imported. On the other hand, scientific studies on examples from both Knossos and East Crete have confirmed local production. Furthermore, Coldstream has established a set of criteria for distinguishing the Cypriot imports from the Knossian close and free copies.

The striking similarity of some Knossian copies, particularly lekythia (fig. 5), to Cypriot originals has reasonably been taken to suggest more than the mere copying of the casual Cypriot imports that were arriving at the time. Coldstream briefly explored the possibility of Cypriot potters producing some of the close copies of Cypriot lekythia, but concluded that they are more likely 'to have been made by Cretan potters than by immigrants'. In the case of an oinochoe, however, Coldstream noted that it 'must have been made by immigrant potters trained in the Cypro- Levantine tradition'. Although Coldstream, discussed the Knossian copies of Cypriot Black on Red on several occasions, he never returned to the possibility of foreign potters he had readily dismissed. He has long favoured instead that Cretan potters manufactured the vases to order for the bottling of unguents produced by a small factory manned by immigrant Phoenicians, an interpretation that has lately been challenged by quite a few scholars, including myself. Leaving aside the relevant criticism, I wish to focus on the possible attribution of the Knossian close copies of Cypriot Black on Red lekythia, which date to the 8th century, to one or more Cypriot potters residing at the site.

I maintain that the possibility attracted less attention than it deserves by Coldstream, but I am most surprised that the scholar's critics have largely failed to notice or explore its potentials. I personally find some merit in the idea of immigrant potters, especially in the case of the aforementioned oinochoe. This fragmentary piece is not only the closest and earliest, but also the most sophisticated Knossian copy of Cypriot Black on Red oinochoai. It is only the difference in fabric that sets it apart from the originals.

Coldstream's attribution of the vase to a Cypriot potter is also supported by the complexities involved in rendering its decorative scheme. The latter comprises diverse groups of concentric circles of varying number, which were in all probability rendered by more than one pivoted multiple brush. The use of different brushes of this kind for the decoration of a single vase is not uncommon on Cypriot pottery of the Early Iron Age, but rare on Greek ceramics. My personal study of almost 1000 vases from Eleutherna has confirmed that the use of two (let alone more) such brushes for the decoration of a single vase is highly exceptional. I therefore doubt whether a Knossian potter could closely imitate such a Cypriot vase, especially without much earlier experimentation. Having established the probability that a Cypriot potter produced versions of Black on Red oinochoai in Knossos, I wish to revisit the local production of lekythia of the same ware. The production of such lekythia commenced just

---

100 Liddy 1996, pp. 473, 476, 487.
102 See, mostly, Coldstream 1984.
104 Coldstream 1984, p. 137.
105 Coldstream 1984, p. 137.
before 800114 and involved close,115 free116 and imaginative117 examples. Coldstream's original attribution of the Knossian copies of Cypriot Black on Red lekythia to local potters was convincingly argued on the basis of the unpolished surface of nearly all lekythia known at the time (1978-1979) from early excavations, mostly those at the cemetery of Fortetsa.118 Maintaining this attribution untouched is, however, questionable after the Knossos North Cemetery excavations,119 which, in Coldstream's words, brought to light 'almost exact local copies, closer to the originals than any of the Creto-Cypriot class in F [Fortetsa]'.120 I would argue that some of those exact copies (fig. 5) should perhaps be attributed to Cypriot hands, albeit not necessarily to those that produced the aforementioned oinochoe. Before the discovery of the Knossos North Cemetery, Coldstream had understandably taken the lack of polishing on the surface of the Fortetsa vases as suggestive of their manufacture by local potters. He had further contrasted this evidence, with that of Rhodes, where the technique and surface treatment argued – in his view – in favour of potters from the east.121 Coldstream, however, maintained his suggestion even after the discovery of local examples, the fabric and surface treatment of which closely resemble those of Cypriot originals.122 He defended his case by pointing out that those characteristics were known to Knossian potters from around the mid-9th century, just before the introduction of the Creto-Cypriot vases; they are found on a class of plain aryballoi, which display an orange polished surface.123 The connection between those aryballoi and the Creto-Cypriot vases should be qualified, however. The earliest known Knossian plain aryballoi, which are the only that predate the production of the lekythia under discussion, are handmade, display no orange polished surface and are suspected to be Corinthian imports.124 Corinthian influence further pervades the entire class and is identifiable in the habit of polishing the surface125 and probably in the orange colour of this surface as well.126 This line of argument dissociates the aryballoi from the lekythia and re-introduces the issue of the Cypriot potter(s), which had in the past been dismissed.

My suggestion for one or more Cypriot potters producing versions of Cypriot Black on Red lekythia in Knossos does not regard all vases classified by Coldstream as close copies. I tend to exclude the few that are uncommonly oversized.127 The 'maladroit, lumpy and degenerate appearance'128 of others is not determining for my purposes, since similar shortcomings are identified on Cypriot prototypes imported to Knossos129

114 Coldstream 1984, p. 132.
118 Coldstream 1979, pp. 261-262.
119 Coldstream - Catling 1996.
120 Coldstream 1996, p. 419. Coldstream's interpretation is not as unchanging as it is usually taken to be. In Coldstream 1979, pp. 261-262, the unguent factory is associated with the free copies of Cypriot Black on Red that were only known at the time. From Coldstream 1984, p. 137 onwards, however, only the close copies are associated with that enterprise. This interpretative adjustment is nowhere explicitly referred to.
121 Coldstream 1979, pp. 261-262, footnote 35.
122 Coldstream 1984, p. 137.
123 Coldstream 1996, p. 357, type B.
124 Coldstream 1996, p. 357. My study of a large ceramic corpus from Eleutherna confirms that wheel-made, polished versions were produced already in the late 9th century (Kotsonas 2005, pp. 175-177), but show no preference for an orange surface.
125 Coldstream 2001, p. 44.
126 Note that the fabric of a Corinthian prototype imported to Knossos is orange-red (personal inspection; no reference to the fabric of the vase is cited in Coldstream - Catling 1996). Furthermore, the surface colour of the entire Knossian class, which is described as 'pale' (Coldstream 1996, p. 357, type B. I confirm the 'pale' look of those vases), was probably aimed at imitating Corinthian fabrics.
128 Coldstream 1984, p. 132. Note, however, that similar problems do occur on a few Cypriot prototypes imported to Knossos (Coldstream 1984, p. 131).
129 Coldstream 1984, p. 131. Schreiber has hypothe-
Those vases described as ‘exact copies’\textsuperscript{130} and the others that ‘even reproduce the deep orange [surface] of the originals’\textsuperscript{131} can, however, reasonably be attributed to Cypriot potters(s). This is particularly because lending the Knossian fabric a colour similar to that of the Cypriot originals has been shown to depend on control of the firing conditions.\textsuperscript{132} This control is, however, identifiable in only a small portion of the Knossian corpus of copies of Cypriot Black on Red, confirming that the Knossian potters were not accustomed to it. This evidence suggests that it was probably one or more Cypriot potters residing in Knossos, rather than their local colleagues, that managed to successfully master a series of techniques concerning the treatment of the fabric, as well as the quality of the shape and decoration, and produce those few exact copies of Cypriot Black on Red \textit{lekythia}.\textsuperscript{133} To conclude, it appears that one or more Cypriot potters specialising in the production of the Black on Red ware of their native island probably exercised their craft in Knossos for some time in the first half of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textit{The case of a Naxian potter working in Knossos}

This case is actually a twofold one, since it involves two different scenarios for the migration of a Naxian potter to 8\textsuperscript{th} century Knossos. The first is based on a homogeneous group of four neck-handled amphorae found in a Knossian tomb at Fortetsa (fig. 6).\textsuperscript{134} Brock, who first studied them, found it hard to decide whether they are Naxian imports or Cretan imitations, but mentioned that the fabric looked Cretan.\textsuperscript{135} His uncertainty actually survives up to the present day.\textsuperscript{136} On the other hand, Coldstream confirmed that the vases are of local fabric, grouped them with other, similar vessels (none of which was fully published), placed them within the sequence of local neck-handled amphorae and assigned them a Late Geometric-advanced date.\textsuperscript{137} Coldstream’s view was not taken into account in two alternative interpretations put forward by Kourou. She originally considered the vases as Naxian imports,\textsuperscript{138} but later attributed them to a potter, that was trained in Naxos and migrated to Knossos at around 700.\textsuperscript{139} According to the later view, the vases are of Naxian style, but of Knossian fabric and technique. Kourou\textsuperscript{140} argued that the close resemblance of the Cretan vases to Naxian prototypes represented in Delos Group Bh\textsuperscript{141} (fig. 7a-b) could not have been achieved by mere copying of imports and noted that no such imports had hitherto been identified in Knossos or the rest of Crete. This last remark remains valid despite the extensive corpus of material, especially that from the Knossos North Cemetery,\textsuperscript{142} published ever since.

Kourou’s suggestion was challenged by Coldstream in a latest article of his.\textsuperscript{143} Coldstream argues that both the shape and the zigzag decoration of the Fortetsa amphorae were at

\textsuperscript{130} COLDSTREAM 1984, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{131} COLDSTREAM 1984, p. 132; COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 353.
\textsuperscript{132} COLDSTREAM 1984, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{133} The line or band that is rendered around the base of most Knossian copies, but is missing from the Cypriot prototypes (COLDSTREAM 1984, p. 132; COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 353) could be cited against my argument. The ubiquitous addition of that ornament perhaps adheres to a notion of appropriateness or is influenced by the local Protogeometric tradition, according to which bands normally adorn the lower part or base of slow-pouring vessels. In any case, it was evidently determined by Cretan preference and one can envisage the foreign potter(s) taking it on.

\textsuperscript{134} BROCK 1957, pp. 62-63, numbers 652, 673, 680, 681.
\textsuperscript{135} BROCK 1957, p. 62 (see also pp. 60, 190).
\textsuperscript{136} JONES 2000, p. 219.
\textsuperscript{137} COLDSTREAM 1968, p. 250; COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 335 (with reference to one of the four amphorae).
\textsuperscript{138} KOUROU 1984, p. 111, footnote 47.
\textsuperscript{139} KOUROU 1994, pp. 278-279.
\textsuperscript{140} KOUROU 1994, pp. 278-279.
\textsuperscript{141} DUGAS - RHOIMAIS 1934, pp. 73-75.
\textsuperscript{142} COLDSTREAM 1996; MOIGNARD 1996.
\textsuperscript{143} COLDSTREAM forthcoming.
home in Knossos from the early 8th century, considerably earlier than the date of the vases.\textsuperscript{144} He further argued that the association of the vases with a closely datable urn favours a mid-8th century date (Middle-Late Geometric transition), considerably earlier than that assumed by Kourou. Lastly, he noted that the disappearance considerably earlier than that assumed by Coldstream’s view. Moreover, Coldstream’s Middle-Late Geometric date is in some discrepancy with the relative chronology he had earlier proposed for one of the amphorae in question.\textsuperscript{145}

A second issue regards decoration. Although the massed zigzags of the amphorae do conform to a non-Atticizing current that is identifiable on some Knossian Geometric pottery; this pottery only covers particular shapes and types and does not involve amphorae or related vessels.\textsuperscript{146} This pottery is characterised by a peculiar ‘thick creamy slip’, unlike the rest of the Knossian ceramics. Interestingly, Brock identified a slip that he described as ‘rather lustrous creamy white’ on one of the amphorae in question.\textsuperscript{148} Unfortunately, I have not personally examined the amphorae to confirm whether their slip is the one found on the non-Atticizing Knossian pottery and resolve the issue of the Naxian potter in a definite manner. That slip does not, however, seem similar to the various slips used by Naxian workshops, including the one used by the workshop of the Delos group Bb amphorae.\textsuperscript{149} An amphora from Archanes (fig. 8),\textsuperscript{150} which is very similar to the Fortetsa amphorae, also argues against the suggestion for a Naxian potter. This vase, however, is decorated in white on dark. The use of this technique to an extent peculiar to Crete leaves no doubt that the vase is local and offers another hint at the local pedigree of the Fortetsa amphorae.\textsuperscript{151}

Despite the criticism, the concept of the Naxian potter proves unpredictably flexible. In his abovementioned article, Coldstream adapts Kourou’s suggestion to argue for the migration of a Naxian potter in Knossos of the early or advanced – not the late – 8th century (Middle Geometric period). Coldstream reckons that the foreign potter contributed to the local Atticizing style of the first half of the 8th century, which involved close imitations of Attic prototypes not only in shape and decoration, but even in fabric and technique.\textsuperscript{152} He also connects the potter with the production of cups with reserved panels of multiple zig-zags, a vessel type which had long disappeared from Athens, but was still manufactured in Naxos (and also in the Argolid).\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{144} COLDSTREAM forthcoming associates the shape of the four amphorae with a type that is well-represented in the Knossos North Cemetery (COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 335, type E) and the decoration with a class of Knossian Geometric vases, mostly lids and oinochoai (see footnote 147 below).

\textsuperscript{145} BROCK 1957, pp. 60 (for the reference); 61-63, numbers 642-681 (for the vases found in the niche).

\textsuperscript{146} COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 335.

\textsuperscript{147} COLDSTREAM 1996, p. 355, type Dii lekythoi; p. 364, type Bi lids: pp. 355; 375, miniature krater number 125.6; p. 418; COLDSTREAM 2001, pp. 35, 42, 68.

\textsuperscript{148} BROCK 1957, p. 62, number 652.

\textsuperscript{149} For Naxian slip see: DUGAS - RHOMAIOS 1934, p. 73; KOUROU 1984, p. 110; KOUROU 1999, pp. 88-89. Naxian vases of Delos group Bb are characterised by a thick light slip, yellowish white or brownish, that comes off very easily.

\textsuperscript{150} SAKELLARAKIS 1986, pp. 30-31, \pi 24349.

\textsuperscript{151} Note that Kourou identifies the technique of the Fortetsa amphorae as Cretan (KOUROU 1999, p. 278).

\textsuperscript{152} Coldstream refers to LIDDE 1996, pp. 471, 490, Group B.

\textsuperscript{153} COLDSTREAM 1996, pp. 388-389, type Ei. Note that nipples flank the zigzag panel of Cycladic cups, but are often located within the panel of Attic examples (KOUROU 1999, p. 61). The Knossian example adhere to the former scheme.
Fig. 6. - Amphorae from Fortetsa, Knossos: nn. 673, 681, 680, 652 (Courtesy of the British School at Athens).

Fig. 7. a-b. Amphorae from Delos group Bb (nn. 4, 5), assigned to Naxos (Courtesy of the École française d’Athènes. The photograph of 7a is by P. Devambez).

Fig. 8. - Amphora from Archanes (Reproduced from SAKELLARAKIS 1986, p. 31. Courtesy of Professor I. Sakellarakis).

Fig. 9. - Amphora assigned to the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ (Courtesy of Professor N.C. Stampolidis).

Fig. 10. a-b - Amphorae from Delos group Ab (nn. 8, 12), assigned to Paros (Courtesy of the École française d’Athènes).
Knossians were, however, importing Cycladic cups of this type and one should not exclude that importation generated local production. Besides, the association of the Knossian Atticizing style of the first half of the 8th century with a Naxian potter is not well argued. Local imitation could have been stimulated by the influx of Attic and Cycladic imports, which peaks at the time. After all, Knossian potters had proved competent imitators of Attic and Cycladic Atticizing ceramic styles since the Early Protogeometric - Middle Protogeometric period. I therefore regard Coldstream’s view as unconvincing.

To conclude, I reckon that the proposed involvement of a Naxian potter in the Knossian ceramic production of the 8th century is improbable. Although stimulating, the suggestions of Kourou and Coldstream remain highly questionable.

**The case of one or more Parian potters working in Eleutherna**

The most convincing evidence for the identification of foreign potters in Early Iron Age Crete is, to my view, furnished by a homogeneous group of unpublished vases from Eleutherna (fig. 9), which I have elsewhere assigned to the 'Eleutherna bird workshop' and dated to the early 7th century. This involves seven amphorae found in chamber tomb A1K1 of the cemetery of Eleutherna and an eighth, similar piece without provenance kept in the Museum of Rethymnon. The group raises a wide range of issues on ceramic production, dissemination and consumption that cannot possibly be fully laid out here and will be thoroughly examined on a future occasion. The present discussion is limited to the evidence and arguments supporting the attribution of the vases to one or more foreign potters.

A macroscopic examination of the amphorae found in Eleutherna suggested that their fabric was not uniform. This was lately confirmed by the preliminary results of a project of petrographic analysis mentioned above. These results suggested that the fabric of most of the amphorae is actually the prevailing local fabric. Local production is therefore established. On the other hand, the second fabric, identified on one vase from Eleutherna and the Rethymnon amphora, finds no match in the local repertory.

Stylistically, the group is highly homogeneous. The style of the amphorae is, however, entirely foreign to Eleutherna and finds no close match elsewhere. Some of the vases carry vertical handles on the shoulder and others horizontal ones. The first shape finds no parallel in Eleutherna or the rest of Crete and is only known in the Cyclades at the time concerned (early 7th century). The closest parallels are found in Delos group Ab (fig. 10a), which also involves amphorae with horizontal handles on the shoulder (fig. 10b) and is attributed to Paros.

Strong Cycladic affinities are also manifested in the decoration of the 'Eleutherna bird workshop'. Although no Cycladic amphora that closely matches the vases from Eleutherna can be identified in the published record, this is not surprising given the current state of research.

---

156 See footnote 27 above.
157 See the following footnote.
158 Kotsonas 2005, pp. 76-77, 86-92; Stampolidis 2004a, p. 246, number 275. For the tomb see Stampolidis 2004b, pp. 122-125. I take the opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor Stampolidis for entrusting me with the study and publication of pottery from the site.
159 Stampolidis 2004a, p. 150, number 7.
161 See footnote 62.
162 Minor discrepancies do occur and allow for the reconstruction of the relative sequence, which is confirmed by context (Kotsonas 2005, pp. 87-88).
164 Dugas - Rhomaios 1934, pp. 29-30, numbers 6, 8.
165 Dugas - Rhomaios 1934, pp. 29-30, numbers 1-3, 7.
166 See, for example: Coldstream 1968, pp. 176-177.
Metopes with birds are popular on Cycladic pottery of the time,\(^\text{167}\) even if none of the Cycladic examples closely matches the scheme displayed on the amphorae from Eleutherna. Secondary ornaments of the latter are also paralleled on Cycladic pottery. Furthermore, the correspondences in the number of linear ornaments found on the vases of the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ are unmatched on local pottery, but widely occur on Cycladic ceramics, particularly the Linear Island Style (or ‘Euboean’) amphorae exhibited in the Museum of Thera.

It therefore appears that both shape and the decoration of the amphorae assigned to the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’ are of Cycladic, particularly Parian, pedigree. Nonetheless, most of the amphorae are made in Eleuthernian fabric. Although peculiar, the fabric of the two remaining pieces shows no affinities with Cycladic ones and must tentatively also be identified as Cretan. The pair perhaps represents the experimentation of the workshop’s staff with different clays or its relocation in another, neighbouring site.

I believe that in this case it was craftsmen mobility that generated the stylistic resemblance and attribute the local production of the amphorae to one or more potters from the Cyclades that settled at Eleutherna. The attribution is supported by the use of a multiple brush for the rendering of linear ornaments. The application of such a tool is otherwise unknown on Eleuthernian pottery, but is commonly found on Cycladic wares. Another indication supporting the hypothesis of one or more foreign potters from the Cyclades is that their presence is missing from Eleuthernian pottery of the late 8th and 7th centuries. In this light, one could not convincingly attribute the Cycladic influence described to an imitation of the Cycladic imports that were arriving in Eleutherna at the time and include a Delos group Ab amphora.\(^\text{168}\) Local imitation of such imports cannot satisfactorily explain the thoroughly Cycladic style of the amphorae, given that the Eleuthernian potters generally disregarded Aegean ceramic influences throughout the Early Iron Age.\(^\text{169}\) It is therefore unlikely that those potters would manufacture vessels closely conforming to an elaborate style that was alien to local traditions and far more demanding than what they normally produced. On these grounds, I conclude that both stylistic and technical evidence favour the assumption that the amphorae discussed were produced by one or more Parian potters residing in Eleutherna.

Questions on the character of the mobility of potters

An inquiry into the conditions that mobilised potters and the circumstances that allowed for their settling in the host communities is essential for gaining an insight in aspects of Aegean society and culture during the Early Iron Age. I intend to address the inquiry into the second and fourth case discussed, in which the advent of a foreign potter to Crete was credited with considerable degree of probability. On the other hand, I exclude references to the first and third cases treated because of their highly questionable reliability. I shall emphasise that the ensuing discussion cannot possibly furnish any incontestable answers due to the limitations posed by the nature of the primary evidence. It is therefore only intended to raise problems that are often avoided in relevant scholarship and point out probable interpretations.

The particular causes that mobilised the potters discussed and other traveling craftsmen cannot be identified solely on the basis of their finished products. Archaeologists have therefore sought to broadly distinguish whether such individuals were free or forced to move,\(^\text{170}\) even if

\(^{167}\) Dugas - Rhomaios 1934, pp. 62-63, group Ae, number 72; 79-80, group Bb, numbers 38-39.

\(^{168}\) Kotsonas 2005, pp. 249-252.

\(^{169}\) Kotsonas 2005, pp. 264-265.

such distinctions occasionally prove rigid. Specialists of the relevant Near Eastern literature of the second and first millennium agree that craftsmen were generally not ‘free-lancers’ moving in search for customers and consider that their mobility was imposed by rulers or states and their misfortunes. Nevertheless, the political geography of the Early Iron Age Aegean is quite different to that of the Near East, whether in the Bronze or the Early Iron Age. On the other hand, free craftsmen mobility of the kind known from later to modern periods is unlikely for Early Iron Age Greece. Further, Homer does not include potters in his list of itinerant specialists and one finds it hard to imagine that such people figured among the specialists that elites of early Greek states asked their peers in neighbouring regions to provide. There are other possible causes of forced movement, including captivity or enslavement, but none can positively be related to the cases discussed.

The mobility of potters faces constraints that do not necessarily apply to cases of other craftsmen. First is the conditions of availability and accessibility of the raw material and second are seasons and the agricultural cycle. The latter probably had a grave effect upon ceramic production in antiquity, even if a relatively small number of potters might have remained unaffected. The traveling potters of the modern Cretan villages of Thrapsano and Margarites, for example, only left their village during the summer months. This raises questions on the character and duration of the ‘visit’ of the potters discussed above to Eleutherna and Knossos. Although largely overlooked in relevant scholarship, the issue is instrumental for distinguishing between itinerant (or travelling) and immigrant (or sedentary) individuals. Such distinctions are clearly hard to draw, but there is ground for reasonable speculation, especially in the case of the amphorae assigned to the ‘Eleutherna bird workshop’. The ‘stratigraphy’ of chamber tomb A1K1, in which those vases were found, suggests that their deposition covers a time span that cannot be reduced to a few years. It can therefore be reasonably assumed that their manufacturer(s) either settled in Eleutherna for a period of considerable length or were regularly visiting the site. On the other hand, those potter(s) could have also worked in another site in the district, judging by the fabric of one of the vases from Eleutherna and the amphora at Rethymno that finds no match on local ceramics. Relying on this evidence and taking into account that vases of this style were – to our current knowledge – not produced outside the Cyclades, the potter(s) in question seem to have settled for long at Eleutherna. Interestingly, Cycladic potters were also residing in Athens at around 700.

Assessing the character of the assumed ‘visit’ paid by the Cypriot potter(s) to Knossos is harder. When viewed against the entire ceramic corpus known from Early Iron Age Knossos or the record of free copies of the Cypriot ware, the actual numbers of lekythia that closely imitate Cypriot Black on Red prototypes seem too small to allow for any suggestion for permanent residence. On the other hand, their contexts show

173 Contrast the view that potters travelled to join established ceramic industries as apprentices and then moved elsewhere to set up shops (Papadopoulos 1997, p. 455).
175 Arafat - Morgan 1989, pp. 326, 328.
176 Voyatzoglou 1974, p. 18.
177 Leontides 1996, p. 72.
178 A notable exception is found in Cline 1995, pp. 277-278. Expatriate potters are mostly, even if implicitly, considered as immigrants (see, for example, Crielaard 1999, pp. 55-56).
180 Kotsonas 2005, p. 351.
181 There are, however, alternative interpretations of this discrepancy, including the experimentation of the foreign potters with different clays.
considerable chronological range, from the middle to the end of the 8th century. One is therefore tempted to explore the possibility of one or more itinerant potters visiting Knossos along with other sites in the Eastern Mediterranean (including Rhodes, Cos and the coastal strip ranging from Cilicia to Al Mina), where local imitations of Black on Red were also produced. Nevertheless, the Knossian examples are superior in quality than all other Aegean imitations and can be distinguished from their Cilician and North Syrian parallels on the basis of fabric and surface treatment, as well as the choice and application of decorative motifs. The suggestion for itinerant potters can therefore not be sustained.

The reception of the foreign potters probably depended on an awareness of the foreign style of their products, as well as on the appeal those products exercised. An awareness of distinctions between regional styles in pottery and metalwork is documented in later, 5th century literary sources, but can also be identified, if only indirectly, in Early Iron Age Crete. This identification relies on a class of Knossian and other Cretan vessels of the late 9th century, which carry Atticizing ornaments on the one side and Cretan patterns on the other. On the other hand, the appeal of the vessels attributed to the foreign potters is assumed on the basis of the Cretan demand for elaborate, local and imported, ceramic styles to serve the expression of material statements in the necropolises of Eleutherna and Knossos. The appeal is further suggested by the influx of pottery originating from the home-regions of the potters. Accordingly, Eleutherna attracted a number of late 8th – early 7th century imports, including amphorae, from Paros and Knossos imported 8th century Black on Red lekythia from Cyprus. On these grounds, I reckon that the arrival of the potters in question is unlikely to have been fortuitous.

Important inferences on the integration of the potters in the Cretan communities can be drawn from the non random distribution of their products in the two necropolises, a considerable section of which has hitherto been excavated. All amphorae from Eleutherna attributed to the Parian potter(s) were found in tomb A1K1 and had served as urns. Such vases hitherto remain unknown, however, in the rest of the extensive necropolis. Judging by its good state of preservation, the related amphora kept at the Rethymnon museum must also come from a tomb, the location of which, however, remains indeterminate. A patterned distribution is also identifiable in the case of the Knossian lekythia attributed to Cypriot potter(s). Almost half of the examples known come from tomb 218, which also produced nearly half of the free copies of Cypriot Black on Red examples, but no Cypriot original. On these grounds, the social groups buried in Eleutherna tomb A1K1 and Knossos tomb 218 appear to have had a particular preference for the vases discussed and a privileged, albeit not exclusive, connection with their makers. Connections of this sort would have been essential for the integration of the foreign potters in the society and economy of the host communities. The attachment of craftsmen to particular social groups was probably not an iso-

184 Coldstream 1984, pp. 132-133.
186 For the peculiarities of the Cilician and North Syrian vases see Schreiber 2003, pp. 277-280.
188 Crielaard 1999, p. 53.
lated phenomenon and has also been argued with reference to a gold workshop active in 8\textsuperscript{th} century Knossos.\textsuperscript{198}

To sum up, the causes that mobilised the foreign potters discussed remain indeterminate. Those individuals cannot be positively identified as itinerants, but can reasonably be assumed to have settled in Crete for a period of some length. Lastly, it appears that specific social groups patronised those potters and probably also held a role in the potters’ reception by the Cretan communities.

\textit{Conclusions}

Craftsmen mobility has preoccupied Aegean Early Iron Age scholarship and has repeatedly been addressed with reference to the archaeology of Crete. Such mobility is, however, persistently identified with the arrival of individuals from the East. Scholarship on Crete of the period further largely overlooks or underestimates arguments raised in favour of the mobility of potters. Drawing from scholarly works of the last twenty-five years, however, I have here collected references to six cases of foreign potters assumed to have been active in Early Iron Age Crete and explored four of them at length.

The analysis has confirmed the complexities involved in determining the craftsman’s ethnic identity on the basis of finished products. It has further underlined the limitations embedded in inferences drawn solely from artefact style and the wider historical context and has laid emphasis on the study of production techniques for the identification of potters working away from home. Applications of archaeological science may well furnish compelling evidence on the origins of techniques involved in ceramic production and the modes of transmission of technical skills. Important information on the issue can, however, also be deduced by scrutiny over the actual material, including its fabric, shape and decoration. By pursuing inquiries along these lines, one can infer the ethnic identity, or, at least, the cultural training of the makers of pottery on a plausible basis. It must, on the other hand, be acknowledged that some of the interpretative steps involved in phrasing such inferences remain vulnerable to criticism, particularly as long as they find no support in literary evidence.

The methodological framework described was applied to four cases of foreign potters assumed to have worked in Early Iron Age Crete. Only in two of those cases, however, was the assumption credited with a considerable degree of probability. Accordingly, it was argued that one or more Cypriot potters produced copies of Cypriot Black on Red pouring vessels in 8\textsuperscript{th} century Knossos, while one or more potters from Paros manufactured amphorae of Cycladic style in early 7\textsuperscript{th} century Eleuther-na. This evidence conforms with broader Cretan attitudes towards clay vessels and ceramic influences from overseas: Cretans of the Early Iron Age show a strong taste for Aegean, mostly Attic and Cycladic, storage vessels both through imports\textsuperscript{199} and local imitations.\textsuperscript{200} On the other hand, Cypriot pouring vessels were copiously imported in Crete,\textsuperscript{201} stimulating a long series of local copies.\textsuperscript{202}

Several uncertainties remain over the condition of the mobility of the potters discussed. The causes that stimulated it cannot be identified. Further, the duration of the Cypriot(s)’s residence in Knossos cannot confidently be estimated. On the other hand, the Parian(s) seem to have settled at Eleutherna for a considerable time-span. It appears that, in both cases, the foreign potters were primarily – albeit not exclusively – connected with particular social groups in the host communities. In any case, these arguments suggest that there is much scope for assessing the role of foreign craftsmen and their products within particular Cretan communities. They further confirm the cosmopolitan character of Crete during the late 9\textsuperscript{th} to early 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries.
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