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A BRONZE FIGURINE OF A MAN
FROM THE SANCTUARY AT KOMMOS, CRETE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Description</th>
<th>Bronze Figurine of a man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kommos Inventory Number B306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus: Kommos, southern area, Trench 63A/5:54, Space 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions: height. 8.1 cm. with, 7.2 cm. without tang; width at head. 1.2 cm.; width at shoulders, with arms: 2.6 cm.; width at hips: 1.1 cm.; width at waist: 0.7 cm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation: complete, except for the termination of the left hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation: Cleaned mechanically and stabilized by immersion in 3% alcoholic benzotriazole. Bit attached to right hand with HMG, a cellulose nitrate adhesive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently a bronze figurine of a man was found in the Greek Sanctuary at Kommos, a Minoan and Iron Age site on the west coast of the Messara plain in south central Crete (Fig. 1, Pls. 1-4) (Shaw 1986, pp. 224-225). Unlike most of the other 40-50 human figurines in bronze of Early Iron Age date found so far in Crete, it emerged from a relatively closely datable context. On account of this rare merit and in the hope that a consideration of its use and typological character may help sharpen our understanding of the development of such early figurines, I contribute this short study—a small token of my deep esteem for Professor Nicolas Platon, who has done so much to enhance our knowledge of the cultural history of Crete.

The discovery of the little male figure came as a surprise in 1985, for after seven years of excavation in the southern area of Kommos where the Greek Sanctuary is located, he was a unique find among other votive figurines, which were mostly in clay, rarely in bronze, and which represented only bulls and horses. The only exceptions among the otherwise zoomorphic offerings had been two imported faience figurines, one of the Egyptian lion-headed goddess Sekhmet, the other possibly of
her son Nefertum, found within the 8th-7th century Temple B, the second of the three temples built at Kommos (Shaw 1980, pp. 229-239, pl. 62 d, e) and possibly offered more on account of their exotic than their anthropomorphic nature.

Unfortunately, the newly found bronze human figurine could not demonstrate that the rarity of other human figurines was simply due to chance and that they did have a place in the cult. This was because a few more bronze objects found in the same stratum and area suggested that the little man, fixed with an attachment, a vertical perforated tang under his feet, might have belonged with them and been part of a larger votive object. The figurine may then have been a mere ornament without cultic significance. These objects were two identical handles of a bronze vessel (Kommos Cat. B252 and B312), with small parts of the lip preserved in one case, and two small bronze quadrupeds (Kommos Cat. B308 and B309), one a bull with tenons projecting under its feet (Pl. 3, where the man, the bull and one of the handles are illustrated).

Before trying to decide whether the little man was related to any of these items, as an attachment to the vessel or part of a sculptural group including the animals, it is necessary to know more about him in terms of his stratigraphic context, his date and comparable material from other Cretan sites.

The figurine was in a rather substantial dump south east of the temple (Pls. 1, Space 26 and Pl. 2, at point X) which contained other votives: the bronze items noted above, fragments of terracotta figurines of horses and bulls, both large and hollow and small and solid; and extensive pottery ranging in date from Protogeometric to Late Protogeometric B. In addition, the dump yielded typical finds for this period: fragments of blue faience bowls, occasional pieces of iron and lead and numerous sherds of Phoenician amphorae. The latter were found even under the floor of Temple A, the first temple built at Kommos, apparently in the late 10th-early 9th century, during the period of the Protogeometric ceramic style. Temple A, which concerns us most here, had two phases of use, represented by two successive floors. Afterwards, Temple B was built directly over Temple A, probably in the late 9th, or possibly the early 8th century B.C.².

Fragments of both pottery and terracotta figurines from the above dump were found to join with sherds on the upper of the two floors of Temple A and with other fragments from dumps of the same date just northeast of the temple (Pl. 1, Space 17)³. It is reasonable to suppose that both these dumps represent a major cleaning operation, probably just prior to the construction of Temple B⁴. Incidentally, both dumps served to raise the level in the areas north and south of the temple, which,
because of the particular configuration of the pre-existing and still partially visible Minoan remains, were markedly lower than the areas west and east of it. The dump in which the figurine itself was found had been deposited just north of a Greek retaining wall, probably the earliest such wall connected with the sanctuary. The votive deposit did not continue south of this wall which was built of Minoan blocks taken from a nearby Late Minoan III building (P) constructed in the 14th century B.C. The figurine itself lay only ca. 0.55 m. (at level c. +3.94 m.) above a Late Minoan III floor and some 0.20 m. above a stratum of sand which had accumulated here, as in other low areas at the site after the Minoan abandonment. Pottery over the sand was exclusively Protogeometric. Just a little higher than the stratum of the figurine was a rough surface of use (at level ca. +4.12 m.) also with Protogeometric B pottery directly above it. Thus the figurine was bracketed by Protogeometric and Late Protogeometric/Protogeometric B strata. Consequently, it could not be later than very early in the 8th c. and, in the light of the dating already suggested for the construction of Temple B, it could be earlier.

It is worth speculating where the figurine may have been set initially, and whether this was within the temple or outdoors. As for the latter possibility, we should note that before the 8th century B.C., when an altar was built just outside Temple B, there does not seem to have been an outdoor structure which could have served as a repository for votive offerings. Nor is there any indication that such a structure might have been removed during later levelling operations. On the contrary, the sequence of Protogeometric to Archaic strata is intact in the areas used during that early period in the immediate vicinity of the temple; and these have been extensively excavated. Thus, as far as we know, the small, early temple was the only focus of ritual activities in the area. This arrangement is quite different from that of other sanctuaries in Crete, such as the Minoan - Early Protogeometric one in the Piazza dei Sacelli at Haghia Triadha (Banti 1941-43) and the Middle Minoan - later Greek Sanctuary at Kato Symi. At the latter, and during the Greek period, a primarily hypaethral worship centred around an altar set in a large open area, with dedications placed in radiating fashion east and south of it (Lembessi 1972-77, 1981a and 1981b).

It is possible that some offerings were placed outdoors at Kommos as well. Nevertheless, definite evidence for the placement of offerings, including figurines, was found within the cella of both Temples A and B. In the latter temple the two, already mentioned, faience figurines, were set along with a small bronze horse in the interstices of the little tripillar structure described above. Nearby, but not in situ, a small bronze bull and fragments of terracotta animal figurines were found. Some of these may have been placed on top of a bench built in the interior along the
north wall, but of which only a small section could be excavated on the east. Though no complete figurines were found within Temple A, which was also provided with a north bench, there were fragments of some in terracotta, missed during the periodic cleaning of the floors. Among these fragments, of which some were found to join others discovered in dumps, were parts of a large, hollow-made bull with painted patterns. This interesting type is known from other, mostly hypaethral, sanctuaries of Crete, and it goes back to Late Minoan III B times, if not earlier. This bull, of which some fragments were found in the same context as the little bronze man, was clearly set initially within the temple, as probably was the human figurine itself.

Two recent studies are most valuable in the search for comparable Cretan bronze figurines for human subjects. Of these, the earlier one by Ute Naumann (1976) deals with the transition between Sub-Minoan and Protogeometric, while the other by Colette Verlinden (1984) covers the much longer chronological range of the Minoan to the Early Iron Age and also includes several, recently discovered examples from Symi. To varying degrees both studies deal with matters of form, style, distribution and use and provide extensive illustrations, to which I will refer when discussing parallels; for convenience, numbers preceded by V will be those in Verlinden’s catalogue, those by S and P (for Subminoan and Protogeometric) in Naumann’s. The majority of the figurines were found in sacred caves, such as Psychro, Patsos, Tsoutsouros and Phaneromeni. With a rare exception, their original positioning is not certainly known. This is partly due to the fact that many were removed illicitly, but it is also possible that there was no customary way of displaying votives in a cave. Other figurines were found in sanctuaries, apparently hypaethral, as at Hagia Triadha and at Kato Symi, where the practice of offering such figurines began in the Minoan period. Thirdly, they came from roofed shrines, as at Kavousi and possibly Vrokastro—simple rooms with a bench, which are thought to reflect the architectural form of the Late Minoan, so-called, «Bench Sanctuaries». In these shrines, figurines and other votives are either known or reasonably suspected to have been placed on the bench, as in Minoan times. Temples A and B at Kommos, probably belong to this last category, at least in their provision with benches, and are the earliest examples known.

As to the form, style and possible use of Early Iron Age bronze human figurines, in particular those of Protogeometric and Early Geometric date, we must note that they form a distinct group. They depict mostly naked women and men, though in some cases sex is either ambiguously or not at all indicated—a strange condition, for both male and some times
female genitals and prominent breasts are occasionally rendered in some
detail. Dress, which is rare, and could even possibly imply that the
particular figurines were imported from outside Crete, tends to be long
and of a generalized type, but hats, caps and helmets provide variation.
So does an assortment of arm gestures, the most common being one
where the arms are brought forward, bent at the elbows and curved over
the chest\textsuperscript{13}. The legs are either close together, or spread apart, mostly
sideways, the feet only rarely attached to a base, and more rarely still
provided with a tenon or a tang for attachment somewhere. The figurines
are, in fact, simple creations, their ultimate appearance and style greatly
dependent, except for the head which is usually ovoid, on rod shaped
units which articulate body, arms and legs. This is a strange conception,
when one bears in mind that the figurines are generally believed to have
been cast, rather than made up of separately joined parts\textsuperscript{14}. However, the
variations in gesture and stance, at times an intentional asymmetry of the
parts, and a slight deviation from strict frontality often impart to them a
sense of animation and spontaneity.

The male figurine from Kommos (Fig. 1, Pls. 3 and 4) conforms with
this general type but, like every other example, it is a unique creation.
Rather smaller than most, it is built around a rod about 1.1 cm. in
diameter, pressed and broadened in the lower part to form the hips and
the typically short 'legs', which are here separated simply by a wide,
vertical groove. The rudimentary feet broaden out to form a base, with a
vertical, perforated tang extending under it, pierced by a hole from front
to back. The head and the arms are distinct parts. The former, turned
slightly to the right, was attached obliquely to the long neck, which is
simply an extension of the cylindrical body. The arms are in the most
usual pose for such figurines, but are arranged in an asymmetrical
fashion, with the left one a little higher and extended a little further away
from the body (Cf. V203, V218, V220, V223). There is no indication of
the hands, the right one represented by the tapered end of the arm, the
left one by a thickened end, possibly suggesting a closed fist and
resembling some other examples (Cf. V203). The face is oval with a heavy
jaw, the mouth a small impressed line, the prominent nose a continuation
of the oblique line of the low forehead. Eyes and genitals were added
separately; ears were omitted.

The two profiles (Pl. 4 a, c and Fig. 1) present interesting alternatives
to the front view. This is particularly true of the left one which is the only
one adorned with a wavy hair strand running down the length of the neck
below an otherwise bald head. Body, neck and head form a continuous
vertical line, but the lower part of the rod has been bent to allow an
articulation of the buttocks and the joints of the legs. Finally, both arms
are at least partially visible and the view also makes more explicit the
ithyphallic state – not an uncommon feature in this class of bronze figurines (Cf. V219). It should finally be noted that front and profile views here, as in several other figurines, are not coordinated. Thus the head looks straight in a front view, but it tilts upwards in profile and the legs do not appear bent in the front view (Cf. V213).

There are more specific analogies in details with other figurines: two, from Patsos and Kavousi, show a similar shape of the head and the face (Cf. V208, V213); three, from Phaneromeni, Kavousi and a private collection, indicate the hair (cf. V212, V213, V223); four, one now in Berlin, the others from Phaneromeni, Patsos, and one of unknown derivation, display the same position of the arms (cf. V202, V217, V220, V223); several others show the same short, bent legs, as does the one from Kavousi (V213). The ithyphallic state is matched by a figure from Patsos (V208) and several figures, often described as warriors, from the recent excavations at Symi, of which some have so far received only preliminarily publication. (V219) At least in the comparison of parts, if not of the overall appearance, the closest parallels are with the male figure from the cave at Patsos and the female one from the shrine at Kavousi (Pls. 5 and 6). Both have been dated stylistically by Verlinden and Naumann to the Protogeometric period and this accords well with the date determined stratigraphically for the Kommos figurine.

Concerning the dating of this entire class of figurines, however, an important question has been raised recently by Colin Renfrew in his discussion of nude male figurines in terracotta, found in the 2nd phase of the West Shrine of the Sanctuary at Phylakopi on Melos, which ends in the Late Helladic III C period (Renfrew pp. 7, 82). Puzzled by their similarity of posture, gesture, nudity and the explicit indication of sex to Cretan bronze figurines, and in particular to some from the Late Minoan III C and later Sanctuary at Hagia Triada, he wonders why the ones at Phylakopi should be of the Bronze Age, while those in Crete have never been assigned a date earlier than Protogeometric. Since most of the latter have been dated only on stylistic grounds and since they are generally believed to continue a local, Minoan tradition, they do not have to be as late. Further in his argument: if the Phylakopi figures evolved under Near Eastern influences, since a Syrian group provides the closest, though not, necessarily, the direct antecedents, why should there not have been other similar figurines of oriental inspiration in the Aegean, and especially in Crete, at this date? A reasonable solution, he feels, would be for some Cretan figurines, and he specifies some from Hagia Triadha, to be dated to the Late Minoan III C period.

Central to the discussion, I believe, is the issue of when complete male nudity was introduced, for it is foreign to the mode of representation in
the Minoan period, although, some of the Theran frescoes show that at least painted representations of nude men were acceptable in this Cycladic island in the Late Bronze I period. Here the Kommos figurine with its dependable date provides an important piece of evidence. The figurines from Hagia Triadha, to which Renfrew wished to give earlier dates, are clearly close typologically and stylistically to the one from Kommos: at least one may even be later. Naturally, there is the remote chance that the Kommos figurine was a Minoan heirloom. If so, it almost certainly did not derive from Kommos itself, for, during the Late Minoan period, remains in the south area, where it was found, suggest a commercial rather than a religious function. Indeed, the only signs of religious activity at Kommos come from the settlement to the north, where a Late Minoan III B household shrine was found (Shaw 1977, pp. 227-231), but, to my knowledge, no bronze figurines of the type discussed here have been found in such shrines. Finally, there is the fact that Kommos went out of use before the end of the 13th century and there is only a handful of sherds of Late Minoan III B2/Late Minoan III C date and one likely Sub-Minoan vase—hardly enough to suggest a continuous use from Minoan to Greek times.

Perhaps the answer to Renfrew’s question will be provided by the rich series of figurines found in the recent excavations in the Sanctuary at Kato Symi. According to the excavator, the sanctuary was used without interruption from the Bronze Age to later Greek times (Lembessi 1981b). A number of clay figurines show affinities with the bronzes which are the object of our discussion. Painted patterns on some of these figurines may parallel those on vases and prove a useful additional criterion for dating both clay and bronze examples. It is interesting to note that two of these clay figurines at Symi, dated by the excavator to the Protogeometric and Geometric periods on the basis of painted patterns and appearance, display the same odd convention as that noted for the Phylakopi male, terracotta figures; they seem to be naked, when patterns painted on them show them to be dressed. In contrast to its Cretan counterparts the sanctuary at Phylakopi has almost no nude female figurines, a fact which may reflect some difference in the nature of the cult, whereas in Crete nude female figures abound among the bronze examples. They have been found in connection with roofed shrines, such as that at Kavousi, and possibly Vrokastro, and also in open-air sanctuaries, as at Hagia Triadha and Kato Symi (V213, V214, V215, V216); and yet complete female nudity was as foreign to Minoan representation as male nudity. On the contrary, the nude female bronze figurines from Crete conform more nearly to the artistic norms of the Early Iron Age, both in Crete and elsewhere in Greece, a development which anticipates the Orientalizing period. Both the male and the nude female figurines from Crete are part
of the same phenomenon and they look forward to the Greek period rather than back to the Minoan past.

We now turn to the questions raised at the beginning of the article: to what was the figurine attached, fitted as it is with a tang? Was it connected with the other bronze items found in the vicinity, especially the vessel?

Judging from the bits of the lip preserved, the vessel was open and rather small, with two handles attached horizontally with rivets and rising slightly above the lip. The shape and position of the handles suggest that it may have been a small cauldron. Normally, such vessels are not adorned with plastic attachments, except when they are an integral part of the so-called tripod-cauldrons, where legs and bowl are one. The tripod-cauldron is provided with large ring handles set vertically on the rim and often adorned with figurines of men and horses. But this type appears to be no earlier than the late 8th century B.C. in Crete, and at that period no human attachments have yet been found among the Cretan examples. The only relevant vessels to have had such attachments on the rim are those described as kalathoi or lekanai, known from ceramic examples of Late Bronze III C date and from funerary contexts, from cemeteries at Perati, Ialysos, Crete and most recently in Palestine in a 12th-11th century B.C. cemetery at Tell Aitun. These figurines are always female and are set upright around the rim, with their hands raised to their heads as a sign of mourning. Clearly, these are of a different order from the Kommos male figurine and the shape of the related vessels a distinct one—to mention nothing of the different contexts.

One final and remote possibility is that the figurine may have been part of the decoration of a cauldron stand to support a vessel, if ever there was a cauldron stand at Kommos. The pertinent type in terms of general date and of decoration is a four-legged, four-sided stand, often with elaborate, figurative, openwork decoration. This type originates in Cyprus in the Late Bronze period and later examples appear in Crete in the Idaean Cave, at Khaniale Teke, and at Kato Symi. Another example comes from Delphi. All the above have been dated to the 8th century B.C. In the case of Symi, where more than one has been found, the excavator made a distinction between two types: the Cypriot and the Idaean Cave types. It is to the latter that a small, ithyphallic, bronze figurine from Symi belongs as part of a metopal composition which also included animals. The figurine, the excavator points out, is closest stylistically to some figurines from Haghia Triadha and Vrokastro, which have recently been dated Protogeometric (Lembessi 1981a, p. 394, pl. 259 b).

This still tentative date for the Symi figurine, nevertheless, brings up the possibility that in Crete the practice of using bronze human figures in
open-work decoration may have started earlier than the time of the well-known example from the Idaean cave with boats, animals and men (Rolley, note 26 below). Even then, however, the figure from Kommos is unlikely to belong to a comparable scene. The human and animal figurines in these stands are attached by welding, not with tangs and pegs and they usually have several points of contact with other figures and with the frame, one of the four sides of the stand, within which the scenes were set. Finally, figurines in such scenes were meant to be viewed from a specific vantage point and were not conceived as sculpture in the round. Visually, they relate more to relief.

It seems reasonable then that the figurine from Kommos was attached to a simple base, probably of wood, similar to the small plinths which support some terracotta examples where, however, figurine and base are one piece (Lembessi 1977, pl. 216 g, pl. 217 b). It could thus be viewed frontally or from a three-quarter angle. Since the little bull (Pl. 3) found nearby is the only one from the site to have been provided with a means of attachment, although with tenons rather than a tang, it is tempting to see the two as being connected, forming, perhaps, an informal group: the worshipper and his sacrificial animal.

The ithyphallic state of the Kommos figurine may have some connection with initiation rites, by analogy to what has been suggested by Lembessi for some other figurines from Symi (1981b, p. 13). The state also, surely, symbolized strength and fecundity, and, perhaps, a form of prayer for both. Introduction into adulthood would be an appropriate time for such an appeal to the gods and the Kommos figure may have been offered on such an occasion. The rich votive finds from the Sanctuary at Symi provide extensive evidence, in the form of cut-out bronze plaques with representational reliefs, that youths offered sacrificial animals, probably during the period of their initiation (Lembessi 1985, pp. 236-237). These plaques, which date mostly to the 7th and 6th centuries B.C., show such practice to belong more to later developments in Cretan cult and to a male oriented society, and away from what — we get a strong impression — are different social habits and a different religion in the Minoan period.
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NOTES

1. I would like to thank the following people who were involved with the recording and preservation of the figurine. Debi K. Harlan, for the preliminary cataloguing, Joseph Clarke for the drawings; Winn Burke for the photographs and Cap Sease for the cleaning and conservation. The trench in which the figurine was found was excavated in 1985 by Professor Eric Csapo to whom I am indebted for his careful reading and editing of this text. Thanks also go to Professor Joseph W. Shaw for his similar help and to Dr. Angeliki Lembessi for her opinion on the matter of the tang of the figurine in question.


3. This conclusion emerged from Callaghan’s meticulous search for correlations between pottery on the successive floors of the temples and in dumps and strews outdoors. I am indebted to him for identifying and putting aside fragments of terracotta figurines which were not distinguishable from pottery sherds during excavation and which he found in the process of his study of the pottery.

4. This has already been suggested for the dump which was found in Space 17, once a long used east-west Minoan road which was still visible in the early days of the Greek Sanctuary (Shaw 1984, p. 282).

5. See note 4 above. Aspects of the topography of the Early Sanctuary as they are inferred from the patterns of distribution of votive figurines were discussed by me in «The Votive Figurines at the Sanctuary of Kommos,» a paper given at the 6th International Cretological Congress, Chania, August 26, 1986.

6. This retaining wall has just been excavated (summer of 1986) and is still incompletely studied. It was built either during the second phase of Temple A and prior to the deposition of the dump, or in connection with the initial construction of Temple B and contemporary, therefore, with the deposition of the dump.

7. See Shaw 1982, p. 187 and fig. 8 for a plan of Temple B where the north bench has been
indicated along with a hypothetical one along the south wall. For further discussion of the north bench see note 12 below.

8. For a recent discussion of these animals, especially the bulls, and a recapitulation of earlier literature on the issue of origins, see Elizabeth French, in Renfrew, p. 278 ff.

9. Verlinden, p. 163, refers to a description by Hogarth, the excavator of the cave of Psychro, of a bronze dedicatory figurine having been placed in the interstices of some large rocks placed at the entrance of the cave. This bears a resemblance, possibly coincidental, with the placement of the faience figurines and the little bronze horse within the interstices of the tripillar shrine in Temple B at Kommos. In particular the horse was so forced between the pillars that its legs bent (Shaw 1980, p. 229-237 and pl. 64).

10. At both these sites there were Minoan buildings used as shrines. In the case of Kato Symi, Lemessi thinks that there was extensive hypaethral worship in the Minoan period as well (Lemessi, 1981 b).

11. At Kavousi fragments of human, clay figures were found on a bench and, though later than Protogeometric, the period with which we are more strictly concerned, their placement may have continued an older tradition. For example, a very early female bronze figurine found at Kavousi may have been displayed in this way in earlier days. Unfortunately, its findspot is not known since it was found prior to the excavation during the installation of a drain which ruined much of the little shrine (Alexiou, pp. 9 and 17 and pl. A, 1). At Vrokastro cult objects, including clay animal and human figures, surely belonged to a shrine and may have been connected with a benched room in the upper settlement (Gesell, pp. 58 and 59). However, these objects were found scattered in several rooms, some near the space with the bench, others further away, but still connected by joining fragments of the figurines themselves (Hall, pp. 101, 108-109, 111). The only possibly Protogeometric bronze figurine was found elsewhere at the site (Hall, p. 121, fig. 71), but may well have been connected with the shrine. The suggestion by the excavator that bronze was worked locally, on the basis of bronze chips and filings at the site (Hall p. 115), may even suggest that it was made there. The observation that its casting is imperfect (Verlinden, p. 164) raises the possibility that it may have been discarded, hence its distance from the other cult objects. At Kato Symi extensive landscaping and the possible construction of terraces, disturbed earlier remains extending back to Minoan times, but it is, nevertheless, clear that worship was mostly carried out outdoors and involved burnt offerings even in the Bronze Age (Lemessi 1981b, p. 13). It is important, however, to remember that at least one of the rooms (Room 1) of the Middle Minoan III B - Late Minoan sanctuary had been remodelled in Protogeometric times with the addition of a bench (0.20 m. high), on top of which were found shells, remnants of offerings. Many other offerings, including a bronze figurine of a nude woman (V206), were found scattered in the very space with the bench. The strong possibility that the bench served for the placement of votives, including figurines, shows that we are dealing with a specially defined space, even if it was unroofed, as the excavator suggests (Lemessi, 1976, pp. 402-403 and 1981 b, pp. 12, 19 and Fold Out Plan B). Also in the Late Minoan III C period two rooms of another Minoan building, these roofed, had been re-used for cult (Lemessi 1981b, p. 14). Thus roofed areas were used in the sanctuary at Symi for most of its history, whatever the extent of their role.

12. Information on the appearance of most of the Early Iron Age shrines is summarized by Gesell (pp. 57-60), who also provides information on the heights of the benches. These heights vary, the one at Kato Symi being 0.20 m., the one at Kavousi c. 0.30 m. and that in Temple A at Prinias, which dates to the 7th century, 0.23 m. The height of the bench of Temple A is so low (0.14 m.) that it is likely that its top course is now missing and was removed during the construction of Temple B. The bench of Temple B is c. 0.30-0.35 m. high, and thus closest to that at Kavousi.
13. For a discussion of gestures see Verlinden, p. 267. Figurines 202, 203, 205, 209, 217-220 and 223 in that book show gestures which are similar to that of the Kommos figure.

14. Alexiou (p. 11) suggests that a model in wood was used in the casting of the figurine from Kavousi, but the use of clay or wax seem to me a more likely material. They could be rolled easily in the typical cylindrical shapes which form the figurines. The simplicity of these forms would have facilitated the casting process, for I cannot believe that a more integrated, naturalistic rendition would not have been tried out, had it not been for technical difficulties. Contemporary clay figurines are certainly not as cylindrical.

15. For male naked and/or ithyphallic figurines in clay and bronze from Symi see: Lembessi 1972, pl. 188 b, d; 1973, pl. 188 b; 1975, pl. 260 b; 1976, pl. 222 g; 1977, pl. 216 g and p. 412, fig. 1; 1981, pl. 256 e and p. 389, fig. 5, a.

16. For Renfrew's discussion of the affinities between the Phylakopi and the Cretan figurine and his suggestion for an earlier dating of the latter see Renfrew, pp. 406—407, 423-424, 440-441.

17. S. Marinatos, Thera, VI, Athens, 1984, pls. 6 and 7.

18. Renfrew refers to four figurines from Hagia Triada, published by Naumann, which could be of earlier date than she suggests. her P7, P20, P2, and S28. Of these P20 and P2 were thought by Verlinden to be Geometric and P7 Daedalic. (See Verlinden, figurines 241, 220 and 217). Votive figurines of clay and bronze from Hagia Triada are presently being restudied by Anna L. D'Agata.


20. The Late Minoan III C pottery has been identified by L. V. Watrous. Nicolas Coldstream has identified a Subminoan vessel found under the first floor of Temple A (Shaw 1981, p. 244, n. 102 and pl. 61 b).


22. As for instance the 8th century ivory figurine of a nude woman wearing a polos from a tomb in Athens (Coldstream, p. 131, fig. 42 b-d).

23. The vessel can best be compared with a small cauldron found in a tomb at Fortetsa and thought to belong with a rod tripod of 10th c. B.C. date (J.K. Brock, Fortetsa, Cambridge, 1957, pp. 21, 22 and pls. 13 and 138).

24. For an extensive and recent discussion of tripod cauldrons, see C. Rolley; and for their chronology in particular p. 105 ff. For examples in Crete see Coldstream, p. 283.


26. Coldstream, pp. 283-284 ; Rolley, pp. 119-125, for a discussion of the examples from the Idaean cave and from Delphi.

27. Eric Csapo in reading my article has made the valid comment that it is possible that the figure is not, in fact, designed to represent an ithyphallic worshipper, but that the genitals are prominent simply to show that the figure is male. I believe that his comment applies more to several other male figurines which have, indeed, been described as ithyphallic rather loosely.
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A BRONZE FIGURINE OF A MAN

FROM THE SANCTUARY AT KOMMOS, CRETE
1. Partial Plan of Southern Area, Kommos (drawing by G. Bianco)

2. Findspot of the Bronze Figurine. View of Area from Northwest (photograph by J.W. Shaw)
3. Bronze Handle and Bronze Figurines from Kommos (photograph by Winn Burke)

4. Three Views of the Bronze Figurine from Kommos (photograph by Winn Burke)