drawings, transcriptions, transnumerations, and tabular transcriptions (for a few archival clay inscriptions) (60–63). Finding any particular inscription in *CHIC* or all inscriptions from a single site involves clever use of the concordances on pages 33–57. This slight inconvenience is a necessary evil imposed by the heterogeneity of the inscriptions.

The most serious problem about CH remains the relationship between the signs and the "texts" carved on seals and those on archival clay documents. Signs appearing on the latter are all clearly part of a phonetic/logographic textual syntax. Whether some of the symbols carved on seals should be excluded from the standard signary and considered "decorative" or "filler" motifs is far from certain, and has been the focus of considerable discussion (cf. T.G. Palaima ed., *Aegean Seals, Sealings and Administration* [*Aegeaum* 5, Liège 1990] 11–23). In *CHIC*, the editors classify certain symbols on seals as decorative motifs and exclude them from transcription (63) and from the table of sign forms (385–447) and the index of signs and sign groups (319–84). Syllabograms or logograms that the editors consider decorative motifs are presented in hieroglyphic font transcription in brackets { }. I will call these category-1 signs. Other "decorative motifs" that are not part of the *CHIC* CH signary are indicated as {!} in the hieroglyphic font transcription and also excluded from the table and index. I will call these category-2 signs. This system will create difficulties for linguistic and structural analyses of the texts that rely purely on the indices. One will have to locate anew all occurrences of these excluded "signs" in order to form an opinion as to whether any of them should be added to the repertory of true CH signs. Here are a few examples.

A "cat's head" symbol appears on Cretan "hieroglyphic" seals. Later, sign AB 80 is clearly a cat's head on Linear A inscriptions like PH 7a.3, AR Zf 1, and IO Za 2d.1. It develops into a nonrepresentational form on Linear A inscriptions from Hagia Triada and Khania, and later is even more abstracted and linearized as a Linear B phonogram with the value *ma*. In his signary Evans (*SM* I, 209) included this symbol as Hieroglyphic sign no. 74, and a full-bodied representation of a cat as sign no. 75. Evans's sign no. 74 occurs framing text #123 from Knossos as a running circular border motif, and it is repeated four times on one face of the four-sided prism #283. Do these have any "meaning"? On texts #196, #247, and #287, no. 74 occurs in sequence with *CHIC* syllabograms. On text #257, Evans's no. 75 also occurs this way. None of these occurrences is indexed. Even more difficult to accept is how the transcription and indexing of sign *CHIC* 070 is treated on the same seal, #268. It occurs on all three faces. On faces α and β where it occurs with two other signs, it is considered category-1 and not indexed. On face γ, where it occurs with one other sign, it is considered an instance of *CHIC* 070 – i.e., a real syllabogram. The criterion applied is that on the first two faces the sign occurs in each case with signs that elsewhere in the corpus form two-sign "word-units," but on face γ it is, as it were, needed to make a two-sign "word-unit." This is exceedingly arbitrary. If we were trying to figure out the Roman alphabet as used to render the still unknown language English, would we be justified in applying the same principle to the following three "word-units": TIN, NOT, AT? That is, would it be prudent to transcribe them as {T}IN, NO{T}, and AT and then index the sign T as only occurring in the sequence AT, because elsewhere in our corpus the two-sign words IN and NO occur? Other more trifling inconsistencies exist. On #188, #192, and #217, a symbol similar to LB 75 is omitted from hieroglyphic transcription. On #240, *CHIC* 001 is considered a decorative motif, and not transcribed or indexed (320), yet it occurs in the table of sign forms on page 386 (cf. #217, face α). On #154 what looks like a clear third sign is left out of account. On #166 this possible correlate for AB 50 is omitted. These are the kinds of minor faults I can find with *CHIC*. Look at it in awe.

THOMAS G. PALAIMA

PROGRAM IN AEGEAN SCRIPTS AND PREHISTORY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712-1181
PASPTGP@UTXVMS.CC.UTEXAS.EDU

LATE MINOAN III POTTERY: CHRONOLOGY AND TERMINOLOGY, edited by *Erik Hallager* and *Birgitta P. Hallager*. (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 1.) Pp. 420, figs. 371, shape charts 10. Danish Institute at Athens/Aarhus University Press, Aarhus 1997. $40. ISSN 1397-1433; ISBN 87-7288-731-1.

In the earlier 1960s, the study of mainland Greek and Cretan pottery dating from the period of Mycenaean cultural hegemony in the Aegean stood at a crossroads. Arne Furumark's massive synthesis of Mycenaean ceramics had been published, to mixed reviews, two decades earlier in 1941. Due to the general hiatus in fieldwork caused by World War II, his elaborate classification of both shapes and painted decoration had yet to be adopted for the publication of any major Late Bronze Age site. On the mainland, Carl Blegen published the first volume of his findings at Pylos in 1966 and classified the Mycenaean pottery he had found there in the same kind of idiosyncratic fashion that he had employed on several previous occasions at sites such as Korakou, Zygouries, and the Argive Heraion. Although he inserted cross-references to Furumark here and there, Blegen made no significant effort to take advantage of the standardized terminological system that the Swede's comprehensive survey of Mycenaean pottery had made possible. On Crete, Mervyn Popham likewise paid scant attention to Furumark in pioneering the serious study of Minoan ceramics produced after the collapse of Neopalatial civilization in the 15th century B.C.

It was the signal achievement of Elizabeth French to have successfully adapted Furumark's system to the publication of often very fragmentary settlement pottery. In a series of groundbreaking articles published in *BSA* between 1964 and 1969, French combined Furumark's morphological and decorative typologies with a novel form of quantitative approach to ceramic analysis. On the basis of a suite of settlement deposits from both inside and outside the citadel at Mycenae, she established definitions for the various phases and subphases of Mycenaean pottery that often

either surpassed in detail or else actually corrected what Furumark had originally proposed. French then trained a substantial number of students—the first were K. Wardle, P. Mountjoy, S. Sherratt, C. Mee, and myself, but there were many more—how to use her modified "Furumarkian" approach. From these lessons came a further extensive series of publications beginning in 1969 and continuing to the present, of which the most widely used and hence most important has been Mountjoy's *Mycenaean Decorated Pottery: A Guide to Identification* (Göteborg 1986). Thanks to French and her school, there is now substantial (albeit not perfect) agreement among all those now engaged in the publication of Mycenaean pottery on questions of terminology and relative (if not absolute) chronology.

The volume under review clearly illustrates what an impact the decision to avoid employing Furumark's classificatory system has had on the study of later Minoan pottery. Little agreement on terminology exists (as B. Hallager makes clear with regard to vessel morphology in the opening essay) and differences over where to draw the boundaries between major chronological phases (especially IIIB vs. IIIC) are often profound. This revealing collection of papers on LM III ceramic groups or sequences from sites evenly spread throughout Crete, together with a response to each by an individual scholar and then a general discussion of the issues raised by both presenter and respondent, constitutes the proceedings of a small-scale gathering of specialists convened at the Danish Institute in Athens during August 1994. Over three days, a group of 21 participants (mostly Greek, American, British, and Danish, but also including Italian, Canadian, and Swedish representatives) heard and discussed 12 papers presented by 16 authors currently engaged in the publication of major bodies of postpalatial Minoan pottery. Although most of the designated respondents were among the authors of the papers, the former included three well-known specialists on the period not charged with delivering papers of their own (Macdonald, Popham, and Watrous).

This publication is extraordinarily valuable for a number of reasons. It contains contributions by just about all the principal figures engaged at present in the study and publication of 15th- through 11th-century B.C. pottery on Crete. It provides a representative cross-section of LM III pottery in both chronological and spatial terms, starting with Vlasaki and Papadopoulou's rich LM IIIA1 assemblage from Khamalevri near Rethymnon, and ending with major groups or sequences of LM IIIC material presented by Borgna from Phaistos, by Rethemiotakis from Kastelli Pediada, by Mook and Coulson from Kavousi, and by Prokopiou from Sybritos Amariou. Although presentations of relevant material from the traditionally most important centers of Minoan culture are included—from Knossos (Warren), Phaistos (Borgna), Mallia (Farnoux), Chania (Kanta), and Palaikastro (MacGillivray)—generally less well known sites receive at least as much attention (in addition to Khamalevri, Kastelli Pediada, Kavousi, and Sybritos, the sites of Petras [Tsipopoulou] and Pseira [Betancourt, Banou, and Floyd]). The volume is so richly illustrated and well stocked with bibliography that it will become a major scholarly resource for these reasons alone. Finally, the carefully considered decision to organize both the meeting and the publication according to the format of paper followed by an individual's response and then by general discussion, with a final discussion wrapping up the three-day event, gives the reader unusual insight into the major preoccupations of those working within this particular subdiscipline.

As for progress on establishing greater consensus with respect to terminology and chronology, relatively little progress appears to have been made. B. Hallager has done her best to gather support for a standard set of terms for shapes (cf. the appendix, pp. 407–17, and the volume's index, which is keyed to shape alone), but nothing appears to have been said about standardizing the terms for decorative motifs or syntaxes, and even Hallager's shape charts do not by any means present the full range of LM III vessel types. As for chronology, agreement on how to define the beginning of LM IIIC, or whether, and if so how, to subdivide LM IIIB, remains elusive. The issue of how to define the beginning of LM IIIB appears not even to have arisen. The pronounced but chronologically variable ceramic regionalism that characterizes Crete in the aftermath of the destruction horizon at Knossos in early LM IIIA2 received some attention, but nowhere near as much as this interesting phenomenon deserves. But this topic, like the nature of LM IIIC Crete with which the final discussion period at the 1994 meeting ended, can be argued to lie well beyond the gathering's intended foci: chronology and terminology.

As suggested above, it seems clear to me that Furumark offers a terminology that could with relatively little effort be adapted for use by Minoan ceramic specialists. Both B. Hallager (18) and M. Popham in his response to her paper (48) argue that Furumark's system should *not* be applied to Late Minoan pottery. In both cases their argument appears to be based on the notion that Furumark's terminology is inappropriate because his mainland-based chronology does not work in a Minoan context. But surely terminology is one thing and chronology is another? Even on the mainland, and particularly in eras like LH IIIC when ceramic regionalism was pronounced, as it was in LM IIIA2–C Crete, specific features of ceramic style need not be universally applicable as chronological indicators in order to be useful as diagnostic markers in local or even regional sequences. The adoption of Furumark's system by Minoanists would have the added benefit of making it possible for researchers investigating contemporary problems on the Greek mainland and in the central Aegean islands to move more easily from their areas to Crete and vice versa. Notwithstanding the fact that it maintained a number of older traditions peculiar to itself in the later 14th and 13th centuries B.C., Crete was undeniably part of a larger "Mycenaean cultural sphere" at this time. A fuller appreciation of this fact would be much simpler if a uniform ceramic terminology were in standard use throughout the region.

JEREMY B. RUTTER

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03755
JEREMY.RUTTER@DARTMOUTH.EDU