

Bryn Mawr College

## Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

---

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty  
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

---

7-1-2004

### Review of *Gla and the Kopais in the 13th Century B.C.*, by Spyros E. Iakovides

James C. Wright  
Bryn Mawr College, [jwright@brynmawr.edu](mailto:jwright@brynmawr.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)



Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

---

#### Citation

Wright, James C. 2004. Review of *Gla and the Kopais in the 13th Century B.C.*, by Spyros E. Iakovides. *American Journal of Archaeology* 108:457-459.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.  
[https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/34](https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/34)

For more information, please contact [repository@brynmawr.edu](mailto:repository@brynmawr.edu).

know her work this will not come as a surprise: Michailidou has long set her own style of analysis and interpretation (see, e.g., her “Το δωμάτιο με τον κίονα στο Μινωϊκό σπίτι,” in *ΑΜΗΤΟΣ, τμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μ. Ανδρόνικο* [Thessaloniki 1987] 509–25). Her meticulous examination of all the data is followed by a unique, almost mathematical, presentation of her thoughts in the form of possible alternative interpretations, with special emphasis to all problems encountered. Each argument is carefully subjected to critical analysis, and the result is often not one but a sum of interconnected conclusions. It is as if the reader is invited to participate in a “round table” where several Michailidou “clones” put forth their views, to be summed up at the end in a just and well-argued manner. It is the transparency of her thinking that makes her work so special and valuable. Methodology, therefore, is just as important as the data presented in this book, as is suggested in the title by the emphasis on “the study” of the upper stories.

This methodology is built step by step, starting with the most difficult task of untangling the information deriving from the excavation process in such a way as to make the safest possible assessments regarding the upper stories—if they existed. These assessments refer both to the architecture and the movable finds. The method used is based on five criteria presented in the Introduction:

1. the preservation of parts of the upper stories;
2. the presence of staircases;
3. indications of upper stories provided by architectural details in the ground floor;
4. the discovery of building materials fallen from the upper story; and
5. the location of movable finds belonging to the upper stories.

After the data have been fully analyzed according to the above criteria and the finds have been attributed to their original place before the destruction of the house (ground floor or upper floor) there follows a synthesis with the aim to understand the spatial organization of the upper stories. This process is presented in four parts. Part 1 consists of an exhaustive analysis of the West House, the best known and more adequately excavated building at Akrotiri to date. The House of the Ladies serves as a second case study (part 2), in order to cross-check the viability of the conclusions arrived at in the previous case, whereas part 3 is an overview of some of the other buildings of the town along the same line of thought. Part 4 presents an overall synthesis discussed below.

Of the five criteria mentioned above, the fourth and fifth are directly related to the process of excavation, which is closely linked to the process of a building's destruction process, since the archaeological debris at Akrotiri has not been disturbed since the prehistoric eruption, by later occupation or by any other means. The collapse of an edifice, however, is a complex phenomenon and difficult to understand, even by modern standards of analysis. There are many imponderable factors at play: the terrain, the method of and weaknesses in construction, initial structural mistakes or accumulated previous damage, the kind of forces exercised on the building depending on the cause(s) of the destruction and the chain of events that was triggered—to name but a

few. Understanding these aspects requires a deep knowledge of structural design and possibly the aid of other disciplines like civil engineering. In the case of Akrotiri, it is even more difficult to assess the destruction process, because seismic events were accompanied by other events related to the eruption of the volcano, such as pumice flow and base surge activity. Michailidou is aware of these difficulties and tries to avoid overinterpretation, yet they remain basic to her study. She points out, for instance, the flaws in such simplistic observations as “the pottery on the floor of the ground floor belongs to that storey and the pottery in the fill belongs to the upper storey”—this is not necessarily true. Her study reveals similar several misconceptions and pitfalls in interpreting the archaeological data.

Part 4 is a synopsis both of the methodology used in order to identify the provenance of each find and the functional analysis of the upper stories. Syntax of space and spatial organization are discussed at length. Though the discussion focuses on the upper floors it unavoidably extends (though somewhat loosely) to the ground floor as well. Michailidou is also interested in issues of meaning in architecture; her always cautious approach refers frequently to the work of theoreticians of architecture.

This book, written in Greek, has a substantial English summary (459–70) followed by a list of figures with extensive captions in English (471–86). The illustrations are not of the best quality (the photographs are dark [Akrotiri is notorious for its bad lighting] and the drawings are rather sketchy, as the author herself points out), but nevertheless they have been well selected to help the reader through the text.

A book related to Akrotiri is a most welcome event in itself, for the publication of the work of scholars who have been working at Akrotiri more than 25 years now is long overdue. Michailidou's book is the quintessence of a long period of copious work and thorough knowledge of the site. It offers an insight to the site itself, but also a model of systematic analysis and evaluation of the excavation material, especially useful to Aegean Bronze Age scholars dealing with a typically multistory architecture.

CLAIRY PALYVOU

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE  
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING  
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI  
540 06 THESSALONIKI  
GREECE  
KPALY@TEE.GR

GLA AND THE KOPAIS IN THE 13TH CENTURY B.C.,  
by *Spyros E. Iakovides*. (Library of the Archaeological Society of Athens 221.) Pp. xv + 172, figs. 93, b&w pls. 187, color pls. 19, maps 2. The Archaeological Society at Athens, Athens 2001. ISSN 1105-7785; ISBN 960-8145-30-9 (paper).

In this study of the Mycenaean citadel of Gla the Archaeological Society of Athens provides both the scholarly and English-reading public a handsome, richly illustrated, and useful synopsis of one of its many important

excavations. S. Iakovides has drawn together and expanded upon the English summaries in the two final reports on the excavations at Gla (*H ανασκαφή 1955–1961* [Athens 1989], which reported on the excavations by J. Threpsiades, and *H ανασκαφή 1981–1991* [Athens 1998] which covered the work carried out by Iakovides). This volume follows closely the presentation and interpretation of material in these two volumes, although naturally some details and illustrations have been pruned, and it also draws on the author's preliminary reports and specialized studies. A brief consideration of Gla's context in the Kopaic basin concludes the volume.

In his customarily thorough manner, Iakovides begins with a history of the site and of work conducted there by various researchers during the 19th century, with particular attention to the survey by F. Noack and excavations of A. de Ridder in 1893. Study of the finds and examination of the notebooks left by Threpsiades provide the bulk of the description of the architecture of the site, and these are supplemented and refined by the results of the systematic excavations undertaken by Iakovides. The book is in three parts: a description and interpretation of the remains, a commentary on the finds and construction, and a consideration of Gla in the Kopaic basin. The writing is straightforward and the presentation orderly; each section is accompanied by an abundance of good photographs and plans (one of which, pl. 27.56 is reversed, and another, pl. 48.98 is mislabeled or misidentified [Room H5 or H3?]). Here and there the descriptive presentation is supplemented by reference and comparison to other literature on Gla and on Mycenaean architecture, pottery, and other finds, and the book is accompanied by a useful bibliography on Gla and the Kopais (to which I add the guidebook, *Κωπαΐδα, μια περιήγηση στο χώρο και το χρόνο* by M. Gripari, C. Koilakou, E. Kountouri, N. Melios, and A. Papadopoulos [Athens 1999]).

Part 1 presents the architecture of the fortifications and architectural remains within them. There is much detailed information, including the locations of fluted half-columns discovered by de Ridder, the burnt areas of the main building (dubbed *melathron* after Homer; cf. P. Darcque, "Pour l'abandon du terme 'mégaron'" in *L'Habitat égéen préhistorique*, edited by P. Darcque and R. Treuil [Athens and Paris 1990] 21–31), the locations of cover tiles, and details of construction. Although disturbed by previous excavation the stratigraphy is straightforward, showing primarily a single phase of use. Iakovides was careful to identify these disturbed areas, but there remain curious and somewhat conflicting interpretations, especially regarding the drains and floor levels of buildings A and H. Obviously if the drains in H lead out of the building, they must also in A (46). It does not make sense that the drain walls were higher in the floor in rooms H2 and H5 (53, 64), when in H3 the floors covered the drains (58); inspection of the discussion in *Γλάς 2* does not provide any more information to clarify these matters.

The analysis of the function of the buildings is insightful; Iakovides argues for a common organization for the mirrored complexes in the south enclosure. Thus buildings B and K were built for large-scale storage and were accompanied by the workrooms or residential quarters of E, Z, and N, while M he thinks was for food preparation. Notably the author shows how the construction

of B and K follows similar principles of defining compartments and then inserting walls (see plans 18 and 29). He curiously ignores (in this publication and in *Γλάς 1* and 2) the same organizing principles of construction for the two wings of the main building, examined in my analysis of it (*AM* 95 [1980] 68–74, figs. 6–8). The consistency of this method of planning and construction is striking, and, in my opinion, it should be considered as also applying to the construction of the fortification walls, where offsets indicate how the walls were built in units (cf. Iakovides' discussion of this matter and of Noack's idea that the offsets in the fortification wall went all the way through its core [12], and, further, K. Kilian, *BCH* suppl. 19 [1990] 95–113, and M. Küpper, *Mykenische Architektur* [Rahden 1996] 32–3). Last, the relationship between the buildings of the southern enclosure and the two-wings of the melathron bears further examination, for buildings E and M correspond as formally planned "megaron"-type units respectively to the westernmost suite 1–3 of the upper wing and the southernmost suite 23–24 of the lower wing of the melathron. Also the formal organization of building Z with offset rooms off a corridor follows the same planning principles as the interior suites of both wings of the melathron. Iakovides points out that these suites are organized to have restricted access through the corridors leading to them, and I have shown that this organization is conceived through the way in which doors open in a purposeful directional movement (*AJA* 89 [1985] 254, ill. 4). Relevant here is the discussion in part two of the location of bronze door shoes. The correspondence from foundations up through the interior corridors and stairways, organized to promote specific patterns of circulation, certainly bespeaks careful planning and coordination between architect, engineer, and contractors.

For us to discover what was going on at Gla is also to gain deeper insight into the character of Mycenaean administrative, economic, and political organization. Iakovides argues with good reason that the large buildings A, B, H, and K were concerned with storage, since much grain was recovered from them, yet he also hints that this is a problem because H4, for example, is decorated with frescoes. The issue is highlighted by examining his reports of pottery frequencies (part two). Kylikes, for instance, constitute 86% of the assemblage from Building K. Does this number represent only fragmentary and worn pieces or does it also include whole or substantial portions? As he indicates in his evaluation of buildings N and M (where frescoes and even the only sealstone from Gla were found), they seem to have had special functions as workshops, living areas, and places for food preparation. H, K, and M contained the greatest variety of vessels, especially those for cooking, serving, and consuming food. M, for example, held the most cooking pottery. Three restorable transport stirrup jars from H1 and H4 deserve notice; one perhaps bears a painted Linear B sign. Comparison with the palace at Pylos would perhaps be in order here, but it would be necessary for the pottery to be quantified in tables.

Part two considers pottery, metal, stone objects, miscellanea, foodstuffs, construction, and decoration (frescoes). The report on pottery identifies the sherd material that dates the construction of the buildings to the beginning

of LH IIIB and their destruction to an advanced phase of LH IIIB. Roof tiles were discovered in association with these buildings, and Iakovides reviews the argument he has presented elsewhere for Mycenaean roofs (*BCH* suppl. 19 [1990] 147–60); notwithstanding their widespread existence, the question remains how they were deployed, since it may still be argued that not enough material has been found at Gla, or elsewhere, to argue for entire roofs being covered. Again, a quantification and distributional analysis is needed to assess better this problem. There is a brief report on the frescoes accompanied by color photographs, and, as with other categories of evidence, their distribution is restricted to the eastern buildings H, Z, K, N, and M.

In part three the author considers the fortified settlement in terms of the Kopaïs basin, the ring of smaller settlements in the hills above the basin and the Mycenaean drainage works that made the rich land available for agriculture. He implies that the bipartite organization of the main upper building can be understood as housing one authority who controlled the entire basin and another who was responsible for the agricultural produce stored in the lower complex. Iakovides believes that Gla was an administrative satellite of Orchomenos and cites Strabo's authority on this point. He briefly and critically reviews the evidence from Orchomenos. He concludes with a survey of the engineering work conducted in the Kopaïs, including recent study of the archaeologically known system of dikes, which Iakovides argues, correctly I believe, must be associated with the LH IIIB fortress of Gla.

This is a useful and thorough compendium of the information about Gla and Kopaïs. We are indebted to Professor Iakovides for his meticulous reconstruction of the remains and careful presentation of the evidence collected at Gla over more than a century of research. Through his work this magnificent Mycenaean ruin is no longer an enigma but understood as fundamental to the management of the agricultural economy of the ancient Mycenaean state of Orchomenos.

JAMES WRIGHT

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND NEAR EASTERN  
ARCHAEOLOGY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE  
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010-2899  
JWRIGHT@BRYNMAWR.EDU

**MYSTERIES OF THE SNAKE GODDESS: ART, DESIRE,  
AND THE FORGING OF HISTORY**, by *Kenneth Lapatin*.  
Pp. 274, figs. 113, map 1. Houghton Mifflin, Boston 2002. \$24. ISBN 0-618-144757 (cloth).

Like a good detective novel, *Mysteries* opens with a retired policeman motoring down to Oxford with an incriminating letter in his pocket. "What is 'the Lady'?" he asks at the Ashmolean Museum—and so begins this riveting account of the forging of Minoan history. While ostensibly exposing the skullduggery surrounding the Boston Goddess (MFA 14.863)—an ivory and gold statuette once considered "the most refined and precious object to have survived the ruin of Minoan civilization"—the

author reveals how our notions of Minoan art and religion rely on the products of early 20th-century craftsmen; and almost as much, as he amply demonstrates, on the products of early 20th-century forgers: the Boston Goddess is only the first in a series of sham chryselephantine and stone statues depicting the Mother Goddess, usually in the guise of a snake goddess, and her consort, the so-called Boy-God. It is not a pretty story, a web of trickery, deceit, and conduct unbecoming a gentleman.

The first and arguably the best of the forgeries, the Boston Snake Goddess was smuggled out of Crete in 1914 by Richard Seager and Bert Hodge Hill, director of the American School at Athens, 1906–1926. The fact that the statuette is a forgery is hardly an extenuating circumstance: both men believed it was genuine. Ethical considerations aside, Lapatin presents documentary (rather than anecdotal) evidence that the master forger was indeed Evans's trusted artist-restorer, Emile Gilliéron père, later joined by Gilliéron fils. With a team of Cretan artisans, the Gilliérons fabricated at least 10 chryselephantine and 6 stone statuettes, as well as an unknown number of other modern "Minoan antiquities."

At the same time, Lapatin unravels a greater mystery: how were so many experts fooled by the Boston Goddess and her ilk (e.g., the Snake Goddess in the Walters Art Gallery, the Fitzwilliam Goddess, "Our Lady of the Sports" in the Royal Ontario Museum, and the two fake Boy-Gods that Arthur Evans himself bought). Using much the same evidence as would have been available in 1914, Lapatin demolishes the case for the Goddesses' authenticity on stylistic grounds. For example, he points to the fatal fact (180) that, although part of the left side of the Boston Goddess's face has sheared away, "the present features—eyes, nose, and mouth—are centered on what remains. This should not be the case: if the piece was damaged after carving, the surviving features should be off center." It is not that some scholars did not wonder. Already in 1915, Professor Ernest Gardner wrote that "the style of the figure, both in face and hands, is extraordinary. . . . The head, in particular, is quite unlike anything known to us in early Aegean or in classical art; it recalls rather the sculptures of Gothic cathedrals of the thirteenth century . . . but that it looks more modern" (27–8). Yet he and others accepted the forgery because they could not imagine how anyone could have made such an imitation between Evans's early discoveries in the first decade of the century and the surfacing of the goddess in Boston in 1914. Besides, as Seager wrote to Evans, "[I] personally don't see why any one should doubt her as she bears all the characteristics one would expect of a Minoan work of the first class. . . . If one hadn't got your ivories [the acrobats from the Ivory Deposit] to judge by she would seem almost too good to be true" (153–4).

Evans excavated the gold and ivory acrobats in 1902, and the Temple Repository faïences, including the famous "Snake Goddesses," in 1903. Gilliéron père had had the wit to combine the materials of the one with the subject and pose of the other. Late 19th-century intellectuals (thanks to Bachofen, Frazer, and others) expected to find a "Divine Mother" in primitive cultures; the Gilliérons obliged. When other Mother Goddess statuettes and her boy-consort came to light in the 1920s and