

Intentionel or accidental design? The tale of Minoan double axes and chisels

Maria Lowe Fri

Numerous Minoan tools have been uncovered by excavations and the most common way of dealing with the material is to classify and place them in a typology. Strictly speaking the typologies demonstrates a tool's development in shape but is also used as a chronological guide-line. Typology construction is a method visualizing the archaeological material, but regarding tools, what is it we typologize? – an as-cast tool with no finishing treatment completed or a tool with a hammered body and sharp cutting edges or a used blunt tool? With these aspects in mind what *is it* we really can conclude with so many different parameters in a typology?

The only convincing conclusion is that tools are of different shapes. But is this intentional or accidental? Many improvements of various objects are due to skilled workmen/women with an understanding of the manufacturing process and an understanding of what the end product will be used for. However, many improvements and developments of objects are due by mere chance or in other words accidental improvements, none the less, important but not thought of during the manufacturing process.

I would like to present some thoughts and conclusions on shape and development of tools by using; already existing typologies and experimental archaeology, and by rising the question are the Minoan double axes and chisels intentionally och accidentally designed?