

EULIMENE

Vol 15 (2014)

EULIMENE 15-16 (2014-2015)



Kefala between Skopela and Gournes A possible Greek sanctuary

Nikos Panagiotakis, Marina Panagiotaki

doi: [10.12681/eul.32811](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32811)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 15-16
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2014-2015

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ

ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ

Π. Μανουσάκη 5–Β. Χάλη 8
GR 741 00–Ρέθυμνο

Χατζηχρήστου 14
GR 117 42–Αθήνα

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ–ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)

Αναπλ. Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)

ΒΟΗΘΟΙ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη (Αθήνα)

Δρ. Σταυρούλα Οικονόμου (Αθήνα)

Γεώργιος Μαυρουδής (Ρόδος)

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

P. Manousaki 5–V. Chali 8
GR 741 00–Rethymnon

Chatzichristou 14
GR 117 42–Athens

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS, EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)

Assoc. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITORS

Dr. Dimitra Tsangari (Athens)

Dr. Stavroula Oikonomou (Athens)

Georgios Mavroudis (Rhodes)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

2014-2015

EULIMENE

ISSN: 1108–5800

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Ομ. Καθ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. Mariusz Mielczarek (Łódź)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Princeton)
Αναπλ. Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελαράκης (Adelphi)
Καθ. Σταύρος Περεντιδής (Αθήνα)

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymnon)
Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymnon)
Em. Prof. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek (Łódź)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Princeton)
Assoc. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (Adelphi)
Prof. Stavros Perentidis (Athens)

Η EYLIMENH είναι μία επιστημονική περιοδική έκδοση με κριτές που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομισματική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινωική / Υπομινωική / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12^{ος} / 11^{ος} αι. π.Χ.) έως και την Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα (5^{ος} / 6^{ος} αι. μ.Χ.).

Η EYLIMENH περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβοτανολογία, Ζωοαρχειολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περίληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.
2. Συντομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Οι εικόνες πρέπει να υποβάλλονται σε μορφή αρχείου .jpg ή .tiff και σε ανάλυση τουλάχιστον 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) προκειμένου για γραμμικά σχέδια και 400 dpi για ασπρόμαυρες εικόνες (στην κλίμακα του γκρι). Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία πρέπει να είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.
4. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται ηλεκτρονικά στις ακόλουθες διευθύνσεις: litinasn@uoc.gr και stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr.

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν ανάπτυπο της εργασίας τους ηλεκτρονικά σε μορφή αρχείου .pdf και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού.

Συνδρομές – Συνεργασίες – Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Π. Μανουσάκη 5 – Β. Χάλη 8, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100 (litinasn@uoc.gr)

Αναπλ. Καθ. Μανώλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Μεσογειακών Σπουδών, Ρόδος – GR 85132 (stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

EULIMENE is a refereed academic periodical which hosts studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenaean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the Late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on Anthropology, Palaiodemography, Palaeo-environmental, Botanical and Faunal Archaeology, the Ancient Economy and the History of Science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, other than that of the paper.
2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, ASP.
3. Illustrations should be submitted in .jpg or .tiff format of at least 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) for line art and 400 dpi for halftones (grayscale mode) resolution. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.
4. Please submit your paper to: litinasn@uoc.gr and stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr.

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Offprint of each paper in .pdf format, and a volume of the journal will be provided to the contributors.

Subscriptions – Contributions – Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society, P. Manousaki 5 – V. Chali 8, Rethymnon – GR 74100

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Department of Philology, Rethymnon – GR 74100 (litinasn@uoc.gr)

Assoc. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis, University of the Aegean, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes – GR 85132 (stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

Περιεχόμενα
EYΛΙΜΕΝΗ 15-16 (2014-2015)

List of Contents
EULIMENE 15-16 (2014-2015)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti6

Eirene Roupaki, Hand mills from the vicinity of the Athenian Acropolis. The findings from Athens Metropolitan Railway excavations..... 11

Nikos Panagiotakis – Marina Panagiotaki, *Kefala* between Skopela and Gournes: A possible Greek sanctuary 55

Απόστολος Δ. Θάνος, Ο ζωγράφος του Τάλω. Παρατηρήσεις στα έργα ενός αγγειογράφου του τέλους του 5^{ου} αι. π.Χ. 67

Εριφύλη Κανίνια, Χρυσά στεφάνια με φύλλα κισσού από τις αρχαίες ροδιακές νεκροπόλεις, 101

† **Γιώργος Δεσπίνης**, Πλακούντες ιδιόσημοι..... 121

Eleni K. Tziligkaki, A quarry-mark from ancient Thera 131

Βιβλιοκρισίες / Book Reviews

Rocha Pereira, M. Helena. *Greek vases in Portugal* (2nd edition with a new supplement; 1st edition 1962). Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra (CECH), 2010. 165 p., 66 p. of plates. €17.00 (pb). ISBN 9789898281241 (**Anthi Dipla**)..... 149

Hans v. Mangoldt, *Makedonische Grabarchitektur. Die Makedonischen Kammergräber und ihre Vorläufer*, Band I: Text, Band II: Tafeln und Karten, Tübingen-Berlin 2012 (**Ιωάννης Π. Τουράτσογλου**). 151

G.F. La Torre, *Sicilia e Magna Grecia. Archeologia della colonizzazione greca d'Occidente [Manuali Laterza, 314]*, Roma-Bari, editore Laterza, 2011. Pp. XIII+409 [ISBN: 978-88-420-9511-8] (**Paolo Daniele Scirpo**)..... 154

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen /

Sommaires / Riassunti

Eirene Poupaki, Hand mills from the vicinity of the Athenian Acropolis. The findings from Athens Metropolitan Railway excavations, *EYΛIΜENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 11-53.

Χειρόμυλοι από την περιοχή της αθηναϊκής Ακρόπολης. Τα ευρήματα από τις ανασκαφές του αθηναϊκού ΜΕΤΡΟ. Το παρόν άρθρο αποτελεί προκαταρκτική παρουσίαση των χειρομύλων για την άλεση των δημητριακών που εντοπίστηκαν κατά την ανασκαφική έρευνα στο οικόπεδο Μακρυγιάννη, στους πρόποδες της Αθηναϊκής Ακρόπολης, την οποία διενήργησε η πρώην Α΄ Εφορεία Προϊστορικών και Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων πριν από την κατασκευή του Σταθμού του ΜΕΤΡΟ «Ακρόπολις». Η έρευνα επικεντρώνεται στους χειρόμυλους παλινδρομικής κίνησης, τους χειρόμυλους «ολυνθιακού τύπου» και στους περιστροφικούς χειρόμυλους, οι οποίοι ήρθαν στο φως κατά την ανασκαφή, όχι κατά χώραν, αλλά είτε ανασύρθηκαν από επιχώσεις διαφόρων χρονικών περιόδων, κυρίως αρχαίων φρεάτων και δεξαμενών, είτε είχαν εντοιχισθεί σε τοιχοποιίες ή θεμελιώσεις διαφόρων κτιρίων. Αυτοί οι χειρόμυλοι ήταν κατασκευασμένοι από ηφαιστειακά πετρώματα άγνωστης προέλευσης, δεδομένου ότι δεν έχουν διενεργηθεί έως σήμερα πετρολογικές αναλύσεις. Οι μυλόλιθοι παλινδρομικής κίνησης «σαμαρωτού τύπου» και οι μυλόλιθοι «ολυνθιακού τύπου» αποτελούν την πλειονότητα των αντικειμένων που μελετήθηκαν και χρονολογούνται σε γενικές γραμμές από την προϊστορική εποχή έως τη ρωμαϊκή περίοδο, ενώ οι περιστροφικοί χειρόμυλοι είναι σπάνιοι. Επιχειρείται η χρονολόγηση των αθηναϊκών χειρομύλων της ανασκαφής με βάση τη σύγκρισή τους με ήδη δημοσιευμένα παράλληλα από άλλες περιοχές, τη χρονολόγηση της στρωματογραφίας της ανασκαφής και τα καλά χρονολογημένα συνευρήματά τους. Τέλος, σκιαγραφείται μία πτυχή της καθημερινής ζωής των κατοίκων της περιοχής, που κατά μερικούς ερευνητές ταυτίζεται με το Αθηναϊκό Δήμο του Κολλυτού.

Nikos Panagiotakis – Marina Panagiotaki, *Kefala* between Skopela and Gournes: A possible Greek sanctuary, *EYΛIΜENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 55-66.

Η Κεφάλα μεταξύ Σκοπέλας και Γουρνών: ένα πιθανό ιερό ελληνικών χρόνων. Αρχιτεκτονικά κατάλοιπα που εντοπίστηκαν στον λόφο Κεφάλα στη βόρεια-κεντρική Κρήτη κατά την επιφανειακή έρευνα *The Pediada Survey Project*, ανήκουν μάλλον σε κάποιο ιερό ελληνικών χρόνων παρά σε μια ακρόπολη ή ένα οχυρό. Την ταύτιση με το πρώτο ενισχύουν το χαμηλό ύψος του λόφου και η εύκολη πρόσβαση στην κορυφή από τα νότια, καθώς και το επιπεδοποιημένο πλάτωμα που τα αρχιτεκτονικά κατάλοιπα ορίζουν. Η ταύτιση των αρχιτεκτονικών καταλοίπων με ιερό ενισχύεται επίσης από την γεωγραφική θέση της Κεφάλας, κατά πάσα πιθανότητα, στα όρια των μεγάλων πόλεων-κρατών της Κνωσού και της Λύκτου-Χερσονήσου, αλλά και την καλής ποιότητας κεραμική που σχετίζεται με αυτά.

Απόστολος Δ. Θάνος, Ο ζωγράφος του Τάλω. Παρατηρήσεις στα έργα ενός αγγειογράφου του τέλους του 5^{ου} αι. π.Χ., *EYAIMENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 67-100.

The Talos painter. Remarks on the works of a late 5th century B.C. vase-painter. The subject of the present article is the works of Talos Painter. The specific painter, whose action is confined in the last decades of the fifth century B.C. and early fourth century B.C., is one of the main representatives of the “Rich Style”. The conventional name “Talos Painter” was given to the vase painter by J.D. Beazley due to the depiction of the mythical bronze giant Talos on the main side of the volute crater that was found in the necropolis of Ruvo in Apulia.

In the first part of the article the stylistic characteristics are examined in order to clarify his artistic “identity”. The analysis of those stylistic characteristics has facilitated the re-examination of older attributions of certain vases.

Following this the types of vases decorated by the Talos Painter were examined. From the study of the available material, it seems that he preferred large vases, especially craters and loutrophoroi and also amphora of Panathenaic type, nuptials lebes, hydries and pelikes. The representations decorating those vases have also been examined and analyzed.

Finally, the article concludes with the examination of his apprenticeship and his collaboration with other painters. This examination can lead to the suggestion that the Talos Painter could have been an apprentice to Meidias Painter and also that he co-existed for a certain period in the same workshop with the Modica Painter.

Εριφύλη Κανίνια, Χρυσά στεφάνια με φύλλα κισσού από τις αρχαίες ροδιακές νεκροπόλεις, *EYAIMENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 101-119.

Gold wreaths with ivy leaves from the nekropoleis of the Rhodian State. The nekropoleis over the greater area of the Rhodian State yielded a considerable number of pure gold wreaths, unfortunately most of them in fragmentary condition. Among them, two gold wreaths with ivy leaves, preserved mostly intact, are of special interest: the wreath from Megisti (Kastellorizo), now housed in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (cat. no. Χρ 1058) and one wreath found during rescue excavation in the eastern necropolis of Rhodes (Rhodes Museum, cat. no. M 1529).

The gold wreath from Kastellorizo, found in 1913 by three residents of the island on the plateau of Hagios Georgios tou Vounou, was handed over to the archaeologist Nikolaos Kyparissis and transferred to the National Museum in Athens as a gift to the motherland from a humble faraway corner of Greek soil. Regarding its date, a first, rather early evaluation is based on its typological similarities with the excavated wreaths from Sevasti (Thessaloniki Museum, cat. no. ΜΔ 2579) and Apollonia (Thessaloniki Museum, cat. no. ΑΠΟ 662), which date to the middle and the third quarter of the 4th cent. B.C. respectively. However, certain construction innovations, already adopted in the Kastellorizo wreath (gold ribbon-shaped stalks, small tubes soldered on the circular stem for the stalks to fit into, the delicate flower sprays instead of steady corymbs etc.), are also encountered in the ivy wreath of Rhodes Museum M 1529 with gold ribbon-shaped leaf-bearing strip; since the latter was found in a stone casket (*osteotheke*), its earliest date is estimated at shortly before the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C. It would, therefore, be appropriate to

lower the date of the Kastellorizo wreath to the final years of the 4th or rather the early 3rd cent B.C. The wreath from Kastellorizo exudes the simplicity of a classical construction (we might characterize it as a work of art) and at the same time, it is enveloped in an aura of a more delicate movement, a subtle playfulness, a concept of wealth, which precisely characterizes a hellenistic creation.

It is doubtful whether the rather unskilled work connecting the two parts of the circular stem of the Kastellorizo wreath with twisted wire is original; the two parts may have originally been joined by a flexible ornamental element (Heraklean knot or double twined wire) or the circular stem may have been constructed as a single piece and the wire coil at the front of the wreath which keeps the two parts of the stem together may be an ancient repair. A close inspection of the stemless and somehow damaged heart-shaped leaflet which ornaments the top of the Kastellorizo wreath (now stuck on site with resin) showed that it did not originally belong to this wreath and most probably it was used (obviously “recycled” from another wreath) to disguise the ancient repair.

On the other hand, the ivy wreath of Rhodes Museum M 1529, seems to be a fine specimen of a massive production, during which the constituent parts of a wreath were made separately and, eventually, assembled according to the wishes of the clientele; this practice may be thought as typical of the vigorous commercial activity in the Hellenistic Rhodian State. Thus, the two ivy wreaths represent two different stages of constructional conception within the chronological framework between the final years of the 4th and the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C.

The two ivy wreaths from the nekropoleis of the ancient Rhodian State (together with a third one, still unpublished, found recently during rescue excavation in the Rhodian nekropolis) constitute a relatively large proportion of the totally ten known pure gold wreaths with ivy leaves; the rarity of ivy wreaths is probably mainly due to the fact that it takes more gold sheets to fabricate heart-shaped ivy leaves than lanceolate myrtle ones. Also, the cost of ivy leaves would have been higher by the additional material and work required to reinforce the support of the sizeable heart-shaped leaves. However, it seems that the wealthy middle class Rhodian society of the Hellenistic time, largely familiar with the cult of Dionysos – obviously under the influence of the active *koinon of Dionysiastai* – could possibly afford the purchase of an ivy wreath. The rather large proportion of ivy leaf wreaths found in the nekropoleis of the ancient Rhodian State could also be associated with the chthonic aspect of the cult of Dionysos, which appears to have been widespread in Rhodes as demonstrated by a series of finds and, most importantly, the relief representations of the Dionysiac procession on the grave complexes at Korakonero (Bilde 1999, 227 ff.).

† **Γιώργος Δεσπίνης**, Πλακούντες ιδιόσχημοι, *EYAIMENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 121-130.

In der vorliegenden Untersuchung wird das Deutungsproblem behandelt, das die Darstellungen auf einer Gruppe von Weihreliefsaufwerfen, die aus Attika stamen und sehr wahrscheinlich alle ins 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. zu datieren sind. Auf diesen Reliefs sind ein, zwei oder dreigleichenartige Motive nebeneinander dargestellt, die aus zwei sich X-förmigkreuzenden, schwacheingetieften Elementen bestehen. Auf den abgerundeten Enden erkennt man in Relief dargestellte oder eingeritzte Mondsicheln und auf dem Kreuzungspunkt einen plastischen Knopf.

S.A. Koumanoudis erwog in seiner 1862 erschienenen Publikation eines dieser Reliefs, das eine Weihinschrift für Demeter und Kore besitzt, dass hier eine Art von Backwerk dargestellt sein könnte, ein Vorschlag, dem die jüngere Forschung mit Zurückhaltung gegenüber tritt. Verf. stimmt Koumanoudis dagegen zu und erkennt in den Reliefdarstellungen ein Backwerk, das in der antiken Literatural *κρηπίδες* bezeichnet wird. Bei Polydeukes und Hesychios ist überliefert, dass diese *κρηπίδες* eine den Schuhsohlenähnliche Form besaßen, von denen sich auch der Name herleitet. Die Kuchen bestanden aus Mehl und Honig und waren *ἔγχυτοι*, was bedeutet, dass der Teig in Formen gegossen wurde. Nach dem sie aus der Form genommen worden waren, wurden sie vor dem Ausbacken über Kreuz angeordnet und an den Enden mit den Mondsicheln so wie auf dem Kreuzungspunkt mit einem Knopf versehen. Wie Polydeukes berichtet, wurde das Backwerk in Stücke gebrochen und zusammen mit Geflügelbrühe verzehrt. Auf das Gebäck wurde auch auf Holzkohlen feuergegrilltes Geflügel gelegt, das alserstes verspeist wurde. Für die eigenartige Kombination von süßem Backwerk mit Geflügelbrühe verweist Verf. auf ein modern griechische Süßigkeit, zu deren Zutaten neben Mehl, Zucker und Milch auch gekochtes Hühnerfleisch gehört.

Eleni K. Tziligkaki, A quarry-mark from ancient Thera, *EYAIMENH* 15-16 (2014-2015), 131-148.

Ένα λιθουργικό σήμα από την αρχαία Θήρα. Οι επαφές μεταξύ Κρήτης και Θήρας κατά την ανατολιζουσα και αρχαϊκή περίοδο, επιβεβαιωμένες από τον Ηρόδοτο, την κεραμική και τη γλυπτική, ενισχύονται επιπλέον από δύο «λιθουργικά σήματα» σε λατομεία των δύο νησιών. Ένα λατομικό σήμα στον τύπο του Παραθύρου ή της Πύλης είχε χαραχθεί σε λατομείο του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ. στο όρος Προφήτης Ηλίας στη Θήρα. Ο αρχαϊκός χαρακτήρας της θέσης σε συνδυασμό με την παντελή απουσία του τύπου του Παραθύρου στο σύνολο των λιθουργικών σημάτων του ΥΜ Ι οικισμού του Ακρωτηρίου, αποκλείουν την πιθανότητα μινωικής χρονολόγησης. Υπ' αυτήν την έννοια, στην παρούσα εργασία υποστηρίζεται ο αρχαϊκός χαρακτήρας στο τμήμα του λατομείου «Στα Σκαριά» Παλαικάστρου Κρήτης, στο οποίο είναι χαραγμένο ένα λατομικό σήμα επίσης στον τύπο του Παραθύρου. Δεν είναι πρωτοφανής άλλωστε η επιβίωση συμβόλων της Εποχής του Χαλκού στην αρχαϊκή περίοδο. Αυτά τα λατομικά σήματα θα μπορούσαν να ερμηνευθούν ως ενδείξεις μιας κομπανίας χτιστών, οι οποίοι μετακινούνταν από μέρος σε μέρος κατά παραγγελία. Παράλληλα προσφέρονται από την Αθήνα του 4^{ου} αι. π.Χ. αλλά και από τα «μπουλούκια» των παραδοσιακών χτιστών στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα από τον 18^ο αιώνα έως τα μέσα της δεκαετίας του '60. Μια πιθανή θαλάσσια διαδρομή μεταξύ της Θήρας του 7^{ου} αι. π.Χ. και των ανατολικών ακτών της Κρήτης απηχείται στον Ηρόδοτο (4.151-152). Αρχαϊκά μαρμάρια γλυπτά από τη Θήρα με επιρροές από την ανατολιζουσα γλυπτική της Κρήτης, θηραϊκή κεραμική στην Κρήτη σε θέσεις εγγύς κοιτασμάτων λευκού μαρμάρου, και οι εμπορικές επαφές της Θήρας με την Αξό, η επικράτεια της οποίας εμφανίζει μαρμαροφορία, συμπληρώνουν την εικόνα της κινητικότητας Κρητών γλυπτών και αρχιτεκτόνων κατά τον 7^ο και 6^ο αι. π.Χ.

KEFALA BETWEEN SKOPELA AND GOURNES: A POSSIBLE GREEK SANCTUARY

THE SITE

Important architectural remains were identified by Nikos Panagiotakis, in 1985, through *The Pediada Survey Project*,¹ on the top of the hill of *Kefala*, immediately south of the modern coastal town of Gournes, east of Amnissos and north-northeast and east of the modern villages Skopela, Kainourgio Chorio, Galype and Anopolis (**figs. 1-8**).

Kefala hill rises gradually to 287 m. above the north sea and extends southwards; it is an elongated, rocky hill situated between the two streams *Patsidiotis* on the west side and *Potamos t' Ai Gianniou* or *Vathi Ryaki* on the east; the streams join further north of the *Kefala* hill to create a delta, which is now occupied by modern Gournes (**figs. 3, 6**). *Patsidiotis* follows a deep ravine where the spring *Krygia Vryssi* flows. Immediately east of *Kefala* runs a track that connects the hinterland with the north coast. All sides of the hill are abrupt; easy access is provided from the south through two rough paths among large rock outcrops most of which seem somewhat cut and rounded.

Kefala dominates both river valleys (and ravine), the coastline of Gournes and a large stretch of the sea from almost the ridge of Rogdia (west of modern Heraklion) to east of Ederi hill; it also overlooks the countryside to its south, east and west, which is part of the hilly region that defines the northeast edge of the Omphalion Pedion. It has direct visual contact with all the main hills in all directions: immediately northwest, the hill of Profitis Ilias of Anopolis; west, the ridge of Amnissos and in particular the peak sanctuary of *Megali Koutsoura* on the southernmost and highest hill of the ridge;² further west, Ai Lias of Knossos; northeast, the ridge of Skoteino and further northeast, Ederi; east, the ridge of Vardia above Chersonisos; and south and southwest, the villages Skopela, Galype and Kainourgio Chorio.

Clearly *Kefala*, despite its moderate height, is an important landmark in the region controlling land routes from the hinterland to the sea to the north as well as sea routes. In connection with the latter, it should be pointed out that the coast north of the *Kefala* hill, possesses one of the largest sandy beaches of central Crete suitable for ships to

¹ The site is mentioned in the preliminary report of the Survey (Panagiotakis 2003, 397), under Kainourghio Chorio as a settlement; however, the present study clearly shows that this view is not valid for the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic occupation of the site. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 11th International Cretological Congress (Panagiotakis et al, in press)

² Panagiotakis 2003, 388; Paliochora is the northernmost hill of the ridge with the Bronze Age installations and the sanctuary of Zeus Thenata (Schäfer 1992), while the cave of Eilytheia is on the hill between *Megali Koutsoura* and Paliochora.

approach in good weather as those of Amnisos and Hagioi Theodoroi/Kokkini Chani³ immediately west.

True, *Kefala* hill is 4.5 km from this sandy beach and further inland than the hill of Profitis Ilias of Anopolis (immediately northwest, at c. 2 km of *Kefala*), and the ridge of Skoteino (northeast, at c. 2.5 km) as well as the hill of Ederi, northeast. However, unlike the other hills, *Kefala* does not attract immediate attention, a fact which enhances its strategic importance, since it is an excellent spot for watching the coastline without being immediately visible. Because of its strategic importance, *Kefala* may have been a watch-and-signal post during the Bronze Age, like the hill of Profitis Ilias of Anopolis⁴ northwest of *Kefala* and the ridge of Ederi northeast,⁵ even if the Survey has not provided enough evidence to support such a use.⁶

THE ARCHITECTURAL REMAINS ON THE KEFALA HILL

The highest part of *Kefala* stretches from north to south for about 52-53 metres and is completely flat. Since the whole hill is covered with rock outcrops, it is possible that this rectangular platform-like area is the result of levelling operations.⁷

Massive wall foundations (**fig. 4**) define the west, north and south sides of the platform, which covers a little more than 1000 square metres. Its orientation follows the main axis of the hill, northeast-southwest.

The west wall runs for about 52 m. north-south (**figs. 4, 5, 6**); its width varies from 1.15 to 1.20 m., its height from 0.50 to 1.15 m. It is built of large irregular blocks of the local *Tripolitsa* limestone obtained from *Kefala* itself; some of the irregular blocks are in fact polygonal boulders with their length varying from 1.12 to 2.00 m. The face of the blocks has been roughly dressed giving the impression of a flat west facade; no plaster or mortar has survived in their joints. The blocks survive to mostly one or two courses above ground on the west side but it is possible that the ancient ground was at a lower level and there are more courses under the visible ones. At one point, near the northwest corner, the blocks lean against a large rock outcrop acting as a natural buttress (**figs. 6, 8**).

The north wall runs for 13.92 m. and the south wall for 19.65 m.; their width is 0.80 m. and 1.20 m. respectively and they join the west wall forming two strong corners, where the accumulation of soil is the greatest. Their construction is similar to the west wall but the size of the blocks is smaller (for instance the length of the blocks of the north wall varies from around 0.65 to 0.95 m.).

Parallel to the north wall, but at a higher level of its last preserved course and within the platform, runs another for about 13 m. A similar situation is observed on the south side; only the inner wall could be traced for 6 m. Both inner walls present a construction similar to the external ones; however, they are of better quality since they include two well-dressed, rectangular blocks at their west ends (the one at the west end of the north wall measures 0.98x0.50 m. and its visible height is 0.26 m., **figs. 4, 8**).

³ Kokkini Chani is in fact called Pacheia Ammos (thick sand) of Anopolis.

⁴ Panagiotakis 2003, 378.

⁵ Panagiotakis 2003, 393.

⁶ On watch-and-signal posts, see Panagiotakis 2003, 348; 2004, 180-184; Panagiotakis et al. 2013.

⁷ It is only near the southwest edge of the platform that there are two rock outcrops left *in situ*.

These two walls could represent the north and south limit of an upper platform; the space between these walls and the external ones could have been some form of a ledge or step flanking this upper platform on the north and south side. The north wall turns south for more than 5 m. and it is possible that this wall represents the east limit of the upper platform. If this is right, the upper platform is flanked on the east by a much larger ledge at least 6.50 m. wide. The presence of scattered rock outcrops in this space further supports this idea.

At a lower level down the slope, the remains of massive wall foundations run north-south on the west and east flanks. A smaller fragment could be traced along the west part of the north flank (**figs. 4, 7, 7a, 7b**). The stone is again the local *Tripolitsa* limestone. The west wall could be followed for 36 m.; it has a straight facade built of very large, irregular blocks, preserved to two to three courses. The blocks exceed 1.50 m. length and they are about 0.80 m. wide, and 0.75 m. high. The east wall presents a similar facade of irregular blocks, one or two courses of which are visible. The largest block is 1.20 m. long, 0.60 m. wide and 0.65 m. high. In both walls the natural bedrock has been cut and incorporated (**fig. 4**). The north and south wall fragments are too poorly preserved to offer detailed description. Despite their fragmentary nature it is possible to suggest that the walls had originally enclosed the top of the hill –an area covering about 5.000 square metres.

The slope between the platform on the top and the megalithic walls below is abrupt and strewn with irregular blocks of the *Tripolitsa* limestone which lie amongst the many rock outcrops that cover the slope. Evidently, most of these blocks must have originally belonged to the walls of the platform above. No traces of any constructions are visible between the platform walls and the peripheral walls.

Among the *Tripolitsa* rock outcrops and stones just below the west wall of the platform (at 2.00 m. distance below the wall and roughly 25 m. from the southwest corner) a triangular corner stone of white limestone (poros, brought from elsewhere) and half a brick were found; another poros block, square in shape, was found at the northeast corner of the platform. None of these architectural elements are *in situ*; their existence, however, points to some construction related to the platform that has not survived.

In conclusion, the visible remains on *Kefala* seem to belong to two platforms, one rising above the other, larger on the south, east and north sides but sharing the west wall; a precinct wall at a lower level of the slope seem to have enclosed the platform area on the top. This interpretation is based on the slight evidence provided by the remains visible today; only excavation can establish with certainty the character of the architectural remains on the *Kefala* hill.

THE FINDS

Apart from a large limestone mortar found immediately below the southwest corner of the platform,⁸ the finds consist exclusively of pottery sherds found mostly within the platform area. The systematic study of the pottery has not been completed yet but it is sufficiently advanced to allow us to date it accurately. It ranges from the Archaic down to the Hellenistic times. Representative examples of each period are shown below.

⁸ The mortar existed when the site was first visited but has not been seen since then.

A rim sherd from a pithoid vase (**fig. 9**) bears the characteristic spiral motif found on pithoi dating from the 7th and 6th c. B.C.⁹ The spiral is combined with a shield-like motif known from 8th/7th c. Cretan pithoi.¹⁰ The careful execution of the design together with the excellent quality of the clay (which has very few inclusions) as well as the careful surface treatment, suggests an important workshop.

The base from a high-necked cup dates from the end of the 6th c. B.C.¹¹ Another base, from an Attic kantharos or maybe a local tulip cup, glazed inside out, dates to the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 3rd c. B.C.¹² The base and part of the lower body of a skyphos/cup might also date from Classical or Hellenistic times.¹³ A fragment of a relief vase (**fig. 10**) with a lotus motif is comparable to those that can be found on mould made bowls of the 2nd/1st c. B.C.¹⁴

Noteworthy is the quality of the pottery, especially of the pithos fragment of Archaic date as well as many tiny fragments of vases (not included in this paper) with fine walls and black glaze strewn on the platform. Important too is the possible Attic import and the relief vase.

INTERPRETATION

How should one interpret the architectural remains on the *Kefala*? Three possibilities come to mind: first, the walls could be part of terracing for cultivation; second, they could be the remains of an acropolis or a fort; third, they could be the remains of a single, large rectangular structure.

Against the first interpretation comes the fact that the surviving walls are too strongly built to have been simple retaining walls to hold terraces for cultivation. Moreover, the only part of the hill free of rock outcrops and thus suitable for cultivation is the platform, which, however, is so windy, that we cannot think of any crop that could do well under such conditions.

The second interpretation, that of an acropolis or a fort, could find support by the presence of the lower walls; because of their megalithic nature, one could argue that they were part of an encircling fortification, implying an acropolis or a fort. However, the space enclosed between the platform and the lower walls is too abrupt and any terraces created would have been too narrow to have housed any constructions (in the case of an acropolis), unless there was substantial cutting of the rock outcrops, which is not the case; as stated above the slope is absolutely covered with rock outcrops. Moreover, the height of the hill and the easy access provided from south, seem to go against the idea of both

⁹ See, for instance, Simantoni-Bournia 2004, 1.3 (Cretan, 690-660 B.C.); 8.18 (Cretan, 640-610 B.C.), 14.33 and 15.34 (Rhodian, 600-510 B.C.). See also, Simantoni-Bournia 1984, 117-121 and pl. 21 γ: continuous or running spiral.

¹⁰ Chatzi-Vallianou and Eythymiou 2000, 539, 552, photo no. 8

¹¹ Erickson 2010, nos 510-515, pp. 213-215 (all dating from 525-500 B.C.).

¹² Sackett et al. 1992, 100, pl. 80, nos 1,2 or 5,6 respectively.

¹³ See Sackett et al. 1992, 95, pl. 77.1 (deposit H7) and 101, pl. 81. 21-24 (echinus bowls), almost all Attic, dating throughout the 4th c. B.C.

¹⁴ Rotroff 1997, no. 622, p. 308, pl. 59 (late 2nd c. B.C.), or Rotroff 1982, 87, no. 359, pl. 64 (ca. 100 B.C.). It should also be noted, however, that the motif also bears a similarity to the outlined tongue motif found on Archaic pithoi. See for instance Haggis et al. 2004, 377, fig. 33 (Cretan, Early Iron Age). Simantoni-Bournia 1992, 66-75 (Chian, 6th/5th c. B.C.).

an acropolis and a fort. But if we, momentarily, accept the idea of an acropolis, where was the city to which it belonged? No remains of a city have been identified in the immediate surroundings (as is the case, for instance, of the Acropolis at Agios Ioannis and the city of Gortyna). If we consider the idea of a fort apart from the easy access provided from the south side of the hill that goes against such an idea, to our knowledge, there are no contemporary forts in Crete that enclose a levelled, flat platform. Moreover, there is no evidence that the walls of any of the two platforms were rising to form a fort and no other walls are visible.

Perhaps the only possible remaining interpretation is that of a single structure. Two possibilities come to mind: (a) a farmhouse or a shepherd's installation; (b) a sanctuary.

The idea of a farmhouse or a shepherd's installation can be rejected on two important issues: first, there is not much cultivable land around the region to justify the presence of a farmhouse of such magnitude on this spot; if *Kefala* overlooked part of the fertile Omphalion Pedion at south, then such a farmhouse could be justified. The *Kefala* hill and the area immediately around it is suitable for grazing, but no shepherd could have been able to build such a construction for a house and less so for a sheepfold. Second, the pottery collected, which, as we stressed above, is of a fine quality, is not usually associated with a farmer's or shepherd's house.

There remains the hypothesis that the visible architectural remains belonged to a sanctuary. The outstanding, dominant position of the structure situated on the southernmost and highest part of the hill, near one of the most important stretches of the sea and land routes of central Crete and perhaps at the boundaries of the important city states of north-central Crete seems to support this idea. A major hindrance against the idea of a sanctuary is the lack of cult equipment such as figurines.¹⁵ However, there are arguments which are in line with the idea of its being a sanctuary rather than a fort or any other structure.

The study of the remains revealed the existence of two platforms. The monumental size of the platforms on the purposely made flat top of the hill with a pronounced emphasis on its length; its northeast-southwest orientation; the quality of the construction –all these facts support the idea of a Greek sanctuary. As stated above there is no evidence that the walls of any of the two platforms were rising to form a fort or a structure that could be seen as a shrine. As far as the lower megalithic wall fragments, below the platform, are concerned, they can be explained as parts of a precinct wall, a *peribolos* that enclosed the sacred area (**fig. 4**). The quality of the pottery is a further argument to support the idea of a sanctuary.

At this point, two questions arise in relation to the idea of a Greek sanctuary on the *Kefala* hill.

The first question concerns its architecture. The architectural remains do not allow us to define precisely its form and appearance.¹⁶ No stone architectural members typical of peripteral temples are to be found. It is, however, conceivable that the upper platform had held an object of focus, be it an altar or a construction of some form. The remaining

¹⁵ It should be remembered that the cave of Eilytheia at only 7.5 km west, lacked cult equipment of any kind, Marinatos 1929: 94-104. 1930: 91-99.

¹⁶ On Cretan sanctuaries of the relevant dates, see Sporn 2002.

space and the ledge on its three sides will have allowed large congregations. This is important since the strongly inclined space between the platforms and the *peribolos* is too rugged and any number of people would thus have to be on the platform.

The second question concerns its status. Did it belong to a city and if so, which one.

Let us consider its position in relation to the well-known major *poleis* of central Crete, since the Survey has not identified any substantial remains that could have belonged to an important contemporary installation (city) in the immediate surroundings.¹⁷ The major city states all around are: Knossos at 10.3 km west (with its harbour at Amnissos¹⁸ at 7.5 km northwest of *Kefala*) and Lyktos at 13 km south (with its harbour at Chersonissos at 11 km east of *Kefala*). As *Kefala* lies nearer to Knossos and Amnissos it may have been within their territory. However, if we consider the territory of Knossos as given by Strabo,¹⁹ at thirty stadia radius (explained as 5.5 km), *Kefala* lies beyond its limits. Lyktos, on the other hand, had a more extensive territory stretching to Chersonissos, and despite the greater distance between it and *Kefala*, the latter could have belonged to it.²⁰ Given, however, the ambiguity of the limits of the territories of the Cretan city states, *Kefala* could have been at the border between Knossos and Lyktos. In the first instance, the sanctuary would have been an “extra-urban sanctuary”; in the second, an “extra-urban”, “border sanctuary”.²¹

We are tempted here to associate the sanctuary with an inscription, dated to the beginning of the 2nd century B.C., found by Knossos.²² It states that the lyre player Aristodamos, supported by all gods, but especially by the father of gods (Zeus) and Artemis Skopelitis, forbids the devotees of the goddess Syria (among others) to approach the sanctuary. The language of the inscription is considered to be Dorian²³ and the cult of Artemis is prominent in Dorian states such as Lyktos. Would it be too presumptuous to identify the sanctuary on the *Kefala* with the sanctuary devoted to Artemis Skopelitis, mentioned in the above inscription?

N. Platon,²⁴ influenced by the treaty between Knossos and Tylissos, known from another inscription, places the sanctuary of Artemis Skopelitis and that of Zeus mentioned in the inscription from the area of Knossos, in the region between Tylissos and Archanes, west of Knossos. No remains of a sanctuary devoted to Artemis Skopelitis have so far been recognized in this region. If the *Kefala* structure was a sanctuary it could have been associated with Artemis Skopelitis on two grounds: (a) the presence of the small village of Skopela at only 3 km. southwest of the *Kefala* hill and in direct visual contact with it; the name of the village, which is mentioned in all censuses, Venetian and

¹⁷ If we take into account Faraklas' study (1998, 102-103) on the boundaries of the Cretan city-states, the possible sanctuary on the *Kefala* hill was at the heart of the territory of Herakleia, a city, however, that has not been located and therefore it cannot be considered in this paper as related to the *Kefala* sanctuary.

¹⁸ Pausanias I, 18, 5 Κρητες δὲ χώρας τῆς Κνωσσίας ἐν Ἀμνισῶ γενέσθαι νομίζουσι Εὐλείθειαν; see also Chaniotis (1992) on the literary evidence of the close relationship between Knossos and Amnissos during the historical period.

¹⁹ Strabo 10. 4. 4.

²⁰ Stavrakis also states the extensive territory of Lyktos (1890, 86-87).

²¹ De Polynac 1995; Prent 2005, 526.

²² Used as a building stone in a field boundary at Fortetsa, published by N. Platon (1948, 93-108).

²³ Masson 1985, 190.

²⁴ Platon 1948, 93-108.

Ottoman and may have thus survived from antiquity, may be associated with the epithet Skopelitis. It should also be mentioned that the dominant position of the *Kefala* “sanctuary” is eminently suited to the epithet skopela –(high-sited and far-seeing) and hence Skopelitis. (b) the sanctuary of Zeus mentioned together with Artemis Skopelitis in the Knossos inscription, may have been the sanctuary of Zeus Thenatas at Amnissos that lies to the northwest and not far off from the *Kefala* structure.

The connection of Amnissos²⁵ and Chersonissos²⁶ with Artemis is well established from the written sources and it is conceivable that either of the two could have a sanctuary dedicated to Artemis in their territories or in their borders. Could they thus share the sanctuary at *Kefala*? It should be remembered that sanctuaries devoted to Artemis are often (although not always) “border sanctuaries”²⁷ and that the region around the *Kefala* hill is not unfamiliar with cult: the cave of Eilithyia,²⁸ the peak sanctuary at *Megali Koutsoura*, the sanctuary of Zeus Thenatas, the cave of Skoteino²⁹ – they have all been identified as sanctuaries some dating to the Bronze Age and others to the historical period.

We hope that future research might shed more light on the remains at *Kefala* and confirm or reject what we put forward as a hypothesis.

²⁵ Amnissos was a favourite resort of Artemis (Apolonius Rhodius, III, 877), who was accompanied by sixty sea-nymphs and the twenty nymphs of Amnissos. Callimachos (IX, v, 25) also calls Artemis a child of Amnissos: “Ἄρτεμι Κρηταῖον Ἀμνισσοῦ πέδον”.

²⁶ The importance of the cult of Artemis in Dorian states such as Lyktos and Chersonissos has already been stressed above. Further evidence on the cult of Artemis at Chersonissos is given by Strabo (X, 479, 14) who mentions a sanctuary at Chersonissos devoted to Britomartis (“Λύττου δέ, ἧς ἐμνήσθημεν καὶ πρότερον, ἐπίνειόν ἐστιν ἡ λεγομένη Χερρόνησος, ἐν ἧ τὸ τῆς Βριτομάρτεως ἱερόν”). Pausanias (III, 18, 4) also mentions a sanctuary devoted to Artemis (“πραθέντα ἐς Κρήτην δουλεύειν ἔνθα ἦν Ἀρτέμιδος τοῖς Κρησὶν ἱερόν”); could it be the sanctuary at Chersonissos devoted to Britomartis or the possible one on the *Kefala* hill? Britomartis is reported in various sources as an epithet of both Artemis and Diktynna (*e.g.* Diodorus Siculus, 5.76.3: “Britomartis, who is also called Dictynna, the myths relate, was born at Caeno in Crete of Zeus and Carme ... she invented the nets (dictya) which are used in hunting, whence she has been called Dictynna, and she passed her time in the company of Artemis, this being the reason why some men think Dictynna and Artemis are one and the same goddess; and the Cretans have instituted sacrifices and built temples in honour of this goddess”). Further Artemis-Britomartis has always been identified with Chersonissos, which owned her wooden *xoano*. The *Kefala* structure may have lied at the borders, within a zone referred to by the ancient writers as the *Lyttion koinon* (Kallimachos *Hymn to Artemis* 15) and if so it could have been closely associated with the Chersonissos Britomartis sanctuary.

²⁷ Prent 2005, 526.

²⁸ The cave of Eileithyia is mentioned by Homer (*Odyssey* 19.188), Pausanias (I, 18.5) and Strabo (X, 476, 8: “Μίνω δέ φασιν ἐπίνειω χρήσασθαι τῶν Ἀμνισσῶν, ὅπου τὸ τῆς Εἰλειθυίας ἱερόν”). In the Linear B tablets of Knossos and Pylos Artemis and Eileithyia are mentioned as two separate goddesses (Flouda 2010, 38-41). Artemis may have in later periods superseded the Bronze Age goddess Eileithyia, although in some sanctuaries she is called Eileithyia/Artemis.

²⁹ During the periods covered by the pottery at *Kefala*, it seems that the only other sanctuary in the region was that of Zeus Thenatas at Amnissos; interestingly, Zeus is mentioned in the Knossos inscription together with Artemis Skopelitis. Skoteino cave had ceased to function as a cult place (we thank Dr A. Kanta for this information, spring of 2014; for the Skoteino cave see Tyree et al. 2009).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chaniotis, A. 1992. "Amnisos in den schriftlichen Quellen: Die Testimonien", in J. Schäfer (ed.) *Amnisos nach den archäologischen, historischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*, Berlin, 51-127.
- Chatzi-Vallianou, D. and Eythymiou, O. 2000. "Κεραμεική από την Ακρόπολη του Σμαριού", in *Πεπραγμένα Η' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου*, 9-14 Σεπτεμβρίου 1996, τ. Α3, *Προϊστορική και Αρχαία Ελληνική περίοδος*, Ηρακλείο: Εταιρία Κρητικών Ιστορικών Μελετών, 537-556.
- De Polignac, F. 1995. *Cults, Territory and the Origins of the Greek City-State*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, B. L. 2010. *Crete in Transition. Pottery Styles and Island History in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Hesperia Suppl 45, Princeton: ASCA.
- Faraklas, N. 1998. *Οι επικράτειες των αρχαίων πόλεων της Κρήτης*, Rethymno: The University of Crete.
- Flouda, G. 2010. "Η θεά Ειλειθια στις κνωσιακές πινακίδες Γραμμικής Β", in A. Κάντα and K. Δαβάρας (eds), *Ελευθία Χαριστήιον. Το Ιερό σπήλαιο της Ειλειθίας στον Τσούτσουρο*, Ηράκλειο, 38-41.
- Haggis, D.C. et al. 2004, "Excavations at Azoria, 2002", *Hesperia* 73, 339-400.
- Masson, O. 1985. "Cretica, VI-IX, La Stèle des ΕΠΙΛΥΚΟΙ de Knossos", *BCH* 109, 189-200.
- Marinatos, S. 1929. "Ανασκαφαί εν Κρήτη", *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 94-104.
- Marinatos, S. 1930. "Ανασκαφαί εν Κρήτη", *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 94-99.
- Panagiotakis, N. 2003. "L'évolution archéologique de la Pédiada (Crète centrale): premier bilan d'une prospection", *BCH* 127, 327-430.
- Panagiotakis, N. 2004. "Contacts between Knossos and the Pediada Region in Central Crete", in G. Cadogan, E. Hatzaki, A. Vasilakis (eds), *Knossos: Palace, City, State*, Proceedings of the Conference in Heraklion organized by the British School at Athens and the 23rd Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Herakleion, in November 2000, for the Centenary of Sir Arthur Evans's Excavations at Knossos, *British School at Athens Studies* 12, 177-186.
- Panagiotakis, N. Panagiotaki, M., Sarris, A. 2013. "The Earliest Communication System in the Aegean", *Electryone* 2, 12-28.
- Panagiotakis, N., Panagiotaki, M., Dipla A. (in press). "A Possible Greek Sanctuary in the North Part of the Pediada Region in Central Crete", presented at the 11th International Cretological Congress (Rethymno, 21-27 October 2011).
- Platon, N. 1948. "Επιγραφή Ιερού εκ Κνωσού", *Kritika Chronika* 2, 93-108.
- Prent, M. 2005. *Cretan Sanctuaries and Cults. Continuity and Change from Late Minoan IIIc to the Archaic Period*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World vol. 154, Leiden-Boston.
- Rotroff, S.I. 1982. *Hellenistic Pottery. Athenian and Imported Moldmade bowls*. The Athenian Agora vol. 22, Princeton: ASCA.
- Rotroff, S.I. 1997. *Hellenistic Pottery. Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material*. The Athenian Agora vol. 29, Princeton: ASCA.

- Sackett, L.H. et al. 1992. *Knossos, From Greek City to Roman Colony. Excavation at the unexplored Mansion II*, 2 vols. British School at Athens Suppl. 21, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Schäfer J. 1992. *Amnissos nach den archäologischen, historischen und epigraphischen zeugnissen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*, Berlin: Mann.
- Simantoni-Bournia, E. 1984. *Ναξιακοί ανάγλυφοι πίθοι*, Ph.D. Thesis, Athens: University of Athens.
- Simantoni-Bournia, E. 1992. *La céramique grecque à reliefs au Musée de Chios*, Athens: Η εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία.
- Simantoni-Bournia, E. 2004. *La céramique grecque à reliefs. Ateliers insulaires du VIIIe siècle avant J.-C.*, Geneva: Droz.
- Sporn, K. 2002. *Heiligtümer und Kulte auf Kreta in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*, Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte.
- Stavrakis, N. 1890. *Στατιστική του πληθυσμού της Κρήτης μετά διαφόρων Γεωγραφικών, Ιστορικών, Αρχαιολογικών, Εκκλησιαστικών κτλ. Ειδήσεων περί της Νήσου*, Αθήνησι: Παλιγγενεσία.
- Tyree, L., F.W. McCoy, A. Kanta, D. Sphakianakis, A. Stamos, K. Aretaki, and E. Kamilaki. 2009. "2005/2006. Inferences for Use of Skoteino Cave during the Bronze Age and Later Based on a Speleological and Environmental Study at Skoteino Cave, Crete", *Aegean Archaeology* 8, 51-63.

Nikos Panagiotakis
Marina Panagiotaki
Herakleio, Crete



Fig. 1. The Kefala hill from northeast.



Fig. 2. The *Kefala* hill from south.



Fig. 3. The area of modern Gournes from the *Kefala* hill.




Fig. 4. Line drawing of the visible architectural remains on the *Kefala* hill.



Fig. 5. West wall of the platform on the *Kefala* hill.



Fig. 6. The northwest corner of the platform on the *Kefala* hill with modern Gournes in the background.




Fig. 7. Lower wall along the west side of the *Kefala* hill (part of the precinct wall).



Fig. 7a. Detail of fig. 7.



Fig. 7b. Detail of fig. 7.



Fig. 8. The northwest corner of the west wall of the platform.




Fig. 9. Line drawing of rim and body sherd of a pithos.




Fig. 10. Line drawing of a body sherd of a relief vase.