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Abstract:

This research essay is a comparative analysis of the Mycenaean palace-citadels of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos, examining the artefacts, architecture and layouts of certain buildings and contexts within both sites to determine how influential Mycenaean culture may have been over their occupants. Which will be examined by classifying certain elements from their remains according to a set of behavioural characteristics in-relation to Mycenaean culture: cultural behavioural adaptations, elements that are different between both sites, and cultural behaviours regularities, which include detailed characteristics that are consistent between both sites.

Mycenae and Ancient Pylos are among the most heavily examined and referenced sites in Mycenaean scholarship. Mycenae was the first palace to be excavated and has over the previous century occupied an “archetypal” role among Late Helladic sites, with a longer habitation period than most of its contemporaries. Ancient Pylos lacks some iconic characteristics shared between Midea, Mycenae and Tiryns, yet it does have the most intact palatial megaron ever found alongside crucial textual and archaeological evidence for the society, economy and beliefs of the Mycenaean people.

The parameters of this report will be confined solely to the LHIIIIB period, as both sites contained multiple periods of occupation and to examine each one in-tern would be too large and complicated for a 50-page research paper. Additionally, only the remains inside the different hilltops of Mycenae and Ano Englianos will be addressed in this report, within the Cyclopean walls at Mycenae and the LHII ashlar walls at Ancient Pylos. This will include the relative layouts of the palaces, surrounding palace-complex, and additional houses within the sites, examining their proximity and roles towards each other, followed by the contexts and functions of certain rooms, to identify the different activities, procedures, techniques and methods that were shared or diverse between both sites, such as security, economic, open spaces, cult-associations, etc.
Moving on to the methods of analysis for this report, it was initially meant to apply Cognitive Archaeology, since according to Marc Ambramluk, it can be possible to study certain behaviours and remains evidenced in the archaeological record to hypothesize the cognitive capabilities and intentions that were involved in their creation.\(^1\) However, after examining the principals and analytical techniques of this paradigm in-depth, it proved to lack compatibility with the limits of this report or would result in too much speculation. Instead, a new approach related to Behavioural Archaeology was utilized for this study, distinguishing between certain behavioural characteristics present at both Mycenae and Ancient Pylos.

Cultural behaviours encompasses certain activities or traits that are prevalent throughout an entire culture, marked by their repetition and transmission across geographical and temporary spaces. Such behaviours were the results of human decisions and activities, and created certain products, artefacts, or contexts that can be studied by archaeologists. However, intricate and surprising characteristics exist in the differences and similarities between their layouts, artwork and the artefacts assemblages of both palaces. These remains can be classified either as cultural behavioural regularities, or cultural behavioural adaptations. Recognizing these different behaviours can allow archaeologists examine how encompassing or influential the cultural identities and characteristics of a particular civilization were.
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1. Introduction.

This thesis will be a comparative analysis of the archaeological remains of two highly renowned and impactful Mycenaean sites in the Argolid and Messenia: the palace-complexes of Mycenae and Pylos (fig.1). Mycenaean palace-citadels, with their megaron-palaces, are often viewed as iconic and intrinsically linked to Mycenaean identities from the Late Helladic III period. Yet, were they as homogenous as many scholars highlight them to be, or do they share greater disparities, which can be indicative of how prevalent or flexible Mycenaean culture was? To answer this question, the following content will compare how certain components of the sites at Pylos and Mycenae are similar or different from each other despite their shared chronological and cultural association.

Since their discovery, these monumental palace-citadels are recognized as the centres of Mycenaean society and culture. Many of them are located in southern Greece and functioned as the symbolic and ideological centres of economic, military and political power during the Late Helladic period. Studies done on their architecture, the range and variety of artefacts recovered from them, and the artwork and symbols found have uncovered a vibrant and highly structured Bronze Age culture and civilization.

Archaeology is often centred around the analysis and preservation of certain objects that were lost or abandoned at some point in the past: ceramic wares, ancient jewelry, buildings and monuments, certain floral or faunal remains, and artistic styles or techniques. All of these were the products or consequences of certain behaviours performed by their original owners.

Over time, the frequency and range of these techniques or artefacts grew, until they spanned vast geographical, chronological and contextual situations. Within the confines of a single culture, these remains can be classified as cultural behavioural regularities, in this case, Mycenaean cultural behavioural regularities, such as megaron rooms, artistic spirals and rosettes, carved female figurines or the language of Linear B.
However, many different societies or individual groups within a single culture often developed different behaviours, which transitioned into certain evolutions or alterations in their material culture. These were likely connected to external influences, such as their environments, different social classes or various production industries. These inconsistencies can be labeled as cultural adaptations, such as different raw materials that were used, varying frequencies of the same type of artefacts across different sites, or different themes and content in their artwork, and reflect the presence of certain evolutions within different contexts of a single culture.

Both of these palace-citadels are among the most famous, distinct and best preserved of all Late Helladic palaces. The archaeological remains found at both sites will be the focus of this research paper, not descriptions of certain proceedings or ceremonies found in Greek poetry or epics.

Mycenae was the first Late Helladic palace to be discovered and shares its name with the civilization. Across the last two centuries, the site has been heavily excavated and examined by Henrich Schliemann, Panaitios Stamatakis, Vasilios Drosinos, Bernard Steffen, Alan Wace, William Taylour and George Mylonas. Each of them uncovered more and more of the site through the 19th and 20th centuries. Later studies, led by Professor Spiros Iakovides were done from 1984 to the early 2000’s and have continued under the supervision of Dr. Kin Shelton and Elizabeth French. ²

However, Mycenae does not necessarily present a “complete” sample of Mycenaean civilization. New discoveries have been made elsewhere, that differ sharply from the characteristics uncovered at Mycenae. Ancient Pylos is one such site, as the source of a handful of revolutionary discoveries for Mycenaean scholarship.

---

To clarify, there are three distinct locations referred to as “Pylos” in Messenia. The focus of this report is on “Ancient Pylos,” during the Late Helladic IIIIB period at Ano Englianos. Archaeologists have recovered countless remarkable finds from this palace-centre, ranging from ritual artefacts to decorative artwork, to the near-intact layout of the Palace, and the epoch-making discovery of the Linear B archive. The occupants at Ancient Pylos repeatedly rebuilt and renovated the site throughout the LHII-III periods. Archaeologists have labelled two of these palaces as the “Palace of Neleus,” and “Palace of Nestor.” This paper focuses on the palace and the associated buildings of the latter in the LHIIIIB period. Carl Blegen discovered this palace and it remains one of the most coherent and impressive building complexes of Mycenaean times.

Mycenae and Ancient Pylos shared cultural associations and geographic positions in the Helladic Peloponnese. However, the scale, artefact assemblages, architectural accessories and features of both palace-centres show powerful differences between them. Mylonas himself noted such disparities in his publications, addressing the two sites as different types of complexes: Mycenae was a complete citadel, a fortified palace complex with an expansive series of different buildings, while the Palace of Nestor was labelled as an independent palace, unfortified with a smaller number of buildings. Yet, from the remains and contents of each palace, archaeologists have made crucial insights into the lifestyles and culture of the people who dwelt in each palace.

---

7 McDonald, 1967, 335.
Geographically, Mycenae was positioned close to other palace-citadels in the Argolid and Attica, including Tiryns, Media and Athens all within a ca.120-kilometer range. By contrast to these relatively close neighbours, Ancient Pylos was over 170 kilometers away and separated by the Parnonas and Arkadian mountain ranges. This relative isolation from other palace-citadels makes the shared cultural, economic, and architectural assemblage between Pylos and Mycenae curious to ponder, and exciting when the differences between both sites are taken into account, such as the different remains of fortifications at each site, to the remains of certain relevant production industries, or the different architectural techniques used by the occupants.

To keep this study condensed and substantial, only a few specific buildings from the LHIIIB period will be addressed. These limits will discount the “Palace of Neleus” stage at Ancient Pylos, and the Reservoir or Grand Staircase at Mycenae. Also, Ancient Pylos was abandoned during the widespread destruction of LHIIIB, while Mycenae was rebuilt or expanded during the LHIIIC.

Within the hilltop sites of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos, certain respective topics from both palace-centres will be identified and described, followed by direct comparisons between certain sub-topics, if any exist, along with acknowledgements to the absence of any correlating features, installations or artefacts, such as the lack of LHIII fortification walls at Ancient Pylos. This will include the layout and distribution of buildings within the respective hilltop sites, the interiors of the Megaron-palaces and their palace-complexes, and artefacts, architecture, accessories found within those buildings or rooms, and occasional references to artwork. Each will be categorized as cultural adaptations or cultural regularities, to determine how influential Mycenaean culture truly was in the construction, purpose, contents and features of these specific palaces.

---

8 During this report, certain names will be capitalized based on the labels they have been given in published scholarly material, while other labels that were given for this report independently will be marked by quotations.
2. Mycenae.

The palace-complex at Mycenae was monumental and is viewed as the most prominent and powerful Mycenaean site in the Argolid. The entire site was enclosed within Cyclopean fortification walls (fig.2a), encompassing over 30,000m² by the LHIIIA-B period. These walls, and many other buildings inside, stood on artificial terraces (fig.2b) that provided strong foundations throughout the uneven hilltop. Comparable terraces were also found at the neighbouring sites of Midea, Tiryns and at Athens.

Complete Plan of Mycenae:

During the time that Ancient Pylos was occupied by the Palace of Nestor, the Lion Gate at Mycenae served as an iconic, imposing and heavily fortified main entrance to the site, and was connected to the Great Ramp. From a total of four iterations of the Great Ramp, Ramp 1 and Ramp 2 were from the LHIIIB period. This paved space was surrounded by groups of houses, forming certain districts. Further up the citadel, the palace-complex included the Megaron palace and an East Wing that included the House of Columns, and Artisan Quarters.

---

9 Niki Scoufopoulos, 1965, 162.
11 Scoufopoulos, 1965, 86 & 130.
12 Ramp 3 predated the Lion Gate, and Ramp 4 ranged from the MH-early LH.
Throughout the entire Late Helladic Period, five different iterations or phases of a megaron-palace existed at different points in the history of Mycenae, some at different locations on the hilltop. During the 14th-13th centuries BCE, Palace IV was the phase that was present. It was built on the south section of a terrace, overlooking the gorge below and providing encompassing views of the surrounding Argive plain. After the completion of Palace IV, a large building program began across the site, including efforts to increase the strength of foundation terraces (fig.2b) across the site, providing more open spaces and to support additional Houses.

Pre-LHIII phases of Mycenae, including the Megaron-palace positions at the hilltop apex.

Palace II:

Mycenae. Conjectured sketch plan of the ascent to Palace II (Mylonas, 1966a, 60).


The Mycenae Palace IV (fig. 3c) stood on different levels, giving some rooms floors with a downwards curve despite the foundation terraces.¹⁶

Palace IV:

Mycenae, 1963 Sketch plan of the latest palace (drawing Garvey after Wace (Mylonas, 1966a, 60).

7, 9=main entrance. 2-4=guardrooms. 10+44=entrance corridor. 81, 82, 83, 11, 12, 13=north storerooms. 45=court. Rooms 29-34=Royal apartments. 36, 38, 39=Domestic Quarter. 55=megaron propylon. 56=vestibule. 57=throne-room 52=Guest Room.

The primary entrance to the palace consisted of a double-propylon entrance (Rooms 7 & 9), with a series of rooms outside the Propylaea, including rooms 2-4, which have been tentatively labelled as either guard rooms or possibly archive rooms.¹⁷

---

¹⁶ French, 2002, 95.
¹⁷ Mylonas, 1996a, 60.
Inside the Palace, the propylaeae were followed by a long stretch that were labelled as corridors 10 and 44, which formed an L-shape, with certain doorways to different wings and an open court (court 45). Court 45 was connected to corridor 46, turning east and leading directly to the Main Court, while corridors 40 and 37 were connected to a series of rooms north of the Main Court (53), the Domestic Quarter (Rooms 36, 37, 39) of the palace. A grand staircase was also found on the southernmost area of the palace, added in the LHIIIC.\(^\text{18}\)

The Main Court (fig.4c) of the Mycenae palace was a square feature and open to the sky, lacking any remains of columns to suggest the presence of a roof.\(^\text{19}\) The southern wall had an open balcony that would have been provided a view overlooked the nearby Argos Plains. The north wall of the Main Court was composed of ashlar-cut poros stone held back by wooden tie-beams, with decorative triglyphs and half-rosettes,\(^\text{20}\) while the floors of the court were coated with layers of stucco with painted patterns.\(^\text{21}\) To the east of this court was a columned porch and a vestibule had been positioned between it and the palace-megaron.

The throne-room, within the only megaron found inside Palace IV, had a hearth in the centre surrounded by four columns.\(^\text{22}\) The surviving layout is incomplete, as the southeastern corner collapsed into the Chavos ravine at some later date (fig.4b). However, reconstructions have noted the space measured 12.92m x 11.5m, with a paved floor surrounded by a border of gypsum slabs (fig.4a).\(^\text{23}\) The walls and floor were heavily decorated, with depictions of battle scenes (fig.5a) and painted floors that matched similar designs found in the Main Court.

---

\(^{18}\) French, 2002, 97. While Mycenae did experience some measure of destruction during the LHIIIB-C transition; it was not completely destroyed or abandoned as Pylos was. The later expansion of the enceinte and construction of the reservoir both dated to the LHIIIC, between 1200-1090 BCE, and so does the Grand Staircase.


\(^{20}\) French, 2002, 98.

\(^{21}\) French, 2002, 98.


No evidence inside the megaron was found to suggest a second storey was added above it, nor was a throne-space identified by the excavators (fig. 12e).24

Another notable room inside the palace was a single large room (Room 52) opposite the throne-room, measuring 5.5m. by 6.2m.25 The floor of the room was similar to the Main Court and megaron throne-room, covered with plaster and decorated with a border of blue stripes between red lines.26 The space, labelled as a Guest Room, lacked any content to definitively indicate its function; however, it was constructed on the same artificial terrace as the Main Court and the throne-room, making it a very deliberate installation to the palace.

Another crucial installation was the Pillar Basement positioned beneath the Guest Room. This space was primarily occupied by a large support pillar, standing on a lower elevation than the rest of the palace, and predated the Main Court or Guest Room above it.27 Elsewhere, north of the Megaron and residence rooms, several storerooms were identified beneath the remains of a later Hellenistic temple (fig.4d) (Rooms 81, 82, 83, 11, 12, 13).28 These storerooms consisted of three separate spaces with rectangular layouts and floors paved with stucco.29 Several storage pithoi were found inside these rooms, along with a large assortment of luxury artefacts. Elsewhere, the fragments of two altars or offering tables were found inside of the long halls of the north storerooms (Rooms 11, 12, 13, 14).30

24 A throne-space at Pylos and an actual throne recovered from Tiryns were both found to the right of their respective hearths from the doorways. At Mycenae, this corresponding area would be in the partially-collapsed south section of the throne-room. This would provide some explanation for why no traces of one have been recovered, as it could have been lost when the south wall fell into the Chavos ravine.
25 Mylonas, 1966a, 64.
26 Mylonas, 1966a, 65.
27 Mylonas, 1966a, 66.
29 The North Wing is admittedly a contested topic in studies of Mycenae. Elizabeth French has even noted that multiple construction layers in this space, including a Hellenistic Temple, make this area difficult to reproduce on maps of the palace. One of the few sources to explore them in-depth was written by George Mylonas, who went into great detail, nonetheless.
30 Mylonas, 1966a, 70.
These rooms were also positioned closer to the East Wing of the palace, where the Artisans Quarters could be found. Some of these artefacts could possibly have been made in the East Wing before they were placed in these storerooms, though this theory would require more in-depth study to become more than a suggestion.

**East Wing:**

The East Wing (fig.3b) of the palace-complex at Mycenae is a collection of buildings connected to the palace, including the House of Columns and the Artisans Quarters. The steep slopes of the hilltop prevented any expansion of the palace-complex except to the east.\(^{31}\) It was connected to the Megaron by the Gallery of Curtains, through the domestic quarter, and divided into three artificial terraces.\(^{32}\) The surface of these terraces measured a noteworthy 50m by 60m and contained four buildings during the LHIIIB period.\(^{33}\) The buildings here primarily consisted of storage rooms, with a large variety of Mycenaean wares found inside (fig.6a), along with artefactual evidence that related directly to the Mycenaean economy, along with their positions in such close proximity to the palace.

---


\(^{32}\) Mylonas, 1966b, 419.

\(^{33}\) Mylonas, 1966b 419.
Additionally, a small passage was added to the House of Columns which connected it directly to the Artisans Quarters.\textsuperscript{34}

The Artisans Quarters was a square building, consisting of eight rooms surrounding an open court, with two long, narrow corridors opposite them, along with a stairway that suggested the building had at least one upper storey.\textsuperscript{35} Within these rooms hundreds of ivory chips were found, along with pieces of gold foil, discarded cores from opals, fragments of copper ore, and several painted offering tables, influencing the label given to the building.\textsuperscript{36} Fresco fragments were also found in a stratum above the floor deposits of certain rooms inside this building, which supports the possible existence of a second floor as they theoretically could have fallen from above during the final destruction phase of the Artisans Quarters. However, crucial as this building may have been, its importance was still overshadowed by the House of Columns.

The House of Columns was the largest building in the East Wing, with a monumental threshold, multiple rooms and a central court with its own colonnade.\textsuperscript{37} It was initially thought the building was a private residence. However, further examinations have influenced many experts, including French, Mylonas and Taylor, to conclusion that it was directly associated with the palace, as part of a broader palatial-complex. There have been suggestions that the House of Columns was a private residence for the ruler, but the living apartments inside the palace leave this topic in dispute between archaeologists. A smaller room inside even shared the same layout as a megaron, complete with its own hearth and a chimney-space.\textsuperscript{38} Additionally, the House of Columns housed the Pithos Basement storage space.

\textsuperscript{34} French, 2002, 61.
\textsuperscript{35} Mylonas, 1966a, 72.
\textsuperscript{36} Mylonas, 1966a, 73.
\textsuperscript{37} French, 2002, 99.
\textsuperscript{38} French, 2002, 99.
This room was separated into two floors, which were used in different phases of the LHIIIIB period.\textsuperscript{39} The earlier floor was part of a different structure, beneath the supporting terrace, while the later one was connected to the House of Columns and contained several pottery sherds (fig.6c), two painted terracotta figurines and the fragment of an inscribed tablet.\textsuperscript{40} These combined artefacts reflect that the House of Columns did function in some capacity as a storage facility, but out of all the rooms inside, only a select few of them have such evidence for storage functions. Which means the primary function of the entire House of Columns is unlikely to be as a storage facility. None of the sparse Linear B tablets found can give any indication of what function the House of Columns served. Unfortunately, the remains found inside the building do not clarify this situation either.

Nearby, there were a pair of additional buildings that complete the East Wing of the palace. House Gamma (24) and House Delta (23) were separated from the House of Columns by open yards, unpaved, with some drains to address rainwater.\textsuperscript{41} The remains of both only consist of basement rooms, although House Gamma had denser foundations that suggest at least one upper storey while House Delta would have had only one basement level and the ground-level storey.\textsuperscript{42} Both buildings have been hypothesized to have functioned as generic storage buildings, lacking evidence for more specific functions in the East Wing. These buildings completed the palace-complex of Mycenae, yet several buildings elsewhere on the site produced crucial evidence relating to the economics, behaviours, cultic-beliefs and cultural influences over the site.

The most remarkable and impactful of the buildings in this area formed a complex of houses near the Lion Gate, composed of the “Grave Circle A District,” and the Cult Centre.

\textsuperscript{39} Mylonas, 1968, 25.
\textsuperscript{40} Mylonas, 1968, 25.
\textsuperscript{41} French, 2002, 100.
\textsuperscript{42} French, 2002, 100.
Another feature, the Granary was located there, but was built in the LHIII C, after the 1200BCE destruction at the site.43 “Grave Circle A District” (fig.3c) included a series of houses adjacent to the graveyard.

“Grave Circle District”

6=Ramp House.

7=House of the Warrior Vase.

8=South House.

Since the houses were built next to the Grave Circle rather than over it, the occupants evidently made conscious efforts to use any available space without obscuring the graveyard. Inside the Ramp House (6), fragments of a fresco depicting athletic activities were found, while the House of the Warrior Vase was the source of a very famous decorative krater.44 They were separated by a small courtyard with a series of drains installed in the foundation terrace,45 including a causeway that connected the district directly to the Cult Centre further south.

---

44 Mylonas, 79.
45 French, 2002, 84.
Cult Centre:

9=Procession Way. 10=Megaron Building. 11=Shrine Gamma. 12=Tsountas House. 13=Centre Court. 14=Temple. 15=Room with the Fresco.

The entire Centre Centre had several access points: one from the “Grave Circle District,” another along the Cyclopean walls (fig.2a), another from a stairway to the east, and the last form the Procession Way. The procession entrance connected to a doorway and a set of stairs that led directly into a location labelled Megaron building. The Cult Centre (fig.3e) was a complex of buildings in the southwest section of Mycenae, with several house-structures positioned closely together around a large central court. Built during the LHIIIA and LHIIIB, the Houses in this centre continued to be used until the destruction phase at the transition from LHIIIB-C. One building, the “Megaron Building,” did follow the standard layout of a megaron but lacked the storerooms or throne-space that are consistent with Mycenaean palaces. More basement storage rooms were found inside, similar to those in the house in the “Grave-Circle District.”

---

A large collection of carved ivories, both functional tools and decorative pieces, were found inside, further supporting its religious role at the site. Another building, Shrine Gamma, further supported the religious role of this district. Two altars were found associated with Shrine Gamma, one outside to the left of the entrance, consisting of a low platform made of plaster, and a horseshoe-shaped altar coated with plaster inside the shrine.

The two most remarkable buildings in the Cult Centre were Tsountas House and the Temple Building (fig.3f), both of which produced intricate wall paintings and varied collections of ivory objects. A plaque of a war-goddess was also found in Tsountas house, along with a distinct horseshoe-shaped altar, coated with several layers of plaster. The Temple, also referred to as the House of Idols, or the Room with Platforms, contained three wooden columns along the east side, with a table in the centre of the room and a series of bench-altars, varying in height, along the far wall (fig.3d).

Multiple ivory idols were found inside the Temple, including one that stood on a single altar, with a small offering table in front of it, while a stairwell bordered by columns, led to a small room that

47 Within Room 36, bronze and bone tools, mortars, pounders, a pestle, five antler tools, and lead sheeting were all found inside. Joined with unfinished ivory products, fragments, and a richly worked steatite mold, with glass on its surface.

48 Olga, H. Krzyszowska, *Well Built Mycenae: The Hellenic-British excavations within the Citadel at Mycenae*, 24: “The ivories and objects of Bone, Antler and Boar’s Tusk.” (Portland, OR: Oxbow Books, 2008), v. Within Basement II and Room 32 of the Cult Centre at Mycenae, several ivory artefacts were recovered. Basement II contained ivory inlays, beads and boars’ tusks, while Room 32 included a block of raw ivory and several worked pieces. French, Moore and Taylor all agree that these ivory pieces were likely under the guardianship of a deity.


51 This plaque was made of plaster, ca.19cm long. The surface is heavily damaged, but what could be recognized included a double-border along the edge. Three figures are painted on the plaque, two women facing a central figure and an altar, covered by a figure-eight-style shield.


contained several different clay artefacts (fig. 6b). All of these buildings shared a similar function based on their locations and context, a pattern that can be applied to the entire site as a whole.

In summary, different buildings in the palace-citadel of Mycenae were positioned close together based on their association or function within the site. The throne-room megaron and associated buildings in the East Wing were positioned at the peak of the hilltop, while private residences and the Cult Centre were further down the slope, closer to the Lion Gate. Basements were heavily utilized throughout the site, and several painted frescos and distinct artefacts were recovered from different rooms, although their frequency varied heavily. The site was continually renovated or expanded, but during the LHIIIB the site was at the height of its prosperity and supported many characteristics of Mycenaean culture, from artwork to production to religion, architectural practices and organization, relating to the megaron at the centre of the citadel to private houses used by the residents.

These characteristics will be compared with their parallels that can be found at Pylos, including their presence or absence, respectively, along with the architecture, artefacts and artwork that have been recovered from both sites. Each of these components can be used to assemble a corpus of the disparities between both sites.

3. Ancient Pylos:

---

54 Female Idols: eight larger ones, several smaller idols, one holding a double-axe or hammer, others with hair. Pottery: kylikes, small bowls, cups, a lamp, two braziers, including a small two-handled bowl, an Egyptian scarab, a cowrie shell, amber beads, rock crystal, lapis lazuli, carnelian and other stones, and glass paste. Male Idols, and more.
Ancient Pylos during the LHIIIIB period occupied a total space of 85 m by 75 m. A defensive wall did exist at the site between LHI-II, encompassing the hilltop space occupied by the palace-complex. The architectural techniques used in these walls were ashlar masonry, yet they were composed of smaller-sized blocks than Cyclopean Architecture. Even after their discontinuation, these walls still defined the limits of the palace-complex that will be the focus of this report.

Map 1: excavation trenches at the Ano Englianos Hilltop (shaded-border=walls).

Map 2: the Buildings in the Palace of Nestor.
Each of the buildings within these limits stood on a flat, uniform surface, without any artificial terraces. This was the result of widespread clearing and burning that was done during the transitions between different building phases at the site, including the Palace of Neleus, for the construction of the Palace of Nestor.

The largest structure at Ancient Pylos during the LHIIIB was labelled as the Main Building (fig.7b), which had the Primary megaron at its centre, surrounded by dozens of small rooms and installations. The principal entrance to this building was a Propylaea gateway, (Rooms 1+2), leading to an open Center Court, that functioned as the nucleus of the Main Building. A large portico stood in the doorway opposite to the propylaea gateway that led to the Primary megaron while smaller doorways on opposite ends of the Center Court led to different rooms and corridors of the Palace. The Primary megaron, inside the Main Building, had some highly decorative walls and floor designs and evidence of an interior balcony on the second storey. Aside from the Primary megaron (Map 3=Rooms 4-6), the eastern section of the palace contained a series of apartments with the inappropriately called Queen’s megaron (fig.8c) (Room 46) and a bathing room (fig.8d). A secondary entrance was also added to the eastern section, through a shallow porch positioned near the bathing room. Staircases were also found inside the remains of the Main Building, indicating that it contained, at the minimum, one additional storey (fig.8e).

Additionally, the renowned Archives were positioned to the left of the propylaea (Rooms 7+8), on the same positional axis as the majority of storage rooms inside the Main Building. Inside the

---

56 Archaeologists have named the different phases at Ancient Pylos from Homeric Mythology; Neleus was a ruler in Pylos until he was killed, and his son Nestor succeeded him. These names and their order-of-succession were applied to the different phases of Ancient Pylos to reflect the chronological transitions of power: Neleus=>Nestor.
57 The “Queen’s” megaron was a label given to room when it was initially uncovered and has remained despite the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that this area was absolutely used by a “Queen” or someone else.
rooms, over 200 tablets were recorded, along with dozens of kylikes and cattle bones, with an MNI\(^{60}\) of 7 different cattle.\(^{61}\) A spearhead and swords were also recovered from Room 7, along with eleven diminutive kylikes near the bones.\(^{62}\) These artefacts have been interpreted to have been directly associated with ritual activities and feastings performed at the site and recorded in the Linear B tablets from the Archives.

Initially, it was thought that Room 7 was the only accessible doorway into the archives, which was positioned to the left-hand-side of the entrance propylæa. Later, however, excavations by Ammett L. Bennet Jr. suggested that another doorway was present into Room 8, making the office accessibly from inside the palace rather than the outside.\(^{63}\) This paradox is quite noteworthy:

As “an entrance near the front door would have been used to store or record details coming into the palace, such as offerings, population records, or communication between local authorities and the central palace. An entrance accessible from within the palace would focus on documents and records pertaining to the interior of the palace, not the exterior.”\(^{64}\)

The Primary megaron at Ancient Pylos measured 12.9m by 11.2m,\(^{65}\) and had all the characteristic elements including a large central hearth, made of plaster with painted designs and four flanking columns. The imprint of a throne-space was uncovered by archaeologists, with a unique libation channel adjacent (fig.7b). Elsewhere in the Main Building, the Queen’s megaron (Room 46), was notably smaller than the Primary megaron, but shared some distinct characteristics. The room was accessed through the Center court, and had several smaller rooms surrounding it, labelled as apartments, one of which had a doorway leading to an outdoor court.

\(^{60}\) Minimum Number of Individuals.


\(^{64}\) Palaima and Wright, 1985, 253.

The room contained a notable collection of artefacts on the ground level and had comparable artwork along the walls and floors. The most notable differences to distinguish it from the Primary megaron were the scale of the rooms, the lack of a definitive throne-space or associated features, the collection of artefacts found inside, and the specific arrangements of images painted on the walls.

The remaining rooms of the Main Building consisted of hallways connected to dozens of storage rooms, most of them containing jars and pithoi that have been labelled as wine or perfume containers. One room even contained over 3,000 kylikes, along with larger storage jars.66

---

Map 3: the Rooms and courts within the Palace of Nestor.

A detailed list of every room and their contents would be too lengthy to add here, however, the most notable among them is the rear storeroom (Rooms 23 and 24), located immediately behind the throne-room megaron (fig.8a), and a small magazine (Room 27) in the northwestern corner of the Main Building.
Elsewhere at the site, a new door was added to Room 60, positioned next to court 59 and could potentially have acted as an observation or a guardroom to monitor traffic to the Building from the main entrance.67

On the topic of guardrooms, another unique feature within the Main Building needs to be addressed: the “sentry stands.” These were elevated platforms some 0.08-0.09m above the floors and varied between 0.9m-1.20m in their lengths or widths.68 These were originally classified as chair-spaces from comparisons to the throne-space found inside the Main Building.69 Later this label was reinterpreted as “sentry stands,” from their positions adjacent to the doorways of certain key locations, including the megaron portico and vestibule, the Archives, and even in the Southwest building, in Hall 64. However, recent studies have led to new proposals over the functions these spaces had during the LHIIIB habitation period, such as torch bearers or incense burners suggested by Mylonas and Ulrich Thaler, respectively, or Mark Peter’s proposal as supports for wine kraters.70

Looking at the Main Building as a whole, the different installations and assemblages highlighted luxury and economic prosperity first and foremost. Most of the living amenities were positioned on the ground floor of the palace. Careful excavations were made to determine that the upper floors of the palace, whether only one or multiple storeys, were used as storage rooms as well.71

Aside from the Main Building, the second most prominent feature in the palace-citadel was the Southwestern Building (fig.7c). This was the earliest feature to date from the 13th century BCE at Ancient Pylos.72

---

67 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 237.
69 Egan, 2015, 139.
70 Egan, 2015, 141.
71 Fitton, 1995, 165.
72 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 34.
The entrance to the Southwestern Building is a direct neighbour with the main gate to the site, with a large hall (Hall 64) inside with three interior columns placed with remarkable accuracy, and with rings of stucco around their bases. The floors of the hall were also paved with stucco and traces of painted plaster were found on the walls. No traces of furniture were found inside Hall 64, although a sentry-stand was identified by the entrance to the second hall, Hall 65. The walls inside were also decorated, with dados and a fresco with men and dogs close by, interpreted to represent either hunting or a battle (fig.11a). The layout of the room and a set of interior columns has led archaeologists to theorize it functioned as an early megaron before the Main Building was erected.

Elsewhere in the Southwestern Building, past Hall 65, a series of rooms complete the layout of the building, which have been identified as storerooms, pantries (fig. 11b) and even a bathing-room (fig.8d). A set of stairs were also found, indicating that, like the Main Building, the Southwest Building contained at least 2 different storeys (fig.9). The majority of rooms in the Southwestern Building functioned as storage units, with large numbers of pithoi, storage jars, cups, kylikes and tripod vessels found inside, although a unified function for the building has yet to be determined. Some of the rooms at the far rear of the building have been labelled as residence apartments, all of which were positioned near the Northwest Workshop (Map 3: Room 82).

One of two workshops at the site and the smallest building in the palace-complex, the smaller Northwest Workshop (fig.7f) is positioned adjacent to the Main Building and the Southwestern Building and has been proposed to have had both practical and religious purposes.

---

73 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 247 & 250.
74 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 252-253.
75 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 248 & 253.
At the Northwest Workshop, two different phases of use were identified inside, the earlier one identified as a storage room, while the later phase lacked any definitive evidence to allow excavators to deduce the building’s purpose.\(^7^6\) Recent studies of the Northwest workshop have noted the quality of the architecture in one room as indicating it was meant to be seen and appreciated; and has subsequently been labeled as a Shrine-room.\(^7^7\) The best source of knowledge for this building was found in Linear B tablets, rather than material evidence, such as tablet \textit{AN 1281}, which recorded workers under the supervision or allotment to a goddess, Potnia.\(^7^8\) A similar account was translated from tablet \textit{Qa 1299},\(^7^9\) along with five additional \textit{Qa} tablets that mention the deity Potnia by name, connected to the North-East Workshop within the Ancient Pylos palace-complex.\(^8^0\)

The larger of the two workshops, the Northeast Workshop (Map 2) was a single-storey building found at the opposite end of Court 58 from the main gate. A large court and a Shrine room were located inside, associated with rituals performed inside the building, while the remaining rooms were heavily damaged by fire. These latter installations did contain a large number of clay sealings, particularly Room 98, including sherds from 30 different pots and 18 clay sealings.\(^8^1\) Despite these results from the excavations, the archaeological remains for the context and activities that occurred inside the Workshop are still less definitive or explicit than the Wine Magazine (Map 2 = “wine store”).

Another structure with a label to indicate its function, the Wine Magazine (fig.7d) had two rooms (Rooms 104 and 105) and contained enough storage space for over 60 wine jars.\(^8^2\)

---

\(^7^6\) Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 92.  
\(^7^7\) Galaty, and Parkinson, 2007, 58.  
\(^7^9\) Tablet \textit{Qa 1299}=recorded amounts of cloth allocated to a man named Kaeseu, a Potnian.  
\(^8^0\) Galaty and Parkinson, 2007, 57.  
\(^8^1\) Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 315-316.  
\(^8^2\) Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 342.
Various seals collected within the building were further indicative of its function as a storage building, while its architectural characteristics have more in common with the North-East Workshop than the Main Building.

Additionally, the spaces between the various buildings were occupied by various courts and narrow ramps, some of them closed off by walls and only accessible from certain doorways through the Main Building (fig. 7b) and Southwest Building (fig. 7c). Most of the ramps functioned to divide the various buildings from each other or to funnel traffic across the site to different buildings. Some evidently functioned as private spaces, and had drains added to them to address rainwater throughout the site. Others were both wider and composed of better-quality architecture, including Court 58. The remains of this court are incomplete, but what has survived occupies a monumental space of 7.10m by 44.90m.\footnote{Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 227-228.} This expanse was covered with paved stucco, and a huge artefact assemblage, including pottery, stone fragments, and several iron and bronze pieces.\footnote{Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 230} It has been hypothesized to function as a monumental pathway to manage traffic moving inside or leaving the citadel-palace.\footnote{Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 228.} Additionally, a small enclosure from the Main Building was identified in the foundations of Court 58, possibly as an observing platform or a shaded porch from the palace.\footnote{Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 228-229.}

In summary, Ancient Pylos was a highly condensed and exceptionally organized hilltop palace-complex, with barely any space in the layout wasted, and many buildings with asymmetrical positions and layouts. While it does have a very prominent assemblage, most of the artwork and luxurious components of the site were concentrated in the Main Building and Southwestern building, while the others were more utilitarian.
The complexity of these buildings, along with widespread dedication to storage and production rooms and evidence of luxury commodities reflect that Pylos had a very encompassing and flourishing state of economic dominance over the western Peloponnese. Curiously, a single shaft grave was found beneath the foundations, which predated the palace-complex. “The clarity and completeness of the ground plan and the excellent preservation of the lower walls and various installations is owed to the fact that no later habitation, as at so many important sites, destroyed or obscured the ruins of the latest monumental Mycenaean phase.” This is a very intriguing situation, as Pylos was located in Messenia, while the majority of the other Mycenaean palaces are in the Argolid.

---

87 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 299.
88 McDonald, 1967, 336.
4. Layout and Buildings.

The palace-citadels of both Mycenae and Pylos can be categorized as “Hill sites,” according to Niki Scoufopoulos’ classifications for Bronze Age Citadels.\(^8^9\) Both of them contain a varied collection of certain buildings across the layouts of their respective site and have produced a broad spectrum of different features and artefacts that have become invaluable references for all Mycenaean civilization. Several cultural regularities are present between them, such as the vestibule=>porch=>main hall along with the hearth and four columns within a megaron throne-room, or ashlar masonry techniques, hearths and altars with painted plaster, or Linear B tablets.

However, certain components between Ancient Pylos and Mycenae are far from identical or even consistent, from the distribution of certain buildings, architectural practices, artefact assemblages, internal layouts of different buildings, and more. Recognizing these differences can provide insights into the environments, the priorities, the occupations and identities relating to the occupants of these palaces, which are often seen as cultural centres of Mycenaean civilization.

For one example, Mycenaean military architecture reached its peak in the 13\(^{th}\) century BCE, culminating with the Cyclopean walls that were added to certain sites, including Mycenae.\(^9^0\) Yet, at Ancient Pylos the opposite occurred, as a series of walls from the 16\(^{th}\) century BCE were demolished by the time the Palace of Nestor was built, and no further fortifications were added during the 13\(^{th}\) century.\(^9^1\)

This is a crucial difference between both sites because it contradicts one of the most widespread perceptions of Mycenaean culture: a warlike people with monumental fortresses.

\(^8^9\) Nikki Scoufopoulos, 1965, (summary)
\(^9^0\) Henri Stierlin, Greece: From Mycenae To The Parthenon, (Koln: Taschen, 2004), 21.
\(^9^1\) Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 32.
Even the majority of palace-citadels in southern Greece during the LHIIIA and IIIB period were heavily fortified or made extensive use of foundation terraces, such as Athens, Mycenae, Tiryns, Thebes or Midea. Yet, Ancient Pylos during the Palace of Nestor phase did not use either measures, even lacking Cyclopean architecture. Such fortifications were cultural adaptations, not cultural regularities.

This is not an isolated example, either, as seen in the placement of certain rooms within the palaces, or the different emphases given to luxury craft-production at Mycenae compared to the wine/oil/perfume industries at Ancient Pylos. All of these can be classified and examined through careful analysis, starting with the layouts of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos.

During LHIIIB-C, the palace citadel of Mycenae was over three times the size of Ancient Pylos, measuring 30,000m², and enclosed within Cyclopean walls (fig.12a). These fortifications encompassed the entirety of the hilltop, and additional terraces were added to provide flat surfaces for the erection of dozens of buildings. The Lion Gate at Mycenae and the Great ramp connected to the “Grave Circle District” and Cultic Centre, while an Ascending Ramp led up the hilltop to reach Palace IV and East Wing positioned at the peak on additional terraces above the Chavos Ravine. By contrast, Ancient Pylos stayed within the natural surface of the Ano Englianos hilltop and had abandoned its fortifications by the LHIIIB period. However, the gateway from these earlier fortifications still functioned as the primary entrance to the palace-citadel and lacked any monumental or fortified doorway.

Ancient Pylos also had far fewer archaeological features condensed within a total space of ca.10,000m², and all of them have been recognized as smaller workshops and magazines to the northwest and northeast of the Main Building, without any significant private houses. While the spaces between the various buildings were occupied by ramps and courts, some of them were enclosed by surrounding ashlar walls that obscured any possible views of the surrounding region.⁹²

⁹² Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 236.
“The systematic planning, the orderly division into apartments and chambers, the evidence of careful attention to detail and the apparent endeavor to provide elegance and luxury demonstrate that the whole construction was designed, and its erection supervised by a master architect.”

Intriguingly, at Ancient Pylos the scope of LHIIIB building phases never extended to the entire Ano Englianos hilltop. Instead, they remained within the limits of the earlier LHII fortifications. This in itself is a serious difference compared to Mycenae, where three different stages of fortifications have been identified during the LHIII period, and each of them expanded beyond the previous limits established by earlier phases, consolidating more living-space and buildings within the citadel. The use of terraces at Mycenae to provide stable foundations for various buildings was applied to the megaron-palace complex, fortification walls, and LHIIIB Houses found throughout the site.

At Ancient Pylos, on the other hand, there was evidence of widespread destruction and clearing of the buildings and installations prior to the construction of the Palace of Nestor, providing stable and open spaces for the new buildings. These differences are a primary example of cultural adaptations made by the people who dwelt at these respective sites, resulting in different settings and characteristics instead of sharing the same methods and results in their architecture. However, these subjects also carry some implications for cultural regularities.

The efforts to establish foundation terraces or clearing away previous buildings both resulted in flat, stable surfaces for new buildings erected at both sites. This can reflect a clear emphasis on how the Mycenaeanst would often avoid inhabiting older buildings or erecting different foundations for each individual structure. Instead they favoured open clear spaces for the foundations of multiple buildings.

---

93 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 34
94 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 32.
These efforts to create strong foundations and open spaces are clear cultural regularities that were used at both sites for any buildings inside the palace-citadels.

Inside the main entrances of these palace-sites, both palace citadels had paved entrance ways, the Great Ramp at Mycenae and Court 58 at Ancient Pylos. Yet the positions of certain buildings along these paved spaces were diametrically opposed to each other, and reflected the different measures takes to address the available space at the hilltop citadels.

At Mycenae in the LHIIIB period, the Great Ramp extended past Grave Circle A and the southwestern Houses, varying between 3.45-2.5m wide. Small grooves spaced apart within the surface of the Ramp were identified, and theorized to have been installed for cart wheels or chariots entering or leaving the citadel. However, the ramp did not lead directly to the Palace within the site, instead it connected to an ascending path that began on the opposite side of the paved pathways near the “Grave Circle District,” at the end of the Great Ramp. Even further up the hilltop, the Ascending ramp did not connect directly to the palace. Instead, an extending pathway was added between it and the LHIIIB entrance-propylaea of the Mycenae palace.

However, at Ancient Pylos, the entrance-gate lay in the south corner of the site and led to Court 58, which was composed of paved stucco. It ran past the Northeast Workshop, along the front of the Main Building and the Southwest Building, to an extent of 44.9m and a surviving width of 7.1m. The Main Building propylaea were directly connected to Court 58, along with a smaller entrance into the Southwest Building and a smaller court connected this pathway to the Northeast Workshop.

96 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 227-228
The Main Building at Ancient Pylos occupied the most direct position to the entrance-way, while the palace at Mycenae was positioned at the furthest extent of the ascending ramp. This would have made the former more accessible to visitors at the citadel-palaces than the latter one, a clear difference made by the adaptations of the occupants at both sites according to their topography or preferences.

Both of these entrance ways contained evidence of heavy traffic moving through them, from the artefacts found across Ancient Pylos Court 58, to the grooves identified in the Great Ramp and were connected directly to the main Palaces of their respective sites. The grooves in the Great Ramp represent stronger contextual evidence for wheeled-vehicles moving in and out of Mycenae. While at Ancient Pylos, Court 58 lacked such distinct features, and the strongest evidence for the presence of chariots was found in Linear-B tablets.

Additionally, the Northwest workshop (fig. 7e) at Ancient Pylos was not connected to Court 58, and was only accessible by passing through the Main Building via a pair of doorways leading to Court 88, another open space paved with multiple layers of stucco. This court also had an oblique shape, since the Main Building and Southwest building were not symmetrically aligned, possibly due to the limited space between them and the edge of the Ano Englianos hilltop. The Southwest Building and Main Building were separated by Court 63, which included a hallway directly connecting both installations to one another.

These components of the layouts at LHIIIIB Ancient Pylos have some intriguing combinations of parallels and contrasts at Mycenae, as the buildings near Grave Circle A and the Cult Centre were all separated by open, paved courts in the foundation terraces.

---

97 Large amounts of pottery found in the black-stratum of a destruction phase, including stone fragments, traces of iron and bronze fragments, yet no luxury materials, i.e. gold, ivory, silver.
100 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 245.
Furthermore, as mentioned before, both the “Grave Circle District” and Cult Centre were connected to each other by a causeway during the LHIIIB, rather than both districts connected directly to the Great Ramp. Further up the hilltop, access to the East Wing of the Palace was limited to an open court that linked it directly to Palace IV, similar to the disposition found at Ancient Pylos between the Main Building and the Northwest workshop.

Moving on to the different activities done throughout the sites, the Northeast Workshop (fig.7e) at Ancient Pylos was directly accessible through Court 58 and contained notable evidence for a shrine and an interior court with evidence of possible ritual activities, particularly from the Linear-B AN tablets and the Qa tablets described earlier. Indeed, one tablet (AN1281) recorded several workers allotted to or supervised by a goddess, Potnia. Furthermore, the contents outside the doorway of Room 97, included 13 clay sealings, while the room itself was largely empty of artefacts. Adjacent to this room was Room 98, containing 18 additional sealings, along with various bronze artefacts and fragments from 30 different pottery groups. In his publications, Blegen noted that both of these rooms related to storage or craft-production, with certain goods stored in Room 98, while Room 97 could have been an apartment where the actual work was carried out.

At Mycenae, the Cult Centre near Grave Circle A had multiple buildings, most of which had similar contents inside certain rooms and different orientations.

---

101 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 306
103 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 310.
104 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 315-316.
105 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 316.
Aside from the higher number of buildings with religious associations, certain materials that are often found in workshops were found in Basement II and Rooms 32 and 36 within this district.\textsuperscript{106} However, none of the contextual evidence from these spaces included actual working pieces, and the most recent interpretations are that it was not a workshop, but rather a storage space associated with a workshop elsewhere inside the palace-citadel.\textsuperscript{107} Also, while no direct evidence for a workshop has been identified inside of the Cult Centre, several Linear B tablets have been found inside this district. One set, the \textit{Oi} series, directly recorded certain goods or activities between workers and specific deities,\textsuperscript{108} including one that recorded the allocation of certain liquids to workers connected to Potnia, who was also recorded in the Pylos \textit{Qa} tablets.\textsuperscript{109} These similar contexts of storage spaces within buildings with religious associations are direct and highly detailed cultural regularities between Mycenae and Ancient Pylos.

Another specific curiosity can also be found between the Northeast Workshop at Ancient Pylos and the Ramp House at Mycenae. Artefacts from the latter have suggested that the Ramp House was built over a LHII shaft grave.\textsuperscript{110} At Ancient Pylos beneath the Shrine room in the Northeast Workshop, evidence of an earlier shaft-grave was found under the foundations.\textsuperscript{111} At a glance, these similarities between the location of the graves could be a cultural regularity, but it could just as easily be coincidental. However, the different instances of cultic-buildings and altars, along with the evidence of on-site production from the Pylos workshops, mean these characteristics fall under cultural adaptations.

\textsuperscript{106} Lupack, 2007, 60. Basement II=ivory pieces (inlays, beads, boars’ tusks). Room 32=a block of raw ivory and several worked pieces. Room 36=bronze and bone tools, mortars, pounds, a pestle, five antler tools, lead sheeting, gold fragments, unfinished ivory artefacts, a richly worked steatite with glass on its surface.

\textsuperscript{107} Lupack, 2007, 60.

\textsuperscript{108} Goddesses: “Mistress of Grain,” “Potnia.”

\textsuperscript{109} Lupack, 2007, 60.

\textsuperscript{110} Mylonas, 1966a, 79.

\textsuperscript{111} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 299.
This combination of Mycenaean cultural regularities and adaptations within the same context can also be found in the palace-complexes at both sites. The Southwest Building (fig.7c) at Ancient Pylos and the House of Columns at Mycenae are both viewed as the most important buildings of their respective sites after the megaron-palace. Both buildings contained different halls that have been labelled as megaron-rooms, along with storage magazines positioned near staircases. Furthermore, the House of Columns contained a basement-storage room, the “Pithos Basement,” while the Southwest Building appears to have one predominant storeroom, Room 60, which contained over 730 individual vessels.112

Evidence of shared architectural techniques was found at both palace complexes, particularly with insertions for wooden beams in the walls and evidence of apartments inside the upper storeys. However, the House of Columns also had a rectangular court surrounded by a colonnade positioned in front of the walls and a basement-space, while the Southwest House had three distinct columns in Hall 64, four columns inside Hall 65, and several smaller storage rooms. However, one of the most distinct architectural differences between both palace-citadels, are the use of flutings in the columns at Ancient Pylos (fig.2c). No columns or column-bases found at Mycenae had evidence for such flutings, yet they were found throughout Ancient Pylos.113 Additionally, there still remains a large amount of speculation over the specific purposes these building had for their original occupants, and the experts remain undecided on whether to give either building a definitive label.

As a result, the House of Columns and Southwest Building are indicative of the limits that cultural regularities can have. Both of them had direct associations with their respective palaces and contain evidence for living-quarters and storage spaces.

112 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 239.
113 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 39-40
However, the differences in their architecture and layouts, along with the periods both were built in and the continued absence of a definitive role leave them both as cultural adaptations. This classification is further reflected in the different rooms and layouts of the House of Columns and Southwest Building, such as the triangular-arranged columns in the latter compared to the colonnade in the former, or the broader range of artefacts, vessels and Linear B tablet-fragments found in the Southwest Building.\textsuperscript{114} Even the artwork and aesthetics found inside both buildings is very dissimilar. the Southwest Building had floors of paved stucco with and a series of dogs on a hunt (fig.11a), while the remains found in the House of Columns lacked such imagery, whether from the ground-floor or debris from a second storey.\textsuperscript{115}

A similar disparity can be found in the additional buildings scattered around the palace-complexes of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos, functioning as workshops and storage magazines. At Mycenae, the Artisans Quarters consisted of multiple rooms surrounding an open court and contained an upper storey. From this building, large amounts of discarded materials were found: 778 pieces of ivory, flawed opal stones, chipped pieces of green steatite and unworked quartz, fragments of gold leaf, copper ore fragments, and large chunks of blue paint.\textsuperscript{116} A small dagger and bronze chisel were also recovered from the Artisans Quarters, which have led archaeologists to label it as a workshop for luxury goods, with residence-space for artisans, and storage rooms.\textsuperscript{117} Additionally, two nearby Houses, House Gamma and House Delta have been acknowledged as storage magazines for the Mycenae palace.\textsuperscript{118} However there is not sufficient evidence to determine whether they contained specific goods or products, unlike the Wine Magazine at Ancient Pylos.

\textsuperscript{114} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 81.  
\textsuperscript{115} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 79.  
\textsuperscript{116} Mylonas, 1966b, 425-426.  
\textsuperscript{117} Mylonas, 1966a, 73.  
\textsuperscript{118} Mylonas, 1968, 19.
Linear B tablets recovered from Ancient Pylos record multiple craft-production activities centred on the Northeast and Northwest Workshops, particularly chariots, leather and bronze work.\textsuperscript{119} From the archaeological reports, the layout of the Northeast Workshop had a similar layout to the Artisans Quarters, with a central open court and six rooms aside from the Shrine room.\textsuperscript{120} One of these rooms contained pieces of bronze and stone, while the remains found in two separate rooms totalled 31 different clay sealings, along with several bronze arrowheads and a black steatite seal from a corridor.\textsuperscript{121} The later phase of the Northeast Workshop barely contained any artefacts, while the earlier phase had an expansive collection of small fragments of raw materials: bronze scraps, pieces of obsidian, quartz, and flint, arrowheads, and half of a female terracotta figurine from LHIIIA-B.\textsuperscript{122} Similar contents have been recovered from the Artisans Quarters at Mycenae, with the exception of sealings.

Sealings were also found inside Room 105 of the Wine Magazine (fig. 10c), which had sufficient room for over 60 wine jars, of which 35 were evidently left behind during the destruction of the site.\textsuperscript{123} Additionally, excavators found painted plaster scattered throughout the strata above the ground floor of the building, interpreted by Blegen and Rawson as indicating the possibility of an upper floor with painted walls above the Wine Magazine.\textsuperscript{124} Additionally, the fragments of wall frescos that were found scattered about the rooms of the Artisans Quarters, were interpreted to be wall-paintings from the upper floors.\textsuperscript{125} Similar remains were found in Room 105 of the Wine Magazine. This is another Mycenaean cultural behaviour that is shared between both sites, in buildings with different yet highly specific functions, directed related to the primary economic industries of the palaces.

\textsuperscript{119} Shelmerdine, 2008, 94.
\textsuperscript{120} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 299.
\textsuperscript{121} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 299-307.
\textsuperscript{122} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 291.
\textsuperscript{123} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 35.
\textsuperscript{124} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 346.
\textsuperscript{125} French, 2002, 99.
In summary, the LHIIIIB remains from both palaces had many widespread cultural adaptations that were made by the different occupants from both sites, particularly in the scale of certain buildings, artefacts recovered across the site and within the palace-complexes. Yet, under closer scrutiny some specific contexts shared specific cultural regularities, such as the Cult Centre and Northeast Workshop. This situation of cultural adaptations outweighing various cultural regularities is a far-cry from what would be expected from a homogeneous culture and is further indicated inside the palaces of these Mycenaean sites.
5. Mycenae Palace IV and Pylos Main Building.

Out of all the complex and expansive buildings found within their respective sites, the palaces of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos contained a multitude of functional, imposing and artistic characteristics that are highly indicative of Late Bronze Age Mycenaean culture. Their roles as social, political and economic hubs were deeply related to multiple sites outside of the palace-citadels, but these topics will not be explored very heavily in this research project. Both of them reflected quite extreme differences and similarities in their respective layouts and the contents found inside. Similar to the broader expanses of the palace-citadels, the layout, positions and contents of different rooms within them give crucial evidence for the life-styles and priorities of their respective inhabitants.

During the LHIIIB period, the front entrances to the Mycenae palace and the Main Building at Ancient Pylos had some surprisingly identical characteristics. Both of these have been labelled as propylaea and were composed of two different spaces, each with a pair of columns positioned in the centre of both entrance halls, supporting canopied roofs (fig.12c). Comparatively few artefacts were found in the doorways, and they lacked any wall frescos. The only true difference between them was a nearby offering table at Mycenae. These propylaea were clear cultural regularities, from their placement in the layouts of the palaces and their highly similar architectural features. Yet, beyond these entrances, the positions of the Main Court and megaron-throne-rooms at each palace were diametrically opposed to each other.

Inside the Mycenae palace, different wings were separated by corridors 10, 44 and 40, and court 45. The primary storage rooms were immediately through stairway 5, connected to corridor 10, immediately next to the propylaea, while the Main Court and megaron were at the furthest end of the corridors and surrounded by rooms that have been labelled as living apartments.
By contrast, the Main Court at Ancient Pylos was immediately connected to the propylaea, with the court and the megaron throne-room positioned directly and immediately accessible from the main entrance at the Palace of Nestor. Visitors to Ancient Pylos could directly approach the Primary megaron through the entrance to the Main Building, while those at Mycenae had to take a longer route before reaching the throne-room, Guest room and Royal Apartments.

These were clearly cultural adaptations and are indicative that although the layouts of different palaces within Mycenaean Greece had distinct cultural components, they were not dictated by Mycenaean cultural regularities or uniform plans. These layouts can even be used to interpret the different security priorities that their occupants theoretically had in mind during the LHIIIB period: economic at Ancient Pylos, and personal at Mycenae. At the former, and Oil-press and a pair of larger storerooms were positioned at the furthest points away from the propylaea or the Main Court, where the largest deposits of products for the perfume, oil and wine industries would have been kept within the Main Palace. At the Mycenae palace, the locations where the wanax and his inner-circle would have lived or assembled were positioned furthest away from any potential visitors. These theories can be further complemented by the positions of the Main Courts at both palaces. One was the nexus for all traffic or activity within the Main Building at Ancient Pylos and had to be passed through before reaching the storerooms, instead of further away through multiple corridors (fig.12a).

These observations are extremely complex, since they reflect both Mycenaean cultural regularities and cultural adaptations layered over one another. The latter can be used to examine how both Mycenae and Ancient Pylos have clear evidence for the use of spatial positioning to limit the accessibility of certain rooms inside their palaces.
Yet, the specific rooms that were given such priorities were direct paradoxes of each other, with the larger storage rooms at Ancient Pylos more restricted than those at Mycenae, while the throne-room at Ancient Pylos was directly accessible from the main entrance (fig.7b), and its counterpart at Mycenae was the most restricted room inside the palace.

Moving on to a related subject, both palaces contained multiple storeys, with some above and some below the main floor. At Ancient Pylos, the stone foundations of stairways have been identified nears corridors 16 and 18 and a third one near the Queen’s megaron, along with evidence of upper storeys that have been found throughout the palace.\(^{126}\) In contrast to this, at the Mycenae palace only traces of a single charred deposit have been interpreted as the remains of a wooden staircase in the Royal Apartments.\(^{127}\) However, at the Mycenae palace, another staircase near the “Guest room” descended into the Pillar basement.

At both sites, one staircase was positioned near the apartments adjacent to the throne-rooms, near the Queen’s megaron at Ancient Pylos and the Royal Apartments at Mycenae. Also, the stone foundations found at Ancient Pylos have led archaeologists to theorize that staircases ascending to a second storey were composed of organic materials, such as wood. Many studies at Ancient Pylos agree that wood was freely used in the walls and second storey of the Main building,\(^{128}\) which does have some relation to the charcoal deposit found in the Mycenae palace indicating a wooden staircase.

\(^{126}\) Most of it consisting of Bronze-age wall-plaster or ceramics found inside the “Queen’s” megaron and the Oil press, found in a stratum above the contents of the ground-floor. Contextually, this indicates that during the destruction of Ancient Pylos, the upper storey collapsed on top of the contents inside these rooms.

\(^{127}\) Mylonas, 1966a, 62. A stairwell has been identified north of corridors 40 and 46, near the doorway to the Main Court. However, I only found references to it in Palace V studies and maps, not Palace IV.

Their comparable placement between the Main Court and residence-spaces, along with a second storey about the living-apartments in both palaces, would initially suggest these two separate features were cultural regularities. However, the other staircases found inside the palaces do not have these similarities.

No parallels for the basement staircase at the Mycenae palace have been identified at Ancient Pylos. While the throne-room inside the latter had evidence of a second storey balcony, that has not been identified in the Mycenae throne-room (fig.11d). Even the materials these different stairs were composed of were very different from each other; at Mycenae only wooden remains have been suggested from burnt deposits, while at Ancient Pylos the lower sections were clearly identified by blocks of poros stone and solid earth filling.\textsuperscript{129} Aside from these different architectural techniques, the second staircase at Mycenae led to the Pillar Storage room beneath the palace. At Ancient Pylos, all of the stairs were oriented to connect with rooms above the ground floor, not below it. This may likely have been due to the use of foundation terraces at Mycenae, which were not present at Ancient Pylos, yet they directly relate to cultural adaptations related to the topography of both sites.

Additionally, the types of ceramic vessels recovered from the storey above the Queen’s megaron at Ancient Pylos have suggested that it contained an olive-oil magazine, rather than additional apartments.\textsuperscript{130} Such remains have not been identified at Mycenae, and, as explored earlier, the layouts of the Mycenae palace separated the living-quarters from storage rooms, rather than overlapping them. Each of the stairs had some combinations of different architectural techniques, different placements or led to rooms above the main floor or below the main floor.

\textsuperscript{129} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 36.
\textsuperscript{130} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 199.
All of these differences between them make it more likely the staircases were cultural adaptations made by the occupants of these palaces. They did not follow cultural-wide rules or standards relating to their locations, materials or orientation that are associated with cultural regularities.

The distribution of the storerooms inside the megaron-palaces are clearly a cultural adaptation made by the palace occupants, and a highly influential one. At the Main Building of Ancient Pylos, the majority of the rooms contained a broad variety of artefacts: gold, silver and bronze foil, ivory fragments, and a massive collection of kylikes, pithoi and smaller storage jars, pots, and more (fig.10a & 10b). One room even contained fragments from over 2,146 individual pots.

At Mycenae, the storage rooms were condensed into a single wing north of the megaron throne-room, not spread out around the entire palace. Their most notable contents were several pithoi sunk into the cement floors, along with small traces of gold foil, four LHIII spindle whorls, and several decorative beads. Each of these rooms was surrounded by corridors 81, 82 and 83, and only accessible through a small doorway in corridor 10, with a couple of steps.

When comparing them, none of the storage rooms inside the Mycenae palace was close to the throne-room, and all of them were positioned adjacent to the propylae. On the other hand, the Main Building at Ancient Pylos had multiple storage rooms spread throughout its layout, all of which surrounded the throne-room, but only Room 9 was close to the propylae. These differences are further indicative of how the layout of the different palaces was heavily influenced by cultural adaptations.

131 Rooms 9, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 30, 31, 32.
132 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 131.
133 Mylonas, 1966a, 69-70.
On a different subject, at Ancient Pylos the Linear B Archive is the largest deposit of its kind found in Helladic Greece.\textsuperscript{134} It consisted of two rooms, with over 200 Linear B tablets that were recovered by archaeologists.\textsuperscript{135} No similar archives have been found inside the Mycenae palace. However, this absence cannot be completely discounted, as it may have been demolished or obscured by later building phases from continued habitation at Mycenae.

Additionally, several Linear B tablets and fragments were found in separate houses across the citadel at Mycenae, including the basement storerooms of the House of Columns.\textsuperscript{136} At Ancient Pylos, 11\% of the tablets recovered were deposited outside the archive complex, in particular from the second storey assemblage inside the megaron,\textsuperscript{137} Court 92 outside the Northeast Workshop\textsuperscript{138} and Room 72 inside the Southwest Building.\textsuperscript{139} The use of these tablets certainly represent cultural regularities within Mycenaean palaces. Additionally, the evidence for where these tablets were stored suggests that neither site consolidated all of their Linear B records in a single series of rooms but had multiple storage-spaces in different buildings outside the palaces. Until an archive is inarguably proven to have been absent from the Mycenae palace, the use and distribution of these records will remain a cultural regularity.

However, out of all these distinct Mycenaean cultural regularities and cultural adaptations, the most complex arrangement of both palaces was found inside the Main Court and megaron throne-rooms (fig.11e). Architecturally, these throne-rooms were connected to the Main Court, separated by porch and vestibule that preceded a square hall with a circular hearth and four pillars. The Main Courts were also connected to additional corridors that led to certain rooms.

\textsuperscript{134} Stocker and Davis, 2004, 2.
\textsuperscript{135} Stocker and Davis, 2004, 2.
\textsuperscript{136} French, 2002, 99.
\textsuperscript{137} Shelmerdine, 2008, 86.
\textsuperscript{138} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 303.
\textsuperscript{139} Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 267.
Yet, the interior layouts and dimensions of the Main Courts at both Ancient Pylos at Mycenae were clearly influenced by cultural adaptations more than Mycenaean cultural regularities. At Ancient Pylos, the Main Court was a rectangle measuring 12.9m by 7.3m and surrounded by solid walls with doorways that led to multiple rooms and corridors. On the other hand, at Mycenae the Main Court was larger, measuring 11.5m by 15m, with doorways only leading to the “Guest Room” and throne-room. Also, the north side of Main Court had a solid wall, with decorative stonework composed of painted triglyphs and half-rosettes, while the south section had an open balcony.

This is a crucial disparity since the Centre Court at Ancient Pylos was a nucleus, surrounded by rooms and corridors that led to different wings of the palace, instead of panoramic traits that were present at Mycenae. Additionally, the floor of the Mycenae Main court was coated with lime plaster, and a layer of painted stucco that included black lines to form tiled textures, coloured with yellow, blue and red. The “Guest Room” and throne-room inside the Mycenae palace also had similar painted floors with the same techniques and colours. On the other hand, the Centre Court at Ancient Pylos lacked such decorations, although the anteroom of the megaron did contain a painted ceremonial procession of men and women leading a huge bull (fig.10c).

Both of these Courts had some degrees of practicality in their layouts, as a traffic hub at Ancient Pylos and a scenic platform at Mycenae. Both were evidently open to the sky, lacking the support-columns that would have been required for roof or upper storey, and they were positioned on the same orientation related to the respective throne-rooms from each megaron.

---

140 Mylonas, 1966b, 19.
141 Castledon, 2005, 43.
143 Castledon, 2005, 43-44.
These are some of the few cultural regularities that both courts shared with each other, along with raised slabs that were found inside the megaron vestibules of both palaces. These slabs have been labelled as offering tables, and their identical placements inside both palaces are a definitive cultural regularity. Otherwise, the artwork, walls, and even locations of these courts inside the palaces are all cultural adaptations that were made by their occupants during the LHIIIB period, as is the case with the megaron throne-rooms.

Remarkably, the measurements and plans of the primary megarons of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos are almost identical, consisting of a columned porch=>vestibule=>main room, including a single doorway from the Main Court. This arrangement is a cultural regularity that was widespread across different contexts of Mycenaean Greece, including palaces and less prominent buildings. However, the great megaron of Tiryns contained three openings in its doorway as opposed to one (fig.12b). Tiryns is an immediate neighbour of Mycenae and one would expect that they would share more cultural regularities with one another, and Ancient Pylos, in Messenia separated by the Arkadian and Parnonas mountains, would have a different doorway. Yet, this is not the case, and the doorway to the throne-rooms at Ancient Pylos and Mycenae share strong cultural regularities.

A throne space was identified at Ancient Pylos (fig. 8b), consisting of a sunken rectangular cut in the floor, with an irregular surface. No definitive traces of a throne-space were found at Mycenae; and initially a tentative space in the north side of the room was labelled as such. In recent decades, however, archaeologists have argued that a throne-space at Mycenae could have been positioned along the south section of the megaron and was lost with some of the palace into the Chavos ravine.

---

145 French, 2002, 98.
146 Mylonas, 1966a, 63.
147 Egan, 2015, 149.
149 Mylonas, 1966a, 62.
This theory has become more widespread and accepted by experts, and crucially, it means that the
throne would have been located to the right of the doorway, the same position as the throne-spaces at
Ancient Pylos and Tiryns, making this another cultural regularity inside the megarons.

Elsewhere inside the megarons, the hearths of both palaces were extremely similar, made of
hardened plaster, decorated with painted spiral and flame-shaped motifs, and sharing the same
positions in the center of their respective throne-rooms. The hearth at Mycenae is the larger of the
two, with an interior space measuring 3.7m in diameter opposed to 3m. at Ancient Pylos.\textsuperscript{150} This
disparity in the sizes of the hearths are another example of a Mycenaean cultural adaptation; it also
has some direct implications towards the difference in scale between the megarons.

One crucial factor to consider would be how the megaron at Ancient Pylos had at least two
storeys, while no such evidence was recognized at Mycenae (fig. 12e). In the case of Ancient Pylos, a
larger hearth could have provided additional heat across multiple floors. Yet, the superstructure of the
second storey at Ancient Pylos is widely accepted to have been composed of wood. A larger fire could
have possibly burned the upper balcony or produced too much smoke for the chimney to funnel
quickly enough, forming a choking hazard for the people standing on the balcony (fig.11e). Therefore,
the choice of a smaller hearth could have been to circumvent this risk. No similar evidence for a
balcony has been found in the throne-room at the Mycenae palace.

This theory is supported by bronze coverings that were identified around the column-bases
near the Mycenae megaron, possibly as a protective measure against the fires inside the hearth.\textsuperscript{151}
These were not found at Ancient Pylos, which can imply that the fires within were not large enough for
the occupants to require such protective measures for the nearby columns.

\textsuperscript{150} Casteldon, 2005, 46.
\textsuperscript{151} George Mylonas, Mycenae rich in gold 1983, 100.
This would make the characteristics of these columns and the size of the hearths fall into the category of cultural adaptations.

Otherwise, fragments of terra-cotta pipes were also found inside the hearths of both megarons and have been interpreted to originate from chimney-systems in the roofs of the megarons. These pipes are another example of Mycenaean cultural regularities used at both Ancient Pylos and Mycenae.

Both hearths were also decorated with layers of painted plaster (fig.12g). Ten of these layers were identified at Mycenae, each of them covered with flame motifs and dotted rosettes, with no changes in their colours or orientation (fig.12g). Yet, at Ancient Pylos, only five layers of plaster were identified on the hearth, and some of these layers had changes in their colours and orientation: black flames on a white background on coats 3 and 5, yet coat 4 had white flames on a black background. Additionally, the flames on the third coat of painted plaster bend to the right, yet the flames on the fourth and fifth bend to the left. The purpose or meaning behind these symbols are very speculative, and their existence can be listed as a cultural regularity between Ancient Pylos and Mycenae. However, since the changes in the direction and colours of the painted flames on the hearth at Ancient Pylos were not replicated at Mycenae, they were a distinct cultural adaptation made by the occupants.

This trend can also be found in the floors and walls inside both megarons (fig. 12f). Artistic techniques or themes are often acknowledged by historians and archaeologists as key parts of a culture’s identity. If they are widespread across multiple different contexts, then they become some of the most recognizable cultural regularities across any cultural study. At Mycenae and Ancient Pylos, some wall-frescos include shared themes, such as ritual processions (Fig.5b & 11c) or warriors.

---

152 Blegen and Rawson, 1966, 87.
153 Egan, 2015, 185.
However, at Ancient Pylos the majority of frescos inside the throne-room consisted of individuals participating in a large feast, or musicians including the “Lyre player,” (fig.11b).\textsuperscript{154} While elsewhere in the Southwest House, the fresco of warriors and dogs were recovered by archaeologists (fig. 11a). At Mycenae, archaeologists have examined and reconstructed the fragments of painted plaster, and recognized images of chariots, warriors or a battle outside of a fortified palace (fig.5a).\textsuperscript{155} These reflect that the majority of themes of these frescos between both sites were not Mycenaen cultural regularities, but independent choices made the occupants.

Artwork is often one of the most heavily symbolic and indicative characteristics used by archaeologists to study cultures and civilizations, which makes these differences in the themes of wall-frescoes between Mycenae and Ancient Pylos a very significant topic. Another very specific example of such disparities can be found at Ancient Pylos, where the images of a lion and a griffin were identified, flanking the throne-space.\textsuperscript{156} Both of these animals have been directly associated with Mycenae, from the monuments at the Lion Gate relief to images of lions and griffins on sealings found in houses located within the palace-citadel, and beyond. Yet, no images of these animals were identified from the remains of the painted walls inside the throne-room of the palace at Mycenae, despite their context at Ancient Pylos. Unfortunately, the lions and griffins at Ancient Pylos were located to the right of the vestibule inside the throne room, or near a throne space. These are both missing from the Mycenae throne-room, and until such evidence is definitively recovered, it remains too vague to label these similarities as cultural adaptations or regularities, similar to the existence of any throne from Mycenae.

\textsuperscript{154} Egan, 2015, 33.
\textsuperscript{155} Mylonas, 1966a, 62.
\textsuperscript{156} Egan, 2015, 33.
Similar cultural adaptations can be recognized from the features and aesthetics from the Main Courts of both palaces (fig. 12d). At Mycenae, a border of gypsum slabs was installed along the edges of the room, which encompassed a series of square panels that were painted into the floor. The gypsum slabs at Mycenae are a highly distinct component, often associated with Minoan prestige architecture. It is also quite unusual because while other Minoan cultural practices were adapted across Mainland Greece, this example has the consistency found in cultural regularities on Crete yet is a Mycenaean cultural adaptation made at Mycenae. Ancient Pylos had a similar arrangement of painted squares used inside the throne-room, but it lacked the gypsum border.

One row of these painted squares at Ancient Pylos has an oblique angle, making one-half of the floor off-set from the other. Most of these squares were painted abstract colours, with a single stylized panel that contained an octopus, positioned in front of the throne-space. Therefore, the painted squares of the floors inside the megarons of Mycenae and Ancient Pylos fall under the category of Mycenaean cultural regularities, while the individual colours and designs were cultural adaptations.

In summary, the megaron throne-rooms at both Mycenae and Ancient Pylos both contained distinct features that were associated with the culture of the Mycenaeans and are even found across other palaces in Late Helladic Greece. Yet, the list of cultural adaptations that were made in the layout, decorations, and additional modifications to certain features inside these throne-rooms was very extensive. Very few Late Helladic artefacts were recovered from inside the megarons, as the majority at Ancient Pylos were associated with a second storey above it that later collapsed during the destruction of the palace. The differences in the designs of the floors and walls, the sizes and designs

---
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of the hearths, and the balcony at Ancient Pylos reflect that the contents of these throne-rooms were more heavily influenced by Mycenaean cultural adaptations, not cultural regularities. However, this was not an absolute case, as the matching one-doorway entrances and vestibule-slabs at both palace-citadels from separate regions, the Argolid and Messenia respectively, is one example of a cultural regularity outweighing any factors that could have encouraged local adaptations. A more expansive study of multiple palace-citadels could address such cultural regularities in depth and detail.

Another critical difference between both sites is the presence of the Queen’s megaron (fig.8c) at Ancient Pylos. No direct equivalent to it has been found inside the palace at Mycenae to date. The “Guest room” does have some very minor similarities, with the same style of floor-painting as the throne-room found inside, and it was built as part of the same unit as the Main Court and the megaron. However, the “Guest room” lacked evidence for a hearth, wall paintings, grooves or pottery that was found inside the Queen’s megaron at Ancient Pylos.

Alternatively, the Queen’s megaron was also positioned close to the entrance of the Main Building and, following the function of such rooms in Mycenaean culture, could have been used to host multiple individuals who gathered within the palace. The room did contain the same plastered floors and painted fresco that were also identified inside the Primary megaron, along with large amphoras, a two-handled-jar, kraters, and a stirrup-vase. Smaller artefacts of precious materials were also recovered by archaeologists, including gold leaf, silver, bronze, stone and ivory. The room was clearly occupied and used quite heavily, as the Primary megaron did not contain such a large pottery deposit. However, the similarities in the floor designs and plastered walls do share some cultural regularities that were found at Mycenae, between the “Guest room” and the megaron throne-room.

161 Mylonas, 1966a, 66.
162 Blegen and Rawson, 1996, 201.
Both of them shared similar positions and have been theorized by archaeologists to have associations with foreign visitors to the palaces. Additionally, they were positioned close to associated bathing installations, although the one at Ancient Pylos is far more definitive than that at Mycenae. The contents found inside both rooms, including the hearth and pottery vessels in the Pylos Queen’s megaron are strong disparities between both rooms. Yet, their similarities should not be overlooked, and would fall under cultural regularities, not cultural adaptations.

During research into the palaces at Ancient Pylos and Mycenae, it was initially thought that the division between the respective cultural regularities and cultural adaptations by different populations of Mycenaean civilization would be simple and straightforward. However, the results were the opposite, and both categories were very layered and complex. The only spaces that were total cultural regularities were the entrance to the palaces. Otherwise, the architecture, throne-rooms and artwork within the palaces contained a combination of different characteristics and aesthetics within the same features or subjects; or cultural adaptations within cultural regularities. The strongest of these were the different frequencies and placements of staircases within the palaces, and the separate characteristics within the throne-rooms and the Mycenae Main Court and Ancient Pylos Court 3. The different locations and contents of storage rooms within both palaces are stronger cultural adaptations. Some characteristics were even unique to only one palace, such as the Pillar Basement and Balcony at Mycenae, and the Queen’s megaron at Ancient Pylos.
6. Summary:

The results of this analysis of the archaeological remains from LHIIIIB Mycenae and Pylos are that the cultural adaptations between both sites outweighed their cultural regularities. These two sites remain only a sample of the broader Late Helladic world, and are so complex that even the content of this report does not encompass everything from each site. Yet what has been addressed is among the more thoroughly examined evidence, while the corpus of archaeological evidence recovered from Ancient Pylos and Mycenae and their surviving remains are among the foremost in Mycenaean Archaeology.

Admittedly, certain categories of archaeological evidence were less thoroughly addressed in the course of this study. Instead, only the accumulative evidence for certain contexts were featured as a sample to reflect the remains in an overall perspective, rather than critically examine the expansive evidence for certain components at each site, including the frequencies of certain ceramic styles and artistic designs, multiple Linear B tablet translations, or evidence for ecofacts at each site, such as animal bones as indicators for ritual feastings and offerings. Such studies would undeniably have new impacts on the balance between cultural adaptations and cultural regularities between Ancient Pylos and Mycenae, building additional layers to this study.

Even the development of the analysis technique used in this project is far from complete, despite the results. The comparisons between cultural adaptations and cultural regularities was only used in this report, and likely could be adapted or refined with time. Additionally, published site reports and later publications were predominantly used to research both Pylos and Mycenae with a handful of first-hand experiences; rather than first-hand examinations of the remains and original site reports. Additionally, this research project was restricted only to a pair of highly notable and the regularities or adaptations between them alone.
Despite these shortcomings, this study of the parallels and divergences between Ancient Pylos and Mycenae, has led to the conclusion that the frequencies of cultural adaptations between both palace-citadels drastically outweigh their cultural regularities. While certain features and contexts did exhibit superficial similarities, closer examination revealed that the differences between them were far more pronounced, such as the use of foundation terraces and basement-spaces at Mycenae which are absent at Ancient Pylos, the locations and remains from the Great Ramp at Mycenae and Court 58 at Ancient Pylos, the layouts and contents of the Mycenae Palace IV and Ancient Pylos Main Building, different emphases on storage rooms within the palaces opposed to the broader sites, evidence for cult-presences and burials inside the hilltops, and the themes of artwork found throughout the sites. Even within highly similar contexts the difference between their characteristics and remains fall distinctly under the category of cultural adaptations: megaron throne-rooms, clay figurines, or additional megaron-rooms outside the palaces. The differences between the positions, features, aesthetics, characteristics and more from each of these contexts and more are indicative of how culturally and behaviourally diverse the Mycenaenians were.

Several highly impactful cultural regularities were identified, however, and may indicate how influential and intrinsic they were to Mycenaean culture: including references to Potnia found in Linear B tablets from cult-buildings at both sites, the near-identical Propylaea entrance-ways inside the palaces and throne-room doorways (fig.12c). Nevertheless, these cultural regularities were extremely rare and both palace-citadels were more varied than they were similar to one another, not the kind of characteristics that would be indicative of a homogenous civilization.

These observations also have strong implications behind the behaviours of the occupants from Mycenae and Ancient Pylos. At the former, multiple buildings would have provided additional storage
spaces to keep certain material goods or remains or fulfill a broader variety of interrelated roles within the Mycenae palace-citadel, while the latter had additional storerooms within the Main Building, and only three specialized buildings aside from the Southwest Building. While Mycenae expanded its influence and possessions across the entire, the remains from Ancient Pylos implies that the occupants practiced consolidation and segregation of their material wealth.

The conclusions from this report are far the end results, however. Aside from further expansions on the corpus of information for this specific case study, the addition of more notable Mycenae sites, including Tiryns, Midea and the Menelaion, would have the potential to add new insights following the model of cultural adaptations and cultural regularities. Alternatively, it would be possible to expand the chronological window of this report to encompass the broader LHIII period, which is notable since the addition of the Grand Staircase at Mycenae in LHIIIC shifted the primary entrance of the Palace to directly connect with the Main Court. Similar to Ancient Pylos where the main entrance was connected to Court 3, and possibly indicative of the additional of more cultural regularities between both sites.
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1. Locations of sites:

Southwest = Messenia. Northeast = Argolid/Argos.


2. Mycenaean Architecture:

2a) Mycenae Cyclopean Walls.

(Personal Photo).
2b) Examples of Mycenae Foundation Terraces.

(French, 2002, 60).

2c) Remains of Column imprints from Ancient Pylos (with traces of flutings).

(Propylon column imprint)  
(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 48).

(throne-room column imprint)  
(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 67).

(Hall 64 column-imprints)  
(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 200 & 201)
3. Maps of Mycenae:

3a) Hilltop site.

(French, 2002, 13)

3b) East Wing:


21=Artisans Quarters. 22=House of Columns. 23=House Gamma. 24=House Delta.
3c) Palace IV:

(Mylonas, 1966a, 60).

3d) Grave-Circle District:

(French, 2002, 81).
6= Ramp House.  7= House of the Warrior Vase.  8= South House.  

(Online aerial shot)
3e) Cult Centre:

(French, 2002, 84).

9=Procession Way.  10=megaron-room.  11=Shrine Gamma.  12=Tsountas House.
13=Centre Court.  14= the Temple.  15=Room with the Fresco.

(Aerial of the Cult Centre at Mycenae with the Tsountas House to the left, 2017, © Odyssey. Adventures in Archaeology, https://www.odysseyadventures.ca/articles/mycenae/article_mycenae04-cultcentre.html)
3f) Artistic reconstruction of the Temple.

(French, 2002, 86).

4a) Artist’s reconstruction.

(The Palace of Mycenae, 2002-2019, Mycenae, Photo Gallery
https://www.ancientgreece.org/archaeology/mycenae.html)

4b) Missing section of the Mycenae Throne-room.

(Fitzsimons, 2006, 411)
4c) Main Court. [From Greece Museums website]

(The Palace of Mycenae, 2002-2019, Mycenae, Photo Gallery © Ancient-Greece.org
https://www.ancient-greece.org/archaeology/mycenae.html)

4d) Outline of the Hellenistic temple above Palace IV storerooms.

(Mylonas, 1957, Plate 14).
5. Art work from Mycenae:
5a) War scenes from the Throne-room.

(Hilker, 2014, 168)  
(Hilker, 2014, 173).

5b) 13th cent. BCE Female Fresco from the “Room with the Fresco” in the Cult District  
(French, 2002, Figure 12).
6. Artefacts recovered from Mycenae:

6a) LHIIIa²-IIIB pottery from inside the site

6b) Artefacts recovered from Temple storeroom.

6c) Pottery assemblage found on the slopes beneath the East Wing of the Mycenae Palace-complex.

6d) Mycenae Ivory figurines.

(French, 2002, 71).

(French, 2002, 89).

(Mylonas, 1968, 29).

(Mylonas, 1968, Plate 128).
7. Maps from Ancient Pylos.

7a) Entire site:

(Hilker, 2014, 149).
7b) Main Building (Palace of Nestor)

(Snap-shot of Main Building from Castledon, 2005, 24).

(Snap-shot of the Ancient Pylos Court, Mylonas, 1966, Plate 52).

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 35).
7c) Southwest Building:

(snap-shot of Figure 7a).

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 208).
7d) Wine Magazine:

[Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 255].

7e) Northeast Workshop: (altar in the centre of court 92)

[Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 223].

(Snap-shot of Image 7a)
7f) The Northwest Workshop (82).

[Snapshot of Image 7a]

8. Remains from Ancient Pylos.
8a) Throne-room + hearth and Rear storerooms.

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 22).
8b) Throne-space and libation channel.

8c) Queen’s Megaron.

8d) Bathing room.

8e) lower staircase remains:
9. Artistic Reconstruction of Southwest Building.

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 419).

10. Artefacts recovered from Ancient Pylos:
10a) Dippers found in Room 22.

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 103).
10b) Pottery deposits throughout the site.

(A Guide to the Palace of Nestor, 2008, 12)

10c) Clay sealings from Wine Magazine (Room 104 and 105).

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 311).
#11. Artwork from Ancient Pylos.
11a) Dogs and men from Southwest House.

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 197 & 198).

11b) Remains of the Lyre-player in the Throne-room.

(Castledon, 2005, 133).
11c) Remains of Bull-offering procession located in Pylos Megaron vestibule.

(Shelmerdine, 2008, 84).
#12. Comparisons.
12a) Palace-complexes: Mycenae (top), Ancient Pylos (bottom)

(Fitzsimons, 2006, 403) 4=East Wing. 1-2=Palace IV. 3=natural ridge.

(Hilker, 2014, 149).
12b) Throne-room Megaron layouts:

(Mylonas, 1966a, 63).

12c) Propylaea entrances:

(Ancient Pylos)  (Mycenae)

(Snap-shot of Image 7B)  (Snap-shot of Image 3c)

(personal photo)  (Mylonas, 1966, 67).
12d) Main Courts:
(Ancient Pylos Court 3)

(Snap-shot of the Ancient Pylos Court, Mylonas, 1966, Plate 52).

(Mycenae Main Court)

(The Palace of Mycenae, 2002-2019, Mycenae, Photo Gallery, © Ancient-Greece.org
https://www.ancient-greece.org/archaeology/mycenae.html)
12e) Outlines of Throne-room superstructures:
(Ancient Pylos; with upper storey and balcony, facing in from Court 3)

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 418).
(Mycenae [from west to east, facing south])

(Mylonas, 1983, 110)
12f) Artist’s Painted Images of the Throne-rooms.

(Ancient Pylos)


(Mycenae)

(Reconstruction of the Megaron of the Royal Palace of Mycenae, 2013, © ArS Artistic Adventure of Mankind, https://arsartisticadventureofmankind.wordpress.com/tag/minoan-civilization/)
12g) Throne-room megarons painted plaster.
(Ancient Pylos)

(Blegen and Rawson, 1966, Plate 66).

(Mycenae)

(Mylonas, 1983, 100).