A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS

(Plates 65-70)

AYIA IRINI, Keos, is primarily a Bronze Age site, but material of Greek date occurs sporadically in surface levels and has been found in quantity in two places. Pottery from the upper levels of the Bronze Age temple testifies to continued religious activity there from the Protogeometric period to the 4th century B.C. or later.1 The second concentration of post-Bronze Age pottery was found in the northeastern part of the site, outside the Bronze Age fortification walls in the area of the Northeast Bastion.2 The following account deals with the latter deposit, which I was invited to study in 1969.3

North of Tower 11E (Fig. 1) was a great fall of big blocks from the Bronze Age fortifications. The tops of the blocks were not far below the modern surface of the ground. Archaic and Classical pottery, with a few fragments of Geometric style, lay scattered in the space east, north and northwest of the tower. It was most heavily concentrated above and among the blocks and was found to a depth of ca. 0.50 m. in the spaces between them. Under some of the blocks, as was seen in one small test, the earth contained sherds of Late Helladic (LH) IIIA. In the angle of Walls I and K were the remains of a late Roman lime kiln (later removed in the course of the excavations), and some pottery presumably from the time of its use occurred in parts of the area.

The deposits were neither purely Greek nor clearly stratified. Of the whole collection—if one discounts stragglers from the edges of the area—more than 8% was of Mycenaean or earlier date, almost surely from the underlying debris. Many of the sherds were small and badly worn, much was plain or coarse and undatable.


2 For description of the area and preliminary discussion of the pottery, see J. L. Caskey, “Investigations in Keos,” Hesperia 40, 1971, p. 374, and “Excavations in Kea,” Δελτ 23, 1968, Χρονικά, p. 389. Most of the pottery is stored as combined lot N15; other pieces are in combined lots N27, N29, N33, N34, and in single lot N18-492.

3 I am very grateful to Professor John L. Caskey for giving me the opportunity to study this material and for his assistance and encouragement. I should also like to thank William G. Kittredge, the excavator, and Jack L. Davis for the time they spared to discuss the details of the excavation; J. Robert Guy, who devoted his visit to Ayia Irini to the examination of the post-Mycenaean pottery both from this deposit and from the temple; and Abigail Dammin for inking my drawings in Figures 1 and 2. Special gratitude is owed to Tucker Blackburn for her unfailing readiness to provide aid in every aspect of this study.

Hesperia, 46, 4
After preliminary sorting some was discarded. Some three-and-a-half tinfuls of Greek pottery have been kept. Of this amount 85% by volume was of fine and glazed wares. Fragments of at least 300 vases were present.

**Fig. 1.** Northeastern Area, where pottery was found.

**GEOMETRIC POTTERY**

Little of Geometric date was found: single sherds from only three or four vases. There are small fragments of two or three cups with articulated rim. Decoration preserved is limited to horizontal and vertical bands. The cups should be of Late Geometric or 7th century date. One body fragment of a krater is preserved bearing Late Geometric painted decoration: bands, zigzags, a star, and (?) a horse’s hoof.

**ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL POTTERY**

For convenience we treat the pottery of this group under the following headings: Attic, Corinthian, Siphnian, other fine wares, household ware, and coarse ware.
The first three terms are used as much to denote types as to pinpoint places of manufacture. Most vases of Attic or Corinthian shape are almost certainly of Attic or Corinthian manufacture, but some may be and others quite clearly are imitations. Siphnian ware, much more plentiful in this deposit than Attic or Corinthian, is less well known and more difficult to define. Under this heading are discussed both vases of previously documented Siphnian shapes and others which seem close enough in fabric but are of shapes not hitherto reported as Siphnian.

**Attic**

Pottery of Attic type makes up about 8% of the Archaic and Classical glazed wares. The great majority of the vases are black-glazed drinking vessels. Figured pieces and vases of other shapes are few. In the following discussion, fabric is described only when the appearance of a piece suggests that it may not be Attic.

*Skyphoi of Corinthian type.* There were fewer than half a dozen vases of this shape, all black glazed. Among the fragments are parts of two or three short, flaring ring feet and a rim sherd with considerable inward curvature (cf. B. A. Sparkes and L. Talcott, *The Athenian Agora*, XII, *Black and Plain Pottery of the 6th, 5th and 4th centuries B.C.*, Princeton 1970, pp. 256-258, nos. 303-309 for the feet and nos. 318-321 for the rim).

*Skyphoi of Attic type A.* Around 30 Attic skyphoi of this type are represented by base fragments. Nothing approaching a whole profile can be restored from the numerous fragments, but certain observations may be made about the shape. Immediately above the base the sides are moderately flaring except in one case where the wall rises nearly vertically. About 80% of the rim fragments show no outward curvature; the remainder curve out to varying degrees. Handles are about equally divided between horseshoe-shaped and triangular. The only fragments catalogued are those bearing graffiti.

1. **K.3620.**
   Base sherd. H. 0.022; est. D. 0.08 m.
   Torus ring foot. Resting surface and underside reserved. Graffito on underside.

2. **K.3833.**
   Base sherd. W. 0.028 m.
   From floor of open vase, probably skyphos. Underside reserved with two glaze rings. Graffito on underside.

3. **K.4118.**
   Base sherd. H. 0.005 m.

4. **K.2456.**
   Rim sherd. H. 0.026 m.
   Rim turns out. Graffito below rim outside.

5. **K.3832.**
   Rim sherd. H. 0.04 m.
   Dark orange clay, slightly lustrous black glaze. Graffito below rim outside.

6. **K.3619.**
   Rim sherd. H. 0.022 m.
Dark orange clay, slightly lustrous black glaze. Graffito below rim outside.

7. K.3621. Pls. 66, 67
Body sherd. H. 0.022 m.

Clay gray below, orange above, glaze slightly lustrous. Graffito outside.

8. K.3623. Pls. 66, 67
Body sherd. W. 0.029 m.
Graffito outside, letters inverted.

In addition to the genuinely Attic skyphoi, there are fragments of others the fabric of which differs so much from the Attic norm that they must be regarded as imitations. Only one or two vases occur in each of three different fabrics: one not unlike Siphnian; another with clay of dead, medium brown color; the third with rather coarse, micaceous clay, brown to reddish brown, and glaze fired in shades of red. Rim fragments of the third fabric have a slight outward curvature.

Cup-skyphoi. The black-figured fragments 9 and fragments of three feet should belong to the Cracow class or its derivatives.

Six fragments, preserving less than one third of body and rim. Est. D. rim 0.135 m.
Rather deep, rounded bowl; short, out-curving rim with thickened lip. Draped figures standing and moving to right. White paint for feet, arms, faces, sometimes drapery. In the field, branches. On the rim, graffito.

Kylikes. With the exception of the Vicup 10, only small fragments are preserved. There are two feet of the low conical shape typical of komast cups and the group of Athens 1104 (cf. Agora XII, pp. 262, 263, nos. 381, 395) and two with the torus profile of type C cups (cf. Agora XII, p. 263, nos. 400-402; cf. also the small stemmed dishes, Agora XII, p. 304, nos. 966-973). Body and rim fragments, small and seldom informative, include three sherds from a palmette band cup.

10. K.3625. Pl. 65
Mended from many sherds, preserved to just above handle level. H. 0.054 m.
Vicup: just enough remains to show that the rim was offset. Underside of foot hollow; center of cone and resting surface reserved. Edge of foot and handle panels reserved and washed with miltos.

Bolsal. Fragment of one.

11. K.4356. Pl. 65
Sherd from base and wall. H. 0.015; est. D. foot 0.08 m.

Flaring ring foot. Upper wall slightly inset. Stamped palmette on floor of bowl.
Cf. Agora XII, p. 273, nos. 539, 541, especially for the foot.

Amphora. Fragments of only one were found, 12, a black-figured amphora of Type I (one-piece).
12. K.3914. PIs. 65-67

Large fragment (three joining sherds) from shoulder, preserving break for one handle. Two more sherds do not join. H. 0.05 m.

Orange-buff clay, somewhat pale for Attic; glossy brown glaze.

Corners of both panels are preserved, framed top and sides with dilute-glaze lines. In each panel, a trace of a figure. On the shoulder, graffito in large letters.

The simple border around the panels is common on, though not restricted to, horsehead and horseman amphoras (J. D. Beazley, The Development of Attic Black-Figure, Berkeley 1951, p. 39).

Kraters. Parts of two were found. One is a rim fragment from a column or volute krater, not inventoried, est. D. 0.225 m., decorated with a meander on the outer face and silhouette animals on top. The other, K.4361, is a body fragment, perhaps from a red-figured bell krater, decorated with palmettes drawn without relief contour.

Oinochoai. Only three of Attic fabric can be recognized: two trefoil, represented only by mouth fragments, of which one belongs to the ring-collar class (Agora XII, pp. 58, 59); and the small black-glazed and stamped oinochoe 13.

13. K.3601 Pl. 65


Missing the handle and half the rim; otherwise intact when found (rim has since been broken accidentally and mended). H. 0.075; D. 0.059 m.

Attachments for high-swung vertical handle at mid-body and top of rim. Underside reserved and washed with miltos. Around body, chain of eight stamped, nine-petal palmettes, irregularly spaced, pendent from incised arcs.

Found inside the mug 25.

Cf. P. E. Corbett, “Attic Pottery of the Later Fifth Century from the Athenian Agora,” Hesperia 18, 1949, p. 326, no. 46 (Agora P 10760); and CVA, Copenhagen 7 [Denmark 7], 286 [289], no. 13 (Copenhagen, National Museum, inv. no. 1686). Both have stamped decoration very similar to ours.

Corinthian

Corinthian vases constitute about 12% of the glazed ware in the deposit. There is little diversity of shape but a great deal of variation in the fabric. Although the clean, pale buff clay regarded as typically Corinthian is infrequent, few if any pieces need be assigned to another place of manufacture. Frequently the clay is fired gray at the core and tan at the surfaces, a coloration which recalls Siphnian but is seen often enough at Corinth. In the catalogue fabric will not be further discussed.

Kotylai. A count of bases shows that there were at least 80 Corinthian kotylai. Three kotylai of small size, of which only fragments are preserved, bear figured decoration (animals), one in true black-figure technique, the others in silhouette. Patterned kotylai (e.g., 14-16) number around twenty. All but three are miniature. Most of the kotylai are of standard size and black glazed. The ring foot may be flaring or heavy and rounded, the zone above the base reserved or decorated with rays. Somewhat more than half the base fragments preserve both the foot and part.
of the zone above. They may be analyzed as follows: flaring foot with close, linear rays, 17%; with tall, spindly, widespread rays, 31%; semi-glazed, 34%; heavy foot with widespread rays, 7%; semi-glazed, 11%. There are a few fragments of the more rounded kotylai with extremely flaring foot and miltos in the reserved zone above. In spite of the large number of vases represented by the fragments, no complete profiles of black-glazed kotylai can be recovered.

14. K.3918. Pl. 68

Large fragment mended from several sherds: one third of upper body, one handle. H. 0.097; est. D. 0.19 m.

Patterned decoration: chain of alternating lotus flowers (black) and buds (red).

Several fragments are preserved of another kotyle, not inventoried, of similar dimensions and decoration (only buds).


15. K.3915. Pl. 68

Mended; whole profile, about one third of vase preserved. H. 0.072; est. D. rim 0.10 m.

Ring foot; one red and three black circles on underside, red band around inner face of foot. Bands on body. Alternate broad bands retain traces of red. Handle zone, vertical wiggly lines.


16. K.4120. Pl. 68

Mended; about 75% preserved; restored in plaster. H. 0.042; D. rim 0.06 m.

False ring foot; underside glazed. Upper broad band: red paint applied directly to clay.


Other banded kotylai of this size or smaller, with a variety of patterns on the rim: K.3916, K.3917, and uninventoried fragments of about a dozen more.

17. K.3831. Pls. 66, 67

Large body fragment mended from three sherds. H. 0.08 m.

Semi-glazed. Two red bands near top of fragment outside. Graffito outside.

18. K.3919. Pls. 66, 67

Single sherd from foot. W. 0.035 m.


Body sherd. H. 0.05.

Semi-glazed. Graffito outside.

Other Corinthian pottery is limited to one fragment each from a black-glazed saucer and a miniature column krater.

SIPHNIAN

Siphnian ware makes up close to 70% of the glazed pottery in our deposit. It has been found in considerable quantity at Kastro, Siphnos, whence its name, and at Tocra. The publications of those sites give detailed descriptions of the fabric and should be consulted.4 At Tocra it proved possible to draw a chronological distinction

between an earlier, "granular" variety of the ware and a later, "soapy" form. The fabric of the material here catalogued as Siphnian fits within the range of variation allowed by the published descriptions. On inspection, however, most of the Siphnian pottery from Kastro is thinner walled and harder fired than ours. Of the shapes which occur at Kastro and Tocra only two, skyphoi and mugs, are found here. Our other possibly Siphnian fragments are from shapes which have no parallels in the fabric at other sites.

Skyphoi. The skyphoi have a disk foot and walls which flare with little curvature over most of their height, bulge gently in the handle zone, and contract to the base of the rim. The rim is short and rather thick. It may be flaring or nearly vertical but is always articulated from the bowl. Two slightly canted, horizontal handles are attached at the level of maximum diameter. The skyphoi are decorated with bands of glaze: outside a broad band below handle level, a narrow one on the rim, glaze also on the handles; inside a solid circle or doughnut in the bottom, a broad band on the upper wall, a narrow band at the top of the rim.

20. K.4367. 
Five joining sherds preserve 20% of cup; base missing. H. 0.059; est. D. rim 0.12 m.
Clay gray at core, pink to orange on surfaces. Glaze brown, gray, reddish brown, streaky.
Cf. **BSA** 44, 1949, p. 47, no. 2, from Kastro, Siphnos; and **Tocra** I, p. 75, no. 886, very close to each other in proportions; the temple at Ayia Irini, Keos, K.4370, unpublished. All Siphnian.

Whole profile, about 65% of cup preserved. one handle stump; mended from many fragments and restored in plaster. H. 0.073; D. 0.108 m.

There were perhaps two dozen skyphoi of this type in the deposit. Fewer than ten can be identified with certainty; but it is probable that most of the larger disk bases of Siphnian fabric (D. 0.045 m. and greater) belonged to vases of this type.

Mugs, group 1. Mugs of this type have a disk foot, high-shouldered bowl, flaring rim, and vertical handle attached at mid-body and rim. The interior is glazed, the exterior glazed or semi-glazed, and the underside reserved. The catalogued

---

5 **Tocra** II, p. 34.
6 Thanks are due to the British School of Archaeology at Athens and to Ioannis Tzedakis, officer in charge of the Ephoreia of Classical Antiquities of the Cyclades, for permitting me to examine this material.
Fig. 2. Profiles and graffito. 20-34, 1:2; 33, 1:4.
examples represent the extremes of proportion: 23 is very nearly the shallowest mug here, 24 the deepest.

23. K.3613. Pl. 68

About 90% preserved; mended from many fragments and restored in plaster. H. 0.064; D. rim 0.096 m.

Clay tan to gray with white and dark inclusions. Glaze greenish gray to brown, worn. Underside concave with broad groove around circumference near edge. Thin walls. Groove between bowl and rim. Glazed over all. More carefully made than most.

24. K.3561. Fig. 2, Pl. 68

Intact except for chips. H. 0.049; D. rim 0.067 m.

Clay orange tan to orange, with sand and white inclusions. Glaze red, worn. Glazed over all except foot.

Other mugs of group 1: K.2029 and three other whole profiles (not inventoried), fragments of nearly a hundred more.

There are parallels in the Siphnian fabric from Kastro, Siphnos, where they were "not very common," Tocra, and the temple (Room XI) at Ayia Irini, Keos.³ Mugs of the same shape are widespread and have generally been regarded as locally produced in each of the areas where they have been found.⁴

**Kylīx.** One fragment may belong to a kylīx of Siphnian fabric. Uninventoried fragment of base and lower bowl, D. foot 0.038 m., clay gray to brownish gray, glaze dull black. Low conical base with spreading bowl.

**Kantharos.** This shape too is represented by a single fragment: uninventoried body sherd, W. 0.051 m., clay gray, glaze black, streaky on the outside. Carinated bowl with vertical handle rising from the carination.

**Oinochoe.** Again there is only one example from the deposit: uninventoried fragment of base and body, H. 0.051 m., D. base 0.029 m., clay light gray with orange-buff surfaces, glaze black to brown, dull and streaky. Flat bottom, underside concave, body probably ovoid. Cf. K.1701, from the temple at Ayia Irini, unpublished, with round mouth.

**Other Fine Wares**

**Mugs, group 2.** As regards base, shape of bowl, and handle, these are very like the Siphnian mugs. They differ in the curvature of the top of the rim and the restriction of glaze to the rim and the upper part of the bowl and handle. There

---


⁴ Melos, Thera, Thasos, Rhitsona, with references, *Tocra I*, p. 72. Of these the Thasos mug and H. Dragendorff, *Thera, II*, *Theeraische Graeber*, 1903, p. 64, fig. 223, are closest to ours. Aigina: D. Ohly, "Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel, II. Untersuchungen in der spatarchaischen Temenos-
is considerable variation within the group as to the shape of the rim. Not all are of the same fabric, and it seems unlikely that any of them is of Sipnian manufacture.

25. K.3590. Fig. 2, Pl. 69

Intact. H. 0.067; D. rim 0.107 m.
Clay light grayish brown. Glaze brown to black. Unglazed portions well smoothed, with light horizontal faceting on exterior. Underside slightly concave.
The Attic oinochoe 13 was found inside this mug.

26. K.3616. Pl. 69

Nearly complete; mended and restored in plaster. H. 0.04; D. rim 0.07 m.
Clay buff with some dark inclusions and mica. Glaze brown to black. Light buff wash inside and out. String-cut base.

27. K.3562. Fig. 2, Pl. 69

Intact. H. 0.031; D. rim 0.055 m.
Hard, orange clay with light and dark inclusions and sand. Glaze reddish brown. Light buff wash outside.

28. K.3618. Fig. 2, Pl. 69

About 75% preserved; restored in plaster. H. 0.037; D. rim 0.06 m.

29. K.3617. Pl. 69

About 65% preserved including lower stump of handle. Mended and restored in plaster. H. 0.024-0.028; D. rim 0.06 m.
Clay buff. Glaze brown. String-cut base. Only a trace of glaze remains, on the rim.

Fragments of three other similar mugs were found, all of the larger size, as 25, and of a hybrid with heavy flaring rim and the limited glazing of this group. I have been unable to find parallels to these mugs.

Miscellaneous. The next pieces do not belong to any of the wares discussed above.

30. K.4360. Mug. Pl. 69

Whole profile in four joining fragments. H. to top of handle 0.055; D. foot 0.036; est. D. rim 0.068 m.
Buff clay, black glaze; fabric similar to Corinthian. High ring foot.
A few uninventoried foot and body fragments, also black glazed, may belong to larger cups of the same type.

31. K.4369. Krater. Fig. 2

Fragment of rim and upper body. Est. D. rim 0.255 m.

Orange-tan clay, brown to black glaze streaky. Surface very worn. Applied disk on rim and possible trace of another.

32. K.4368. Bowl. Fig. 2, Pl. 70

Fragment of rim and upper body, part of handle. H. 0.09; est. D. rim 0.20 m.
Hard, reddish tan clay, gray at core in places, with white grit and mica. Dull brownish gray to black glaze. Potter's mark on edge of handle: three short incised strokes. Unlike other fabrics and shapes. Bronze Age?

Household Wares

The term is used with reservations: only some of the vases are of household types, though all but the lekanai are of the same fabric. This distinctive fabric can
be isolated but has not been identified with any ware known elsewhere. The clay is tan to deep pinkish orange, usually clean and hard fired. The glaze varies from reddish brown to black and has little luster. To unglazed surfaces a matt wash is applied, usually grayish brown, almost lavender, sometimes shading to rosy tan. There are not more than a dozen vases of the fabric here, all very fragmentary.

*Drinking vessels.* Base and body fragments from about six vases. Half seem to have been semi-glazed kotylai with disk base, the zone above it washed. Other cups, with flat bottom or low base, seem to have been shallow.

*Jugs.* There are rim and shoulder fragments from at least three round-mouth oinochoai. With them we may probably associate body sherds (Th. 0.003-0.005 m.) from several closed vases decorated with glaze bands of varying width. At the top of the shoulder a slight ridge sets off a wide flaring neck with flat-topped rim. A high-swung vertical handle rises from the rim. There is a glaze band around the shoulder. The top of the rim and top of the neck inside are glazed. The outside of the neck is sometimes glazed, sometimes reserved. These are reminiscent of oinochoai of the banded round-mouth class, *Agora* XII, p. 64.

*Large closed vessels.* Many body fragments (Th. 0.005-0.008 m.) belong to one or perhaps more large closed vases. All are coated with the typical wash. Many bear glaze bands, either single or in pairs.

33. K.3913.  
Fig. 2, Pl. 69  
Shoulder fragment mended from many sherds. D. neck 0.085 m.  
Glaze band around bottom of shoulder. Graffito in large letters.

With this we may perhaps associate an uninventoried fragment with flaring neck and flat-topped overhanging rim (est. D. 0.18 m., glaze on top and outer face of rim, top of neck inside).

*Lekanai.* Of biscuit similar to that of the group just discussed, but lacking the wash typical of that fabric, are fragments of large household lekanai. There were at least three such vessels. No profiles can be restored. One base is preserved: disk foot (est. D. 0.16 m.) with a glaze band at junction of base and bowl. Rim fragments (est. D. 0.35-0.40 m.) are out turned and overhanging, flat or nearly so on top. One preserves traces of a handle just below the rim. The interior is coated with streaky glaze, as are the top of the rim and varying amounts of its outer face. For the rim profile, cf. the Attic lekane, *Agora* XII, p. 363, no. 1806. Ours might be Attic.

**Coarse Ware**

Coarse and cooking ware made up 15% by volume of the pottery saved. Few of the fragments are informative.

*Amphoras.* Rim and handle fragments of at least five large amphoras in as
many different fabrics. None of the larger fragments has a good parallel for both shape and fabric.

**Beehive.**

34. K.4357. 

Fig. 2, Pl. 70

One rim fragment, two body fragments. Est. D. rim 0.36; Th. (body) 0.005 m.

Orange-brown clay with coarse grit and flakes of schist. Combed grooving inside, horizontal, vertical and oblique. Flange below rim.

A few other body fragments, not inventoried.

On ancient terracotta beehives, see J. E. Jones, A. J. Graham, and L. H. Sackett, "An Attic Country House below the Cave of Pan at Vari,” *BSA* 68, 1973, pp. 397-413; and M. J. Geroulanos, “Beehives at Trachones, Attica,” *ibid.* , pp. 443-448. None of these examples has so pronounced a flange as ours.

**Pithos.** Two fragments, probably from a single pithos of small size.

35. K.4538, K.4539. 

Pl. 70

Body sherds. W. 0.08 and 0.123; Th. 0.007-0.01 m.

Coarse clay, dark gray at core, brown on surfaces. Handmade. Applied decoration. (The surface of one larger fragment, K.4539, is smoother and of a slightly grayer hue. The differences seem likely to be the result of differing preservation.)

**INSCRIPTIONS (Plates 66, 67)**

All the inscriptions from the deposit are graffiti on pottery. They occur on the following pieces: 1-9, 12 (Attic), 17-19 (Corinthian), 33. Few preserve more than one or two letters. In 12 we may have the conclusion of a dedicatory inscription and in 9 a personal name. All the legible letter forms are normal for (but not unique to) the alphabet current on the Ionic islands of the north and central Aegean in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C., and most are paralleled in inscriptions of that period from Keos itself.⁹

**MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS**

Few miscellaneous objects were found, none positively stratified with the pottery and none certainly contemporary. Only the following need be of date later than the Bronze Age: of bronze, an illegible coin, and of iron, pieces of five or more spikes and a lump (none inventoried), of terracotta, one object (K3.593) which has post-Bronze Age parallels. It is a four-sided pyramid (H. 0.051 m., base 0.035 × 0.037 m.) of rather coarse clay, unglazed, and not pierced for suspension. Terracotta pyramids of similar size occur in Athens (decorated) and Corinth in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. and are thought perhaps to be votive objects.¹⁰


CHRONOLOGY

Attic. Somewhat less than one third of the Attic pottery belongs to the 6th century or the beginning of the 5th. The earliest pieces, from the first half of the 6th century, are the feet of cups of the group of Athens 1104 or similar, and of skyphoi of Corinthian type. The amphora 12 is perhaps early, and the ring-collar oinochoe fragment is probably of the second or third quarter. A number of pieces may be dated toward the end of the 6th century or early in the next: the fragments of Cracow-class cup-skyphoi (e.g. 9), the type of C feet, and the black-figured krater.

About 60% of the Attic pottery belongs to the 5th century: the Vicup 10 (second quarter); the sole red-figured fragment; the skyphos rim of Corinthian type (second half); the bolsal 11 (last quarter), the oinochoe 13 (late 5th), and probably most of the skyphoi of Attic type A.12 (Many skyphos rim and base fragments might equally well be earlier, but the bell-shaped handles typical of the 6th century do not occur here.) From the 4th century we have a smaller number of skyphoi, of which at least two go down to the middle of the century. Imitations of Attic skyphoi should belong to the 5th and early 4th centuries. In short, the Attic pottery spans the years from the second quarter of the 6th century to the middle of the 4th. There appears to be no time within this period when it was not present, but the 6th and 4th centuries (especially the latter) are poorly represented in comparison with the 5th.

Corinthian.13 The fragments of the one true black-figured kotyle should be dated before the middle of the 6th century B.C. Little if anything else need be so early. The catalogued examples of patterned kotylai, 14-16, find their closest parallels in the second half of the 6th and the early years of the 5th century. Some uncatalogued pieces seem to be more at home later in the 5th century. The black-glazed kotylai are in general too fragmentary to allow any but the broadest dating. Those with flaring foot and close-set rays above the base (17%) should be dated to the closing years of the 6th century or the first quarter of the 5th. Those with tall rays (38%) may begin as early as the latter half of the 6th century and continue down at least to mid-5th. Our semi-glazed kotylai with flaring foot (34%) may fall anywhere in the long period between the middle of the 6th century (or perhaps even earlier) and the end of the 5th century.14 The semi-glazed kotylai with heavy foot (11%)

---

11 Where no substantiating reference is made, see parallels noted in text and catalogue above.
12 For Attic type A skyphoi compare description of our fragments with Agora XII, pp. 84, 85.
13 The chronology of Corinthian kotylai is based on Corinth XIII, pp. 105-108, 123-128.
14 In the North Cemetery the earliest semi-glazed kotylai with flaring foot are from graves of ca. 490 B.C. There are two (C-47-568 and C-47-569, unpublished) from an earlier context elsewhere in Corinth. I am grateful to C. K. Williams, II, Director of the Corinth Excavations, for permission to mention these vases. They were found together with numerous figured and ray-based kotylai in a well filled in the third quarter of the 6th century B.C. The latest Corinthian pottery from the well has been dated slightly earlier to the mid-6th century; the earliest belongs to the
may be placed in the second and third quarters of the 5th century, the few fragments of rounded kotylai in its second half. Corinthian pottery, then, appears before the middle of the 6th century but in very limited quantity. It becomes frequent only in the second half of that century, enjoys its greatest popularity in the first half of the next, and dwindles to nothing before the end of the 5th century.

_Siphnian._ The shallower form of skyphos, as 20, has been dated to the 7th century at Kastro, Siphnos. At Tocra it should not be earlier than the last quarter of the 7th century.15 The deeper form, as 21 and 22, has been found at Tocra in a deposit dated 565 to 520 or 510 B.C.16 Mugs of Siphnian fabric begin as early as the skyphoi. At Kastro they are dated to the 7th century.17 At Tocra four from good contexts may be dated 620-590, another 590-565 B.C.18 Mugs of the same type but not said to be Siphnian have a longer chronological span. That from Thera which is most like ours should belong near the end of the 7th century, that from Thasos in the 7th century or the first half of the 6th.19 Only one mug of this type has been dated later than the mid-6th century, that from Aigina, which has been placed in the decade 510-500 B.C.20 Our deposit is too mixed to provide any independent evidence as to the date of these shapes. On the basis of the evidence from other sites we may date our Siphnian vases to the closing years of the 7th century B.C. and the first half or perhaps even most of the 6th.

About two thirds of the datable pottery belongs to the late 7th and 6th centuries, only one third to the 5th and 4th. Until the middle of the 6th century Siphnian vases outnumber all the others. If the Aigina date for the mugs may be applied here, Siphnian vases still have first place in the second half of the century, but with growing competition from Athens and Corinth. After 500 B.C. Siphnian is entirely replaced by Attic and Corinthian products, which from late in the 6th century through much of the 5th seem to have found equal favor. Thereafter Corinthian

---


16 _Tocra_ II, p. 35, nos. 2083, 2084, and p. 3 on Deposit III.

17 _BSA_ 44, 1949, p. 48, no. 5, and section heading, p. 45.

18 Late 7th century to 590 B.C.: _Tocra_ I, p. 75, nos. 887-889; _Tocra_ II, p. 35, no. 2085, and p. 3 on Deposit I. To 565 B.C.: _Tocra_ I, p. 75, no. 892, and _Tocra_ II, p. 3 on Deposit II.

19 Thera: _Thera_ II, p. 64, figs. 221-225; the other vases from the same grave provide the date. Thasos: L. Ghali-Kahil, _Études thasiennes, VII, La céramique grecque (Fouilles 1911-1956)_ , Paris 1960, p. 72, no. 128.

20 _JahrB_ 86, 1971, _ArchAnz_ , p. 524.
declines until at the close of the 5th century Attic pottery has become the sole recognizable import. These remarks apply only to our small deposit and do not necessarily reflect patterns of pottery use in Keos or even at Ayia Irini.

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the pottery in the deposit is of fabrics which have already been assigned a home. The remainder is of diverse fabrics, no single one of which is present in sufficient quantity to suggest that it is a Kean product. A few pieces of coarse ware (e.g., the beehive fragments 34, with their schist temper) recall the locally made ware of the Bronze Age, but the similarity is not strong enough to warrant identifying them as local. This deposit, then, fails to give any evidence for the existence of a pottery industry in Keos during the Archaic and Classical periods.

Caskey has suggested that this dump of Archaic and Classical pottery from outside the fortification walls may have come “from a cleaning out of some shrine in the area of the temple, the only other place where material of that period has been found in any quantity . . . at Ayia Irini.”21 The character of our pottery is consistent with his suggestion. It has not a little in common with the votive material found in the temple.22 Drinking vessels preponderate in the fine ware of both deposits, many of the same shapes and fabrics occurring in both. Both sources yielded graffiti. Although ours are short and inconclusive it is not impossible that they, like some of the graffiti from the temple, were dedicatory inscriptions. The absence of figurines does not preclude a sanctuary origin, for only one figurine of our period was found in the temple area. Further, our pottery is contemporary with one long phase in the even longer post-Mycenaean history (10th through late 4th centuries B.C.) of the temple shrine. By its date, then, as well as by its character it would not have been out of place in the temple.

But the very presence in the temple of ample material contemporary with ours raises doubts whether our pottery was originally housed there. (If our vases are rejects from the temple, the grounds on which they might have been selected are difficult to discover. Many of the vases from the dump are newer—hence presumably more fashionable?—than vases found in the temple. Nor can condition have been the criterion, for a few of the rejected vases were intact: 24, 25, 27, and 13 nearly so.)

It seems preferable to conjecture that our pottery comes from another sanctuary, perhaps indeed not far from the temple shrine. That such a sanctuary has not been found need occasion no surprise. In the higher, inland parts of the site, ancient levels are generally very close to the surface. Closer to the shore, where the rise in sea level has obliterated part of Bronze Age buildings, later structures may also have suffered.23

22 See footnote 1.
23 Hesperia 31, 1962, pp. 268 and 274 (Area B).
The possibility of later disturbance, especially strong in the area of Tower ne, makes speculative any attempt to determine the circumstances in which our pottery might have been thrown out. Since the latest pieces belong to the middle of the 4th century B.C., they cannot have been discarded before that time; if all was discarded at once, the same date would apply to the group as a whole. Clearly, the pottery was deposited here after the collapse of the Bronze Age fortifications, since it rested upon the fallen stones. The depth to which it penetrated in the spaces between the stones indicates that no very long time should have passed between their collapse and the arrival of the pottery. An occasion for this pair of events may be sought near the middle of the 4th century, though any later date is a possibility.

A force strong enough to have dislodged the large blocks may perhaps be found in the severe and geographically widespread natural upheavals of the year 373 B.C., in which both Delos and Delphi suffered and Helike and Bura in Achaia were totally destroyed.24 Our pottery would have been dumped some years afterwards. Its abundance and its long chronological span suggest that it is the product of an extensive cleaning, such as might have been necessitated by severe damage to the shrine. The conjectural disaster of 373 B.C. is too early for our latest pottery; but the sanctuary might have been injured then and its condition ignored for many years. The period of sharply reduced activity implied by this explanation would help to account for the scarcity of 4th century pottery in the deposit. Two other known occasions may be mentioned as possible causes of the sanctuary's having been thrown into disrepair. Another earthquake is attested at Delphi in 354 or 352 B.C., nearer to the date of our latest pottery, and may also have struck here.25 Alternatively, in the late 360's B.C., the Ayia Irini promontory may have suffered in the fighting which attended the Keans' revolt from the Second Athenian Confederacy.26 The consideration of possible connections between our pottery and known events should not be allowed to obscure the strong possibility that the origin of the deposit lies in circumstances, never recorded, of only very local interest. Although the conditions of the pottery's use and disposal cannot be established, the deposit remains a testimony to the continuation of activity at Ayia Irini long after the greatest days of the site and a source of information about the commercial relations of Keos during the Archaic and Classical periods.

KATHRYN L. BUTT

24 RE, Suppl. IV, cols. 348, 350, 351, with references to ancient reports.
25 RE, Suppl. IV, col. 348.
Attic. Scale 1:2

KATHRYN L. BUTT: A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS
Graffiti. Scale 1:2

KATHRYN L. BUTT: A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS
Sherds with graffiti. Scale 1:2
Corinthian (14-16) and Siphnian (21, 23, 24). Scale 1:2

KATHRYN L. BUTT: A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS
Other fine wares (25-30) and household ware (33). Scale 1:2

KATHRYN L. BUTT: A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS
Miscellaneous (32); coarse-ware beehive (34); pithos (35). Scale 1:2

KATHRYN L. BUTT: A DEPOSIT OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREEK POTTERY AT AYIA IRINI, KEOS