

## ARTEMIS ORTHIA AND CHRONOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

THE British School's work in the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta was in its day generally hailed as a classic example of carefully observed stratigraphic excavation in Greece. Equally general has been the reluctance of scholars to accept the dates which were proposed by the excavators for their finds on the basis of their observations on stratigraphy and pottery contexts. In this the excavators were at fault in their choice of absolute dates for the main periods; and, equally, critics have been at fault in failing to adjust their dating. Kunze pointed out the major inconsistencies and the results of accepting some of the excavators' dates in his review of *Artemis Orthia* (published in 1929 by the Hellenic Society) in *Gnomon* ix (1933) 1–14. In their answer to another review the excavators gave an excellent account of their method and of the use and abuse of stratigraphy (*JHS* l (1930) 329–36). By reconsidering the absolute dates they proposed I think it is possible to recover much of the value of the observations they made about the stratigraphy and the relative chronology of the finds, and to make some new suggestions about the history of the site and dating of some Laconian objects.

The main feature in the stratigraphy of the sanctuary was a blanket of sand which covered the whole area, and which, according to the excavators, sealed deposits earlier than about 600 B.C. Beneath the sand there was a succession of deposits down to virgin soil, which clearly represented a gradual, although by no means even, accumulation of earth and discarded votives. The only significant physical difference in levels which could be observed was offered by the presence of a pebble pavement which was associated with remains of the earliest altar on the site. This pavement, preserved only in small patches, was embedded in the main 'Geometric' level, as it was defined by the excavators. This contained much burnt material. The pavement was assigned to the ninth century.<sup>2</sup>

This sort of gradual accumulation of earth and objects is most difficult to interpret without the presence of clearly defined new floors or pits. The main deposits seem to have been disposed in batches. Fortunately the dating of the objects was not made wholly dependent on their depth, but on the sort of pottery found with them, and finds are described as being 'with Geometric pottery' or 'with Laconian I', &c. These were direct and valuable observations which cannot lightly be ignored. The main pottery divisions observed by the excavators below the sand were 'Geometric', 'Laconian I', and 'Laconian II'. 'Protocorinthian'<sup>3</sup> pottery was seen to occur with both 'Geometric' and Laconian I, so the beginning of Laconian I was set at 700, although it was admitted that 'Geometric' might persist to 675. The thickness of the upper deposit (assigned 100 years) compared with the thickness of the 'Geometric' one led to the belief that the deposits began in the ninth century. This principle of dating by the assumption of a regular rate of deposit is quite unrealistic, and especially so on a site such as this which offered not a sequence of ruined houses and debris from continuous occupation, but more or less haphazard sweepings. It is safer to discount here arguments based on the absolute depth of any object, or even deposit, and to follow rather the indications given of pottery contexts. Apart from the groups mentioned there was a 'Subgeometric' one distinguished by style

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Professors R. M. Cook and C. M. Robertson for reading drafts of this article and for their comments upon it.

<sup>2</sup> The stratigraphy is described in *AO* ch. i. In the earlier reports in *BSA* separate strata were observed: an 'Archaic', an 'Intermediate' (with 'Protocorinthian', 'Archaic', and

'Geometric'), and the 'Geometric', but it was admitted that there were no sharp dividing lines. The 'Intermediate' strata were the richest; their pottery is later described as 'Geometric, Protocorinthian and Laconian I'.

<sup>3</sup> I use inverted commas for the excavators' terms which we have yet properly to define in current terminology.

alone. The transition from Laconian I to Laconian II was put at 635. The excavators' scheme, then, was:

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 'Geometric'   | 9th. cent.-675 |
| ('Protocorinthian' with both 'Geometric'<br>and Laconian I; 'Subgeometric') |                |
| Laconian I  | 700-635        |
| Laconian II   | 635-600        |
| ----- the sand -----  |                |

In reconsidering the dates of the main pottery groups it may be easier to begin with the latest. Laconian II is an orientalizing figure-style with outline-drawn animals of a rather crude type and some black-figure. If the sand rather than the style be taken to define the end of Laconian II, some of the latest pieces must be the black-figure *lakaina* figured in *AO* pls. 7 and 8 and the cup *AO* 82, fig. 55. On style alone these could hardly now be put earlier than about 580, as Lane pointed out in his study of Laconian pottery (*BSA* xxxiv (1933-4) 129 f.). Lane distinguishes Laconian II and III by style, and this way the vases are clearly of his later group. They certainly have much in common with the earliest of the black-figure kylixes, especially in their subsidiary ornament. But there is in fact a Laconian III kylix from beneath the sand, which has generally been overlooked. It is *AO* pls. 9-10; its find place is described in *BSA* xiv (1907-8) 22 ff.; cf. *AO* 85, 88, where Droop is honestly uneasy. It is from a deposit below the sand north of the temple where the latest objects were found (bone dolls, &c.; cf. *AO* 15, where the region is briefly mentioned). It has been associated with the work of the Arkesilas Painter<sup>4</sup> and will hardly be earlier than 570.

Lane (op. cit. 122, 129) put the end of Laconian II (as a style) at 590 and is followed by Cook (*Greek Painted Pottery* 95). This is certainly a move in the right direction, but possibly not far enough. He cites Laconian II vases with Middle Corinthian at Taranto (ibid. 122, 186). These have now been published by Miss Pelagatti<sup>5</sup> and show that even 580 might be too early for the end of Laconian II. It seems from the evidence of Sparta that the end of Laconian II (again as a style) comes appreciably before the depositing of the sand; and that the sand may have arrived as late as 570-560.

The transition between Laconian I and II is not marked stratigraphically but is a fairly clear point in the development of the decoration and shapes of the vases. Laconian II could hardly have had a very long life, and Lane's date for its beginning, 630, might again be a little early. The excavators put the transition at 635, at least for the Orthia site. At the Menelaion a more generous deposit of Laconian II was excavated, but it does nothing to confirm or upset the dating. It included some terracottas which are no later than the very beginning of the sixth century by conventional dating.<sup>6</sup> An upper date of c. 620 for Laconian II will not be too early.

Laconian I was given a life of sixty-five years, from 700 to 635. The year 700 still exercises a fascination over scholars as the point at which orientalizing schools of vase-painting should begin. As the starting date for Laconian I it has been accepted by Lane and Cook despite the general down-dating of the yardstick—Protocorinthian.<sup>7</sup> The style represents a real break from the 'Geometric' but is not ambitious. The range of shapes is limited and develops very little. The range of decoration too is very limited. Commonest are squat rays and rows of squares

<sup>4</sup> *BSA* xlix (1954) 302, no. 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ann.* xxxiii-xxxiv (1955-6) 11 ff., esp. 18.

<sup>6</sup> For the Menelaion excavation see *BSA* xv (1908-9) 108 ff.

<sup>7</sup> The starting date for East Greek orientalizing (the Wild Goat style) has similarly had to be lowered from about 700 to at least the middle of the century.

between dots. The latter remind one most of the dividing bands on East Greek vases of the later seventh century. Stripes of colour appear quite often. So far as the patterns go it seems to represent a plainer Laconian ware which appears still in the sixth century.<sup>8</sup> The duration of Laconian I before the advent of a canonic figure-style (Laconian II) is not readily determined, but it is hard to credit that it could be as long as sixty-five years, or even as much as fifty. The shapes—notably the cups with high offset lips—match nothing Greek of the first half of the seventh century and there seems no particular reason for believing that the style began much before the middle of the century.

If this is correct it means that the excavators' 'Geometric' may come as late as 650. If one looks at it this is easily believed. The multiple brush patterns, zigzags, and jejune meander and key patterns are quite close to the patterns which appear in East Greece at least as late as 650. This later 'Geometric' of *AO* is Lane's 'Transitional' (op. cit. 107–15). The upper date for the main series of 'Geometric' pottery from the sanctuary is not easily fixed, but there is hardly anything which looks earlier than the eighth century.<sup>9</sup>

The excavators' date for the start of Laconian I was in part suggested by the presence of 'Protocorinthian' with both 'Geometric' and Laconian I.<sup>10</sup> One fragment ('almost on virgin soil': *AO* 63, fig. 37*a*), with 'Geometric' pottery, is of the end of the eighth century.<sup>11</sup> There are a few other Protocorinthian vases which are as early (*AO* 114). A skyphos of the early seventh century (*AO* 109, fig. 84*c*, 114) was found with 'Geometric' only, and the same type with 'Geometric', 'Subgeometric', and Laconian I mixed; conical oenochae (as *AO* 109, fig. 84*a*, 114), some of which are certainly of the first half of the seventh century, with 'Geometric' alone (one on the pebble pavement), and with 'Subgeometric' but not with Laconian I; and late eighth-century aryballoi (as *AO* 109, fig. 84*b*, 114) with 'Geometric' alone. Cylindrical pyxides with straight sides, known through all the Protocorinthian periods, were found with 'Geometric' and 'Subgeometric'. One (*AO* 110, fig. 85*a*) found with 'Geometric', 'Subgeometric', and some Laconian I looks early-seventh-century (cf. *NC* 342; Benson, *Geschichte* 120, no. 466); and 'from a similar stratum' is a piriform aryballos (*AO* 98, fig. 70*f*), LPC or Transitional. The ring vase with a plastic head (*AO* 98, fig. 70*g*, 115; with 'Subgeometric' and Laconian I) is no earlier than Early Corinthian. So little 'Protocorinthian' was found with Laconian I that a date for the start of Laconian I c. 650 will accord with the evidence of excavation better than the excavators' 700 B.C.

There remains the 'Subgeometric'. This includes a variety of styles and the excavators' use of the term cannot therefore easily be given even approximate dates. However, a few pieces so described are in an outline style (as *AO* 68, fig. 41) which can now be seen to owe something to the vase-painting of mid-seventh-century Argos, Athens, or the islands. Much may be contemporary with Laconian I, and may represent a period of experiment before the figure-style of Laconian II was established. The existence of such non-Corinthianizing figure-styles in the Peloponnese is better understood now with the recent finds in the Argolid.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> As at Taranto, *Boll. d'Arte* xlvii (1961) 267.

<sup>9</sup> Thus Miss Benton (*JHS* lxx (1950) 17 f.), but she also draws attention (p. 22) to a few fragments of Protogeometric type said to be from the site (Desborough, *Protogeometric Pottery* 289, pl. 38). See below, n. 24.

<sup>10</sup> *AO* 70, 114–30: 6 per cent. of the 'Protocorinthian' with 'Geometric' alone; 14.2 per cent. with 'Geometric and Subgeometric'; 37.3 per cent. with 'Geometric, Subgeometric, and Laconian I'; 9.7 per cent. with 'Subgeometric' and Laconian I; 8.2 per cent. with Laconian I only and scraps of Laconian II.

<sup>11</sup> This was observed by Miss Benton, op. cit. Lane (op.

cit. 112, pl. 25*e*) has this as a Laconian imitation.

<sup>12</sup> The Polyphemos fragment and another (*BCH* lxxix (1955) 1 ff., figs. 1–4, 16), the Argive Heraeum stand (ibid., figs. 9, 15; *BSA* xxxv (1934–5) pl. 52). When black-figure is adopted it is in the Attic manner: *BSA* xlviii (1953) 56 f., fig. 30. A sherd from Mycenae (*Archaeologia* lxxxii. 33, fig. 17*d*) shows the developed outline style beside the new black-figure. It is no longer fashionable to see Argive influence in the Fusco craters from Syracuse (*BCH* lx (1936) pls. 10–14, except 11*a*, Corinthian, according to R. M. Cook; Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery* 147; Villard-Vallet, *Mél.* lxxviii (1956) 23), but their connexion with such pieces as *BCH* lxxxv

The excavators' terms for pottery should, then, I suggest, be understood to refer to styles which the following approximate (or conventional) dates may be assigned:<sup>13</sup>

|                              |               |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| 'Geometric'                  | 8th cent.–650 |
| Laconian I                   | 650–620       |
| Laconian II (to the sand)    | 620–570/560   |
| (Laconian II as a style      | 620–580)      |
| ----- the sand 570/560 ----- |               |

It remains only to test this dating against the recorded pottery contexts of other finds, and to see how far the new dates for these finds better accords with what we might otherwise expect of them. The pottery contexts cited here have been gleaned from *AO* and checked, where possible, with the *BSA* reports.

### *Ivory and Bone*

'Geometric' alone: fibula plaques with *potnia theron* (*AO* pls. 91; 92. 1, 2; 93. 1, 2) and sphinx (*AO* pl. 93. 3). These have the most primitive of the carved figures, with large noses and small crowns to the head. There are no frontal 'Dedalic' heads, and a date around or before 650 seems most reasonable. The plaques with *prothesis* scenes (*AO* pl. 102. 2, 3) were with 'late Geometric' and show a more advanced style, but the curly beards of the dead men and immense eyes put them before the main series of Spartan figured plaques. The Heracles and Hydra plaque (*AO* pl. 103. 1) is much later in style. It was found with 'Geometric', but since 'in the stratum below one sherd of Protocorinthian was found' (*AO* 211) the pottery context may have been a disturbed one. The Dedalic head, *AO* pl. 121. 1, would be dated about 655–645 on Jenkins's chronology for such pieces (cf. *Dedolica* pl. 4). Some of the seated figures, *AO* pls. 122 below, 123. 3, belong here and correspond roughly with the figures on the fibula plaques; but the pair, pl. 125. 1, have more Dedalic heads. Some spectacle fibulae were found with 'Geometric' alone (*AO* pls. 132. 4; 133c), one of them on the pebble pavement; so too the bird-fibulae (*AO* pl. 134), a few of the rosette pin-heads (*AO* pl. 136. 1), one of the four-sided seals, as *AO* pls. 139–40, and a few of the circular seals, as pls. 141–7 (not specified which). Several of the couchant animals were found with 'Geometric', three of them even below the pebble pavement. The two ivory objects, *AO* pl. 167 B, called kohl-neededles by Dawkins (probably stili; see *Perachora* ii. 445 f.), were from the 'Geometric' deposit; one below the pavement. The superb ivory head, *AO* pl. 167. 1, invites comparison with the 'Subgeometric' sherd, *AO* 68, fig. 41a, or Middle Protoattic vases. Minor objects include a square plaque, *AO* pl. 167. 2 (? from a fibula), and various seals (*AO* pl. 168), of which a three-sided one (*ibid.* no. 3) has elaborate figure decoration rather like the fibula-plaques.

'Protocorinthian': a vague classification, but a few objects are singled out as found with 'Protocorinthian' vases: the combs with a winged horse (*AO* pl. 126. 3), with the Judgement of Paris, sphinxes and victim (pl. 127); a great many of the four-sided seals, disk seals, and couchant animals. The Prometheus plaque and another (*AO* pl. 100) were with 'Geometric and Protocorinthian'; the former does not follow the usual (later) convention for the scene, that is, with a seated hero. Our next category spans the same period.

'Geometric, Protocorinthian, and Laconian I': most of the ivories fall in this group. The fibula plaque with a horseman, *AO* pl. 92. 3, has been compared by Kunze with mid-century

(1961) 676, fig. 4 from Argos (very close to the Fusco crater, pl. 12b), *Argive Heraeum* ii, pl. 56. 8–10, and *Perachora* ii, pl. 44. 4001 seems to me undeniable.

<sup>13</sup> These depend on the accepted dating of Corinthian

pottery. For this I follow Payne, although it seems likely that a slight down-dating of Transitional and Early Corinthian may prove justified.

Attic.<sup>14</sup> There are the large figured plaques, *AO* pls. 94–96; 101; 102. 1; 104, on which the figures are better proportioned than on the ‘Geometric’ plaques, the human heads are Dedalic, and the maned lions (as pl. 96. 3) recall the Chigi vase at earliest, as do the small cavaliers with long-legged horses (pl. 104). Wings have given up the earlier cross-divisions and resemble more those on LPC or later vases. The gorgon head (pl. 102. 1; on a winged leonine body) has the Corinthian lion-mask, only adopted for the creature in the mid-century.<sup>15</sup> Two of the bone dolls, as *AO* pl. 117, belong here; so do the protome disks with developed Dedalic heads (*AO* pl. 121. 3–7), many of the seated figures (*AO* pl. 122 below, 123. 5—a fine specimen, 125. 2—a pair), the combs (*AO* pl. 126. 1, 2) and many spectacle fibulae (*AO* pl. 132). The majority of the four-sided and disk seals (*AO* pls. 139–46) are also of this group. The animals on them resemble those on LPC vases, the lions are maned, but the gorgon heads are uncanonic (pls. 141. 3; 145. 2). The couchant animals, *AO* pls. 148–60, are of the same date, with similar creatures: the lions having squarish heads, but cross-hatched manes; and the other figures, being larger, are also better cut and more readily comparable with the plaques and combs of this group. Other minor objects (*AO* pls. 169–72. 1) are in a similar style, and include a fine Dedalic kouros (pl. 170. 5) and animals.

Laconian I: these objects are, as we should expect, closely matched in the last category, but offer nothing like the ‘Geometric’ ivories. There are plaques (*AO* pls. 97–99; 105; 106;<sup>16</sup> 116. 1), four seated figures (as *AO* pl. 122 below), combs (*AO* pls. 128–9), including one with a superb pointed-nose lion with a cross-hatched mane before a volute (very like *AO* pl. 96. 3 of the last group). Many of the seals have already been discussed. There is a fine griffin head (*AO* pl. 172. 6) and scraps (*AO* pl. 173. 1–3).

Laconian I–II, or Laconian II: a number of pieces have a context described as Laconian I–II. Best are the plaques, *AO* pls. 103. 2; 107. *AO* pls. 108–11 are from the ‘latest strata below the sand’. These include several pieces which are far more advanced in style and technique than any so far listed; notably the warrior (pl. 108) and the ship (pls. 109–10). Only the lions (pl. 111) hint at a style earlier than anything we might readily associate with the decades around 600 B.C.<sup>16</sup> Several of the minor trinkets belong here too (*AO* pls. 135; 136; 161). With Laconian II only are the crude seated figure (*AO* pl. 123. 4), the fine Late Dedalic head (*AO* pl. 173. 5), and the gorgon plaque (*AO* pl. 173. 6). It should be noted that none of the couchant animal seals with intagli appeared after ‘Protocorinthian’.

If the revised dates proposed above for the pottery styles are applied to these categories we find no serious incongruities. It might even be thought that the dates are still too high. The Dedalic forms apparent on some ‘Geometric’ pieces could suggest an even later date for the start of Laconian I, or, more likely, that the excavators’ use of the term ‘Geometric’ was even looser than we have suspected. The main series of figured ivories need not now be thought to begin much before the mid-seventh century. Earlier are only some nondescript figure pieces and copies of the geometric bronze spectacle fibulae. For figured Peloponnesian ivories of the first half of the seventh century we have to look to Perachora and the Argive Heraeum.<sup>18</sup>

### Bronzes

The indications of pottery contexts for the bronzes (*AO* ch. vii) are fairly simple. The pins with a disk head and a large number of small mouldings are with ‘Geometric’ (*AO* pl. 75);

<sup>14</sup> Kunze, *Kretische Bronzereliefs* 254 n. 23.

<sup>15</sup> Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder* 65, dates it in the late seventh century.

<sup>16</sup> Pl. 106. 1—from two plaques, cf. Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours* 86. Kunze, *Schildbänder* 136,

dates this to the early sixth century, but Perseus’ head recalls the Nessos Painter.

<sup>17</sup> Kunze, *op. cit.* 56, dates it in the second half of the seventh century.

<sup>18</sup> See *Perachora* ii, pt. 2 for a valuable study of these ivories.



those with two large bulbs beneath the disk head are with Laconian I–II (*AO* pl. 86). The distinction is that which Jacobsthal draws between his Geometric and Orientalizing pins. The dating contexts he gives (*Greek Pins* 30–33) for the Orientalizing pins—except for Sparta, where he cites the excavators' dates—do not bring them earlier than the mid-seventh century. Of the animal figurines—mainly birds and horses on openwork stands (*AO* pls. 76–79)—few were in the lowest 'Geometric' strata, most were with 'Protocorinthian' and some even with Laconian I. Miss Benton would put most of these at the end of the eighth century (*JHS* lxx (1950) 21 f.) but we should admit the possibility that they come well into the seventh century also. Of the fibulae the spectacles (*AO* pls. 81–82) were the earliest; and most of the other varieties were with 'Geometric to Laconian I'. They include the usual geometric types with a square catch plate, and others with long thin catch plates, which are matched in East Greece in the first half of the seventh century.<sup>19</sup> The fine fibulae with couchant lions (as *AO* pls. 87 f, 88 m) were with Laconian II (and Laconian I?), as were two with a Dedalic head and a lion's head together (*AO* pls. 87 a, 88 k). Finally there are plaques with Dedalic heads (*AO* pl. 89 f, g, k, l), which Jenkins might date to the third quarter of the seventh century, with 'Subgeometric' and Laconian I.

### *Terracottas*

Jenkins made a detailed study of Spartan terracottas in *BSA* xxxiii and in *Dedalica*, dating them closely—probably too closely—by stylistic criteria. He found it impossible to accept the excavators' chronology for the finds at Sparta. To take first the few pieces that can be immediately identified or matched in *AO* we have *AO* pl. 38. 1–4, with 'Geometric', dated by Jenkins c. 655 (*BSA* xxxiii. 71); *AO* 68, fig. 41 c, on a 'Subgeometric' vase, dated 640–630 (*BSA* xxxiii. 74, fig. 1); *AO* pl. 30. 7, with 'Geometric to Laconian I', dated 670–655 (*BSA* xxxiii, pl. 8. 7); *AO* pl. 29. 1, a type of which a few were with 'Geometric', most with Laconian I, dated 655–630 (cf. *Dedalica* pl. 3. 5); *AO* pl. 29. 7, as the last, dated 645–640 (cf. *Dedalica* pl. 5. 4–5); *BSA* xiv (1907–8) 59, fig. 4 e, with 'Geometric and Protocorinthian', dated 630–620 (*Dedalica* pl. 7. 1). In general most of the figures with Dedalic heads which Jenkins would date in the middle and third quarter of the seventh century are with 'Geometric' and Laconian I. The seated figures, as *AO* pl. 34, begin with 'Geometric' and 'Protocorinthian'. Plaque fragments with long-legged horses (*AO* pl. 39. 1), a man (pl. 39. 2), and a griffin (pl. 39. 3) were with 'Geometric'. The horses and griffin look mid-century. A later plaque with a sphinx (*AO* pl. 39. 5) is with Laconian I and looks like the creatures in Cretan plaques and pithoi of the third quarter of the century. Actually in the sand were the very advanced bust, *AO* pl. 35. 2, and the three-figure plaque, *AO* 160, fig. 114. We hear (*AO* 160) of female-bust vases with 'Geometric' and Laconian I. In East Greece these begin just before the end of the century; and possibly earlier at Corinth (*JC* 179). The fragments of a disk akroterion from beneath the sand have been studied by Dinsmoor and Searls (*AJA* xlix (1945) 72 f.), who, by following Lane's revised dating, are able to draw satisfactory comparisons with the akroterion from the Heraeum at Olympia. Again we find a general correspondence between the revised dates and the dates proposed on other grounds. For the grotesque masks, very few of which were found below the sand, we may note that the series may not in fact begin before 600.

### *Lead*

The small lead figurines were carefully classified by Wace in *AO* ch. ix. Very few were classed as Lead O, being found with 'Protocorinthian'. The rest, Lead I, II, &c., were with Laconian I, II, &c., pottery. Their style gives little away, but in general the figures correspond fairly closely

<sup>19</sup> The Emporio (Chios) excavations have given a good stratified sequence.

with those on the ivories from the same deposits. The only figure pieces in Lead O (with 'Protocorinthian') are the sphinxes (AO pl. 179. 1-2), but Wace thought that other types found in later contexts (not necessarily later if 'Protocorinthian' is found with Laconian I) might go with them. The most important result of the suggested redating is that none of the figure pieces need be much earlier than the mid-seventh century—including the 'hoplites'<sup>20</sup> and other warriors.

### *Other objects*

The scaraboid seals, AO 380, fig. 144*a-c*, are of a class studied by Miss Porada<sup>21</sup> and dated by her around and just before 700 B.C.<sup>22</sup> They were well down in the Geometric deposit. Two Near Eastern glass seals (AO pl. 206. 15, 16) were with 'Geometric' and of one Hall remarked (AO 381) its probable seventh-century date. A silver leech fibula (AO pl. 204. A1) was in a late 'Geometric' deposit. A pair of silver-gilt pins (AO pl. 202. 1) were with 'Protocorinthian'. These are of the type which, in bronze, begins with Laconian I (see above). The imported faience scarabs (AO 379 f., figs. 143, 144*d*) were mainly with 'Geometric', few with Laconian I; and the faience vases (AO pls. 207; 206. 14) were with 'Geometric, Protocorinthian, and Laconian I'. The last, which may be from a Rhodian factory, have been studied by von Bissing,<sup>23</sup> who dates them to the seventh century and generally late in it. Amber and three-cornered glass beads were mainly with 'Geometric'. On the apparent seventh-century date of these see Dunbabin in *Perachora* ii 521. Iron spits were only with 'Protocorinthian' and Laconian I.

In virtually every case which can be tested the revised chronology for the main periods seems to be vindicated. Indeed, there are one or two indications that it might still be too high, but our dates are largely conventional, based on the dating of Corinthian pottery. I suspect too that Laconian II vase-fragments which happened to have no figure decoration were classified as Laconian I by the excavators. The main categories are still, admittedly, very broad, but if the major pieces for which we can find a date by other means can be seen to fall into place in the revised chronology for the site, it may now be possible with more confidence to speak of the chronology of the many other objects at Sparta which reveal little or nothing of their date from their style. For the history of the site it may be remarked that its earliest structure, the pavement and altar, need be no earlier than about 700.<sup>24</sup> And for the history of Sparta itself the down-dating of most of the ivories, which can now be seen as representative of only the latest and poorest of the Peloponnesian series, should make us think again about Sparta's position *vis-à-vis* the east and the development of Greek orientalizing art. At all events, I hope to have shown that it would be improper to ignore completely the evidence of pottery contexts in such an important and prolific site, when it has been so conscientiously recorded.

JOHN BOARDMAN

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* 179 f. on their significance.

<sup>21</sup> In *The Aegean and the Near East* (Studies presented to Hetty Goldman) 185 ff.

<sup>22</sup> Fresh evidence for these seals from Ischia (still unpublished) confirms this date.

<sup>23</sup> *Zeit und Herkunft* 55 ff., with pls. 5-6, chronology on pp. 72 ff.

<sup>24</sup> In *Bonner Jahrbücher* 158 (1958) 170 ff. Kirsten discusses

the early structures. He had identified pottery of 'Proto-geometric' Amyklaion type (see above, n. 9) in Sparta Museum, from below the cobble pavement. He believes it typical of the finds below the pavement, and that this, and the Early Temple which soon followed it, belong with the earliest of the 'Geometric' deposit, no later than c. 750. But the ivories below the pavement (see above) go with the rest of the 'Geometric' deposit, whatever we may think of the date of the earliest pottery.