

- Voutsaki S. 1995a. "Social and political processes in the Mycenaean Argolid: the evidence from the mortuary practices", *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 12], R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 55-66.
- Voutsaki S. 1995b. "Value and exchange in pre-monetary societies: anthropological debates and Aegean archaeology", *Trade and Production in Premonetary Greece: Aspects of Trade*, C. Gillis, C. Risberg and B.L. Sjöberg (eds.), Jonsered: 7-17.
- Voutsaki S. 1997. "The creation of value and prestige in the Aegean Late Bronze Age", *Journal of European Archaeology* 5: 34-52.
- Voutsaki S. 1998. "Mortuary evidence, symbolic meanings and social change: a comparison between Messenia and the Argolid in the Mycenaean period", *Cemetery and society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 41-58.
- Voutsaki S. 1999. "Value beyond Ugarit", *Archaeological Dialogues* 6: 27-31.
- Voutsaki S. 2001. "Economic control, power and prestige in the Mycenaean world: the archaeological evidence", *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States*, [Cambridge Philological Society 27], S. Voutsaki and J. Killen (eds.), Cambridge: 195-213.
- Wace A.J.B. 1932. *Chamber Tombs at Mycenae*, [Archaeology 82], Oxford.
- Wagstaff J.M. 1987a. "Introduction", *Landscape and Culture: Geographical and Archaeological Perspectives*, J.M. Wagstaff (ed.), Oxford: 1-10.
- Wagstaff J.M. 1987b. "The new archaeology and geography", *Landscape and Culture: Geographical and Archaeological Perspectives*, J.M. Wagstaff (ed.), Oxford: 26-36.
- Walters H.B. and Forsdyke E.J. 1930. *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Great Britain 7, British Museum 7*, London.
- Wardle K.A. 1969. "A group of Late Helladic IIIB 1 pottery from within the citadel at Mycenae", *BSA* 64: 261-97.
- Wardle K.A. 1973. "A group of Late Helladic IIIB 2 pottery from within the citadel at Mycenae 'the Causeway deposit'", *BSA* 68: 297-348.

**The South-eastern Aegean in the Mycenaean Period:
Islands, landscape, death and ancestors**

Volume 1

**Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University
of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by**

Mercourios Georgiadis

February 2003

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: ENVIRONMENT AND MOVEMENT	8
CHAPTER 1: THE ENVIRONMENT	9
1.1 Geology	9
1.2 Geographical Information	12
1.3 Island Archaeology	14
1.4 Practical Considerations	19
CHAPTER 2: MOVEMENT AND IDENTITY	22
2.1 Movement of People	22
2.1.1 Migration	22
2.1.2 Colonization	26
2.1.3 Invasion	29
2.1.4 Thalassocracy	30
2.2.1 Movement of Ideas	34
2.2.2 Movement of Artefacts	35
2.3 Identity	38
2.3.1 Cultural Identity	38
2.3.2 Ethnicity	40
CHAPTER 3: THE PREHISTORY OF SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN	45
3.1 The Earliest Human Colonization in the Aegean	45
3.2 The Neolithic Period	46
3.3 The Early Bronze Age	49
3.4 The Middle Bronze Age	53

3.5 The Late Bronze Age	55
3.6 Discussion	58
PART II: THE LANDSCAPE	60
CHAPTER 4: LANDSCAPE METHODOLOGY	61
4.1 The Theoretical Framework	61
4.1.1 The Basis of Phenomenology	61
4.1.2 The Archaeological Context	64
4.2 The Seascape	70
4.3 Methodological Considerations: the language of death	72
4.4 Discussion	77
CHAPTER 5: THE REGIONAL LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OF CEMETERIES IN SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN	79
5.1 The Pre-Mycenaean Burial Evidence in the South-eastern Aegean	79
5.2 Late Bronze Age II-III	82
5.2.1 Karpathos and Kasos	83
5.2.2 Rhodes	85
5.2.3 Kos	93
5.2.4 Astypalaia and Kalymnos	97
5.2.5 Anatolia	98
5.2.6 Samos	101
5.2.7 Chios and Psara	102
5.2.8 North-eastern Aegean	103
5.3 Discussion	105
5.3.1 The Topographic Context of Cemeteries	105
5.3.2 The Landscape Setting	110
5.3.3 The Diachronic Pattern of Cemetery Usage during the Mycenaean period	113

PART III: BURIALS	117
CHAPTER 6: BURIAL PRACTICES AND TRADITIONS	118
6.1 The Theoretical Background	118
6.2 Burial Customs, Beliefs and Practices	121
6.3 Communality versus Individuality?	123
6.4 Horizontal Divisions	125
6.5 Vertical Divisions	127
6.6 Ancestors and Symbolism	129
6.7 Rituals, Power and Ideology	132
6.8 Exchange, Consumption and Value	135
CHAPTER 7: THE MYCENAEAN BURIAL TRADITION	140
7.1 The Tomb Types	140
7.2 Deposition Practices	143
7.3 Burial Iconography	144
7.4 The Burial Rituals	146
7.5 The Burial Offerings	151
7.6 The Social and Political Dimensions of Burials	154
7.7 Consumption in the Funerary Context	157
7.8 Discussion	159
CHAPTER 8: THE TOMBS IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN	161
8.1 Tomb Architecture	161
8.1.1 Karpathos	161
8.1.2 Ialysos	162
8.1.3 Rhodes	168
8.1.4 Kos	175
8.1.5 South-eastern Aegean	177
8.1.6 Discussion	179
8.2 Internal Arrangements and Rituals	183
8.2.1 Karpathos	183

8.2.2 Ialysos	184
8.2.3 Rhodes	190
8.2.4 Kos	195
8.2.5 South-eastern Aegean	198
8.2.6 Discussion	201
CHAPTER 9: BURIAL OFFERINGS	205
9.1 Pottery	205
9.1.1 Karpathos	206
9.1.1.1 LH/LM IIIA1	207
9.1.1.2 LH/LM IIIA2	208
9.1.1.3 LH/LM IIIB	208
9.1.2 Ialysos	209
9.1.2.1 LH IIB	210
9.1.2.2 LH IIIA1	210
9.1.2.3 LH IIIA2	211
9.1.2.4 LH IIIB	211
9.1.2.5 LH IIIC	212
9.1.3 Rhodes	215
9.1.3.1 LH IIIA1	216
9.1.3.2 LH IIIA2	216
9.1.3.3 LH IIIB	217
9.1.3.4 LH IIIC	218
9.1.4 Kos	221
9.1.4.1 LH IIB	221
9.1.4.2 LH IIIA1	222
9.1.4.3 LH IIIA2	222
9.1.4.4 LH IIIB	223
9.1.4.5 LH IIIC	223
9.1.5 South-eastern Aegean	225
9.1.5.1 LH IIIA2	226

9.1.5.2 LH IIIB	227
9.1.5.3 LH IIIC	227
9.1.6 Discussion	229
9.2 Small Finds	235
9.2.1 Karpathos	235
9.2.2 Ialysos	236
9.2.3 Rhodes	242
9.2.4 Kos	245
9.2.5 South-eastern Aegean	249
9.2.6 Discussion	250
CONCLUSIONS	254
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUDING REMARKS	255
10.1 Cultural Context, Burial Rituals and Eschatological Beliefs	255
10.2 The Historical Context and the Migration Hypothesis	265
10.2.1 LH II-III A2: The Mycenaean Expansion in the Aegean	265
10.2.2 The <i>Ahhiyawa</i> Problem and the Mycenaean Influence in East Aegean	269
10.2.3 LH IIIC: Continuity and Change	272
10.3 A Synthesis	275
BIBLIOGRAPHY	277
Abbreviations	278
APPENDICES	328
Appendix Abbreviations	329
Appendix A.1 The Architectural Elements of the Ialysos Tombs	330
Appendix A.2 The Architectural Elements of the Tombs on Rhodes	334
Appendix A.3 The Architectural Elements of the Tombs on Kos	336
Appendix A.4 The Architectural Elements of the Tombs in the South-eastern Aegean	338

Appendix B.1 The Contents of the Ialysos Tombs	339
Appendix B.2 The Contents of the Tombs on Rhodes	342
Appendix B.3 The Contents of the Tombs on Kos	344
Appendix B.4 The Contents of the Tombs in the South-eastern Aegean	346
Appendix C.1 The Pots from the Tombs on Karpathos	348
Appendix C.2 The Pots from the Ialysos Tombs	353
Appendix C.3 The Pots from the Tombs on Rhodes	396
Appendix C.4 The Pots from the Tombs on Kos	430
Appendix C.5 The Pots from the Tombs in the South-eastern Aegean	441
Appendix D.1 The Small Finds from the Tombs on Karpathos	449
Appendix D.2 The Small Finds from the Ialysos Tombs	450
Appendix D.3 The Small Finds from the Tombs on Rhodes	476
Appendix D.4 The Small Finds from the Tombs on Kos	483
Appendix D.5 The Small Finds from the Tombs in the South-eastern Aegean	492
TABLES	493
Table 5.1 Cemeteries on Rhodes	494
Table 5.2 Cemeteries in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean	495
Table 9.1 The quantity of pottery types diachronically on Karpathos	496
Table 9.2 The percentage of pottery types according to period on Karpathos	497
Table 9.3 The percentage of pottery types in each period on Karpathos	498
Table 9.4 The quantity of pottery types diachronically at Ialysos	499
Table 9.5 The percentage of pottery types according to period at Ialysos	500
Table 9.6 The percentage of pottery types in each period at Ialysos	501
Table 9.7 The quantity of pottery types diachronically on Rhodes	502
Table 9.8 The percentage of pottery types according to period on Rhodes	503
Table 9.9 The percentage of pottery types in each period on Rhodes	504
Table 9.10 The quantity of pottery types diachronically on Kos	505
Table 9.11 The percentage of pottery types according to period on Kos	506
Table 9.12 The percentage of pottery types in each period on Kos	507
Table 9.13 The quantity of pottery types diachronically in the rest of the	

South-eastern Aegean sites	508
Table 9.14 The percentage of pottery types according to period in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean sites	509
Table 9.15 The percentage of pottery types in each period in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean sites	510
Table 9.16 Quantity and percentage of pottery types at Karpathos, Ialysos, Rhodes, Kos and the rest of the South-eastern Aegean	511
FIGURES	512
Keys to Map-Figures	513

ABSTRACT

The South-eastern Aegean is considered, in this thesis, as an ideal region for addressing questions related to island archaeology, perceptions of the landscape, burial rituals and beliefs. This is viable for the Mycenaean period, particularly from the introduction of chamber tombs in LH IIB, until their abandonment as the main tomb type in LH IIIC. The area covered is what is known today as the Dodecanese, Samos and Ikaria, as well as coastal south-western Anatolia.

In the first part of this work the geological and geographical dimensions are presented, along with the theory of island archaeology and an assessment of the extent that it can help us in our analysis. Moreover the issues of migration, colonization, invasion and thalassocracy are reviewed and their definitions are sought along with examples. An explanation of the movement of ideas and goods is offered, as well as of identity and ethnicity which are central to hypotheses about this area. The earlier prehistoric background is also presented so as to provide a context. The second part is concerned with landscape archaeology and the way it can help us to highlight new dimensions of beliefs and symbolisms. These ideas are used in the burial context in the South-eastern Aegean, where the cemetery orientation and the landscape seem to play an active and meaningful role in the local beliefs. The third part reviews the theories related to death and the burial practices and traditions of the Mycenaean world. Thus an analysis of the burial evidence from the South-eastern Aegean is presented, based particularly on the architecture of the tombs, their internal arrangements and the practices that can be seen. The pottery and small finds are discussed as burial offerings, viewed as symbolically meaningful in their context rather than for their typological character.

The cultural context, the burial rituals and the beliefs of the South-eastern Aegean are presented. Hence localized differences in the burial practices and the role of the ancestors are highlighted and used to reconstruct socio-political conditions in the region. Additionally the migration hypothesis is placed in a historical context, indicating the theoretical and practical problems which such an explanation involves, while the evidence for a Mycenaean presence in the East Aegean is assessed. Finally the Mycenaean identity and the importance of the burial context in the way that was constructed is considered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are no words to describe the degree of encouragement and support, financial and most importantly moral, that my parents Kiki and Yannis, my aunt Lela, my grandmother Athanasia and my uncle Nireus, to whom this work is dedicated, have offered me all these years. Without them the present thesis would have been impossible to undertake, I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Greek Archaeological Committee U.K. for their scholarship during the Academic Year 2001/2 and personally to its president Dr. I. Lemos for all her support.

Many thanks are owing to The British School of Ankara for their financial help with my fieldwork during the summer 2001 and to the financial aid of the Humanities Graduate Centre of The University of Liverpool for my fieldwork in the summers of 2000-2. I would like to thank for their aid in the course of my fieldwork Dr. A. Karnava, Ms. E. Roussaki and Ms. S. Roussaki for Karpathos, Ms. D. Ntertsou and Mr. H. van Versendaal for Astypalaia, Mr. E. Özcan for Müskebi, and Mr. H. Gianniris and Dr. P. Vlachos for Chios.

During my presence in Liverpool Dr. N. Dimitratos, Mr. A. Kanaras, Dr. P. Kousoulis, Ms. D.C. Naoum, Dr. A. Sugi and Mr. G. Yalouris have offered me their friendship and support, many thanks are owing.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues with whom the discussions were enlightening and fruitful: Dr. to be I. Galanaki, Dr. I. Georganas, Mr. G. Katavoutas, Dr. A. Koltsida, Dr. O. Kouka, Dr. N. Leriou and Dr. Y. Vavouranakis. In particular Dr. C. Gallou was kind enough to provide me a copy of her recent thesis and discuss with me a lot of her ideas. Dr. G. Muskett had the tantalizing task of reviewing my English and being a very supporting friend and colleague, I thank her very much for everything.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. C. Broodbank, Prof. S. Deger-Jalkotzy, Prof. A. Erkanal, Prof. H. Erkanal, Dr. A. Greaves, Dr. N. Momigliano, Dr. B. Niemeier and Prof. W.-D. Niemeier, head of the German Institute in Athens, Prof. T. Palaima, Dr. R. Tuncel, for their advice and the information they provided.

Very important was also the help provided to me by The British Museum and personally by Dr. L. Fitton. I am also grateful to the support from the KB ephorate of

Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in my studies and more particularly by Dr. A. Dreliosi, Mrs. E. Pharmakidou, Ms. E. Skerlou in Kos museum, Dr. I. Papachristodoulou, ex-ephor, Dr. A. Giannikouri, head of the Archaeological Institute in Rhodes and Dr. M. Philimonos-Tsopotou, current ephor.

Moreover the help of Ms. P. Winker and Prof. J. Davies, ex-head of S.A.C.O.S. in the University of Liverpool during the course of my studies was invaluable.

However this work would have never been completed without the guidance, advice, information and aid of Dr. E. Karantzali, Dr. T. Marketou and Prof. C.B. Mee, my supervisor and current head of the S.A.C.O.S. department, to whom I am deeply indebted.

Νιρεύς αυ Σύμηθεν άγε τρεις νηας εϊσας,
Νιρεύς Αγλαϊης υϊός Χαρόποιό τ' άνακτος,
Νιρεύς, ός κάλλιστος ανήρ υπό Τλιον ηλθε
των άλλων Δαναων μετ' αμύμονα Πηλεϊωνα
αλλ' αλαπαδνός έην, παυρος δέ οι είπετο λαός.

(*Il. ii. 671-5*)

to Nireus
for the privilege of
being related to him

INTRODUCTION

A new field of archaeological enquiry has been established in recent decades, that of island archaeology. The geographical autonomy and/or isolation of islands have created unique microcosms in which it was thought that socio-cultural trends and influences could be more easily analyzed. Although this has proved not to be the case, cultural isolation on islands or in mainland areas and interaction have become important issues in archaeology. These questions were addressed mainly in the Pacific archaeological context in order to appreciate better and understand the regional processes and the local insular character, but have been applied in the Aegean as well.

The Mycenaean culture has been thoroughly studied and is well understood on the Greek mainland, nonetheless in the Aegean islands the situation is not so clear. The islands, due to their geographic peculiarities, have a special character and it is essential to appreciate the extent to which their environment affected the local culture. These processes and the way they operate can help us in understanding the character of Mycenaean influence on the islands. Inextricably linked to this line of thinking is the question of migration, colonization and invasion that has been proposed for the islands, entailing population movement from mainland Greece. This ultimately leads to the question of ethnicity and the nature of Mycenaean cultural identity. In order to investigate these ideas, they must be analyzed to find out how they can be applied and perceived in the archaeological record.

An ideal region for such research questions is the South-eastern Aegean. The quantity of tombs and offerings is large enough for a thorough assessment of the area. The way in which these excavations were undertaken was not always ideal. Some are poorly documented and many were illicit, but the available information is adequate for the aims of this analysis. A major drawback in the South-eastern Aegean is the lack of a well-stratified settlement excavation. Trianda seems to have been the main site on Rhodes, but alluviation has destroyed the Mycenaean layers, while at Kos the settlement was constantly used from the EBA until nowadays, not allowing a clear picture for the Mycenaean period. Similarly at Miletos, the available evidence is insufficient to assess

the character of the site. Thus cross-checking of burial and settlement data will be rather limited.

Before proceeding to the research previously conducted in the area, the geographical and chronological boundaries of this study need to be explained. The South-eastern Aegean, as defined here, comprises Samos, Ikaria, Phournoi, the islands of the Dodecanese as well as south-western Anatolia, that is the Carian coast opposite Rhodes, and part of the Ionian coast up to the Küçük Menderes river, Kolophon and Bakla Tepe. Chios and Psara are two islands outside the geographical boundaries of the region outlined above. Nonetheless their finds will be used in this analysis in order to highlight contrasts with the area under research, as well as wider cultural, social and political processes.

For the better understanding of this region, the earlier periods, from the Neolithic onwards, will be presented and discussed. Although contacts between the South-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland existed at least from LH I, the starting point is taken to be the earliest appearance of chamber tombs that contained Mycenaean style offerings, which in Greek mainland terms, took place in LH IIB. This early date is not universal in the region and thus every cemetery had a time-span of its own, but always after LH IIB. The end of the period under review is the abandonment of the chamber tombs as the main burial practice late in LH IIIC. After the end of the Bronze Age there is a hiatus in occupation on most of the sites in the region. Moreover in the Early Iron Age the burial practices changed to single graves with either inhumations or cremations.

Research in the South-eastern Aegean was started in 1870 by Biliotti who excavated the cemetery at Ialysos. Further excavations followed by Italian archaeologists with detailed publications of their finds at Ialysos by Maiuri (1926) and Jacopi (1930/1), at Kalavarda by Jacopi (1932), at Eleona and Langada by L. Morricone (1965/6), for the Akavi pottery collection from southern Rhodes also by M.L. Morricone (1979/80). Pottery from Rhodes and Karpathos was published by Walters and Forsdyke (1930). After the Second World War the excavations were conducted by Greek and Turkish archaeologists at Makelli by Charitonidis (1961/2), at Archangelos by Charitonidis (1963), at Müskebi by Boysal (1969), at Vonies by Zachariadou (1978) and at Pylona by

Karantzali (2001). More sites have been investigated, but their publication was rather limited without a full account of all the finds.

An early attempt at listing and presenting all the cemeteries found on Rhodes was made by Inglieri who produced a very good map (1936). Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962; 1970; 1973) followed this by attempting to locate the older Italian excavations, commenting on the local topography of the cemeteries, and identifying settlements through extensive survey in the Dodecanese.

A synopsis of the pottery from this region, as well as the whole eastern Mediterranean was presented by Stubbings (1951). However the first real synthesis of all the burial offerings was conducted by Mee (1975) for the whole region, with subsequent more specialized presentation of the finds from Anatolia (1978) and Rhodes (1982). Apart from a better understanding of the local pottery, migration, colonization and ethnicity issues were raised. This was based not only on stylistic and morphological pottery studies, but was followed by the chemical and spectrographic analyses carried out by Jones and Mee (1978), Jones (1986), supplemented by Gödecken (1988) for Miletos and more recently by Karantzali and Ponting (2000) for Pylona. Dietz (1984) published the finds and the diaries of the Danish excavations conducted in southern Rhodes and carried out a survey to locate specific cemeteries. Macdonald (1985) followed with a presentation of the LBA character of the islands, including the Dodecanese. Melas (1985) presented a survey and summary of sites and finds from prehistoric Karpathos. A thorough analysis and presentation of all the available tomb finds from Rhodes was published by Benzi (1992), including Italian diaries and a survey of all cemeteries on the island. Voutsaki (1993) then looked at the Dodecanese as a politico-cultural unity comparing it with the Argolid and Thessaly. The main focus of this study was on the architectural elements of the tombs and the small finds as a wealth indicator for understanding the character, political and social dimensions of these regions. Özgünel (1996) has published all of the pottery finds from Müskebi and other coastal Anatolian sites. Mountjoy (1998) has discussed the character of this region, based on the local pottery style and re-addressing the migration issue. Her study of regional Mycenaean decorated pottery includes the Dodecanese (Mountjoy 1999a).

The works cited above will be used as the basis for taking a new approach to the archaeology of the South-eastern Aegean, but they do have several limitations. There has been a tendency to concentrate on the stylistic character of the pottery found in tombs in order to examine issues of migration, colonization and ultimately the ethnicity of the local population (Mee 1982; Mountjoy 1998; Özgünel 1996). This overemphasis on pottery has limited the discussion, analysis and presentation of the tomb architecture, the burial rituals performed and the small finds, which have been allowed secondary or no importance at all. A common characteristic of all these synthetic studies is that they treat the South-eastern Aegean as a socio-political and cultural unity *a priori*. Moreover the only real analysis that encompasses the whole region was made by Mee (1975 *contra* Mee 1982; Benzi 1992; Voutsaki 1993). Voutsaki (1993) has analyzed the Dodecanese without including Samos or south-western Anatolia, giving a rather artificial impression of this region. Treating the area as a unity and comparing it with entire mainland Greek regions did not reveal much about the socio-political structure of the South-eastern Aegean. In retrospect the works cited provide discussions related only to some parts of the South-eastern Aegean and are concerned mainly with the burial offerings and not the burial practices.

By contrast the present research will attempt a twofold analysis based on the available funerary information. Thus the migration, colonization and ethnicity issues will be re-addressed with special reference to the LH IIB-III A2 and the LH IIIC periods. The new dimension highlighted in this thesis will be an attempt to understand the regional burial traditions and their connected beliefs through the study of the cemetery as a find in its landscape framework, the tombs, the rituals performed and the offerings deposited in them. In other words to comprehend the real meaning and role of the funeral in the conduct of everyday life, local society, political structures and cultic beliefs, by contextualizing its analysis. The whole of the South-eastern Aegean, as defined earlier, will be included in the current study, so as to understand its internal socio-political structure and the degree to which it was a unified area. Therefore the character of the South-eastern Aegean will be appreciated as well as its part in the historical process of Late Bronze Age III. Hence the analysis presented here will

highlight new dimensions of this region and at the same time review issues raised by earlier researchers.

The burial tradition is a well-documented aspect of the Mycenaean culture. Nevertheless several dimensions of funeral practices have not been treated in enough details, such as the rituals and the role of the landscape. The former gives us a better appreciation of local/regional characteristics, which can thus be compared with other areas. The latter will underline the role, if any, of the surrounding environment in the local funerary beliefs. Social, economic and political dimensions related to the burials also make it easier to draw comparisons with other regions in the mainland and elsewhere, returning to the question of population movement, ethnicity and identity. Thus alongside older analytical methods, new ones will be added such as the role of the landscape in the burial practices and beliefs. The South-eastern Aegean is an excellent case for pursuing these aims due to the number of cemeteries and the diversity and wealth of finds. An understanding of the regional and local character as well as the migration/colonization hypothesis, can only become possible by combining the analyses of all available burial data. Exchange, trade networks and the origin of the imported goods will play a secondary and more supplementary role, because these cannot be covered in detail.

The thesis is divided into three parts, each subdivided into chapters. These three parts are interrelated and interlinked and could be read in any order, but here they follow the logic of moving from the more general to the more particular. Part I, on environment and movement, consists of three chapters which focus on the interaction between people and of people with their environment. In Chapter 1 the geographical and geological setting of the area is presented, as well as a theoretical presentation of island archaeology. Chapter 2 is concerned more with the theoretical analysis of population and artefact movement and consequently questions of migration, colonization, invasion, thalassocracy and identities, both cultural and ethnic. In Chapter 3 the prehistory of the South-eastern Aegean is summarized, from the first island colonization in the Neolithic period until the end of the Late Bronze Age. Part II, entitled Landscape, attempts to add a new analytical tool in the context of death, underlining the close, meaningful and

symbolic interaction of man-made environment with the physical landscape. In Chapter 4 the theoretical basis of landscape studies is considered, as well as how these can be used archaeologically and the tools needed for its decipherment. Chapter 5 consists of a survey and analysis of earlier burial traditions, as well as those of the Mycenaean period in different areas of the South-eastern Aegean. Part III is the largest, since all the burial information from the South-eastern Aegean is presented and discussed. Chapter 6 is concerned with the theoretical treatment of death. In Chapter 7 the Mycenaean burial tradition is presented, indicating the major questions to be addressed, its character and at the same time the dimensions highlighted. The burial offerings in Chapter 8 and 9 are presented by area in the South-eastern Aegean. Chapter 8 is subdivided into two parts, the first concerned with the presentation of the tomb architecture, whilst the second reviews the internal installations as well as the rituals performed. Chapter 9 is also subdivided into two sections, the first related to the discussion of the pottery offerings deposited in tombs, which are presented in a diachronic manner, while in the second section the small finds are examined. The conclusions follow in Chapter 10, where the role and meaning of the burial context is assessed and reviewed in conjunction with the main aims of this research. Finally, it must be stressed that the Appendices provided have brought together for the first time all the available information from South-eastern Aegean burials, i.e. the architectural elements of the tombs, their contents and a thorough analysis and presentation of all the offerings.

PART I:
ENVIRONMENT AND
MOVEMENT

CHAPTER 1: THE ENVIRONMENT

This chapter aims to outline aspects of the natural environment that affected the region under review. There will be information on the geological and geographical background to provide a better understanding of the available resources and ecological conditions. In that context the island archaeology theories will be discussed and some additional dimensions will be highlighted. Moreover the role of the sea will be underlined in conjunction with the rise in sea-level, as well as practical considerations related to navigation and consequently movement.

1.1 Geology

The South-eastern Aegean comprises south-western Anatolia and a number of islands off its coast. Geologically this area shares a lot of its history with the Menderes massif, which consists of a mixture of metamorphic rocks such as gneisses, schists and marbles similar to the Attico-Cycladic region, although their relationship is unclear (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 130).

The north/south stretching of the crust is responsible for the topographic formation of the western Anatolia region, whilst the east/west faults formed from this movement created the paths for the major rivers of the area (fig.1.1) (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 131). At Ephesos the region is dominated by marble, although the alluvial deposits were the result of the rise in sea-level and the advance of the shoreline that drastically altered the topography, so that the harbour of Ephesos is now 10kms from the present coast (Bammer 1986/7: 1-10; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 142-3). The same situation is found at Priene, while the ancient coastline around Miletos is today a flat alluvial plain due to the deposition of sediments by the Büyük Menderes river (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 147-9). Samos is just 3kms from the Anatolian coast with a sea-depth of less than 100m, whilst the geological composition of the island consists of marbles, schists, limestones and phyllites (GHS 1945: 532-3; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 145). At

the site of Ancient Samos and Pythagorion there are soft and hard limestones, whilst the Heraion plain west of Pythagorion, is mainly formed from alluvial deposits (GHS 1945: 533; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 146-7). Ikaria, further west, is divided geologically into a western part that consists almost exclusively of granite and an eastern that it is a mixture of gneisses, schists and small areas of marble at the easternmost point of the island (GHS 1945: 546; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 144).

The Dodecanese and the Carian shore form another unified geological and geographic region (fig.1.2). The subduction of the African plate under the Aegean is an important factor in the topography that is seen today (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 151). The northern part of this region is dominated by the Menderes massif and its metamorphic rocks up to Kos, while further south crustal stretching formed the Hellenic arc with non-volcanic islands starting from Crete and including Kasos, Karpathos and Rhodes (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 151). Iasos is between Miletos and Halikarnassos and consists of limestone, but close by there are rich sources of white and red marble (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 156). Patmos, the northernmost island of the Dodecanese, has an irregular shape made up of volcanic rocks without being active today. Apart from marble, there is a series of rhyolite and trachyte domes, volcanic ash, breccia and lava deposits, highlighting the volcanic past of the island (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 157). Phournoi, Lipsoi, Syrna, Levitha, Kinaros, Leros, Kalymnos, Tilos, Symi, Chalki, Karpathos, Kasos, Saria and Kastellorizo consist almost entirely of limestones, making them barren and dry in most cases (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 158; IGSR 1963a; IGSR 1963b; IGME 1984; IGME 1986a; IGME 1992; IGME 1999). Volcanic tuffs create fertile valleys in the eastern part of Tilos and at Pothia and Vathy on Kalymnos (IGME 1983; 1985). The exception is Leros where most of the central part of the island is made up of schists (metamorphic and semi-metamorphic rocks), probably the basement on which the limestone lay, while alluvial deposits make the central part of the island quite fertile (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 158; IGME 1999). Astypalaia consists of limestone in its eastern and westernmost part, while the central and most of the western region consists of flysch (IGME 1986b). The Halikarnassos peninsula is dominated in the east by limestones, while the western part consists of pyroclastic rocks and lavas, the result of volcanic action (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 163).

Kos is separated from Kalymnos and the Halikarnassos peninsula by a shallow underwater shelf. The frequent earthquakes, hot springs and recent volcanic activity highlight the active faults in the area (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 158). The Dikios mountain range is dominated by marble and schists, probably a continuation of the Menderes massif; there are also Neogene sediments on the northern slopes of the Dikios mountain, while south of Pyli a granite-like rock is found, known as *amygdalopetra* (Chatziconstantinou and Poupaki 2002: 27-8; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 158-9; Leontaris 1970: 41-5). The central and north-western parts of the island consist of flysch and limestones, but the western part of the island is dominated by recent volcanic rocks (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 16; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 159; IGME 1994; IGME 1998; Leontaris 1970: 45-6). The city of Kos is built on recent alluvial sediments north of the main mountain range of the island (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 160; IGME 1998).

Gyali is divided into a north-eastern part that is dominated by a lava dome with a core of obsidian and perlite and the south-western area that consists of sedimentary rocks and pumice (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 161). Nisyros is the easternmost active volcano in the South Aegean arc, thus most of the island is covered in lava and pumice with a large range of andesites to dacites (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 165). Moreover rhyolite domes dominate the western part of the caldera and the island as a whole. The Knidos peninsula is divided into two parts geologically and topographically. The western part is dominated by limestones, while the eastern is made of peridotites and serpentinites (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 165).

Rhodes is the largest island in the Dodecanese and is separated from Anatolia by a channel almost 400m deep, while to the south-east the depth rapidly falls to over 3,000m in the Rhodes basin (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 153). The geological history of the island resembles that of Crete, the Peloponnese and western Greece (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 153; Mutti *et al.* 1970: 79). Limestones are deposited around the island, mainly forming the mountains such as Attaviros and Prophitis Elias, while flysch is found in the southern parts of the island (Mutti *et al.* 1970: 155-66). The Neogene sediments are marked by a thin shelly limestone known locally as 'panchina' mainly found in the north (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 154). At Ialysos Mt. Philerimos is dominated by limestones, while the lower slopes and smaller hills are composed of

marls (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 155). Further down, the coastal area has alluvial deposits, which have buried the Minoan and Mycenaean settlement 3-4m below the current surface level.

1.2 Geographical Information

Most of the islands are small in size, mountainous, infertile with very small valleys and quite dry, such as Phournoi, Patmos, Kalymnos and all the surrounding islands, Astypalaia, Nisyros, Tilos, Symi, Chalki, Karpathos and Kasos (figs 1.1, 1.2) (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 151). Most of western Anatolia is mountainous and hilly with small valleys, but they are better watered, with olive trees and vineyards, whilst the flora and fauna is not unlike the fertile islands off the coast and that of mainland Greece. Larger rivers with fertile valleys are found in the area of Ephesos with the Küçük Menderes river and the region of Miletos with the Büyük Menderes.

Samos has two large mountains, Ambelos in the centre of the island and Kerketeas at its westernmost point. It is a large (476km²) very fertile island with valleys, hills and it is watered by streams that are dry during the summer (GHS 1945: 536). Samos traditionally produces timber, olive oil, wine of great quality and several kinds of fruits (GHS 1945: 544-5; Higgins and Higgins 1996: 144). Although Ikaria is a forested island (255km²) and has plenty of fresh water, its mountainous character does not allow much farming to be practiced apart from vines, a few olive and fruit trees (GHS 1945: 552). Samos and Ikaria seem to form a geographical bridge in the Aegean connecting Anatolia and more particularly the Ephesos area with the Greek mainland via Mykonos, Tenos and Andros to Euboea and Attica (GHS 1945: 546). Iasos on the other hand is in an area with small valleys and hills with olive trees, while it is a region rich in fish (Higgins and Higgins 1996: 156). Leros is also a fertile island, although its size is small.

Kos is 290km² with a very mild climate, like Rhodes (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 15, 18). The mountain range is in the southern part of the island, running in an east-west direction, with Dikios being the highest peak at 846m (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 19). There are no rivers flowing all year around, but there were two small lakes (Chatzivasiliou

1990: 20-1). The island also has deposits of copper, lead and iron, while marble, granite and alum were exploited in the classical period (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 22). Half of Kos is a lowland area that traditionally produces grain, olive oil, wine, vegetables and beans, while the animals that dominate are goats and sheep (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 28-30). The forests consist of various kinds of pine trees (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 31-2). Fishing is not practiced to a great extent, but is enough for the local need and some exports (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 32).

Rhodes is the largest island in the region and the fourth largest in the Aegean being 1,398km². The climate is warm and mild all the year round (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 338-9; Venetokleous 1930: 17). The island is mountainous with many hills and valleys, mainly in the coastal areas (Papachristodoulou 1972: 12). In the western part of the island there are the highest mountains: Mt. Attavyros (1,215m) and Mt. Profitis Elias (800m) (Papachristodoulou 1972: 13). There are no perennial rivers, but streams that run into the sea or occasionally into small swamps by the sea, and there are no natural lakes (Papachristodoulou 1972: 17; Venetokleous 1930: 16). The traditional agricultural products are mainly grain, olive oil, wine, figs, honey, beans and vegetables, while there are several trees with fruits (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 372-7; Papachristodoulou 1972: 17-20; Venetokleous 1930: 23-5). Moreover the mountain range of the island creates a difference in the micro-climate and thus the harvest of agricultural products in the southern part takes place five to ten days earlier than in the north (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 341). Pastoralism mainly involves goats and sheep, while pigs are limited in number (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 364-7; Papachristodoulou 1972: 20-2; Venetokleous 1930: 27-8). The forests are dominated by varieties of pine trees, whilst close to streams planes and oak-trees are found (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 343-5; Papachristodoulou 1972: 22-3). The wild fauna includes rabbits, grouse, seasonal birds, foxes and a kind of deer known as *platonis* (Papachristodoulou 1972: 24). There is also a large variety of fish (Biliotti and Cottret 1881: 349-50; Papachristodoulou 1972: 24; Venetokleous 1930: 28). There are also deposits of marble, gypsum, kimolia and agate (Venetokleous 1930: 28-9).

1.3 Island Archaeology

The South-eastern Aegean is a region that includes a large number of islands, whilst the coastal Anatolian area can be also seen to some extent isolated from the Anatolian heartland due to high mountain ranges. Thus it is useful to review the island archaeology theory for better understanding of the cultural processes of the whole region.

The physical circumscription of islands has led to them being seen either as an extension of the mainland or as separate, autonomous entities. The latter perspective favoured the laboratory theory and biological models. The island environment and the species that lived on them have been the focus of biogeographical analyses. The inheritance characteristics made it clear from the beginning that species migrated to the islands (Darwin 1859: 386). The factors that affected this movement were currents, winds, and sea depth. MacArthur and Wilson (1967: 4) tried to quantify the relationship of the environment with the animal and plant population in an attempt to understand colonization, adaptation, evolution and extinction. For them the size of the islands, their isolation and the different climatic conditions from the mainland resulted in a reduced habitat variety (MacArthur and Wilson 1967: 65). Today it is apparent that insular characteristics can occur in remote and isolated habitats as Williamson has emphasized (1981: 1)¹. Moreover the history of islands, both climatic and geophysical, has affected the species found on them (Williamson 1981: 13). Thus their ecosystems could be characterized as unique, however the principles that exist on them do not differ from the continental ones (Mueller-Dombois 1981: 485-6). It is also stressed that the adaptability characteristics the species should have are fundamental in order to survive climatic changes such as the glacial and interglacial periods (Williamson 1981: 14-5). As for the equilibrium of species found on an island, Williamson (1981: 27) argues that it totally depends on the period when we review an island habitat. The variety of islands is very large, but according to Whittaker's definition (1998: 7) we are dealing, in the South-eastern Aegean, with continental shelf islands, meaning islands that at some stage were part of the continent. Hence the term 'island' is very arbitrary, nevertheless we will

¹ The 'island effect' and more particularly nanism can be seen in the cases of the dwarf elephants recovered on Rhodes and Tilos (Chatzivasiliou 1990: 17; Marinos and Symeonidis 1977: 355-6).

consider here, as Whittaker (1998: 7-8) does, only the masses of land currently surrounded by the sea. As for humans they have affected the islands more than the insular environment has affected them (Mueller-Dombois 1981: 500; Whittaker 1998: 228-30).

John Evans was the first archaeologist to treat islands separately and he set the theoretical foundations for their study. With biogeography as a background, he argued that the environmental restrictions, climatic conditions and isolation were fundamental for the human population as well as other species (Evans 1973: 517). Nonetheless, he noted that the technological level of the humans was an important variable in this process. The limited resources available would lead to adaptation, as in the case of other species. He also recognized exaggerated cultural developments, mainly connected with rituals and ceremonies, something like developing an endemic characteristic. Moreover communication between neighbouring communities was ideal in order to see the development and the contacts between them, as MacArthur and Wilson had proposed (1967: 144). According to Evans (1973: 520) size, geographical and geological variables, range of habitats, resources, size of human population and its cultural diversity must be taken into consideration. Evans also initiated research in the Mediterranean. Island isolation, the first colonization and the causes of the human migration were the main aims of his research. Island isolation was decreased by factors such as visibility from the mainland or their accessibility through small islets or reefs, known as 'stepping stones', as MacArthur and Wilson call them (1967: 144). As far as the causes of colonization were concerned, they are related to the adoption of farming during the Neolithic period. The consequent population increase and the problems in land availability were the main motives for colonization (Evans 1977/8: 14). Socio-cultural developments were thus conditioned by human and environmental factors, closely related to the distance from the mainland and geographical characteristics. The two models proposed are based on the Maltese islands and their inward-looking society, with an emphasis on the religious monumentality and the Lipari Islands and their complex contact network. He also concluded that the Polynesian models are not appropriate for the assessment of the Mediterranean islands (Evans 1977/8: 24).

Cherry (1981) turned more to the Aegean area, following ecological and socio-geographic models. He contrasted the passive colonization of plants and animals with purposeful human colonization, underlining the role of boat technology (Cherry 1981: 42). He also highlighted the Holocene sea-level rise and its effect on island selectivity and movement by humans. Distinguishing colonization from utilization, seasonal visits or occupation is not an easy task and criteria were set such as the presence of houses and burials. He also points out that the islands first colonized were neither the closest to the mainland nor the easiest to reach. He concludes that before the Neolithic period there were only few movements and no permanent occupation existed; the permanent settlements were a late phenomenon and took place on remote and large islands. Due to their poor resources the islands were colonized quite late in the Neolithic in a 'wave of advance' pattern. Bintliff (1977a: 120-1, 539) proposed that fishermen were the first settlers on the islands and he argued that maritime activities were part of the subsistence strategy employed. Also the 'founder effect' is important, since the limited number of individuals that came from the mainland brought with them only a part of their mainland population gene pool. Consequently this led to a rapid divergence between the mainland and island populations. Cherry (1985: 26) uses the same argument for the reproduction of culture, emphasizing the loss and the exaggeration of some of its elements. Furthermore he argues in favour of a spatially extensive mating network that in practice extended the social links and communications (Cherry 1985: 24). He also stresses that, apart from the quantifiable biogeographical elements, there are factors that cannot be counted, such as soil fertility, water availability, diversity of wild animals and volcanic islands and their products. Moreover, the first settlers introduced domesticated animals on the islands showing that colonization was an organized and well-planned enterprise. Humans, like any other animal, are subject to the insular effect, but at the same time their cultural level affects their isolation (Cherry 1981: 64). He finally emphasizes that the pattern of migration in the East and West Mediterranean was quite different (Cherry 1981: 58).

Held (1989: 10) defines island archaeology as a combination of anthropological and biogeographical studies. The technological and cultural complexity of the area under review is also important. He adds three variables for the target island: the absolute size

of the landmass, its orientation and the distance from which it is observed. Moreover the Target-Distance Ratio (T/D ratio) is a means of measuring the probability or possibility of reaching an island (Held 1989: 13).

Davis (1992: 703) argues that, although the Aegean was navigated since the Palaeolithic period, successful long-lived colonization only took place in the Neolithic period. The domesticated plants and animals gave colonizers a better chance of survival, in areas with restricted wild resources. Moreover he recognizes that there were more factors involved in the selection of the colonized island, than the ones proposed by biogeographic models. The intentional settlement of islands with favourable islands such as Crete, points to the fact that colonization was not just an occupation of free space, but a purposeful action (Davis 1992: 703).

Knapp (1992a) also recognizes the difference between the Aegean and other archipelago, mainly due to the fact that it is almost surrounded by mainland regions. The proximity of the islands is the reason why in his opinion those colonized first were not necessarily the closest to the mainland (Knapp 1992a: 54). Adaptation to the new environment had much to do with the natural isolation and the socio-cultural strategies employed to overcome the natural and cultural shortages. Isolation sometimes led to genetic and cultural differentiation, as Cherry has suggested. Environmental restrictions and social problems turned people to interaction and more intensive sea voyages (Knapp 1992a: 55). Moreover of special value were the volcanic islands with their resources that played an important role in the interaction modes in the Aegean. Closer analysis of local and regional factors should be undertaken in order to understand the context of interactions in the Aegean (Knapp 1992a: 56). However this openness in cultural and social terms fluctuated through time and was in no way spatially stable.

Patton (1996) emphasizes that sociogeography avoids functionalism and determinism and recognizes the active role of the individual. Population movement can be a result of varied conditions such as population pressure, internal social competition, ecological dimension and adaptation (Patton 1996: 27). The variables used by biogeography are distance effects, configuration effects and area effects. Nonetheless, the difference between discovery and colonization cannot be distinguished. The measurable variables are distance, size, T/D ratio and visibility (Patton 1996: 43).

Visibility, though, can be a barrier as much as a positive element, since conditions such as the winds, the currents and the atmosphere of the island may affect in either way its selection (Bass 1998: 180). Palaeographic information has also been used to illustrate conditions in the Aegean in the Holocene period (Patton 1996: 39).

Broodbank (1999a) used three spatial approaches for Neolithic island colonization, the first being the dry-shod colonization. He collected bathymetric and eustatic data and questioned in some cases the assumption that an island was an island or an extension of the mainland in the period concerned. The second is the colonization of super-attractive islands, mainly the largest ones in the Aegean. The third approach has two variables. The first is the voyaging nurseries, meaning that islands very close to the mainland might have almost been considered non-islands, and the second is autocatalysis. This is the process of colonizing nearby islands until a natural barrier or threshold dramatically increases the distance between islands, and this practice stops (Broodbank 1999a: 22-5). He widens the spectrum of the colonization inquiry about Aegean islands using models and ideas that are applied in the Pacific (Broodbank 1999a: 37). Moreover he offers more than one model of colonization movement rather than applying one diachronic idea for the whole Aegean. He also argues that interaction is fundamental for the insular culture, an active process with several important consequences (Broodbank 2000: 1). The islands slide from integration in the Aegean and wider interaction matrices and isolation according to spatial and temporal variables (Broodbank 2000: 10). As for the definition of insularity he agrees with Whittaker's (1998: 7-8) suggestions, adding that for humans it is rather a cultural construct than a natural one (Broodbank 1999b: 238; 2000: 20). He favours the idea that the people make the islands as much as the islands make people (Broodbank 1999b: 235). He also proposes the term islandscapes for the combination of landscape and seascape in island contexts (Broodbank 2000: 22-3). Furthermore Broodbank (2000: 33) questions the laboratory notion by emphasizing that an island is not necessarily a unity.

A strong criticism is made by Rainbird regarding the overemphasis of biogeography on insular isolation and not interaction (1999a: 227 *contra* Keegan 1999: 255). He correlates seafarers with nomads and tries to see how they perceived the sea and space (Rainbird 1999a: 230). Thus he proposes that insular populations might not

view themselves as a community within boundaries in a limited landscape, but as an open one in the seascape. Although van Dommelen (1999b: 247-8) shows an interest in the different perceptions of the sea by some Pacific people, he argues that the difficulty of recognizing these notions might be no different from those of non-insular or non-coastal communities. Furthermore he emphasizes the role of both insularity and mountains in the Mediterranean islands, perhaps extending the analysis Braudel (1993: 45; van Dommelen 1999b: 249) had proposed.

1.4 Practical Considerations

Practical matters concerning navigation, particularly in the Aegean, highlight the distinctive character and the problems that early seafarers faced. Some of them played a vital role in the development and frequency of navigation that had a social and cultural effect. The sea-level, the climate, the effect of the wind, the maritime environment, the geology, the hydrology, the current and the seasons affected voyages and consequently contacts. Palaeographic evidence suggests that during the glacial maximum the sea level was as low as -120 to -130 m (fig.1.3) (Bintliff 1977a: 12; van Andel 1989: 736; van Andel and Shackleton 1982: 446; Whittaker 1998: 18). The rise in the sea level was a continuous process, but varied enormously according to spatial and temporal conditions (van Andel and Shackleton 1982: 447; Whittaker 1998: 18). The Cyclades formed one large land mass in the middle of the Aegean (van Andel and Shackleton 1982: 450). However, making deductions based on present day contour lines is not an adequate method, especially in areas with active tectonic movement (Whittaker 1998: 18), thus there must be caution in reconstructing maps and theories based on them.

In glacial maximum in the South-eastern Aegean, with the sea-level at -130 m, the islands between Kos, Samos and Ikaria were all united with Anatolia, while the rest were slightly larger than today (van Andel and Shackleton 1982: 449-50). At the beginning of the Holocene, at -36 m, Samos seems to have been an extension of Anatolia, while Kos, Kalymnos and its surrounding islands, Leros, Lipsoi and Arkoi,

were most probably part of a peninsula stretching out from the Halikarnassos area (fig.1.4) (van Andel and Shackleton 1982: 449-50).

During the Mesolithic period a -25m sea level is proposed and -10 to -12m for the Neolithic period, which reminds us that there could well be quite a few submerged coastal sites of that era (Agourides 1997: 2; Flemming 1983: 263-4; Gifford 1983: 272-80; Perlès 2001: 36). Moreover, reefs 1-3m below water and small islets today were landmarks, or better seamarks, for navigation, during the Neolithic and EBA period.

The predominant winds in the Aegean, all through the year, are from the north and north-west, while there is also an anti-clockwise current around the Mediterranean that can be as powerful as 2 knots and dramatically affected pre-sail navigation (Agouridis 1997: 3). Moreover landmasses separated by narrow channels can cause local phenomena unrelated to the general pattern or to the conditions a few miles away. *Meltemia* are also active during July and August with north and north-west winds creating storms in the central Aegean. Their exploitation must have been decisive for voyages since they have a daily cycle and in the afternoon they die out. Visibility can vary enormously according to the atmospheric conditions (Broodbank 2000: 71). During summer the night sky is clear and allows celestial navigation as Homer confirms (*Il.* 10.251-4, *Od.* 12.312 and 14.483). However, the most common practice, which continued until medieval times, was to spend the night in a port or close to the shore (Braudel 1993: 123-8 *contra* Georgiou 1993: 360-1). Exceptions to this were few, such as the route from Rhodes to Egypt (Alexandria), which, with favourable winds, did not take long. The lack of space on small vessels forced them to make frequent stops for water, food and other necessities (Braudel 1993: 128). From classical literature, most notably Hesiod (*Works and Days* 670-7), and historical sources we know that navigation was avoided between November and April (Braudel 1993: 303-4; Broodbank 2000: 92). Georgiou (1995: 37) disputes this belief by citing a voyage of a Roman courier with military intelligence during winter from Rhodes to Rome; she adds that during winter visibility is far better and questions the validity of a model based on later periods. Her point is an anachronistic paradox and has no force as an argument, since an exceptional event in the Roman period rare enough to be specifically mentioned cannot be taken to support an everyday practice in the Bronze Age. She also points out that there is a

difference between identifying a possible trade or sea route and determining whether it was certainly used (Georgiou 1997: 122). However arguments like that, apart from their generalized sense, do not have anything to add and are misleading, since it is not the actual route or event, but the whole sense of maritime contacts that concerns us. Hence our attention should be on the interaction that was active in each period and its intensity and secondarily to the actual sea routes. Nonetheless it can be assumed that during fine weather in winter, such as the Halcyon days (in January and February), short voyages must have taken place for various reasons, although rarely long-distance ones (Agouridis 1997: 5-6; Braudel 1993: 305).

Maritime contacts are of a multi-faceted character including exchanging goods, fishing and raiding, even on the same trip. Short-distance voyages must have been an ordinary everyday activity for those who lived in most of the coastal sites. However long-distance trips would only have been undertaken by specialized sailors, most probably islanders, since they will have needed special skills in ship building and navigation which they developed from their intensive involvement with the sea (Agourides 1997: 20; Georgiou 1991: 61; 1993: 362; 1995: 37-8). Certainly these sailors must have established the complex and multivariant local maritime networks, while in the Bronze Age they extended their activities well into the eastern Mediterranean as well.

CHAPTER 2: MOVEMENT AND IDENTITY

So far we have discussed the human colonization of insular environments; however human movement has been constant since the early hominids and is perhaps one of the basic characteristics of our species (Cohen 1996: xi; Lewis 1982: 1). This movement has many facets and characteristics, and there are a number of words to describe it such as migration, colonization and invasion. Archaeologists have tended to use these terms in accordance with their beliefs and the social context of their times, something that is unavoidable for every researcher (Chapman 1997b: 18-9). In a broader sense archaeology is always concerned with the movement of people from one region to another, followed primarily by a significant change in the material culture and secondly the ideology. Nonetheless the use of this terminology is in many cases the 'easy' explanation of the cause of cultural, social and political change that is found in material culture (Chapman and Hamerow 1997: 2). Thus it is necessary to understand the terms we use and their characteristics and criteria, as well as the extent to which our data can be helpful and reveal the nature of change. However migration, colonization and invasion are interrelated words and their meaning partly overlaps as we shall see. After the discussion of these terms Minoan and the subsequent Mycenaean "thalassocracy" will be considered. In the second part of this chapter the identity and ethnicity issues will be addressed, which are the core of the migration and colonization theories.

2.1 Movement of People

2.1.1 Migration

Studies of human migration are numerous, however no unified field exists and its approaches can be characterized as interdisciplinary (Lewis 1982: 3-4). Thus different questions are set by sociologists, anthropologists, economists and geographers, all of which are concerned with data from contemporary societies or at least of the industrial

era. Thus their results should be carefully analyzed, as to which factors can be applied in pre-industrial and prehistoric contexts and which not.

Defining the term migration is not as easy as one would think. The movement of permanent or semi-permanent residence from one point to another is not enough to describe it, since the movement of a household from one house to another in the same neighborhood cannot be taken as migration (Cohen 1996: xii; Lee 1966: 49). Thus a significant spatial distance between the two points should be entailed. Moreover the movement of a person might be thought to be temporary, while for various reasons it might end up as permanent (Lewis 1982: 2).

Migration studies are concerned with the causality of human movement which should be found in the area of origin, as well as the effect of the migrants on their destination. In archaeological explanation there is a tendency to invoke migration only for interpreting the changes in the destination area, while the reason all too often offered for the movement is population pressure. Thus processualism was eager to form mathematic formulae for calculating the demography of any given area and period in order to explain cultural transformation (Hassan 1981: 259-61). However migration should be seen rather as a social strategy and not as an automatic response to overpopulation (Anthony 1997: 22). Population density is dependent on subsistence strategies, technological capacities, resource management and cultural characteristics and idiosyncrasies of a specific region and period.

The variables that affect the decision to migrate are a result of a highly selective condition and a combination between 'push' and 'pull' factors; the first is the negative situation in the area of origin and the second the positive conditions in the destination region (Anthony 1997: 22; Lee 1966: 56). Another important factor is the cost of transportation as well as the feedback about the destination area. The decision-making can be individual, kin-based or more collective and can have personal or wider socio-economic causality, whilst rationality should not always be expected (Lee 1966: 51). Furthermore people do not respond in the same way to a specific problem, but according to various factors such as sex, age, cultural context, social status, economic conditions and belief-systems.

When migration does occur it is rather as a stream and perhaps with temporal intervals, long or short, rather than broad waves that cover entire landscapes as single events in time (Anthony 1997: 23). Exchanges and interactions between people are signs of contact and access to information that may prove useful for a future decision to migrate. Perhaps the sharing of common styles and ideas in the material record is a first step towards that point (Anthony 1997: 24). In such a case it is quite interesting to see what kind of styles and ideas are shared, the distance between the two areas as well as from which region, either the origin or the destination of the migrants, these were initiated and how they were adopted. It is important to add that a crucial factor for migration is the population density and socio-cultural characteristics in the destination area. Additionally innovations or improvements in transportation technology lower the threshold of movement and increase the options (Anthony 1997: 24).

Anthony (1997: 26-7) proposes five modes of migration based on modern studies, aiming to describe it in pre-industrial conditions. The first can be called local, since it is limited within a range of a familiar area spatially and culturally, a fact that creates and maintains regional cultures. The second is circular with an annual movement that ends in a return to the departure point. The third is chain migration where people move to unfamiliar, but specific destinations, which their kin have informed them about. When long distance migration is involved then they move along with their kin, by a particular route, in many cases established through exchange (Schofield 1983: 295). The aim of such movement can vary between wealth, security or prestige, but it is limited to individuals or kin groups. Tribal migration seems unlikely, since there is a strong belief that cultures do not migrate and even in the case of large-scale movements there are numerous chain clustered events. This mode of migration is believed to have been followed in the European Linearbandkeramik culture, a colonization based on a series of chain migrations. The fourth mode is career migration, which affects specialized workers or craftsmen that move to large centres. The fifth mode is coerced migration, where displaced people are forced by various social, cultural and religious reasons to leave their place of origin (Petersen 1958: 261).

Collett (1987: 106) raises two points from his research in a South African context. The first is to demonstrate that the material culture is spatially similar between

the homeland and the destination area. The second is to show that in the destination region the material evidence is later than in the area of origin. He also points out that the migrants do not change their material culture completely, but some aspects of it only, when they are part of their belief-systems (Collett 1987: 115). However these two points are so general that they could be used as evidence of trade, thus one more criterion should be the extent to which the material culture is similar, both quantitatively and qualitatively in the socio-cultural framework.

After this theoretical treatment of migration and its problems it is time to review some of the beliefs and ideas proposed by archaeologists to recognize and read migration from the archaeological record.

Mee (1988a: 57) argues that there was abandonment at Ialysos in LH IIIB and that displaced individuals or refugees coming from the Greek mainland reused the cemetery in the LH IIIC period. The same process took place in the rest of the cemeteries on Rhodes and at Eleona and Langada on Kos. Benzi (1988b: 70) on the other hand believes that the appearance of depopulation in the LH IIIC is rather a result of internal migration from the rural areas to the main centre of the island. His basic argument is that the pottery style is mainly of the local tradition and mainland influence is limited in comparison to the previous periods. The problem is summarized by Åström (1992: 27-9) who tries to find ways to set criteria and questions in order to correlate and interpret the emerging evidence.

Niemeier (1998b: 26) expresses the belief that Mycenaean people should not be equated with Mycenaean pots, but requires a combination of cultural characteristics such as figurines, metal objects, architectural forms and techniques, tomb types and writing. He uses the same criteria for the Minoan presence outside Crete. He applies this idea as far as Miletos is concerned demonstrating its Minoan and later Mycenaean character (Niemeier 1998b: 27-8, 40). He uses the same criteria for Iasos and Müskebi as well (Niemeier 1998b: 40). In the case of the Philistines he believes that their origin is the "Mycenaeanized Aegean" based on similarities in the typology of loomweights and figurines, but not on the architectural and the burial evidence that came to the Levant via Cyprus (Niemeier 1998b: 48-9).

2.1.2 Colonization

In the case of colonization, invasion and conquest, the key words to demonstrate their basic character are political domination and economic exploitation, which are also recognized as their consequences (Rowlands 1998: 327; van Dommelen 1997: 308). This concept is heavily influenced by the characteristics, ideas and practices of modern European colonialism. The Europeans used the examples of Greece and Rome in order to legitimate their actions as missions of civilization (van Dommelen 1997: 307). This led to the 19th century European distinction between civilized and primitive in order to justify racism, genocide and brutality (Rowlands 1998: 329).

Two concepts are recognized by Rowlands (1998: 327) as fundamental for colonization. The first is the presence of one or more groups of people away from their place of origin. The second is evidence of socio-economic exploitation or domination over the colonized who are usually the majority of the population, an idea based on power relations that is strongly criticized today. The first concept is exactly the same as migration, while the second is rather difficult to demonstrate convincingly in the archaeological record since power has many roles and multiple meanings and depends on the interpretation of the researcher. Perhaps in a general sense it can be argued that colonization as a process presupposes a strong socio-political background for the colonizers and in some cases planning, since this is an intentional act that involves a number of people. Moreover a prior knowledge of the region from pre-colonial contacts through trade is proposed, but it has not been verified in all cases of Greek colonization in Italy and Sicily, which is better understood (Graham 1990: 45, 60).

At the same time no attention was paid until recently to matters such as the relationship between colonies and homeland or colonizers and colonized. Furthermore interest was concentrated on the indigenous people and more specifically on their exploitation and domination, as well as the forms of their resistance to the imposed rule, in a rather polarized fashion (Gosden 2001: 242; van Dommelen 1997: 308).

In the *metropolis*/colony relationship in the case of Greek colonization an important issue is the extent to which the colony is independent to diverge, develop on its own and be original. This idea also affects the approach to the Phoenician diaspora

(Rowlands 1998: 330). Both processes seem to have created cultural *hybrids* of a cosmopolitan character rather than imposing a unified cultural package in all the areas colonized.

The further division of colonizers and colonized into categories based on class, status, ethnicity and gender complicates the simplistic picture used so far (van Dommelen 1997: 309). The interaction of a diverse population redefines social positions and roles creating new social conditions. At the same time all have a share in the structure of power either dominating or resisting local rule, since power is inherent in all human relationships, as Foucault has convincingly demonstrated (Gosden 2001: 243). Thus a deviation from the dominant culture and the colonial reproduction of the indigenous culture is created, a process called *hybridization* and *creolization* (van Dommelen 1997: 309). In other words it is the ways in which social, economic or ethnic groups form a distinct identity in the colonial context and position themselves in relation to the dominant colonial culture (van Dommelen 1997: 309). Even so, the character of the colonies might have an essentially different basis as in the urbanism that characterizes Greek colonialism as opposed to a model closer to the 'port of trade' of Phoenician colonialism (Boardman 1999: 43; Niemeyer 1990: 484-5, 488).

The local context is of paramount importance and most probably unique in each case, though with similar processes to other instances of colonization, but not necessarily the same results (Danov 1990: 152-3; Laronde 1990: 180). Nonetheless there are still social groups defined as colonizers, colonized and in-between (van Dommelen 1997: 310). Often we can see a structure of political domination and economic exploitation by the colonizers, but at the same time we note that this domination cannot be found in other concepts or practices in the colony under review (van Dommelen 1997: 320). Perhaps colonialism is created from the co-existence of the colonizers and natives in as much as they are defined as such by colonialism (Gosden 2001: 247).

Branigan (1981; 1984: 49) tried to categorize the character of colonies in the Aegean with special reference to Minoan influence on the islands. He divided colonies into three varieties: in governed colonies people are mainly indigenous, but controlled and governed directly by foreign powers; settlement colonies are founded by self-governed

immigrants, or governed by foreign powers in the region of the settlers' origin; in community colonies a significant segment of the population consists of immigrants, however indigenous people govern the settlement (Branigan 1981: 25-7).

Colonization hypotheses are quite appealing in the case of the Mycenaean culture. Furumark (1950: 150, 202) recognized Mycenaean colonizers on Rhodes due to the number of chamber tombs found throughout the island, as well as on Miletos because of the tomb and settlement evidence there. The settlement of Trianda was recognized as a Minoan colony that became Mycenaean after a period of peaceful and friendly coexistence. Subsequently due to the lack of Minoan pottery, Furumark proposes that they were enslaved by the Mycenaeans (1950: 180-1, 262-3; Iakovidis 1995: 211; Niemeier 1986: 251).

Kilian (1990: 445), more ambitiously, attempts to define Mycenaean colonization through a study of the spatial distribution of the material culture setting as criteria the socio-political organization and religious features. In order to do so he defines the characteristics of the Mycenaean civilization through four basic points (Kilian 1990: 445-7): first the spatial organization of the settlements based on a hierarchy clustered around the residence of the local ruler; secondly a social pyramid under the *wanax* supplemented by an administrative system, expressed through the quality of houses, clothing, diet and cult; thirdly a centralized economy of redistributive character, marked by the presence of numerous storage containers; lastly the mode of representing class/status, in other words cult practices and ancestral cults. After reviewing a number of cases in Northern Greece and the Central Mediterranean he concludes that there was no homogeneous Mycenaean colonization, but a complex variety of expansion related to space, time and pattern (Kilian 1990: 465). He argues that community colonies existed in Macedonia, on the Italian coast, Cyprus and Troy, mainly from the percentages of imported and locally imitated pottery (Kilian 1990: 467).

2.1.3 Invasion

The last of these terms is perhaps the most difficult to demonstrate archaeologically, especially in a prehistoric context. However it has been used a lot in the past, rather uncritically, while the term peaceful invasion is also applied as far as cultural diffusion is concerned. Chapman and Hamerow (1997: 7) believe that the size and scale of social interaction is closely correlated with the range and form of migration and invasion. Even some kinds of colonization and migration presuppose invasion and polemic attitudes either physical or ideological. The problem in Aegean prehistory is that it is difficult to determine whether settlement destruction was the result of human or natural disaster, since both can be equally frequent and devastating. Abrupt cultural changes are attributed to invasion and the arrival of new peoples (Adams 1968: 194). Again the problems start with the area where the invaders came from as well as the causality and the purpose of such an act. Furthermore the criteria for defining such an event or a series of events cannot be isolated, since they have a different spatial, temporal and cultural background in each case, complicating further any attempt to view it archaeologically. Thus, the definition of Adams (1968: 194) as far as the abrupt change in the material culture still remains our basic, if not the only, criterion.

Driessen and MacDonald (1984: 49-50, 56) argue that the Pylian as well as the Knossian Linear B tablets reveal a number of captive women and troops with non-local names associated in the case of the latter centre with the maintenance of the Mycenaean regime. The point is further strengthened by the military character of some burials, based on the presence of many swords, while the rest of the burial gifts underline the status of the warriors (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 58-9). However the appearance of weapons does not necessarily indicate warriors or even men, but perhaps status or the desire to show off if the funeral has become an arena of social display. Moreover such a statement repeats the stereotype of pacifist Minoans versus warlike and militaristic Mycenaeans. The same point is argued as far as Rhodes is concerned that three warrior graves in the LH IIB-IIIA period signify a military presence on the island after 1450 BC (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 58-9). Apart from the fact that the sample is extremely small in

comparison to the tombs found in that period on the island, the simple assumption that weapons in graves equates with warriors was criticized earlier and will be discussed later (6.5).

After reviewing migration, colonization and invasion it has become apparent that what interests researchers is rather the consequences of movement. Lewis (1982: 168) summarizes the three questions: what are the effects of migration/movement on the structure of society, what are the effects upon the community of origin and destination, and what is the effect on the individuals that participate in the process. The word acculturation is central for individuals or even societies depending on the character and number of people coming to the destination of the movement. Acculturation has various degrees and dimensions that can be total in some aspects and absent in others, with superficial or deep penetration as regards the personality of the individual or of the society. Nonetheless most of the examples presented so far are more interesting for the changes *per se* rather than the consequences for the local culture or people and how the new characteristics were integrated in the new social conditions.

In any case the essential characteristics of these terms cannot fit all historical and cultural contexts in the same way, therefore a closer reading of our material is necessary in a contextual manner (Chapman and Hamerow 1997: 2). Although there are problems in these ideas and terms we cannot discard them altogether; on the contrary a deeper understanding and alternative readings should be tested and proposed (Collett 1987: 105). We should also realize that there is not a single explanation of change, as processualists have argued, and that colonization, migration or invasion can be a factor, perhaps the most or least important, among many (Lewis 1982: 166).

2.1.4 Thalassocracy

The idea of a Minoan thalassocracy derived from Thucydides (1.4). The reason for discussing this hypothesis is that it affects the whole of the region under review in the preceding period. Moreover, the thalassocracy model has been used to highlight the role

of the Mycenaean intervention and presence since Furumark wrote (1950: 180-1; Kanta 1998: 40; Niemeier 1984: 214). Although the character, if not the very existence of thalassocracy is widely criticized, it is still widely accepted. Moreover in 1984 a conference with this theme was held and since then no serious attempt to de-construct it has been made.

Chronologically the Minoan thalassocracy is believed to have started in the Protopalatial period (Niemeier 1984: 207). The only exception seems to have been Kythera, where, from the pottery, the change most probably took place after the beginning of the EH II phase and before the end of EM II (Coldstream and Huxley 1972: 276; 1984: 107-9). For Branigan, Kythera is the only certain case of a settlement colony as he has defined it (1984: 49).

Furumark (1950: 180-1, 200-1) made a categorization as to which sites/islands were colonies and which not. Trianda and Kythera were Minoan colonies, while Phylakopi in Melos was not due to its local pottery production, while Karpathos was under the sphere of Cretan influence.

Stos-Gale and Gale (1984: 61) argue that the metal sources of the Aegean were the main motive, although they are quite sceptical about the character of the Minoan penetration in the Cycladic islands. They prefer to see the islanders as middlemen in trade, especially in metal, in MM III-LM I (Stos-Gale and Gale 1984: 61). The influence on the Greek mainland is considered more stylistic as a result of social change and the desire to display power and prestige, while a limited number of Minoan artists could have been present on a permanent or semi-permanent basis (Dickinson 1984: 115-7; Hägg 1984: 121). Barber (1984: 180) sees close relationships of interaction between Phylakopi and Crete during the Second City, while from the beginning of the Third the non-pottery Minoan elements such as frescoes, the use of Linear A, stone vases, local and imported, increased. The domestic architecture also had some Minoan characteristics, but the overall picture is local, especially when seen in contrast to the case of Akrotiri (Barber 1984: 181; Branigan 1984: 52). As for Ayia Irini, the ceramic imitation of Minoan prototypes in pottery and clay loomweights is considered to be a response to production competition from Crete (Davis 1984: 160-2). Moreover the

adoption of foreign cult is probably a means of reinforcing symbolically the bonds of the local elite with Crete rather than signifying Minoan conquest (Davis 1984: 165).

The Eastern String covers the area under study and more details will be given below in the prehistoric overview of the region (3.4, 3.5). Cadogan (1984: 13-5) goes so far as to propose that Crete was responsible for new foundations in the South-eastern Aegean with control exercised by the Minoans during MM III-LM I, but he is unable to define the way it was managed, as he admits. This belief is based upon the numerous Minoan inspired objects found such as pottery, kitchen ware, architectural elements, religious and administrative features, luxury items such as frescoes, stone vessels and faience (Cadogan 1984: 13; Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 548). For Niemeier (1986: 249; 1998b: 36; Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 552-3) the Eastern String was important for Crete, connecting it with west Anatolia and the metal trade.

Nonetheless maintaining such a control and relationships must have been a very difficult task. The *Pax Minoica* is considered to be a result of Minoan militarism by Hiller (1984: 27-30), expressed in the form of weapons in burials during the EBA and MBA, as well as the weapons industry that existed until LM II at Knossos. This Minoan imperialism involved a form of naval hegemony (Hiller 1984: 28; Niemeier 1984: 208; 1986: 250; Wedde 1991: 92), reminiscent of the 5th century Athenian empire and perhaps providing the justification Thucydides sought for evoking and most probably exaggerating the Cretan past.

Wiener (1984: 27) proposes an entirely different reading, arguing for the 'Versailles effect' on local elites. Thus there was imitation of all Cretan aspects of art, lifestyle and even language, without any political or economic dependence or domination from Crete, from the MM period to LM IB. As far as the South-eastern Aegean is concerned, he believes that from MM II-III period the settlements were Minoan (Wiener 1984: 27). In other words his model works only for the Cyclades and partly for mainland Greece. On the same lines, Branigan (1981: 32; 1984: 49) argues that the Cycladic islands might have been settlement colonies with Minoan immigrants. Schofield (1984: 45-7) suggests that the extent of an immigration enclave can vary enormously and that, although there might be evidence of Minoan colonists in the loosest sense, there is no evidence to suggest the existence of Minoan colonialism.

Melas (1991: 170) prefers to view a process of Minoanization as a social phenomenon and not through colonization or politico-economic dependence. The interaction between Crete and the islands was due to the need for raw materials and led to close relationships between the two (Melas 1991: 176). A core/periphery relationship was formed between Crete and the islands and cultural ideas and politico-economic structures were transported to the peripheries (Melas 1991: 175-6). Thus acculturation was achieved and imitation of Cretan prototypes occurred, with the Versailles effect described, by Wiener, evident on a large scale (Melas 1991: 181). Nonetheless he describes change as a dialectic relationship between foreign acculturation and interaction, and internal evolution (Melas 1991: 187-8).

Summarizing this review, the first point to be made is the imbalance in terms of the Western and Eastern String. The former, with well-excavated sites, is treated on a contextual basis and various degrees of Minoan influence are seen in different aspects of the material record and the socio-economic structure. For the latter area all explanations have a holistic character, both spatial and cultural. The lack of evidence from this region during the EBA and MBA certainly contributes to this picture, but a more nuanced interpretation is necessary. The inherent problem of the Minoan thalassocracy is the single explanation for its existence as well as the way it is imposed. In other words the only way to create and retain a naval hegemony is by militaristic means, as the Athenians did a millennium or so later. The problem here, apart from the obvious anachronism, is that during the MM period in the South-eastern Aegean, when 'new settlements' or 'Minoan colonies' were set up, Crete was by no means unified, but consisted of a number of competing or coexisting polities. This fragmented situation continued in the LM I period, although the hegemony of Knossos is possible. Moreover politico-economic control of the South-eastern Aegean area would have been a very difficult task, with no obvious advantages apart from the metal trade and the Anatolia markets that still remain an archaeological phantom. We do not envisage competing colonizers from different Minoan polities, nor do the South-eastern Aegean colonies seem to follow the socio-political changes that were taking place at the same time in Crete. What I am arguing here is that if these sites were so dependent on Crete, as is proposed, then we have a serious inconsistency. In my opinion it is more probable that

the sites in this region took many Minoan elements and incorporated them into their own culture, partly a Versailles effect, perhaps affecting most of the people rather than just the elite. At any rate the effect was not the same in all sites in the region, nor can it be assessed fully before we have a better understanding the EBA and the MBA. Instead contextual readings should be made and cautious general remarks should be drawn, especially in comparison with the Cyclades.

2.2.1 Movement of Ideas

Through exchange and interaction ideas, concepts and practices are shared, however their exact nature cannot always be understood. Apart from the goods exchanged, issues like adaptation, imitation or inspiration can be very difficult to demonstrate (Wedde 1997: 68). Moreover the message may lose something of its meaning in transit and in the end it speaks a different language with a different meaning (Steel 1998: 285; Wedde 1997: 73). Thus it becomes apparent that even the borrowing of an image does not necessarily entail the holistic adoption of its ideational framework (Wedde 1997: 75). Therefore an amalgamation of meanings, concepts and symbols can develop based on foreign and local elements, in a blend that, according to spatial, temporal and socio-cultural variables, can have various characteristics. In other instances there might be a sharing of ideas and practices, such as the introduction of particular metal types in the 12th century BC in Italy and the Aegean (Snodgrass 1973: 210) or the Mycenaean drinking vessels in Cyprus and Syria-Palestine (Steel 1998: 293-4).

Part of this process is also the movement of craftsmen, as we have seen in the migration modes. Nonetheless, although foreign schools or artists have been proposed from the Late Bronze Age and later on for the diffusion of motifs, forms and symbols identifying them is a difficult task. The criteria are seldom made explicit (Hoffman 2000: 185). Their status, whether state controlled or not, is not easily elucidated and depends on the socio-political and exchange conditions, which are related to spatial and temporal variables. The presence of Minoan artists at Kabri in Israel and Tell ed-Dab'a in Egypt is proposed due to the unique artwork found there and more importantly the

technique and iconography (Cline 1995: 268). At Tel Nami in Palestine, because of the similarities in cult practices between Crete and Syria-Palestine during the 13th century BC, the possibility of a transported cult by mariners or even the presence of a Minoan priest has been proposed (Artzy 1991: 205). It is argued that the existence of these artists is economically dependent on the elites, but their trafficking is a result of free movement (Cline 1995: 278-9; Papadopoulos 1997: 460). The problem is that their role in the diffusion and transference of innovations and ideas cannot be assessed or comprehended (Cline 1995: 282). This can be seen in the local production of Mycenaean pottery during the 12th century BC in a number of places around the Mediterranean, in particular Southern Italy, along with the working of faience and at the same time the spread of similar types of metalwork (Holloway 1992: 40-1).

2.2.2 Movement of Artefacts

Pottery is by far the commonest archaeological artefact. This has biased researchers as to its significance and role, which is overemphasized, sometimes to a great extent (Jones 1997: 30). Biek (1983: 304-10), for example, argued that pottery especially is a good ethno-technological indicator that penetrates everywhere, however it is more a temporal characteristic rather than a clear-cut ethnic one. Hodder (1981: 219) suggests that the links between pottery style, social complexity and the production mode depend on the conceptual and symbolic framework which varies according to the cultural context. Symbolisms attributed to pottery must be interpreted in close association with the structure of the society and the transformations that are possible in that society and ethnographic data must not be uncritically used without knowing the real nature of the local culture (Hodder 1981: 216 *contra* Arnold 1989: 236). Pottery should be studied as one component of the material culture and in relation to other ones as well as the social structure (Hodder 1981: 219-20). Moreover we should not necessarily connect all social changes to pottery. Lambrou-Phillipson (1993: 365; Papadopoulos 1997: 449, 458-9) underlines the limitations of the pottery model for identifying trading colonies, by mentioning historical and testified invasions that are not connected to pottery.

Distribution and imitation of pottery can have various characteristics and modes that are by no means universal (Blitzer 1990: 708; Papadopoulos 1997: 457-8). The mode of interaction and exchange can also be found from the context in which the pottery is located as well as its form and use (Steel 1998: 286-7, 289-90). This can be seen in the case of the imported Mycenaean drinking vessels in Cyprus and Syria-Palestine that are connected with elite practices and later on the disposal of the pottery as burial offerings underlining the status of the deceased (Steel 1998: 293-4).

Distinctive technological applications that are introduced for the first time in a place are considered a good criterion for showing the arrival of new people or of a group of specialists (Lambrou-Phillipson 1993: 366). Arnold (1981: 31; 1989: 231) amplifies the discussion of pottery production, arguing that, apart from the technological and cultural variables climate, demography, agricultural practices and the degree of sedentariness are important for the creation of a pot. At the same time the diversity of techniques in pottery production can give us trade and exchange information, but this idea has a limited use when a particular forming technique is widespread (Arnold 1989: 236). He favours the notion that the persistence of a pottery type reveals social stability, while a rapid change in the forms and the introduction of new ones is closely associated with population movement or of economic interactions (Arnold 1989: 236). In the case of a conquering and a subordinate population the coexistence of two different pottery techniques and production modes may reflect different societal aspects and segments of population (Arnold 1989: 237).

Furthermore a fundamental tool in social analysis is the typological sequence of various artefacts. The 'genealogy of objects' is based on two assumptions, that change is gradual, occurs regularly and uniformly throughout a spatial homogeneous region, and that the most important factor in variation of design is date of manufacture (Jones 1997: 38). Thus different assemblages are due to social or spatial distance and indicate different people or different periods, while similar ones are the product of the same group of people at a particular time (Jones 1997: 25). This monolithic concept of culture, social process and human action is used in a holistic way in various cultures and periods as a given truth.

A case of a distinct pottery style and its distribution can be seen in the LM IB Marine Style pottery recovered at Seraglio, which is connected to east Cretan workshops (Marketou 1987b: 169). There is a suggestion of migrant potters that cannot be confirmed. However the position of the Seraglio may have played a very important role in the distribution of this kind of pottery, whether imported or locally produced, to neighbouring sites such as Iasos, Miletos, Knidos, Kalymnos and Samos (Marketou 1987b: 169).

In Cilicia during the 14th and 13th centuries BC, tight Hittite control did not permit much interaction with the Aegean as the pottery evidence reveals (French 1975: 74; Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 341). During the 12th century a large amount of LH IIIC pottery is found on a number of sites in this region, locally made with some stylistic links to Cyprus and the South-eastern Aegean and very few Argolid imports (French 1975: 55; Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 341). French (1975: 74) presupposes knowledge of the LH IIIB style and suggests the area had its own development in the LH IIIC period, although active contacts also continued with the Mycenaean mainland. The 12th century pottery is associated with Aegean refugees and the pottery is directly linked to ethnic and linguistic identity (Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 342). The problem with such an interpretation is that no other criterion for a Mycenaean presence is found in this region, such as chamber tombs, whilst the stylistic evidence cannot be correlated with a single area in the Aegean in order to pinpoint the departure region (Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 344). An inverse relationship between Hittite control and interaction with the Aegean is emphasized with the 12th century involvement of Cilicia to the maritime routes that connect Syria-Palestine to the Aegean through Cyprus and Cilicia (Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 345). The problem of identifying pottery with people and the wider politico-economic conditions of this period in the Eastern Mediterranean makes the case for Mycenaean immigration less and less likely (Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 346).

2.3 Identity

2.3.1 Cultural Identity

The basic problem in identifying culture is culture itself, as can be seen in the summary of definitions provided by Shennan (1994: 5-6). Apart from the fact that people separated spatially have different ways of life, this does not necessarily mean that it is due to culture, but rather results from a number of equally important variables such as time, climate and others. The real problem is caused when culture is treated as a historical entity that acts, equating it with tribes, societies and ethnic groups (Shennan 1994: 6; Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 138-9; 1996b: 81). Moreover there is always the danger of identifying people through a single artefact type, very frequently pottery as we have already seen, and considering an area as a unified region on the map (Shennan 1978: 114). Thus combination of the distribution of all objects is required to define culture (Shennan 1978: 138). At the same time a holistic treatment gives us little information about the complexity of social and spatial interactions. Thus the whole picture should be broken down into its constituents (Hodder 1978: 104). For example different classes of pottery could have different modes of production, use and distribution according to socio-economic variables (Hodder 1978: 106).

The way of recognizing culture is through a series of hierarchical entities such as assemblage, artefact, type and style (Dolukhanov 1994: 267). The last is especially important, as demonstrated by Shennan (1994: 18), and can be subdivided into emblematic and assertive. The first transmits a clear message defining a group and it emphasizes boundaries rather than interaction. The latter is more personally related and gives an identity to the individual, mainly subconsciously. Isochrestic variation in the particular artefacts or aspects that are not important and choices of how to make and use them are automatic and subconscious, a result of local enculturation and can be seen at the micro-level of the society (Arnold 1994: 181; Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 142-3; 1996b: 93-4; Shennan 1994: 18). However this approach limits the role of material culture to a passive reflection of the society and not an active element in the formation of the society (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 252-3). On the contrary it is believed that

material culture can demonstrate not only the cognition and social systems, but also the dynamics and the processes under way in the society (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 146; 1996b: 84-5). Thus stylistic studies can give more information than just showing boundaries, groups and interaction; they can reveal to us the changing relations between the individual and society through time (Wiessner 1989: 62). Style has an active role in the expression of symbols in society with various meanings and interpretations, often polysemous and, according to the context, relating the agent and the social structure in a multi-level way (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 131). Context, social conditions and time affect, increase, decrease or create different styles that can change their symbolic character, not always in predictable or fixed patterns (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 132-3; Shennan 1994: 19; Wiessner 1989: 62).

Although typology is a very useful tool for dating a site and understanding its context, it may easily give an illusory image of a unified entity. In other words it may give a homogeneous picture of a site through the identification of specific objects in their spatio-temporal distribution (Jones 1997: 131). Thus an understanding of the stylistic variation is necessary in all spatio-temporal and cultural contexts before trying to answer or understand issues of identity. A necessary prerequisite for this is the analysis of most, if not all, aspects of the material culture available, not always resulting in a harmonious picture, but sometimes a contradictory one (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 133).

On the symbolic character of style Tilley underlines the role of signs and their decoding in close relation to the maintenance of power (1989: 187). Thus some aspects of the material culture can be used by certain individuals for their own interests, manipulating them accordingly (Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 154-5). Material culture transforms, stores and preserves social information and can be seen as text, a form of writing and discourse, though with a certain degree of autonomy from language (Shanks and Tilley 1996b: 99; Tilley 1989: 189). Furthermore there is no single ultimate meaning to an object, but there is rather a multiplicity of readings, sometimes even contradictory, perhaps more than in language as Tilley believes (1989: 191-2; Shanks and Tilley 1996b: 103-4).

This is particularly demonstrated in Whitley's (1991: 181) analysis of pottery type deposited in tombs in Athens from the Submycenaean period to the Late Geometric. Pots and other artefacts were the vehicles for demarcating gender, age and social identities. Their relation and role changed through time reflecting to some degree the transformations of the local society (Whitley 1991: 182-3).

2.3.2 Ethnicity

Ethnicity is but one of the identities a person has often overlapping with others or being one of its dimensions. The role of ethnicity in the area and period under review is one of the basic questions set by researchers, in a way forming the agenda of our inquiry. Its fundamental character is created through dialectics, since it needs at least two people or groups to create a difference and therefore ethnic identity (Eriksen 1993: 1; Gosden 1999: 190). Contacts and interactions are necessary in order to base an identity on what one is not, therefore the idea of 'Us' versus 'Them' is fundamental (Eriksen 1993: 9-10; Jones 1996: 66; 1997: 84).

Moreover the relationship of historians and archaeologists with ethnicity is very closely linked. Nations and consequently countries need a past for their existence, while ethnic groups diachronically tend to have myths of common origin and support endogamy (Eriksen 1993: 12; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996: 1). The role of archaeology with contemporary cultural identity and politics can be seen in many instances, and it is common to project modern concepts and ideas into the past in order to justify claims of various types (Jones 1997: 10).

Race is another term which is often associated with the genetic similarity of a group of people. However it has been shown that this assumption is false, boundaries are very frequently crossed and great variation exists (Eriksen 1993: 4). Although this point is true, race as a concept is quite important since people recognize it as existing and it affects their thinking and acting, therefore it has a cultural basis, whether it has a biological reality or not (Eriksen 1993: 4-5).

The idea of bounded, homogeneous cultural entities has been equated with ethnic groups, viewing culture as an essentially conservative phenomenon, from the time of Childe (Jones 1997: 24). Gradual change was attributed to internal pressure, whilst a radical change was interpreted as a consequence of external influences and more importantly diffusion through contacts or invasion and migration (Jones 1997: 25).

Ethnographic studies since the 1970s have shown the problems and variations of definition that analytical units such as tribes and culture have (Jones 1997: 49). For sociology ethnicity was never regarded as a defining part of the social system nor a necessary and universal characteristic (Jones 1997: 53). However in the last thirty years it has gained an important position in sociological studies due to new socio-political conditions (Jones 1997: 54-5).

Definitions of ethnicity can be divided into 'objective' and 'subjective' (Jones 1997: 57). The former regards ethnic groups as social and cultural entities that are isolated with not much interaction with other groups. The latter considers ethnic groups as culturally constructed units that include social interaction and behaviour (Barth 1969: 29-30). Moreover, Barth (1969: 12) has argued that an ethnic group spread over an area of varying ecological subregions, reflects local diversities and not different cultural orientation. The point raised by Barth (1969: 14) is very important, that there is no one-to-one correlation between ethnic groups and cultural similarities and differences (Eriksen 1993: 37-8; Jones 1997: 60). Attitudes towards ethnicity are mainly divided into primordialism and instrumentalism. Primordialism considers that ethnicity is an innate aspect of human identity and that it is related to emotions, cultural symbols, language, customs and kinship bonds (Gosden 1999: 190-1; Graves-Brown 1996: 83-6; Jones 1997: 68-72). Instrumentalism is expressed through the ideas of Cohen and views people as changing ethnic identity when this is considered advantageous. He believes that ethnic identity is partly a social strategy to achieve ones' aims, and he is interested in inter-ethnic relations and the maintenance of boundaries (Eriksen 1993: 46-7; Gosden 1999: 192-3; Jones 1996: 67; 1997: 76-9). Thus ethnic identity has a strong socio-economic basis and is a rather flexible concept. The problem with primordialism is that the overall idea is quite vague and it does not take account of the social and historical context, whilst instrumentalism fails to explain the causes of its existence and is

inadequate to explain the relationship between ethnicity and culture (Jones 1996: 67-8; 1997: 72, 79). Furthermore Barth (1969: 14-5) believes that ethnic groups should be defined from within, from the group members and not by 'objective' criteria, first because a holistic definition would be inadequate and second because people can feel like A and behave as B (Eriksen 1993: 37-8; Shennan 1994: 14-5).

Perhaps a good start is to use the broad processual definition of ethnicity, that ethnic groups have ascribed culturally identities, which are expressed with real or assumed common culture and descent. Although much criticism has been launched at such a general expression, it is better to use it as a starting point and apply it in each social, cultural and temporal context (Jones 1997: 87).

A more balanced view is put forward by Bourdieu (1977: 72) and his *habitus* (4.1.1), arguing for the constant transformation of social structure, a structuring structure and a structured structure at the same time. The agent plays an important role in this process by participating positively or even by resisting new conditions. Thus ethnicity is not a passive image of society, but an intersubjective belief based on the shared subconscious dispositions of the *habitus* which shape and are shaped by commonalities of everyday practices (Jones 1996: 68; 1997: 90).

Moreover ethnicity underlines the cultural differences, which are related to the dialectic opposition of different cultural traditions and practices, whose form depends on the people's *habitus* and the social conditions in any framework (Jones 1996: 69). However the temporal, spatial and social variables and contexts create a number of different cases, therefore it is unlikely that we will find a one-to-one correlation between ethnicity and the entire range of cultural practices in any society (Jones 1996: 70). The manifestation of ethnicity in the material culture, or the *emblemic insignia*, may vary in different social contexts, as well as the forms and scales of interaction, which can change through time (Barth 1969: 35; Hall 1997: 136; Jones 1996: 72). Thus a diachronic analysis is a necessary tool for the archaeologist to view the shifts in the expressions of ethnicity and the dimensions of the material culture that highlight it (Jones 1996: 73; 1997: 126). Nonetheless there is also a fear of treating culture as an epiphenomenal symbolic set whose only purpose is to serve the expression of ethnicity

or other social identities (Jones 1997: 119-20). We should rather view material culture as both structuring and structured by ethnicity (Jones 1997: 120).

It is certain that ethnic groups have never been well formed as territorially bounded culture-bearing units either in the present and/or definitely not in the past (Jones 1996: 75; 1997: 104). Furthermore ethnicity is a dynamic phenomenon that it is manifested in different ways in different contexts (Jones 1996: 74; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996: 17). Ethnicity should not be projected into the past in order to present it as homogeneous, but it should be seen in its own historical context (Jones 1996: 75-6). The importance of ethnicity derives from the correlation between culture, identity, social organization, the multivocality of symbols, continuity and change, whilst it is expressed by a limited set of cultural characteristics (Barth 1969: 38; Eriksen 1993: 162).

For many researchers ethnicity is cultural differentiation, closely connected to the existence of social, cultural and political resources, as well as contacts that have common characteristics (Eriksen 1993: 147). Shennan's argument goes a step further to suggest that state and human identification are very closely correlated (1994: 15). Moreover ethnic identity derives from the destruction of the identity provided by kinship and it is seen as one of the roots for the creation of states and perhaps their ideological and social reproduction (Shennan 1994: 16). It has been suggested that the intensity of ethnic consciousness and therefore material culture differentiation is related to politico-economic stress conditions (Jones 1997: 110). Perhaps the two fundamental points for identifying identities are the degree of interaction and the power relations between groups of people in each cultural context (Jones 1997: 128).

Attempts to identify ethnicity in the archaeological record are numerous. Sherratt (1992: 317) points out that the Mycenaean pottery found on Cyprus is related to cultural and linguistic identity by several scholars. Thus in the LC IIIA period Mycenaeans were recognized on Cyprus, using Cypriot temples, houses, tombs and domestic pottery, but burying Aegean-looking White Painted Wheelmade III shapes with the dead, a point showing their economic importance in the local society (Sherratt 1992: 324). This is a very good example of how researchers identify ethnicity through the most 'important' insignia, pottery, because they want to identify ethnicity. Thus people are once more

equated with pottery, whose role in the society is rather uncertain, in order to project the Greek ethnogenesis on the island back to the 12th century BC (Leriu 2002: 170-2).

The case of the Philistines in Syria-Palestine is interesting, related to the Sea Peoples phenomenon. However the issue is further complicated due to the fact that Israeli archaeologists want to pinpoint archaeologically the so-called proto-Israelites. Bunimovitz (1990: 211-6) reviews all the available data, such as settlement, pottery, cult and burial customs. He concludes that the social identity of the Philistines is emphasized more than their ethnicity which is not clearly defined and what we see is part of a polysemous identity (Bunimovitz 1990: 217-8). Eventually the artefacts that show these differences are lost through intensive interaction with the Canaanites (Bunimovitz 1990: 219). Bunimovitz and Yasur-Landau returned to this issue (1996: 89), relating their ideas of ethnicity to culinary practices. The basic problem with their idea is that all kitchenware is recognized as an ethnic indicator *a priori*, because it is not traded, is produced locally and there is no stylistic variation (Bunimovitz and Yasur-Landau 1996: 91). However it is doubtful whether people recognized ethnic groups or differences through kitchenware or culinary practices. The Philistine kitchenware is related to Mycenaean shapes and consequently settlers and is considered the *emblemic insignia* for pinpointing Israelites archaeologically (Bunimovitz and Yasur-Landau 1996: 92-3). Mycenaean immigration to Cyprus is considered to be similar in character in terms of the ethnic origin and practices (Bunimovitz and Yasur-Landau 1996: 95-6). Once again the more distinctive pottery style is invoked without further evidence supporting the idea that this specific artefact category was in any way associated with the desire to express differentiation and more specifically ethnicity.

CHAPTER 3: THE PREHISTORY OF SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN

In this chapter the prehistory of the South-eastern Aegean will be reviewed in order to highlight the diachronic developments in this area. Thus the unity or diversity of the region will be assessed over time as discussed in Chapter 1, as well as the movement of people and their identity as seen in Chapter 2. The evidence that will be reviewed in most depth here is related to the settlements, since the tombs will be treated in Chapter 5. For the LH III period detailed analysis of the settlement pattern of the large islands and sites will be also provided in Chapter 5, since the landscape will be assessed for both cemeteries and settlements.

3.1 The Earliest Human Colonization in the Aegean

The Aegean archipelago contains a number of islands that are close to the mainland. Thus the degree of isolation in the Aegean and the ecological limitations in sea travel is less than in the Pacific islands. Nonetheless man had reached Australia 40,000 years ago (Johnstone 1980: 5; van Andel 1989: 738).

Until recently the earliest evidence of seafaring in the Aegean came from the cave of Franchthi in the Argolid where Melian obsidian was found in a late Upper Palaeolithic context. The date given is 10880 +/- 160 b.p. (Broodbank 1999a: 20; Runnels 1995: 720; van Andel 1989: 737). As a matter of fact there is Middle Palaeolithic evidence recovered on Alonnesos in the Northern Sporades, in a period when it was insular, as well as during the final stages of the Upper Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic periods (Panagopoulou *et al.* 1996: 716, 718). Similarly there are Middle and Upper Palaeolithic finds from Gramiza in the North Sporades which was most probably insular even in the Glacial maximum (Sampson 1998: 18-20). Moreover Palaeolithic evidence has been found in the North Sporades, Lesbos and Thasos, which were most probably extensions of their neighbouring mainlands at the time (Charisis *et al.* 2000: 86; Flemming 1983: 263; Koukouli-Chrysanthaki and Weisgerber 1996: 89; Sampson

1996a: 58). Recent research has revealed Mesolithic occupation at Kythnos, Gioura and other small islands in the North Sporades, that were definitely insular in that period, whilst the acquisition of Melian obsidian continued at Franchthi (Broodbank 1999a: 20; Honea 1975: 278; Sampson 1996a: 58-9; 1996e: 48; 1996f: 610; 1998: 18-21). All this evidence reveals how extensive these maritime networks already were. Definite evidence of colonization and continuity comes from Knossos on the island of Crete during the Aceramic phase of the Neolithic period dating to the late 8th or early 7th millennium BC (Broodbank 1999a: 21; Broodbank and Strasser 1991: 236; Davaras 1996: 92; Patton 1996: 51). The fact that the settlers came either from the Greek mainland via Kythera or from Anatolia through Rhodes and Karpathos is not in doubt. Nonetheless, in these three islands colonization ranges from the late 6th to the 4th millennium BC (Davis 1992: 703; Melas 1985: 170; Patton 1996: 49-50; Sampson 1987: 65). So the pattern of colonization is far from straightforward and selectivity seems to have been a vital factor for migration.

However humans seem to have been more successful in settling during the Neolithic in the Aegean, due to the new subsistence strategies employed and the number of the domesticated animals and plants these settlers brought with them (Davis 1992: 702; Patton 1996: 22). Moreover storage facilities, crop diversification, exploitation of wild resources, local and regional exchanges were used to deal with crop failure. The causes of migration (Chapter 2), as well as the impact of the humans on the island ecosystems (Chapter 1), were discussed in general terms, and the same variables apply in the Aegean as well.

3.2 The Neolithic Period

The evidence from the South-eastern Aegean comes mainly from the cave sites Kalythies and Koumelo on Rhodes (fig.3.1). The former is the earlier, with occupation dating perhaps to the later part of the 6th millennium BC and certainly in the early 5th millennium BC (Sampson 1987: 65). The earliest domesticated chicken and black rat in Europe seems to have been introduced to Rhodes in this period, along with the rest of

the domesticated animals, goat, sheep, pig and cow (Davis 1992: 745; Halstead and Jones 1987: 135-8). Moreover Kalythies cave was also used as a primary burial place for infants, juveniles and adults (Phountoulakis 1987: 166-73). Tephra recovered from Koumelo proved not to have come from Thera, but most probably from Gyali during the Aegean Late Neolithic 4 (Cambouroglou 1987: 179 and pers. comm.)². In both caves the habitation is most probably seasonal rather than permanent (Sampson 1996b: 90). At the very beginning of the Late Neolithic period evidence of occupation is found at Tigani on Samos, which continued in use throughout the Neolithic times (Davis 1992: 743; Niemeier 1998b: 31). The site of Ayio Gala on Chios gives a definite late 6th millennium BC date. According to Sampson (1985: 257; Mellaart 1998a: 56) the similarities of the pottery found on Chios and in Anatolia at Hacilar suggest where the colonists came from. The pots share decorative and shape characteristics with Anatolian and Aegean prototypes throughout the Late Neolithic period (Broodbank 2000: 162-3; Sampson 1984b: 242-3). There are no clear stylistic boundaries and they definitely do not mark cultural areas; what is underlined here is interaction and movement of people and objects. The first settlers seem to have had a mixed subsistence economy, practising fishing, farming, herding and hunting according to the season (Halstead and Jones 1987: 143). They were as self-sufficient as possible and, in the case of famine, migration to other islands or to the closest part of the mainland must have been the strategy followed.

Nonetheless evidence of contact exists; this can be demonstrated through the presence of obsidian at Kalythies cave in all the phases of its occupation, whether permanent or seasonal. 80% of the obsidian comes from Melos, some from Gyali and a few pieces from a source in Central Anatolia, either Acigol or Hasan Dağ (Sampson 1984a: 72). The pattern that is believed to have existed, as far as the obsidian acquisition is concerned, is less through exchange, but mainly through direct access to the material, as part of a multi-purpose sea voyage (Broodbank 2000: 157-8; Cherry 1985: 15; Perlès 1992: 128, 145). Some processing of the material must have been taken place on the spot at both Aegean sources.

² The terms Aegean Late Neolithic 4 (LAN), Final Neolithic or Chalcolithic period all correspond roughly to the same period, the 4th millennium BC. Only they are used in different areas, the first for the Dodecanese, the second for mainland Greece and the last for Anatolia.

Although the quality of the Gyali obsidian is not good, it was used for blade and other tool production. It turns up from the 5th millennium until the LBA in a number of places: Leros, Kalymnos, Kos, Tilos, Symi, Chalki, Alimnia, Rhodes, Karpathos, Crete and some pieces were recovered on Keos, Saliagos, Naxos and Tenos (Betancourt 1997: 173-4; Sampson 1984a: 69-72; 1988: 217). However, it still does not have the wide distribution of the obsidian from Melos and Central Anatolia, due to its low quality. During the MBA and LBA it was also used for the manufacture of stone vessels almost exclusively on Crete. Architectural evidence has been found on Gyali, in the 4th millennium, including terrace walls and curving walls (Davis 1992: 746; Sampson 1988: 211). Interestingly enough Melian obsidian was also found on the island (Sampson 1988: 211; 1996b: 90). As for the local economy farming, herding, hunting and perhaps fishing were practiced at this time (Sampson 1988: 212, 215). The metal finds are among the earliest in the Aegean along with those found at Kalythies (Sampson 1988: 218-9). Furthermore there are remains of more than seventy-five cist graves with pottery, but with no bones recovered (Davis 1992: 746; Sampson 1996b: 90). However, Sampson (1984a: 67 *contra* Sampson 1996b: 90) is uncertain whether the settlement on Gyali was permanent in the FN and the EBA. Despite the architecture and the burials, he argues for seasonal occupation on the basis of recent ethnoarchaeological evidence and the lack of water (Sampson 1988: 211-2 *contra* Halstead 1987: 77). There are several strategies employed for overcoming the latter problem on most of the medium and small size islands of the Aegean, as he admits (Sampson 1988: 211), whilst his ethnoarchaeological parallel is applicable to specialized pastoralism which is not thought to have existed in the Neolithic and EBA periods (Sampson 1993: 102-3). It seems that there was a small community, perhaps a handful of families, that stayed permanently on Gyali for a few generations in the Final Neolithic period, but settlement did not continue.

During the 5th millennium BC, Aegean Late Neolithic 1-3, evidence from Symi (Panormitis and perhaps Seskli), Kos (Asklupi), Karpathos (Skopi), and Astypalaia (eight sites) seems to suggest that the human presence on these islands was, most probably, permanent (Melas 1985: 170-1; Sampson 1987: 117).

More sites are found during the 4th millennium BC in the South-eastern Aegean. A tendency to abandon caves in favour of open ones is observed during this period (Sampson 2002: 115). At Partheni on Leros we have settlement evidence dating to the mid 4th millennium BC with a large quantity of cheese pots, 50% of the total pottery recovered (Sampson 1987: 89-90). Special mention must also be made of Alimnia, which has produced the earliest evidence of domestic architecture with an apsidal house that had a gravel floor and several hearths (Sampson 1983: 8). The apsidal shape is probably of Anatolian origin and the pottery is similar to that found at Archangelos II phase on Rhodes (mid 4th millennium BC), with plenty of cheese pots. On Rhodes the number of sites recognized remains the same during this period, whilst more are found on Kos and Leros (Jacopich 1928: 99-100). The occupation of the Ayia Varvara, Chiromandres and Daskalio caves on Kalymnos starts in the 4th millennium BC (Aegean Late Neolithic 4) as well (Maiuri 1928b: 107-10, 114; Sampson 1987: 118). Evidence of activity in this period also comes from Patmos, Chalki, Tilos, Kastellorizo, Karpathos, Iasos and Teichioussa (Berti 1993: 190; Greaves 2002: 43; Melas 1985: 172; Sampson 1996b: 90; Voigtländer 1986: 621). At Akyeniköy, Assessos and Killiktepe, sites close to Miletos, Bakla Tepe and at Miletos itself Final Neolithic finds have been recovered (Greaves 2002: 40-3; IRERP 2000; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997: 243; Voigtländer 1983: 12). A number of obsidian blades from this region have been analyzed and a Melian provenance confirmed, suggesting contacts with other sites in the Aegean (Greaves 2002: 43-4). Perhaps this area functioned as a middle point on an obsidian route from Melos to Aphrodisias and Central Anatolia (Greaves and Helwing 2001: 505). Tigani on Samos continued to be occupied, while evidence of settlement appeared at the Heraion as well (Niemeier 1998b: 31).

3.3 The Early Bronze Age

The start of the Bronze Age sees a number of social changes, while contact and exchange networks seem to become better established. There is an expansion in the number of settlements, shipbuilding developed and trade connected sites and islands

more than ever before. In the Cyclades during the Keros-Syros culture (EB II), the increased settlement density does not necessarily mean urbanization, but rather the appearance of more small settlements, as in the case of Melos (Broodbank 1989: 321). Although larger sites seem to have existed, such as Chalandriani on Syros, it did not have more than a hundred people, and there was probably social stratification or ranking (Broodbank 1989: 327). The longboats, represented on frying pans, show the technological advances in oar-propelled ships during this period (Johnstone 1980: 60). Their symbolism must have been social, as an ideological manifestation of power and status either communal or personal, and perhaps they also had religious connotations (Broodbank 1989: 335; 2000: 251). Their construction and use required communal effort and inter-community cooperation, creating new social conditions. They must have been designed for warfare and raiding rather than trade (Broodbank 1989: 336; 2000: 253-6). The longboat is a manifestation of social change in the Cyclades, probably analogous with that seen on the mainland, where centralization and monumentality appeared as in the case of 'the House of Tiles' at Lerna (Broodbank 1989: 337). The islands actively involved in the exchange networks including the largest and those with the least promising environment for subsistence, such as Keros and Dhonoussa (Cherry 1985: 28). Communities depended on each other, in social and economic respects, making interaction and seafaring vital for their survival (Broodbank 2000: 166; Davis 1992: 704). Moreover the finds from Dhokos, either of a shipwreck or of a port, signify the scale of the exchanges and the range of items involved (Papathanassopoulos *et al.* 1991: 27-8). The movement of objects and ideas as symbols consist in different social strategies and new conditions affecting the social equilibrium (Broodbank 1993: 315, 323-4). In this context the burials reveal social differentiation and an accumulation of personal wealth in some cases (Broodbank 2000: 170, 247). Although the space model used by Broodbank (1993: 321; 2000: 181) (1.3) is questionable as to whether it can be applied everywhere, it demonstrates the existence of several small regions rather a homogeneous archipelago.

In the South-eastern Aegean our evidence is scarce and comes from few sites (fig.3.2). In a pithos burial at Mesaria on Kos, a marble EC II bowl testifies to contacts with the Cyclades. Moreover the spread burials and the surface finds on Kos reveal a

scattered pattern of small settlements (fig.3.3), perhaps hamlets during the EB II period (Marketou 1990b: 40; Mee 1982: 79; Sampson 1988: 229-30). However at Seraglio during the EB III there are two occupation phases with houses and a kiln (Kantzia 1984: 330; Marketou 1997: 407). Interestingly in the latter phase a fortification wall was constructed revealing social complexity and new social conditions i.e. raiding (Marketou 1990b: 41). Furthermore it is probable that local elites had already emerged that were able to mobilize the necessary labour force for the completion of such a work. The overall settlement pattern on Kos resembles the conditions and practices in the Cyclades as Marketou suggests (1990b: 42). Red-burnished rounded bowls are the commonest pottery type found, with close affinities to the Cyclades, eastern Greece and Anatolia i.e. Beycesultan (Marketou 1990b: 41). At Asomatos on Rhodes long megaron-like buildings were recovered dating to EB III, with earlier EB II phases of rectangular buildings (Marketou 1990b: 41-2; 1997: 396). The density of the buildings has suggested the existence of a fortification wall, but further investigation is needed (Davis 1992: 748). The pottery displays a large variety of shapes and decoration, bowls of various sizes, a few pieces of duck-vases, cups, tankards and coarse pithoi. It is also interesting to note that late EBA sherds reveal occupation on Mt. Philerimos in this period and at a number of other sites on the island (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 143, 146, 149-52; Marketou 1988a: 621; 1988b: 28). At Tigani on Samos the site was occupied but the layers were disturbed, in contrast to the Heraion where megaron-like buildings were found, similar to the ones at Asomatos with wide streets around them (Marketou 1997: 408). Moreover part of a fortification wall was found at the Heraion with round towers (Davis 1992: 743). There are close affinities noted in the pottery of Tigani with Vathy cave on Kalymnos (Furness 1956: 208).

A diffusion of several Anatolian pottery types seems likely, underlining the existence of contacts with the mainland and between islands. The sites of Seraglio, Asomatos and Heraion share many characteristics.

Although Melas (1985: 171-2) favours an Anatolian origin for the first settlers on Karpathos, he stresses the close contacts between Crete and Karpathos from the Final Neolithic period. From Rhodes and Kalymnos we also have duck-vases, an EB III type pottery widely distributed in the Aegean, Eastern Greece, the Cyclades and Anatolia

(Broodbank 2000: 351; Dietz 1974: 139; Marketou 1997: 401). Their existence indicates the exchange and contact networks that were active during this period, reaching as far as Lapithos on Cyprus (Dietz 1974: 142-3). More evidence of occupation comes from Astypalaia with clear evidence of contact with the neighbouring Cyclades (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 161-7; Mee 1982: 78). Moreover surface evidence suggests permanent occupation on Symi, Tilos and Leros (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 52-4, 63-8).

The occupation of Killiktepe, Teichioussa, Miletos and Bakla Tepe continued in this period, with evidence of contact with the Aegean as the marble Cycladic idol found at Miletos testifies (Greaves 2002: 45; IRERP 2000; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997: 243). The pottery from Miletos reveals close links with Samos and the rest of the Aegean in this period (Voigtländer 1982: 41). These sites were most probably occupied continuously until the Late Bronze Age. In the Early Bronze Age at Iasos there was a large cemetery and settlement with many Cycladic elements that will be reviewed later (Mee 1982: 79; Mellink 1986: 141; Pecorella 1984: 106). At Müskebi an Early Bronze Age settlement has been suggested close to the seashore (Vermeule 1964: 246-9). From Knidos and Cape Krio, the only available evidence is still the result of 19th century excavations (Mee 1978: 132). The lack of excavation in south-western coastal Anatolia has prevented us from understanding and assessing Aegean and Central Anatolian influence on the pottery style and of the local culture (French 1997: 588-90). It is of particular interest that during this period a number of settlements have been found in the Izmir region and all possess fortifications, indicating that throughout the Aegean there are similar socio-political changes (Erkanal 1999: 237-8).

As for the settlements, from the available evidence a decrease in the numbers is seen on Karpathos and Kasos in comparison with the Neolithic period, whilst elsewhere in the South-eastern Aegean there is a smaller decrease. In contrast to this we find an increase in settlement on Rhodes, Kos and Astypalaia, although more excavations can alter this picture. It is noteworthy that Asomatos, Seraglio, Iasos, Miletos and perhaps Müskebi were coastal sites and perhaps that played an important role in their development, as was the case in the Cyclades (Broodbank 1993: 322-3). As for the pottery, the increase in the number drinking vessels has been connected with a

movement of ideas and practices with all their social connotations from Anatolia (Marketou 1990b: 43). In this context the tankard cups and trefoil jugs having parallels from Beycesultan, can be assessed. The total absence of material related to the Near East underlines the point that relations with that area were only initiated at a later stage (Broodbank 2000: 285). Perhaps technological innovations, as well as the limited exotica found, were the result of occasional rather than more frequent seafaring episodes (Sherratt and Sherratt 1991: 367 *contra* Broodbank 2000: 366) or came through the Anatolian plateau via a northern route. The suggestion of affinities between the pottery of eastern Crete and South-eastern Aegean during EB II is an interesting one, but further investigation is needed (Broodbank 2000: 304; Haggis 1997). In general the EBA seems a rather dynamic period with an intensification of interaction especially with Anatolia and the Cyclades, and less with Crete. New settlements were established with town planning, fortifications and more elaborate burials when compared to the Final Neolithic period, underlining the new social conditions that existed.

3.4 The Middle Bronze Age

In the MBA an important innovation is the use of sails on ships, making them faster and able to undertake longer and more hazardous enterprises (Cherry 1985: 21; Roberts 1991: 59). For Broodbank (2000: 341) this development was fundamental for the social changes at the end of EB III and the beginning of MB I. The increase in speed and flexibility, the enlargement of cargo capacity and the need for good anchorage were the consequences of the new technology and altered maritime conditions in the Aegean (Broodbank 2000: 345-7). Perhaps this helps to explain why Crete managed to develop and gained power.

As far as the South-eastern Aegean is concerned, this period is again rather unclear with limited data (fig.3.4). The big question in this period is the Minoan thalassocracy and the existence of eastern string, as hypothesized by Niemeier (1984: 206). Broodbank (2000: 356-7) calls the whole system dendritic, but its essence is the same as the strings proposed by Niemeier. Karpathos, Kasos and Rhodes are considered

to be stepping-stones for the contacts between Crete and Anatolia. The evidence from Mt. Philerimos on Rhodes is dated to MM IB/II and from Palio Mitato, Lakos and other sites on Karpathos and Trapeza, Kephala and tou Stamati to Laki on Kasos to MM I/II (Benzi 1984a: 98; Marketou 1987a: 616; Melas 1985: 173-4; Niemeier 1998a: 29; Patton 1996: 161). More evidence from Rhodes comes from the northern part of the island, Maritsa and Kalavarda (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 139-42; Mee 1982: 79). There is also evidence of occupation in this period at Potamos-Ayioi Anargyroi on Chalki, Kastelli on Patmos and Vathy on Kalymnos (Benzi 1984a: 96; 1997: 384; Melas 1988a: 307). Seraglio continued to be occupied, while at the end of the period the Trianda settlement on Rhodes was established (Marketou 1990b: 44; Morricone 1972/3: 384; Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1982: 181-2).

The domestic architecture is quite simple and is similar to Cycladic examples rather than the Asomatos prototypes (Marketou 1998b: 42-3). At Trianda it seems that the houses formed small clusters in the wider Trianda area (Davis *et al.* 2001: 93). The pottery reveals a continuous local production, while the evidence from Seraglio suggests closer relations with the Cyclades rather than Crete (Marketou 1998b: 43). On the other hand Benzi (1984a: 100) argues that the material from Rhodes indicates Cretan immigrants who settled on Philerimos, establishing a 'settlement colony' as defined by Branigan (1981: 26). Furthermore a core-periphery economic exchange system is proposed for the relationship with Crete that eventually developed into a tribute-based redistribution system controlled by the Minoan palaces (Patton 1996: 161). The same argument is used for the whole area of the Dodecanese by Davis (1992: 706) to illustrate the relationship of the region with Crete. From Tigani on Samos Cretan imports were present from MM I alongside local pottery (Davis 1982: 38). At Miletos we have the same type of evidence with Minoan pottery, loomweights and seals appearing from the MM IA period, at around the time the Old Palaces were established on Crete (Greaves 2002: 46; Niemeier 1998b: 32; Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 546, 553). Additionally continuity of occupation with strong Cretan elements in the pottery comes from Knidos and Iasos (Mee 1982: 80; Niemeier 1998b: 31).

During this period there is a sharp decrease in the number of settlements found in the South-eastern Aegean. Karpathos and Kasos are an exception to this rule, perhaps

due to this proximity and interaction with Crete. It is also interesting that in the north-western part of Rhodes an important concentration of settlements seems to have existed. However the MBA is not well documented in this region and definitely more research will change the current picture.

3.5 The Late Bronze Age

Minoanization is a widespread phenomenon into the Aegean in the LB I period. Trianda has a number of Minoan characteristics in domestic architecture, pottery production, economy and perhaps religion in the LM IA and IB periods (Davis 1992: 748; Furumark 1950: 177-80; Marketou 1988b: 30-2; 1998a: 56, 62; 1998b: 63-5; Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1982: 149-81). We have the same picture from Seraglio on Kos (Marketou 1990a: 496; Morricone 1972/3: 388-92), except that it also produced a characteristic type of local pottery, light-on-dark and dark-on-light, dating to the LM IA period (Davis 1982: 36; Marthari *et al.* 1990: 176-8 *contra* Papagiannopoulou 1985: 85-91). The picture seen at Trianda and Seraglio corresponds to what we see at Miletos and there is Minoan pottery from other sites close to Miletos as well (Greaves 2002: 49-53; Greaves and Helwing 2001: 505; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997: 229-42; 1999: 547-9; Schiering 1959/60: 21, 25-8). At Iasos there is Minoan style pottery, architecture and small finds, but their significance has not been fully assessed yet (Momigliano 2000: 12; 2001: 15). Minoan style conical cups were recovered on Tilos, revealing occupation and contact with the wider South-eastern Aegean (Sampson 1980: 72), while a Minoan stone lamp was found on Symi (Kaninia 1993: 559). On Karpathos, Kasos and Saros a number of sites have produced Minoan material, revealing close contacts with Crete (Melas 1985: 174-6). Minoan pottery has also been reported at Teichioussa and Didyma (Mee 1978: 126; 1998a: 137; Niemeier 1998b: 35; Voigtländer 1986: 622-3, 642-51).

The interpretation of the evidence has been made in conjunction to the Minoan thalassocracy (2.1.4), with Niemeier and Niemeier (1999: 552-3) expressing their belief that Minoans settled at Miletos and in fact throughout the South-eastern Aegean.

However, Marketou (1990c: 111-2; 1998b: 63-5) argues in favour of the local characteristics of these settlements and rejects the colonization hypothesis.

At the end of LM IA, the Thera eruption caused destruction both at Seraglio and Trianda, while layers of tephra have been found in various places on these islands, and recently identified at Iasos as well (Benzi *et al.* 2000: 342-5; Marketou 1990c: 109-12; Momigliano 2000: 12; 2001: 15). Radiocarbon analyses conducted on the well-stratified layers of Trianda (Marketou *et al.* 2001: 24-6), favour the high Aegean chronology (Manning 1999: 335-40; Manning *et al.* 2002: 742).

Minoan influence continued in the LM IB-II period, except that from LH IIA-B a Mycenaean presence becomes more apparent on Rhodes and Kos (Mee 1982: 81-2; Morricone 1972/3: 392-4; Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1982: 184). The first chamber tombs appear and Mycenaean pottery is found in both these settlements, as well as other sites on these islands (5.2.1, 5.2.2) (fig.3.5). Unfortunately at Trianda and Seraglio we have no stratification and little preserved architecture. The Trianda settlement was most probably not abandoned in LH IIIB and C as Furumark (1950: 180-1) believed, but used until the LH IIIC period (Benzi 1988a: 53-4). As for Seraglio the continuous use of the site in later periods does not allow us a better picture of the settlement.

Mycenaean characteristics in the burial context as well as settlements are also evident on Kalymnos, Astypalaia, Múskebi, Samos and Ikaria (5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6). On other islands and sites only sporadic settlement evidence has been reported. At Potamos on Chalki, apart from the Minoan finds, there might have been continuity into the LH III period, but no definite evidence exists (Melas 1988a: 293, 304-7). As for Tilos there has been found a single sherd proving that the Megalo Chorio site was most probably occupied during the LH III period (Philimonos 1996: 693). On Symi the acropolis seems to have been the location of the settlement with the fertile Pedi plain to the east and the natural harbour to the west (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 63). On Nisyros in the area between Paliokastro and Krios in close proximity to the modern town of Mandraki, settlement evidence has come to light (Melas 1988a: 288-92). On Leros the area of the Kastro at Ayia Marina was most probably the main settlement on the island with a good anchorage and a small plain extending west and north-west, while sporadic evidence was reported at Partheni (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 53-4; Marketou 1980: 557). On

Patmos the site at Kastelli seems to have been the central settlement of the island during the prehistoric period, with a small plain extending to its east as well as a good harbour (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 48-50).

The case of Karpathos is different; although they follow the chamber tomb tradition, the imported and locally produced pottery is closer to Crete. On that issue Patton (1996: 133-4) bases his argument on remoteness and security that leads to cultural conservatism, as these islands are closer to Crete. It has to be noted that LH IIIB finds are rather limited on the island, whilst there is no evidence of occupation during LH IIIC. On Kasos at the site of Poli the settlement evidence recovered suggests occupation during LH IIIB and C (Melas 1985: 83). The settlement and cemetery at Archontiki on Psara were used during the LH IIIA-B period (Achilara 1986: 11), whilst at Emporio the settlement was occupied most probably since LH IIIB, given the burial evidence, and definitely during LH IIIC (Hood 1981: 579-80).

The same applies at Iasos, where the evidence is even more elusive (Mee 1998a: 139). Some unstratified Mycenaean pottery or sherds without context are found at Knidos at cape Krio, as well as at Kuşadasi, Mylasa, Stratonikaia, Didyma and Tire-Ahmetler (Greaves 2002: 56; Mee 1978: 132, 142-4; 1998a: 138). At Ephesos apart from a tomb, settlement evidence has been reported at the Artemision site as well as the Ayasoluk hill where a fortification wall probably existed (Bammer 1990: 141-2; Büyükkolancı 1999: 2-3). At Miletos there is a large amount of Mycenaean pottery, locally produced and imported with at least seven kilns, which have Cretan and/or Greek mainland parallels, and some house layouts of Mycenaean and more general Aegean type (Greaves 2002: 57-8, 60; Hommel 1959/60; Niemeier 1997: 351; 1998b: 31-5; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997: 192-200, 218-29; Schiering 1959/60). Moreover there is clear evidence of a fortification wall, built most probably in LH IIIA2 late/B early period following Hittite prototypes (Greaves 2002: 59-60; Mallwitz 1959/60: 67-76). At Kolophon the tholos tomb remains the only Mycenaean evidence (Bridges 1974: 265-6; Mee 1978: 125), while four kilometres to the north at Bakla Tepe a tomb with Mycenaean pottery offerings has been recovered, belonging to the LH IIIB period (Erkanal 1998: 401-5; IRERP 2000). Also at Metropolis a few kilometers east of Bakla Tepe on the local hill with the Hittite fortification LH IIIC pottery was recovered

(Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94; Schachner and Meriç 2000: 99, 101). In recent years the excavations in sites around Smyrna such as Liman Tepe/Clazomenai and Panaztepe has produced Mycenaean evidence in a local Anatolian context. It is still too early to assess those sites and outside the geographical area of this work. They have the potential to enrich our outlook and become subject of further research (Erkanal and Erkanal 1986: 72-4; Ersoy 1988: 55-9; Greaves and Helwing 2001: 504-6; 2003: 93-4; Mee 1978: 142-3).

The LBA period ends with the abandonment of all settlements and virtually no evidence of occupation in the whole South-eastern Aegean until the Late Protogeometric period. However we have limited evidence from the Anatolian coast and a few Submycenaean graves in the Halikarnassos area, while pottery of the same period and also Protogeometric comes from Stratonikaia, Ephesos and Miletos (Bammer 1990: 142; Bass 1963: 357-61; Boysal 1967: 43-5; Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1968: 51-3; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997: 205-6). For this period more evidence is needed in order to appreciate the picture of the Early Iron Age in the South-eastern Aegean.

3.6 Discussion

Interaction between sites, islands and regions is evident from the Neolithic period and reached an acme in LB III. Its character and impact was not the same in every case or period (Georgiadis 2002b: 40). However it is clear that parallel socio-cultural developments are seen in the whole Aegean. This is particularly true from the EBA onwards with interaction being a catalyst in this process. In this temporal and spatial context a peer polity interaction could be proposed for the Aegean in a broad sense (Cherry 1986: 19; Renfrew 1986: 6-10). Parallel socio-political processes seem to be under way at a number of sites, as outlined earlier, with ideas shared as well as significant differences. Perhaps this is best demonstrated during the LB III period when autonomous polities seem to exist in mainland Greece, Crete, the Aegean islands and western coastal Anatolia.

The different characteristics and degrees of interaction have obscured the way we read the archaeological record. Thus the same data are used to support migration, exchange and ethnicity hypotheses. A holistic approach causes considerable problems, therefore what will be attempted here is a more pluralistic analysis and presentation of the available evidence. It should also be emphasized that interaction is by no means a strictly interregional phenomenon, but equally operates at an intra-regional level. In other words interaction is vital for the understanding of this area and all the processes that were active.

PART II:
THE LANDSCAPE

CHAPTER 4: LANDSCAPE METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I intend to focus on the theoretical issues of landscape archaeology. The island analysis offered (1.3) can be seen as macro-scale, both spatial and also temporal. As a second step a micro-scale approach is necessary for the sites that have been located. Thus their spatial context will become clearer and we will be able to take account of the landscape and its significance. This is especially important for this region, where the vast majority of the sites are cemeteries.

4.1 The Theoretical Framework

4.1.1 The Basis of Phenomenology

The basis of phenomenology is philosophical and can be traced back to 1927 through the work of Heidegger and his influential study *Being and Time*. His ontological research underlined the way that an entity is shown and revealed to anyone and how this is conceived in relation to time (Heidegger 2000: 36-63). Being and entity demonstrate the role of the individual and how an object appears and is regarded by a person. The methodology of phenomenology is concerned, according to Heidegger (2000: 50), not with questions associated with *what*, but with *how*. The definition of phenomenon in the phenomenological way of thinking is that which shows itself as Being and as a structure of Being (Heidegger 2000: 91). The way of addressing the philosophical problem and approaching any subject matter is primarily empirical and therefore subjective (Heidegger 2000: 54-5).

Heidegger (2000: 79) believes that all entities have a relationship in space, since they are within the world. However, according to our concerns we define/interpret the use of the things around us (Heidegger 2000: 102). Signs are equipment for showing or indicating objects and ideas, more importantly referring and ultimately relating each other (Heidegger 2000: 108). The proximity of an entity/object to a person has a

calculative value for manipulation and use (Heidegger 2000: 135). An object can belong to a place, at a time, adding or ascribing character to it, especially when it is close at hand and is considered of special value or use (Heidegger 2000: 136).

According to Heidegger (2000: 80) *I am* means I reside or dwell alongside the world in a particular way. Thus directionality is an important factor, not subjective, but existential, for Being and being directed/oriented in an already existing world (Heidegger 2000: 143). Closeness in proximity is not necessarily what is at the shortest distance from us, as looking at a map. Space has to be viewed with circumspection in order not to be reduced to pure dimensions and neutralized regions (Heidegger 2000: 147). Space is in the world, and any subject is spatial; in other words space is one of the basic things that is constitutive of the world (Heidegger 2000: 146-8).

Bourdieu is more concerned about the social space/world and its understanding. He also highlights the central role of time in human action and for its understanding (Bourdieu 1977: 7-9). He believes that an agent is not able to comprehend its totality, but a small part of it, the one that appears in his everyday life (Bourdieu 1979: 169). He also emphasizes that the points of view people have depend on their position in society and their will to transform or retain it (Bourdieu 1979: 169). The *habitus* is the dialectic structure of the society, a structured structure and a structuring structure at the same time, a constantly shifting equilibrium (Bourdieu 1977: 72; 1979: 170). The common characteristics of a group recognized by its agents reveals the homogeneity of the *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977: 80). This is demonstrated symbolically in every-day actions and practices. Moreover the synchronization and orchestration of different and similar activities within a group strengthens their social cohesion and common belief-system (Bourdieu 1977: 163). Hence the *habitus* is formed by history and from the common practices it creates history (Bourdieu 1977: 82).

Social connection, comparison and power create social differentiation among groups, an essential component for classification, which is recognized by the agents and conceived by them as natural (Bourdieu 1977: 169; 1979: 172). Also cultural consumption is an expression of this social condition, where the capital value is emphasized by the rarity of the practice. This rarity distinguishes the richest in the

economic and/or cultural capital respect, from the others (Bourdieu 1979: 176). Simultaneously the symbolic capital may have a similar importance and role with the capital value (Bourdieu 1977: 183).

The human body is the main focus of Foucault's (1991: 25-6) work and its interrelation with social control and power. For Foucault (1991: 26) power is exercised, but is not possessed by the dominant class or any other. Nonetheless power does not have a class or any other standard characteristic, while it has a relation of dependence with knowledge (Foucault 1991: 27-8).

The visibility, the duality to see and be seen, as well as access to it, creates a homogeneous effect of power (Foucault 1991: 200-2). Panopticon is a mechanism of observation that can penetrate into the behaviour of the individual; in a way it is the tool of political technology (Foucault 1991: 204-5). This mechanism, however, can have a religious, social, political or economic state or a multi-level ideology. With the aid of architecture and geometry panopticon affects individuals since it gives 'power of mind over mind' (Foucault 1991: 206). The power that is exercised is not external, but rather socially present and increases through contact (Foucault 1991: 206). The domain of panopticism is the details of bodies, their multiple movements, their heterogeneous forces and their spatial relations (Foucault 1991: 208). 'The play of signs defines the anchorages of power' (Foucault 1991: 217), humans are not repressed by social order, they are rather fabricated in it. Discipline creates a subordinate group and thus an inequality between people (Foucault 1991: 222-3). The effect of multiple and complex power relations is a central issue, that is directly related to the human body, through various panoptic mechanisms (Foucault 1991: 308).

Giddens uses Heidegger, Bourdieu and Foucault, adding the historical variable. He suggests that the time-space relations in social systems are closely linked to the formation of power (Giddens 1995: 3). Power is expressed in domination, which is recognized over the material culture or over the social world (Giddens 1995: 4). In this context, especially in the pre-capitalist societies, memory, knowledge of tradition and rituals are the main ways that time-space is controlled (Giddens 1995: 5). Thus time-

space is central for stability or change of a social system, which in reality is in constant formation (Giddens 1995: 17). Moreover the duality of structure is central to the theory of structuration he proposes, since the production of social interaction leads to the reproduction of the social system across time-space (Giddens 1995: 26-9).

Nonetheless the means for the production and reproduction of the social system are the *locales*, the physical settings and/or objects that are the nexus of memories and experiences which can vary in size, shape or importance (Giddens 1995: 39). Thus control is achieved by the strategic manipulation of resources and meanings and thus power asymmetry is formed (Giddens 1995: 61). Nevertheless all people, whatever degree of power they possess, have an active participation in the production and reproduction of the social system (Giddens 1995: 62).

4.1.2 The Archaeological Context

These ideas had a serious impact on archaeology and along with geography created the theoretical framework of phenomenology which was developed during the 1990s. Hodder (1987c: 141), rather unprophetically, had dismissed the use of phenomenology in archaeology, in a conference that was meant to be the *prodromos* of that approach.

Up until the 1990s space was conceived as an abstract, neutral idea, applicable everywhere. It was the natural scenery of actions with the same impact on all societies and all cultures. Maps were used, as well as quantification measurements, in order to define boundaries. This spatial approach in archaeology had many limitations in the role of space and the actions of agents (Thomas 1993: 73-4). The new view considers space as part of human action, different according to the society, group, individual and time. People must be placed in their past space in order to understand them better (Thomas 1993: 74). By re-centering the human we see him/her as an active member, negotiating different and opposing interests, interacting, choosing, using strategies to overcome problems and manipulating the spatial and temporal contexts and meanings (Hodder 1987c: 139). Thus the contextual/post-processual archaeological concepts were a necessary foundation for building the archaeological theory of phenomenology. The

main characteristics of this approach are the subjectivity of the person reading the landscape and the empiricism of the approach by the modern interpreter that creates a narrative (Prevelakis 2000: 30).

Space and time are two variables not only linked, but most importantly omnipresent in all human actions (Ingold 1993: 152). Thus Barrett (1999b: 255-6) believes that the pre-existing meanings in a society serve as a tradition for contemporary acts, an idea based on the Heideggerian theory and Giddens (4.1.1). The reading or the interpretation of a social transformation depends on the physical manifestation of its own landscape heritage. A good example given is the use of burial mounds in Iron Age Britain with the context of the Bronze Age tradition (Barrett 1999b: 257-8). Thus it can be seen that the duality of landscape and temporality are fundamental for people's lives. Elements of past landscapes always modify present ideas, although the messages of the monuments may be differently interpreted (Crumley 1999: 272).

Tilley (1994: 10) argues that space is a social production that is reproduced or changed through human agency, in the daily *praxis* of groups or individuals. Space has no significance on its own, without the social role ascribed to it by the human agent. The interaction between humans and the physical world combines cognitive, emotional and physical aspects in an everyday multi-level relationship. Furthermore Tilley (1999: 180) stresses that places are physical, cultural and historical at the same time, not distinguishable, while they are multisensory i.e. seen, heard, touched, felt and smelt. Bender (1992: 742-4) extends this idea, by arguing that the indivisibility of nature and culture is the topography anthropomorphized and mythologized. Consequently, the reading of any landscape should seek to understand the way people realize and act in the world, always in accordance with their temporal and spatial context (Bender 1992: 735).

Roberts (1987: 80-1) adds that every generation inherits a landscape and changes it or adapts it to new conditions, needs and demands- it is a mixture of old and new. Therefore the landscape is never complete, but always under construction. Thus separating the 'physical' from its 'artificial' form is a futile distinction since landscape is a totality and in its essence a palimpsest (Ingold 1993: 162; Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 1; Olwig 1995: 308; van Dommelen 1999a: 277). Landscapes are like arenas of social cooperation, contest and negotiation (Bender 1992: 750). Thus understanding the

symbolisms in the landscape or decoding it is an important aspect and depends upon our/their perception of social, political, economic and cultural relations (Bender 1992: 752). Therefore social changes are expected to be reflected in the landscape through the re-use of monuments, abandonment or continuity and perhaps new or different symbolisms attributed to them. The beliefs of Foucault about body movement and access are of paramount importance and are discussed in accordance with the social reproduction of relations. A good example of this is given by Kirk (1993: 184) in the case of the passage graves and long mounds of Early Neolithic Brittany. Furthermore this body movement was enriched with the reading of space and the reproduction of society through the knowledge of the ancestors, communal history and ritual practice.

Nonetheless the relationship of a person to space is not neutral and depends on several variables such as age, gender, social, cultural and historical situation (Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 20-1). The basic interest of phenomenology as defined by Tilley (1994: 11-2) is the understanding and the description of things in the way that the subject experiences them. Therefore the subjectivity of the landscape is stressed, as well as the different reading and experience of the world (Young 1992: 255-6). Landscape has an element of biography for humans and can relate action, movement, memory, experience, emotion, perception and intentionality. A person is able to find a place as a result of his/her own biography and a fixation of a larger social order (Barrett 1999b: 259). Therefore there is interplay of the self and the other(s) as well as a person's life timetable and that of the social rhythm (Barrett 1999b: 259).

Space, according to Tilley (1994: 15), is the context of places that possess values and more particular meanings for individuals. Place can create identity, either personal or collective. However, places overlap according to the meanings, functions, symbolisms and beliefs attached to them by individuals or groups. The familiarity, memory, experience of a place can be viewed in the case of a local and a traveller, the contrast of somewhere and nowhere (Crumley and Marquardt 1990: 77). Place names create shared memories and experiences with cultural significance and are fundamental according to Tilley (1994: 19; 1999: 177) for creating landscapes. Moreover memories and past social actions affect the hermeneutics of objects for humans with a primordial

pre-understanding of what they are and how to interpret them (Kirk 1993: 197). Thus memory, location and power are interwoven and dependent on each other, creating myths and cosmologies. Richards (1999) emphasizes this through the role of history, landscape and ritual in the case of Egypt for the maintenance of the cosmological and social order. The landscape is a common dwelling place of humans, kings, gods and the dead, a cosmos that shares the same landscape and all play their role in the maintenance of cosmic order (Richards 1999: 87).

Paths and their metaphorical meaning in life are manifested through ritual processes (Tilley 1999: 178). Following paths is not a human privilege, but can also be attributed and recognized for artefacts, assigning them certain biographic values (Tilley 1999: 179). Moreover artefacts can have layers of metaphorical meanings as places do, because of their source, exchange, technological process, origin, ownership, how they were destroyed, what is done to them, how they were used and their relation to other artefacts (Tilley 1999: 264-6). Artefacts can also be markers of spatial appreciation, as well as evidence of knowledge of distant places and control of and access to material beyond the horizon (Barrett 1998: 21-2).

Structures, especially non-domestic, have a life cycle of several generations whose significance can be altered through time as we have already seen, in these they are also connected with stories, biographies and experiences. The selection of a specific place for the construction of an artificial landscape is an important aspect of its meaning. Moreover, it is a point of reference for people, where social reproduction takes place. In many cases an architectural monument defines these special places where the division of 'inside' and 'outside' is created, giving specific meanings and symbolisms (Richards 1995: 147; Thomas 1993: 78). For Barrett (1999b: 257) the monuments do not reveal social formations, but rather the cultural values of social reproduction.

In landscape, people move choreographically and define it socially through everyday *praxis* that includes action, memory, experience and intentionality (Tilley 1994: 34). Semiotics and the reading of the landscape is an important tool in the decoding of this process. For Kirk (1993: 185) the material objects are like text, music and dance, they constitute a semiotic code that can be read and interpreted. Signifiers are polysemous

with multiple potential meanings, whose real meaning can only be found through its context and the audience that it refers to (Kirk 1993: 185). Although it is debatable what the 'real' meaning of a signifier is and whether it exists, it would be more accurate to say that semiotics help to establish a different reading and that more meanings can thereby be found.

However, there are some limitations in the interpretation of artefacts and landscape as a text. First of all textual interpretation was a privilege of a small group, though, as artefacts, all people can interpret them but with a different level of reading. While some would have the ability to access knowledge, all would have an opinion or idea. On the contrary, an artefact's use and understanding are more unconscious and informal, though explicable and more dependent on the intention of the agent. Perhaps text is not as good a parallel as song. The latter contain lyrics and music in a combination of meanings and interrelations that affect more senses, as dwelling in the world does; it is a multi-sensual experience.

Restricted access is related to power over rather than power to; in other words the control of landscape through processual and visual access creates inequalities and consequently hierarchies (Children and Nash 1997: 3). In the 'political anatomy' of monuments we can see the hegemonic practice and the imposed meanings of authority, as well as resistance, doubt and the reinterpretation of prevailing beliefs and values (Kirk 1993: 188; Thomas 1993: 91). The degree of influence depends on the dominant system, ideology or knowledge. Following Foucault's belief, the link between power and knowledge is recognized and emphasized (Kirk 1993: 198; Thomas 1993: 80). It is connected with ancestors, elders, juniors, labour, kinship and ritual (Kirk 1993: 198). This can be viewed in the control of funerary space, through access to restrictions imposed upon it or restriction to it, re-creating or re-organizing social relations (Kirk 1993: 199). This segmentation of space is the beginning of the carceral society as defined by Foucault. Space can be controlled, although every participant will not understand the same thing. Nonetheless the channeling of bodily action is a way of influencing the reading and interpretation of space (Thomas 1993: 79). This can be demonstrated in the case of the Newgrange passage grave in Neolithic Ireland (Thomas

1993: 89-91). Space can be controlled, but not the subjects (Thomas 1993: 93). Other rituals for example, that take place in more marginal areas, or beliefs that are more fluid and difficult to control, pose a threat to the social order (Bradley 2000: 159). Thus landscape can represent order and control and at the same time turmoil, chaos and disorder (Children and Nash 1997: 1).

Therefore it can be argued that metaphors are manipulated as a domination mechanism for social control, since they play a central role in rituals and myths because they combine and connect ideas, beliefs, actions, experiences and memories with symbolic meanings (Sherratt 1997: 353; Tilley 1999: 10). Rites not only say something, they do something; spiritual powers are present for the beholder and they continue or alter the social reproduction by transmitting knowledge (Tilley 1999: 27-9).

Moreover the building of monuments could have included values of the past that could be controlled by a particular group. New landscapes were created due to new experiences and the realization of new networks of power, although past and present co-existed alongside one another (Barrett 1999b: 261). Continued use of the same burial ground, for example could have served as a manifestation of a sequence linking the past with the present (Barrett 1999b: 262). Thus power partly functioned as an inheritance from the past, while the burial places which were not reused could have acquired mythical significance (Barrett 1999b: 262). From places the inhabitants are able to establish references to past times and other places, thus the transformation, or the metaphor according to Tilley's beliefs, is a result of reworking the past and of political control (Barrett 1999b: 263). Political authority was based on the inheritance of the past and its representation in the present. Thus past conditions always form the appropriate framework for reading and recognizing the mythical histories that are experienced in the present. This can be seen in the interpretation of the Bronze Age burials, in Britain, during the Iron Age, as proposed by Barrett (1999b: 263-4).

Landscape should be treated as any other artefact that awaits archaeological explanation and interpretation (Children and Nash 1997: 3). Nevertheless landscape should not be related only to burials or settlement, but in its totality (Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 4; van

Dommelen 1999a: 284). Only then will we be able to have an insight into past societies and understand the agent and his everyday life.

4.2 The Seascape

Hodder (1987c: 139) argues that there is a symbolic significance in the division between sea and land, an important antithesis in life. However he does not pursue this argument in more detail. In contrast to the land, the sea seems more uniform, unstable and unclear, containing creatures invisible to the naked eye. This mystic character, along with its unpredictable dangers, are interwoven in the human understanding of the sea. Nonetheless it has the potential to offer a richness not only of food, but more importantly of possibilities and resources in remote locations.

Landscape has a vertical and horizontal axis enriching its polysemous meanings (Bender 1995: 2-3) and the same can apply to the seascape. The sea is more emphatic in its horizontal and vertical axes since they are vivid aids to analyze space. That does not mean that it was necessarily divided in that way by all cultures, though the axes serve as good descriptive and analytical tools. The horizontal axis has, more than any other comparable landscape, the characteristic of Foucault's panopticon, at least in its physical geometric sense. Thus landmasses of whatever size and distance are signifiers/points of familiarity, memory, past experience or connotation. This might indicate a number of possibilities such as navigation, shelter, directionality and/or others. The vertical axis can be arbitrarily divided into three parts. The first is the sky with its signs, birds flying and indicating land, clouds giving clues for the weather, the sun or the night sky for orientation, as well as the winds associated with bad or good navigable conditions. The second is the sea surface with its colours and their variable significance, the currents and the waves. The sea surface also functions as the only visual barrier to the depths, the third part of the vertical axis. The depths provide fish and other seafood. However this visual barrier restricts access to this world and rare fish or fabulous creatures further mythologize the seascape, connecting memories, events and actions, as well as omens

good or bad and perhaps ancestors. Nonetheless these two axes are inextricably linked in a journey and form one entity with multiple meanings, the sea.

One more important point is that ancient seafarers knew the sea from experience and visual aids, not through maps and aerial photographs (Agourides 1997: 17). Cognition of the landscape plays an important role in the sea, a process of mapping the surroundings of humans (Westerdahl 1992: 5). Thus the shape of the coastline, the wave action and the colour of the sea change when close to the coast; the behaviour of the birds, the shape and direction of the clouds, reefs and smoke from coastal areas, are signs that land is close (Westerdahl 1992: 8). Furthermore, naming prominent features such as islets with animal names, due to their distinctive shape, or other places to indicate nationality, harbour name, sailing marks, hazards and so forth, is an old practice that helped sailors to remember their route (Westerdahl 1992: 9-10). Although routing can be done on a map, this is an ideal case that can change as a result of a number of unforeseen events. Moreover the port sites can possess varied qualities such as safe havens, good protection, fresh water and avoidance of strong winds, which are not found spread at equal intervals (Knapp 1997a: 158). Bronze Age merchants, as well people living by the sea, had to deal with pirates, currents, winds, reefs, inshore rocks, taxation, suitable landfalls and duties (Knapp 1997a: 154). Production and distribution of goods through ports create settlement inequalities in the power relations of people and groups, since it involved access to material (Knapp 1997a: 157-8).

Everything in the landscape flows and moves including the whole nexus of meanings and materials, following the Heraclitian principle, so there are multiple connotations and narratives through them (Thomas 1995: 28; 1996: 91; Tilley 1994: 202; Young 1992: 255). In the sea this is more true as a physical and notional situation where the sea vessel is always in motion even when the sea is totally calm. Thus there is a constant transformation of viewpoint and movement as well as physical conditions that alter these conditions.

The basic principles of space and time, as defined by Heidegger, do not change. However, the temporality in the sea has a completely different character and significance. In the section on navigation above (1.4), the seasonal character of voyages was discussed. It must be stressed, though, that it functioned in parallel to the

agricultural cycle and was certainly associated with rituals and cosmological beliefs. In the human micro-scale time at sea can be crucial in a number of circumstances, such as the prediction of weather change, the proximity of the vessel to a place, the measures taken to continue a journey or to avoid danger. The unpredictability of weather is inextricably linked with time and the different effect it has when someone is at sea.

On long distance voyages, which required muscle power, the crew must have been, in most cases, male. This sexual seclusion must have had an impact on the community and the position of men and women in it. Furthermore access and power could be exercised through permission to use boats, which was connected to knowledge, physical, spatial, navigational, spiritual or other. The elders would have this knowledge, as well as the experience aboard the ship, creating a *de facto* hierarchical system. On an unstable vessel, with unpredictable physical conditions one person is taking life and death decisions, something equally true today. Moreover the knowledge of sea routes and the cognition map of the journey also served to sustain this social division.

These social conditions were limited in time, but their impact must have been analogous to the community's dependence and use of the surrounding sea. The argument here is that the seascape and all its characteristics were present and active in a person's mind, while he/she appreciated and understood landscape. Therefore the person was able to interpret place in two different ways, a static and a mobile one, a predictable and an unpredictable one. This duality enriched the person's hermeneutic abilities and added more layers of understanding to both landscape and seascape. The significance of seascape can be seen in some societies as being embedded in their belief systems, mythologies and cosmologies. More practically they can be connected with burial practices and ancestral stories as well as the position of the settlement and/or cemetery vis-à-vis the seascape.

4.3 Methodological considerations: the language of death

This section will concentrate to the landscape of death and in particular to the tools and methods used by other scholars to analyze it. Some of the ideas presented here can be

challenged and others can be useful or developed in a different context, but overall they present the ways the landscape theory can be applied in the archaeological context.

The tomb is naturalized through interaction with the landscape and the landscape is encultured through the structural remains, the artefacts and the tomb (Nash 1997: 18; Parker Pearson 1999: 157; Tilley 1995: 78). This interaction/dialogue is not always equal, but depends on the culture, the place and the time (Tilley 1995: 79-80). Attention should be paid to the outside as well as the inside of the tomb, the cognitive values attributed to tomb space and design (McHugh 1999: 55-6). The internal space of the tomb can be related to the outside landscape (and perhaps cosmos), as a format of cultural and symbolic map. Thus the monument is integrated into the landscape, whilst at the same time it is a microcosm of it (Nash 1997: 22). Inside the tomb the body is a special reference point it creates axes of its own and its placement in the tomb reveals their special and symbolic structure (Barrett 1991: 8). In some instances the tomb space seems to oppose the symbolism of the body, and for that reason there is disarticulation of the human skeletons, as if dehumanising space (Nash 1997: 20). In this context human bones and their arrangement inside the space of the tomb indicate the relationship between the individual and the group (Chapman 2000: 174-5). The opposition of life-death, public-private, nature-mechanical, social-ritual, open-closed, familiar-unfamiliar ephemeral-permanent, inside-outside and visible-hidden is there, a symbolic antithesis (Küchler 1995: 98; Nash 1997: 20). The metamorphosis of the inner space to a symbolic, ritual map diminishes the inside-outside antithesis so that the reading of the landscape is more easily controlled and manipulated through a partial monopolization of knowledge and consequently power (Nash 1997: 22; Richards 1995: 148-9). Limitation of access can be seen in some tombs, through their long and low entrance passage that links the outside with the inside. The small dimensions restrict movement, as well as visual contact with the inside. Moreover the limited penetration of light and sound inside restricts the number of participants in the rituals, two aspects that emphasize secrecy and accessibility as two characteristics of these tombs (Richards 1995: 151; Tilley 1995: 82). Visibility and burning inside the tomb have their significance, mainly symbolic and perhaps ritualistic or both (Richards 1995: 157). Thomas (1993: 91) points out that the progression from the outer world to the inner space of the tomb seems like a

choreographed reading of a spatial text where there is an interplay of control and its attempt to regulate subjective interpretation. However despite the attempts to control the reading of a monument, its significance does not remain unchanged, it is constantly reinterpreted (Bradley 2000: 158).

The tomb is the link between the living and the soul of the deceased, wherever this may have been (Merrifield 1987: 61-3). It is the focal point in matters of space in the burial process and several characteristics such as decoration, form, structure, orientation and shape might have symbolic significance related to social processes, as Hodder (1984: 53; Chapman 1995: 34) has argued for tombs in north-western Neolithic Europe. For McHugh (1999: 45) horizontal division is seen in the structural details of the tombs rather than the details found in individual burials. Bintliff (1989: 87, 91; Murphy 1998: 27) has correlated the spatial arrangement of settlements with the tombs in Early and Middle Bronze Age on Crete, in order to show the link between the ancestors and the land.

The funeral procession from the settlement to the cemetery is linear, while each death is a social event with its own significance serving as a timemark. Kin shared tombs and the cemeteries serve as a guardian (or as an ark) of long-term memory for the social group and underline duration (and continuity), through the living memory of the ancestors (Edmonds 1999: 61). Moreover seasonal rites involve speaking to and on behalf of the ancestors of the community, and the people that perform this function had a special status, since they control access and knowledge (Tilley 1995: 82). Rituals are ways of narrating a story with mythological and cosmological significance or telling the past and the relationship of people to ancestors and gods (Bradley 2000: 127).

Visual contact with monuments is of paramount importance and enables the viewer to see what is open to view and what is hidden, and more generally the interaction with the place through movement and senses (Thomas 1995: 30). A very useful example of this perspective is given by Bradley (2000: 22-3), who uses Pausanias' criteria for ascribing sacred character to sites. The interest lies in the fact that Pausanias was part of the culture he was describing. Most of the natural features he mentions such as springs, mountains, caves and trees, are directly associated with a structure (Bradley 2000: 22-3).

Less important for Pausanias, but mentioned, were gorges, rocks, rivers, lakes, waterfalls, capes and small islands (Bradley 2000: 23). He lays emphasis on springs that originate from underground streams and rivers as well as caves that are links with the world beneath (Bradley 2000: 25). The coastline was also a place of importance combining threat and hope, while it also served as a religious point for sacrifices (Bradley 2000: 27). It is as a boundary between polluted and pure, a transitional point. Some rocks or hills might have special importance and were related to the dead as a burial ground (Bradley 2000: 139). In a way Pausanias sets the agenda by pointing out to us the character of the places that contained sacred elements.

Nevertheless, as we do not know which natural places were ascribed a sacred character, in the South-eastern Aegean our interest will be mainly on the burial places and cemeteries of the periods under review. Tombs are placed for their visual effect in the landscape, as a prominent topographic entity in some cases (Nash 1997: 21). For Nash (1997: 17) the interest lies in the orientation of tombs, their passage view and chamber alignment with prominent features in the landscape, i.e. rivers, streams, valleys, uplands, lowlands, ridges and spurs. Form, orientation of the monument, its geographical setting and the artefacts, connect tombs and social conditions (Rault 1997: 5). Intervisibility is also important in the case of some monuments (Tilley 1994: 134; 1995: 58). The deposition of the deceased and the rearrangement of the remains of the ancestors in tombs were of great significance. The evidence of animal bones reveals feasting cycles, making these places meeting points with symbolic and social connotations (Tilley 1994: 142).

Solar movement and orientation were sometimes very important for the identity of the deceased and the community, because they were associated with parallels from the life cycle (Nash 1997: 22).

Rivers, their courses and the seacoast are points of reference and are related to tombs by their axes (Nash 1997: 20; Rault 1997: 15; Tilley 1995: 59). Tilley (1999: 193) gives an example in South Dorset, where pebbles are associated with rituals in tombs and their place of origin, the seacoast. Moreover visual contact between tomb and sea seem to be important since all of the barrows have a view of the sea (Tilley 1999: 216). The association of the sea with the dead is shared by many cultures, though it is

differently expressed (Bradley 2000: 135). However the visibility of the sea is not always related to the proximity of the monument to the sea (Tilley 1994: 93).

Moreover tombs might deliberately face certain mountain ranges. Some tend to be at a distance from the slope and the mountain itself in order to have a better angle of view (Tilley 1995: 61). Some geological formations are explained by reference to mythical stories, knowledge of which might have an important role in ritual activities (Tilley 1999: 195). As people move around in space, their perspective of the landscape changes (Tilley 1994: 204). Monuments have the ability to freeze perspectives through orientation and position in space, thus they control the viewpoint and the interpretation of the surrounding area by the individual. Cultural markers were used to create a new sense of place, legitimize social control relating to the restriction of access to knowledge and the reproduction of social order. All of this happened through the ancestral beliefs and their role in the landscape (Tilley 1994: 208). A striking natural setting and inaccessibility are their basic characteristics and thus access to knowledge was necessary (Bradley 2000: 5-6). Therefore power is connected with access to knowledge and the polyvocal reading and understanding of space (Thomas 1995: 44).

An example is the passage graves found in Bronze Age Britain, which are connected with an inward focusing of views, but are not oriented according to landscape features (Tilley 1995: 73). Walking into the passage and the tomb is like going towards the centre of a hill or mountain (Tilley 1995: 76). Tombs combine a microcosm and a macrocosm, they are a landscape in miniature, a place where the ancestors live (Tilley 1995: 76-7). As for the flat cemeteries in Hungary, during the Chalcolithic Age the sanctity of the place and a strong public symbolism were maintained despite the invisibility of the tombs in the landscape. The reason for choosing a particular location could be that there was a distinctive natural marker, i.e. a grove, brook or river, the presence of grave marker, or the regular abandonment of cemeteries that might reveal the denial for re-use of a special place and a continuous formation of new ancestral narratives (Chapman 1997a: 41).

In the case of EM Crete the tholos tombs are not associated with prominent landscape features and are built mid-slope on hills (Branigan 1998: 13-4). The settlements are quite close to their cemeteries, ranging from 10 to 250 metres. The tombs

are rarely placed west of the settlement, they face to the east and never towards the settlement (Branigan 1998: 19). Perhaps a close relation between the deceased and the sun can be suggested and more specifically to the sunrise (Goodison 2001: 79-80). In most cases the settlements are higher than the cemetery, but suggesting that they have a kind of dominance over the cemetery is not convincing (Branigan 1998: 15). The off-centre entrances, the existence of antechambers and of the tomb doors indicate an anxiety, if not fear, of the living for the deceased, although from their proximity the role of the dead in the society must have been important (Branigan 1998: 19, 25-6). Moreover the disarticulation of bones is argued to have been a public event were the community participated. It could even be suggested that through the disarticulation of the bones, the living became closer to the deceased and were not afraid of them any more. The installations around the tombs emphasize their central role in festivities and socio-religious events. The role of the ancestors is of particular importance, since from ethnographic parallels it is suggested that the land belongs to the ancestors rather than to the living, who have rights due to their lineal descent over the land (Murphy 1998: 31). In that framework the re-use of tombs might indicate new claims by a returning corporate group or newcomers, basing their legitimization on lineal descent (Murphy 1998: 32). The role of the bedrock has been underlined as the medium for transmitting symbolic messages in the funerary context (Vavouranakis 2002: 41-2).

4.4 Discussion

The landscape analysis presented here will be related exclusively with the surrounding environment of the cemeteries. It will be treated in a holistic manner, but emphasis will be given to the main axes created by the tombs and the cemetery itself. The visibility of the site and its position in the landscape will be considered as well as the view it provides. Thus its orientation will be tested in case there is any connection to the solar movement. Moreover the view to specific landscape features such as hills, rivers, coastlines, ridges, mountain ranges, uplands and lowlands will be reviewed. Another

important factor is the orientation and position of the cemetery in relation to the settlement.

With the help of these tools a de-coding of the landscape of death in the South-eastern Aegean will be attempted in order to reveal whether there is any belief associated with it or not.

CHAPTER 5: THE REGIONAL LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OF CEMETERIES IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN

The use of diachronic and regional mortuary analysis will allow us to broaden our horizons and relate environmental, social, economic and political circumstances rather than attempting to generalize on the basis of idiosyncratic and isolated data from a single site/cemetery (Bradley 1995: viii; O'Shea 1995: 126-7). Moreover, regional analysis enriches our understanding of boundaries, whatever form they may have taken, such as cultural, economic, social and political (O'Shea 1995: 128). Larsen (1995: 260) adds that a number of questions can be addressed from the funerary context, especially in a regional scope, such as individuality, gender, ethnic, political and social identity, ritual and meaning, trade, resource control, labour, social inequality, residence patterning and population dynamics.

5.1 The Pre-Mycenaean Burial Evidence in the South-eastern Aegean

The South-eastern Aegean is one of those areas where burial evidence during the Neolithic, Early and Middle Bronze Age is rather limited. During the Neolithic period (fig.3.1), at Kalythies, secondary burials of adults and a permanent burial place for infants were found inside the cave (Davis 1992: 745; Halstead and Jones 1987: 143-5). The earliest organized cemetery attested in this region was at Gyali, where more than 70 cist graves were located. Unfortunately no bones or pottery remains were found, but from the sherds in the vicinity and the stone tools recovered they are dated to the LAN 4 period, 4th millennium BC (Davis 1992: 746; Sampson 1988: 211).

For the Early Bronze Age (fig.3.2), the cemetery of Iasos is a rare exception, where 96 cist graves of various shapes, mainly rectangular, were recovered, belonging to EB II (Berti 1993: 190; Pecorella 1984: 91). A significant number of tombs contained more than one deceased, with the bones of the previous burial pushed to one side. The deceased were placed in a crouched position, while an east-west orientation of the

graves was most common (Pecorella 1984: 92; Wheeler 1974: 418-9). The type of tomb is closest to Cycladic examples, but the orientation to that of Anatolia, except that in the latter region pithos burials were the most common grave type (Alpaslan-Roodenberg 2002: 91; Broodbank 2000: 177-8; Hoffman 2002: 535; Wheeler 1974: 419). Nevertheless the finds reveal close contact between Iasos and the Cyclades, if not as close as Pecorella argues (1984: 97-8, 106). At Bakla Tepe an extramural EB I-III cemetery was recently found, including pithos burials, pit and cist graves (IRERP 2000). One of the pithoi had an east-west orientation with its opening and the head of the deceased to the east, whilst the deceased was placed in a contracted position (Erkanal 1998: figs 7-8). On Kos (fig.3.3) at Askklupi three pithos burials and an oval cist grave of EB II date were found close to each other, their orientation is east-west with their opening to the east (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 57; Morricone 1972/3: 263-70). Two of the pithos burials contained more than one burial, placed in a contracted position with the head as often to the east as the west (Morricone 1972/3: 263-4, 269). Another find from the same island comes from Mesaria where a pithos burial was recovered that contained a marble EC II bowl, whilst the tomb probably belongs to the end of the EBA (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 58; Marketou 1990b: 40; Mee 1975: 275). The Askklupi burials are close to, if not oriented on a spring, while the Mesaria burial had a large stone heap above it and is 50m east of the local *revma*³. At Kastro Vayi on Astypalaia a small Cycladic-style cist grave has been recovered, but its state of preservation does not give us much information (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 165). At the Heraion on Samos two pithos burials were found containing children, placed in pits lined with stones (Milojčić 1961: 10-2). The fact that the pithoi contained children does not allow us to conclude anything about the character of the local burial type used. Nonetheless Anatolian and Cycladic elements most probably coexisted in various degrees in each site, underlining the interaction between these two regions.

At Trianda we have glimpses of the local mortuary tradition. During the Middle Bronze Age (fig.3.4) there is almost no evidence apart from a recently found pithos burial close to Trianda, with the deceased facing west in a crouched position (Marketou

³ The Greek word *revma* (plural *revmata*) is used to describe the seasonal streams that exist in the South-eastern Aegean.

1998b: 45). The pithos had an east-west orientation with its mouth closed by a stone slab at the east end.

During the LB IA period we have a few intramural burials recovered at Trianda. They are associated with the destruction of the settlement in LB IA, probably due to pre-Theran eruption earthquakes (Marketou 1988a: 616; 1990c: 103; 1991: 482; 1998b: 61). However the most striking find comes from north of the Trianda settlement, where a cemetery of 31 inhumations in pits was found, close to the seashore, along with three pithos burials. All of them were in a crouched position, with seventeen facing south and six were placed on a pebble floor. Inside the pithoi one of the burials faced south, one north and one east (Marketou 1988a: 616). Moreover a horse inhumation was recovered close to the burials, also in a crouched position with its head turned to the south, while another inhumation of an individual was adjacent to it. Both skeletons lay on a pebble floor and a child may be connected with these burials, while a bull and a goat skull were recovered 5m south of the horse skeleton (Marketou 1988a: 617). About 160m south-east of this cemetery another was found containing thirteen inhumations, four pithos burials and two cist graves. Of the adults, two are reported to be facing south, two to the east and two west, while three child and three adult burials were lying on a pebble floor (Marketou 1988a: 615; 1991: 482). One of the children is placed in an extended position. The first of the cist graves has an east south-east/west north-west orientation, the second east south-east/north north-west. The deceased were again in an extended position. Inside the pithoi the three adults and the child are all crouched. These burials did not contain offerings of any kind.

The clear association of the burials with the sea must be stressed, as well as the ritual deposition of at least the animal heads. The connection with the sea is reinforced by the presence of a pebble floor in some inhumations. Despite the fact that there is no uniformity in the direction the deceased face, the majority are looking south, towards the settlement and Mt. Philerimos, whatever significance that may have. This is in contrast to the previous examples where an east-west orientation was favoured, along with a preference for pit and cist graves over pithoi. The vast majority of the burials are placed in a crouched position with the notable exception of the two cist graves and a child burial, as seen in other areas and previous periods. The first two are clearly

differentiated from the rest by the grave structure as well as their position, probably revealing their status and thus some kind of social stratification. So it seems that in this region, single burials in pits, cists and pithoi were the main grave types used.

It seems that in the case of the Trianda cemetery there was probably a massive burial event, perhaps with a single ceremony for all the deceased. Its cause may have been a natural disaster or disease. The first possibility gains ground when associated with the settlement destruction and the intramural burials found there. Although the burials are single, they do have some common characteristics, and it is interesting to note the probable existence of two burial clusters in the same cemetery.

5.2 Late Bronze Age II-III

For the completion of this part of the dissertation fieldwork was necessary in order to review the cemeteries in their landscape context. In identifying the sites there were a number of difficulties and uncertainties regarding their location. Thirty years after Hope Simpson and Lazenby's articles the landscape has often altered significantly with terracing or the opening of new local roads that helped in some instances, by allowing access, or alternatively had destroyed the sites. Sometimes I managed to identify the approximate location without finding the tombs themselves, either due to destruction or inaccessibility. Places where I identified the sites from descriptions or the available maps, and consequently the photographs taken, were of a general character and sites where the cemeteries and the tombs were found.

The questions that will be addressed here concern the location of the cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean, whether there is a pattern or trend related to beliefs and the role of landscape, whether there is any symbolism or not and the diachronic cemetery pattern. Thus the cemeteries will be treated as finds in their landscape context, like any other kind of artefact.

5.2.1 Karpathos and Kasos

Karpathos has produced five cemetery sites so far (fig.5.1). In the southernmost part of the island at the site of Tou Stavrou To Kefali (A10) (fig.5.2) a chamber tomb was in use from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIB (Melas 1985: 32). It is situated just below the north summit of a low hill, looking towards a local *revma* and hill slopes (fig.5.3). To the west is the hill itself, while to the east the *revma* and low hills are visible. To the south a lowland area extends to the sea that is visible in the far background. The vegetation in the surrounding area is low and the land relatively fertile.

At the site of Vonies (A11) in the Arkasa region another chamber tomb, in use from LH IIIA1-B was found just to the south of the road that connects Arkasa and Menetes (fig.5.4) (Melas 1985: 39; Zachariadou 1978: 249). A hill dominates the view to the south, while to the east a gentle slope is visible. To the west low hills and part of a small plain can be seen and to the north (fig.5.5), where the dromos faced, a small valley is visible that extends further north confined by low hills. Fig and olive trees exist in the surrounding area.

At Pigadia (A12) (fig.5.6), the modern capital of the island, an extensive cemetery must have existed in the period under review, allowing us to conclude that it was the centre of the island in that era as well (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1962: 159). By the Diakonis' Hotel, Melas (1985: 28) reported a chamber tomb on the lower part of the Embasi hill (fig.5.7). To the north, where the tombs most probably faced, a limited lowland area and partly the sea is visible. To the south the view is dominated by a local hill, whilst to the east and west there are views of valleys. On the south-east side of Embasi hill, in the area known as Makelli, several tombs were allegedly found, mainly by locals (Melas 1985: 28). The only tomb in this area that we have information about, was published by Charitonidis (1961/2a: 32). The tomb seems to have been on the flat part below the hill and faced east (fig.5.8), towards the small valley around it and the gentle slopes, limited by the Acropolis and Sisamos hill. To the north the seashore and the sea must have been visible, while to the south part of the lowland area can be seen. To the west the Embasi hill dominates the scenery. Another chamber tomb has been reported by Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962: 160) at the Tsaousopoulos house, about

a hundred metres south of the Acropolis hill. Around the Xenona hotel Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962: 160; 1970: 68-9) collected a number of LH III sherds, perhaps indicating part of the Late Bronze Age settlement. If so, the cemetery is very close to the settlement, just south-west, while the Tsousopoulos tomb lies to the south-east. Perhaps two clusters of tombs existed, one to the east close to the Acropolis and one more to the west around the Embasi hill. This region is gently sloping and fertile with a lot of water. The natural port is relatively small and there are several good bays to the north of it.

In the north-east part of the island a chamber tomb, in use from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB, was excavated in the Diafani area (A13). Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962: 161; Melas 1985: 43) have proposed that this tomb was situated at the Kambi site (fig.5.9), about 500m south-east of Diafani village. The hill forms a promontory bounded by ravines, steep on the west side, and relatively fertile with pine and olive trees. To the north-west above the local *revma* there are terraces forming a place that could have been part of the settlement and the cemetery, according to Melas (1985: 44). Diafani offers not only a good anchorage but also access to the north-western part of the island.

Still in the north, but on the west coast of the island at the site of Avlona (A14) a chamber tomb has been found, in use during LH IIIA1-B (Platon and Karantzali forthcoming). The area is the most fertile in this part of the island (Melas 1985: 44). About 2kms north of Avlona, at Brykous, Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962: 161-2) recovered evidence of Late Bronze Age occupation. The site is on a rocky promontory and has a good harbour (Melas 1985: 44).

On Kasos no cemetery evidence has been found so far, but settlement evidence has been recovered at Poli (A5) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 70; Melas 1985: 49). The site is inland on a sharp hill, in a naturally defensive place and produced evidence of occupation at least for LH/LM IIIB-C.

5.2.2 Rhodes

I will review the cemeteries moving anticlockwise from Trianda to Kattavia (fig.5.10) and from there to Aphantou as Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1973) have done, following the course of my own survey. The burial clusters of Moschou Vounara (fig.5.11) and Makria Vounara (fig.5.12) at Ialysos (B6) are west of the Trianda settlement (B5) (fig.5.13) with the Minoan and Mycenaean occupation (Benzi 1992: 227; Hope Simpson 1965: 184; Mee 1982: 8). The cemetery consists in total of at least 129 tombs in use from the LH IIB-IIIA1 to LH IIIC period. The tombs to their north have a view of lowlands and the sea, while to the south they view more lowlands with olive trees, with the pine clad Philerimos Mountain dominating the background (fig.5.14). West of Moschou Vounara (fig.5.15) there is an extensive valley with olive trees while a *revma* known as 'Potamo di Trianda' (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 136) separates the cemeteries from the Minoan/Mycenaean town. East of Makria Vounara low hills with pine trees can be seen. It should be noted that in both cemeteries the dromoi of the tombs are oriented to the north, north-east, east and south-east (Jacopi 1930/1: 255; Maiuri 1926: 88, 168; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 221-2). The burial sites are placed south-west of the settlement and at a higher elevation, though still below Philerimos.

The site at Maritsa (B8) was located from the description given by Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1973: 139; Benzi 1992: 409; Mee 1982: 49), but the tombs were not visible, so their actual position is not clear. At least two tombs have been reported, in use from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB. Visible to the west was the upper part of a low hill and to the north (fig.5.16), where the dromos of one of the tombs faced, another low hill can be seen and the valley beyond that, while to the northwest the top of Paradeisi Mountain is visible. To the south pine trees and a low flat hill can be seen and the surrounding area seems to have a lot of ridges. To the west, there is a small *revma* close by and a large valley with olive trees and a lot of cultivated land.

At Paradeisi (B9), there were two burial clusters (fig.5.17). The one at Asprovilo in use in LH IIIA1 to LH IIIA2 was located (Benzi 1992: 408; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 138; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 47). The cuts for the tombs were most probably identified on the west side of a modern local road that had largely destroyed

them (fig.5.18). Moreover terracing was being constructed west and east of the cemetery. East, west and south of the cemetery the slopes of Mount Paradeisi can be seen with pine and olive trees. To the south a shallow steep ridge/*revma* seems to have existed, with a north/south course, destroyed today by the local road. The tombs were built on its west side and their dromoi faced towards the north-east (fig.5.19). North of the tombs a small valley would be visible along with the sea. The Kouri cemetery must have been close by, with a similar view (Benzi 1992: 408; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 138; Mee 1982: 48). At Paradeisi the cemetery must have been to the west of and perhaps lower down from the Mycenaean settlement.

The site mentioned by Inglieri (1936), number 44 on his map and marked as Asprovilo, seems to be at the west end of Paradeisi Mountain, or may be the site known as Zuccalades (B10) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 138). There was probably one tomb that was in use only during the LH IIIA2 period. A general view from the west (fig.5.20) reveals the probable area of the tomb, the valley and the local *revma* to the west and south, full of olive trees and cultivation. The view to the east was dominated by Paradeisi Mountain, while to the north the lowland and the sea must have been visible.

The cemetery at Tolon, which consisted of one tomb used in LH IIIA1, was eventually located (Benzi 1992: 411; Mee 1982: 49). The first problem was that the name of the village has been changed to Theologos (B12). Moreover the ruined chapel mentioned by Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1973: 140), has been repaired, and it is from this site that the local village has taken its name, while work around it has deformed the site. The site has to its south a hilltop full of pine trees. To the west a small valley exists between this hill and one further west, today covered with olive trees and other types of cultivation, while a *revma* crosses it in a more or less north/south direction. To the north (fig.5.21) a valley with similar vegetation extends to the sea, which can be seen in the far background and to the east a large valley with olive trees is seen along with a *revma* which runs in a north/south direction. The vegetation today does not allow a sight of both *revmata*, however going to the hill from the east, west or north means crossing them, since they meet north of the hill. The tomb must have been situated to the north of and on lower ground than the identified Mycenaean settlement (fig.5.22).

Due to a lack of evidence the sites of Kremasti (B7), Damatria (B11), Soroni (B13), Kalopetra (B14) and Phanes (B15), could not be located (Benzi 1992: 412; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 140-1; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 50).

At Kalavarda (B16), on the Aniforo hill, the area, where the Aniforo, Tzitzo and Kaminaki-Lures cemeteries may have been situated, was identified (fig.5.23) (Benzi 1992: 412-3; Hope Simpson 1965: 184; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 141-2; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 50-3). They might have been part of a single cemetery, but their identification today, as well as the toponymic problems, do not help us to demonstrate this convincingly. Five tombs definitely belong to this cemetery, which was in use from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC. The west part of the hilltop is today heavily bulldozed and terraced for cereals, destroying the remains of the tombs. They had an orientation towards the east (fig.5.24), as Jacopi records (1932: 133-50). The view to the north would include part of the Aniforo hill and in the background the sea. To the south the Aniforo hilltop was visible and to the east part of the same hill and, in the background, part of a valley. To the west lowlands can be seen with low sloping hills of olive and pine trees, as well as other types of cultivation and a ridge with a *revma* crossing the area in a north/south direction. The Aniforo cemetery seems to have been north-west of and also lower than the settlement area (fig.5.25).

At Kameiros (B17), the site of Papa-Lures was approximately located without finding the tomb that dated to the LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB period (Benzi 1992: 418; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 143; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 53). It was most probably at the west end of the hills, to the south of classical Kameiros (fig.5.26). The north-east view is of a small valley, with olive trees and cultivation surrounded by hills, and the Kameiros site at the highest point, full of pine trees. To the north-west there are some olive trees, a shallow ridge with a *revma* and in the background hills, also with pine trees.

At Apollona the site of Lelos (B19) was identified and most of the nine tombs were found, although the vegetation did not permit very good photographs (Benzi 1992: 422; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 144; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 55). The site is on a thin spur between two ridges, and was in use from the LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC. The dromoi of the tombs faced west (fig.5.27), north-west and south-west. To the west slopes

and hills are visible with a lot of pine trees, while olive groves can also be seen. To the north the mountaintop of Prophitis Elias is clearly visible (fig.5.28), while to the south, behind the trees, the mountaintop of Attavyros can be seen. To the east the lowlands with sloping hills are partially visible, where olive groves and other types of cultivation exist.

The Kariones cemetery (B20), consisted of two tombs in use during LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB, located approximately 1km north-east of Lelos (Benzi 1992: 420; Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 144; Mee 1982: 54 *contra* Inglieri 1936). To the north Prophitis Elias dominates the scenery, while east and west the slopes of the mountain are visible with pine trees. To the south (fig.5.29) a large lowland area extends with olive trees and cereal crops, while to the south-west Mt. Attavyros dominates the scenery. Although the Lelos and Kariones cemeteries are relatively close they must belong to different settlements.

At Mandriko (B21) the site of Melissaki was identified by local informants, as Melissakia, but the tomb, used during LH IIIA2, was not located (Benzi 1992: 419; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 144-5; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 54). The area today is heavily terraced with a lot of olive groves and other kinds of cultivation, and it is situated further south-east than the point shown by Hope Simpson and Lazenby on their map (1973: 134). To the east a hill and its slopes dominate and to the south-west there are slopes of hills with olive and pine trees, while in the far background Mt. Attavyros can also be seen. To the north, slopes and lowlands full of cultivation are visible as well as the sea in the background. To the west (fig.5.30) there is a valley and lowlands full of cultivation, as well as a *revma* that crosses the valley in a north/south direction and in the background a higher hill dominates.

At Skala Kretenias (B22) a site was recognized by the locals as Astraki(a) and not Kastraki, where a single tomb cemetery in use in LH IIIA2 existed (Benzi 1992: 431; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 145; Mee 1982: 58 *contra* Inglieri 1936). The site is located between two small *revmata* that meet a larger one at the valley. To the north and south hill slopes are visible with pine trees, while to the east the steep slope of a hill extends upwards. To the west (fig.5.31) there is a fertile valley, with olive trees, vines and other cultivation, limited by the hills opposite. A *revma* crosses the valley,

cutting it in the middle, in a more or less north/south direction. To the north-west, the sea dominates the scenery behind the valley. The cemetery seems to be 400m north-east of the settlement on slightly higher ground

The sites of Ayios Isidoros (B27), Siana (B25) and Monolithos (B26) were quite problematic, as Hope Simpson and Lazenby have pointed out, and they could not be located (1973: 146-7).

At Apolakkia (B28) two cemeteries have been discovered, Trapezies Paraelis, with twenty tombs, and Chimaro, with one tomb, both on a low flat hill (Benzi 1992: 434; Dietz 1984: 67, 74-5; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 147; Mee 1982: 61). At Trapezies Paraelis remains of the tombs, used from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC, were located with a south-east orientation of the dromoi. To the north, the hilltop and, further distant, the mountains can be seen. To the west the slopes of the Trapezies hill are visible as well as the sea in the distance. To the south (fig.5.32) there is a valley, with a large *revma* cutting it into two, limited further south by mountains. There are extensive olive groves and other cultivation as well as pine trees in this region. To the east (fig. 5.33) part of the valley can be seen along with the modern village of Apolakkia and in the background there are several hills. The second cemetery, Chimaro, is on another spur of the Trapezies hill further west, used during at least the LH IIIC period (Dietz 1984: 107). The site of the tomb is on the uppermost point of this spur (fig.5.34) with a view to the south (fig.5.35) towards part of the valley, the *revma*, and the hills, as in the case of Trapezies Paraelis, as well as part of the sea. To the north the slopes of the hill can be seen and to the west a small hill with low shrub vegetation. The proximity of these two cemeteries perhaps indicates that they served the same settlement.

At Kattavia (B29) the site of Ayios Minas was located at the north-west end of the modern village on a hill (Benzi 1992: 434; Dietz 1984: 78; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 147-8; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 65-6). It consisted of at least three tombs occupied from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC. The tombs were identified and their dromoi face south-east (fig.5.36) towards a shallow ridge with a *revma*, while hills and lowlands can be seen in the background. The north-east has a view of high hills and to the north-west only the tomb is visible (fig.5.37). To the south-west, part of the *revma* can be seen as well as the valley and the modern village that extends south with cultivation, limited

in the distance by low hills. From Ayios Minas the surrounding landscape is clearer with the north and west dominated by the hill slopes and the south and east by the valley and shallow ridge with the *revma*. The site at Ta Tzigani mentioned by Dietz (1984: 84; Benzi 1992: 434) is also visible east on the hill opposite Ayios Minas (fig.5.36) and is most probably part of the same cemetery, consisting of at least one tomb. To the west the Ayios Minas hill is visible as well as the *revma* that separates the two hills in the foreground, and to the north the hill slope dominates. To the east a deeper ridge with a *revma* is seen in the foreground and in the background a plain, limited by a high hill. This plain widens to the south, where it shares the same view, more or less, with the Ayios Minas cemetery and settlement. Both burial areas extend south and south-east of the settlement that was identified just above the tombs on the Ayios Minas hilltop.

As for the site of Karavi (B30), it is further east on a low hill, where a single tomb has been recovered (Benzi 1992: 435; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 148-9 *contra* Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 66). To the south there is a hill, while to the east and west the narrow lowland creates a defile. To the north there is a low ridge with a *revma* running in a south-east/north-west direction and a narrow valley between two hills.

At Yennadi (B34) a new cemetery area has been located at Ayios Giorgos Koutsos (Karantzali pers. comm.). One tomb has been cleared out, used from the LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC period, in an area that seems to contain a more extensive cemetery. The dromos faces north-east (fig.5.38), where a shallow ridge with a *revma* and a low hill opposite is visible. Today the area is partly terraced and planted with olive trees. To the south-west only the part of the ridge the tomb was built on can be seen. The north-west view is limited by the ridge and hill slopes, but to the south-east part of the ridge with the *revma* can be seen, while in the far background the sea is visible. Karantzali (pers. comm.) reports that 600-700m east of the church (fig.5.39) evidence of the Mycenaean settlement was recovered. If that is the case, the settlement had its cemetery to the west or west/north-west.

In the Vati region three cemeteries were situated (fig.5.40). The Passia cemetery (B36) is at the top of the hill with extensive views (fig.5.41), consisting of four tombs in use from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC (Benzi 1992: 440; Dietz 1984: 21; Mee 1982: 71). To the south (south-east) where the dromoi faced (fig.5.42), the small north/south ridge of the

hill ends in a large *revma* running in an east/west direction. Moreover low hills and a higher hill, Palaiokastro, dominate the background. To the west and the east the slopes of the hill are visible, an area dominated by olive and pine trees.

The Kalogrios hill (B36) was identified north of the Galatusa chapel (fig.5.43) and of the long local *revma* known as Athramilas, which runs in an east/west direction (Benzi 1992: 439; Dietz 1984: 65-6). Two tombs have been reported in use during the LH IIIA2 period. The region is dominated by olive and pine trees and its west and east view are mainly slopes of hills, the local *revma* and opposite, to the south, lowlands with olive groves and low hills, which the dromoi faced.

The Apsaktiras (B37) cemetery is situated on a low hill (fig.5.44) and consists of 25 tombs used from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC (Benzi 1992: 437-8; Dietz 1984: 50-1; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 150; Inglieri 1936; Mee 1982: 67). The dromoi have an east (north-east and south-east) orientation facing a narrow valley with a *revma* running in a north/south direction, limited to the east by another low hill, full of olive and pine trees. To the north the slopes of hills are visible as well as to the south where the large Athramilas *revma* meets the local one.

It must be also noted that there was no adequate information to locate the cemeteries at Lachania (B33) and Asklepeio (B38) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 149-50; Mee 1982: 66, 72; Benzi 1992: 435-7, 440).

At Lardos (B41) the cemetery was located on the west slope of the hill, on top of which the local school is situated (Benzi 1992: 440-1; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 150-1; Mee 1982: 72). The number of tombs is unclear (fig.5.45), but there seem to be several in use from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC. The tombs were identified and their dromoi have a west (north-west and south-west) orientation (fig.5.46), looking towards lowlands and low hills full of olive and pine trees. To the north the valley, a high hill and a shallow ridge with a *revma* are visible from some of the tombs, while the east is dominated exclusively by the hill itself. To the south a valley extends limited by a high hill that dominates the background.

In the Pylona region two cemeteries have been discovered. The first is at Ambelia (B42), in a narrow lowland area between two hills connecting the Lardos and Pylona plains (Benzi 1992: 445-6; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 151; Inglieri 1936:

Mee 1982: 73). The tomb is now destroyed, but was located in the local football field (fig.5.47) (Karantzali pers. comm.), and was used from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC. South of the area hill slopes are visible and to the south-west the high hill that can be also seen from the Lardos cemetery. To the north-east the local hill dominates and to the north another prominent hill is visible. To the west the limited local plain is visible. The area is full of pine and some olive trees.

The vegetation is similar in the Pylona cemetery, known as Aspropilia (B43), north-west of the modern village (Karantzali 1993: 542; 1999a: 285). Six tombs have been recovered, which were in use from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC. The cemetery is built on a very low hill and the dromoi face the south (south-east) (fig.5.48). They look towards the plain of Pylona limited by low hills, full of olive trees. To the east the plain is also visible and the slopes of hills in the background; to the west hill slopes can be seen as well as a shallow ridge with a *revma*, whilst to the north slopes and further hills are visible.

The natural harbour of Lindos (B44) is west of the Pylona region, dominated by the Hellenistic and Medieval acropolis (fig.5.49) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 151). It is the best port on the eastern coast of the island, in that it is protected from winds, with an orientation towards the east. Mycenaean remains confirm its use in this period, while some pottery allegedly comes from tombs in the vicinity of this site, dating from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC (Benzi 1992: 448-9; Mee 1982: 74).

At Archangelos (B46) the cemetery is located on the slopes of the local hill (fig.5.50) (Benzi 1992: 449; Charitonidis 1963: 135; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 153-4; Mee 1982: 75). Two tombs used from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC were located, though they are destroyed today. The dromoi had a north-west orientation (fig.5.51), facing an extensive valley with olive trees and other cultivation, limited in the background by low hills. To the west hill slopes and a prominent hill are visible and to the south the hilltop on which the tombs are built dominates the view (fig.5.52). To the north-east is the local castle and the slopes of surrounding hills can be seen. The Mycenaean settlement was probably centred on the Anagros hill and the cemetery seems to have been situated south-west of it.

3.5-4km north/north-east from Archangelos, in an area known as Vigli, (B47), a tomb was reported and Mycenaean vases were handed over (Karantzali pers. comm.). However, there are no visible signs of the tomb, it is only reported that it was located below the slope of the Rifi hill (fig.5.51). The tomb was in use from LH IIIA2 until LH IIIC.

At Kolimbia in the Theotokos area (B48) surface evidence suggests the presence of a Minoan and subsequent Mycenaean occupation, close to the sea in an area that offers a good anchorage (Benzi 1992: 450; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 154; Mee 1982: 76; Melas 1988a: 300).

At Aphandou (B49) there are two sites identified by Inglieri on two opposite hills (1936 *contra* Benzi 1992: 450; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 154; Mee 1982: 76). They are close and on hills by the sea (figs 5.53, 5.54). Lowlands and a *revma* running in an east/west direction separate them. To the west the valley is fertile with olive and pine trees as well as other types of cultivation, limited to the west by prominent hills. To the east the sea dominates the scenery and to the south the valley is visible, while to the north hills can be seen.

At Kalythies (B1), Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1973: 155; Benzi 1992: 450; Mee 1982: 77) have probably found surface remains on Mesonos low hill that suggest that there was a Mycenaean settlement.

As for the Koskinou area (B50) and the vases recovered from a tomb, there is no indication of its topography and thus locating it was impossible (Benzi 1992: 451; Charitonidis 1963: 133-4; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 155; Mee 1982: 77). The tomb was used from LH IIIA2 until LH IIIC.

5.2.3 Kos

Kos has also given us a number of cemeteries (fig.5.55) and their presentation will follow an east to west order. Kastello or Kastelles (D3) is the easternmost one, about 4km south-west of Kos town (fig.5.56) (Papachristodoulou 1979: 458-9; Papazoglou 1981: 62-5). The tomb, used during the LH IIIB period, is still preserved and its dromos

faces east. The view is of gentle hill slopes and part of a small plain, but the scenery is dominated by the sea (fig.5.57) and in the background Anatolia is also visible. To the north slopes can also be seen, along with a small plain that contains olive and pine trees, while in the background the sea is visible. To the west is the hill of Kastello, behind which the *Bokasia revma* is situated with a more or less north/south course (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 55). South of the tomb the higher hills of the Dikios range are visible.

At the site of Iraklis (D4) in the Psalidi region probable remains of a chamber tomb were recovered, used from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB (Skerlou 1993: 553). It is a lowland area full of vegetation and cultivation, having the sea to the north (fig.5.58) and the Dikios range in the background to the south (fig.5.59). Moreover in the surrounding area settlement evidence was also found (Skerlou 1996: 690).

The largest cemetery on Kos is at Eleona and Langada (D6) 1km south-west of the harbour (fig.5.60) (Hope Simpson 1965: 187-8; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 55). At least 82 tombs have been found dating from LH IIB-III A1 to LH IIIC. The area is difficult to find, because the tombs are not preserved and the wider region known as Langada is heavily built up now and terraced. Local informants identified the Eleona area but, even if this is not the exact place, the whole region has similar topographic characteristics. The site is in a flat area without any special reference point of its own. To the north (fig.5.61) and the east the plain can be seen with olive and pine trees and in the background the sea might have been partly visible, while further away the mountaintops of Anatolia can be glimpsed. To the west more of the plain is visible and to the south the Dikios mountain dominates the scenery (fig.5.62). Eleona and its tombs are separated physically from Langada by the presence of the *Langada revma* (Morricone 1965/6: 9-10). One striking difference between the two burial clusters is their position and orientation. The Eleona tombs are built on an east/west axis in a rather linear way, with the dromoi most probably facing north. At Langada the tombs are on a north/south axis using the gentle slope of the local *revma* as a reference point for their dromoi. The majority of the tombs face the west, north-west and north, but only one case to the south-west and one to the south. Both cemeteries are situated south-west of the Seraglio settlement (D5) and the modern Kos harbour.

A stirrup jar recovered at Yapili (D7), 2km south of Kos town suggests the existence of a tomb, used during the LH IIIC period (Morricone 1972/3: 271). The exact location remains unknown, but the site is in a fertile lowland area.

The only tholos tomb found on the islands is about 3km west of Kos town (fig.5.63), and was in use in LH IIIA2 and LH IIIC (Skerlou 1996: 690). Today it is preserved under a modern construction known as Giorgaras (D10), on a gentle slope in an area recently surveyed without producing evidence for more tombs. The dromos faces the north (fig.5.64), with a view of the plain and the sea in the background. The plain stretches to the east, as well as to the west, with olive and pine trees, while also to the west the sea and Pserimos Island are visible. To the south the plain (fig.5.65), is restricted by sloping hills and in the background the mountain range of Dikios dominates the scenery.

One more tomb is reported to have been found at the Asklepieion (Morricone 1972/3: 253) (D9) (fig.5.60), dating to the LH IIIA2 period. It must have been destroyed or looted during the construction of the classical site, thus its exact position is unknown. However the area is one of dense pine forest with a slope in a north-south direction from the Dikios Mountain range towards the sea. Probably the tomb faced north or north-east, following the natural slope, while to the south the impressive mountain and its peaks and to the east and west hill slopes covered in vegetation can be seen. To the north (fig.5.66) the plain is visible near the sea, which dominates the background, with Anatolia and Pserimos Island visible to the north-east.

South of the Asklepieion on the site of Asklupi (D8) there seems to have been a Mycenaean settlement on hill terraces in an area covered with pine trees (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 57)

Close to Mesaria (D11), 150m north of the local road leading to Asphendiou, one more chamber tomb was found (fig.5.67), in use during LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB (Papachristodoulou 1979: 457-8). It was situated on a low hill and its dromos faces the north. The view is of a fertile valley and lowlands that extend up the sea that is visible in the background. To the east and west a valley with olive trees and other cultivation can be seen. To the south a small hill is visible, while in the background the Dikios mountain range dominates the scenery. It is unclear whether there was a *revma* close by and the

relationship of this site to an Early Bronze Age burial is also uncertain (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 58).

South of Mesaria there is the site of Misonisi at Zia (D12), high on the mountain, where EBA and LBA sherds indicate occupation (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 58-9). The area is secure and has fertile land around.

Close to Linopotis Piyi surface pottery suggests the occupation of the site in the Middle or Late Bronze Age (D13) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 60). Between the Linopotis Piyi and Pyli in the central part of Kos, in an inland area close to the Ayia Paraskevi chapel (fig.5.68), which today has a cemetery (D14), a chamber tomb was discovered, in use from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 60). The exact site is not clear, but from the chapel to the north (fig.5.69) a *revma* is visible and beyond that part of a plain, as well as a hill that dominates the north-east. The plain stretches to the east and south with olive groves and in the far background part of the Dikios range can be seen. To the west a valley dominates the scenery with olive groves and other cultivation, while in the background the sea can be seen as well as part of Pserimos Island. The tomb might have been somewhere on the hill mentioned earlier.

At Palaiopyli Kastro (D15), 3kms south-east of Ayia Paraskevi, Cyclopean walls along with Mycenaean sherds suggest the existence of a settlement (fig.5.70) (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 59-60).

Close to the village of Eleona (D16), near to Kardamaina on the south side of the island, one more cemetery has been located with allegedly about twenty tombs of unclear date (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1962: 171). They are on a low hill plateau by the modern road just west of the village (fig.5.71). The hollows preserved are in the southern and northern part of this low hill. To the north they face low hills and to the east there is a view of part of the Dikios range, along with low hills and the sea in the background. To the west the local *revma* and part of the plain are visible, while in the background small hills can be seen. To the south, where most probably the tombs of both areas faced, a *revma* is visible and part of a small valley, but the sea is the element that dominates the scenery. The settlement evidence reported derives from the plateau that extends between the two burial sites.

At the ancient coastal site of Halasarna (D17), in modern Kardamaina, about 3.5kms west of Eleona, Mycenaean sherds have been recovered indicating one more settlement site on the southern coast of Kos (Aleura *et al.* 1985: 1, 18).

From the site of Antimacheia (D18) come two pots, today in the British Museum, probably belonging to a single LH IIIB-C tomb. We do not know the exact point where they were found, but they are the only finds from this region. This area is in general a flat one, quite fertile even quite high up. The volcanic geology of this region creates low flat hills with a lot of cavities and allows a range of cultivation to be practised.

5.2.4 Astypalaia and Kalymnos

On Astypalaia two Mycenaean cemeteries have been discovered as well as one settlement. The first cemetery is at Armenochori (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 161-2; Zervoudaki 1971: 550) (C19) in the south-western part of the island in a fertile inland region, where two tombs, in use from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC, were excavated (fig.5.72). The tombs face north-east towards a fertile plateau (fig.5.73), well watered, with trees and cereals. To the north-west and south-east barren hill slopes are visible and to the south-west a low hill can be seen.

The second site is at Syngairos (Doumas 1975: 372) (C21) in the middle of the island, where a narrow isthmus connects the eastern and the western part of the island. Two tombs were found dating from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB. The cemetery was in the northern part of this area (fig.5.74), and the tombs look straight at the sea. To the east, west and south barren hill slopes are visible. It is interesting that a few hundred metres to the south-west there is a fertile plain with a lot of vegetation and also a good harbour, but facing the sea to the south, perhaps indicating the probable settlement site.

Settlement evidence has been recovered at the Kastro Tou Ayiou Ioannou (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1973: 162-4) (C20) in the eastern part of the island (fig.5.75). The site is placed on a high hill close to the sea surrounded by gentle and fertile hills, commanding the sea-passage to and from the Cyclades.

On Kalymnos a Mycenaean cemetery has been identified on the Perakastro hill (E1), below the Medieval castle (fig.5.76) and windmills (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1962: 172-3). However today the area has been altered due to heavy building and the *revma* mentioned by Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962: 172) is covered by a local road. Thus we do not know how many tombs existed here, but they were in use from LH IIIB to LH IIIC. To the south the Perakastro hill slopes extend upwards to where the windmills exist and to the east hill slopes are also visible. To the west the slopes of the Perakastro hill go downward and the road, where the *revma* was, can be seen today. To the north the road/*revma* is also visible, while the mountain opposite dominates the scenery. The area around is hilly with pine trees. From Perakastro castle the whole of Pothia valley can be seen, as well as the port of the island which is not far from this point (fig.5.77). The tombs might have been the depressions on the hill just above the road/*revma*, perhaps looking to the north-west (fig.5.78). The settlement seems to have been placed in the middle and lower parts of the south and east sides of the Perakastro hill. Thus it was placed facing the harbour, higher than the cemetery, which was situated north-west of the settlement as well.

Apart from Perakastro there seems to have been a Mycenaean settlement in the fertile Vathy valley (fig.5.79), as the evidence from the Daskalio cave suggests (Benzi 1993: 275, 281-7; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1962: 172).

5.2.5 Anatolia

On the west coast of Anatolia five cemeteries have been discovered so far and they are discussed from south to north. Before describing them it should be noted that at the site of Knidos there is evidence of Late Bronze Age occupation in the form of Mycenaean sherds (Mee 1978: 132).

The largest is located on the Halikarnassos peninsula and is known as Müskebi (E3), although the present name of the area is Ortakent (Bass 1963: 353; Boysal 1967: 31-4; Hope Simpson 1965: 194; Mee 1978: 137). Forty eight tombs have been excavated, dating from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC. The cemetery is 1km along the road from

Ortakent to Yalkavak, on the left side of the road (fig.5.80) behind a ceramic shop, which is not very visible from the road, but is just before a local discotheque. It is situated in a fertile inland plain, full of pine, oak and olive trees as well as other types of cultivation. The tombs were built on gentle slopes, but are destroyed today. This, as well as the lack of any topographic sketch of the area or orientation details, has made their analysis difficult. To the north the plain is limited by high hill slopes and to the east the scenery is dominated by Pazar Mountain. To the west gentle slopes and the plain can be seen, while to the south the extensive plain broadens out with a slight downward slope ending at the sea in the far background. The tombs are divided into three clusters, the dromoi of the ones in areas A and B probably facing the south/south-east (fig.5.81), while the ones in area C most probably faced east (fig.5.82).

North of the Halikarnassos peninsula and south of Miletos there is the coastal site of Iasos (E7) in a limited lowland area (fig.5.83). The actual settlement remains are on a peninsula, that might have been an island in the Late Bronze Age, where Minoan and subsequently Mycenaean sherds have been recovered along with Anatolian pottery (Benzi 1984b: 29-30; Laviosa 1988: 183; Levi 1972: 471-4, 478, 480-1; Mee 1978: 129-30).

The second cemetery is situated at Miletos (E15) on the Değirmentepe hill (Mee 1978: 133-6; Niemeier 1998b: 36). The eleven tombs recovered belong to the LH IIIB and LH IIIC periods. The wider area has been altered by alluviation and what was once the sea is today an extensive valley (fig.5.84). The hill where the cemetery is located was part of a peninsula in the Mycenaean period (fig.5.85). The dromoi of the tombs face east and south-east, towards part of the Miletos plain, the sea and the Bronze Age town (Niemeier pers. comm.). To the west hill slopes and to the north slopes along with the sea were visible. The cemetery is 1.5kms south-west of the Mycenaean settlement and on higher ground.

The third cemetery in this region is further north at modern Selçuk on the Ayasoluk hill (E24), in front of the Basilica of St. John (fig.5.86) (Boysal 1967: 45-6; Hope Simpson 1965: 193; Mee 1978: 127). Today this site is also inland, but in the Bronze Age the area was coastal like Miletos. The tomb was found by the entrance of the ruined basilica on a low hill, and dates to the LH IIIA2 period. The area around is

fertile with olive, pine and other cultivation. To the south there is a small plain as well as hills through which a route connects this region with the southern part of coastal Anatolia. To the east more of the plain can be seen, limited by high hills in the background, and to the north a higher hilltop is visible with the Medieval castle that produced remains of a Late Bronze Age wall and Mycenaean sherds (fig.5.87) (Büyükkolancı 1999: 2-3). To the west (fig.5.88) an extensive valley exists today, but most of it was part of the sea in the Bronze Age which would thus have dominated the scenery. A few kilometres south-west the classical site of Ephesos can be seen from this hill. A few hundred metres to the south-west, in a lower area around the classical Artemision, Mycenaean evidence seems to suggest the existence of a settlement (Bammer 1990: 141-2; 1994: 38). From the finds discovered close to the temple, the existence and continuity of Mycenaean cult to the historic era has been argued (Bammer 1994: 38-9).

The fourth cemetery and the most uncertain of all, due to the conditions under which it was excavated, is at Kolophon (E25) (Bridges 1974: 264-6; Mee 1978: 125-6). The tholos tomb found here is the subject of controversy concerning the period during which it was built as well as its unique character. However today, in the light of the tholos tomb discovered on Kos, its role and significance have gained another dimension and an additional argument for dating it in the LH IIIB or C period. It was located in a flat fertile area facing towards the north-east, though today it is no longer visible.

About four kilometres north of Kolophon is the site of Bakla Tepe (E26) (fig.5.89). A built tomb has been excavated recently with pottery dating to the LH IIIB period (Erkanal 1998: 401, 405; IRERP 2000). The tomb is on the highest point of a low flat hill surrounded by plains to the north, east, the direction the tomb faced, and west, while a river flows in north-east/south-west direction past the site. To the south, apart from the plain, higher hills can be seen. It is of particular interest that the tomb had the same orientation as the EBA pithos burials.

5.2.6 Samos

On Samos there are two cemeteries identified so far, both in the southern part of the island and part of the same long valley (fig.5.90). The first is at the Heraion (E20), a site better known for its Archaic temple, which also had Mycenaean levels (Hope Simpson 1965: 190). The tomb was found just north of the Temple of Hera (fig.5.91), below its foundations (fig.5.92) and is a built tomb dating to the LH IIIA2 period (Milojčić 1961: 25-6). To the north there is a valley, limited by hills, and to the north-west Ambelos Mountain dominates the landscape. To the west the valley only extends for a short distance, since there are hills quite close by, but is much longer to the east where it extends to the hills around Tigani in the far distance. To the south, where the tomb faced, part of the plain is visible (fig.5.93), but today the vegetation around the site does not allow immediate visual contact with the sea, though old photographs indicate that this used to be possible. The area is full of water, as the reeds and the *revma* to the west of the site testify, although this is not visible today from the tomb area. There is much cultivation including olive trees and vines, while the hills and mountains are thickly forested with pine trees. The settlement and the tomb area do not seem to be separated in any obvious way apart from the 6m-diameter mound that demarcates the tomb. An interesting point about the settlement is that it seems to have had a fortification wall. East of the Heraion is the Tigani site (E21) (fig.5.94), where a Mycenaean settlement existed (Hope Simpson 1965: 189-90).

The second cemetery is in the modern village of Myloi (E22), at the west end of the valley on a hilly inland site (Hope Simpson 1965: 190). The tomb, in use in LH IIIA2, was not easy to locate from the description offered by Zappeiropoulos (1960: 249), but fortunately the tomb it is still preserved and signs indicated its location (fig.5.95). It is behind the modern school in the village and has a north-east/south-west orientation. To the north-east only the slope of a hill can be seen and to the east and west hill slopes are visible with olive and pine trees. To the south-west, where the dromos faces (fig.5.96), there are gentle slopes with olive groves as well as a shallow ridge with a *revma*, while in the background higher hills are visible. It is very interesting that today

the area around the modern village is the main producer and exporter of oranges and lemons, since it underlines the agricultural character of this site.

Brief mention should be also made of two intact vases from Ikaria, most probably from the same tomb, dating to the LH IIIC period (Mountjoy 1999a: 1146). The interest is mainly in the strategic position of the island with regard to maritime routes connecting the Cyclades and mainland Greece with the north-east and south-east Aegean. Nothing is known of the place where the vases were found.

5.2.7 Chios and Psara

On Chios the only cemetery so far identified is situated in the south-east part of the island at the site of Emporio (fig.5.97) (E31), more or less opposite the coast of Anatolia (Hood 1981: 152-3). The two cist graves have a north-west/south-east axis, and were in use during the LH IIIB period (fig.5.98). To their west hill slopes can be seen, to the south and south-east the sea, along with hill slopes (fig.5.99). To the east, 20m from the graves, on the summit of the hill, there is a *revma*, while the Emporio acropolis hill dominates the background (fig.5.100). To the north slopes are visible and a high hill. The settlement of Emporio is just east and north-east of the hill on which the graves are found and possesses a good natural harbour (fig.5.101) (Hood 1981: 583-4).

Another site has been recently reported at about 9kms west/north-west of Emporio at Kato Phana (E32). The survey conducted there has yielded settlement evidence close to the sea, in an area facing the central Aegean (Hood 1981: 6).

The same is true of the site of Levkathia (fig.5.102) at Volissos (E33), a coastal area in the north-west part of the island, where Mycenaean sherds indicate a settlement (Hood 1981: 8). The area has a strip of good arable land full of pine, fig and olive trees and a *revma* crosses it.

On Psara a cemetery in use during the LH III period has been excavated at Archontiki (E35), a coastal site in the western part of the island, 3kms north/north-west of Psara

town (Achilara 1986: 10; Charitonidis 1961/2c: 266). A large number of cist graves and three built tombs are situated by the seashore (fig.5.103) for a hundred metres along the coast, while the settlement was identified north-west of the cemetery and on the Daskalio islet (Achilara 1996: 1350-3; Papadimitriou 2001: 143, 145-6; Papadopoulou *et al.* 1986: 2-3). To the north and east of the cemetery the low slopes on which the tombs are placed are visible. To the south the seashore and the sea dominate the view, as well as to the west where the Daskalio islet can also be seen. The strategic position of the island on the maritime routes between mainland Greece and central and northern Anatolia, underlines the importance of this site. Evidence of interaction between Psara and mainland Greece is already attested in the LH IIA period. The good anchorage and the orientation of the site help us to understand the expansion of Mycenaean social and cultural influences into the central and northern Aegean.

5.2.8 North-eastern Aegean

Although the northern part of the Eastern Aegean is geographically outside the area under review, some similarities and differences can be highlighted.

At Panaztepe, a site 20km north-west of Smyrna, a cemetery has been excavated (fig.5.104). The site was most probably on the southern slopes of an island or a peninsula, definitely in a coastal area (Erkanal and Erkanal 1986: 67-8; Ersoy 1988: 59; Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94). The cemetery contained more than seven oval-shaped and circular tholoi with short dromoi and large a number of cist and pithos burials, all oriented south-west with Mycenaean and Anatolian offerings (Erkanal and Erkanal 1986: 69-72; Ersoy 1988: 59-80; Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94). The cemetery seems to have been in use from LH IIIA to LH IIIC, with cremation and inhumation practices, and the deceased placed in a crouched position. Recently a wall with a north-west/south-east direction and 1.4-1.6m wide has been found, probably enclosing and demarcating the cemetery as a separate and perhaps special place (Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94). Parallels of a wall encircling a cemetery have not yet been recovered anywhere else in this region dating to the LBA.

On the south-west coast of Lesbos, at least three large cist graves have been reported by the seashore at Makara, but are still not excavated (Charitonidis 1961/2b: 265; Spencer 1995: 275). They are probably dated to the LH III period and structurally they have an internal divider creating two sections (fig.5.105). It has been argued that one part functioned as a dromos (Charitonidis 1961/2b: 265), but this is uncertain since Papadimitriou (2001: 146-7) identifies at least one of them as a built tomb.

Additionally the Beşik Tepe cemetery at Troy enriches our understanding of this region (fig.5.106). At least 56 structures were found representing mainly pithos burials, one cist grave and one built tomb, where inhumation predominated (Korfmann 1986: 21-2; Sperling 1991: 156). The built tomb is probably similar to these at Makara. The Beşik Tepe cemetery was by the beach, 15m from the 13th and 12th century BC seashore (Korfmann 1986: 20). The burial gifts were mainly Gray Ware and Mycenaean pottery, most probably locally made, whilst most pithoi were oriented towards the south-east, fewer to the north-west and south (Korfmann 1986: 22-4). A second cemetery existed at Troy, 550m south of the citadel, belonging to the 14th century BC. Cremation was the norm inside urns (kraters and jars), while there is also evidence of pithos burials with local offerings and some Mycenaean pottery, locally made and imported (Blegen *et al.* 1953: 370-91; Mountjoy 1999b: 284; Sperling 1991: 155).

In the North-eastern Aegean the older burial traditions, pithos and cist graves, continued. At the same time at Troy, cremation was introduced in the 14th century BC and different burial clusters coexisted as parts of the same cemetery. Built tombs, either in chamber shape or tholoi, appeared at Panaztepe, Makara and Beşik Tepe. Furthermore it is interesting that all these three cemeteries were built close to or by the seashore and every cemetery has a common orientation.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 The Topographic Context of Cemeteries

A first step in analyzing the topographic context of the Mycenaean cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean is to review their actual setting. Nonetheless we should always bear in mind the limited number of cemeteries with tombs preserved, as well as the small number of tombs in many of these cemeteries. These limitations allow us only to make general suggestions about trends and tendencies rather than express certainties and identify definite patterns.

A correlation between the cemeteries and the geology of the areas where they were constructed needs to be made in order to find out if there is any specific pattern. Fourteen cemeteries are built on Neogene deposits that predominate on Rhodes. However all Neogene sediments are not the same and they have enough differences for geologists to subdivide them into three categories. Six burial sites are on flysch and two on limestone. Two cemeteries are in poros areas and two more on conglomerate sediments. The geological mosaic of Rhodes on its own clearly indicates that there is no pattern or any specific preference (1.1, table 5.1). Rather they seem to follow the settlement pattern that probably pre-existed the Mycenaean phase. On Kos four of the cemeteries are built on Neogene sediments, three on alluvial soils, one site, Antimacheia, is either on tuff or marine deposits, while one, Ayia Paraskevi, is found on dolomitic limestone (table 5.2)⁴. However, the case of Kalymnos is different where it seems that the cemetery was built on Neogene deposits with pumice (*pozzolana*), rather than the local limestone that predominates on the island (Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1962: 172 *contra* Higgins and Higgins 1996: 151-2). On Astypalaia, both the Armenochori and Syngairos cemeteries are situated on flysch. In the geologically more varied coast of Anatolia we have Müskebi built on pyroclastic rocks, Değirmentepe on Neogene sediments and Selçuk on marble. On Samos, the Heraion is on alluvial sediments and Myloi on schists, while Emporio is situated on a hill formed of volcanic

⁴ For Kos the geological work conducted by Leontaris (1970), Higgins and Higgins (1996) and the IGME maps were used (1.1). The latter two were also used for sites on the other islands and Anatolia.

sediments and Myloi on schists, while Emporio is situated on a hill formed of volcanic rocks and Archontiki is on limestone. Outside Rhodes the variety is even greater, reinforcing the point that there is no geological criterion for the selection of the burial site which is clearly dependent on the location of the settlement. Cavanagh (1987: 164) reached the same conclusion in his analysis of Mycenaean cemeteries across the Greek mainland. Thus perhaps practical considerations were the most important criterion, the choice of either hard or soft depending on how durable they wanted to make the tombs, a decision that was probably not the same in every case, as our analysis suggests.

The location of the cemeteries seems to have been related more to that of the settlement, in the sense that while they were clearly separated, so as to have an identity of their own, at the same time they were close by for practical reasons. The distance might range from a few hundred metres up to a kilometer, while in the Argolid they range from 1-1.5kms (Cavanagh and Mee 1990: 55). This is confirmed by Kos/Eleona and Langada and Miletos/Değirmentepe. The same picture emerges from the rather limited surface finds of the settlements at Pigadia, Theologos, Aniforo, Astraki, Yennadi, Archangelos, Iraklis and Archontiki. At Trianda/Ialysos this pattern is further emphasized by the presence of the local *revma* that separates the two sites. The same applies to the cemetery and the settlement at Emporio, with the notable difference that the two sites are very close and the local *revma* is the boundary between the areas. The case of Ayios Minas at Kattavia and Perakastro on Kalymnos is similar in a way because the cemetery is just below the hill on which the Mycenaean settlement was situated. At the Heraion the settlement and cemetery are almost adjacent. At Paradeisi and Eleona the settlement is between the burial clusters, similarly at Ephesos.

The orientation of the cemeteries in relation to the settlements, so far identified, is not consistent or uniform. Trianda, Seraglio, Miletos and Archangelos all have cemeteries south-west of the settlement; the cemetery at Emporio is west/south-west, the Heraion just west, while at Paradeisi west and probably east of the burial clusters. At Pigadia the cemetery seems to extend southwards from the settlement (south, south-east and south-west). At Kalavarda and Perakastro the cemeteries are north-west of the settlement, whilst Yennadi has its cemetery to the west. At Theologos the tomb was north of the settlement, at Astraki north-east and at Ayios Minas south and south-east.

of Eleona the tombs seem to be north and south of the settlement, at Ephesos both south and north-east. On Rhodes there is a preference for cemeteries being placed to the west and south-west of the settlement (fig.5.107), in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean south-west and the south (fig.5.108). As a whole a strong tendency can be seen for the south-west and secondarily the west and south. There might have been some belief associated with the solar cycle and its symbolism in respect of the position of the cemetery vis-à-vis the habitation area. Nonetheless this does not seem to be rigid and practical considerations or topographic characteristics might have limited this. In any case if the location had a metaphysic symbolism, it must not have been of paramount importance or of strict cultic significance. Furthermore the fact that cemeteries are west of the settlements is not unique, but also seen in the Argolid, but again inconsistently (Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 242). It must also be noted that at Ialysos, Paradeisi and Eleona the dromoi are oriented towards the settlement, therefore no fear of contamination seems to be associated with the dead, as argued for EM Cretan contexts (4.3) and suggested by Dabney (1999: 172).

One hypothesis that can be tested as far as the settlement is concerned and its relation to the burial sites, namely whether they are located on higher or lower ground. Of the seventeen available cases eight are from Rhodes and the picture here is that five cemeteries are built lower down than the settlement and only three on higher ground, Ialysos, Astraki and Yennadi. However it has to be emphasized that in all available cases the settlements were built on gentle hill slopes, with the notable exception of Trianda. In the sites outside Rhodes this picture is reversed and of the seven sites, three cemeteries are built on higher ground, Pigadia, Eleona and Langada, and Miletos, two on lower and higher, Eleona and Ephesos, two more or less at the same level, Heraion and Emporio. At Archontiki and Perakastro the cemetery was lower than the settlement. Although the evidence is again partial and tentative, this overview suggests a considerable, but not absolute difference between Rhodes and the rest of the sites in the South-eastern Aegean.

It is also interesting that there seem to have been clusters of tombs that clearly belong to the same cemetery and to the same settlement. At Trianda Moschou Vounara and Makria Vounara are clearly separated by a plateau, but form one burial area

(fig.5.13). The same applies at Kattavia, where the local *revma* divided the Ayios Minas from Ta Tzigani cemetery. The Eleona and Langada cemetery is not only separated by the local *revma*, but there is also a different layout and orientation of the tombs. There is also the possibility that at Kalavarda and Paradeisi there were two or three clusters of tombs, but it cannot be as convincingly argued as in the other cases. At Eleona on Kos and Pigadia on Karpathos there seems to have been a similar case with two clusters of tombs belonging to the same cemetery. They were most probably placed at the edges of the settlement, as if guarding it or in opposition to one another each other. Especially at Pigadia they seem to surround the southern limit of the settlement rather than being separate clusters. At Müskebi there are at least two clusters of tombs with different orientations, as at Eleona and Langada, which definitely belong to the same burial place, and probably serve the same local settlement. At Apolakkia it seems that Trapezies Praelis and Chimaro also belong to the same settlement. These clusters of tombs are not easily explained as a practical response to a lack of space in which to build new tombs. This could only be argued for Ialysos, though the two burial areas were used at the same time. Chronological differentiation between the two burial grounds seems to have been the case only at Kos, where the Eleona group is earlier and continued to be used alongside the Langada, but the former was abandoned before the latter. This change from one cluster to another is difficult to explain, considering that the landscape and the locations are hardly very different, while there is plenty of space in the area for more chamber tombs. Although it seems that clusters of tombs are common in extensive cemeteries, the case of Kattavia is exceptional since the cemetery seems not to have been as large as the previous examples. Nonetheless we do not know exactly how many tombs existed there. In the analysis of the tombs and their burial goods I will examine whether there are any distinctions between these clusters and whether they represent any social, political or other division.

It must also be noted that these chamber tomb cemeteries give the impression of being organized areas which have a common, although not uniform, orientation. This is the case at Paradeisi, Aniforo, Lelos, Trapezies Praelis (fig.5.109), Ayios Minas, Passia (fig.5.110), Kalogrios (fig.5.111), Apsaktiras (fig.5.112), Lardos, Aspropilia (fig.5.113), Archangelos, Armenochori and Syngairos. These are all sites in the South-eastern

Archangelos, Armenochori and Syngairos. These are all sites in the South-eastern Aegean where the tombs can still be seen or their dromos orientations were reported by earlier researchers. Ialysos is more complex (fig.5.114), but still the orientations range from the north to the south-east, although the Eleona and Langada burial clusters face different directions (fig.5.115), the first mainly to the north, the second to the west, including north-west and south-west. The same applies to Múskebi with tombs at areas A and B facing to the south and south-east, while in area C to the east.

An assessment of the orientation of the tombs found in this region will be attempted on the basis of all the tombs whose orientation is known, a corpus of 194 tombs. From the available information on Rhodes it seems that the vast majority of the tombs on the island face east (south-east and north-east), as well as north (fig.5.116). However the large number of tombs at Ialysos biases the general picture of the island. Thus at Ialysos the north and north-east are favoured in contrast to the rest of Rhodes which the east and south-east are preferred. Moreover it seems that there is no further division in the cemeteries of Rhodes as far as their orientation is concerned, between the north and south of island for example (table 5.7). In the rest of the South-eastern Aegean cemeteries there is a completely different picture since the preference is clearly for the south and west (fig.5.117), although note the number of tombs at Langada with their preference for a western orientation.

It is clear that in no island or area in the South-eastern Aegean is there a strict preference for an orientation of tombs to the east, as is the case on Crete during LM II-III (Blomberg and Henriksson 2001: 78, fig.6.6; Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 45-7; Papathanassiou and Hoskin 1996: 55) (compare figs 5.116, 5.117 to 5.118a). A close association with the sunrise and, especially, the moonrise (Eliade 1996: 147-51, 171-2) has been proposed for Armenoi (Hoskin 2001: 222; Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 53; Papathanassiou and Hoskin 1996: 58), but it can be applied to all the cemeteries on Crete with an eastern orientation. However the preference for an eastern orientation on Crete is hardly surprising since this is also true of the EM-MM tholos tombs (4.3). In fact there is a long tradition of eastern tomb orientation in western Mediterranean during the late Neolithic and Chalcolithic period, associated symbolically with the sunrise (Hoskin 2001: 8, 213-6). Nonetheless there is a general preference on Rhodes for the

east and north. Elsewhere the evidence is more varied and in that respect closer to the mainland picture, but there is no trend whatsoever for the south-west (Blomberg and Henriksson 2001: 78-84, fig.6.7) (compare figs 5.116, 5.117 to 5.118b). The fact that the tombs in the same cemetery tend to have a common orientation is perhaps the most important point. The same belief is seen in all of the cemeteries, but expressed differently, emphasizing the diversity and individual character of each site. In my opinion this is a continuation of an earlier tradition, already existent in the EBA, especially in Anatolia, but also affecting the South-eastern Aegean. The burial clusters at LB I Trianda and the common orientation of the graves, as well as the common orientation of EBA and LBA tombs at Bakla Tepe highlight this point. The eschatological symbolism continued to be active and meaningful, despite the use of new burial types, such as chamber and tholos tombs. At the same time the surrounding landscape played a more prominent role in the symbolism of the tombs and cemeteries exemplified.

5.3.2 The Landscape Setting

Reviewing the position of the cemeteries in their landscape setting is not only about orientation, but more importantly their surroundings. From the analysis and the survey conducted there are some interesting results in terms of what is visible from the tombs and in the area around them. A funeral comprised a number of rituals including the *ekphora* from the settlement and the house of the deceased to the cemetery. The *pompe*, which could entail a walk of a few hundred metres to more than a kilometer, must have been a standard process followed in most, if not all cases. The visual reference points in this movement must have been multiple, bearing in mind the return journey as well as the time spent in the cemetery for the performance of the necessary ritual activities. Thus the whole landscape, in a choreographic fashion, must have played an important symbolic and cosmological role. Although it is not easy to find or reconstruct this exact process or path, we are able to examine the elements of the surrounding landscape and

suggest some reference points that might have been of particular significance, such as the sea, a low or prominent hill or mountain, valley or *revma* (tables 5.1, 5.2).

The sea is visible in eleven sites out of the 26 on Rhodes and twelve or thirteen of the seventeen sites in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean. It must also be noted that in the vast majority of the cases on Rhodes only a limited view of the sea is possible and only in the tomb at Chimaro, does it have a view of the sea from the dromos. Outside Rhodes the picture is quite different. At Pigadia, Kastello, Iraklis, Mesaria, Giorgaras, Asklepieion, Eleona, Syngairos, Selçuk, Heraion and most probably at Eleona (Seraglio), the dromoi face precisely towards the sea. The same applies with the Emporio cist graves in that their south-east axis is oriented towards the sea. In the case of the Archontiki cemetery the graves actually line the coast. The meaning of the sea, as far as mortuary beliefs are concerned, may be to do with everyday activities as well as metaphysic beliefs. Hence it could be proposed that Rhodians may have been more concerned with agriculture rather than maritime affairs, with the notable exceptions of Trianda and Lindos which offer good anchorage. However it is difficult to relate the beliefs about death to the sea in the case of Rhodes. The same can perhaps be argued for Karpathos, where Tou Stavrou to Kefali, Vonies and Avlona are inland sites in contrast to Pigadia and probably Diafani. At Armenochori, Perakastro, Müskebi and Myloi the sites themselves highlight in a way their inland and agricultural character. On the other hand the islanders of Kos seem more attracted to the sea, similarly the inhabitants of harbour sites such as Miletos, Selçuk, Heraion, perhaps Tigani, Emporio and Archontiki. Perhaps in these cases everyday activities and metaphysic beliefs were interrelated and symbolically expressed in the orientation and setting of the cemeteries. Nonetheless it must be stressed that only in the case of Syngairos, Archontiki, Emporio, Panaztepe, Makara and Beşik Tepe were the cemeteries built by or very close to the seashore. This could be related to the location of the LB I cemetery of Trianda, indicating older or different mortuary values associating the individual, the role of seashore as a liminal space and eschatological beliefs. However during the LH III period this principle changed and the sea became part of the landscape rather than the focal point. The importance of the sea changed in the South-eastern Aegean in contrast to the North-

eastern region where it retained its significance along with the importance of the individual in the funerary context.

The low and prominent hills/mountains are interrelated and in my opinion complement each other. However that does not mean that they are the same. Although hill/mountains are visible from most sites only in the case of Tou Stavrou to Kefali, Vonies, Maritsa, Aniforo, Passia, Apsaktiras, Aspropilia, Armenochori and Múskebi are the dromoi facing them.

Valleys seem to have been a landscape element that was visible from all of the tombs on Rhodes and the rest of the South-eastern Aegean sites. The only exception is Passia, Tou Stavrou to Kefali and Syngairos, which do not have visual contact with any valley or plain. The alignment of the dromoi probably of ten sites on Rhodes and ten elsewhere reinforces the importance of the valley in the burial landscape. Perhaps the connection of the deceased with the earth, agriculture, subsistence and regeneration (Eliade 1996: 349-52) were multilevel symbolisms that coexisted in one or more meaningful messages to the participants in the burial process.

The last element that stands out are the local *revmata*, which seem to be present in most cases. There are only three or four sites on Rhodes that do not view a *revma*, while at least ten of the other South-east Aegean cemeteries are related to one. Actually they seem to be more important in terms of visual contact than the sea. Moreover, in my opinion, the *revmata* are even more significant than they might seem to be at a first glance. This is underlined by the fact that in nine of the Rhodian cemeteries the dromoi look towards a *revma*, although in the rest of the South-eastern Aegean sites there are only five cemeteries related to *revmata* so directly: Tou Stavrou to Kefali, Eleona and Langada, Eleona, Perakastro, Myloi and Emporio. Myloi and Perakastro are good examples, since they are the two sites which do not have a view of the sea, they are inland and are more related to the agricultural environment. Thus the *revmata* seem significant at several sites on Rhodes, almost equally, in terms of dromos orientation, to the valleys. Elsewhere in the South-east Aegean they are as important as the sea. Perhaps the best example of this are the Emporio cist graves, in that their axis combines a view of the sea along with that of a *revma*.

Although the *revmata* are dry most of the year, during rain or more generally during the winter period, depending on the local topography, they bring fresh, drinkable water for people and animals and irrigate the fields. Their importance in the local context and the conduct of everyday life has given them a special status, sometimes related with the underworld, especially when the water springs out of underground aquifers. In some cases the *pompe* of the deceased might have passed through *revmata*, when they were between the settlement and the cemetery, as in the cases of Apolakkia/Trapezies Paraelis, Yennadi and Trianda/Ialysos. They might have even been a focus for rituals, such as breaking pottery or pouring libations for the deceased and seen as a point which facilitated a *rite of passage*. It must be stressed that this can only be suggested and indeed for comparatively few cases. Nonetheless there is one more hint that connects burials with *revmata* and that is pebbles, which have been found inside tombs for paving the areas where the corpse of the deceased was laid. They are probably from *revmata* rather than the seashore, perhaps bringing their symbolism inside the tomb itself. Examples of sea pebble pavements are reported in the LB I burials by the seashore at Trianda. Furthermore pebbles inside chamber tombs have been recovered at Ialysos, Eleona and Langada, as well as at Yennadi. Unfortunately most of the older excavations, illicit or not, did not record their presence. All these points refute the tentative hypothesis proposed by Dabney (1999: 174-5) for the Argolid, that Mycenaean cemeteries were located away from sources water due to fear of contamination.

Although I have subdivided the landscape elements this does not mean that I think they operated independently. Rather they are interrelated and interwoven in unique landscape formations and meanings for every cemetery. Separating them made it easier for me to demonstrate the common elements and the differences that exist, as well as the inconsistencies. The landscape of death is complex and multilevel and to some extent depends on individual choice following or not, the ordinary processes and rituals. The belief expressed here is that the surroundings of the tombs, the hills and mountains, valleys, *revmata* and the sea, created microcosms and cosmologies, each one with its own symbolism and at the same time interwoven together in one whole, in a single event, death.

5.3.3 The Diachronic Pattern of Cemetery Usage during the Mycenaean period

As there is only limited evidence available for the way in which the settlement distribution evolved, reading of the diachronic cemetery pattern will be attempted here so as to understand the changes in this region.

Overall it seems that in LH IIB-III A1 (fig.5.119) there was a limited use of chamber tomb cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean (thirteen cemeteries), a tradition more widely practiced in LH III A2 (fig.5.120), especially on Karpathos and Rhodes where it reached its acme (46 cemeteries). In the LH IIB period (fig.5.121) there is a more varied picture with stability on Karpathos and Kos, a slight decrease in the number of cemeteries on Rhodes, while elsewhere there are a few more cemeteries than in the previous period (45 cemeteries). During LH IIIC (fig.5.122) there is no evidence of cemeteries on Karpathos and a further decrease on Rhodes and in the whole South-eastern Aegean (30 cemeteries), but not to the extent seen on mainland Greece, highlighting the idiosyncrasy of the whole South-eastern Aegean. What matters here are the tendencies rather than the actual numbers since new evidence might alter the picture. The use of cemeteries does not always correspond with that of the settlement, as the available evidence from Miletos, which was occupied from LH III A, Emporio, which continued into LH IIIC and Kasos, with no corresponding cemetery, underline.

Thirty six cemeteries have been recovered and were in use during the Mycenaean period on Rhodes (fig.5.10). For the Argolid, Mee and Cavanagh (1990: 229) have demonstrated that the sites are 1.5 to 4kms apart, with a median distance of 3kms and only three sites between 5 and 8kms. The average distance between cemeteries on Rhodes is c.6.23kms, while the median distance is 5kms. In the north of Rhodes the 20 cemeteries are on average 5.15kms apart, with median distance of 4.5kms. In southern Rhodes the average distance between 16 cemeteries is 5.82kms and the median 5kms. The difference in the average distances is a result of some special cemeteries that are well away from the rest in southern Rhodes, such as Siana and Ayios Isidoros. However considering the median distance the difference between the north and south part is 0.5km, which is minimal, especially considering the geographical and topographic

differences between the two regions. Adding to these observations the fact that most cemeteries seem to have been close to fertile valleys and plains, as Hope Simpson and Lazenby comment (1973: 143), with *revmata* watering them, the settlement pattern on Rhodes during the Mycenaean period can be also hypothesized. A similar picture is seen on mainland Mycenaean sites, although Bintliff (1977b: 9) suggests coastal locations were equally favoured. On Rhodes the vast majority of sites are situated away from the sea, perhaps indicating the limited way in which it was exploited, the importance of agriculture and a fear of sea-raids. That does not mean that there was no concern about maritime routes and the role and importance of ports such as Trianda and Lindos in long-distance as well as short-distance exchange networks for moving goods within the island and from and to other small islands should be emphasized.

Nonetheless the general diachronic picture for the island is rather misleading, since a different pattern seems to exist in the north and south. In the north the smaller cemeteries disappeared after the LH IIIB period, in contrast to the larger ones such as Ialysos, Kalavarda and Lelos that survived until LH IIIC (compare figs 5.123, 5.124, 5.125). This trend continued during LH IIIC. Contrary to this, the pattern in the south seems to be stable until LH IIIC. Hence only in the north is there a decrease in sites. This might be partly due to the fact that most of the cemeteries consist of a single tomb and more research and evidence might alter the present picture. Nonetheless with the present evidence a tendency to nucleation could be suggested for the northern part of the island, especially around Trianda during LH IIIB and even more so in the LH IIIC period.

On Kos the ten cemeteries allow us to make a good assessment (fig.5.55). The relatively simple geographic characteristics and the fertile plain on the northern part on the island give a straightforward image of the cemetery pattern. To the southern part of the island are Eleona and Halasarna, both close to the sea, as was Seraglio and most probably the recently excavated Iraklis site. The average distance between the cemeteries seems to have been 3.58kms and the median one 3kms, giving the pattern of this period in eastern and central Kos, leaving a large question mark for the absence of evidence from the western Kephalos region. Kos seems more densely occupied in the north and east, while

the distances between the cemeteries seem to be quite smaller than on Rhodes. In fact the pattern is closer to the Argolid, but this cannot be overstretched since the topography of the island, in a way similar to the Argive plain, must have played an important role in this.

On Kos chamber tombs appeared in the eastern part of the island in LH IIB-III A1 (fig.5.119) and LH III A2 (fig.5.126), while in LH IIIB cemeteries spread to the central part of the island (fig.5.127). However during LH IIIC fewer cemeteries are found (fig.5.128), mainly concentrated around Eleona and Langada. They were placed inland and perhaps enjoyed the protection offered by the settlement at Seraglio. The available evidence is limited, but they could suggest a nucleation trend around Kos as in northern Rhodes in LH IIIC.

PART III:
BURIALS

CHAPTER 6: BURIAL PRACTICES AND TRADITIONS

Moving to the burial practices and traditions is the next step for a better understanding of the South-eastern Aegean. In order to evaluate the beliefs related to mortuary studies in this region, it is of paramount importance to discuss first the wider problems of burial data, as well as what we can extract from them in a theoretical framework. After reviewing the theories that have influenced burial studies, the customs, beliefs and practices will be seen in an intercultural context. Moreover the individuality versus collectivity expressed in burials will be discussed, while the way horizontal and vertical divisions are manifested or should be addressed will be also considered. Symbolism is important in this context, and in some cultures the role of ancestors is also fundamental. Furthermore the central importance of rituals will be demonstrated and the way they can generate power and through it manifest specific ideologies, making the burial context an active socio-political arena. Finally, the way exchange and consumption are interrelated in relation to value will be assessed in conjunction with the burial framework and their role in the expression of socio-political ideologies.

6.1 The Theoretical Background

Death and burial are integrated in a sequence of events that relates time, space and people. Death is the most certain thing in one's life and omnipresent in all societies, however the response to it varies enormously. Through burials people tend to come together and confirm collectivity, social and moral cohesion and they ultimately reproduce society itself, as Durkheim (1964: 414) has argued.

Building on that idea van Gennep (1975: 2-3) related mortuary practices with other ritual activities and proposed the existence of a tripartite system he called 'rites of passage'. These are divided into ceremonial rites of separation, transition and incorporation to the new social or cosmic conditions (van Gennep 1975: 10-1). Especially in funerary contexts he observed that the rites of separation are less frequent

and often quite simple, while the transitional ones lasted longer and were far more complex (van Gennep 1975: 146). The rites of passage are closely associated with the incorporation of the person into society, the nature of the expressed symbolisms and the moral relativity of cultures (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 29-30). Metcalf and Huntington (1992: 112) recognize the usefulness and validity of van Gennep's arguments, though only when they are connected to the values and beliefs of the specific culture under research. Moreover they can reveal a dynamic dialogue between the rite of passage scheme and the symbolisms of the particular society.

Hertz combined both the beliefs of Durkheim and van Gennep in a more solid way (Bloch and Parry 1982: 4). He believed that a person, as well as being an individual, was also a social being and his/her death was a threat to the society and for that reason there were two mortuary phases (Hertz 1905/6: 123-5). The first is called disaggregation and is related to the temporal disposal of the deceased, while the second is the reinstallation phase, when a secondary burial is performed where collectivity is highlighted (Hertz 1905/6: 136-7). Hence the first ceremony gives time for the society to readjust and the second finalizes the transfer of the soul of the dead and the return to normality for the living.

Under the influence of processual archaeology, mortuary studies concentrated more on social structure. Saxe formed eight hypothesis for reviewing and underlining status and the social *persona* of the deceased, as well as for understanding the complexity of society through the burial framework (McHugh 1999: 4-5; Parker Pearson 1999: 29-30). The basic problem in his arguments and points is that the variables that have a social meaning are not always known; thus it is very difficult to distinguish the important from the less important ones in order to interpret the particular society (McHugh 1999: 6). Saxe's hypothesis 8 has received special attention; he argued that the appearance of formal cemeteries was a result of increased competition for access to essential resources and that descent groups tried to monopolize them, justifying this through their lineage with the deceased (Morris 1991: 147; Parker Pearson 1999: 30). Goldstein (1981: 61) expanded this idea forming three more sub-hypotheses: the first is that one means of ritualization of the mortuary practice is to maintain a permanent disposal ground for the deceased, the second is that the particular area represents a

corporate group that exercises control over the limited resources, expressed through strong linear descent from the dead, and the third is that the more formal the disposal area is the fewer the alternative interpretations of social organisation will be. Morris (1991: 148-9, 163) used these hypotheses in Greek and Roman contexts and concluded that they were only useful when applied in a more dynamic and agent-oriented way, always in conjunction to the specific socio-cultural context.

Another influential set of beliefs was proposed by Binford (1972: 232-3) who believed in the direct association between social rank of the deceased and the people who had a relationship with him/her, while the social *personae* should vary in the funerary practices according to the social position of the deceased in life. Moreover he correlated the organization of the society with the symbolisms of the social *persona* found in burials (Binford 1972: 234-5, 239). Criticism of his ideas concentrates on the fact that the subsistence economy he used in cross-cultural assessment of social complexity is quite unclear, and subject to environmental and other variables, also that the archaeological record does not always give a representative image of the symbolisms in burials and that he was uninterested in the ideological and ritual aspects of the funeral data (McHugh 1999: 8). Furthermore Whitley (1991: 31) concluded that the complexity of society is analogous to the differentiation in the mortuary practices with the social structures and thus horizontal social position is emphasized (Parker Pearson 1999: 31).

Tainter (1975: 1-2), following Saxe and Binford, believes that status during lifetime is reflected in the symbolisms of the mortuary rituals and that this has a universal application. He associated rank with energy expenditure in the funerary framework, something that is recognized in the elaboration of the facility, method of disposal of the deceased, the treatment of the corpse and the nature of the grave offerings (Tainter 1975: 2). His ideas are based on ethnographic studies tested with mathematic formulae applicable to all societies (Tainter 1975: 13-4). However, Ucko (1969/70: 273) warns us about the use of ethnographic parallels, expressing his pessimism as regards to the ability of archaeologists to understand burial traditions and practices of past societies. The monolithic explanation of energy expenditure as a result of status can be also criticized. Moreover horizontal differentiation is not considered, the quantitative and qualitative form of energy expenditure cannot always be adequately

assessed, while part of the expenditure might not be archaeologically visible and overall diachronic change is not regarded as a possibility (McHugh 1999: 9-11; Wason 1996: 78, 86; Whitley 1991: 28). To put it more simply a number of variables can affect energy expenditure and Tainter's model only reviews one.

The perspective of processual archaeology on the funerary record is inadequate on its own, since it concentrates on the extent to which it reflects the social hierarchy. Thus other dimensions of the funerary context, such as horizontal or ethnic, are not sought, the ritual and ceremonial elements of the practices are ignored, and a single attitude to death is imposed in all cases, despite evidence that this is not always the reality (Goody 1962: 42; McHugh 1999: 12-3). Furthermore ethnographic information is used in a general and simplistic manner, often creating intercultural rules and formulae applicable to all societies and all historical instances. However, ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies are useful tools, not to show intercultural and inter-social trends and models, but rather to enrich the researcher's understanding of funerary practices and traditions and thus the possibilities of interpretation.

6.2 Burial Customs, Beliefs and Practices

There are some common themes and ideas related to burial customs, beliefs and practices that are found across cultures, that can enrich our understanding of past funerary traditions.

A belief in an afterlife is frequently manifested in the deposition of offerings in the funerary context (Ucko 1969/70: 264-5). The soul leaves the body and after a journey goes to the afterworld, a pleasant place commonly situated at a subterranean site, beyond the sea on an island or lakeshore, or in the sky and the clouds (Durkheim 1964: 244-5; Goody 1962: 14; van Gennep 1975: 152-4). This journey in many cultures has to do with crossing water, either the sea or a river, which if unsuccessful, would result in a wandering and dangerous ghost (Merrifield 1987: 64). Perhaps this trans-cultural belief is based on the appearance of the deceased in dreams, as well as beliefs

and ideas connected to death and the afterlife in the specific society under review (Durkheim 1964: 288).

Responses to death vary enormously and, apart from lamentation, dances might be performed, as in the case of the Merina and the Nyakyusa people, demonstrating courage and strength against death (Bloch 1971: 155; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 55). Lamentation can also be a carrier of memory of individuals through verbal recital and a necessary part of the burial rituals for a 'good death' (Hallam and Hockey 2001: 191-2). Colour symbolism on garments of the deceased and/or mourners is also attested with black, white and red being the most frequent (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 63-4). Hair has in many cases a special treatment, either cut or let to grow, sometimes even both by different members of the same social group (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 67; Parker Pearson 1999: 46, 143). The same idea is seen in the noise or silence observed by people.

Pollution is another common belief, connected not only with the fear of natural decay, but more importantly, based on the idea that the deceased is not yet a spiritual entity and therefore potentially a threat to the living (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 80-1). The kin relationship is the basic criterion for the degree of pollution that often ends with the transition of the deceased to a spirit (Bloch 1971: 145; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 81-2). Washing is most commonly considered the proper purification for the pollution from the deceased, along with certain actions and a given time period (Bloch 1982: 226; Goody 1962: 41).

Secondary treatment of burials is also common when the deceased is in its spiritual form and is often associated with clean bones, as in the example of the Merina and Bara people (Bloch 1971: 121-2; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 85-6). This is followed by the movement of the corpse from the temporary burial ground to a permanent one, with the dead being now anonymous and not harmful to the living (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 97). In the case of the Merina people the anonymous deceased becomes part of the ancestors, when his/her memory is forgotten, something that should not be equated with ancestor worship (Bloch 1971: 124-5).

All of these customs should be viewed in conjunction with their social, cultural, historical and ideological context in order to be understood.

6.3 Communalism versus Individuality?

At death the group, social, tribal or kin, is gathered to manifest its unity, as Durkheim (1964: 414) has argued, transforming the burial process into a theatrical stage where a number of signals, symbols and messages, most often multivariant, are transmitted to the participant. In order to demonstrate this it is necessary to understand why people meet and how this re-grouping takes place and is emphasized.

Death is frequently seen by people as a threat to the moral order of the society and the funeral ceremonies help in the restoration of this order and the social equilibrium (Goody 1962: 28; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 51-2). This is emphasized even more in the case of communal burials where social differentiation is either masked or highlighted depending on the social structure and the particular culture. Nevertheless the change from individual to collective burial further underlines the membership of a person in a group and their status (Wason 1996: 92). Physically, social collectivity can be shown with the mingling of bones, when the individual loses its personality and is integrated into the whole social body (Brown 1995: 5). This idea is expressed in the case of the Merina people at Madagascar, where there was a fear of being alone in life and death (Bloch 1971: 165). Bloch (1971: 170) stresses that the ceremonies emphasize the unity of the dead and the tomb, while at the same time the person is depersonalized as Brown argued earlier.

The emotional impact of death is intense and usually grief, sadness, fear and sometimes anger are interrelated and expressed variously in funerary contexts (Merrifield 1987: 59; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 43). Especially when the social group is of limited size, the loss of an individual might be a very significant event (Brown 1981: 28). The relationship between ritual and emotion is inextricably linked and one does not determine the other (Bloch 1982: 214; Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 2-4 *contra* Durkheim 1964: 397). Mourning and lamentation are the most common emotional expressions of the survivors, which in many cases coincide temporally with the transitional period of the deceased. The temporal duration of mourning also depends on the degree of kin-relationship one has with the dead, according to the standards set by the particular society (van Gennep 1975: 146-7). Furthermore the number of participants

may in some instances be related to the status of the particular deceased (McHugh 1999: 52). Thus solidarity is expressed through mourning and lamentation commonly held by the group for the deceased.

Communality is also manifested in the funerary practices when common meals are held in honour of the deceased during various stages of the funerary rites of passage (Bloch 1971: 152-3; Burkert 1996: 193; Garland 1985: 36-7, 39-40). Thus the bonds of the group are reaffirmed by all the participants, expressing again solidarity, while there are instances where the deceased is believed to participate in them (Durkheim 1964: 337; van Gennep 1975: 164-5).

The human corpse is always the focal point in all burial practices, inhumation or cremation, the real protagonist even if there is a secondary treatment and the corpse is dismembered or disarticulated inside/outside the tomb. It has been extensively and variously treated as a symbolic expression with multilevel meanings marking differences between groups, social, cultural or other. According to Chapman (2000: 175) the more complete the corpse is, the more clear is the expression of his/her social *persona* and the more easily is the social or cultural message transmitted. Therefore its visibility during the rituals is of great importance (McHugh 1999: 51-2). The orientation of the corpse links space and meaning, sometimes creating axes, like a compass (McHugh 1999: 43; Parker Pearson 1999: 54). The treatment of the human body may mark social inequality in a clear way to the participants. However, similarities and even uniformity in the practices may give the impression of an egalitarian society, while the opposite is true (McHugh 1999: 55). In other words the elite might have been able to impose these similar practices as a result of their extended power and influence. There are also the cases of cenotaphs where the notion of the individual is expressed without being there physically and all the rituals are performed as if they were there (Parker Pearson 1999: 55-6). This practice definitely highlights the importance of the mortuary rituals, the individual as well as the communal beliefs about the deceased and their souls.

However individuality is recognized not only in the person of the deceased, but for each participant who is an active agent in the process. For Barrett (2000: 61, 66) action, time, space and agency are interrelated and people tend to understand the world

according to past prejudices shared with others and become social beings through the discourse relationships with power, following the ideas expressed by Foucault. The bond between agent and society is also stressed by Dobres and Robb (2000: 4, 8). In this respect material culture is an important arena for manipulation and expression of social conditions, although there is no consensus on the active or passive role of an artefact in this process. Nevertheless material culture ultimately reveals social heterogeneity rather than constructing universally applicable rules (Brumfield 2000: 253; Dobres and Robb 2000: 12, 14; Wobst 2000: 47).

What we can infer from the points raised is that communality and individuality are two interrelated ideas and practices that are separated only when it is socially and/or culturally important to do so. The interpretation of events relies on the individual who is embedded in the society that brought him up and its collective beliefs, although resistance to past ideas is not infrequent. The interaction between individual and communality can be seen in the case of the corpse, which is taken to the tomb as a member of the communality and then left on its own in the tomb, in the case of single burials. At the same time the deceased in his/her grave becomes part of a wider cemetery, an area of people with similar and sometimes shared social and cultural identities. In multiple burials, after a liminal period, the remains of the deceased are no longer part of an individual, but of a larger family through the disarticulation of the remains.

6.4 Horizontal Divisions

Gender is a frequent form of horizontal division in society. It is culturally, socially and in some cases politically constructed and maintained (Parker Pearson 1999: 95). Moreover social changes and gender roles might be visible in the funerary context through diachronic analysis (Gibbs 1987: 87; Hodder 1984: 66). There are cases of women being placed in specific locations or excluded from burials, while orientation differences are not unknown (McHugh 1999: 30-1). Also the female role in ceremonies

such as mourning may have symbolic significance related to fertility and sexuality, while status can be applied differently according to gender (McHugh 1999: 31-2, 35-7). The more balanced the presentation of status in both sexes is, the more important is heredity in highlighting rank (Wason 1996: 98). Furthermore age variables may play a significant role, proportional or not to the gender representation, in the funerary context. Mortuary evidence is inadequate on its own to reveal the picture of gender in society, since in most cases we do not understand the gender roles in everyday life and how or if these are presented in burials.

Age is another dimension closely related to social beliefs. Adulthood is perhaps the most important distinction in society, and is often accompanied by a series of ceremonies and rites of passage (McHugh 1999: 20). Adult status might be manifested with specific artefacts placed in the grave or by just having a 'proper' burial. Moreover marriage might also be a dimension of significance and symbolically emphasized in the accompanying objects (McHugh 1999: 22-3). Archaeologically age differentiation in treatment is seen in the case of child burials, as they have not achieved any social status. Nonetheless some social characteristics are recognized in some cases only automatically with birth of the few children that are higher in the social hierarchy and thus their importance is underlined in the burial context (Brown 1981: 28-9, 31; McHugh 1999: 24; van Gennep 1975: 160-1). When child burials are associated with inherited status, they ultimately reassure the stability of the status system in the local society. However there are societies where child burial is disassociated from social changes or social structures and reflects tribal, cultic, personal or other concerns (McHugh 1999: 26). Therefore child burials should not be equated only with status manifestations, but should be viewed in their wider socio-political framework.

Ethnic groupings may have a horizontal dimension, as much as vertical, in some societies. Their role in the construction of the social *persona* and the way they can be expressed were discussed in detail in 2.3.2. However, it must be stressed that in the mortuary context the rituals used strengthen the tradition and the identity, highlighting the social and cosmological order with specific symbols and signs (Beck 1995: 171). Sometimes even the inclusion of a burial in the cemetery is indicative of its membership of a specific ethnic group. The most interesting and perhaps significant point raised by

Beck is that the particular selection of symbols in the funeral and the manner of their application will not be encountered outside the membership of that ethnic group (1995: 172). The same ideas can be used for clan or tribal divisions in societies, making the analysis and understanding of horizontal divisions more difficult. Perhaps the last point raised by Beck, the characteristics of the specific society and the size of the sample, might differentiate ethnic from clan or tribal groupings.

One more grouping that can be included, with some caution, is religious affiliations. Sometimes researchers are too concerned to rationalize burial evidence and identify social, political or economic variables. There are many instances where afterlife and religious beliefs are expressed in the orientation of grave or corpse and through the offerings (McHugh 1999: 48). The position of the objects in the tomb might have a special significance or symbolism, while others might be placed as offerings to powers of the underworld in order to allow a safe passage of the soul to the underworld (Merrifield 1987: 66).

Competition between horizontal groups is very difficult to comprehend, since its symbolic significance is as different as its expression. Moreover, it interrelates indistinguishably with vertical divisions in most of the cases in no set or clear way. There are also cases where the types of horizontal differentiation mentioned above might have a vertical expression in the burial context and at the same time the importance of different groups in the same society might change over time. Therefore close analysis and several methods should be used, taking into account all the possible interpretations of the burial evidence in the research.

6.5 Vertical Divisions

Wealth and hierarchy, as we saw before, were core interests of processualists and although many of their methodologies and beliefs have been heavily criticized, the importance of social stratification and complexity in burial context has not been undermined. Nonetheless, in the previous section it became apparent that they might depend on or highlight other social divisions such as age, gender or any other horizontal

differentiation (Pader 1982: 59). Social stratification should be defined in pre-capitalist societies not as class, but rather as the amalgam of status, power and class (Parker Pearson 1999: 83).

The importance of rank is seen and created from the emergence of hereditary inequality that is accompanied in some cases by the rise of rulers (Brown 1981: 26; Whitley 1991: 29). This outlook should not be limited to a passive image, but rather seem as a dynamic process that changes over time and space. Social hierarchy emerges from the competition for wealth and/or alliances such as marriage, but it is independent of specific surplus control and is demonstrated through social custom and ceremonies (Brown 1981: 26-7). It seems more likely that the emergence of rank is a result of power that is achieved through the control of important resources or of communication networks; however, depending on the size of the society, age, gender and personality may matter more in burials (Brown 1981: 28). The most important of manifestation of wealth, status, rank or social differentiation in the material culture is either one or a combination of several items, ranging from the tomb and its construction, to the flowers and the meal after the burial. In the burial context, hierarchy may be closely related to exchange and inequality in the distribution and consumption of prestige goods, as well as control over rituals (Kristiansen 1984: 85-6). Thus special importance is placed on the value of the objects and the various symbolisms of the items in the tomb, as well as their position in relation to the deceased, matters that will concern us later on (Parker Pearson 1999: 78-9). There is also the issue of inheritance, which is related to rank and/or status, with material possessions being transferred from the deceased to the survivors upon death or at some point during the burial process. However the quest for rank as a measure of social organization might not be of any use when the study is concerned with power and ideology (Parker Pearson 1999: 94). Burial analysis can give us evidence of social inequalities in a cycle of production, distribution and consumption (Trinkaus 1995: 71).

6.6 Ancestors and Symbolism

When there is a belief in the ancestors manifested in the funerary practice, then we are dealing with a suppression of individuality that is frequently associated with disarticulation of bones (Scarre 1994: 80). At the same time communal cohesion and solidarity is emphasized, as in the case of the megalithic tombs of Neolithic Europe. This relation of ancestors, land and imposing burial constructions is also seen in the case of the Merina people of Madagascar, expressing solidarity and an idealized way of life at the same time (Bloch 1971: 112, 114; 1982: 211). Moreover, through ancestors, the collective local memory can be stored and be protected from oblivion, including identities that may pass to the next generation (Hallam and Hockey 2001: 4).

However a distinction must be made between the cult of the dead and mortuary rituals associated with an ancestor cult. In the first individuality and competition are underlined, while in the latter membership and cohesion are highlighted (Morris 1991: 153-4). The rituals that are used for the first are associated with the separation of the deceased from the living, while in the second the rituals provide continued access to the deceased in the afterworld, and at the same time the ancestors are sometimes considered as playing an active role in the rituals of the living (Barrett 1999a: 397; Morris 1991: 150). The movement of disarticulated skeletal remains may symbolize the transition of the recently deceased from the living to the ancestors (Edmonds 1999: 58-9; Kirk 1993: 204). This movement may entail washing bones and taking them outside under the sunlight and then back into the tomb. Thus the deceased becomes part of the clan or local ancestors and the person's memory revives as in some exhumation cases (Hallam and Hockey 2001: 192). Ancestors serve as an ideal image of the past and its continuity is manifested through the rituals in which the depersonalized ancestors and time dissolve and acquire static and timeless roles (Pader 1982: 39). Thus time, ideals, beliefs, ancestors and living are all amalgamated into one entity that ensures continuity and cosmological equilibrium. Ultimately the continuation of the social order through time, a triumph over death and immortality is achieved through the ancestors (Parker Pearson 1999: 143).

After the loss of someone, readjustment to the new conditions means also the transfer of rights, property and even status among the descendants, because without inheritance and succession tension and ultimately conflict would occur (Goody 1962: 30). The link is even more important when death, property and ancestors are related, since claims on land and resources can be made and established. This can be demonstrated in the case of the Merina people, where the descent group is reunited in the land of the ancestors in a process that also fabricates the ideal social order (Bloch and Parry 1982: 36; Scarre 1994: 80). However the importance of descent groups and inheritance should not be overstressed, as Morris warns that it is not always clear when the transfer of inheritance takes place in each society (1991: 152). The vagueness of the rights over crucial resources, as well as the notion of property, depends on historical conditions (Morris 1991: 155). Moreover his analysis of the cemeteries of Athens and Rome proves that the transmission of property was disconnected from the existence of either specific burial places or increased elaboration of the tombs (Morris 1991: 161). Additionally we should avoid calling all the dead ancestors, as Whitley (2002a: 122) points out, but evidence should be provided such as rituals and beliefs that favour this hypothesis.

Symbolic meaning is a result of the world we create around us since we are active members in society, but the material culture through which symbolism is expressed differs from culture to culture due to several variables, economic, physical, environmental and social (Hodder 1998: 11-2). Moreover there is a certain dialectic between the object and the context from which each one takes its meaning (Hodder 1998: 15). Symbols are negotiated and manipulated according to the social practice, while they have the ability to mask, contradict or manipulate certain messages or social relationships (Hodder 1998: 26, 41).

Death in general and ancestor cult is expressed through symbols in the mortuary rituals. In many cases the continuity of the society and the importance of the ancestors is marked by symbols expressing sexuality and fertility and strengthening collectivity (Metcalf and Huntington 1992: 108; Parker Pearson 1999: 158). Bloch demonstrates this point in the case of the Merina people and their *famadihana*, the secondary treatment of

the deceased (1971: 221). However sexuality can be considered in opposition to fertility, the former to be related with women and the latter with men as in the case of the Dobuan, Bara and Lugbara people (Bloch and Parry 1982: 19, 21-2). In many cultures death and birth are seen as the same thing, as if life is an eternal cycle rather than a beginning and an end in a linear fashion (Bloch 1982: 218-9; Bloch and Parry 1982: 9, 15). Fertility is seen as the driving force for the rebirth of people, animals and land, thus the revitalization and continuity of the cosmological order is secured. Solar symbolism also occurs in many cultures, for example the Neolithic burials of North-western Europe and the pyramids in Egypt (Hodder 1984: 64; Scarre 1994: 77).

Bartel (1982: 51-3) gives a good general picture of the symbolic acts that can be performed in the funerary context. The treatment of the corpse, its washing and dressing in special clothes, the lamentation, the procession of the people to the burial ground, the grave goods, the feast and the revisiting of the tomb have varying degrees of symbolic significance according to each society and culture. However it remains uncertain to what extent the pre-mortem and post-mortem events are important in understanding the social attitude towards death (Bartel 1982: 55).

Symbolism is mainly expressed through the material culture, either in the form of specific items, as in the case of Bronze Age Hungary with the social boundaries set in the burial landscape to demarcate different tribal groups, or in the form of spatial arrangement of burials in Bronze Age Scandinavia and the role of bronzes in that burial context (O'Shea 1995: 140, 143-4; Sørensen 1987: 101). The symbolism of material culture is the medium by which communality, individuality, vertical and horizontal differentiation, rituals, traditions, power, and ancestors are expressed more successfully. At the same time we should always bear in mind that the symbols associated with the deceased depend upon the survivors and may be representative of him/her or not, expressing social order or the political use of the deceased or even both, depending on the context (Brown 1995: 19-21). Nonetheless burials are not random samples of material items in use at the time of the deposition, but rather a choice and response to the society and culture. One variable that emerges from ethnoarchaeological parallels is the durability of an object associated with death that is inextricably linked to its temporal qualities (Hallam and Hockey 2001: 48). Although the practices are inherited from the

past, they are modified on every new occasion, consciously or not, allocating identities to the deceased according to the needs of the social conditions (Whitley 1991: 32-3).

6.7 Rituals, Power and Ideology

All actions are unique in time and space and not entirely free from past ones (Hodder 1987b: 9), however routine actions limit the conduct of new ones (Mizoguchi 1993: 223). Mizoguchi (1993: 224) also believes that the deceased do not make decisions for their funerals and the messages given in the funeral are mainly of and for the living and only partly of the deceased. However this is not certain since there might be societies where the person could direct and dictate his/her funeral. Past actions and memories of how past deceased were treated affect the next funeral (Mizoguchi 1993: 225).

Ritual is a form of communication, of expression and of understanding, actions that draw heavily on past experience, knowledge and understanding of the world (Barrett 1991: 1-2). Talk, movement and material culture in specific places and/or times are interrelated, signifying and symbolizing meanings that can be variously interpreted, re-interpreted, challenged, created, re-invented and recalled in various contexts (Douglas and Isherwood 1980: 65). Formalism is an important part of the rituals, where restrictions on gestures and verbal expression underline hierarchical identities and power inequalities, as Foucault (4.1.1) has suggested (Bell 1997: 139-41). However openness of the rituals lay with the members that participate in them, but most importantly in the wide range and freedom of their interpretation, while at the same time continuity is underlined, linking the present practices with the past (Barrett 1991: 5; Bell 1997: 136, 145; Garwood 1991: 13). Rituals are related to actions rather than places, where everyday items can be used creating shared discursive knowledge (Barrett 1999a: 396; Hallam and Hockey 2001: 179). Mortuary ritual in particular is an open arena where the intervention of ancestors in life or ideas of death and rebirth can be constructed effectively (Barrett 1999a: 397). Though it must be noted that funerary rituals give meaning to the existence of a person and a destiny and consequently death reveals the meaning of life and not necessarily religion itself (Parker Pearson 1999: 147). For

Thomas (1991: 33), rituals are performed in a way so as to minimize the interpretation, although it remains an arena for negotiating meanings. In the burial context he highlights the cultural connotations and relations of objects that exist in the tombs with the external world in order to appreciate their ritual role (Thomas 1991: 34). Part of this process must have been the re-arrangement of the contents of a tomb for the reading and interpretation of the rituals according to the temporary moment of the funerary process. The ritual has the ability to legitimize and naturalize ideas and social inequalities and is recognized by its formality, the context and the time it happens, manifesting stability, diachronic values and cosmological order (Bell 1997: 94, 137; Bourdieu 1977: 117-9; Pader 1982: 37-8). Nonetheless the difference between ritual and non-ritual is not always rigid or archaeologically visible, but is considered as an action different from the everyday and context-dependent (Pader 1982: 37, 41). Funerary ritual is perhaps one of the most important processes where the society of the living can be organized and the past values reconfirmed and re-established (Pader 1982: 42). Rituals reflect several processes, such as exercise of power, status maintenance, exchange networks, competition for areas, labour and social groups (Trinkaus 1995: 54).

Power is omnipresent in social actions and has a positive as much as negative value depending on its use and the context in which it is used, as Foucault has suggested and has been discussed in Part II. Power is not owned by individuals or people, but rather exercised by them, nonetheless that is not always clear to all people (Miller and Tilley 1984: 6; Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 129-30; 1996b: 73). 'Power over' means that the individual or group is doing something that it otherwise would not, underlining the concept of domination and social control. Nonetheless power remains a dialectic concept, since resistance to the exercise of control can be made (Miller and Tilley 1984: 8). Power can be achieved through limitations on access to and regulation of resources, either material or not, as is the case of knowledge and rituals.

Power can be an important element in the burial process, since the deceased is transferring it to the living, either to individuals or to the whole group. This inheritance can take several forms and can be considered as a gift of the individual dead person or of the ancestors in general as in the case of the Merina people (Bloch 1982: 212). Thus the

past is constantly reconfirming and re-establishing identity or identities in the present, adding one more dimension to the mortuary framework, that of politics. Ancestors, land, group and power merge in one whole in space and time, underlining the importance of the burial practice. Competition for power between groups might not be always visible, but becomes more apparent in times of social and economic stress, underlining identities of all kinds (Parker Pearson 1984: 61-2; 1999: 87).

The combination of memory, knowledge and restricted access can help in the reproduction of static and organic models in society and all this is accomplished through the use of rituals (Mizoguchi 1993: 233). Even the concept of time can be changed through the manipulation of past memories. Competition over the dominant interpretation of rituals is frequent through the creation and/or re-creation of past actions, which would be considered as unaltered and orthodox by the participants (Mizoguchi 1993: 231). A good example of this is the megalithic tombs in Neolithic Europe, where they are thought to symbolize communal effort and the heroic ancestors who legitimize and assure the transfer of power to the successors (Kristiansen 1984: 81; Sharples 1985: 73). In Neolithic Orkney, tombs also mark territoriality, although when there is a more centralized social structure these tombs are a challenge to the authority and thus their destruction is hardly a surprise (Sharples 1985: 73). Barrett (1991: 5) elaborates all these ideas, suggesting that the power of ritual is not only for the dominant political groups, but more importantly it is the metaphor that makes everyday values seem to derive from a different world, perhaps that of the ancestors. Hodder (2000: 23) adds that it is necessary to underline also the creativity and the intentionality in the actions of people and not only to relate them to control and power.

Symbolism through rituals can be used for the exercise of power, although what is necessary on a larger scale than in a small social group is a shared ideology. Ideology and power are inextricably linked with social practices and the reproduction of society as a whole (Miller and Tilley 1984: 14). As we have mentioned before, the burial context emphasizes the unchanged order and the legitimization of the traditional authority, but at the same time it is an arena for challenge (Bloch and Parry 1982: 11; Spriggs 1984: 3). Bloch (1982: 227) emphasized that there were three stages for the construction of

ideology in the mortuary practices of Merina people. The first stage was concerned with pollution and sorrow, the second was the homogeneous result of the first and the legitimization of authority through the manifestation of fertility, and the third was that the authority was demonstrated as natural and frequently expressed at the expense of women.

Miller and Tilley (1984: 13-4; Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 181) offer a model of ideology. Firstly it is believed that society is analyzed in terms of conflicting group interests, secondly the social group that tries or has the power wants to represent its interests as part of the cultural world, thirdly these representations try to exhibit the partial as universal, coherence when there is conflict and the cultural as natural, fourthly power ideology may be one of the means for maintaining social control, fifthly ideology is not equated with all social practices, but only with those that generate conflicts in interests and sixthly there are always groups that oppose the dominant ideology and can overcome its control.

The strength of death in this framework is the renegotiation that takes place at several levels, such as political, social, economic and religious expressed through symbols (Barrett 1999a: 396). The identification of the social reality as the natural one reflects also the cosmological equilibrium as the aim of ideology. Ideology is an active part of human life expressed through action and the material culture, constantly transforming, though giving the illusion of stasis and hiding the contradictions it produces from the actors (Miller and Tilley 1984: 14; Parker Pearson 1984: 61; Shanks and Tilley 1996a: 181). However ideology is not always manipulating people or ideas and even if it exists it is possible in some cases that burials might reflect an accurate picture of the particular society (McHugh 1999: 16-7).

6.8 Exchange, Consumption and Value

The offerings in burials can be viewed as reciprocal exchanges between the deceased, his family, the ancestors in general or the spirits of the afterworld, depending on the culture or beliefs. Exchange is part of a wider control of access to vital or restricted

resources that ultimately leads to social inequality, frequently underlined in the mortuary practices (Barrett 1999a: 395; Sahlins 1974: 206; Trinkaus 1995: 56). Exchange and value are interdependent and one does not exist without the other, while according to Appadurai politics creates the link between them (2001: 3; McLellan 2000: 474; Miller and Tilley 1984: 9).

Gifts are perhaps the earliest forms of exchange. Although apparently voluntary they are not, and Mauss points out the obligations they create (1969: 1; Sahlins 1974: 153). Friendship, social bonds and a number of different sentiments are inextricably linked with gifts, while refusal to accept them varies from humiliation to a declaration of war. Thus an important factor in gift-exchange is the timing of the return gift, as well as the style this is done (Bourdieu 1977: 5-6). Gift-giving is a form of social contract between groups, without the need for a state, as Sahlins stresses (1974: 169). Antagonism and rivalry are the other side of the coin that are generated from gifts as in the case of the *potlatch* seen in the wealthy Chinook Indian tribes of North-western America (Mauss 1969: 4). The occasions on which they are given or received are numerous and varied, but they always represent prestige and honour for the donor and the receiver. Gift obligations and asymmetries create inequalities closely related to power, status and even moral superiority among people and/or groups (Berking 1999: 7-8). Thus in many cases the burial context becomes an arena of social imbalance that creates and reflects it at the same time.

Reciprocity is another form of exchange where two parties are engaged in a dialectic manner, while in the case of redistribution a central authority is required, emphasizing the communality of the group and their subordination to the chief (Berking 1999: 36; Sahlins 1974: 188-90). The forms of reciprocity have varied characteristics, but they all contain social, economic and moral aspects (Appadurai 2001: 9; Sahlins 1974: 200). The accumulation of gifts is the means to acquire symbolic capital, in non-monetary societies, and consequently symbolic power with all the connotations it may have in the specific socio-cultural framework (Berking 1999: 40-1). The transition from symmetric reciprocity to asymmetric redistribution highlights the social transformation from horizontal to vertical hierarchy (Berking 1999: 40).

Gift-giving and various forms of reciprocity can coexist, even with redistribution, as can be seen in the case of the *kula* exchanges, as Malinowski (1960: 363, 510-1) has demonstrated in Polynesia, where rituals play an important role in the processes undertaken. The social surrounding of the kin-group creates concentric circles that describe the way the form of reciprocity takes place and the social and moral importance in the interaction of the two parties (Sahlins 1974: 279-80). The longer the spatial zone over which an exchange takes place, the more gifts tend to be of equivalent rate or value.

In order to understand the meaning of value, a good start is the general application of the supply and demand theory expressed by Adam Smith. Demand is socially dependent and rather an active process sending messages, while at the same time receiving ones (Appadurai 2001: 31). A number of factors can affect value such as ecological, practical, social, cultural, political, economic, as well as temporal. The latter especially seems to remain stable in the short term, when shortages appear, but change does occur in the long term (Sahlins 1974: 295, 308-9). The different exchange modes, their role in the community and the particular social structures affect the sensitivity to changes, as well as supply in general (Sahlins 1974: 313).

Mauss (1969: 63) has recognized that objects do not only have material value, but also emotional. In this he criticized the Marxian view of goods as items closely bound with production and labour expenditure, in a strict economicocentric outlook (McLellan 2000: 458-61). Culture highlights a collectively shared cognitive world with common beliefs, values and morals that is also expressed in objects and consequently their value (Kopytoff 2001: 70). At the same time there are idiosyncratic personal or group values creating in some instances clashes between the universal and the individual perception of things (Kopytoff 2001: 76). The level of similarity in values can be variable according to the particular context and item exchanged (Appadurai 2001: 15): The commodity is the moment in an object's life when it is exchanged for something else in a socially relevant way (Appadurai 2001: 13; Kopytoff 2001: 73). Temporal, social and cultural variables co-exist in the process of an item becoming a commodity (Appadurai 2001: 15). However it is interesting that in every society there are things

publicly denounced as commodities, with cultural, symbolic or political importance (Kopytoff 2001: 73). The latter especially can be associated in many cases with access to commodities and therefore with power, ideology and political interests. Kopytoff (2001: 83) believes that some of the power given to items is a result of individual cognitive and cultural process of emphasizing its uniqueness. In many non-complex societies the individual status of a commodity's owner, if not spirit, is added to the commodity creating part of its biography (Kopytoff 2001: 89). Thus the interaction in the exchange is emphasized, while communality through shared beliefs and morals is highlighted. Ultimately commodities and society are interrelated and interdependent especially when rituals play a prominent role, as in the occasions of burials.

Consumption of commodities may have many forms, depending on their nature as well the purpose and the context of their consumption. Their sacrificial destruction is not infrequent and has an element of sacrifice to the deities and/or dead for achieving favour and power for the benefit of an individual or the group (Berking 1999: 50; Mauss 1969: 14, 37, 72). A good example of this is the annual festival in Polynesia where the spirits visit the village and goods are sacrificially exhibited to them in order to please them (Malinowski 1960: 512).

Among the offerings to the deceased there has been attested in some instances the ceremonial breaking or 'killing' of specific objects (Grinsell 1961: 475). The purpose of such action varies: it was to assist the dead on his/her journey to the afterworld, out of fear of pollution, to symbolize authority, to release the spirit of the object to accompany the deceased, or in order for it not to be used again (Grinsell 1961: 476-8; Merrifield 1987: 64).

Consumption is the use of goods outside commerce, playing an important role in defining hierarchies and social purposes (Douglas and Isherwood 1980: 66). In celebrating specific events consumption makes statements concerning order, competition, defiance, affirmation and redefinitions of meanings (Douglas and Isherwood 1980: 68). In these cases objects are no more commodities, but rather signs that symbolize status, moral and cosmological order (Appadurai 2001: 45). An arena for putting a commodity out of circulation is the funerary context, where objects are

decommoditized through social, cultural and ritual processes (Appadurai 2001: 23). A special class is luxury objects whose existence is fundamentally political and can be singled out through the manner of their consumption rather their general category (Appadurai 2001: 38). Their characteristics can be restricted access due to 'price'-value, the complexity of acquiring them, the symbolic social message they convey, the specialized knowledge needed for their consumption and the high degree of symbolic connection between their consumption and individuality. Appadurai (20001: 57) does not restrict the political role of commodities to elite access and control, but believes that the existing framework of price and exchange is constantly renegotiated, always shifting the political balance. Value and exchange take shape through the commodity and are highly political processes, not so much in everyday activities, but rather when they are present in the ritualistic and symbolic context. Consumption of commodities in burials is evidently a multilevel stage for social, cultural, religious and political messages that can be analyzed and produce insight into these processes.

CHAPTER 7: THE MYCENAEAN BURIAL TRADITION

It is time to describe the burial traditions of the Mycenaean world. We will address issues such as the tomb types, deposition methods, related iconography, rituals, offerings, social and political dimensions and consumption in burials. Finally the main questions in the data analysis of the South-eastern Aegean will be addressed, bearing in mind both the theoretical constructs and the Mycenaean context.

7.1 The Tomb Types

The Middle Helladic burial tradition was mainly single inhumations in pit, cist or pithos graves and less often multiple ones under tumuli (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 26-7; Dickinson 1992: 43-4; Taylour 1995: 65; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 354; Vermeule 1972: 79; Wardle and Wardle 1997: 25). The extramural graves are commonly found in groups, suggesting that they belonged to the same family or clan (Dickinson 1992: 94). At the end of this period the shaft graves in the Grave Circles appeared at Mycenae, and are especially rich in offerings in comparison to everything found earlier, a situation that continued during the LH I period (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 28-9; Dickinson 1992: 45, 95; Taylour 1995: 65-70; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 354-6; Vasilikou 1995: 24-30; Vermeule 1972: 82-90; Wardle and Wardle 1997: 27).

The breakthrough in tomb construction at the start of the LH period is the introduction of multiple burials inside tholos and chamber tombs. With the presently available data, tholoi seem to have been introduced earlier than the chamber tombs (Dickinson 1996: 224-5).

Tholoi appeared in Messenia at the very end of the MH period, however their origin is a highly debated issue, seen either as a local development, a petrification of the tumuli (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 44-5; Desborough 1964: 33; Dickinson 1982: 123; 1983: 64; 1992: 100; 1996: 225-6; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 507; Vermeule 1972: 125-6) or as

Minoan influence (Hood 1960: 176; Kanta 1997: 246-7; Taylour 1995: 70; Vasilikou 1995: 122-3). As structures they are underground, circular with a beehive dome, built out of stone and covered with earth, and have a dromos that leads to the entrance of the tombs (Belli 1991: 425-6; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 45-6; Iakovidis 1969: 121-2; Mylonas 1966: 118; Pelon 1976: 267-9; Taylour 1995: 70-5; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 357; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 115-6; Vasilikou 1995: 106; Wardle and Wardle 1997: 55). Through time they increased in size and/or their masonry and construction techniques improved, while their elaboration developed as well (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 45-6; Taylour 1995: 70; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 504-7). The highest concentration is found in Messenia and the Argolid, but they also turn up in small numbers across the Mycenaean world (Mylonas 1966: 120; Pelon 1976: 392-417; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 354, 508). Their overall number is quite small when compared to the widespread chamber tombs.

Chamber tombs appeared in limited numbers in the LH I period in the Argolid, Laconia and Boeotia and spread thereafter becoming the most popular tomb type (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 48; Dickinson 1983: 61; 1992: 106-7; 1996: 230). Their prototypes are considered to be chamber tombs found at Knossos and Kythera (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 48; Dickinson 1983: 64; 1996: 223; Taylour 1995: 81). They were carved in the rock or dug in the earth and had a chamber of variable shape—rectangular, oval, circular, trapezoidal, hemispherical or irregular with a flat or concave roof, while they had a shallow entrance known as the stomion and a dromos, a passage leading to it (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 49; Desborough 1964: 32; Dickinson 1992: 98; Iakovidis 1969: 121; 1970: 3-12; Mylonas 1966: 111-2; Pantelidou 1975: 205; Stais 1895: 192-3; Taylour 1995: 81-2; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 357, 507; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 132-3; Vasilikou 1995: 103-4; Wace 1932: 135-6, 143). The chronological development of the chamber tombs can be seen in the case of the dromoi, which are initially short and wide, and later long and thin, with sides which incline inwards as their height increases (Vasilikou 1995: 104; Wace 1932: 124). Side chambers are also found in some cases as well as other peculiarities or rare characteristics (Dickinson 1992: 98; Vasilikou 1995: 103). Kontorli-Papadopoulou (1987: 158) reviewed these characteristics and suggested that they might be practical, in imitation of types from other regions,

independent local tradition, fear of robbery, religious beliefs or an expression of the social status of the owner.

Built graves were constructed like the tholoi, but their chamber and roof were similar to the rock-cut chamber tombs. In other words they were not different to the main two multiple burial types (Dickinson 1992: 97; Papadimitriou 2001: 185). They were most probably not considered desirable, judging from their small number and limited distribution mainly on the mainland, and in the course of the LH period fewer and fewer were constructed (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 46-8; Dickinson 1983: 61; 1996: 227-8).

Tumuli are the last category of multiple burials, but they are rather uncommon in this period and are found sporadically in the mainland (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 62-3).

Multiple tombs in general are quite close to settlements, up to a kilometer or so distant (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 55; 1998: 118; Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 229-30). Moreover in the Argolid it has been shown that the majority of the cemeteries are west of the settlements, except in four or five cases (Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 242).

Nevertheless single burials continued to be used during the Late Helladic period, following the Middle Helladic tradition. Pit, cist and pot graves are the commonest types found, in most cases in the same cemeteries along with chamber and tholos tombs, while the shaft graves are quite uncommon after the LH I period (Blegen *et al.* 1973: 176-8; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 62; Desborough 1964: 33-4; Dickinson 1982: 123; 1996: 227-8; Iakovidis 1970B: 21-4; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 24; Lewartowski 2000: 7-12). Other single graves are found intramurally, while they are not uncommon inside chamber and tholos tombs or in their dromoi (Blegen *et al.* 1973: 181-2, 195, 203-4, 208; Dickinson 1983: 57; 1996: 229; Iakovidis 1970B: 14-5; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 149; Pantelidou 1975: 206; Taylour 1995: 83; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 508; Wace 1932: 135-6). However they are considerably fewer in number than the chamber tombs, which clearly predominate in the Late Helladic period. From the LH IIIC period onwards there was an increase in the use of single graves of all types, a tendency that led them to predominate in the Post-Mycenaean period (Desborough 1964: 36-8).

7.2 Deposition Practices

During the Late Helladic period inhumation is the norm; however in LH III sporadic cremations appear in the Mycenaean world and increase at the end of the period.

The bodies in chamber tombs are usually supine and in an extended position, while in the single graves the extended or the contracted positions are favoured, with the head slightly raised in some cases (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 114; Lewartowski 1995: 105; Wace 1932: 139). Lewartowski (1995: 106) argues that the orientation of the bodies in chamber tombs is mainly to the east, south or north and in the single graves to the north-east, north-west and north, facing in the chamber tombs to north and west, in the single graves to south-west. Vermeule (1972: 299) argues that there was a tendency for the deceased to face towards the door of the tomb. Twice as many people were placed on their left sides as on their right sides inside single graves (Lewartowski 2000: 58). Right and left seem not to have been of any particular importance for the placement of the offerings and the position of the body was most probably influenced by personal preference, local traditions or ritual beliefs (Lewartowski 2000: 51, 53). The offerings were placed mainly by the head, the middle part of the body and the hips, while in chamber tombs deposits by the legs are more common than in the single graves (Lewartowski 1995: 109). However in the LH III period in chamber tombs offerings close to the head and legs decreased, though in the single graves there is an increase in offerings by the legs and close to the head (Lewartowski 1995: 110).

Another infrequent practice is the deposition of the corpse in a wooden coffin or bier positioned inside chamber tombs (Iakovidis 1969: 123; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 21; Mylonas 1948: 69; Vermeule 1965: 124). Hägg and Sieurin (1982: 178-80 *contra* Vermeule 1972: 301) have convincingly argued in favour of the custom's mainland origin from the MH III/LH I period at sites in the Argolid and Athens. Wooden coffins were later introduced on Crete during the LM II period, probably as a result of mainland influence, later to be replaced by clay ones (Demakopoulou 1997: 101-2; Hägg and Sieurin 1982: 180-2; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 561). Nevertheless clay larnakes are also found in the mainland, though sporadically, at Thebes, Mycenae, Prosymna and Ayios Kosmas (Iakovidis 1966: 46; Wace 1932: 139-40). However the largest concentration of clay

larnakes is at Tanagra, where they are found widespread inside the local chamber tombs dating to the LH IIIA and B period (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 46; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 508-9; Vasilikou 1995: 337-8; Vermeule 1965: 125; 1972: 210).

Cremations are rare and only start appearing in the LH IIIA period (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 156; Melas 1984: 33; Vermeule 1972: 301). This custom has been found sporadically in Greece throughout the ages, but during this period it was reintroduced and the South-eastern Aegean seems to have played a pivotal role in this diffusion (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 25; Melas 1984: 28-30). They are found either inside urns or in heaps inside the chamber tombs or in pits alongside the other inhumations (Dickinson 1996: 231; Iakovidis 1970B: 40; Kanta 2001: 60; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 510). As for the origin of this tradition, Iakovidis (1970B: 43-57) and Melas (1984: 24-33; 2001: 17) have reviewed all the available cases from the areas around Greece and both have concluded that it came from Anatolia. There is also the recent proposal by Melas (2001: 27) that cremation is closely related to an expression of fear towards the deceased, a hypothesis that is difficult to test.

7.3 Burial Iconography

Before analyzing the archaeological finds recovered so far it is important to describe the rather limited iconographic information related to funeral rituals. Our main corpus comes from the themes depicted on larnakes from Tanagra and from a couple of examples on Crete. The fact that these larnakes are mainly from one site could cause serious doubts about the general application of their themes, however a recently found pictorial krater from Elis with similar scenes allows us to use the evidence with less caution (Schoinas 1999: 257).

On the Tanagra larnakes the commonest theme is a procession of women wailing, strongly suggesting that women took the principal role in the funeral rituals, prothesis scenes or on their own, in a posture that is found also in Geometric times (Benzi 1999b: 217; Cavanagh 1998: 111; Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 46; Goodison 1989: 86; Iakovidis 1966: 47-9; Schoinas 1999: 261; Vasilikou 1995: 339-40; Vermeule 1965:

126; 1972: 211-3). Grief and perhaps bleeding from self-inflicting wounds are also depicted, while the open mouths are considered evidence for ritual laments (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 47; 1998: 107; Hoffman 2002: 542; Iakovidis 1966: 48; Vermeule 1965: 142). Cavanagh's (1998: 112; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 107-8) proposal about dance gestures cannot be proved. In the iconographic representations they seem as gestures in processions, whilst the Psi-figurines are found singly, in tombs, and the ones on the rims of kalathoi argue against such an idea (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 51; Vasilikou 1995: 264). The deposition of the corpse in a larnax by women is depicted on larnakes from Tanagra and also on a larnax from Pigi on Crete (Benzi 1999b: 217). A winged female figure on one larnax has been proposed by Vermeule (1965: 128-9, 146; 1979: 65) to represent the *psyche* of the deceased (Goodison 1989: 104; Marinatos 1997: 290). On another larnax a female figure is holding a kylix, presumably ready to make a libation or toast in honour of the deceased (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 50). The killing of animals is sometimes found among the themes and is associated with the funerary context (Benzi 1999b: 223; Schoinas 1999: 261). Moreover dueling, hunting, warriors marching and bull leaping, heroic activities are also depicted as appropriate themes related to death (Benzi 1999b: 229; Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 50; Vasilikou 1995: 342-3; Vermeule 1965: 130-1). Hunting in particular according to Marinatos (1997: 284), is believed to represent the mastery of man over nature and consequently death itself. Chariot scenes as well as a depiction of a boat point towards a symbolic representation of the journey to the afterworld (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 50; Gallou 2002a: 23-5; Vasilikou 1995: 321-6; Vermeule 1979: 67). This symbolic travel of the *psyche* is linked, according to Goodison (1989: 94) to the sun as the ultimate resting place. Marinatos (1997: 282-4, 288) stresses the wavy lines on the larnakes as a symbolic representation of the sea and the role of the seascape, especially on Minoan larnakes where squids and octopuses are frequently attested, perhaps indicating the final resting place of the deceased. In the Mycenaean repertoire palm trees and pillars denote the landscape, while mythical beings such as large birds and sphinxes are also present in the burial context (Marinatos 1997: 289-90; Vasilikou 1995: 344-5; Vermeule 1965: 144; 1979: 69).

Chariot scenes, men and animals, as well as geometric motifs are also found on grave stelai, especially those from the shaft graves in the Grave Circles at Mycenae

(Andronikos 1961/2: 163-5; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 358; Tsountas 1896: 5, 12; Vasilikou 1995: 37). Mylonas (1951: 147; Gallou 2002a: 21-3; Vermeule 1972: 91-2 *contra* Andronikos 1961/2: 165-6) associates the chariot scenes with funerary themes since in some cases the arms are not depicted.

7.4 The Burial Rituals

By using archaeological information, iconographic representations and analogies, where appropriate, with the better documented Classical practices, a reconstruction of Mycenaean funerary rituals will be presented. Anachronism poses a problem and some points are rather blurred and elusive, but they will be highlighted in the narrative of the rituals.

In Greek antiquity, at least from the time of Homer, funerary rituals had three stages, *prothesis*, *ekphora* and the deposition of the deceased inside the tomb (Garland 1985: 21). Iconographically both *prothesis* and *ekphora* are found, while archaeologically we have the deposition remains, something that allows us a certain degree of comparison between the Mycenaean rituals and those of the Classical period.

The body of the deceased was washed and in some cases anointed with aromatic oils, most probably by women, while it is probable that seawater was sometimes preferred during Classical times (Cavanagh 1998: 111; Garland 1985: 24; Vasilikou 1995: 336-7). The mouth and the eyes were closed and after being clothed, the deceased was placed on a bier for the *prothesis* (Mylonas 1948: 57). The use of a shroud is proposed (Cavanagh 1998: 104; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 109), but it remains unclear whether it was a universal practice or according to local, personal or other preferences (Lewartowski 2000: 56). The *prothesis* took place in the house of the deceased and lasted for a day, for practical and ritualistic reasons, at which time people could visit to bid farewell to the deceased, while the relatives surrounded him or her and lamented (Burkert 1996: 192). The *ekphora* followed with the transport of the deceased on his bier or coffin to the tomb followed by relatives, friends and perhaps people with other kinds of social bonds. Lamentation and mourning, in the form of singing, was practiced

mainly by females as attested by the open mouths of those on the Tanagra larnakes and for the Classical period (Garland 1985: 29-30), while men might have come dressed as warriors in order to honour the deceased, as well as in ordinary clothes (6.2). In both *prothesis* and *ekphora* women inflicted damage on themselves by cutting their hair, beating breasts, scratching cheeks, throwing ashes on their heads and wearing old torn clothes, as has been noted during Classical times and as seen on one larnax (7.3) (Burkert 1996: 192; Garland 1985: 29; Hoffman 2002: 542; Mee 1998b: 165).

The deceased was placed in the tomb with his/her offerings. Libations, ritual performances, further standardized singing as well as a probable personal farewell by the participants is likely, but it remains speculative at which stage of the deposition process it took place, before or after the deceased was placed in the tomb. In Classical times libations were poured on the earth, either for the deceased or the underworld deities, liquids such as water, honey, milk, wine, blood, while this is believed to be true for the Mycenaean period as well from ritual vessels such as the rhyta or from kylikes (Cavanagh 1998: 111; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 115; Garland 1985: 113-5; Hägg 1990: 178, 183; Mylonas 1948: 59-60; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 149-50). Animal bones are also found in a few cases on the mainland, either as food offerings or to accompany the deceased (Blegen *et al.* 1973: 79; Iakovidis 1969: 124; 1970B: 59; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 120; Mylonas 1948: 72; 1966: 116-7). In other cases the sacrifice of animals is observed, but it is an uncommon practice (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 115; Iakovidis 1969: 124; 1970B: 59; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 152; Wace 1932: 145).

Up to this point the rituals are common for multiple or single burials, inhumations or cremations, revealing a high degree of similarity. From here we will concentrate more on the chamber tombs due to their widespread character and the better evidence they have produced.

After the offerings were placed in the tomb and the necessary rituals were performed the blocking of the stomion with stones was a common practice (Mylonas 1966: 112-3; Stais 1895: 198; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 139; Vasilikou 1995: 107), an action variously interpreted as fear of tomb-robbery or of the deceased walking away (Wace 1932: 144; Wells 1990: 133). However I do not see how the stone blocking

would prevent robbers, or why there was not such a fear in the case of pit burials of the same period which are found in the same cemeteries in some cases. Moreover the re-use of the tombs casts additional doubt on the hypothesis about the fear related to the deceased. At any rate after the tomb was closed, a meal might have been consumed on the spot in some regions, but certainly a farewell toast or libation was made with kylikes, which were smashed either on the stone wall or the dromos floor (Åström 1987: 215; Dickinson 1996: 229; Grinsell 1961: 482; Iakovidis 1969: 124; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 118; Mountjoy 1993: 128; Mylonas 1948: 72; 1966: 112-3; Tylour 1995: 83; Vermeule 1972: 299; Wace 1932: 130-1; Wardle and Wardle 1997: 29). Perhaps libations are further emphasized in the rare cases where grooves are found connecting the dromos with the chamber, since there are thought to have been for pouring liquids with ritual significance (Åkerström 1988: 202, 205; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 150-1; 1995: 119; Wells 1990: 133-4). After the appropriate rituals the dromos was filled with earth and sometimes stone grave markers have been recovered or perishable ones have been proposed to have existed, but the extent to which this custom was generally followed is not certain (Andronikos 1961/2: 167, 171; 1968: 116-8; Dickinson 1992: 98; Iakovidis 1969: 124; Mylonas 1948: 65-6; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 152; Wace 1932: 128 *contra* Stais 1895: 219). Funerary games are believed to have taken place after the burial by Mylonas (1948: 77), however it remains an unconfirmed hypothesis.

Then a funeral banquet might have been held at the house, known in Classical times as the *perideipnon*, which might have been repeated when the soul was believed to have reached its final destination, after 30 days in Classical Athens (Burkert 1996: 193; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 111; Garland 1985: 36-7, 39). During the *trita* and *enata*, the third and ninth day respectively, food was taken to the grave in Classical times, although the mourning and pollution period was not standard in the Greek poleis and did not always correspond to the final departure of the deceased's soul (Burkert 1996: 194; Garland 1985: 40-1). Purification was common through water bathing for the relatives to remove the pollution of death (Garland 1985: 43-4). Regular and irregular visits were paid to the tombs and floral, libation or other offerings were common, perhaps symbolizing the fertilization and regeneration of the earth (Garland 1985: 105, 116-8).

Moreover festivals related to the dead existed; in the Athenian *Antheateria* the second day was known as *Choes* and was dedicated to the *psychai* of the dead which were believed to be wandering, as well as the *Genesisia* and the *Nekysia* (Burkert 1996: 194; Garland 1985: 44, 121). The existence of Mycenaean festivals associated with the dead has been proposed on the basis of some readings of the Linear B tablets, such as the festival of the thirsty and the festival of lamentation, however they remain hypothetical (Goodison 1989: 101; Vasilikou 1995: 377; Vermeule 1979: 57).

Unburied people were believed to have been condemned to haunt the earth and thus *cenotaphs* were built for that reason in Classical times (Garland 1985: 101-2). Such a case is argued for chamber tomb 2 at Dendra where two stone *menhirs* were found inside as well as offerings without human bones (Andronikos 1961/2: 169; Mylonas 1948: 75-6). The same is proposed for a chamber tomb from Kalkani, Prosymna, as well as the tholos tomb at Kokla (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 112; Mylonas 1966: 117-8; although Demakopoulou 1990: 120 disagrees about the case of Kokla).

When another burial was to be made, the dromos, or most probably part of it, was cleared, the stone wall opened and the new deceased was placed in the chamber or tholos tomb with his/her offerings. It is quite common to find heaps of bones swept to the sides of the tomb from previous burials without any attempt at differentiation between the individuals (Iakovidis 1970B: 69-70; Stais 1895: 194; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 509; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 137; Vermeule 1972: 299-300; Wace 1932: 144-5). This action has been variously interpreted as a practical response to constant re-use and lack of space, revealing disrespect (Mylonas 1948: 70-1; Vasilikou 1995: 108; Wardle and Wardle 1997: 29) or alternatively respect (Andronikos 1962: 48-9). In some tombs earth was added to make a new floor, while pits, shafts or niches were built inside the tomb, or in the dromos for human remains (7.2) (Iakovidis 1969: 124-5; 1970B: 76; Lewartowski 1996: 749; Mylonas 1966: 112-3; Taylour 1995: 82-3). In some rare cases a side chamber was cut and remains of previous or new burials were placed there (Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 135-6; Vasilikou 1995: 107). The point on which there is a consensus, though, is that the Mycenaeans believed that the *psyche* left the body when the flesh had completely decayed (Mylonas 1948: 62-4; Vermeule 1979: 56). There are

cases when the tomb was reopened and most probably the previous deceased had not decomposed entirely and additional offerings were made, presumably to appease him/her (Iakovidis 1969: 126). Perhaps this point refutes the idea of fear that the dead might walk and perhaps argues against a long period of pollution imposed on the relatives. The evidence of fire found in some tombs is thought to be connected to purification, fumigation, to give light to the deceased on their way to the afterworld or dispel the smell when the previous deceased had not decomposed entirely; however these hypotheses remain speculative (Blegen *et al.* 1973: 78; Mountjoy 1993: 126-7; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 138-9; Vasilikou 1995: 108; Wace 1932: 140, 142; Wells 1990: 136-7).

The similarities in the funeral rituals between chamber and tholos tombs exist at all levels and the differences are “of degree and not of quality or essence” as Mylonas (1966: 120, 133) remarks (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 121; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 511). The same can be said about the multiple and single graves as far as the funeral practices are concerned, only that in the latter there are rarely second burials attested (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 24; Lewartowski 1995: 105). Apart from the general characteristics of the Mycenaean funeral practices such as *prothesis*, *ekphora*, libations and feasting, all the other practices show tendencies and local indiosyncracies rather than norms such as the offerings deposited, the form of tomb and the deposition of the deceased (Lewartowski 2000: 62).

Nonetheless the question concerning the importance of the bones remains unanswered. It becomes more complicated when there are instances where the bones are swept to the sides or into heaps, but no new burial is placed in the tomb, as at Dendra T.10 and in some cases at Perati (Iakovidis 1970B: 75; Wells 1990: 135). Thus a second burial hypothesis has been supported by Cavanagh (1978: 171-2; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 76; Wells 1990: 136) and reinforces a tripartite division of the rites of passage and the liminal period proposed by van Gennep and Hertz respectively (6.1). As for cult of the dead there is no positive evidence in favour this idea, but still the issue is debated (Dickinson 1996: 229-30; Iakovidis 1969: 126; 1970B: 79-80; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 22 *contra* Gallou 2002b).

For multiple tombs Voutsaki (1998: 45) proposes that the tomb has a tripartite arrangement which reflects the rituals in relation to the body. As for their design it is argued that multiple tombs restrict access to the visits paid to them (Voutsaki 1998: 46). The unity of the group is stressed from this multiple use of the tomb and the shared cognitive, social and moral values giving an identity to its occupants, making mortuary practices central for the Mycenaean culture (Voutsaki 1998: 46). Thus an emphasis on descent and ancestors is made through secondary treatment and re-use of the tombs (Dabney and Wright 1990: 52; Papadimitriou 2001: 199-200; Voutsaki 1995a: 60). Voutsaki (1998: 46) also stresses the importance of *miasma* in the Mycenaean burial practices, more as a moral rather than physical concept, however the re-opening of the tombs, even before total decomposition, by kin-members argues against the long-lasting and central role of pollution.

7.5 The Burial Offerings

The offerings and the purpose for which they were deposited and by whom is unclear. They could have been items the deceased loved, possessed, were given by relatives and perhaps a few special friends or included due to custom. The most probable thing is that it was a combination of these reasons, varying according to local or personal preferences (Lewartowski 2000: 50). Mylonas (1948: 73 *contra* Vermeule 1979: 56; Wace 1932: 144) argues that the offerings were placed out of fear of the spirit of the deceased, rather than to accompany him/her to the afterlife. The fact that there are examples of tombs without offerings, although in some of them the offerings were taken out after the burial, favours the idea that they were not of paramount importance for the passage of a person to the afterlife (Iakovidis 1970B: 59-6, 77; Lewartowski 2000: 50; Wells 1990: 139).

Apart from regional variation there are some differences as well as similarities between multiple and single graves. Weapons, tools, mirrors, seals and buttons are more common in chamber tombs, but simple beads, spirals, rings and other personal adornments are more usual in single tombs (Lewartowski 1995: 107; 2000: 48). Interestingly the buttons are in most cases found by the trunk and head in multiple tombs

and by the head in the single ones (Lewartowski 1995: 109). Alabastra may be found containing jewellery and Konstandinidi (2001: 236-8, 245) argues that, along with ivories, they indicate women, while rings, quantity of jewellery and weapons denote social rank. Furthermore it seems that there was no gender difference between the jewellery deposited in tombs, only that men had less in quantity and more of bronze (Konstandinidi 2001: 247). There are also the so-called warrior tombs that are associated socially, politically and ethnically with the Mycenaeans due to their high concentration of bronze weapons, glass beads and pottery and they are found in mainland Greece, Crete and the Aegean (Matthäus 1983: 203-5, 212). However Preston (1999: 143) has suggested, more persuasively, that this phenomenon was part of a wider one seen in the Aegean during the LH IIB period, concerning social and political expression through the funerary context. Mycenaean as well as other archaeological parallels question the equation of warriors and indeed only adult males with weapons (Whitley 2002b: 220, 222-3).

Reference should be made to the occasional 'killing' of bronze offerings, such as swords and daggers and the deliberate smashing of pottery, especially when only parts such as spouts and handles were broken off (Åström 1987: 215; Grinsell 1973: 113; Iakovidis 1970B: 71-2; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 119; Soles 1999: 787). The interpretations proposed suggest either that no other person could use the offerings or out of fear that the deceased might use them against the living (Åström 1987: 216-7). Grinsell (1961: 476-8; Soles 1999: 789-90) adds that swords or other symbols of authority are 'killed' because of their close association with the deceased, a practice that continued down to the Iron Age (Grinsell 1973: 111; Fossey 1985: 21).

As for the ceramics, alabastra, storage vessels and feeding bottles are commoner in multiple tombs, while pouring and drinking vessels are more usually found in single tombs (Lewartowski 1995: 108; 2000: 48). The unguent containers were most probably used for oil to anoint the body or perfume, perhaps considered as an appropriate burial gift (Cavanagh 1998: 106). The tightly fitting lids on jars from Prosymna reminds us that the contents of the pouring and closed vessels was also important as supplies for the deceased and the fact that the pottery was not empty (Mylonas 1966: 134). The kylikes and their breaking in the dromos seems to have been practiced until LH IIIB, while in

LH IIIC the evidence from Perati argues against this practice (Iakovidis 1970B: 68). It must also be noted that in Achaea the smashing of pottery in the dromos is hardly attested (Cavanagh 1998: 106-7). Figurines are quite common on the mainland, but they are rare in most cemeteries in Attica (Cavanagh 1998: 109-10; Stais 1895: 202).

Children were sometimes buried alongside adults, while their association with female figurines is a regional and contextual matter rather than of different religious beliefs in general (Cavanagh 1998: 112-3; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 113 *contra* Iakovidis 1966: 45; 1969: 123-4).

The chamber and tholos tombs were re-used and it has been observed that in many cases the offerings from previous burials were removed. This pattern is so consistent it cannot be explained as tomb-robbers, but must form part of a practice, if not ritual, followed by the relatives of the deceased who had hereditary rights in the use of the tomb. Thus the offerings could have been considered as family property and people were allowed to take them out without committing sacrilege, an act perhaps in some cases dictated by need or greed (Iakovidis 1969: 125; Vermeule 1979: 56; Wace 1932: 138; Wells 1990: 126-7). Therefore it seems that the funerary belief was that the offerings did not accompany the deceased to the afterlife, but were rather used during the liminal period until the decay of the flesh and the departure of the *psyche* (Wace 1932: 145 *contra* Wardle and Wardle 1997: 32). It is unclear whether this was made out of fear or respect for the deceased (Mylonas 1948: 70-1; 1966: 113).

The burning or half-burning of items has been also reported inside tombs (Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 147-8). Mylonas (1948: 74-5; 1966: 181; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 121) has proposed that this was when the tomb was re-opened and the previous burial had not yet decomposed. The incense burners analyzed reveal charcoal for fuel and not aromatic substances, while the presence of lamps might have had a symbolic rather than functional significance (Goodison 1989: 88-9). These points suggest that the fumigation hypothesis is not applicable in all instances and that another kind of ceremony existed, perhaps connected to the non-decomposed corpses or the second burial rituals (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 112-3; Wells 1990: 137).

7.6 The Social and Political Dimensions of Burials

Tholos tombs are especially connected with the demonstration of power and prosperity (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 111). Their chronological range, shows that tholoi reached their peak in LH IIIA and decreased in numbers from LH IIIB on, suggesting that particularly in the Argolid a close correlation between state power and their use existed (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 51-3; Voutsaki 1995a: 63; 1997: 44-5; Wright 1987: 183). Wells (1990: 128) favours a status differentiation between the tholos occupants and those buried in chamber tombs. Wright (1987: 173-4, 184) adds that tholoi expressed horizontal social groupings or clans rather than rulers and reflected the social transformation from chieftains in the Argolid to early forms of the state. The people placed in the tholoi thereby legitimize their power, ideology and the tombs also functioned as territorial markers for land ownership and perhaps control since they face or are quite close to settlements (Wells 1990: 128). However the fact that tholos tombs do not exist in Thebes and close to Athens demonstrated that they were used in some cases as clan or local symbols and not necessarily as *emblemic insignia* of dominance (Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 229; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 511-2).

The increased use of chamber tombs in the LH IIB-III A1 period in the Greek mainland and the Aegean demonstrates a radical change in Mycenaean society. These tombs served the bulk of the people that probably lived in small and scattered villages and not only the Mycenaean middle class (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 62; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 123; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 512; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 131 *contra* French 2002: 71-4). Cavanagh (1987: 161-7) has analyzed the architectural elements of chamber tombs and found four categories related to wealth. Moreover there seems to have been a considerable difference in construction in the LH IIIC period especially in the stomion, perhaps connected to a reduction in entrance rituals, and a decrease in the size of the chamber, as in the case of Perati, although not in western Greece (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 60; Iakovidis 1970B: 68). Moreover in this period the re-use of chamber tombs, which were abandoned at least by the LH IIIA2 period, is attested in mainland Greece and Crete (Cavanagh and Mee 1978: 31-6, 40). The proposed reasons are that the family died out, the family left the area, there was an abandonment of the

tomb because the family preferred to invest in a new one, or new people came in the LH IIC period and re-used it. These new settlers were allowed to re-use the old tombs either because the older inhabitants did not object or because the locals were uncertain if they should construct in a new tomb rather than use an older one (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 59-60).

The construction of built graves underline their differentiation to the other tomb occupants when both tomb types coexist in the same cemetery. Thus they emphasize a new or higher status for its occupants (Papadimitriou 2001: 198). This grave type appeared mainly in the early parts of the Late Helladic period and later on they reappeared only in some peripheral areas (Papadimitriou 2001: 203).

Chamber and tholos tombs coexist in cemeteries and sometimes they are associated as in the Argolid and Achaea, though the social significance of this cannot be entirely comprehended (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1995: 122). Nonetheless the idea that chamber tombs are built around tholoi is refuted by many cases where some chamber tombs are earlier than the tholoi (Cavanagh and Mee 1990: 63). They are close to the settlements and are sometimes found in clusters (Iakovidis 1969: 122). These clusters do not represent different community in the Argolid, because they appear to belong to the same settlement and perhaps they exist due to hierarchical, clan or other kinds of division (Cavanagh and Mee 1990: 62-3; 1998: 131-2; Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 231, 234 *contra* Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 132; Wace 1932: 121). However this is not necessarily the case for all settlements in the Mycenaean world since the small village pattern is proposed by Pantelidou (1975: 224-5) for Athens and seems to work. Clusters might manifest family alliances closely associated with political formations within the Mycenaean social structure (Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 243).

The fact that single graves are often found close to multiple tombs reveals their close relationship, but at the same time it suggests that their occupants did not have the right or privilege to be buried there. The explanations remain speculative: social standing or the circumstances of death or the fact that death might have occurred at a time when the multiple tombs could not be opened (Lewartowski 2000: 55). Apparently the single graves do not represent a separate class in Mycenaean society, although the people

placed there are generally less wealthy (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 125; Dickinson 1982: 123; 1983: 55; Lewartowski 1995: 110-1). As for the particular grave type used, the social *persona* as much as local tradition were the most important factors (Lewartowski 2000: 56). Wells (1990: 135) connects the existence of pit and shaft graves inside chamber and tholos tombs in an attempt to link the deceased with the past and more particularly the MH tradition. Such an argument is rather weak and cannot be proved.

As for the occupants of the tombs anthropological studies suggest that the number of burials in chamber tombs is underestimated by a factor of two (Cavanagh and Mee 1995: 56). Anthropological analysis in T.13 and T.14 at Dendra indicate that children are also underrepresented in terms of the expected age proportions (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 129; Wells 1990: 138). In matters of gender more men are found in the tombs in the Athenian Agora and Deiras, while the number of men and women is equal at Dendra (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 55). From overall calculations there is a 63:37 bias in favour of men over women in chamber tombs, though women did not receive less prestigious goods (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 127; Mee 1998b: 167-8). Moreover the average age for men among 322 examples is 39.1 and 32 for women, perhaps due to childbirth factors, indicating according to Mee (1998b: 169) that the status of women was defined by their role as wives and daughters (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 128). Thus it seems that the answer to who used the multiple tombs is not just the family (Wace 1932: 121), but a more complex one perhaps a result of status acquisition inside the clan or the extended family (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 131).

Burial evidence reflects social conditions, but it is unclear which ones (Mee and Cavanagh 1984: 61). Voutsaki (1995a: 60; 1998: 44) argues convincingly that mortuary rituals create social reality and forms the perception of the world and the position of the person in it. Social and political processes are parallel in different regions in the Mycenaean world, but not identical due to different local structures and different exchange and alliance networks (Voutsaki 1998: 56). Overall, perhaps a cultural regionalism can be seen from the distribution and character of the cemeteries, that suggests social and in some cases political divisions (Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 241-2).

In my opinion burial evidence both creates and reflects the basic aspects of the local society in an idealized form. Perhaps in the case of the Mycenaean culture it is the burial context that reflects the Mycenaean character. Thus it generates and projects a social rather than ethnic identity that seems to me synonymous with the Mycenaean identity in a wider sense and not strictly that of an emerging local elite. This is not to say that group interests, ideologies and agendas are not manifested in a regional burial context, but that the main burial characteristics also have a deeper social significance shared in the Mycenaean world, namely identity. Moreover regional analysis allows us to highlight local cultural characteristics of the areas under review and comment on the social and political structure.

7.7 Consumption in the Funerary Context

Funerary rituals function as a marker of group identity, while they also express the basic metaphysic belief of the society as a whole (Cavanagh 1998: 103).

Konstandinidi (2001: 237, 250) suggests that while the quantity of jewellery reflects social position, this is not the case with the quantity of pottery. For Voutsaki (1995a: 56) the diversity rather the quantity of burial offerings should be analyzed, since symbolic significance and relative exchange rate are subjective. Chronologically, until the LH IIIA period, competition is seen in the construction of tombs as well as burial offerings among the elite, revealing how fragile the social structure was in the Argolid (Sjöberg 1990: 65-6; Voutsaki 1995a: 62). From the LH IIIB period there is a decrease in wealth deposited inside tombs, apart from exceptional cases reflecting a centralized small social and political elite closely linked with the palatial centres (Voutsaki 1995a: 58-9; 2001: 205).

Voutsaki (1995b: 7; 1997: 35) follows the anthropological line in interpreting consumption, exchange and value as social, moral, political and economic phenomena (6.8). In kin-based societies gift-exchange creates prestige and social competition that ultimately leads to political power (Voutsaki 1995b: 8). Consumption is the main tool of political asymmetry and more importantly conspicuous consumption terminates the gift-

exchange cycles and establishes hierarchy (Voutsaki 1997: 39-40). The most prominent context for conspicuous consumption is the burial practices and rituals that sanctify the whole process. Moreover she argues that change occurs not so much from the control of production but from the manipulation of consumption and demand, a result of endogenous and exogenous factors (Voutsaki 1997: 47). The problem with this idea is that the Linear B tablets are primarily concerned with control of production, and not all aspects of it, for example trade, specific animals and crops. Although this model overall is quite promising, in practice the conspicuous consumption described here is partial in the Mycenaean burial tradition. This is so because the material goods that are placed in the tombs are not necessarily taken out of circulation, since removing burial offerings from the tombs was a common practice (7.5). Moreover such an analysis is quite economicocentric, allowing us only to speak about rank and elites, frozen in time and a closed system applicable everywhere. Material goods in the mortuary context can also reveal horizontal divisions, as discussed earlier (6.5), raising issues such as age, gender, clan and ethnicity and not necessarily only rank. In addition this proposed system creates a core/peripheral structure as far as goods and power are concerned at the interregional level. This forms a web like construction with politico-economic dependencies, resulting in Mycenae being seen as the centre of wealth and politics in the Mycenaean world and areas like the South-eastern Aegean as provincial, if not colonial.

The answer is perhaps van Wijngaarden's (1999a: 3) proposal that all social groups create identities and probably even ideologies and should be thoroughly reviewed. The analysis of imported goods may allow us to have an insight into circulation patterns, social groupings and even the exchange modes active in that period (van Wijngaarden 1999a: 4). At the same time the assimilation of imported goods into the local value system, either social or moral, is quite important for understanding the local context (Steel 1998: 292; van Wijngaarden 1999a: 5). Comparison of different imported categories should be made, as well as between local and foreign, from a diachronic perspective (Voutsaki 1999: 28-9; Whitelaw 1999: 33). Moreover comparison between objects from the burial and domestic contexts should be carried out to see whether they share the same social messages or not (de Mita 1999: 26-7).

Another process of consumption closely related to the funerary practices is that of food and drink during the ceremonies and rituals. Cavanagh (1998: 111-2) associates the kylix with wine and its significance as a social and religious symbol is related to the palatial system. Its decline in use in burial practices is linked with the fall of the palatial system and the associated social stratification. He contrasts the use of wine with that of oil for libations and its mainly religious character that did not decline in the post-palatial period and in fact continued down to Classical times. Hamilakis (1998: 116-7) in a more general sense, correlates collective memory with food and drink and the fact that new social bonds are created on such occasions. The consumption of alcohol must have intensified further the sentimental tension of the funeral process (Hamilakis 1998: 126). The case of Cyprus, where kraters are associated with wealthy burials, is quite an interesting one. Their pictorial repertoire and their role in the drinking reinforce their use among the elite who could afford to take them out of circulation (Steel 1998: 291, 293). Moreover pyxides, flasks and juglets are more common perhaps used as perfume containers, appropriate for the burial context (Steel 1998: 295).

7.8 Discussion

In Chapters 6 and 7 the current problems, thoughts and concerns have been discussed from a theoretical as well as contextual perspective. By doing so the aspects that interest us most in this analysis come into light, dimensions that were not adequately addressed or answered by researchers in this specific region or in the wider framework of Mycenaean burial practices.

The belief expressed here is that the review of the material cannot be made by addressing issues only in term of social, economic, political or religious concerns. The burial context is far more complex, as demonstrated in this chapter with the variables mentioned before inextricably linked and interrelated to a high degree. The power and importance of the mortuary practices derives from the rituals performed in their social setting, spatial and temporal. Thus rituals will be a central concern of this analysis and will enable us to review two further issues, local burial customs and the social trends,

highlighting aspects such as collectivity, local characteristics, the character of symbolism and the cult of the ancestors, as well as the horizontal and/or vertical divisions at local and interregional levels. Bearing in mind both these points, which are interrelated rather than independent, issues such as power, ideology, political conditions and consumption will be reviewed. Hence the main questions for this region will be addressed, related to the cultural and ethnic identity of the area, and consequently the migration hypothesis and the regional political structure or in other words whether the area is unified or fragmented politically. Moreover the local social conditions will be discussed as well as the belief systems seen from the mortuary framework. Two points of caution should be underlined here. The first is that the lack of settlement evidence deprives us of the ability to cross check the socio-political results and the second is that the burial context tends to create and reflect idealized images of the social and political reality. Furthermore all this analysis will be made having always in mind the wider historical context of the periods under review as well the inheritances of the past that these regions had.

CHAPTER 8: THE TOMBS IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN

In this chapter the analysis of the tombs will be presented. In the first part (section 8.1) the tombs' architecture as well as the spatial arrangement inside the cemetery area will be analyzed by site. There will be no chronological order to this presentation since the frequent re-use of chamber tombs does not allow secure dating. Nevertheless comments will be made concerning general time periods. In the second half of the chapter (section 8.2) the internal spatial arrangement of the tombs will be discussed regarding issues such as the *in situ* burials, the placement of the offerings, the scattering of the skeletal remains and the broken pottery in the dromos. In other words the ritual remains and traces of the burial practices will be analyzed.

8.1 Tomb Architecture

8.1.1 Karpathos

From the five sites recognized so far on the island only two chamber tombs have been excavated, by Charitonidis (1961/2a) and Zachariadou (1978). These two tombs were found by chance and many of their characteristics were destroyed before any documentation could take place. Thus our information is rather limited as regards the local tomb construction, as seen in the synthetic work of Melas (1985) for the island.

Both the tombs from Makelli at Pigadia and Vonies at Arkasa were constructed in the LM IIIA1 period and used down to the LM IIIB period. Their dromoi are not preserved and only in the case of the Makelli tomb, in which the dromos was excavated to a limited extent, could the width be measured at 1.2m. From the same tomb we also have evidence of the chamber height, which was 1.5m. Moreover in both tombs no stone wall blocking at the stomion has been reported. The shape of the chamber is circular with the first being 6.28m² (fig.8.1) and the latter 7.07m², relatively large⁴.

⁴ All measurements are calculated by the present author.

Another point that should be raised here is that, of the five sites on the island, four of them produced a single chamber tomb. However the implications of this are difficult to assess bearing in mind the fact that none of the sites has been properly excavated and all our evidence is a result of rescue or finds being handed over by locals. The exception is Pigadia, where a number of tombs have been reported (Melas 1985: 28-30). They seem to have been placed in two areas creating clusters (5.2.1, 5.3.2), most probably surrounding the Minoan/Mycenaean settlement. Nevertheless, new finds might alter this idea and reveal that the tombs in fact surrounded the settlement, located at its edges, as was the case at Knossos (Hood and Smyth 1981: 5-6; Kanta 1980: 30) and Palaikastro (Kanta 1980: 193; Pini 1968: 89).

8.1.2 Ialysos

The cemetery of Ialysos consists of two burial areas on low hills, Makria Vounara (fig.8.2) and Moschou Vounara (fig.8.3) and (5.2.2), with at least 39 and 90 tombs respectively. The cemetery was excavated by three different expeditions, in 1868-1871 by Biliotti, in 1914-1921 by Maiuri and in 1927-9 by Jacopi (Mee 1982: 8). From the excavations of Biliotti only the pottery evidence can be associated with specific tombs, but not the small finds. Fortunately we have detailed reports from the excavations conducted by both 20th century excavators, Maiuri (1926) and Jacopi (1930/1), for about 90 tombs and the detailed analyses of Mee (1975; 1982) and Benzi (1992). Moreover Voutsaki (1993) has produced an interregional comparison of the larger Dodecanesian cemeteries with the Argolid and Thessaly.

The vast majority of the tombs are chamber tombs, apart from T.39, T.41 and T.76 which were pit graves. The first two are rectangular in shape, while the third is oblong. T.68 is an unclear case and could have either been a chamber tomb or a pit grave. One more notable exception is T.81, which is a shaft grave 2.55m deep (fig.8.4), oval in shape and 1.17m² in size. It is smaller than the Mycenae ones and parallels come from Athens, Voula, Zakynthos and Knossos (Benzi 1992: 230, n.10; Dickinson 1983: 56; Evans 1906: 11-5; Pantelidou 1975: 95-106). Interestingly enough all of the single

graves have been found in the Moschou Vounara cluster, however there is no chronological link between them. At any rate single graves seem rare in this cemetery.

The chamber tombs in both clusters range from the LH IIB to the LH IIIC period (for all details refer to Appendix A.1). From the offerings deposited, the chronological sequence of construction has been deduced. It is clear that at least 33 tombs were in use in LH IIB-III A1, 65 during LH III A2, while in LH IIIB only 36 tombs seem to have been used and 50 during LH IIIC. Some tombs cannot be accurately assigned to either LH III A1 or A2, as much as some LH III A2/B ones, while in seventeen no date can be offered. Of the tombs constructed in the LH IIB to LH III A1 period, eleven continued to be used in LH III A2, while T.10 was used down to LH IIIB. Of the tombs constructed in the LH III A2 period, only thirteen continued to be used in LH IIIB, while T.12, T.40, T.41, T.42, T.43 and OT.12 seem to have been used down to LH IIIC. Of the tombs constructed in LH IIIB T.30, T.38, T.64, T.66 and OT.35 continued to be used in the LH IIIC period. During the LH IIIC period at least 10 LH III A2 tombs were re-used, as well as T.32A, T.35, T.36, T.69, T.78 and T.79 which had previously been used exclusively in the LH IIB-III A1 (Benzi 1982: 325-33; 1992: 225, 227; Cavanagh and Mee 1978: 36-8). This re-use might have been on an even greater scale if the clearance of tombs was total and some of the LH IIIC tombs might in reality have been constructed earlier. Although we are unable to demonstrate this convincingly, it must be taken into serious consideration in concluding remarks or hypotheses. Thus as far as tomb architecture is concerned there will be no chronological division, but rather a general impression of the cemetery will be given in order to allow interregional analysis⁵.

It is worth noting that in the LH III A1 period, the tombs at Makria Vounara were placed in the eastern part in two rows and in the centre of the hill (Benzi 1992: 227). Perhaps in the same burial ground we see again a separation into two clusters. This situation dramatically changes in the LH III A2 period when the whole hill is used and the same applies in LH IIIB only to a lesser extent. During LH IIIC no new tombs were constructed at Makria Vounara, though six were re-used. From the beginning their

⁵ All measurements from this point exclude the Old Tombs, since no information is available, except if stated otherwise.

orientation was north and north-east and that remained the case throughout the use of this burial place.

At Moschou Vounara during the LH IIB-III A1 period the tombs were constructed in the middle part of the hill on lower, medium and higher ground (Benzi 1992: 227). During LH III A2 the tombs are found all around the hill, while in the LH IIB period the centre in the lower, medium and higher levels of the hill was preferred. In the LH IIIC period new tombs are constructed, while older ones were re-used all over the hill. During all the periods of use of Moschou Vounara the orientation ranges from North to South-west.

The overall picture from the cemetery of Ialysos is that the average dromos is 6m long, almost 1.5m wide and at its highest point slightly more than 1m. In 38 tombs the dromos sides incline inwards, while there is only one exception, T.14 where the sides of dromos slopes outwards. As for the stomia of the tombs, they are 0.55m long, 0.8m wide and 1.25m high on average. Of the 90 tombs, in 54 their stone wall blocking was found at the entrance of the stomion and seems to have been a more or less standard practice. As for the shape of the chambers the irregular rectangular is the most popular with 43 examples, the more canonical rectangular is found in 26 cases, square are T.23, T.71 and T.82, trapezoidal are T.34 and T.60, and irregular in shape are T.24 and T.36. There are also semi-circular tombs such as T.47, T.74 and T.75, T.8 and T.29 are circular, and T.14 is oblong. The rest of the tombs are badly eroded or destroyed and thus their shape cannot be definitely determined. Nevertheless it seems that the circular shape in general is not popular at Ialysos and the reason cannot only be due to construction problems and the geologic consistency of the hills. If that was the case the tombs would be of a more precise shape and not irregular as in most cases. At the same time religious reasons cannot be invoked due to lack of evidence or any association of the rectangular shape, irregular or canonical, with metaphysical beliefs. It rather seems to be a purposeful and conscious decision perhaps with social significance that reflects a regional preference or taste.

The size of the chambers averages slightly over 4.6m² (median 4.31m²). Benzi (1992: 229) divides them into three categories *piccole* 0.4-3m², *medie* 3-7m² and *grandi* 7-15.7m². The *medie* category prevails in the LH IIB-III A1 and LH III A2, the *piccole* in

LH IIIB, while in the LH IIIC period, although most of the tombs are *medie*, the *grandi* are quite numerous. The last point is the result of re-use and some new tombs being built in the Ialysos cemetery. Although his division is useful for demonstrating different chamber sizes, it is not supported by any other evidence so as to indicate an association with status, wealth or any other kind of differentiation and thus it remains a single arithmetic division. Voutsaki (1993: 142, table 9.8, 9.9) created a five-fold division of tombs in order to make interregional comparisons and she indicated that the Ialysos chamber size was rather smaller than that of the Argolid. This is especially true for the Early Mycenaean period when tombs in the Argolid tend to be larger than in later times. At the same time the tendency of the tombs at Ialysos is to become larger from LH IIB to LH IIIC, a reverse image from the one attested in mainland Greece.

It must be also mentioned that from the information we have about the Old Tombs, it seems that at least the first nine had a rectangular chamber, allegedly measuring 18.6m², whilst OT.2 also had a 10m dromos (Biliotti 1870a: 3, 5). However it should be stressed that the tombs Biliotti excavated were situated at the top of the hill and most probably were the most prestigious of all. Moreover we are informed that the tombs were carved almost 7m deep (Biliotti 1871: 3).

In some cases the geology of the hills is proposed as the main reason for the size of the tombs and this may have been one factor, however it was a conscious decision to build small tombs because, if they wanted to do otherwise, Mt Philerimos was not far away. It has a different geologic consistency, a harder bedrock that would allow cutting larger tombs. Perhaps the reason these two hills were preferred was a matter of orientation (5.3.1), as well as the view (5.3.2), rather than the hardness of the bedrock.

Nonetheless there seem to have existed some differences between the two clusters of tombs, Makria Vounara and Moschou Vounara. The average dromos length in the first is 6.35m and in the second 5.93m, while the average dromos width and height, as well as the average stomion length and width are identical. Moreover the height of the stomion at Makria Vounara is 1.35m and at Moschou Vounara is 1.19m, not unimportant in terms of entering the chamber with offerings or with the corpse of the deceased. However the most striking difference is in the chamber size which in the former is on average 5.02m² (median 5.03m²) and in the latter is 4.43m² (median

3.61m²). There seems not to have been a chronological association between the differences mentioned above. The longer dromos, the higher stomion and the larger chamber in my opinion indicate a purposeful differentiation. The different tomb clusters were not merely a response to lack of space but the expression of a social division marking two groups, either clans and/or political factions. Furthermore the lack of single graves, as well as the fact that in the LH IIIC period there was no new tomb built, but only a few re-used, underline further the differences between these two clusters.

Another point that should be raised is the way in which the size of the tombs develops over time. The measurements from the 21 LH IIB-IIIA1 tombs, including T.46, have produced an average dromos length of 6.22m, but the median is only 5.5m. The reason for this difference is the presence of three tombs with a dromos more than 10m, T.17, T.46 and T.50, differentiating them considerably from the rest of the tombs. The dromos width and height are more or less the same as the overall assessment for the cemetery. The same applies to the length of the stomion, however the width is on average 0.75m, slightly smaller than the overall average seen above. The most striking difference is the size of the chamber, which on average is 4.34m² (median 3.61m²), almost identical to the Moschou Vounara size measurements, but considerably less than the average for the whole cemetery (6.11m², including the Old Tomb information) and especially so for Makria Vounara. It is interesting that the dromos length does not exactly match with the expectation of LH IIB-IIIA1 size in other areas of the Mycenaean world, and is different from the later LH III periods. As for the chamber size, it is striking and unexpected to find that at Ialysos the size increases over time in contrast to the evidence from the Mycenaean mainland (Voutsaki 1993: 94).

Apart from the canonical image of the chamber tombs there are a number of special features that should be noted here. Near T.86 a dromos has been found with no chamber, perhaps an attempt to construct one but due to structural problems, as seems to be the case at Armenoi (Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 43), or unwillingness to proceed to its completion, it was abandoned. In T.24, T.85 and T.86 the dromoi are off-centre from the chamber and stomion, while in T.86 there is also a pseudo-dromos leading to a dead end. Moreover in OT.2, T.15, T.36, T.53 and T.54 the dromos had steps (fig.8.5),

emphasizing further that the deceased was carried on a bier to his/her burial place; similar examples are known in the Argolid, Attica and Armenoi, however they remain uncommon, with Ialysos having the largest concentration (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 65 n.32; Gilmour 1995: 157 table 17.1; Mylonas 1966: 112; Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 43; Stais 1896: 192-3; Wace 1932: 143). In T.53 there is also an incised cornice above the stomion, emphasizing and elaborating the entrance to the chamber. Parallel can be found at Aidonia T.10 (Kristalli-Votsi 1996: see fig. in p.23), T.Z at Katsamba (Alexiou 1967: 18-20) and T.171 and probably other tombs at Armenoi (Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 43, 44 fig.2). The disturbed T.14 was blocked by a single sandstone slab, a practice that is also found rarely in the Argolid, Messenia, Kephallonia and Armenoi (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 152; Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 44 fig.2). T.23 had at the entrance of the stomion a double stone wall instead of the standard single stone blocking wall. Another peculiarity found at Ialysos is the presence of antechambers in T.19, T.24 and T.43; in the first two there was deliberate deposition of pottery, while in the third there were only sherds. The first tomb also had a pilaster supporting it. All three belong to the LH IIIA1 and LH IIIA2 periods.

Special mention should be made of the *semata* recovered exclusively in Makria Vounara. The presence of *semata* in the Mycenaean world was discussed earlier (7.4), but they remain rare and the concentration of seven here is so far unique. They were found in T.27, T.48, T.50 and T.55 in the collapsed chamber, in T.54 above the stomion entrance, and in T.59 in the dromos. Only in T.51 was the *sema* found *in situ*, probably above the chamber, but unfortunately the exact location is not given. The *semata* (fig.8.6) were rectangular and had circular incised designs, simple (T.51) and crossed (T.50, T.59), but the one from T.51 had two rectangular motifs, one horizontal and one vertical, as well as a lozenge design. The *sema* from T.48 was cylindrical, but it also had a crossed circle design, while the one from T.54 was damaged and two circular incised motifs are reported. The case of T.27 is more complex (fig.8.7) since the oblong stone had holes and it is likely that it was a re-used anchor, but of irregular shape, while another rectangular stone was recovered whose use remains unclear (Benzi 1992: 229; Maiuri 1926: 150; McCaslin 1980: 18-20). All of the tombs were in use during the LH IIIA2 period, but T.50 was also is used in LH IIIA1 and T.59 continued down to LH

IIIB. Parallels to these *semata* come from Pylos T.E6, T.E8, T.E9 and T.K1 (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 66), and Armenoi on Crete (Rehak and Younger 1998: 153).

The fact that all of the tombs with *semata* were placed in the central part of the hill might indicate the reason for their preservation. Alternatively it could be argued that in the LH IIIA2 period, when many chamber tombs were built next to each other, the *semata* were employed for practical reasons and/or deliberate differentiation for social or status reasons. Additionally the incised designs must have had a religious meaning and the circle especially, simple or crossed, has been often associated with solar symbolism (Goodison 1989: 31, 75-6). This hypothesis is consistent with the association that was made between the position of the tombs in relation to the settlement as well as their orientation towards the solar cycle (5.3.2). Moreover the *sema* from T.27 could have functioned as a two-fold symbolic sign, as both cultic and stressing the maritime association of the particular family. If the *semata* were some other kind of insignia, such as status or clan, the designs would be quite different from each other rather than similar. As for the proposal of Andronikos (1961/2: 168-9; 1968: 117-8), connecting them directly to a hieratic group or people from Anatolia, it remains pure speculation without any kind of support.

All these individual characteristics found occasionally in the Ialysos cemetery underline the interaction of this site with the rest of the Aegean and the Mycenaean mainland, as well as the local indiosyncracies.

8.1.3 Rhodes

Rhodes has produced a large number of cemeteries during the Mycenaean period. However most of them were illicitly excavated and no record of their architectural features was kept. Fortunately there is some information regarding cemetery excavation in Jacopi (1932) and Charitonidis (1963), the publication of a survey and of older Danish excavations by Dietz (1984) is also helpful as well as the synthetic work of Benzi (1992) for all Rhodes. Finally we have the best-documented cemetery excavation, as far as the Mycenaean period is concerned, in the South-eastern Aegean by Karantzali (1993;

1999a; 2001). The sample presented here is rather heterogeneous, from various cemeteries, artificially put together to form a unity. This will be made in order to have enough quantitative information for comparison with other large cemeteries at an interregional level. Nevertheless where the evidence is enough comparisons will be made between Rhodian cemeteries. The tombs analyzed here are 37: Kouri T.1, T.2, Asprovilo T.6, Maritsa T.1, T.2, Kalopetra/Damatria T.2, Kalavarda T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, Lelos T.1, T.5, T.6 Chimaro T.1, Ayios Minas T.1, T.2, Tzigani T.1, Yennadi T.1, Passia T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, Kalogrios T.1, Apsaktiras T.1, T.2, T.8, T.9, T.10, Ambelia T.1, Aspropilia T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5, T.6 and Archangelos T.2.

From the information we have, all the cemeteries on Rhodes contained only chamber tombs. The sole exception is T.1 at Kouri, which is most probably a pit grave of unknown date, 1m² in size, found close to chamber tomb T.2. The report of a pit or cist grave cemetery of the Mycenaean period at Soroni remains unconfirmed, since no graves are visible today and no pottery can be positively attributed to this site.

The tombs recovered have a time span from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC, corresponding to Ialysos and elsewhere in the South-eastern Aegean (for all details refer to Appendix A.2). It should be noted that there is continuity in use of the tombs, as seen at Ialysos (8.1.2). The spread of chamber tombs took place during the LH IIIA2 period, when the majority of the cemeteries discussed were in use. Moreover the re-use of LH IIIA2 tombs in the LH IIIC period is found at Kalavarda, T.1, T.2, T.3 and perhaps T.4, Passia T.1, whilst at Mandriko and Asklepeio, from which no architectural information have survived, both sites have only produced two pots, thus no definite conclusion could be drawn and at the same time the LH IIIC date for the Mandriko pots is debatable (Benzi 1982: 334-5; 1992: 419; Cavanagh and Mee 1978: 39; Dietz 1984: 98-9). There is unclear evidence of newly built tombs in the LH IIIC period, the only positive evidence comes from Aspropilia T.4. Single chamber tombs are reported at Zuccalades, Theologos, Mandriko, Karavi, Yennadi, Ambelia, Vigli and Koskinou. It is unclear whether much research took place to find more tombs at these sites, while in the case of Ambelia it seems that the tomb was part of an extensive cemetery and at Yennadi more tombs must exist (Karantzali pers. comm.). Moreover from Kremasti, Phanes, Damatria, Kameiros, Siana, Monolithos, Ayios Isidoros, Lachania, Asklepeio and Lindos we have

the pottery from the tombs but their actual number is unknown. Thus there can be no certainty about single tomb cemeteries on Rhodes. Clusters in cemeteries have been reported at Paradeisi, Kalavarda, Apolakkia, Kattavia and Aphantou, however in most cases no available evidence exists for architectural comparison of these clusters, as in the case of Ialysos. Nevertheless the social and clan differences between the clusters noted at Ialysos may be also suggested for the aforementioned cemeteries.

The picture that emerges from the tombs on Rhodes is that they have a dromos on average slightly more than 4m in length, 1.28m wide, the highest point of the dromos being more than 2.1m. The dromos sides incline in T.2, T.3 and T.4 at Kalavarda as well as in all the tombs from Aspropilia. The stomion is 0.82m long, 0.81m wide and 1.2m high on average, and was blocked with a stone wall in 18 out of the 37 cases. It is quite interesting that the length and width of the stomion are almost equal in size creating a square shape for it. The shape of the chamber most commonly in 23 cases found is rectangular (fig.8.8), both irregular and regular, trapezoidal ones have been noted exclusively at Aspropilia, again regular and irregular, at Yennadi T.1, Passia T.4 and Apsaktiras T.1 are square, while there is also one hemispherical chamber at Archangelos T.1 (fig.8.9). In the rest of the tombs, due to preservation reasons, it was impossible to determine their shape. We can see the overwhelming preference for the rectangular shape over the circular one across the cemeteries on the island, as we have seen at Ialysos (8.1.2). The average size of these tombs is 4.99m² (median 4.52m²).

Testing the hypothesis of a difference between the northern and southern part of the island, as defined in 5.3.3, we will use the architectural information available. The samples presented here are not equal since from the northern part we have 15 tombs and from the southern 22 tombs; again the interest here is the trends rather than the numbers by themselves. The similarities that occur are the average dromos width ranging from 1.26-1.29m and the stomion length and width ranging from 0.8-0.82m. There is a difference in the dromos length which on average in the north is 3.55m (median 3.1m) and in the south 4.25m (median 3.1m). Although the average does vary, the median value is exactly the same, suggesting that the divergence is due to the larger southern sample and some exceptionally large tombs there. Moreover the highest point of the

dromos in the north is on average 0.3m and in the south 2.32m. This is based to a large extent on the poor state of preservation of the few tombs found in the north of the island. One more distinction is the stomion height which in the north is on average 0.8m and in the Southern 1.24m. The last and perhaps most important variation between the two areas is the size which in the north is on average 3.95m² (median 4.1m²) and in the south 5.6m² (median 4.76m²). The median value may reflect better the extent of the difference between the two areas. However, there does seem to be a variation in the construction of the tombs, in particular is the stomion height and more importantly the chamber size.

One more interesting comparison will be attempted here to reveal the heterogeneity as well as the homogeneity of some cemeteries from southern Rhodes. The cemeteries of Kalavarda, Passia, Apsaktiras and Aspropilia were selected on the basis of the number of tombs with reported architectural elements, ranging from four to six. The samples are in reality small, but they can be compared and there are no larger samples available anyway. At Kalavarda the tombs have an average dromos length of 2.67m (median 2.55m), width 1.33m, highest point 0.3m, stomion length 0.8m, width 0.9m (median 1.1m), no height reported and chamber size 3.83m² (median 4.1m²). At Passia the tombs have an average dromos length of 4.6m (median 3m), width 0.75m, highest point is not reported, stomion length 0.68m, width 0.67m, height 1.2m and chamber size 4.75m² (median 4.47m²). At Apsaktiras the tombs have an average dromos length of 4.39m (median 4.5m), width 1.03m, highest point 3.16 (median 2.45), stomion length 0.78m, width 0.76m, height 1.19 m and chamber size 6.38sqm (median 6.11sqm). At Aspropilia the tombs have an average dromos length of 6.01m (median 5.19m), width 1.7m, highest point 1.9m, stomion length 1.93m (median 1m), width 0.9m, height 1.28m and chamber size 6.86m² (median 7.2m²). The points worth commenting on are the preference for long dromoi at Passia, Apsaktiras and especially Aspropilia, the deep dromoi that were especially favoured at Aspropilia and more importantly at Apsaktiras, and the similarities in the stomion height at Passia, Apsaktiras and Aspropilia. Overall Aspropilia seems to have built the largest tombs and thus it has the highest architectural variables in almost all categories.

Individual elements are also found in some tombs as well. Of special interest are the stone blocking walls found at the start of the dromos in T.1, T.2, T.8 and T.9 at Apsaktiras (fig.8.10). For the rest of the tombs no mention is made of stone walls, but this practice has not been reported from any other cemetery on Rhodes. The only parallels come from mainland chamber tombs, especially Dendra, Asine, and Megalo Kastelli at Thebes (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 154), as well as tholoi in the Argolid (the Tombs of Atreus and Klytemnestra), Attica (Menidi) and Dimini in Thessaly (Mylonas 1966: 118-9; Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 140-1). The question of its use remains open, as posed by Tsountas and Manatt (1897: 140). Certainly it was not done for practical reasons, since only a very small number of tombs had this feature. It could hardly have functioned as a retaining wall for the dromos fill and there seems not to have been a problem of earth sliding from the dromoi over the course of the centuries. Furthermore it cannot be argued that it was placed there in order not to have to fill the dromos, because it would not have prevented someone robbing the tomb, if indeed the filling of the dromos had that purpose. Nonetheless no adequate answer has been proposed. In my opinion this wall was part of the ritual activities that took place after the burial of the deceased. In front of the filled dromoi it is likely that at given times, such as a festival or religious event, offerings of food, flowers or even libations were made to honour collectively the ancestors that rested in the tomb. Thus the ancestors could communicate with the living in that fashion and perhaps this reinforces the idea that the orientation and more particularly the view from the dromoi were connected with the ancestors and through this their protection could be channeled. Thus the stone walls were nothing more than an elaboration of this point of communication between the ancestors and the living, where the offerings could be placed and at the same time they could have functioned as grave markers. Thus this specific place functioned as a liminal point and the stone wall as a device for the more elaborate performance of the rituals.

Additionally on Rhodes there are four cases of side chambers reported, unlike Ialysos where antechambers were found (fig.8.11). Two of these are T.3 at Passia and T.1 at Apsaktiras, with the side chamber on the right side of the dromos and the main chamber. It must be noted that T.3 at Passia is not canonical, although the drawing provided suggests otherwise (Dietz 1984: 36, 37 fig.30 compare with 38 fig.31). Perhaps

it was constructed in haste or without any interest in making it more symmetrical. Although Cretan influence cannot be dismissed, it seems less likely to have affected Passia than sites closer to maritime routes, such as Apsaktiras and Aspropilia. The Apsaktiras tomb is almost square, 1.93 by 1.9m in size. Less canonical is T.2 from Aspropilia, where the main chamber is trapezoidal; the chamber to the left of it is an irregular circle and the one to the right is reported as being hastily made and half is curvilinear and the rest rectilinear (Karantzali 2001: 16). T.5 from Aspropilia has a side chamber to the left of the main chamber and the dromos, and this has an irregular rectangular shape. Although the presence of a side chamber is well attested in many books describing Mycenaean burial practices (Tsountas and Manatt 1897: 135-6), there are in total not more than thirty across the mainland (Gallou 2002b: table VI.I; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1987: 147-8). Only Spata T.1 and Prosymna T.XXV have two side-chambers; where there is one side-chamber it can be to the left or right of the main chamber. Although the mainland has produced some examples of multi-chamber tombs, the interest on Rhodes is that four is quite an important concentration, in fact the largest outside the Argolid, reinforced by the fact that they are found in close proximity. This highlights the degree of similar beliefs and practices shared in the communities of southern Rhodes and perhaps a common social structure, not to mention the close interaction between the sites. All of them seem to have been constructed during LH IIIA2, but apart from Passia T.3 they continued to be used in the LH IIIB period and in the case of Apsaktiras T.5 down to LH IIIC. Nevertheless it remains unclear in which time period the side chambers were dug, with the exception of Passia T.3 which was constructed in LH IIIA2, but it still remains unclear whether it was built from the start or later on.

It must also be mentioned that the dromos of T.1 from Aspropilia had two steps (fig.8.12). Moreover a large step or bench has been found in the dromos of T.2 in the same cemetery, between the main chamber and the left side chamber. Chamber T.6 from Aspropilia had its dromos lower than the stromion entrance which is elevated by 0.05m. The presence of steps in the Mycenaean world is also found at Ialysos (8.1.2), and must be stressed as a rarity rather than a common practice. Finally in Aspropilia T.1 the

stomion entrance is elaborated by the presence of an incised cornice (fig.8.12), as in T.53 from Ialysos, one more extremely rare practice (8.1.2).

The individual characteristics mentioned above reveal attempts at differentiation and elaboration of the tombs. Their significance is not that important in the religious framework, even in the case of the stone wall at the beginning of the dromos which underlines the rituals performed rather than generating them. What I want to stress here is that these characteristics come from specific cemeteries, Passia, Apsaktiras and Aspropilia, revealing the desire for differentiation inside their local communities and the degree of close interaction between them. Aspropilia especially seems to have been very keen on the elaboration of tombs in terms of shape as well as additional embellishments such as steps, cornices and side chambers, perhaps the arena of competition for manifesting status in this settlement was its burial ground.

The main point raised by the architectural variables presented here is the diversity that exists among the cemeteries. The tombs in the cemeteries are consistent with each other, but not at an interregional level on the island. They clearly follow local norms, practices and tastes, an argument that can be reinforced by the diverse orientation that they were demonstrated to have, even in the cases where the cemeteries were quite close (5.2.2, 5.3.1). Furthermore this underlines the fact that the architecture of the chamber tombs was not set or imposed by a single centre, such as Ialysos, and thus the afterlife beliefs and rituals were not directly associated or manipulated by a specific political centre. The fragmentation seen here should not be overstressed, since it is only the presence of chamber tombs and all their architectural elements which highlights interaction and common belief systems. Nonetheless no attempt at manipulation or homogeneity can be suggested. Even if we argue that the architecture of the tombs is a form of defiance towards the political, social and/or economic control of Ialysos, the point remains that the architecture of tombs and perhaps the burial practices in general were outside the sphere of influence of that centre. In the cemeteries themselves attempts at differentiation can be noted at the structural level, as seen at Passia, Apsaktiras and Aspropilia. Nonetheless these three cemeteries seem to share some structural characteristics and they are neighbouring ones indicating shared beliefs and practices.

Thus it is clear that the overall image of homogeneity on the island, seen at the beginning, should not be taken as real, but as artificial for interregional comparisons.

8.1.4 Kos

The main cemetery on Kos is Eleona and Langada, comparable in size to that of Ialysos, however detailed information comes only from Langada since the notebooks for Eleona were lost during the Second World War (Morricone 1965/6). The rest of the cemeteries are published by Papachristodoulou (1979), Papazoglou (1981) and Hope Simpson and Lazenby (1962; 1970). Moreover there are also clusters reported at the site of Eleona in southern coastal Kos, but their architectural characteristics remain unknown (5.2.3).

The vast majority of the tombs are chamber tombs. Nevertheless the *pozzolana* consistency of the ground in the Eleona and Langada site does not allow in some instances an identification of the exact nature of the tomb. Thus T.3, T.6 and T.9 from Langada may have been pit graves. The first seems circular 3.14m² in size, used in the LH IIIA2 period, while the other two are rectangular, dating to the LH IIIC period, 2.38 and 3m² respectively. Therefore it is quite likely that single graves and chamber tombs coexisted in the Langada cemetery.

The use of chamber tombs on the island started in the LH IIB-III A1 period and lasted until LH IIIC (for all details refer to Appendix A.3). Unfortunately, though, the consistency of the ground as mentioned above prevents us from analyzing in detail the architectural characteristics of the tombs. In most cases only the approximate size of the chamber can be measured, while its shape is rather unclear. For that reason the little information we have will be presented along with the Kastello and Mesaria tombs in order to give a more general picture from the whole island.

At Eleona and Langada the tombs used during the LH IIB-III A1 period were eleven, increased to fifteen in LH IIIA2. More tombs appeared in LH IIIB, when 23 were in use, and the figure doubled to 50 during the LH IIIC period. There are also six for which no specific date can be proposed. This sharp increase in tombs at Kos can be seen as a sign of nucleation during this period. Though, the picture from Kos seems

different from that at Ialysos, where small sites around it were abandoned (5.3.3). It seems that on Kos there was a preference for the eastern part of the island during the LH IIIC period.

Concerning Eleona and Langada we must note that the former has its tombs facing north, while in the latter they look west. These two clusters of tombs have a chronological difference since Eleona was used from the LH IIB-III A1 period to LH III A2, but only occasionally in LH IIIB; however in LH IIIC T.7, T.11, T.12 and T.15 were re-used (Cavanagh and Mee 1978: 39). In that respect Eleona is quite close to the pattern of use seen at Makria Vounara. Langada started being used in LH III A2 and continued until LH IIIC. Most of the tombs have only one period of use. Only T.10 was used continuously from LH III A2 to LH IIIC, and only T.37 was used from LH III A2 to LH IIIB. However T.11, T.17, T.40, T.48, T.52, T.53, T.57, T.59 and T.60 show continuous use from LH IIIB to LH IIIC. Nevertheless there are signs of re-use of LH III A2 tombs in the LH IIIC period, such as T.15, T.19, T.20, T.25, T.41 and T.51 (Cavanagh and Mee 1978: 39-40).

During the LH III A2 period the tombs at Langada were concentrated in the northern part of the cemetery (fig.8.13). Only T.15 was found in the southern part on its own, on higher ground and at a distance of about 40m from the southernmost tomb of the northern cluster. T.3, probably a pit grave, is also found in the southern part, about 25m south of T.15. In this period chamber tombs are on average larger in size 4.83m² (median 3.14m²) and almost all seem to be circular in shape. During LH IIIB and LH IIIC the tombs are found spread throughout the Langada cluster. Moreover their chamber size decreased to 3.07m² on average (median 2.54m²) during LH IIIB and in the LH IIIC period the chambers are 2.63m² on average (median 2.38m²). The shape of the chambers in both periods is equally rectangular and circular.

The general picture we have from elsewhere on Kos is rather limited. For the tombs at Kastello and Giorgaras we have on average 1.5m dromos length and 1.2m for the dromos width. A better picture comes from the stomion, with an average length of 1m, width 0.77m and 0.78m height (median 0.83m). Of the 58 tombs on Kos we have information that in 29 the stone blocking was found. The stones were mainly local white stones from the local *revma*, while in some cases black stones were used, known as

amygdalopetra, most probably from Pyli (1.1) and in the case of T.58 volcanic rocks. The chamber shape is in 22 examples probably circular, in 18 rectangular, square in Langada T.8, T.17 and T.59, Kastello T.1 is irregular elliptical (fig.8.14), and in 18 cases the shape cannot be defined. The average size of the chamber in all tombs on Kos is 3.14m² and the median value is 2.57m².

The recently found tholos tomb was located on its own more than 3km west of Kos town. The tomb is 4.14m in diameter and is canonical with a stone wall at its entrance, but smaller when compared to mainland examples, 13.45m². It was constructed in LH IIIA2 and most probably re-used in the LH IIIC period.

8.1.5 South-eastern Aegean

In this section the limited evidence from Astypalaia (Doumas 1975; Zervoudaki 1971), Samos (Milojčić 1961; Zapheiropoulos 1960), Müskebi (Boysal 1967), Miletos (Niemeier 1998b), Kolophon (Bridges 1974), Bakla Tepe (Erkanal 1998), Chios (Hood 1981) and Psara (Achilara 1986; Charitonidis 1961/2c), will be presented in turn, but all the tombs will be combined to give a unified picture that will allow comparison with other regions (for all details refer to Appendix A.4).

At Astypalaia the two tombs from Armenochori and the two from Syngairos are chamber tombs of canonical shape and characteristics. At Armenochori the two tombs were almost adjacent (fig.8.15) and the wall separating them has collapsed making them appear as one tomb. They were constructed in LH IIIA1 and continued down to LH IIIC.

Unfortunately the cemetery at Perakastro on Kalymnos was illicitly excavated at the end of the 19th century and thus no architectural information has been preserved, apart from some cuts on the bedrock.

In Anatolia the Müskebi cemetery was used from the LH IIIA2 period down to LH IIIC and consisted exclusively of chamber tombs. Architectural information comes only from T.5, T.6, T.12, T.15, T.16, T.22, T.38, T.39, T.43, T.44, T.45 and T.46. Three clusters were identified, but the available data are not enough to demonstrate architectural differences. T.15 is reported to have its stomion and chamber 0.2m deeper

than its dromos. All tombs at Múskebi seem to have a kind of plaster for dressing the walls of the chamber to make them more durable. During the LH IIIA2 period 36 tombs were in use and 24 in LH IIIB. In the LH IIIC period only four tombs were still in use, whilst nine cannot be accurately dated.

The chamber tombs at Miletos are reported to have been canonical, of rectangular shape (Niemeier 1998b: 36). One characteristic seen in T.D 33 is that the deepest section of the dromos from the surface is 4.9m. The Ephesos tomb was most probably a chamber tomb, circular in shape. At Bakla Tepe it is unclear whether the built tomb possessed a dromos and thus it could either resemble that of the Heraion or those at Archontiki.

On Samos two tombs have been found, one at Myloi and one more at the Heraion. The first is a canonical tomb, while the latter is a built tomb. It has a dromos and the built is rectangular, covered by stone slabs and by earth forming a mound 6m in diameter. No other tombs were found close by, while both belong exclusively to the LH IIIA2 period. Parallels for this tomb form are found at Eleusis, Delos and possibly Kea (Papadimitriou 2001: 142-3). As for Ikaria the tomb where the pottery came from is unknown.

The cases of Emporio on Chios and Archontiki on Psara are unique. They consist of cist graves and both are quite close to the seashore. The first seems to be used only during the LH IIIB period (fig.8.16), while the second was used from LH IIIA to LH IIIB, if not earlier. Special mention should be made of T.10, T.11 and T.13, which are rectangular built tombs without dromoi or very large cist graves, constructed during the LH IIIA and LH IIIB period. They were most probably covered by an earth mound that has not been recognized and they are made of medium-sized stones and covered by stone slabs.

The overall picture that emerges is that in the LH IIIA2 period the use of the chamber tomb was widespread in the South-eastern Aegean until LH IIIC. On average the dromos length is 3.59m (median 3.3m), width 1.06 (median 1.1m), and the stomion is 0.75m long (median 0.84m), 0.75m wide (median 0.73m) and 1.59m high (median 1.5m). Of the 23 tombs analyzed only in T.1 and T.2 from Armenochori, T.6 and T.45 from

Müskebi and T.10, T.11 and T.13 from Archontiki, was the stone wall blocking preserved. The shape of these examples is in eleven cases rectangular, in five circular, T.1 Myloi, T.1 Armenochori, T.5, T.16 and T.38 Müskebi (fig.8.17), in two elliptical, T.2 Armenochori and T.6 Müskebi, in T.D 33 at Değirmentepe square and in four undefined. The size of the chamber is on average 4.08m² and its median value is 3.43m².

The tholos tomb found at Kolophon most probably belongs to the LH III period (fig.8.18). The dromos was not excavated, but the stomion was 1.9m long and 1.5m wide and some stones found in front of it suggests the existence of a blocking wall. The size of the tholos chamber is 11.82m², 3.87m in diameter, but still a small one compared to mainland examples. The size and construction resembles the tholos recently found on Kos.

8.1.6 Discussion

The picture which we have of all the cemeteries in this region is complex, but still many common elements can be found. Chamber tombs predominate, while single graves are mainly found in large concentrations of tombs, such as Moschou Vounara and Langada; the exception to this is Paradeisi. Moreover there are two exclusively single grave cemeteries at Emborio and Archontiki. Tholos tombs, although rare, exist in the region under review, enriching our knowledge of the extent of Mycenaean cultural penetration in the area.

The fact that at Emborio and Archontiki there are two cemeteries with single graves should be noted. The proximity of the two islands reveals similar social conditions at least during the LH IIIB period. Although the architecture of the tombs compared to the rest of the South-eastern Aegean is fundamentally different, it is hardly foreign. The striking fact in Archontiki is the large number, as well as the exclusive use of cist graves. The content of the tombs is Mycenaean in character, not unlike the rest of the sites in this region, thus it seems that the emphasis in this cemetery is on differentiation. The difference, in my opinion, is highly social since individuality is highlighted rather

than the family or the clan. Thus the idea of the ancestors, if it was shared at Chios and Psara, had individuality as a characteristic and not collectivity, while it was probably not maintained for more than one or two generations.

In comparing the chamber tombs from the regions discussed above, similarities and differences can be highlighted. Clusters of tombs have been reviewed here and in 5.3.1 and some differences have been seen, either chronological or architectural, suggesting social if not clan differences. Furthermore at Ialysos and Eleona and Langada the same tendency is observed, that in one of the two burial clusters, Makria Vounara and Eleona, no new tombs were built during LH IIIC, but a few were re-used. Perhaps the social divisions seen in the previous periods were no longer in the burial context. In any case it is interesting that a similar trend is attested in the two larger cemeteries in this region, suggesting parallel sociopolitical transformations.

As for the individual elements of the tombs, it seems that Ialysos has the longest and widest dromoi, while in the other regions their length and width is more or less the same. As for the dromos height, Rhodes has the deepest of all the regions. On Rhodes, Kos and the rest of the South-eastern sites the stomion length is the same, but at Ialysos it is smaller. The stomion width on the other hand is the same in all regions. The height of the stomion is the same at Ialysos and Rhodes, less at Kos, while the highest is found in the other sites of the South-eastern Aegean. Moreover the rectangular chamber shape is predominant at Ialysos and Rhodes, while the circular is commonest on Kos and Karpathos; in the rest of the South-eastern rectangular chambers are preferred, but circular are also commonly found. On average the size of the chambers is larger in the cemeteries of Rhodes other than Ialysos, however their median value is closer. In South-eastern Aegean cemeteries the size is slightly smaller, while Kos has the smallest chamber size compared to all other sites in the area. The tombs from Karpathos are rather few for comparison, but seem to be larger overall, perhaps partly because of their early date of construction, LH IIIA1-2.

It is of special interest to note that the LH IIIA2 period tombs re-used in LH IIIC are concentrated mainly in three cemeteries: at Ialysos and Kalavarda, in northern Rhodes, with the addition of Passia in southern Rhodes and at Eleona and Langada on Kos, supplemented by the Giorgaras tholos.

Tombs that stand out are the two tholoi, which were both found on their own in relatively flat areas. The mound covering them would make them impressive and should be taken as a status symbol, making a social and perhaps political statement. The same could apply to the Heraion built chamber tomb, given the presence of the mound and its close proximity to the settlement. Again no other burial close by has been reported. Thus differentiation and prestige seem to go hand in hand. Perhaps the same could be argued for the single chamber tomb recovered at Ephesos (Hawkins 1998: 1). The character of the settlement remains unclear, but it is less likely to have strong Mycenaean characteristics, although imports are reported. Therefore the imitation of the chamber tomb has a different meaning in this context, perhaps that of social status again and/or a manifestation of political standing or alliance with the Mycenaeans. This is particularly clear if we accept the equation of Ephesos with Apasa of the Hittite documents and the whole political and military relationship of this region with the Mycenaeans and the Hittites. Similar symbolic messages could be also suggested for the built tomb at Bakla Tepe with its covering mound at the highest point of the hill and the Mycenaean offerings deposited.

The case of Archontiki is dissimilar, since we find built graves in a cist grave cemetery. Again a differentiation of the people using these communal tombs is clear with the rest buried in cist graves. However here the differentiation is in a cemetery with other burials, not isolated as in the previous examples. Thus we see here a monumentalization of the cist graves, but in the same burial context. This situation underlines at the same time the differentiation of the particular family groups and the continuation of the local tradition. Thus again the demarcation of a social unit is made, perhaps additionally expressing a political message in the local context and a different attitude towards the ancestors.

Overall tholoi and built tombs are small in size when compared with the mainland examples, but larger than most of the South-eastern Aegean chamber tombs, emphasizing their differentiation from the rest of the tomb types, with both construction and size.

The picture seen here is of different local traditions and localism as far as the architecture of the tombs is concerned. Despite the differences between Ialysos and the rest of Rhodes the overall picture for the island seems similar. However the comparison between Ialysos and Kos reveals differences in chamber shape and size, revealing different tastes and preferences. The chamber size in the two main cemeteries follows exactly an opposite pattern with chambers being larger in LH IIIA on Kos and decreasing thereafter, whereas at Ialysos the LH IIIA tombs are smaller than in the subsequent periods, reaching a peak during LH IIIC. Moreover the difference between the landscape orientation overall in the two islands (5.3.1, 5.3.2), as well as the presence of a tholos tomb on Kos underlines the existence of two different social and political units, that nevertheless have close interaction between them and similar responses to new socio-political conditions as the same diachronic use of Eleona and Makria Vounara testifies. In the rest of the South-eastern Aegean local characteristics predominate, but in general they are closer to Kos rather than Ialysos, in dromos length, and chamber size. The relationship between Kos, Kalymnos and Múskebi might have been more than close interaction and further analysis of all available data might give us a fuller view. As for Karpathos, Astypalaia, Samos, Ephesos and Kolophon the limited information suggests localism, an image that could change with new finds. However the sharp contrast in the Emborio and Archontiki cemeteries clearly indicates that, although they expressed themselves as Mycenaean to some extent, their social structure seems to have been based mainly on individuality and in the expression of its differentiation. Thus these two sites help us to appreciate the area as a place with some shared cultural, social and perhaps political structures. Nevertheless this does not mean that the South-eastern Aegean should be treated as a unified or homogeneous area.

The similar orientation and the close grouping of the tombs found in the South-eastern Aegean is consistent on every site. This tendency suggests close ties between the deceased, creating an idealized image of egalitarianism for the local society. Nonetheless the structural characteristics of the tombs reveal a desire for conscious differentiation with social rather than religious or other messages. The presence of two or three clusters is attested at Pigadia, Ialysos, Paradeisi, Kalavarda, Apolakkia, Kattavia, Aphantou, Eleona and Langada, Eleona and Múskebi, in other words they are found in the largest

cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean. It can be argued that those clusters represent social divisions or clans inside the local society. They might underline the existence of family alliances with social and perhaps political bonds. Their presence is widespread in this region reflecting and generating similar social conditions and similar responses to them.

8.2 Internal Arrangements and Rituals

8.2.1 Karpathos

The recovery problems discussed in 8.1.1 are more evident when we try to reconstruct the internal arrangement of the tombs and the rituals performed in them. Thus from the available information from Karpathos, on average 2 burials are found per tomb (median 2), with 33 pots (median 15) and 4 small finds (median 2). The small finds pose a problem in counting and comparing. In some cases tens or hundreds of beads are recovered that most probably are parts of one necklace, while there are only three bronze items. The idea of counting used here is that beads similar in shape and material are treated as one object rather than several.

There are no reliable data to indicate whether there were entrance rituals, such as the deliberate breaking of pottery in the dromos. Inside the chambers there was no primary burial found⁶, but in most cases the bones were scattered. At Tou Stavrou to Kephali the burial was most probably found within the amphoroid krater, but it remains speculative whether it contained an inhumation or a cremation. At Arkasa we have a better picture of the burial traditions (fig.8.19) since a larnax containing inhumed bones was recovered, with the head of the deceased to the south surrounded by pottery. This type of larnax (fig.8.20) is commonly used in burials from the EM to the LM III period on Crete, both central and eastern (Palaikastro and Olous). In the same tomb, on the west side, an ash layer was found with bones and sherds. It seems like a cremation, however

⁶ By primary burial the *in situ* preservation of the corpse is meant with no attempt to move it, of course the same cannot be argued about his/her offerings.

the state of its recovery makes it difficult to be certain. The use of this particular tomb ranges from the LH IIIA1 to B period, thus if it is a cremation, it is one of the earliest in the Aegean. In the tomb at Makelli it is interesting to note that the bronze weapons were found below the recovered bones.

The available information from Karpathos is rather scanty and no certain conclusions can be drawn. Nevertheless the probable presence of cremation as well as the larnax reveals a wide interaction spectrum with Anatolia and Crete. The use of different burial traditions on the same island demonstrates the impact of contact with other regions in the practices and perhaps funeral beliefs. Moreover it is striking that although Karpathos is close to eastern Crete and the large Palaikastro centre, the tombs used on the island seem canonical Mycenaean, already from the LH IIIA1, and not cave tombs as at Palaikastro and Olous (Bosanquet 1901/2; Dawkins 1904/5; 1905/6; Kanta 2001: 60). Additionally the scattered bones noted earlier and the lack of a primary burial at Makelli highlights the practice of secondary treatment⁷. Even though more evidence is necessary in order to have a better picture of the burial customs performed on the island, it is clear that different practices coexist in the local context.

8.2.2 Ialysos

From Ialysos the evidence is far more clear, however there are two major drawbacks. The first is that it is unclear how much attention was given to the dromos finds and secondly whether calculations of the number of burials inside the tomb were based on skull, skeleton or deposit counting rather than on anthropological analysis.

Broken sherds from the dromoi in the Ialysos cemetery are reported in ten tombs, T.12, T.23, T.36, T.37, T.38, T.40, T.42, T.43, T.53 and T.55 (*contra* Voutsaki 1993: 136). Special reference should be made of T.36, T.38 and T.40, which were all re-used in the LH IIIC period and where sherds were found in the dromos as well as inside the

⁷ In secondary treatment the purposeful disarticulation of bones is supplemented by appropriate rituals as a continuation of the burial process.

chamber. Perhaps they resulted from the chamber cleaning process. In the dromos of T.23 parts of a figurine and a glass paste bead were found along with the sherds and in T.43 there was a gold rosette as well as sherds. In the dromos of T.12 a whole stirrup jar was recovered, while in T.53 a whole kylix and a spouted cup were found. Another interesting case is the stone mortar in the dromos of T.44. The fact remains that in few dromoi were broken pottery recovered, mainly belonging to LH IIIA and B. In the case of the tombs re-used in LH IIIC, it remains unclear whether pottery was actually broken in the dromoi. Overall this practice seems to have been rare and it was probably not as popular as in the mainland.

Of the three tombs that possessed an antechamber in T.19 a jug and a stirrup jar had been placed and in T.24 two piriform jars, three stirrup jars, a three-handled cup, a jug and probably a brazier. T.43 contained only a primary burial in a tomb re-used during the LH IIIC period. In both T.19 and T.24 the presence of piriform jugs and stirrup jars indicate that they functioned as offerings of some kind that were not supposed to be placed inside the tomb along with the other offerings. Interestingly enough in both tombs there were no primary burials, but only secondary ones were present. Perhaps in the tombs that possessed an antechamber, when the secondary burial rituals were performed new deposits were made as part of the ceremony. The same could apply to the other chamber tombs without an antechamber, except that the offerings were placed inside the chamber. Perhaps in this case we have a rare insight into the ceremonies which involved the secondary treatment of the burials, however more examples would confirm this proposal. Alternatively the finds could be associated to a cult of the particular dead, but our evidence is inconclusive for such a claim.

The average number of people buried in tombs is 2.33 (median 2), accompanied by 12.23 pots on average (median 8) and 5.54 small finds (median 3) (for all details refer to Appendix B.1). However between Makria Vounara and Moschou Vounara there are some variations. On average the first had 2.62 burials (median 2) and the second 2.33 (median 1). It is clear that the average value does not have a significant difference, but from the median it appears that single burials inside chamber tombs were far more frequent at Moschou Vounara than the more communal Makria Vounara. However the

overall average of burials is very low when compared to the mainland, perhaps indicating that at Ialysos there was not much continuity in the use of the chamber tombs and that it was restricted to a few members of the family to whom the tomb belonged. Also the extent of re-use of tombs in the LH IIIC period and the cleaning of many tombs might have been an additional factor contributing to this low number. Furthermore the fact that tombs where anthropological analysis has taken place reveal double the number of burials to calculations based on skull or deposit counting should also be taken into consideration.

The presence of children or infants in the tomb is reported in some cases and also inferred due to poor bone preservation as in T.11, T.13 and T.21. Here only the reports where a skeleton was found will be discussed. In T.49, T.51 and T.57 children and adults coexist in the same chamber, all in Makria Vounara. The case of T.71 is unclear since it seems that the cremation found belonged to a child, but no anthropological analysis had taken place. In T.8, T.18, T.22, T.62, T.72, T.76, T.77 and T.85 only child burials were recovered. Children or infants are equally found as primary and secondary burials, highlighting that in this respect they were not treated dissimilarly to the adults. However it must be noted that overall the children and infants are underrepresented, considering the high mortality rate that must have existed, constituting only 16 out of the c.182 burials reported.

Inside the chamber there are constructions used to accommodate the burials. One of them is a bench, carved in the bedrock along one side of the chamber, where the deceased or offerings were placed. Although they are uncommon, they are found in T.28, T.51, T.61 and T.85, placed on the west, south-west and south sides (fig.8.21). In T.33 there are benches on three sides of the chamber. They are found in tombs either used only in the LH IIIA2 period, the first two, or only in the LH IIIC period, the last three. Benches were also found in the Argolid, particularly at Mycenae and Prosymna (Gallou 2002b: table IV.II; Gilmour 1995: 157 table 17.1). Nonetheless no LH IIIC chamber at Perati possessed one, emphasizing that Ialysos it was a local preference (Iakovidis 1970B: 15).

The presence of pits, circular, rectangular or oval is more common. It is interesting that in T.17 and T.80 two pits were found, in the first both circular and in the

second circular and rectangular, while in T.32 three rectangular pits existed. In T.17, T.19, T.20, T.32, T.80, T.83, T.84 and T.87 the pits are found on the right as one enters the tomb (fig.8.22), in T.17 and T.38 on the left, and in T.32, T.33, T.47 and T.51 the pits are situated in the centre of the chamber. The pit in T.34 was situated close to the stomion. The preference for the right side is not followed in any other respect, thus it remains uncertain why it was preferred. Of the 17 pits recovered only four did not contain anything, two pits in T.32, T.51 and T.80. Only in T.20 were the pits covered, with three stone slabs, and in T.17 both pits and in T.32 the pit in the north-west corner were covered by a single stone slab. Most of the pits were found in tombs at Moschou Vounara, but they were not unknown at Makria Vounara. Chronologically all occur in tombs used or re-used during the LH IIIC period with the exception of T.19, which was exclusively used in the LH IIIA period. Thus it seems that, although known before the LH IIIC period, it became a common practice only at a later date. It is quite interesting to note that they also appeared, in limited numbers, at Perati during the LH IIIC period, revealing a similar preference for such an internal installation (Iakovidis 1970B: 14-5).

The paving of the chamber floor also occurs, but is quite rare. Only in T.42 were there stone slabs placed on the south side of the tomb, but nothing was deposited on them. Moreover pebble floors are found in T.56, T.69 and T.83 in both burial areas and are present in all periods the cemetery was used. In T.57 there was a pebble layer on the carved bench of the chamber. It must be remembered that in the LM I pit and cist burials pebble paving was used for the deceased (5.1). Perhaps we see here the persistence of an older custom or its intermingling with the chamber tradition. Apart from its practical use the pebble floor could symbolize the sea and the sea journey to the afterworld, and perhaps bears metaphysical meaning. There are also niches carved on the east and south sides respectively in T.56 and T.58, while in T.12 they are carved on three sides of the chamber. All of the tombs with niches were used in the LH IIIA2 period and only T.12 was re-used in the LH IIIC period. These examples, although uncommon, reveal extra care and preparation for the deceased and underline the importance of the primary burial.

A number of tombs were excavated which were destroyed completely or partly and no burials were recovered, such as T.1, T.11, T.14, T.26, T.27A, T.32A, T.34, T.44 and T.45. In T.30, T.46, T.60, T.80, T.82 and T.86 there were offerings, but the deceased were missing. The purposeful cleaning of the tombs of bones, either as part of the rituals or for practical reasons, and the existence of cenotaphs are equally plausible explanations. Perhaps all of these reasons apply in different tombs, but they cannot be confirmed. The case for cenotaphs in a large port site is appealing since some of the inhabitants would have been mariners lost in shipwrecks as they do today; nevertheless this idea must remain speculative.

Cremations occur in the cemetery at Ialysos in both burial areas. They are found inside jugs, which are placed in pits in T.17, T.32, T.33 and T.87. Inside T.38 and the second example in T.17 the cremation ashes were deposited simply in a pit. In T.15 and T.71 the cremated ashes were also found in jugs, but they were left in the chamber along with the other burials. The case of T.20 is not clear since bones were found inside a hydria, but the information we have does not specify their character. At any rate all of the examples mentioned above belong to the LH IIIC period along with inhumed burials. The picture we have from Ialysos is similar to that found at Perati, apart from the urn type used and the fact that multiple cremations are not found in Ialysos (Iakovidis 1970B: 40). In T.19 the bones recovered were partly burnt and it is possible that they were cremated, but this particular tomb was exclusively used in the LH IIIA period and it remains an arbitrary case.

Nevertheless the predominant burial rite at Ialysos is inhumation. All burials are placed on the floor of the chamber or inside pits apart from the shaft grave T.81, where there is evidence to suggest the use of a larnax for the deposition of the deceased. Interestingly enough in a primarily mainland grave type, such as the shaft grave, the occurrence of a larnax is an unusual find, but it is unclear whether the larnax belongs to the mainland or Cretan tradition (7.2), due to its fragmentary state. Nonetheless a parallel of a shaft grave containing a larnax comes from the Zafer Papoura burial area at Knossos (Evans 1906: 15, 50), perhaps indicating a limited Cretan influence. Inside 35 chamber tombs there are only primary burials, in 26 only secondary burials were recovered, while both coexist only in 14 tombs.

At least 83 *in situ* primary burials were found. They are placed almost exclusively in an extended position along the main axis of the chambers. In 55 cases the heads are placed close to the door (fig.8.23), while only in seven cases are the heads near the back of the chamber (fig.8.24). Additionally there are ten cases where the deceased was placed parallel to the stomion by the back wall and eleven where their exact location is not clearly reported. The bodies were deposited in 35 cases on the left side of the chamber, when entering it, and slightly less, 26 on the right, while nine in the centre have been reported. Perhaps the most important thing was for the body of the deceased to be aligned with the main axis and orientation of the tomb in order that the power of the ancestors would be channeled through the dromoi to areas where their protection was needed. Thus the preferred location of the head inside the tomb is to the north-east and secondly the north-west.

The fact that the head is usually placed closer to the stomion allows us to visualize part of the *ekphora* process. The bier on which the deceased was placed was transported from his/her house to the tomb with his/her feet at the front and the head at the back. Thus the deceased formed a part of the procession with the rest of the participants, not opposing them and becoming the focus of the procession through facing backwards. Perhaps it was felt that the deceased was still part of the community until deposited in the tomb. Probably a few more rituals were performed outside the dromos, either libations or funerary dirges and a few words were spoken about the deceased before entering the tomb. Again the bier would be taken inside the chamber in the same fashion since the bier would be impossible to manoeuvre in the dromos and difficult in the small chamber. Apart from the practical difficulties there may well have been a symbolic dimension, as discussed before.

The offerings are equally placed by the head, body and feet of the primary burials. Beads were worn as part of necklaces, while in some cases, such as in T.3, a silver band was found on the skull of the deceased and in T.19 there was a lead sheet by the skull. Moreover in T.51 a knife was placed on the chest and in T.73 a bronze mirror on the stomach of the burial. These cases indicate more care and a close relationship between the deceased and specific objects that either were dear to them or were symbolically appropriate for that particular person. Therefore some differentiation might

have existed amongst the people deposited inside the same tomb and/or these special items were placed alongside the deceased on his/her bier throughout the journey from home to the tomb giving this special treatment a public display.

The picture that we have is rather diverse, but there is a tendency to retain primary burials without evidence of secondary treatment, especially when compared to the Argolid (Voutsaki 1993: 81-4, table 9.5). This can be seen especially in tombs where there are plenty of *in situ* burials, as in T.7, T.31, T.32, T.52, T.57, T.58, T.62 and T.70. This single burial number is quite high for a Mycenaean cemetery, but we must not forget the extent of re-use, since at least 14 of them were used or re-used during the LH III C period. Nevertheless there are at least 29 tombs reported to have single burials, where we equally find primary burials and secondary treatment.

The second burial treatment is known (fig.8.25), but seems less popular than primary burial, even when repeated burials were made. Thus it remains unclear when it took place, if there was a set time or it was for the specific family to perform it or not. Perhaps what we see here is the existence of two different burial treatments coexisting in the same cemetery. Perhaps they express a difference in social, religious or personal/family beliefs rather than anything else.

Thus it can be said that the characteristic of Ialysos is the small size of the chamber tombs with few burials and the tendency to retain the primary burial in an extended position with the head close to the stomion. As for the rest of the characteristics inside chambers, they are similar, only less commonly attested, to the mainland cemeteries. Nevertheless the diversity that exists and the characteristics that are present highlight a canonical Mycenaean cemetery with some strong local features.

8.2.3 Rhodes

Of the other cemeteries on Rhodes the information comes from different places and is of uneven quality: Kouri T.1, T.2, Asprovilo T.5, T.6, Maritsa T.2, Kalopetra T.2, Kalavarda T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, and T.5, Kaminaki-Lures T.1, Lelos T.1, T.2, T.6 and T.7,

Ayios Minas T.1, Tzigani T.1, Yennadi T.1, Passia T.1, T.2 and T.4, Kalogrios T.1, Apsaktiras T.1, T.2 and T.11, Aspropilia T.1, T.2, T.3, T.4, T.5 and T.6, and Archangelos T.1, a total of 33 tombs.

. Sherds recovered from dromoi are uncommon, coming from Passia T.1 and T.2. However the conditions of recovery and/or excavation of these cemeteries should be taken into consideration. This point is further highlighted when we compare them with the recently excavated Aspropilia cemetery, where in all the tombs sherds were found in the dromoi. Furthermore the dating of the sherds corresponded more or less to the periods the tombs were used, including the LH IIIC period in T.5 and T.6. It must also be noted that the sherds were found mainly close to the stomion and in T.5 sherds were recovered in the stomion as well. Although the evidence comes from only six tombs in a single cemetery, the conditions of the excavation demonstrate the extent of the problem in this region and suggest that breaking pottery was practiced everywhere. Moreover by the blocking wall of Aspropilia T.3 animal bones were recovered, perhaps connected to the funerary meals consumed or offerings to the deceased in the dromos.

In order to have a broader picture from the area, the burials and offerings from the cemeteries on Rhodes have been analyzed (for all details refer to Appendix B.2). Certain cemeteries were excluded such as Apolakkia and Lardos, because we have only pottery evidence and it is unclear from which tombs it comes and whether it comprises the whole corpus from the cemetery. The same applies for Apsaktiras, apart from a few cases where the number of burials, pottery and small finds are reported by the excavator and Dietz (1984). Thus it seems that on average there are 3.03 burials per tomb (median 2), with 10.1 pots (median 6) and 4.3 small finds (median 3).

The problem of burial counting discussed in 8.2.2 still persists and in almost all cemeteries where the content of the tombs has been reported, skull, skeleton or deposition counting has taken place. Fortunately in the Aspropilia cemetery anthropological analysis of the skeletal remains was carried out. Without it, and based on depositional counting a number ranging from 9 to 16 would be proposed for the six tombs, however the analysis has given evidence for 30 burials (McGeorge 2001: 82-93). Moreover 10 males, 10 females and 10 children have been identified. The picture we

have is a rather balanced one even in individual tombs during LH IIIA2-B. It seems that there was no gender bias or exclusion from the privilege of being buried in the chamber tomb. Nevertheless it should be noted that only two infants are represented, perhaps highlighting that a certain age had to be achieved for burial to be allowed in these tombs (McGeorge 2001: 94). However during LH IIIC it is interesting to note that seven children come from T.4 indicating a contrast to earlier practices. Perhaps this change reflects a social stress on the family connected to the local population and the threats that might have been present, in a period of wider socio-political unrests.

In the internal arrangement of the tombs on Rhodes various characteristics are found. Low carved benches occur only at Aspropilia, in T.2 (central chamber), T.3, T.5 (central chamber) and T.6 (fig.8.26). In T.2 and T.6 they are found along the left side when entering the tomb, and also in the case of T.5 except that the bench was not built along the whole side, but most of it. In T.3 the bench was carved along the right side of the chamber. All of the tombs were cut in the LH IIIA2 period, and the carving must have taken place in the initial stage of their construction as indicated by its presence only in the central chamber of the two multi-chamber tombs. The popularity of carved benches at Aspropilia is not reported anywhere else in the South-eastern Aegean apart from Ialysos (8.2.2). However the proportion is higher at Aspropilia even when compared to mainland Greece (Gallou 2002b: table IV.II).

There are no pits reported in any cemetery on Rhodes. Nonetheless slab paving has been found in Passia T.2 in the north-east and north-west corner of the chamber (fig.8.27). On the latter bones, offerings and a skull were found. Stone slabs are also found in Apsaktiras T.1 on the north side of the chamber in two different areas close to the north-eastern and north-western corners, on which two primary burials were placed. There is a cavity cut at Ayios Minas T.1 on the left of the stomion where scattered bones were found, probably functioning as a niche. Moreover Dietz (1984: 53) reports the existence of niches cut in the side walls close to the stomion in Apsaktiras T.11, but unfortunately no more details are given. Furthermore in Yennadi T.1 a pebble floor was found on the northern side of the chamber, to the left, as the chamber is entered, but since half of the tomb was bulldozed it is uncertain to what extent the rest of the

chamber was paved. The pebbles in this case seem to be from the nearby local *revma*, rather than from the seashore. Therefore in sites on Rhodes, apart from Ialysos, we find the same tendency for more internal elaboration that has as its purpose the comfort of the deceased, especially when we consider that it is unclear how many people were allowed to enter the chamber. These installations seem not to have played a vital ritual role, if indeed they had one, since they were not particularly common.

The tombs with no skeletal remains are limited to Kalavarda T.4, Lelos T.2 and Aspropilia T.6. Preservation reasons as well as cleaning of the tombs for practical or ritualistic purposes cannot be dismissed or confirmed from the available evidence.

Moreover cremation, if practiced, was a rarity rather than a new tradition. There is uncertain evidence from Kaminaki-Lures perhaps of a partial cremation, but it probably comes from a LH IIIA2 context. Nevertheless the practice of cremation at Müskebi and Karpathos in this early period does provide some support for such a claim. The main problem is the context and the degree of firm evidence inside the tomb (Benzi 1992: 418; Mee 1982: 53).

In all cemeteries on Rhodes inhumation predominates, however secondary treatment was far more favoured than at Ialysos. Primary burial has been preserved only in seven cases at Asprovilo T.6, Maritsa T.2, Kalopetra T.2, Kalavarda T.1, T.3, probably Lelos T.1 and Apsaktiras T.1. On the contrary there are 21 cases where secondary treatment has been found (fig.8.28) and only in Aspropilia multi-chamber T.2 do primary burial and secondary treatment coexist (*contra* Voutsaki 1993: 134). At Kaminaki-Lures it seems that there were secondary burials, but it is unclear whether a primary one existed.

Of the inhumations left *in situ* those from Kalavarda T.1 and T.3 are placed in an extended position with the heads aligned to the door. The same applies in Kalopetra T.2 except that the deceased was placed in a contracted position. The case of Maritsa T.2 is different, where all three burials were placed with their heads at the back of the chamber. In the other two cases the position of the bodies is not clearly reported. Nevertheless it must be noted that the vast majority of the sites with primary burials were in the

northern part of the island. Thus the influence of Ialysos might be partly responsible for this similarity either at a social or cultural level.

The limited number of tombs in which primary and secondary burials coexist is striking on Rhodes, outside Ialysos. It occurs only at Aspropilia represented by a single primary burial, probably the last, surrounded by several secondary ones. The primary burials in the main chamber at Aspropilia T.2 and probably the one from the side chamber are found in a crouching position on their right side looking towards the side wall and their head is placed at the side of the back wall.

The offerings were most frequently placed mainly close to the head and secondly by the feet and less often close to the body. At Kalogrios T.1 a whetstone and a razor were placed below the skull, as a result of the secondary re-arrangement of the tomb. In Apsaktiras T.1 one of the deceased was reported to have been found wearing his helmet, while another deceased in Aspropilia T.2 side chamber was wearing rings on both hands. Moreover the evidence of linen on the jaw of a burial in Aspropilia T.1 suggests that it was a way to hold the mouth of the deceased closed *post mortem* (Karantzali 2001: 15). All these points underline the extra care taken by the living for the deceased as well as highlighting their *persona* and social identity in their last resting place. Linen remains occurred also in a jug and a piriform jar in Aspropilia T.1 and in another piriform jar from the main chamber of T.2, wrapped around the necks in order to retain the liquid offerings they contained (de Wild 2001: 114-5). This should remind us that pottery deposited in tombs was not always an offering in its own right, but containers of the real offerings that were intended to accompany the deceased on his/her journey to the afterworld. Furthermore it must be noted that in Passia T.4 charcoal was reported in the chamber in front of the stomion. Perhaps this indicates the practice of purification rituals in some cases, probably connected to the secondary treatment of the deceased.

The presence of a single burial in tombs is unclear since most of the tombs contained secondary burials. Therefore the counting is based on the presence of bones and skulls if they were found. One burial is reported at Asprovilo T.1, Kalavarda T.3, T.5, Lelos T.7, Ayios Minas T.1, Tzigani T.1, perhaps Yennadi T.1, Passia T.1, Kalogrios T.1 and Apsaktiras T.2. Only at Kalavarda T.3 was there a primary burial with no evidence of

another one. In the side chamber of Aspropilia T.5 a single burial was recovered, which had received secondary treatment.

The popularity of secondary treatment shows continuity and a very consistent practice for the deceased through a more frequent re-opening of the tomb and re-arrangement inside with all the appropriate rituals performed. In my opinion it reveals a closer and more frequent interaction of the living and the dead, something that highlights the importance of the deceased in the everyday conduct of life in the local community. This point is reinforced by the elaboration features found inside the tombs as well as the structural ones seen in 8.1.3. Perhaps the role of the ancestors was more important in the rural areas of Rhodes than in the main settlement of the island.

8.2.4 Kos

From Kos our evidence comes primarily from the Langada burial cluster as well as the tombs at Kastello, Iraklis, Giorgaras, Mesaria and Ayia Paraskevi.

From Langada in the dromos of T.48 kylix sherds were reported. In the same cemetery in T.40 a jug and a drinking vessel were recovered and at T.60 a one-handled bowl and a stemmed bowl were found. Moreover in T.58 in front of the stomion a fragmentary female figurine was found probably smashed against the stone wall. However we must bear in mind that in this cemetery as a whole the dromoi were not excavated. From Mesaria T.1 a sherd was also recovered from the dromos revealing that breaking pottery was practiced outside the main cemetery of Kos.

As discussed in 8.1.4 the *pozzolana* consistency of the bedrock does not allow good preservation of bones, therefore the picture we have is unhelpful when compared to other areas (for all details refer to Appendix B.3). Nevertheless on average there were 1.88 burials recovered per tomb (median 1), accompanied by 5.39 pots (median 4) and 6.17 small finds (median 3). Although in pottery Eleona and Langada have the same average and median value, in small finds there is a considerable difference with the first having 4.38 on average (2.5 median) and the second 6.75 (3.5 median).

Perhaps due to the poor preservation conditions only two tombs have produced positive evidence of child burial in T.59 and T.61. Another was recovered inside a pithos in the dromos of T.58. Alternatively if the number of burials was in fact so few per tomb then perhaps children were not permitted inside the chambers due to age or status limits imposed.

Although the shape of chamber as well as their size is uncertain, we have an insight into some of the internal arrangements. Only in Langada T.1 and T.21 has a carved *pozzolana* bench been found 0.6m and 0.5m high respectively. In Mesaria T.1 there was a shallow pit, on the right side when entering the tomb. The same is found in the Giorgaras tholos tomb, where a shallow pit or a depression extends from the stomion to the centre of the tomb. Depressions inside chamber tombs are quite rarely attested with one example from Mycenae T.532 and probably one more from Asine, most probably underlining the unique character of this particular tomb (Gilmour 1995: 157 table 17.1; Wace 1932: 110). In the tholos tomb there was stone paving in the centre of the tholos. In Langada the presence of stones forming shallow benches seems more popular and is found in T.29, T.37, T.38 and T.53. In T.17, T.45 and T.60 we have evidence of stones but it is uncertain whether they were part of the stone wall blocking or of a stone bench. On a stone slab from T.45 a stirrup jar was placed, perhaps reinforcing the idea that it was part of a stone bench or paving. Moreover on the stone bench in T.37 there were some offerings and in T.38 a jug was found on the bench.

There are some tombs where no burials were recovered such as Langada T.2, T.3, T.8, T.11, T.13, T.16, T.22, T.31, T.32, T.33, T.37, T.39, T.41 and T.56 and Eleona T.21. It is clear that the number is quite high and that the conditions mentioned before have contributed to this distorted picture.

There is only a single case of cremation reported in T.44, where the ashes and the bones were placed inside a jug. The tomb was exclusively used during the LH IIIC period.

The predominant burial practice on Kos is inhumation inside chamber tombs. The only exception is a pithos burial found in the dromos in front of the stone wall

blocking in Langada T.58. Perhaps this pithos burial is a continuation of an older burial tradition that is reported on the island since the EBA. This is the only occurrence of a dromos burial in the cemeteries of South-eastern Aegean and more generally of the insular Mycenaean world (Lewartowski 1996: 758).

The presence of primary burials only is attested in seven tombs, while only secondary treatment is found in 30 tombs. In seven tombs primary and secondary burials coexist. The overall picture from Kos indicates a similarity to the Rhodian sites rather than Ialysos.

The available reports about the specific location of the primary burials come from nine tombs in Langada, one tomb from Mesaria and one from Iraklis and concern 18 individuals. Of these, nine are placed with their heads at the back, five with their heads close to the stomion and three are situated vertical to the main axis of the chamber, while the case of the Iraklis burial is unclear. Nine are in an extended position and there are nine in a crouched one. Thus they give a more mixed picture and no set practice can be seen as in the case of Ialysos. Nevertheless there seems to be a preference for the head to be placed close to the back wall, as seen in Rhodes especially and unlike Ialysos, while the posture of the deceased is more balanced and no preference seems to prevail.

The low coexistence of primary burial with secondary treatment is as striking as in the sites on Rhodes apart from Ialysos. Again the re-opening and re-arrangement inside the tombs seem more frequent and thus the bonds between the living and the deceased closer. Perhaps this secondary treatment underlines the role and the importance of the ancestors in the local context. Most probably this was also the case for the tholos tomb, but the state of its preservation is not very clear.

As for the offerings, the reported cases are rather few but there seems to be a preference for depositing them close to the head, secondly along the body and less frequently at the feet. Moreover there seems to be a preference for depositing bronze weapons and items close to the head, perhaps indicating that they were particularly treated or underlining the social status of the particular individual. Special note should be made of the 'killed' sword recovered in Langada T.21 on the carved bench. Here the

item is made purposefully useless and taken out of circulation serving the deceased only symbolically.

It should also be mentioned that in Langada T.25 and T.57, at the back of the chamber, evidence of burning exists on the ground. The area of this burning is strange, if fumigation is the explanation, since the area close to the stomion would be more practical. Perhaps we are viewing ritual activities connected to purification and perhaps to secondary treatment. In Langada T.21 and T.61 clay buttons were found burnt in the chambers reinforcing the hypothesis raised above.

The presence of single burials inside tombs has been noted in the median value of the burials per tomb. This is found in Langada T.1, T.6, T.7, T.10, T.14, T.15, T.18, T.20, T.21, T.23, T.24, T.26, T.27, T.28, T.29, T.35, T.36, T.38, T.42, T.44, T.46, T.47, T.48, T.49, T.52, T.58 and perhaps Iraklis T.1. In the vast majority scattered bones from the secondary treatment were recovered and therefore one burial is counted since no more than one skull was found and no anthropological analysis has been conducted. Thus this picture, along with the evidence of many empty or destroyed tombs and the almost total lack of information from the Eleona burial area, gives a distorted image of the cemetery.

The fact remains, though, that the locals elaborated in some cases the internal part of their chambers for accommodating the deceased. Furthermore they frequently rearranged the burials practising secondary treatment, transforming their deceased into ancestors and integrating the realm of the dead with that of the living.

8.2.5 South-eastern Aegean

The sites discussed in 8.1.5 are the only ones that produce some insight into the internal arrangement of the chambers and the rituals performed in them (for all details refer to Appendix B.4).

In Astypalaia both tombs from Armenochori have produced kylix sherds in their dromoi, while in T.1 more sherds of crude pottery were found. It should be noted that in both tombs no bones were recovered, while at Syngairos both tombs produced a few

scattered burnt bones and ashes. At Armenochori the long use of the tomb may suggest a clearance of bones with the intention of making room for new burials and at Syngairos the bones may represent one or more cremations. Although it is unclear whether they represent entirely or partly cremated bones, the fact remains that evidence of cremation exists in LH IIIA2 and LH IIIA2-B contexts on the island. In both cases the burnt bones and ashes seem to have been deposited on the floor of the chamber.

From Müskebi we have positive evidence for the treatment of the dead in T.6, T.15, T.22, T.34, T.39 and T.45. All contained bones of one burial with the exception of T.39. Interestingly enough *in situ* burials seem to be favoured in four tombs and only in T.22 is there evidence of secondary treatment. In T.15 most of the scattered bones recovered were carbonized, suggesting a cremation, as is the case in T.39, where primary inhumation and cremation coexist. In both these cases the cremated bones were just placed on the floor of the chamber, in contrast to T.3 where the cremated remains were placed inside a pot. All of the cremations are found in a LH IIIA2-B context and reveal Anatolian influence (7.2).

From Miletos only a plan of T.D 33 is provided, revealing secondary treatment of bones, while it is unclear whether a darker concentration represents a cremation or something else (Niemeier 1998b: photo 11). At Ephesos the few bones probably belong to one person and they were found inside a krater, but it remains unclear if this was the result of secondary treatment or of cremation. Moreover inside the burial area animal bones were recovered along with other offerings, a practice rarely attested in the South-eastern Aegean. At Bakla Tepe human and animal bones were found scattered in the chamber both cremated, but probably they were placed originally in pots. Interestingly enough a number of small bronze animal figurines were found partly melt, indicating that they were in the funerary pyre, emphasizing their symbolic value. A large stone plaque existed in the back wall, in the north-west, which had a number of circular holes, most probably connected to the rituals that were taking place inside the tomb. Moreover sherds were recovered at the dromos that joining broken pots inside the chamber, while both the dromos and the tomb floor had a gravel floor.

The built chamber tomb at the Heraion on Samos has produced bones of an adult and an infant. The fact that the offerings were swept to the sides of the chamber indicate

that the bones were intentionally scattered, as part of the secondary treatment. In contrast, at Myloi, the chamber tomb contained most probably two primary burials. It is also interesting to note that at the Heraion the floor of the chamber was paved with stone slabs and pebbles. This particular tomb had a special external and internal treatment making it really stand out.

At Emborio on Chios the cist grave was found without traces of bones, while the floor was laid with pebbles. It is interesting that the EBA rock-cut tomb found almost 200m west of it had a pebble layer on its floor. This suggests the continuation of an older tradition as far as the pebble floor is concerned, whilst at the same time rock-cut tombs were not followed by chamber tombs, as would be expected, but by cist graves, perhaps following a MBA tradition.

At Archontiki on Psara the built tombs have produced a view of the communal burial tradition on the island. In T.11 and T.13 there is a primary burial in a crouched position among more scattered bones, indicating the practice of secondary treatment. The same applies to T.10, except that there were two primary burials, most probably both in an extended position. Thus it seems that there was no special preference about the posture of the deceased inside the chamber. The primary burial belonged to a 25 year old female (Agelarakis 1987: 4), revealing that there is no gender bias as far as this use of the tomb is concerned. Of course this does not mean that there were no different age or status criteria more generally. In T.11 the primary burial was placed on a layer of pebbles, while at the north-western corner of the chamber there was a pile of stones whose function is uncertain. As for the cist graves in T.12 only a child burial has been reported.

The overall picture that comes from the chamber tombs of this area is that there are on average 2.23 burials per tomb (median 1), accompanied by 8.18 pots (median 4) and 6.1 small finds (median 7). Especially for the burials in tombs the median value is much affected but the number of single burial tombs from Müskebi contrasts with the numerous burials found at Archontiki. This highlights the degree of local variation in practices. Although at Müskebi primary burials are favoured and on Astypalaia

secondary treatment is more prominent, in all sites in this area primary and secondary treatment is attested.

8.2.6 Discussion

The emerging picture in the South-eastern Aegean, as far as the internal arrangement of the tombs and the rituals are concerned, is as diverse as the tomb construction (reviewed in section 8.1).

The conditions of the discovery and excavation of the tombs is a problem highlighted by the recent systematic excavation conducted at Aspropilia on Rhodes. A good example of this is the presence of broken pottery in the dromoi which is sporadically reported in the area, but is present in all the tombs at Aspropilia. Thus, although the fact remains that tombs in the South-eastern Aegean seem to contain fewer burials, that was not necessarily the case for the whole region and the lack of anthropological analyses has seriously blurred the picture.

Inside the tombs in the cemetery of Ialysos carved benches and more importantly pits are more popular than in the rest of Rhodes, with the exception of Aspropilia where carved benches were very popular. As noted earlier the benches are almost as common as in the Argolid, while there is a similar preference for them at Perati and Ialysos. At Langada stone benches were favoured more than any other chamber installation. At the Giorgaras tholos the depression found has probably only two parallels from the Argolid, one from Asine and one from Mycenae (8.2.4). It is interesting to note the persistence of cist graves at Emborio and Archontiki as the predominant grave type, as well as the occasional presence of pit graves at Ialysos, Kouri and perhaps at Langada. The existence of a pithos burial at Langada on Kos, as well as the presence of pebble floors inside the chamber tombs at Yennadi, Ialysos, Heraion and Archontiki, shows that older burial traditions are sometimes incorporated or exist alongside new ones, such as the introduction of chamber tombs in this region. Overall the internal arrangement of tombs is as varied as in the rest of the Mycenaean world.

Children are well represented only in the tombs of Ialysos, but not in the rest of the sites. However the evidence from Aspropilia, based on anthropological analyses, should make us question this, as much as the state of preservation of the skeletons at Kos. What we can say is that care was taken at least for some children and infants and especially at Aspropilia all of them probably had the right to be placed in the tombs. This point, as well as the fact that the people were buried almost exclusively in chamber tombs, suggests that it was the main burial tradition. It is unclear if there were any social or other criteria based on gender or age which permitted or restricted burial, but it seems that all social classes could have a family chamber tomb. The fact that there is an increase of children deposited in chamber tomb during LH IIIC at Aspropilia may be socially significant, but more evidence is needed to confirm that it was not just a local phenomenon.

Cremation was a new burial method that appeared in this region from the LH IIIA2 period. Although sporadic in character it is found from Karpathos and Rhodes to Astypalaia, Kos, Müskebi, Ephesos and Bakla Tepe, most probably as a result of close cultural interaction with north-western and central Anatolia. Its popularity increased during the LH IIIC period especially at Ialysos. Interestingly enough cremation has not been reported so far in the northern part of the region under research, on Samos, Chios and Psara.

Comparing the number of burials per tomb, with the accompanying offerings, pottery and small finds between areas, we have a broader image of the South-eastern Aegean. At Karpathos, Ialysos, Kos and the other South-eastern sites two burials are found per tomb, with Rhodes having the largest average, just above three. Overall the numbers are quite low in comparison to mainland practices. The median offerings per burial are 4 pots for Ialysos, Kos and the rest of the South-eastern cemeteries, with Rhodes providing 3 and Karpathos 7.5. The median value for the small finds is just 1 for Karpathos, 1.5 for Ialysos and Rhodes, 3 for Kos and 7 for the other South-eastern Aegean cemeteries. More similarities exist between Ialysos, Rhodes, Kos and the other South-eastern Aegean sites, although the latter have a high small finds median value. Karpathos

diverges in both pottery and small finds, partly due to chronological reasons, the small sample and partly due to stronger localism.

However the fact remains that there are specific tendencies in different cemeteries, underlining the local role of the beliefs related to death and its accompanying rituals. At Ialysos (fig.8.29) there is a preference for primary burial with the deceased placed in an extended position and the head close to the stomion. 46.6% of the tombs have only *in situ* burials, 34.6% contained only secondary burials and only 18.6% of the tombs had primary and secondary burials together. This trend is closely paralleled at Mycenae, however in the latter site the tombs that have exclusively primary burials are counted along with the ones that have more than one primary burial and secondary ones (Cavanagh 1978: 171). Thus Ialysos, more than any other site, has a strong preference for exclusively primary deposition of bodies in tombs. In the rest of the sites on Rhodes (fig.8.29), apart from a few cases that show similar trends with Ialysos in the northern part of the island, the other cemeteries favour secondary treatment of the deceased. In 23.3% of the tombs only primary burials were recovered, in 70% only secondary ones and only in 3.3% did primary and secondary coexist. On Kos secondary treatment was also popular (fig.8.29), whilst the primary burials were equally placed in an extended and crouched position, but with their head, unlike at Ialysos, at the back of the chamber. 16% of tombs have exclusively primary burials, 68% only secondary ones and 16% both primary and secondary. Thus a similar preference for exclusively secondary treatment inside tombs is seen on Rhodes and Kos, while there are no such parallels from the mainland. In the rest of the South-eastern Aegean sites there is no single tendency, but rather local characteristics. At Müskebi, which has provided most of the evidence, single primary burials seem to be preferred. The overall picture we have from 162 tombs in the South-eastern Aegean, as a unified area for comparison with other regions, is that tombs with exclusively primary burials constituted 33.3%, with only secondary treatment 52.4% and both coexist in 14.2% (fig.8.30). It is striking that the secondary treatment is very popular, that there is a high percentage of tombs with primary burials exclusively, while there is a rather low number of tombs where primary and secondary burials coexist.

Although the degree of secondary treatment depended on local preferences, its use highlights that it was well known. For Karpathos, Rhodes, Kos, Astypalaia and for the occupants of the built chamber tombs of Archontiki, secondary treatment meant something more, as argued before. It suggests, in my opinion, the transformation of the dead to ancestors by the living so as to receive their protection and help. This also explains, in some cases, the orientation of the tombs towards the settlement. Perhaps the powers of the ancestors was related to the fertility of the local population, as much as that of the land and/or protection from or of the sea.

Summarizing it can be said that the basic ideas and practices that are connected with chamber tombs were performed to various degrees in this region. The local characteristics of the social structure, the degree of interaction with other sites as well as the older traditions formed these local differences. That is not to say that this region formed a unity, but rather that there were many common elements in the social structures, as well as the beliefs connected to burials, between the areas discussed here.

CHAPTER 9: BURIAL OFFERINGS

In this chapter the burial offerings will be analyzed, both pottery and small finds. The thorough and extensive analyses, listed in the Introduction provide a wealth of details. However the purpose of presenting the burial offerings here is not a matter of mere repetition, but to assess the finds in their burial context in the light of their ritual and socio-political significance through time. Pots were not only appreciated for their style, but mainly for their function, as Tournavitou (1992), Leonard (1981) and the evidence from Pylona (8.2.3) have demonstrated. Although pottery and small finds form a unity as burial offerings, a point that we frequently forget, they will be discussed here separately so as to be presented more clearly and be better understood. First the pottery evidence will be treated and then the small finds by island, as in the previous chapter. In section 9.1 each pottery type will be presented in chronological order.

9.1 Pottery

The significance of burial offerings is that they are purposely deposited in specific places, tombs, and a selection of some kind has taken place. The division presented here is as follows: vessels serving for oil (stirrup jars), jars (piriform jars, amphorae and amphoriskoi), jugs (jugs and hydriai), unguent containers (pyxides, alabastra, askoi, thelastra and flasks), open shapes (bowls, dippers, kraters, kylikes, cups, mugs, deep bowls, stemmed bowls, angular bowls and kalathoi) and ritual vases (basket vases, braziers, kernoi and rhyta). Although vessels probably have more than one meaning and often function since items can bear multi-level symbolisms in different contexts or to different people, this categorization will highlight patterns and trends that could suggest some of their symbolic significance.

At this point it must be clear that for the South-eastern Aegean there are some chronological issues that must be addressed. From LH IIB to LH IIIA2 the pottery styles are more or less identical in the mainland and the South-eastern Aegean. For LH IIIB a

subdivision into two periods is proposed (French 1966: 219-22; 1967: 182-4; 1969: 75, 87; Mountjoy 1976: 81-2; Wardle 1969: 265-6; 1973: 304-5), but it seems to be mainly a characteristic of the Argolid found less frequently in the rest of the mainland (Sherratt 1980: 183-90, 199). In the South-eastern Aegean this chronological division is absent as far as the available funerary context allows us to see (Sherratt 1980: 192-3). The LH IIIC period is divided into three phases (Iakovidis 1979: 459). However during LH IIIC early and LH IIIC middle the local pottery style has many Minoan characteristics and thus these phases cannot be distinguished. Therefore the local LH IIIC corresponds to the mainland LH IIIC early *and* LH IIIC medium period; there is also limited evidence of pottery that can be assigned to LH IIIC middle/advanced and LH IIIC late in mainland terms (Mountjoy 1999a: 985-9).

9.1.1 Karpathos

The corpus of pottery from Karpathos is large enough to give us information regarding the LH/LM IIIA period, less for LH/LM IIIB and nothing for LH/LM IIIC (tables 9.1, 9.2). Bearing in mind these chronological limitations we will proceed with the analysis of the available material (for more details refer to Appendix C.1).

The pottery style found on Karpathos has a strong Minoan character, especially during the LH/LM IIIA1 period, which seems to be mingled with Mycenaean elements in LH/LM IIIA2. The same thing can be said about the LH/LM IIIB period, however this combination or hybridization seen on Karpathos must be a local product. The extent of the Minoan and Mycenaean influence on pottery has been variously assessed, but there is a consensus that the pottery found is mainly Minoan in character locally produced, whilst there is an increase of Mycenaean imports (Charitonidis 1961/2a: 75-6; Mee 1975: 331-3; Melas 1985: 176-8; Mountjoy 1999a: 971; Voutsaki 1993: 138; Zachariadou 1978: 293). Analysis of two pots from Karpathos reveals a mainland/Argolic provenance rather than local (Karantzali and Ponting 2000: 237; Ponting and Karantzali 2001: 108 *contra* Mountjoy 1999a: 973). Moreover the links of Karpathos with east Crete and more particular Palaikastro are noted (Charitonidis

1961/2a: 33; Kanta 1980: 302), as well as with Rhodes (Charitonidis 1961/2a: 75). Further clay analysis on ten pots of LH/LM III date, but of unclear context, indicates a Rhodian and central Cretan provenance and none from east Crete (Jones 1986: 298, 510).

9.1.1.1 LH/LM IIIA1

Beyond the specific extent of Mycenaean and Minoan pottery influence, which cannot be assessed adequately yet, it is important to underline the tendencies of the pottery deposited inside the tombs. In the LH/LM IIIA1 period (table 9.3) oil containers were very popular among the funerary offerings. Stirrup jars, in particular, were one of the most common pottery types, second only to cups, something that continued in the later periods. Jars are also found in large numbers for storing the necessary provisions for the afterlife. A spouted amphora has been found at Arkasa dating to the LH/LM IIIA1 period, while a single amphoriskos was recovered at Arkasa, but its date is uncertain. Jugs are common among the funerary deposits. It must be noted that a single one from Makelli is dated to the LH/LM II-III A1 period, the earliest found in tombs. Unguent containers are as common as jugs, both a pyxis and an alabastron were attested. Open vessels were almost as popular as the oil containers. Kraters were also popular during the whole LH/LM IIIA period, more so during LH/LM IIIA1, when they comprised almost one in four of all the deposited pots. The presence of quite a few kraters is of particular interest, perhaps connected with wine drinking, but it is unclear whether they were placed in the tombs full or not. It should also be mentioned that kraters were not very popular in Crete at such an early date, apart from a few examples from Knossos (Kanta 1980: 273). In contrast to this is the small number of drinking vessels such as kylikes and cups. As for the kraters, perhaps they have a symbolism of their own in the funerary context and/or a social one for gathering and perhaps wine drinking.

9.1.1.2 LH/LM IIIA2

During LH/LM IIIA2 there is far more pottery deposited in tombs and a larger variety of pottery types (table 9.3). Oil containers are still popular, but less so than the previous period. Jars are also common among the offerings, but not as popular as in the LH/LM IIIA1 period. Jugs remain as common as they were before, while the unguent containers become rather uncommon. The same applies to alabastra, which come exclusively from Makelli. They are found both in LH/M IIIA1 and A2, while there is another one of uncertain date. A single flask also appeared at Makelli during the LH/LM IIIA2 period. These pots could have been imports from outside Karpathos. Open vases predominate among the offerings, comprising half of the deposited pottery. More importantly in this period drinking vessels were very popular with cups being preferred to kylikes. A single mug was recovered during this period at Avlona. It seems that during this period drinking became more symbolic and appropriate for the funerary context. Perhaps it reflects new social conditions related to wine drinking. Ritual vases appeared in this period only rarely among the burial offerings. The basket vase is a characteristic Rhodian pottery type and two of them were found in the same tomb at Makelli dated LH/LM IIIA2. It is believed that they were imported from Rhodes rather than made locally. Their use remains unclear. The brazier is another pottery type frequently attested on Rhodes, found more commonly than the basket vases, mainly during the LH/LM IIIA2-B period. Most are generally classified as LH/LM III, however they most probably date to the LH/LM IIIA2 or B period.

For the LH/LM IIIA2-B period, the high percentage of jugs and bowls should be mentioned. Rhyta appeared also in LH/LM IIIA2-B at Karpathos with one example from Makelli.

9.1.1.3 LH/LM IIIB

During LH/LM IIIB (table 9.3) oil containers and jars were slightly less popular than before. Jugs and unguent containers are totally absent from tomb deposits, while open vases continue to predominate. Nevertheless the kylikes seem more popular in this

period than cups. The important presence of drinking vessels emphasizes the increasing role of drinking that was already seen in the previous period. However kraters seem less popular in LH/LM IIIB when none are found. Ritual vases are also found more commonly than before in the funerary context. These were two rhyta at Diafani, one dated LH/LM IIIB and another of uncertain date.

One more point that should be raised is the existence of at least 29 monochrome pots, more than 10% of all the pottery, mainly cups, kylikes, jugs and bowls. All are vessels of everyday use and their monochrome decoration might have been due to their imitation of metal examples. At least 26 pots, jugs, stirrup jars, cups, kylikes and an amphoriskos, have linear decoration and more than thirteen were unpainted, such as braziers, conical cups, jars, bowls, a larnax, a krater and an amphora. This reveals that a number of pots were deposited in the tombs, not so much as status symbols, but rather for serving the deceased and/or for ritualistic purposes.

9.1.2 Ialysos

Ialysos has produced the earliest Mycenaean pottery inside chamber tombs, dated LH IIB, and has the longest sequence of use until the end of LH IIIC (table 9.4) (for more details refer to Appendix C.2). During the LH IIIA period there is a large corpus of pottery recovered which decreased rapidly in LH IIIB (table 9.5). Nevertheless in the LH IIIC period there is an astonishing increase in the pottery deposited in tombs, more than six times as much as in the previous period.

Clay analysis has been conducted by Jones and Mee (1978; Jones 1986: 501-8) on several pots from the Ialysos tombs. The picture that derives for LH IIIA2 is that more than 80% was imported from the Argolid, 15% was imported from other sites and only 5% was local. In LH IIIB 50% of the tested pottery was from the Argolid, 40% was from Thebes/Knossos and Attica, and only 10% was locally made. During the LH IIIC period the picture changed with 5% imported from the Argolid, almost 20% came from Thebes/Knossos, Attica, East/West Crete and East Crete/Naxos, while 75% was

produced locally. Recently Karantzali and Ponting (2000: 230, 234) have analyzed sixteen sherds from the settlement of Trianda, belonging mainly to the LH IIIA2 and LH IIIA2-B1, period and found out that two thirds were imported from the Argolid and one third from another unknown source, named provisionally South-eastern Aegean. Both analyses reveal a large quantity of imported pottery, underlining the close interaction with the mainland as well as other sites in the Aegean. Moreover they reveal the purposeful deposition of good quality vessels in tombs as burial offerings.

Stylistically the pottery finds have many mainland characteristics, while Minoan influence can also be detected, but not as much as on Karpathos (9.1.1). In LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB a local style is present with distinctive pottery styles and decoration, based on mainland and Cretan motifs. However during the LH IIIC period Rhodes produced its own idiosyncratic style; we find an important Cretan influence as in the examples of the 'octopus style' stirrup jars and a number of other motifs (Benzi 1992: 9-10; Kanta 1980: 306; Mountjoy 1999a: 985-9). Furthermore a number of Pictorial Style pots have been recovered dated to LH IIIC, with a variety of motifs on kraters, jugs, jars and kylikes (Charitonidis 1960; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 151-6).

9.1.2.1 LH IIIB

During the LH IIIB period we have a small sample (table 9.6), but it is still clear that jars were used. Jugs were favoured in funerary deposits, and open vessels are also well represented. Perhaps at this early date we see the essential offerings to the deceased for his/her journey to the afterworld. Jugs served to hold drinks, jars as containers for the necessary provisions for the journey and open vessels for drinking, perhaps both during the journey and in the afterworld.

9.1.2.2 LH IIIA1

In LH IIIA1 (table 9.6) oil containers appear for the first time, but still they are found in small numbers. Perhaps they reveal the start of more specialized production. Jars became by far the most common pottery type deposited, showing how important the

provisions were for the deceased and his/her journey. Jugs are not as well represented as in the previous period, but still they are present. The popularity of unguent containers reveals the attempts to provide aromatic and scented substances for either the journey or for practical reasons, such as the re-opening of the tombs by the living. This can be seen in the numbers of both pyxides and alabastra found. Open vessels, predominately kylikes were also important, underlining the role of feasting and in the afterworld.

9.1.2.3 LH IIIA2

During LH IIIA2 the variety of pottery types is large (table 9.6). Oil containers became the most common vessels inside tombs and perhaps they underline the importance of oil in whatever form in the funerary context. Jars are almost equally popular, emphasizing that their importance remained stable through time. Jugs are represented more or less as in the previous period. Unguent containers became less popular than in LH IIIA1, but still they are common. Open vessels remained quite popular among the burial offerings in LH IIIA2. Ritual vessels also appeared in this period and are not uncommon among deposits, perhaps revealing a new tendency towards more elaborate rituals associated with burial.

9.1.2.4 LH IIIB

For LH IIIB the decrease in pottery mentioned earlier did not particularly affect the variety of pottery types deposited (table 9.6). Oil containers remained as popular as in the previous period, underlining their significance as offerings, both practical and symbolical. Jars were less popular, but they are still found in some cases. Perhaps in this period provisions for the deceased were not thought as necessary. Jugs remained as common as in the two previous periods. The significance of unguent containers in the burial context further decreased, perhaps suggesting that they were a luxury and that in this period they were used only for a few. Open vessels predominated in the funeral assemblages being almost half of the pottery recovered. Hydriai and dippers were not placed in tombs during this period. In contrast, kraters were more frequently deposited in

tombs in LH IIIB. This emphasis on open vases shows the role and importance of feasting in the society through its symbolic association with the deceased. Kylikes are the dominant vessel, but kraters, cups, mugs, deep bowls and kalathoi are well represented. Both variety and quantity highlight the special interest in feasting and more importantly drinking. As for the ritual vessels they remained almost as common as in LH IIIA2.

9.1.2.5 LH IIIC

LH IIIC pottery constitutes more than 40% of all the pots found at Ialysos (tables 9.5, 9.6). Oil containers remained as popular as they were during LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB. Special mention should be made of the 36 LH IIIC early-late 'octopus style' stirrup jars that appeared at Ialysos. The motif is of Minoan inspiration, however a local style and production was developed, shared by other Aegean centres such as Crete, Perati, Naxos and Kos-Kalymnos (Benzi 1992: 86-91; Desborough 1964: 154-5; 1995: 31-3; Iakovidis 1970B: 181-9; Kanta 1980: 255-6; Kardara 1977: 9-21; Mee 1982: 34; Mountjoy 1999a: 1045-53, 1068-73; Popham 1967: 347; Vasilikou 1995: 329). Jars became quite popular in this period, however this picture is partly due to categorizing amphoriskoi as jars rather than unguent containers. Thus it should be noted that this categorization might distort the picture from this period for these two groups, since the function of amphoriskoi, if indeed it was the same in all cases, is uncertain. The popularity of jars is the result of the widespread use of amphoriskoi. Jugs became more popular in LH IIIC than in the previous periods. During this period strainer jugs were introduced, a shape deriving from the LH IIIB Argolid, and they were also popular. Unguent containers were found in larger numbers, especially pyxides, whereas askoi were extremely rare. Open vases remained popular, but they are significantly fewer than in LH IIIB. Their range is the same as in the previous period, but the most important point is the rarity of kylikes and the predominance of cups as the main drinking vessel. Angular bowls appeared only during this period and were rare among the offerings. Kalathoi were more frequent in LH IIIC, while there were five with linear decoration on the body and clay Psi-type figurines on their rims, coming from T.15, T.21, T.32, T.84 and one of unknown

provenance, but still from Ialysos. Ritual vases decreased in this era and are uncommon among the offerings. Basket vases stopped being deposited in tombs, while kernoi were more commonly found than before.

There are also a large number of LH IIIA-C pots whose date is uncertain. A fair quantity of them are oil containers and jugs, but they would not probably distort the picture we have. The same applies for jugs and unguent containers to a smaller extent. However in the case of the open vessels and more importantly the ritual vases, quite a number of pots cannot be accurately dated, for example the majority of the braziers, and they might have been more common than suggested here. Thus their significance may be underrepresented, but the aim of this presentation is to give the fullest view we can have and underline the trends and the tendencies rather than absolute percentages.

Of special interest are a small number of Cypriot vessels found in T.31, T.67, T.76 and T.86. In total two Cypriot Base Ring I juglets, two Base Ring I or II bulls, one White Slip I jug and one flask were recovered (Benzi 1992: 11; Mee 1982: 22). Especially in T.76 and T.86 there were no other offerings apart from the Cypriot vessels, though the tombs are canonical chamber tombs, except that the latter had two dromoi (8.1.2). All of them can be dated to the LH IIIA1-2 period and it has been suggested that in these two tombs Cypriots were buried (Mee 1982: 22). The use of Base Ring I is associated with opium consumption (Rudgley 1998: 25-6), but its limited presence at Ialysos indicates that it was not part of the local funerary practices.

Although rare, there are nineteen tinned vessels, all of which are open vessels, predominantly kylikes (15) and a few angular bowls. Unfortunately their chronological range is LH IIIA1 to C. Given their burial context they mainly belong to LH IIIA1-2 (T.31, T.50), LH IIIA2 (T.4, T. 56) and LH IIIB (T.5, T.53) (Benzi 1992: 6-7). Perhaps the most interesting thing is that all of these tombs are on Makria Vounara and none is found on Moschou Vounara. This cannot be accidental, since they are found over a large time span and in a number of tombs. Tinned vessels have been found in funerary contexts in several places on the Greek mainland and Zafer Papoura on Crete, in a limited variety of shapes with kylikes predominant, but they remain rare finds (Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 65-6; Gillis 2001: 453; Immerwahr 1966: 386; Pantelidou 1971:

436-7; 1975: 172-3). They were certainly luxury items, imitating gold, rather than silver, vessels and retaining their high status as commodities (Gillis 2001: 454). Their association with feasting and more importantly drinking clearly indicates the role of wine consumption as a social and ritual component in the local society.

Fifty five vessels were monochrome, with red and black being the most popular colours, representing all periods. Thirty are open vessels, predominantly for drinking and mainly kylikes, while there are also a few thelastra as well. Perhaps we see again an attempt to imitate metal vessels, a hypothesis strengthened by the presence of tinned open vessels and more specifically kylikes.

Bucchero ware is also found Ialysos, as unpainted types of Mycenaean pottery with a grey or grey/black clay. It is rather rare in funerary contexts (Kalogeropoulos 1998: 43-9), but might be more frequently found in settlements, ranging chronologically from LH IIIA2 to C. Only ten vessels have been found at Ialysos and they consist of four stirrup jars, two cups, one pyxis, one jar, one kernos and one more vase. There were also a large number of unpainted pots, about 92 of all dates. Half of them are braziers and most of the rest are kylikes. There are also more than 200 pots with linear decoration, again of all dates, but most of them are LH IIIC. The rest of the pottery is decorated.

In Ialysos we have a number of primary burials, as discussed earlier (8.2.2), and a number of vessels were placed close to the deceased. Where the description of the vases deposited allows, an assessment has been made. The evidence comes from 25 burials from 20 tombs of all periods. The sample is random, but again certain trends appear. Oil containers are found in one third of this sample, while in a few cases more than one per deceased was deposited. Jars are found in half of the examples, but less often more than one was left. Jugs are also found in one third of the burials, more than one in most cases. Unguent containers are less common, once in every five burials, and only one seems to be placed per deceased. Open vases are present in one third of this sample and in most cases one is given to each buried person. Only in one example are several given and they are of more than one type. Ritual vessels are rare, found in just one case. This picture allows us to see that no one pottery type or variety was necessarily deposited in tombs and confirms the hypothesis that there was no specific set as far as the funerary offerings

were concerned. It is also a reminder that the percentages discussed earlier represent the whole of the pottery assemblage and should not necessarily be taken to imply a uniform picture in every burial. Gender, age, status, personal choices are some of the reasons for choosing which pots should accompany the deceased.

9.1.3 Rhodes

In the rest of the island of Rhodes Mycenaean pottery in tombs first appeared in limited quantities during the LH IIIA1 period, except for a few sporadic earlier finds (table 9.7). Contrary to previous beliefs this was not confined to the north-western part of the island close to Ialysos, but is also attested in the southern part on the sites of Lardos and Apsaktiras. Nevertheless in LH IIIA2 there was an extensive use of chamber tombs and a very large number of pots were deposited in them (table 9.8). A significant decrease can be seen in the LH IIIB period, but not to the extent at Ialysos. In LH IIIC the number of pots placed in tombs was identical to that of the previous period, only in fewer cemeteries, whilst there was a larger variety than ever before (for more details refer to Appendix C.3).

Clay analysis has recently been conducted on a large sample from the Aspropilia cemetery on Rhodes as well one more vessel from Kalavarda (Karantzali and Ponting 2000; Ponting and Karantzali 2001), supplementing the picture derived from the analysis of the material from Ialysos (Jones and Mee 1978). Another Rhodian clay type was identified, most probably located in southern Rhodes. Moreover the extent of imports in LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB Ialysos is confirmed at Aspropilia and Kalavarda, as well as the local character of the pottery during LH IIIC (Karantzali and Ponting 2000: 235; Ponting and Karantzali 2001: 107). In addition another unknown clay source was traced called South-eastern Aegean, that seems quite important during LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB and less so in LH IIIC. It could be in the Dodecanese, eastern Crete or even in the wider South-eastern Aegean area. At any rate the fact remains that the majority of the pottery deposited in tombs seems to be imported from the Argolid and elsewhere, rather than being local. Again we see the same trend as at Ialysos to purposefully choose imported

and most probably good quality pottery, in the eyes of the locals, as more appropriate and/or desirable to accompany their deceased.

Stylistically the same picture is seen here as at Ialysos (9.1.2). Perhaps the only significant difference is the total lack of 'octopus style' stirrup jars outside Ialysos on Rhodes. Perhaps this signifies two things, firstly that the Rhodian examples were produced at Ialysos itself and secondly that the imported ones were exchanged only at Ialysos. It is possible that the octopus symbol was emblematic of the content of the pot, which seems from its distribution and size to be a highly specialized and precious produce. As for the nature of its content we can only speculate that aromatic or scented oil could be one possibility.

9.1.3.1 LH IIIA1

For the LH IIIA1 period few things can be said since the amount of pottery is limited (tables 9.8, 9.9). Jars are the most popular vessels deposited in tombs, in contrast to the commonly found jugs. Furthermore unguent containers, mainly pyxides, are quite popular as well among the offerings placed with the deceased. Rhyta appeared as early as LH IIB, but mainly from LH IIIA1-2 on.

9.1.3.2 LH IIIA2

During LH IIIA2 (table 9.9) oil containers appeared for the first time and they became quite popular among the offerings. Jars seem to have retained their popularity, but substantially less than in the earlier period. Jugs still were common, but they were not especially popular. Unguent containers were also common, though far less popular than in LH IIIA1. Nevertheless open vessels were by far the most popular pots in tombs, comprising 40% of the total pottery assemblage, with kylikes predominating. A single hydria has been recovered outside Ialysos, at Aspropilia, and is dated LH IIIA2, probably an import. Ritual vases also appear in this period and are common in tomb contexts. The basket vase was a locally produced shape that appeared in LH IIIA2 and until LH IIIC is found occasionally in the burial contexts. Special mention should be

made of the pictorial rhyton with a relief bucranium recovered in the main chamber of Aspropilia T.2 (Karantzali 1998: 89-94). Braziers appear for the first time in LH IIIA2, although rarely in burials and the two LH IIIA2 torches recovered at Aspropilia should be added, as they are the only known case of these artefacts placed in tombs (Karageorghis 1987; 1999: 511-2; Karantzali 1999b: 404-5). Their function remains unclear, but either they had a practical/ritualistic use, like the braziers, and/or they had a symbolic significance perhaps associated with a dark journey to the afterworld.

9.1.3.3 LH IIIB

In LH IIIB (table 9.9) oil containers remain as popular as before, except that their number increased considerably. In a period of less pottery and tombs the importance of oil products is underlined in the funerary context. In contrast jars become less common and lose their previous significance. The same can be said about jugs, while the unguent containers become rather uncommon among the funerary offerings. Alabastra, askoi and thelastra for example were no longer placed inside tombs. The popularity of open vases increases and they comprise almost the half of the total deposited pots. Kraters, mugs and kalathoi were found in this period more frequently than before or after in the burial context. Angular bowls also appeared from this period on. The important presence of open vessels in this period perhaps emphasizes that feasting and all its consequences, family bonds and social coherence, are of more importance than ever before and thereafter. This should be seen also in relation to the significance of oil containers in the burial context. Ritual vessels become rare among the pottery placed in tombs, significantly less than in the previous period. Braziers were no longer deposited in tombs in this period, though it must be noted that more than half of the recovered ones cannot be accurately dated. Rhyta disappeared from the burial context from this period and thereafter.

9.1.3.4 LH IIIC

During the LH IIIC period (table 9.9) oil containers remain popular, but not as much as before. Interestingly enough no 'octopus style' stirrup jars have been found in any site on Rhodes outside Ialysos. On the other hand jars become quite popular in sharp contrast to LH IIIB, especially piriform jars. Amphoriskoi and amphorae were most probably introduced in LH IIIB-C. In LH IIIC amphoriskoi were found quite often among pottery deposited in the burial context. It is interesting that they were especially preferred in the southern part of the island, if we do not consider Archangelos and Vigli as northern sites. The popularity of jars perhaps reveals a new trend for giving the deceased more provisions for his/her journey to the afterworld. Jugs also become popular with an equally impressive increase from the previous period. The strainer jugs that were seen as popular at Ialysos are almost totally absent, apart from two examples from Aspropilia. Unguent containers also become common among the offerings placed in tombs, with a significant increase from the previous era. Although the number of open vessels is considerably decreased they remain the most popular pottery types deposited in the funerary context. Dippers disappear from tombs in LH IIIC. Interestingly enough kylikes were still found in some numbers, though elsewhere in the Mycenaean world they were only rarely deposited in tombs at this time. However deep bowls became quite popular and were the favourite drinking vessel during this period. The diachronic significance of open vessels on Rhodes must be stressed and is definitely connected to the social structure and the belief/symbolic systems of these people. Ritual vases are found in larger numbers than before, but they remain rather uncommon. Braziers reappeared in LH IIIC but were found only rarely inside tombs. Kernoi appear occasionally in LH IIIB-C and mainly in the LH IIIC period inside tombs.

As for the pottery that cannot be dated, if most of it were included it would hardly have change the tendencies highlighted here. Exceptions are the large number of open vessels and the ritual vases. The pots belonging to the first category would just underline something that has been already demonstrated, but in the case of the second the significance of ritual vases would have been better appreciated if it were possible to incorporate them.

The geographic distribution of pottery types has an interest of its own. Alabastra are found in southern Rhodes exclusively at Aspropilia and Apsaktiras. The distribution of flasks is mainly confined to southern Rhodes, perhaps with the exception of Lelos and Vigli. Basket vases appear at Lelos and Kariones and in the south rather than the north part of the island. Dippers are mainly found in southern Rhodes and at Lelos, Archangelos and Vigli. Mugs have so far been found exclusively in southern Rhodes. Stemmed bowls are present mainly in southern Rhodes perhaps with the exception of Lelos.

It should be noted that a single tinned kylix has been found outside Ialysos, but not too far away, in Maritsa T.2 dated LH IIIA2-B. The proximity of the two sites can be seen as the main reason why tinned vessels were found at Maritsa. The lack of this pottery type elsewhere underlines the role of Ialysos as the main provider and distributor of luxury items on Rhodes.

A very small number of *bucchero* pots have been found on sites outside Ialysos. A jug was recovered from Passia T.4, conical cups from Kattavia T.1 and most probably Apsaktiras (Akavi collection). Nevertheless their occurrence is rare, if not exceptional, and not much can be deduced from their presence apart from the fact that they were not only confined to Ialysos.

Monochrome pottery also occurs on several sites on Rhodes and at least 63 examples exist. The vast majority, 52, are open and mainly drinking vessels with 30 kylikes comprising almost half of them. The desire to imitate metal types seems to be greater than at Ialysos. Thus this process underlines the importance of drinking vessels and strengthens the hypothesis of their close association with social and metaphysical meanings/symbolisms.

There are at about 91 pots of various shapes and dates with linear decoration, while at least 114 vessels were unpainted. The rest, about 700 pots, were decorated and constitute the vast majority.

In order to demonstrate the diversity of the local tradition in pottery offerings deposited in chamber tombs through time, the largest cemeteries will be presented on their own (fig.9.1). At Kalavarda the peak period of offerings is LH IIIA2, while in LH IIIB there is a dramatic decrease, followed by an important increase in LH IIIC reaching almost the LH IIIA2 period levels. The favourite shapes seem to be the piriform jar for LH IIIA2, the stirrup jar for LH IIIB and the jug and the stirrup jar for LH IIIC.

At Lelos most of the pottery was deposited in LH IIIA2 and in LH IIIB there is an important decrease, which continued in LH IIIC. The predominant pots for LH IIIA2 are stirrup jars and kylikes, for LH IIIB cups and for LH IIIC stirrup jars.

At Trapezies Paraelis yet again LH IIIA2 is the richest period in finds, but in this cemetery there is a rather gradual decrease of offerings in LH IIIB that continued in LH IIIC. The favourite pots were stirrup jars and kylikes for LH IIIA2, stirrup jars for LH IIIB and piriform jars for LH IIIC.

At Passia we have exactly the opposite image since LH IIIA2 is the poorest period in finds and there is a steady increase in LH IIIB with the cemetery reaching its acme in the LH IIIC period. There is no predominant pottery type for LH IIIA2, but in LH IIIB stirrup jars were preferred and continued to be so in LH IIIC, along with kylikes.

At Apsaktiras there is a large quantity of pottery deposited in LH IIIA2, but in LH IIIB even more was placed in tombs, making this cemetery the only one that thrived during this period in the whole island. In LH IIIC there is a decrease in the offerings deposited. The favourite pots in LH IIIA2 were piriform jars along with kylikes, in LH IIIB stirrup jars and kylikes, while in LH IIIC jugs were preferred.

At Lardos LH IIIA2 is the richest period followed by a sharp decrease in LH IIIB and another increase in LH IIIC reaching almost the levels of LH IIIA2. The same picture comes also from its neighbouring cemetery at Aspropilia. At Lardos the favoured pottery type was the kylix in LH IIIA2, the sample for LH IIIB is rather small, whilst for LH IIIC it was the kalathos. At Aspropilia stirrup jars and kylikes were preferred for LH IIIA2, kylikes in LH IIIB and amphoriskos along with stirrup jars and jugs in LH IIIC.

9.1.4 Kos

On Kos Mycenaean tombs appeared in LH IIB and, with a steady increase in offerings and tombs, reached their peak in quantity and diversity during the LH IIIC period (tables 9.10, 9.11) (for more details refer to Appendix C.4).

Unfortunately from Kos we do not have any clay analysis conducted on the pottery recovered from tombs, but a strong local character is anticipated (Morricone 1965/6: 294-304). However there are 20 samples from the site of Seraglio, dating LH I-III, most of which were locally produced, with some imports either from the central Crete or the Peloponnese (Jones 1986: 291, 508-9). As for the style of the pottery, in LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB, local east Aegean influences appeared, the result of the long local pottery tradition. Nevertheless Mycenaean and Minoan elements were not infrequent. During LH IIICearly an East Aegean Koine was most probably shared between Kos, Kalymnos, Astypalaia and Miletos (Mountjoy 1999a: 1078). In LH IIICmiddle this style seems to expand north to Chios and several other places on the Anatolian coast, however its most interesting characteristic is the quantity of Pictorial Style pottery (Mountjoy 1999a: 1079-80). The repertoire is quite varied (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 159-62) and is found on krater sherds from Seraglio, and on deep bowls, kalathoi, stirrup jars and jugs from Eleona and Langada.

9.1.4.1 LH IIB

The LH IIB period has produced limited pottery evidence (table 9.12), but it seems that jars were popular as burial offerings. Unguent containers were the favourite pottery type deposited in tombs, both pyxides and alabastra. Open vessels were also popular in this period. A single small hydria has been recovered from Kos in Eleona T.2, belonging to the LH IIB period.

9.1.4.2 LH IIIA1

During LH IIIA1 (table 9.12) jars become the favourite pottery type placed inside tombs. Jugs seem quite common, while unguent containers remain popular, but less than in the previous period. Askoi and thelastra appear from this period on, but they were rare among the funerary deposits. Open vessels, mainly cups and bowls, were common in the burial context, but less popular than in LH IIB. Ritual vases also appeared for the first time during LH IIIA1, but were uncommon among the rest of the pottery offerings. Another unique vessel is the brazier found in Eleona T.8, dating to this period. This reveals a sharp contrast between Kos and Karpathos, Ialysos and Rhodes.

9.1.4.3 LH IIIA2

In LH IIIA2 (table 9.12) oil containers appeared for the first time as offerings in tombs and became quite popular. Jars are found relatively frequently and jugs were more common. Perhaps this indicates more liquid offerings, associated with drinking habits, placed in tombs as provisions for the journey to the afterworld. Unguent containers remain among the most popular pottery types deposited, but their number decreased when compared to the previous period. Flasks appeared in this period and were more frequently found than thereafter. Open vessels become the most popular pottery type in tombs, marking an important difference. One krater has been found at the Giorgaras tholos, while another comes from the Ayia Paraskevi tomb dating to the LH IIIA2-B period, but none are attested at Eleona or Langada. Kylikes predominate among the drinking vessels, while cups were common. Mugs and kalathoi also appeared during the LH IIIA2 period, but remained unpopular until LH IIIC. Nonetheless bowls were no longer placed inside tombs. Ritual vases are rarely recovered in the funerary context during LH IIIA2. A single rhyton has been found in Langada T.51, at Kos.

9.1.4.4 LH IIIB

During LH IIIB (table 9.12) oil containers become extremely popular, comprising almost 40% of the total pottery types recovered inside tombs. Jars became less common in this period, while jugs remained frequent, but not as much as in the previous period. The popularity of unguent containers seen in LH IIIA2 was considerably reduced and they were not found as often in LH IIIB tombs. Open vessels were quite as popular as oil containers, dominating the pottery assemblages. Dippers mainly appeared in this period and became rather rare subsequently. The importance of kylikes and cups remained as before, but they were slightly less in number. Deep bowls appeared for the first time in the burial context and were more frequently found than in the next period. The same applies for the stemmed bowls, while bowls reappeared, only to disappear in LH IIIC. Ritual vases totally disappeared from the funerary context. We must bear in mind that during this period there was an increase both in the quantity of pottery found as well as in the tombs used, unlike the areas previously reviewed.

9.1.4.5 LH IIIC

In LH IIIC (table 9.12) oil containers remained the favourite pottery type placed in tombs, but their number decreased from the previous period. 'Octopus style' stirrup jars are found in limited numbers and seem to be both Minoan imports as well as local products (Mountjoy 1999a: 1115-21). Jars increased and are found frequently in tombs, mainly amphoriskoi and rarely piriform jars. A single amphora was recovered at Kos in Langada T.45, belonging to the LH IIIC period. Jugs became popular during this period. Strainer jugs are present at Kos in Langada T.39 and T.52, but they do not seem as popular as at Ialysos. Unguent containers became quite popular with a rapid increase from the previous period, especially pyxides, while alabastra were no longer deposited in tombs. Open vases were significantly reduced in number and became less frequent among deposited pots, with cups dominating and kylikes rare. Angular bowls appeared in LH IIIB-C and mainly during LH IIIC, but overall were rarely deposited in tombs.

Ritual vases reappeared, but were found only rarely. Kernoi appeared for the first time in LH IIIC, but they are uncommon.

Most of the undated pottery consists of jugs and open vases. Thus in these two categories the frequency most probably was slightly higher than demonstrated.

For more specific pottery types, special reference can be made to two Anatolian vessels recovered at Kos. One jug comes from Eleona T.17 and one flask from Langada T.12, highlighting a degree of interaction between Kos and Anatolia and its intrusion into the funerary context.

At least twelve pots could be called *bucchero* from Eleona and Langada, predominantly jugs. They mainly belong to LH IIIA and a few to LH IIIC (Morricone 1965/6: 296-7). Interestingly enough one more LH IIIA2 *bucchero* jug has been found in the Mesaria tomb.

Moreover at least 36 monochrome vessels have been found, belonging mainly to the LH IIIC period. Half of them were open, eight deep bowls and six kylikes. Again the emphasis is on drinking ware imitating the more expensive metal prototypes as seen in the previous cases.

The rest of the pottery consists of at least 79 unpainted pots, almost 108 with linear patterns and more than 250 with decoration.

A last point that should be raised about Kos is that the overwhelming majority of our evidence comes from the Eleona and Langada cemetery. From Kastello, Iraklis, Yapili, Giorgaras, Mesaria, Ayia Paraskevi and Antimacheia we have only 33 published pots. The sample is quite small, but distributed from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC, and there is an evident preference for open vessels, fourteen out of 33. It is clear that there is a trend, but a larger quantity is needed for a better assessment. Perhaps when the corpus of material is enriched, then the hypothesis of different taste between the cemetery of the main settlement of the island and that of the rest could be highlighted. The case of Ialysos and the rest of the Rhodian sites may not have been unique after all.

9.1.5 South-eastern Aegean

The diversity in quantity and the chronological range in the rest of the sites in this region, Astypalaia, Kalymnos, Müskebi, Samos and Chios, is great (for more details refer to Appendix C.5). The unevenness is also an important point: at Müskebi from 48 tombs we have 178 vases and at Astypalaia 128 pots were recovered from only four tombs. Apart from these two sites and perhaps Kalymnos, the rest of the places have less than twenty vessels. Furthermore treating each island or area on its own would give a very uneven picture, therefore the sites will be treated as one and special reference will be given to island characteristics. After all this holistic approach is no less artificial than treating each island on its own (table 9.13). Apart from a single LH IIIA1 pot, the use of tombs and the placement of offerings started in LH IIIA2 (table 9.14). Thereafter there was a steady decline in tombs and vessels in both quantity and diversity of shapes. Nonetheless this important decrease in LH IIIB and LH IIIC might not have been so sharp, had it been possible to include the Miletos material dating to LH IIIB and LH IIIC.

Clay analysis has been conducted on the pottery from Miletos revealing two distinctive workshops that produced both Mycenaean and Anatolian ware (Gödecken 1988: 310-5). A number of pots that were deposited in the tombs at Müskebi seem to be from both Milesian workshops. Nonetheless caution should be exercised about the results of this analysis until the chemical results are properly published. One more analysis has been made on fourteen LH III samples from Perakastro suggesting a few central Cretan imports with all the rest most probably from the Peloponnese. Nevertheless the local clay sources have not been identified and their composition could have equally been local, therefore further analyses are needed for secure results (Jones 1986: 290-1, 509). Recent analysis of a LH IIIC pictorial sherd from Miletos confirms the hypothesis of an active local pottery workshop (Mommson and Maran 2000/1: 104).

Stylistically local elements are mingled with Mycenaean and Minoan characteristics to varying degrees on every site reviewed. For Astypalaia more Minoan elements existed in LH IIIA2, but in the subsequent periods east Aegean shapes and decoration were more evident (Mountjoy 1999a: 1138-9). On Kalymnos the pottery is

very similar to Kos creating a stylistic unity that perhaps included Miletos (Mountjoy 1999a: 1125-7). Moreover the Pictorial style is well represented in a jar, stirrup jar and a kalathos, highlighting the close ties between this island and Kos (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 157-8). Müskebi reveals a different picture with ties to Kos and Rhodes as well as the Greek and Anatolian mainland, a stylistic crossroads (Mee 1978: 137-42). As for Chios the LH IIC pottery from the settlement reflects stylistic similarities to the east Aegean koine and more particularly to Astypalaia, Kos, Kalymnos and Miletos (Mountjoy 1999a: 1147-8).

9.1.5.1 LH IIIA2

During the LH IIIA2 period (table 9.15) oil containers were quite popular inside tombs. Jars were also frequent, but jugs were uncommon. Amphoriskoi appeared briefly in this period mainly at Myloi. Unguent containers were as common as jars, with pyxides, alabastra and flasks appearing in this period. Nevertheless the latter were not used after LH IIIA2 and occurred only at Armenochori, Heraion and Müskebi. A single askos was recovered at Müskebi, belonging to LH IIIA2. Another unique vessel for this region is a thelastron found in a LH IIIA2-B context at Müskebi. Nevertheless the favourite pottery type deposited inside tombs was open vessels, mainly kylikes and slightly fewer cups. A single LH IIIA2 hydria was recovered at Syngairos T.2. Dippers were also mainly recovered during this period, all coming from Astypalaia and marking their popularity on the island, while one was also found at Perakastro. However ritual vases were uncommon. A single basket vase was recovered at Müskebi T.2, belonging to the LH IIIA2 period, most probably a Rhodian import. Braziers were deposited in tombs during the LH IIIA2 and LH IIIA2-B periods only at Müskebi T.22, T.23 and two in T.32. Most probably they are imports from Rhodes. Moreover two rhyta were also recovered, both at Selçuk.

9.1.5.2 LH IIIB

In LH IIIB (table 9.15) oil containers remained popular among the funerary offerings. Jars retained their popularity as well, but no amphoriskoi were found. However jugs became uncommon. A rapid decrease was also seen in the case of the unguent containers, which are rarely deposited in tombs during LH IIIB. Open vessels dominate the pottery assemblages, being the favourite vase type. A bowl was found in the LH IIIB-C period, while two more cannot be dated, all coming from Armenochori. Mugs were more common than before or subsequently, coming from Armenochori, Müskebi and Emporio. The same applies to deep bowls and stemmed bowls, which occur at Armenochori, Perakastro and Müskebi. Ritual vases disappeared from the tombs during this period.

9.1.5.3 LH IIIC

During LH IIIC (table 9.15) oil containers were popular, but not as much as in the previous periods. Only two 'octopus style' stirrup jars have been recovered, both from Kalymnos, suggesting a local or Koan provenance (Mountjoy 1997/8). Jars became more popular than before. One amphora has been found at Perakastro and is dated in the LH IIIC period. Amphoriskoi became quite popular in this period and were found at Perakastro, Armenochori and Müskebi. Jugs remained uncommon, if not rare inside tombs, with a single strainer jug coming from Ikaria. Unguent containers were also popular among the deposited offerings having a significant increase from LH IIIB. Pyxides became quite common once again and were found in almost all sites except Myloi and Ikaria. The same applies to flasks, which were attested at Müskebi, Armenochori, Perakastro and Selçuk. Although open vessels were not found in the quantities of the previous period, they were still the favourite pottery type in tombs with cups predominating and kylikes being rare. In LH IIIC there is only one mug, from Perakastro. Kalathoi became popular in this period and were found at Armenochori, Perakastro and Müskebi. Moreover ritual vases reappeared in LH IIIC, but only rarely, such as the single kernos from Perakastro.

Of the pots that could not be dated a large number belong to the unguent and open vase category. Thus a higher proportion of these two types should be anticipated.

A few more comments on the distribution of pottery can be made. It is interesting that no stirrup jars were found at Syngairos, Heraion, Ikaria and Emporio. Piriform jars come exclusively from Astypalaia and Müskebi. Jugs were only found at Müskebi, Ikaria and Armenochori, revealing how unpopular the shape was outside Kos. Kylikes were found at Astypalaia, Perakastro and Müskebi, perhaps suggesting that in the northern part of the region under review they were not popular at all. Cups were recovered in all sites apart from Samos, Ikaria and Selçuk.

A fair number of monochrome pots have been reported, at least 32. Twenty six of them belong to the open type and half of them were kylikes. There are also at least 58 unpainted pots and 40 with linear patterns. The ones with decoration number more than 216.

We can see some trends on each island in each period in relation to the general picture presented above, although we must bear in mind the limited sample from this area.

Astypalaia in LH IIIA2 as a whole has a clear preference for oil containers, less so for jars, while half of the pots are open vessels. In the last category kylikes and kraters predominate. All the other types are not represented at all. During LH IIIB the picture we have follows the general one apart from the absence of unguent containers. In LH IIIC the same is true with only the jugs and the ritual vases being absent.

On Kalymnos the LH IIIB period sees a preference for oil containers and open vessels, while only one unguent container is found. The rest of the pottery types are not attested. In LH IIIC oil containers seem more popular than the other types, but all are represented as in the general trends with the exception of jugs.

Müskebi in LH IIIA2 has exactly the same trends as seen in the general pattern. In LH IIIB we have the same picture except that jars seem more popular and unguent containers are absent. As for LH IIIC, jars still seem to be the preferred vessel type, otherwise only unguent and open vases were represented.

At Bakla Tepe the number of pots recovered is unclear, however there seems a preference for open Mycenaean wares, namely kylikes and stemmed bowls, as well as stands and alabastra. As for the local plain ware their character is undetermined, but all belong to a LH IIIB context.

On Samos during LH IIIA2 the major categories are found in funerary contexts with the extraordinary exception of open vessels, which are totally absent. Perhaps this is partly due to the small sample from this island. The same applies for the pottery attributed to LH IIIA2 Selçuk, LH IIIB Emporio and LH IIIC Ikaria.

9.1.6 Discussion

Diachronically the quantities of pottery deposited in the areas under review have a different pattern and no uniformity can be seen (fig.9.2). Based on the pottery chronology the earliest appearance of Mycenaean tombs took place in LH IIB at Ialysos. The limited LH IIB material from the rest of the sites on Rhodes could have been deposited during the early LH IIIA1 period. The same can be said about the LH IIB pots from Kos, since there is no closed context of that period, but always mixed with LH IIIA1. Thus the appearance of Mycenaean tombs at Eleona should be dated either to late LH IIB or early LH IIIA1. At this early date there are indications of a preference for jars and open vessels at both Ialysos and Eleona. However the most popular vase type at Ialysos seems to have been the jug and at Eleona unguent containers.

In LH IIIA1 (fig.9.3) oil containers appeared at Ialysos and especially on Karpathos, where they were quite popular. Jars were the most common pottery type on all sites with the exception of Karpathos. Jugs were equally popular in all areas. Unguent containers were rare on Karpathos, common at Ialysos and quite popular on Rhodes and Kos. Open vases were the favourite type of pottery on Karpathos and fairly popular at Ialysos, while they are common on Kos. Ritual vases also appeared occasionally in this period, but only on Kos.

During LH IIIA2 (fig.9.4) oil containers were everywhere more popular, with the exception of Karpathos, at the expense of jars. Jars were fairly common everywhere

apart from Kos where they were less frequently found. At Kos jugs remained popular and in the rest of the region they were also common. The importance of unguent containers decreased on Karpathos, while at Ialysos, Rhodes and the South-eastern Aegean they were commonly found. On Kos they remained a favourite pottery type. Open vessels were the most popular vessel especially at Karpathos, Rhodes, Kos and South-eastern Aegean sites, less so at Ialysos. As for the ritual vases, they were uncommon to rare except at Ialysos and Rhodes where they were frequently attested.

The LH IIIB period should be of special interest since there is a sharp decrease in the quantity of pottery in all regions, except Kos, suggesting rapid socio-political changes (figs 9.2, 9.5). Oil containers remained almost as popular on Karpathos and Ialysos, but in the rest of the sites they became even more popular. The frequency of jars decreased everywhere with the exception of the South-eastern Aegean where they stayed as common as before. Moreover jugs decreased in numbers, as did unguent containers, which range from common to uncommon among pottery offerings. However a rapid increase was found in the open vessels, dominating at all sites and ranging from 40% to almost 70% of the pottery placed in tombs, most probably including Bakla Tepe. Ritual vases were only rarely found at Rhodes and more commonly at Ialysos and Karpathos. The dominance of open vases and oil containers and the decrease in all the other categories is perhaps a common response to socio-political changes during this period. They may mark the vital role of oil and wine in the funerary rituals and even more the role of feasting for retaining social cohesion in periods of severe socio-political change.

LH IIIC is also important since more pottery was deposited on Kos, Kalymnos and Ialysos during this period, in contrast to the mainland sites (figs 9.2, 9.6). The proportion of oil containers decreased, but not their importance. In contrast, jars became as popular as oil containers with the exception of Kos. Jugs were more frequently found in all sites apart from the South-eastern Aegean where they became rare. There was a small increase in unguent containers at Ialysos and Rhodes and a larger increase on Kos and the South-eastern Aegean. Open vessels lost much of their importance at Ialysos and Kos, although remaining popular, but on Rhodes and the South-eastern Aegean sites they were still the favourite pottery type. Ritual vases reappeared occasionally in all sites

that were still occupied. Although LH IIIC was marked by more socio-political changes in this region, there is no similar picture to that seen in the previous period.

Some local characteristics can be illuminated from the preference for specific pottery types (table 9.16). Striking is the popularity of the stirrup jars, with Karpathos the only exception. Moreover the popularity of jugs on Kos is unparalleled elsewhere in the region, as was the case of amphoriskoi at Ialysos. Pyxides were especially preferred both on Kos and the South-eastern Aegean. Thelastra seem to be found more commonly both at Ialysos and especially Kos. Basket vases and braziers were also found more frequently at Ialysos and Rhodes and bowls at Karpathos and Rhodes. Kraters were preferred on Karpathos, though less so on Rhodes and the South-eastern Aegean. Kylikes were especially popular on Rhodes and less so on Karpathos and the South-eastern Aegean. However cups were much preferred on Karpathos, while mugs were mainly found in the South-eastern Aegean. Deep bowls were relatively common in all areas apart from Ialysos where they were rare. Furthermore kalathoi seemed to be especially preferred at Ialysos rather than anywhere else in this region.

Moreover the large number of monochrome pots should be noted. They comprise between 5 and 8% in most sites with the exception of Karpathos where the proportion is significantly higher. The imitation of metal prototypes has been noted, as well as the fact that most of them were open vessels and more particularly drinking ones. Thus we see attempts at elaboration in the offerings to the deceased and at the same time the importance attributed to drinking.

From similarities between pottery categories and more specifically between pottery types we can trace patterns of interaction and relations (compare figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and table 9.16). The closest similarities are seen between Ialysos and the rest of the Rhodian sites. Their differences are minor, revealing idiosyncratic characteristics such as the preference for amphoriskoi at Ialysos and for kylikes in the rest of Rhodes. The similarities can be seen both in the diachronic analysis as well as overall, with jugs, unguent containers and ritual vases being more or less the same. Perhaps the last two marked the status of the deceased, not only because of their relative rarity in the burial

context, but more importantly for the probable aromatic or highly specialized content of the unguent containers and the symbolic significance of the ritual vases. In both these pottery types their content or symbolic significance was taken out of circulation, adding to the status of the deceased and in fact the whole family. Oil containers have a similar distribution but diachronically at Ialysos they appear more consistently than in the rest of Rhodes. Jars also seem more popular at Ialysos, but diachronically they seem similar in the two areas with the exception of LH IIIA2. This overall popularity of jars is closer to some cemeteries in Attica rather than the Argolid, Pylos or Thebes (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 227-228, figs 6.19, 6.22-3). The provision of jars as containers could both serve metaphysical needs for the journey to the afterworld as much as to underline the status of the deceased. Open vases were especially popular on Rhodes, but far less at Ialysos. Diachronically they were only equally preferred during the LH IIIB period. It should also be noted that in LH IIIC 'octopus' stirrups jars and strainer jugs are found almost exclusively at Ialysos suggesting its central role in their production and exchange (Mountjoy 1998: 60).

However when breaking down the Rhodian cemeteries a real burial mosaic can be seen (fig.9.1). Each cemetery has its preferences and a different diachronic attitude forming a diverse image. Nonetheless there is a common trend in most of them, with a large quantity of offerings placed in tombs during LH IIIA2 and a subsequent decrease in LH IIIB, while attempts at recovery are seen in LH IIIC. However there is divergence from this pattern for example at Apsaktiras, which reaches its peak in LH IIIB, and Passia which has a similar increase of offerings as Eleona and Langada.

Important similarities exist between Karpathos, Ialysos and Rhodes (compare figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and table 9.16). However Karpathos and southern Rhodes are closer. Jars, jugs, unguent containers, open vessels and ritual vases are similar overall in both these areas, but not necessarily diachronically. The only major difference is in oil containers with Karpathos having significantly fewer than the rest of the area. Nevertheless the proximity of Karpathos to southern Rhodes and the similarities in pottery preference in the burial context underlines the degree of interaction between the two islands.

Interestingly there are some similarities and differences between Ialysos and Kos (compare figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and table 9.16). They have more or less the same preference for oil containers and open vases both in the overall number as well as diachronically. Perhaps this similarity reinforces the points raised above about the role of Seraglio and Trianda/Ialysos as social, economic and political centres of their islands, sharing the same *emblemic insignia* of social differentiation expressed in the burial context. However there are significant differences, since jars and ritual vessels were far more popular at Ialysos, jugs and unguent containers on Kos. Perhaps the last might indicate a local specialized manufacture of aromatic substances, especially when associated with the popularity of oil containers (Hamilakis 1996: 20). In addition there might have been a close association between rituals and/or the social meaning of aromatic substances with specific social groups.

The South-eastern Aegean seems to share more characteristics with Kos rather than Ialysos or Rhodes (compare figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and table 9.16). They share the same preference for oil containers, jars and ritual vases. Although unguent vessels are not as popular as on Kos, they are found quite frequently in tombs. However they have a different taste for jugs with the South-eastern Aegean following the rest of the area, while in the open vessels they share the same preference as Karpathos and Rhodes. These similarities, along with the stylistic links, show not only close interaction, but also shared social and metaphysical beliefs.

Idiosyncratic local characteristics and preferences are to be expected, but they seem more diverse, as was the case in Attica rather in the Argolid (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 227-8, compare figs 6.19, 6.23).

Special mention should also be made of the strainer jugs that appeared during the LH IIIC period, at Ialysos, Aspropilia, Langada and Ikaria. The shape derived from mainland prototypes of LH IIIB, but the presence of strainers on these vessels is an innovation. It seems that a new tradition started in this period, the origin of which most probably should be sought in Anatolia, where strainers were popular since the MBA at Beycesultan (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 4-5). The exact use of strainers is unclear, but their appearance in the Mycenaean world in this specific period, in a single shape must

be connected to a particular use. Moreover in the South-eastern Aegean they are found in many instances in the burial context. Unfortunately no chemical analysis exists to enlighten us as to their use, thus only speculation can be offered. From the pottery shape we can deduce that it is related to a liquid, which contained some solid parts that were unnecessary in its consumption. Its popularity at Anatolia should be stressed in contrast to the absence of such vessels in mainland Greece. Here it is proposed that the liquid that was contained in these pots was beer. From Mesopotamian texts and images we find that in some beer processes the cereals were not de-husked (Rudgley 1998: 31), and therefore some kind of separation was needed. This does not necessarily mean that beer was introduced into Greece during LH IIIB, but that in this period it must have been quite popular so that specific vessels were created for its consumption. This trend is found in the South-eastern Aegean during the LH IIIC period, related to death and the afterlife. Perhaps the communal drinking of beer had the same symbolic meaning of cohesion for the community and the ancestors as wine drinking had. Although they are not widespread in this region, it should be mentioned they are found in the cemeteries of port settlements such as Trianda and Seraglio, or in settlements close to ports, as Aspropilia is to Lindos. This might indicate its transfer by sea as a commodity, with Trianda being a good candidate for its production and diffusion.

One more category of distinctive pottery type is the brazier, which are found in large numbers at Ialysos, Rhodes, and Karpathos and less frequently on Kos and Müskebi. Their popularity in the burial context is a local idiosyncrasy, perhaps related in a way to the rituals performed or the atmosphere of the ceremonies. It is unclear whether they served as incense burners or as mere providers of light. Nonetheless in either case the light effect in the chamber must have been quite spectacular, if not symbolic, as if the walls were the night sky with bright stars. This is reinforced by the presence of torch-holders deposited at Aspropilia.

9.2 Small Finds

Small finds is a generic term covering a variety of items from bronze vessels to shells. It is basically a name for all non-pottery items recovered inside tombs. Small finds have a number of problems apart from their diversity, in particular their inadequate dating. For that reason their pottery context is often used, though the successive funeral depositions do not allow us to have a clear view of their diachronic use or preference. Moreover the extent to which our evidence reflects the wealth of deposition is also a frequent problem, since it is believed that in some cases during the reopening of the tombs some valuables might have been taken out. Their value also cannot be assessed due to the diversity mentioned earlier and the problem of defining value on its own (Hughes-Brock 1999: 290-1) (6.8). However, contrary to pottery, they can give us a more complex idea about the personal items of the deceased as well as *emblemic insignia*, social, political, racial or other, attributed to the deceased by the living. They can be more informative also about material and commodities imported or locally produced and thus allow us to have a glimpse of the exchange networks active during this era, as well as to assess the value of items thought appropriate or preferred in the burial context.

The presentation of the small finds will be made according to the sites and will be divided into seven categories. Vessels will be one of them, including all material apart from pottery, weapons of all kinds, jewellery of all materials, tools, cosmetics, figurines and miscellaneous, a division adapted from Cavanagh and Mee (1990: 57, table 1), excluding the furnishing and food categories that are not found in this region.

9.2.1 Karpathos

The small finds from Karpathos consist almost exclusively of metal items and particularly bronze (for more details refer to Appendix D.1). This phenomenon cannot be totally chance since two tombs were more or less properly excavated. Perhaps we are looking at a significant local preference if not an idiosyncrasy, however their unclear dating cannot help us to determine any chronological variable.

The weapons recovered so far are mainly spearheads and secondarily swords and daggers (Sandars 1963: 149). As for the jewellery a number of rings of undetermined material have been found, as well as a probably bronze hair spiral, while two lead beads were also recovered. From the tools category only a knife and a whetstone have been found, while from the cosmetics two razors and a mirror were recovered.

This interest in weapons, half of all small finds, could perhaps indicate that they were used as status markers for the deceased. Unfortunately our evidence is not good enough to suggest if this status had a gender or age bias. However it seems to underline the social standing of the individual, if not of the family that owned the tomb as a whole. Even though they might have marked status, they were more widely used than expected, since they were recovered in all burial contexts with the notable exception of Arkasa. Perhaps this raises the issue of who is using the chamber tombs on Karpathos. Either the wealthiest of the local community had this kind of tomb with symbolic offerings, such as weapons, to indicate the status of the deceased and his/her family or the weapons had an important metaphysical symbolism on Karpathos. The latter can be linked to social practices and symbolisms related to militarism, defensive, offensive or both. Exchange networks, maritime routes, islands and piracy are interrelated and could be one of the reasons for this popularity of weapons.

9.2.2 Ialysos

The quantity and diversity of small finds recovered in the tombs at Ialysos is great (for more details refer to Appendix D.2). In this site the burial context can give a better chronological picture about the preferences for small finds in tombs. However a considerable number of small finds were recovered in Biliotti's excavations, but their context remains unknown in contrast to the pottery finds. Thus the term Old Tomb(s) will be used in order to indicate where the small find was recovered.

There are a small number of non-pottery vessels found. Fragments of an ivory pyxis were recovered in T.17, most probably made of hippopotamus and perhaps imported from the Levant (Benzi 1992: 193). Parts of a few more made out of bone and ivory were recovered in the Old Tombs, with one having the shape of a duck and one more most probably with a seated figure coming from Egypt. Fragments of an ostrich egg were found in T.31, as well as a serpentine oil lamp in T.60, all from the Makria Vounara burial site. Mortars out of steatite and various stones were deposited in T.67, T.44 and T.61, all in Moschou Vounara, dated LH IIIC. The first two were most probably of Cypriot provenance and the third most probably of local manufacture (Benzi 1992: 206). A copper basin and cup come from T.56, while another bronze basin was attested in T.53 and a bronze juglet was found in T.71. Three more bronze cups come from the Old Tombs. Moreover fragments of a glass paste vase were recovered in T.62 at Moschou Vounara and one more from the Old Tombs in the shape of a small amphora, having an Egyptian provenance.

Weapons were common in the tombs of Ialysos with ten swords, of various types, found in T.4(3), T.45, T.50, T.53, T.74 and three from the Old Tombs, in contexts ranging from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIB, with none from the LH IIIC period (Sandars 1963). Spearheads were particularly popular with 26 examples from more than eleven tombs, dating from LH IIIA1-C. Thirty arrowheads were also recovered in T.2(2), T.27, T.46, T.50(2), T.54(2) and in Old Tombs. Stone pommels were recovered in T.4, steatite in T.31, T.79 and one from an Old Tomb, while an ivory one probably belonging to a knife comes from T.32 and two bone ones from the Old Tombs, one of which had golden attachments. Furthermore bronze armour was recovered in an Old Tomb, perhaps part of a helmet.

The jewellery category encompasses a number of different materials of diverse shapes and types as well as uses. Beads, pendants, buttons, rosettes, discs, seals and scarabs are common, made of semi-precious stones, clay, ivory/bone and glass paste/faience, while rings, earrings, diadems, bracelets, foils and sheets are frequent among the metal items.

Special mention should be made of semi-precious stones, most of which were foreign imports in the form of beads. Agate is found in T.20, T.21, T.50, T.53, crystal in T.53 and in the Old Tombs, amethyst in T.53, T.54 and an Old Tomb, onyx in T.5, galanite in T.56 and amber in T.4, T.20, T.53, T.54, T.57 and the Old Tombs (Harding 1984: 82; Harding and Hughes-Brock 1974: 152-6, 160), covering every period. Sardonyx, in T.71(3) and T.73, a serpentine bead and a jasper sealstone were found in Old Tombs, whilst hematite sealstones were recovered in T.17 and T.67. A unique bead made out of lapis lazuli was among the small finds found from the Old Tombs, revealing an extensive network of contacts with the East. Carnelian was quite popular in LH IIIA2 and more so in LH IIIC, recovered in eleven tombs and few more come from the Old Tombs. One was apparently found in the shape of a scarab with gold attachments in T.11. The relationship between carnelian and children can be seen only in T.20, T.51 and T.72, while in most cases there is no correlation between the two, making Konstandinidi's argument (2001: 252) rather weak for Ialysos. Steatite was by far the most popular semi-precious stone, found in 25 tombs and few more come from the Old Tombs, mainly as buttons or *conuli*. Their use is uncertain, but it seems possible that they were related to long garments and/or shrouds, or served more multiple functions (Iakovidis 1977: 118-9; Konstandinidi 2001: 29). Clay jewellery was found only in T.5, T.31, T.51 and Old Tombs, and bone/ivory in T.15(2), T.17, T.32, T.37, T.53, T.71 and the Old Tombs. In the last category special mention should be made of a shark tooth in T.67, clear evidence of deep-sea fishing. As for glass paste/faience, it was the most numerous and common of the small finds, deposited in 37 tombs and few more come from the Old Tombs. Beads and pendants could have been used as necklaces or as diadems for honouring the deceased (Yalouris 1968). One ivory and four glass paste/faience scarabs, along with the carnelian one from T.11, have also been found.

Copper, tin and iron are rarely found in tombs, but bronze and lead were more common, recovered in fifteen tombs in both burial sites from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC, while only one lead item came from the Old Tombs. Although silver is more common than lead, it is placed in less tombs, twelve along with a few of the Old Tombs. The majority of the silver items are rings, 25, underlining the rarity of the material as well as its limited distribution. It seems like a prestige item, especially when compared to the

more widespread use of gold, as well as its distribution in 29 tombs and the quantities found in the Old Tombs. It is interesting that there are at least 26 gold rings, some could be either rings or earrings, almost exclusively of LH IIIC date, while the silver ones are also exclusively found in LH IIIC contexts. The four bronze rings are similarly from LH IIIC tombs. It is clear that in this late period a new fashion was introduced and rings became more appropriate than ever before as offerings to be placed with the deceased. Perhaps they mark attempts at social differentiation during LH IIIC and at the same time it is possible to argue that there was more abundance of precious metals and perhaps local production. The same picture also comes from Perati, and Aplomata and Kamini on Naxos, but not from other Mycenaean cemeteries of this period (Iakovidis 1970B: 291 n.4, 373-6; Kardara 1977: 4-7; Vlachopoulos 1999: 308-9).

Tools are commonly represented in the tombs at Ialysos. Seventeen knives were found in T.15, T.26, T.32, T.39, T.48, T.59(2), T.87 and nine from the Old Tombs, dating from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC (Harding 1975: 199; Sandars 1955: 179-83). Twelve chisels were also attested in T.9, T.15, T.50, two sporadic and seven from the Old Tombs. There are also four hooks recovered, two in T.15 and two from the Old Tombs, while a single axe was deposited in T.70. The hooks and axe belong to LH IIIC contexts and come only from Moschou Vounara. Moreover thirteen whetstones had been placed in T.21, T.26, T.27, T.32(2), T.54, T.56, T.59, T.62 and four from the Old Tombs. It seems that overall a later date was preferred for depositing tools in the burial context. Furthermore at least nine bronze rivets were found most probably parts of weapons or tools, all coming from the Old Tombs.

Cosmetic items are less frequently found in tombs than tools. Twenty four razors were recovered at Ialysos and seem to have been popular from LH IIIA1 to LH IIIC (Spyropoulos 1972: 103-8). Six mirrors were also placed in T.61, T.67, T.69, T.73, T.84 and an Old Tomb. They were found only in the Moschou Vounara burial area most probably all belonging to the LH IIIC period with parallels from Cyprus (Spyropoulos 1972: 132-4). Moreover two tweezers have been attested in T.32 and T.65, yet again only in Moschou Vounara tombs. In this case the context of the first is LH IIIC, but in

T.65 it belongs to the LH IIIA2 period. Two pins made of bone and three out of bronze were recovered as well as a bone comb, all coming from the Old Tombs.

Many hypotheses have been related to the figurines from Ialysos and more specifically their absence (Benzi 1999a: 276-7). Fourteen female figurines have been recovered of which only two are of the Phi-type, both found in T.59 and dating to LH IIIA2, one is Tau-type found along two Psi-type in T.15, and the rest are also Psi-type in T.17, T.21(2), T.32(2), T.33, T.35, T.40 and one from an Old Tomb, all belonging to LH IIIC (French 1971: 116-39; Mylonas 1954/5: 139-43). Another fragmentary example was reported in the dromos of T.23. A larger figurine face was also recovered in T.80 in a LH IIIC context, while a bull figurine comes from T.64 and is dated to the same period. Two more ox figurines come from the Old Tombs, both belonging to the LH IIIB period. One more bronze animal figurine has been recovered in the Old Tombs, but its missing head does not help us to identify the animal. Additionally there is a chariot group figurine found also in one of the Old Tombs, dating to LH IIIA2. There is also a small clay throne attested in T.79 which belongs to LH IIIA1. Figurines are rather rare in tomb contexts at Ialysos, but they became more frequent in the LH IIIC period. Some researchers add to these figurines the ones found on kalathoi, but certainly their function and use was of a different kind.

In the miscellaneous category the shells recovered in T.21, T.25, T.32 and T.73 should be noted, belonging either to LH IIIA2 or LH IIIC. All of them are of the *Conus* type and only in the case of T.73 were they used as beads. This kind of shell has parallels in other Mycenaean cemeteries at Tiryns, Prosymna, Mycenae, Nauplion and Perati, but in larger numbers (Reese 1983: 354-6). Especially at Perati they were associated with child burials according to Iakovidis (1970B: 364-6), but at Ialysos this does not seem to be the case. Regeneration can be but one of the symbolisms attributed to shells in the funerary context (Claassen 1998: 203-6), as well as a link between the sea and the afterlife journey of the deceased.

Overall we can say that non-pottery vessels are relatively common at Ialysos, while spearheads were the favourite weapon to accompany the deceased. Perhaps the sword was reserved for a few individuals in order to emphasize their high status. The popularity of rings made out of any material during the LH IIIC period should be noted as a new trend in this cemetery. The same applies to tools and cosmetic implements, which were found mainly in Moschou Vounara, as well as the clay figurines. Thus we see new preferences, if not new social conditions, in LH IIIC that should be associated with the new pottery trends as well as the architectural characteristics of tombs during this period. It is certain that more metals than ever before were deposited with the deceased, a fact that should be seen in its wider historic framework. It also seems that the differences noted between the architectural characteristics of Makria Vounara and Moschou Vounara are supplemented by different choices of small finds placed in tombs.

The limited presence of figurines is not unique in the Mycenaean world, since this is also the case in Achaia and several sites in Attica (Cavanagh 1998: 109-10). Moreover the limited use of figurines in tombs does not necessarily mean that they were unpopular in domestic or religious contexts in the South-eastern Aegean (Benzi 1999a: 278-81).

Special mention should be made of a semi-bulla from Ialysos and a cylinder seal made out of hematite in T.17, of LH IIIC date. Both were of Hittite manufacture, constituting two out of the eight certain Hittite objects so far recovered in the Aegean according to Cline (1991b: 136-7; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990: 101). One more cylinder seal from Ialysos, tomb uncertain, is most probably of Northern Syrian provenance (Cline 1991b: 139; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990: 75). Overall of the twelve seal stones, only six have a clear date, all belonging to LH IIIC. As for the scarabs they are most probably of Egyptian manufacture, whilst their popularity is in the LH IIIC period as well (Lambrou-Phillipson 1990: 64). Thus the central role of Ialysos as an active nexus in the exchange networks during the whole LH III period is reinforced.

9.2.3 Rhodes

The number of small finds from the sites on Rhodes, excluding Ialysos, is limited (for more details refer to Appendix D.3). This might be partly due to fewer small finds having been deposited and partly due to the conditions of the discovery and excavation of the cemetery.

Non-pottery vessels are rare outside Ialysos. Only two have been found at Aspropilia in T.1 and T.3 in LH IIIA2-B contexts. However weapons are far more widespread. Only four swords have been recovered, underlining their rarity, from Papa-Lures, Siana, Passia T.2 and Aspropilia T.3. Spearheads are popular, found at Ambelia T.1, Aspropilia T.1 and T.3, Siana, Trapezies Praelis (2) and three are of unknown provenance. A single dagger is of unknown provenance, while a single arrowhead is attested in Passia T.2. A bronze helmet was reported inside Apsaktiras T.1, but it has not been preserved (Dietz 1984: 52).

The bronze weapons from Siana, especially the rare sword type H, reveal a mix of Levantine and Aegean characteristics, perhaps indicating the presence of local production on the island (Sandars 1963: 140-2, 152-3).

Furthermore there are few semi-precious stones deposited in tombs. Agate is found in Aspropilia T.1(2), of LH IIIA2-B date, a crystal seal comes from Lelos T.6 and basalt beads and a button from Apsaktiras and one more button of unknown provenance. Carnelian is more common, found at Asprovilo T.6, Kremasti, Ayios Minas (4), Aspropilia T.1 and T.4(3). Nevertheless, steatite is the commonest attested semi-precious stone, mainly the button shape, recovered at Kouri T.2, Asprovilo T.6(3), Theologos T.1, Lelos T.1(2), T.5 and T.6, Ayios Minas T.1, Aspropilia T.2(2) and T.5, and two are of unknown provenance. Other kinds of stone beads come from Kouri T.2, Yennadi T.1, Apsaktiras (2). Clay buttons and beads are attested at Theologos T.1, Yennadi T.1, Apsaktiras, Aspropilia T.1 and T.3 and two are of unknown provenance. Bone items come only from Aspropilia, in T.2 a bead and in T.4 a comb. Glass paste/faience is the commonest small find along with bronzes. They are found at

Asprovilo T.6, Lelos T.6(2), Ayios Minas (5), Yennadi T.1(5), Passia T.4, Apsaktiras (7), and Aspropilia T.1(8), T.2(5), T.3(7) and T.4(5). Special mention should be made of three scarabs recovered from Papa-Lures (2) and Ayios Minas, most probably from LH IIIA2-B contexts.

A single lead item, a spindle whorl was recovered in Ayios Minas T.1, while two silver rings come from Passia T.2 and an unknown provenance. Gold is commoner, in the form of beads and pendants attested at Asprovilo T.6(2), Apsaktiras (2), Aspropilia T.3 and T.4 and four are without provenance. Bronze jewellery is equally common, mainly rings coming from Passia T.2, Aspropilia T.2(3) and T.4(3), and two of unclear provenance. In Aspropilia T.1 a needle was found, while in T.4 an arched fibula was attested, belonging to a LH IIIC context.

As for tools, knives seem particularly popular, in fact more than any other bronze item. Nineteen have been recovered from Theologos T.1, Lelos T.5, Siana, Tzigani T.1, Yennadi T.1, Passia T.2, Apsaktiras (4), Ambelia T.1, Aspropilia T.4 and T.5, Lindos and five are of unknown provenance. Particular mention should be made of the knife from Theologos because it is a Cypriot type and most probably an import. A single fishhook comes from Ayios Minas, while three axes have been found at Lindos (2) and one is of unclear origin. The axes from Lindos are of the trunnion type that originates in Anatolia or the Near East (Bouzek 1985: 151). Moreover two spatulas were found at Aspropilia T.4 belonging to the LH IIIB-C period. A schist whetstone comes from Lelos T.6.

The commonest cosmetic implements were razors. Eleven have been recovered at Kaminaki-Lures T.1, Trapezies Praelis, Kalogrios T.1, Aspropilia T.1 and T.3, Archangelos T.2 and five have no specific provenance. Additionally two tweezers come from Kaminaki-Lures T.1 and Aspropilia T.2, dating to LH IIIA2 and LH IIIA2-B respectively.

Four figurines have so far been recovered in sites outside Ialysos. They come from Passia T.4, Apsaktiras, Aspropilia T.3 and one is of uncertain provenance. Special

mention should be made of the chariot group found at Aspropilia (Karantzali 1999b: 405), a rather rare find in general (French 1973: 347-8), with a parasol implement as also depicted on painted kraters (Crouwel 1973; 1976). There may be a symbolic link with afterlife beliefs, however the limited appearance of the type of figurine should be underlined and could indicate a personal preference or the extraordinary status of the deceased, something that perhaps should be argued for Aspropilia T.3 in general.

In the miscellaneous category yet again shells appear in the funerary context. At Asprovilo T.6 and Lelos T.1 and T.5 *Pecten* type shells were deposited. At Asklepeio a *Triton* shell was found among the offerings. With the exception of the first site, the rest are far from the sea and perhaps a kind of symbolism related to the afterlife journey could be proposed, but it definitely had a limited extent and this may be a matter of family or personal preference.

In the sites on Rhodes outside Ialysos there was again a preference for spears as appropriate offerings. Carnelian, steatite and glass paste/faience were popular in these places as well, while gold and bronze jewellery are common. Tools are also popular, especially knives, and similarly razors.

The quantity of small finds is rather limited to make an assessment by site. However their diversity indicates the exchange networks active in this period, allowing us to have a glimpse of the conspicuous consumption practiced in the funeral context. Thus the wealth of some sites could be partly suggested from the burial offerings, since no other available evidence exists. Aspropilia is the site with by far the greatest diversity, quality and quantity of small finds, something that could be related to the extra care seen in the architecture of the chamber tombs (8.1.3). The proximity of this site to the main eastern port of Rhodes, Lindos, must have been an important factor in this. Therefore the site seems to have been important in the exchange network between inland sites on Rhodes. A large diversity of small finds is also seen in the case of Apsaktiras, Passia and Ayios Minas forming an active network in southern Rhodes. To these Yennadi should be added, considering the diversity that it had in a single tomb. Lelos also reveals a large diversity and was probably a nexus site for the inland exchange

network of the island, and to a lesser extent Siana as well. The same applies to Asprovilo, a site in the north-western part of Rhodes not very far from Ialysos, and Kalavarda (from both Papa-Lures and Kaminaki-Lures). Moreover the diversity seen in the single tomb at Theologos completes the picture of this network in the northern part of the island. The evidence from Lindos is rather limited, however the quality and character of the small finds underline the central role of the port in interaction and exchange. From this presentation a contact network could be reconstructed, which surprisingly does not include Trapezies Praelis as one would expect. Perhaps this has to do with the circumstances in which the site was discovered. The rarity of silver items is a surprise, underlining the role of Ialysos, especially during LH IIIC, when gold is common. The quantity of available small finds is rather limited for establishing the distribution of specific items or to determine the wealth and status of each site. For these matters more data, as well as settlement information would be needed.

9.2.4 Kos

A large variety of small finds has been recovered on Kos, almost equal to Ialysos but less in quantity (for more details refer to Appendix D.4).

Of the non-pottery vessels only one marble cup has been recovered, but its provenance is unclear. Nevertheless weapons were present with five swords found in Eleona T.6/7, Langada T.21, T.46 and T.53, and Asklepieion (Sandars 1963: 145, 148, 150-1). From the last site comes one dagger and another one is reported from the Giorgaras tholos tomb. Spearheads were the most popular large bronze item placed in tombs attested at Eleona T.4/5, T.6/7(2) and T.21, Langada T.15, T.16, T.21 and T.46, and Asklepieion (2). Eight arrowheads have also been found at Langada T.34(2), T.37, Giorgaras T.1(2) and three are of unknown provenance, while one more made out of stone was found in Langada T.53.

Special reference should be made to Langada T.21 where the sword, of Naue II type, and the spearhead, have close European parallels and belong to a LH IIIB context (Bouzek 1985: 122, 138; Harding 1984: 166; Sandars 1963: 142-3).

There are also a few semi-precious stones found among the jewellery placed in tombs. Agate and amethyst are found in Langada T.10 and crystal in Langada T.38. Amber is recovered in bead or disc type at Eleona T.22, Langada T.10(2), T.34, T.35, T.37 and T.57 (Harding 1984: 82; Harding and Hughes-Brock 1974: 160). Carnelian is more common attested in Eleona T.16, T.22, Langada T.10(2), T.31, T.34(2), T.42(4), T.57(2) and T.61, and one is of unknown provenance. However the most popular semi-precious stone was steatite found in the form of buttons in nineteen tombs and in Eleona T.22 in the form of a sealstone. Other stone beads and discs are attested in Langada T.30 and T.42. Clay buttons were also popular recovered in fifteen tombs, mainly at Langada and less so in Eleona. Bone/ivory items are mainly attested at Langada, with one exception at Eleona, dated mainly to the LH IIIB and LH IIIC periods. Special mention should be made of four scarabs found at Langada T.12, T.35, T.50 and one of unclear context. Glass paste/faience was also found in fifteen tombs, but in larger quantities than the clay items. Of these tombs only one belongs to the Eleona burial place, while one comes from Antimacheia. A fifth glass paste scarab was recovered at Langada T.42, most probably manufactured in Egypt (Lambrou-Phillipson 1990: 64). Moreover coral pendants were found in Langada T.57.

Tin fragments were recovered in Langada T.14 and T.37, while in T.14 a tin ring was attested of LH IIIC date. Three rings made out of tin and silver were all found in Langada T.10. Eleven gold items were recovered consisting mainly of beads and rings from Langada T.10(8), T.19 and T.57(2). The last two tombs are better dated with T.19 belonging to LH IIIC and T.57 to LH IIIB-C. The rings were interestingly found in pairs in T.10 and T.57. Moreover an unspecified number of gold rosettes and beads come from the Giorgaras tholos tomb belonging in LH IIIA2 and/or LH IIIC, making this tomb particularly rich in gold. It is of particular interest that gold items were found in only four tombs and that only in the tholos do they coexist with weapons. Bronze jewellery was most popular with fourteen rings from Langada T.19(4), T.23, T.26(2),

T.34(2), T.35(2), T.37 and two of unclear context, whilst one comes from Asklepieion. Six bracelets come from Langada T.14, T.17, T.19, T.24 and T.31(2). Moreover four pins come from Langada T.15, T.37, T.43 and T.53, two needles from Langada T.58 and one of unknown provenance, and two fibulae from Langada T.10 and T.20, most probably of LH IIIC date (Bouzek 1985: 155-6). Overall rings of whatever material were particularly popular on Kos during the LH IIIC period, as was the case at Ialysos,

The most popular tool is yet again the knife, recovered in Eleona T.15, Langada T.15, T.38, T.42 and T.46(2) and Asklepieion. A single obsidian blade was recovered in Eleona T.21 belonging to the LH IIIA1-2 period. Two chisels have been attested at Langada T.58 and Asklepieion. A single axe comes from Langada T.37 and one more axe has been recovered at Asklepieion, while one fishhook was attested in Langada T.10. Moreover three stone whetstones have been found, all at Langada T.11, T.37 and T.43. As for the cosmetic items razors are the commonest found in Eleona T.17, T.21, T.23 and Langada T.11, T.25, T.34, T.46, and T.52. Tweezers were only recovered in Langada T.11 and T.43.

As for the figurines only four were attested, exclusively at Langada T.17(2), T.52 and T.57. All of them are of the female Psi-type and belong to LH IIIB-C contexts. Finally in the miscellaneous category two *Conus* shells can be placed, coming from Langada T.17 of LH IIIB-C date, while one more is from an unknown context.

Weapons were generally uncommon since all of them were found in just ten tombs. However it must be highlighted that there is no correlation between bronze offerings and weapons in particular, and chamber size. Perhaps this reveals their role as status symbols rather than ethnic markers, an idea emphasized by their presence in the tholos tomb. Even the suggestions about mercenaries overlook the rest of the deposited offerings, canonical Mycenaean pottery, as well as the character of the tombs (Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 52, 56, 67). Moreover there is no positive evidence to link weapons with an expression of ethnicity. These weapons, in my opinion, reveal the exchange network active in this period and the rising role of Kos in it.

The presence of both gold items and weapons in the tholos tomb along with the character of the tomb itself emphasizes the status of the people buried here and their social differentiation from the rest. Nonetheless of the four tombs that contained gold items only Langada T.10 and the tholos tombs are large, unlike T.19 and T.57. The bronze jewellery should also be particularly mentioned for its variety and quantity. The rings, of whatever material, tend to be found in pairs inside nine tombs, mainly in LH IIIC contexts. They seem to be as common as the weapons, nonetheless they were not found in the same tombs. The only case of coexistence of weapons and rings is in Langada T.34 and T.37, which contained just arrowheads. Moreover the popularity of bronze tools is also attested, while of the cosmetic items razors were common. Scarabs also seem to be popular during the LH IIIC period, in contrast to the sealstones that were preferred in LH IIIA1.

Overall local preferences and trends can be seen, while it must be noted that many tombs did not contain small finds at all. This is especially true of the Eleona burial area and less so at Langada. The difference between the two burial sites has already been already noted (8.2.4), but here it can be more graphically seen. Semi-precious stones are occasionally attested at Eleona, while metal items were rare. The difference between the two burial areas can be partly explained because Eleona was the earliest. Perhaps the lack of wealth deposited in tombs reflects the relative poverty of the site and even the limited role of the island in the active exchange networks in LH IIIA. However the chronological divergence can be but one of the reasons, since the burial site continued to be used alongside Langada. As at Ialysos, it is possible to see these differences as indicating different social factions, based on bonds of alliance, with socio-political implications for the local society. The access to commodities either imported or locally made in large quantities underlines the role of burial as an arena of social inequality.

The quality and types of small finds confirm that Kos was an important area as far as interaction and exchanges in the Aegean were concerned, especially in the LH IIIB and LH IIIC periods. This is further underlined by the presence of European inspired and probably manufactured weapons of LH IIIB date and the LH IIIC fibulae.

9.2.5 South-eastern Aegean

In this section the evidence from Astypalaia and Samos will be discussed, while the finds from Müskebi are limited and not published yet (for more details refer to Appendix D.5).

Non-pottery vessels come only from Armenochori T.1, a bronze cauldron and a dipper. Spearheads were especially popular at Müskebi (7) as well as on Astypalaia, recovered at Armenochori T.1 and Syngairos T.1 and T.2. Moreover a single dagger has been reportedly found at Müskebi. A stone pommel comes from Heraion T.1.

Of the semi-precious stones only steatite was found in the form of buttons and rosettes at Heraion T.1 and Armenochori T.2. A clay bead and weight was found in Armenochori T.2 and Müskebi T.45 respectively, while a single glass paste pendant comes from Myloi in a LH IIIA2 context. As for the metal jewellery, a silver bead was recovered at Heraion T.1 of LH IIIA2 date and gold beads and earrings come from Myloi T.1, of the same period. At Müskebi a gold ring has been reported among the burial offerings.

The tools deposited in tombs were numerous. Three knives were found at Müskebi and two at Armenochori T.1 and T.2. Two spatulas and three chisels were recovered at Syngairos T.1(4) and T.2. A single axe comes from Armenochori T.1 and a fishhook from Syngairos T.2. To the latter the lead fishing net weights should be added from the same tomb. Moreover two whetstones come from Armenochori T.1 and Syngairos T.2. Two obsidian blades and one core were found at Armenochori T.2 and Syngairos T.2(2). As for the cosmetic implements only two razors have been reported, one from Müskebi and one more from Armenochori T.1.

The limited available evidence reveals a smaller deposition and distribution of semi-precious stones and jewellery in general. In contrast weapons and especially tools were extremely popular. These observations are mainly for Samos and Astypalaia, where more

tombs would be needed to have a fuller view, while in the case of Müskebi it is unclear how representative are the small finds published so far.

Although the case of the Bakal Tepe built tomb is interesting, the material has not been published yet. Nonetheless it contained a number of ivory pieces, glass paste beads and inlays, as well as gold and bronze objects, displaying a large quantity and diversity of deposited small finds, all found in a LH IIIB context.

9.2.6 Discussion

Comparing the whole region, it is clear that there is a large diversity, while at the same time certain similarities exist. Non-pottery vessels are sporadically attested only in the large cemeteries, Ialysos, Eleona and Langada and wealthy ones, Aspropilia and Armenochori. As for the weapons, swords were uncommon and perhaps reserved as status symbols. The popularity of spearheads is also common in all areas, but this cannot be argued for daggers. The spearheads, which appear mainly in the cemeteries of the large islands could have not only a military use, but also or even more importantly a hunting one. Arrowheads turn up at Ialysos and Eleona and Langada, but they were only rarely attested on Rhodes. It seems that the weapons comprise about 10% of the small finds in this area with the exception of Karpathos and the South-eastern Aegean. Particularly in the last area, this is due to the large number of weapons recovered at Müskebi. Thus a special relationship between burials and weapons existed at Karpathos, Müskebi and perhaps Astypalaia, most probably associated with status symbols, but not necessarily for the same reasons.

A diversity of jewellery and its components, such as semi-precious stones, clay, bone/ivory and glass paste/faience can be found on almost all sites. At Ialysos we see the largest collection with the largest range and exotica such as ostrich egg and amber, underlining the position of the site in the exchange network of this era. This can also be seen to a lesser extent at Eleona and Langada. Other exotica such as scarabs are found at Ialysos, Rhodes and Eleona and Langada, emphasizing the complexity of the active networks and the interaction between areas, especially during LH IIIC. The same can be

said about the popularity of sealstones at Ialysos in this period. Carnelian and steatite were the commonest semi-precious stones in these three regions, as well as some sites in the South-eastern Aegean. Nonetheless the most popular type of jewellery deposited in tombs was glass paste/faience, as in all Mycenaean cemeteries.

As for metal jewellery, lead, tin and silver are sporadically found on almost all sites, apart from Karpathos where only lead has been recovered. Bronze jewellery was also found in large quantities in all the areas discussed. However gold is the most popular metal for jewellery in all cemeteries, with the exception of Karpathos and Kos. At Ialysos gold items outnumber bronze, while on Kos the opposite case exists. Special mention should be made of the silver and secondarily gold jewellery from Ialysos, mainly rings, recovered from the same cemetery and mainly dated to the LH IIIC period. Perhaps Ialysos had close connections with Attica, and particularly with Perati, to acquire lead and silver in LH IIIC (Stos-Gale and Gale 1982: 485). At Ialysos, unlike the sites in the rest of the island, but as on Kos, rings made of all metals date to LH IIIC, suggesting more intensive exchanges and perhaps an economic prosperity demonstrated in the funerary context. The same is also true of Perati, Aplomata and Kamini on Naxos underlining this point (Iakovidis 1970B: 415-6; Vlachopoulos 1999: 308-9). Fibulae also appeared in this region from LH IIIB at Aspropilia on Rhodes and Eleona and Langada on Kos.

Tools were also quite common in all cemeteries, especially knives and less so chisels. This tendency is more important at Ialysos and Eleona and Langada in the LH IIIB and LH IIIC periods, but it cannot be inferred for the rest of the sites.

The rarity of terracotta figurines inside tombs is common for all cemeteries. They are sporadically attested only at Ialysos and Eleona and Langada, with single examples from Passia, Apsaktiras and Aspropilia. Apart from these five cemeteries none has been found elsewhere. Thus in the South-eastern Aegean the symbolism of the figurines was rather weakly associated with the afterlife, as was also the case in other areas of the Mycenaean world such as some parts of Attica and Achaea (Cavanagh 1998: 109-10). However it must be noted that, from the limited settlement evidence we have, figurines are present in this region (Benzi 1999a: 278-81; Günel 1998: 445-9; Pilali-Papasteriou 1998: 44-5). Thus no inference should be made about the religious beliefs of the locals

as a whole and more importantly about ethnic origins or other *insignia* based on their absence in the chamber tombs.

The presence of shells should also be mentioned. Although rare, they were found at Ialysos, Eleona and Langada, Asprovilo, Lelos and Asklepeio. They are few in number, but as widespread as the figurines, highlighting their significance but also their limited symbolic character.

In both large cemeteries of this region with two distinct burial areas, namely Ialysos and Eleona and Langada, differences are attested. Small finds act in a way as wealth indicators and it seems that at Ialysos they were more widespread compared to Eleona and Langada where few tombs stand out. In the burial display Eleona and Langada seems far more hierarchically divided than other sites. This is less evident in the sites on Rhodes, except Ialysos, since even at Aspropilia where a diversity of offerings was buried, there is a uniform distribution of small finds in the cemetery. Interestingly enough at Ialysos and Eleona and Langada the degree of wealth corresponds to the number of tombs used and the quantities of pottery. Thus in LH IIB and LH IIIA1 there are in most cases no small finds, while more are found in LH IIIA2. In LH IIIB there are fewer at Ialysos and more at Eleona and Langada, whilst in LH IIIC more wealth was deposited in tombs of both cemeteries.

Nonetheless, overall the tombs in the South-eastern Aegean are less wealthy than those in the Argolid (Voutsaki 1993: 143; 2001: 209). This is partly due to the limited use in time span and the few deposits found in the tombs. The non-presence of many exotica or valuables in the South-eastern Aegean might have to do more with its internal socio-political structure in LH IIIA-B period, which changed in LH IIIC due to both internal and external factors. It could be equally possible that the deposition of valuables in the funerary framework might not have the same symbolic value and its display could be more meaningful in other contexts such as the domestic. The clay figurines are a good parallel to this process and a reminder that we do not find what we expect.

Small finds also allow us to glimpse exchange networks and wider interactions. The majority of the semi-precious stones, ivory and all metals were imported as raw materials or finished goods. The same is true of the glass paste/faience, as the Ulu Burun

shipwreck suggests (Bass 1997: 161-2; Georgiadis 2002a: 42; Pulak 1997: 242). The extent of the local manufacturing industry cannot be determined from the funerary context. Nevertheless small finds allow us to understand the role of each site in this network. As discussed above, Rhodes as a whole had a complex interaction, with Ialysos being a nexus not only for the island, but also for the whole region, and an international role. Kos is similar but not to the same extent and more especially during the LH IIIB and LH IIIC periods.

CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUDING REMARKS

10.1 Cultural Context, Burial Rituals and Eschatological Beliefs

Social, political, economic and cultic aspects are not only interrelated and overlap in the burial context, but they are expressed through it. The role of burials in negotiating identities, relations, ideologies and cosmological beliefs has been emphasized earlier (Chapter 6). A number of issues will be addressed here in order to understand this region better. Before analyzing these dimensions it is necessary to recapitulate the diachronic development of the tomb types and burial practices in the South-eastern Aegean.

Although interaction between the Greek mainland and the South-eastern Aegean existed at least since the LH I period, the first chamber tombs only appeared in LH IIB and LH IIIA1. In this period tombs were quite small in size containing few pots and small finds which were limited in quantity, quality and diversity. Nonetheless they are canonical in their form, while the rituals performed inside the chambers are identical to those attested in mainland Greece. No monumental tombs occur in the form of tholoi or built tombs, while social differentiation might be seen with the limited presence of weapons in some burials. Moreover relatively few sites with chamber tombs existed during LH IIB-III A1. At Karpathos a number of cemeteries were in use, similarly in north Rhodes, but only a couple existed in the southern part of the island. Astypalaia seems to have had chamber tombs already in this period, while on Kos only Eleona and Langada had started.

In LH IIIA2 there is a real expansion in the number of chamber tomb cemeteries across the South-eastern Aegean, reaching its acme as far as their quantity is concerned. Cemeteries are found across Karpathos, Rhodes, Astypalaia, Kos, Samos and Anatolia. Far more pottery and small finds accompany the deceased and more architectural elaboration is seen in the tombs. *Semata* appear in limited numbers during this period at Ialysos, while on Kos a unique tholos tomb was constructed containing rich offerings. A built tomb with an impressive earth mound above it was in use during LH IIIA2 at Heraion, with similar tombs at Archontiki.

During the LH IIIB period there is a diverse picture in the South-eastern Aegean. The number of cemeteries across the area remains unchanged. However on Rhodes there is a slight decrease and some evidence of nucleation in the north-western part of the island mainly around Ialysos and Kalavarda. There is a decrease in the number of tombs in use and far less pottery and small finds were deposited on Karpathos, Rhodes and Múskebi, while no burial evidence is available for Samos. In contrast, more tombs and offerings are found on Astypalaia, Kos, Kalymnos and Miletos. A different development between the southern and northern part of the South-eastern Aegean can be detected.

Although in LH IIIC there is a general decrease in the case of cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean, this phenomenon is not as abrupt as in mainland Greece. Based on the present evidence, during this period no cemetery seems to be active on Karpathos. Furthermore the decrease in north-western Rhodes is more evident in this period, almost completing the process of nucleation at Ialysos and Kalavarda. However, in southern Rhodes the cemetery pattern remains unchanged. The tendency to re-use LH IIIA1 and A2 tombs in this period at Ialysos and Kalavarda underlines this process. At Ialysos many tombs were in use, while old and new all seem to be the largest in the cemetery. Inside the chambers benches and pits were popular during this period. Far more pots than ever before are deposited and rich small finds are offered to the deceased, especially silver and gold rings, as well as knives. Thus LH IIIC is a period of prosperity for Ialysos with more burials, tombs, larger chamber, more internal installations and offerings of all kinds in quality, quantity and diversity. In the rest of the tombs on Rhodes more or less the same amount of pottery is deposited as in LH IIIB, except that it is now found in fewer cemeteries. On Kos fewer cemeteries were in use, though Eleona and Langada expanded further. More tombs and pots were deposited and a few were re-used, including the tholos tomb, perhaps suggesting a similar case of nucleation as in north-western Rhodes. The cemeteries on Astypalaia, Kalymnos, Múskebi and Miletos continued in use.

From the first appearance of chamber tombs across the South-eastern Aegean two points are clear. The first is an overwhelming preference for multiple burial tombs, since there had hitherto been a preference for single inhumations, emphasizing the role of kin as a

central component of the new socio-political conditions throughout the region. However this practice is not an entirely new conception, since there is evidence of two or three burials in the same pithos or cist grave in the EBA. The second point is that tombs in the same cemetery have the same orientation. This is not an idea which came from mainland Greece, but is a local phenomenon. Moreover it has been suggested earlier that it had its origins in the earlier burial traditions of western Anatolia and the South-eastern Aegean (5.1). The common orientation of tombs reveals a common belief shared by the living who constructed the tombs and the deceased deposited in them. Thus the new burial practices incorporate earlier traditions, establishing the idiosyncratic character of this region.

Nevertheless the offerings placed in the tombs underline attempts at differentiation, either horizontal or vertical, in all cemeteries. Social stratification seems to exist, but it is differently expressed in each cemetery and region. At Ialysos and Rhodes architectural elaboration is seen with the use of antechambers, side-chambers, *semata* and stone walls at the beginning of some dromoi. In the offerings for the deceased weapons, bronze vessels and tools, and jewellery further emphasize this. The preference for weapons is also seen in the tombs of Karpathos, perhaps also expressing status. On Kos weapons seem to have the same social value as gold items, all found in very few tombs, while the presence of a tholos tomb indicates a more hierarchical order than in the other areas. On Astypalaia tombs contained a large number of bronze offerings, perhaps suggesting that chamber tombs were mainly used by the upper strata of the local society. At Archontiki the existence of a few built tombs among the cist grave cemetery underlines differentiation, which is further reinforced with the quality and quantity of offerings deposited in them. Furthermore the limited chamber size of all the tombs in this region and the fewer dead placed in them perhaps suggest that not all family or kin members were permitted to use them. Age, gender or status can be argued as a criterion for horizontal stratification, but the available evidence from Aspropilia, the only cemetery where anthropological analysis has taken place, reveals a more balanced picture in terms of gender and age groups. Nonetheless the increase in child burial in LH IIC is of particular interest and related to new socio-political anxieties of that period.

Two issues are directly related to the picture of social stratification presented here. The first is the extent to which tombs reflect the socio-economic conditions of their times. The fluctuation in the number of tombs, burials and offerings from LH IIB until LH IIIC suggest that there was only a limited degree of political, social and economic stability in each cemetery and for the South-eastern Aegean as a whole. However there is one point that gives us a glimpse of how socio-economic conditions are linked to the burial context. The popularity of rings deposited in tombs is a LH IIIC phenomenon attested at Perati, Aplomata and Kaminia on Naxos, as well as at Eleona and Langada, Ialysos, Passia and possibly Aspropilia. It suggests similar responses to socio-political conditions, perhaps due to the symbolic meaning attributed to them and the availability of the commodity. During the LH IIIC period it is of particular interest that at Ialysos there is an increase in stone mortars, scarabs, rings and bronze tools. The cargo from the *Gelidonya* shipwreck is dated about 1200 BC and contained bronze and copper ingots, damaged and complete tools, scarabs, a cylinder seal, maceheads and mortars (Bass 1967: 164-5). The correspondence between the goods which were being exchanged in this period with the small finds deposited in tombs is clear, suggesting that the burial context is associated with daily life at Ialysos. The funeral arena is not only a medium of reflecting social status, as argued earlier, but equally producing and/or reproducing it.

The second issue, which seems a paradox given the existing social stratification, is why there is a common orientation of tombs in cemeteries. It does mean that a common concept must have been shared in all cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean. Therefore it is necessary also to review the burial rituals in this region. The practices so far recognized do not diverge from those attested in mainland Greece. The breaking of pottery in the dromos is not frequently found, but this is definitely due in part to excavation conditions, as the recently published cemetery at Aspropilia indicates. Benches, pits, slab paving and perhaps side chambers do not add anything to the rituals, but are designed to accommodate the deceased and the living using the tomb during the ceremonies.

The most striking local ritual characteristic is the popularity of what we have called secondary treatment. Although at Ialysos primary burial was preferred, secondary treatment is as common as at sites where this practice was particularly favoured,

Mycenae for example. In the rest of Rhodes, Kos, Astypalaia and probably Karpathos the practice of secondary treatment is almost ubiquitous from LH IIB to LH IIIC. Müskebi is probably an exception, but the excavation has not been properly published yet. Still the nature of secondary treatment has to be defined as much as possible from the available data. Thus it seems that after the burial had taken place and a considerable time had elapsed to allow the flesh to decompose, the tomb was reopened. This was not done when a new burial occurred in the same tomb, since the coexistence of primary and secondary treatment is rare. Especially on Rhodes, Kos and Astypalaia most tombs contain exclusively secondary burials. This process was not a simple one since the dromos had to be at least partly cleared so that one or more persons could enter the tomb. Whether new offerings were brought or how openly this ceremony was conducted, is unclear. Perhaps the bones were washed, taken out into the sun and returned to the chamber. What is clear is that the bones were scattered around the tomb in disorder without any special treatment of the skull or any other bone. Limited evidence of fire could argue for some burning taking place inside the tomb, but when this ritual took place and whether it was always performed remains elusive. It is possible that some offerings were taken out, in times of need or as part of the ritual practice. The killed sword at Langada T.21 is negative evidence of this practice, rendered useless so that it would not be removed. This casts some doubt on whether all offerings were meant to be taken out of circulation permanently, but the offerings that we find definitely were. Overall this treatment has nothing to do with practical matters, the deceased are not reburied in pits or niches, but at the same time they are not removed from the tomb to make more space. The scattering of the bones is not only meaningful, but more importantly highly symbolic. The deceased is no more a dead kinsman, his/her soul had departed, but still the remains were important enough to be preserved. At the same time the living members of the kin group could turn the deceased into an anonymous ancestor, a protector of their kin and of the land. The accumulation of ancestors would strengthen their power, which must have been thought to be pivotal in the tomb.

The interaction of living and deceased was not limited to the performance of the secondary treatment. As pointed out earlier, the presence of a stone wall at the beginning of the dromos is an elaboration of some kind of rituals performed there (8.1.3). Perhaps

the beginning of the dromos was a point of communication and offerings such as flowers or agricultural products and/or libations were deposited to honour the ancestors. This might have been a practice during some specific festival related to the ancestors or a kin matter of no specific calendar period. In this respect perhaps the antechambers found at Ialysos in T.19, T.24 and T.43 should be seen as an elaboration of this process, while the offerings found in them might have been to honour the ancestors yet again. The interaction of the living and the ancestors was frequent and quite close and thus the fear of pollution must have been limited and not as dramatic as Voutsaki (1998: 46) and Dabney (1999: 172) have argued. The available evidence strongly suggests, in my opinion, that the protective power of the ancestors was channeled through the dromos to the outer world.

The ancestors were placed in tombs which shared a common orientation most probably for two reasons. The first could be called socio-political, because ancestors and consequently their kin were considered equal to those in other tombs. All contributed their powers for the benefit of the local community. Thus communality and an idealized egalitarian image were promoted at least for the ancestors, if not the local society itself. This did not prevent expressions of social stratification and status which perhaps had more to do with the living family or kin rather than the deceased. The second was related more to cosmological beliefs, since the ancestors through their presence in the tombs channeled their powers to specific areas.

However, not all cemeteries have the same orientation, a large diversity exists across the South-eastern Aegean. It can be argued that, especially in the case of cemeteries or even single tombs that have a general eastern orientation, there might have been a symbolic association with the sunrise and/or the moonrise (Blomberg and Henriksson 2001: 84; Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 45-7; Papathanassiou and Hoskin 1996: 58). On the other hand the west is associated with the sunset and the symbolic values related to that. The cemeteries with a general eastern or western focus have internal variation in the orientation of their tombs, something that could be attributed to the specific location of the sun or the moon at the time the tomb was constructed (Papathanassiou *et al.* 1992: 54; Papathanassiou and Hoskin 1996: 58). Perhaps the preference for the east or west is connected with the solar cycle, but it does not seem to

have a strict role in the selection of the burial ground, as seen earlier (5.3.1). It could indicate a local preference for the timing of the funeral, morning/east and evening/west. Although there might have been beliefs associating solar and/or lunar symbolism with death, I believe that they were of secondary cultic importance. Most probably the common orientation of the tombs in a cemetery was more concerned with the area it viewed and the landscape setting rather than a specific point on the horizon.

Consequently as discussed earlier (5.3.2) the topographic features emphasized on Rhodes are valleys and *revmata*, while on Kos valleys and the sea were highlighted. In the rest of the cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean one or other of these sets is preferred. Therefore it can be argued that ancestors and land or sea are inextricably linked. Goodison (1989: 198) proposes that collectivity and egalitarianism are seen in the reproductive cycle, closely linked to the cycle of fertile vegetation. The role of ancestors in this regeneration symbolism is associated with the land, vegetation and the sun. Protecting the land and its fertility legitimizes the kinsmen of the ancestors to claim rights on the land and their power ensures regeneration, social and cosmological, if not natural, order and stability. The importance of either the land or the sea for the local community is underlined in this way, while in the case of the sea, the ancestors offer protection from it and for its fertility.

Feasting can be intermingled with the funerary practices as part of the rituals with various symbolic meanings, for example the *perideipna*. Thus in some cases we might be able to see the role of feasting and wine drinking in the local social structure and its symbolic value (Dietler 1990: 386, 391; Eliade 1996: 350-1; Galaty 1999: 30; Hamilakis 1999: 40-1). Perhaps feasting in small communities was more common and more widespread (Bell 1997: 120, 122), being present in many contexts of daily life. Moreover Rhodes has been renowned for its wine production from antiquity until nowadays and it is quite possible that there was large-scale production in the Bronze Age. Possibly its symbolic significance had more to do with the cohesion of the social structure and this was manifested in the funerary context as an image of idealized social egalitarianism on Rhodes and in some other South-eastern Aegean sites. Perhaps this egalitarianism is to be connected with the practice of the secondary treatment and the

associated ideas and roles attributed to the ancestors. Wine, feasting, social cohesion and death, kylikes and drinking vessels in general seem to be interlinked. This is more apparent in the cemeteries on Rhodes, and less at Ialysos, where interaction between living and ancestors was more frequent and the open vessels were recovered in large numbers (figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6). However the presence of fewer drinking vessels and tinned vases at Ialysos and on Kos may indicate that feasting and wine drinking were more markers of social differentiation in these two cemeteries. The conspicuous consumption of drinking vessels, by being deposited in tombs or smashed in the dromos, reveals the multi-level symbolic significance of the vessels with important ritual and social dimensions. However, the stylistic similarities and the same source of imports, along with a similar taste for specific pottery types and categories, suggest a more unified picture for the whole of Rhodes, including Ialysos. It is possible that Trianda and Seraglio were the centres of their islands and as a result of elite competition the symbolic significance of feasting and wine drinking was highlighted. Thus the role of wine should not be taken as granted in all areas of study (*contra* Hamilakis 1996: 23). Interestingly enough the popularity of open vases at Pylos, from where the information of Linear B tablets mainly comes (Galaty 1999: 1999: 31; Palmer 1994: 191, 195; Wright 1996: 302), Ialysos and Kos is almost identical (compare Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 228, fig. 6.22 with figs 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6).

Having established the social and religious aspects of the burials, it is time to address the political dimensions that can be seen in the mortuary record. Unfortunately our evidence is uneven and not easily comparable between cemeteries, thus a similarity/difference approach will be used, applied to all available data from the tombs. Rhodes is the best candidate for such a task, since a large number of cemeteries have been excavated. There are several similarities found across the island, the common orientation of the tombs, with a general preference for the north and east, the size and the shape of the chamber, architectural elaboration, the pottery types preferred, however strong local tendencies exist synchronously and diachronically. The most important exception to this is Ialysos, where more primary burials are attested than anywhere else on the island, perhaps along with Kalavarda; there is a more diverse orientation of the tombs, an

impressive increase of tombs and pots in LH IIIC and a large quantity, quality and diversity of small finds.

The popularity of oil containers at Ialysos throughout the period under review is indicative of their appreciation and symbolism in the funerary context. Perhaps they also indicate the central role of Ialysos as the centre for redistribution and therefore as the socio-economic and more importantly political centre of the island. This perhaps is reinforced by the equal preference for oil containers at Kos, with the exception of their greater popularity during LH IIIB. This difference perhaps reveals partly the reason for Koan prosperity during this period, in contrast to most of the other South-eastern Aegean sites. Moreover it seems probable that this increase in the popularity of oil containers was analogous to the decrease in unguent containers which, if they contained aromatic substances, may have had oil as their main substance. Therefore oil was used more as a commodity on its own, rather than for more specialized products. Nevertheless this hypothesis is based on the assumption that most of these pots indeed contained oil or oil by-products and that olives were widely cultivated on the island, as was the case throughout its known history (Hamilakis 1996: 23).

Kos, Kalymnos and Astypalaia might form one socio-cultural unity sharing the same pottery style at least from LH IIIB. The same has been proposed for Miletos, based only on pottery style. The preference for secondary treatment, a general orientation preference to the west and south, while the valley and the sea were the focal landscape elements, are shared elements in these sites. Moreover a similar development through time can be seen, while there is no special interest in drinking vessels.

Karpathos has a character of its own with many Cretan elements in the pottery. Moreover different pottery vessels were favoured with a special interest in kraters, while secondary treatment is very common, as in southern Rhodes. The local preference for weapons deposited in tombs in LH IIIA and B is important. The case of Müskebi remains unclear, but the locals preferred primary burials. Samos had similar characteristics to the cemeteries already reviewed, but the limited data do not allow more conclusions. The same applies for Selçuk, Kolophon and Bakla Tepe. As for Emporio and Archontiki, the earlier burial traditions seem to prevail, while the built tombs at the second site are most probably a result of elite imitation.

The overall political pattern suggested here views Rhodes as being unified at least from the LH IIIA2 period. This is based on the wealth at Ialysos and its limited diffusion to other cemeteries, suggesting a certain control of distribution and inequality. However it must be emphasized that the local cemeteries demonstrate a high degree of autonomy in the burial context. This is seen in the types of offerings, as much as the cemetery orientation, which is not similar even in adjacent ones. Thus an important localism can be proposed for the burial context that seems to defy the control exercised by Ialysos, if that was the case. Kos, Kalymnos and Astypalaia could form another socio-cultural unity and perhaps even a unified polity from LH IIIB. Miletos could be incorporated in this, most probably only socio-culturally since it seems that in the course of LH IIIB it was under Hittite rule, at least briefly but not all of the 13th century BC, but for LH IIIC more evidence is needed. More or less the same could be true of Mūskebi. The same unclear picture comes from Samos, which most probably stood on its own, Archontiki must have controlled Psara, while the evidence is rather limited to assess the role of Emporio in Chios.

Although important differences exist between islands and cemeteries, the South-eastern Aegean shares a number of characteristics. The result is not only a product of interaction, but also of a common socio-cultural and belief substratum. The elements that are shared in this region come as a contrast to some mainland Greek burial practices. There is an overwhelming preference for chamber tombs, with single graves and tholoi being a rarity. Tombs tend to be small in size containing few burials, whilst structural elaboration was not unusual. Secondary treatment is well represented, closely connected to the role of the ancestors in the local community. Tombs in the cemeteries tend to have a common orientation with a special symbolism attributed to the surrounding landscape, related to ancestral beliefs. A large variety of pottery was offered to the dead, while the rarity of figurines in tombs is a general phenomenon in this region.

At the same time chamber tombs are structurally canonical compared with those found on the Greek mainland. Moreover the rituals performed are also the same as in the rest of the Mycenaean world. The South-eastern Aegean belongs socio-culturally to the Mycenaean world but, through the burial practices, a strong regional character is

revealed. The local indiosyncracies emphasize the amalgamation of Mycenaean elements with local traditions in the eschatological and metaphysical beliefs and practices, from LH IIB until LH IIIC. This is further highlighted when analyzing the South-eastern Aegean, and it becomes apparent that a strong regionalism existed (*contra* Voutsaki 2001: 210). What is unique in the area is the role and importance of the ancestors in the everyday life of the local community. This strengthens the kin groups as the basic social and political unit. Moreover ancestors legitimize status, ideologies and any other group aspirations by generating and expressing stability, fertility, regeneration and ultimately cosmological order.

10.2 The Historical Context and the Migration Hypothesis

10.2.1 LH II-III A2: The Mycenaean Expansion in the Aegean

In order to understand and assess the position and the role of the South-eastern Aegean in the Mycenaean world, it is necessary to review the processes that were under way in mainland Greece during LH IIA-B. The date of the first Mycenaean palaces with their associated socio-political structures is still unclear. There is some speculation about an LH II palace at Mycenae (Dickinson 1992: 154; French 2002: 45-7), while there is evidence for the Menelaion being in use as an administrative centre during LH IIB (Rutter 1993: 96), but the local polities were evidently smaller than the ones seen in the LH IIIA2-B period. Social changes and definite evidence for a palace are not found until LH IIIA1 at Tiryns (Dickinson 1992: 156; Rutter 1993: 96; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 454-5; Vermeule 1972: 114).

During LH IIB/LM II-III A2 it is proposed that Mycenaean rulers existed at Knossos, taking power by military means (Furumark 1950: 264; Kanta 1980: 320; Popham 1980: 166; Taylour 1995: 156; Vasilikou 1995: 20-1; Vermeule 1972: 145-6; Watrous 1993: 86 *contra* Niemeier 1983: 217), or more peacefully (Driessen 1990: 120; Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 68; 1997: 117-8). Although new pottery types were introduced on Crete, actual mainland imports are limited (Haskell 1997: 188; Watrous

Mylonas
1966: 59

1993: 86). Some Linear B tablets belong to the LM IIIA1 period, while warrior burials are found in the newly introduced chamber and tholos tombs, indicating a new Mycenaean military elite (Popham *et al.* 1974: 253; Driessen 1990: 125; Haskell 1997: 193 *contra* Niemeier 1983: 226). Nevertheless, the warrior graves, a rather unsatisfactory term, may be connected to status and not necessarily to a military aristocracy (Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 58, 68), while the adaptation of Mycenaean burial characteristics can equally be part of a local social and political transformation and not an ethnic marker (Preston 1999: 141-3; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 561). The presence of Mycenaean rulers remains open to debate, while the only real evidence for such a claim is the Linear B tablets (Dickinson 1996: 304-5; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 565-6).

In LC II/LH IIB or LC III/LH IIIA Mycenaean influence and mainland rule has been suggested for Phylakopi due to the imported pottery from the Argolid and the architecture of its megaron (Barber 1987: 224; 1999a: 135-7; 1999b: 317; Furumark 1950: 264; Taylour 1995: 158). Naxos is also thought to have a similar relationship with Attica (Barber 1999a: 138). No wholesale adoption of Mycenaean architectural styles has been found at Phylakopi, hence there is nothing to suggest political domination from the Greek mainland (Schallin 1993: 175-6, 188; Treuil *et al.* 1996: 463-4). A more balanced and gradual socio-cultural transformation for the Cyclades becoming Mycenaean is proposed, but yet again some kind of migration/colonization is suggested at least for Thera (Davis and Bennet 1999: 113). In that process warfare must have played a role in both the Cyclades and Crete (Davis and Bennet 1999: 113-4; Deger-Jalkotzy 1999: 124).

The arrival of Mycenaean on Rhodes and Kos is also dated to the LH IIB-III A1 period (Benzi 1992: 212; Furumark 1950: 262-3; Karantzali 2001: 78; Mee 1982: 82; 1988b: 301; Taylour 1995: 158; Vasilikou 1995: 388). Three warrior burials existed at Ialysos in LH IIB-III A, suggesting a Mycenaean military elite (Benzi 1988b: 61-2; Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 67). Mee (1988b: 303) does not rule out some acculturation along with new settlers from the mainland, while Mountjoy (1998: 51) argues for acculturation with no colonists. For the advocates of the migration/colonization hypothesis, a new wave of Mycenaean came in LH III A2

settling in the whole of the South-eastern Aegean (Macdonald 1985: 192; Mee 1988b: 304).

In other words it has been suggested that during LH IIB-III A1 the Mycenaeans invaded, conquered, migrated or colonized the Cyclades, Crete and the South-eastern Aegean. The reasons proposed are expansion and control of trade routes in the Aegean (Voutsaki 2001: 210, 213 *contra* Sherratt 2001: 216, 222-3, n.17). The desire for land-acquisition or economic control through gift exchange/tribute corresponds well to the Hittite and Egyptian practices. Moreover it is compatible with a Mycenaean thalassocracy (2.1.4) and the ideas related to a unified Mycenaean empire. However the political situation in mainland Greece was quite different at this time: small, rival polities, with limited resources and aspirations to control the Argolid, Boeotia or Messenia rather than possessions overseas. Even in the case of a coalition with one of the polities as *primus inter pares*, meaning Mycenae due to the Homeric heritage (Barber 1999b: 316-7; Taylour 1995: 158; Vasilikou 1995: 21), such a task would be impossible. The period in which all this supposedly happened was quite short, and the forces, logistics and the continuous military presence needed could not be met by the polities of this period, only by empires and not small competing states. Moreover such a movement of troops and subsequently settlers to these areas would mean depopulation in the mainland, something that our current evidence argues against.

Thus different interpretations have been sought and mercenaries were argued to have helped the Mycenaean overlords to acquire and maintain their power at Knossos (Driessen and Macdonald 1984: 52, 56). According to the same line of thinking, displaced aristocrats from the mainland, as a result of competition within and between, came at least to the South-eastern Aegean, i.e. Rhodes, Kos and south-west Anatolia (Benzi 1996: 951; Mee 1988b: 304; Niemeier 1999: 149; 2002: 21). However it remains doubtful how and with what resources these aristocrats could have controlled the areas they fled to. More importantly in LH IIB-III A1 there is no elaborate burial in the whole South-eastern Aegean, no large or elaborate chamber tomb, no impressive built tomb with a large earth mound and no tholos tomb. In other words they remain archaeologically invisible, if they ever existed. There are also more extreme beliefs, such

as the suggestion put forward by Gates (1995: 297) that Mycenaeans were already present in the South-eastern Aegean since the MBA.

It is clear that Mycenaean expeditions of the proposed magnitude in LH IIB-III A1 could not have taken place. Aristocrats, adventurers or individuals could have fled from the mainland to the islands, but their social, political and cultural influence was minimal. The appearance of chamber tombs and Mycenaean pottery does not necessarily mean presence of Mycenaeans from the mainland. The issues of migration, colonization, invasion and ethnicity were raised in 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.3.2 and seen as inextricably linked to the Mycenaean thalassocracy/empire hypothesis (2.1.4). Nonetheless the real core of this problem is simple, what/who is Mycenaean? Unfortunately the answer is not so simple. In my opinion Mycenaean is a socio-cultural identity, which is differently expressed and can overlap with other social, political or ethnic identities. The use of Mycenaean material culture both imported and locally produced is important, but Mycenaean architecture is less fundamental, since older traditions could prevail. Religious beliefs would be another indicator, as well as the general character of the material remains from the habitation areas. The combination of all these elements would give us a better understanding of the local cultural character. However of central importance, in my opinion, would be the burial context, since it is related to the socio-political role of the kin group/family, a fundamental aspect of Mycenaean society.

In the South-eastern Aegean the settlement evidence is limited, the available funerary record reveals inter-local and intra-local social hierarchy. Moreover the kin/family is emphasized through the burial practices, whilst the pottery and the small finds, whether imported or local, are Mycenaean. The religious beliefs, especially the aspects related to the burial tradition, reveal a real blend of earlier local ones with new practices coming from mainland Greece. In other words the burial context is an excellent indicator in the South-eastern Aegean that the socio-cultural identity of the local societies and peoples is Mycenaean.

10.2.2 The *Ahhiyawa* Problem and the Mycenaean Influence in East Aegean

Since the decipherment of the Hittite tablets a fierce debate has existed about the translation of two names *Ahhiyawa* and *Millawanda*, which are closely associated. Their geographic location has produced a number of hypotheses, but recently most scholars have accepted the equation of *Ahhiyawa* with the Mycenaeans and *Millawanda* with Miletos (Bryce 1989a: 6-7; Gurney 1990: 21; Hawkins 1998: 30; Niemeier 1998b: 37, 45; Taylour 1995: 158), but others place them in Thrace and the Troad (Easton 1984: 34; Houwink ten Cate 1973: 148; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 97-8). However a number of scholars favour *Ahhiyawa* not being the Mycenaeans on the Greek mainland, but on Rhodes or more generally in the South-eastern Aegean (Benzi 1996: 967; Boysal 1967: 55-6; Desborough 1964: 219; Gates 1995: 296; Mountjoy 1998: 50-1; Page 1959: 15-6; Sherratt 2001: 217-8, n. 9; Vermeule 1972: 272). The equation of *Ahhiyawa* with Mycenaeans is not only based on philological grounds, but more importantly on circumstantial evidence. The status and power attributed to their king by the Hittite tablets and the total lack of material finds of any culture of that standing in western Anatolia, apart from the Mycenaean, strengthens this point (Bryce 1999: 59-91).

The true problem with the *Ahhiyawa* question is where the seat of its king should be placed. The advocates of *Ahhiyawa* being situated in mainland Greece favour a *primus inter pares* king, either at Mycenae (Bryce 1989a: 5-6) or Thebes (Niemeier 2002: 20), exercising direct political control over the South-eastern Aegean. A more refined, but basically similar, idea is the so-called maritime confederacy, with Mycenae as a leading power, controlling the South-eastern Aegean politically and economically (Karantzali 2001: 79-80; Mee 1998a: 143; Voutsaki 1993: 166-8; 2001: 210-1). All these theories try to explain indirectly the Trojan expedition (Vasilikou 1995: 21). In contrast those who suggest that the seat of the king was at Ialysos view the South-eastern Aegean as an autonomous, but unified political entity. Another suggestion that has not drawn much attention is proposed by Cline (1994: 69), in which the term *Ahhiyawa* used in the Hittite texts changes location in different periods.

One dimension of the Hittite texts that, in my opinion, has not drawn enough attention is the geography of western Anatolia. From the first references to western Anatolia two things are clear, that it comprised a number of independent polities and that from the time of Tudhaliya I until the fall of the Hittites all kings had to deal with revolts in the region. The Assuwa confederacy and its attack against the Hittites gives us a list of 22 polities, as well as the fact that a coalition was possible against a common threat (Bryce 1989b: 308; 1999: 134-6; Cline 1996: 145; Güterbock 1986: 40; Niemeier 1999: 145; Vasilikou 1995: 389). Wilusa, equated with the Troad, Seha River Land, Arzawa, Mira, the Lukka Lands, equated to Lycia, are repeatedly mentioned in the 14th and 13th century BC Hittite texts (Easton *et al.* 2002: 98-100; Niemeier 1999: 142-3). It is also probable that Arzawa, with its capital at Apasa=Ephesos (Hawkins 1998: 1), had managed to acquire independence, briefly at least, as its correspondence with Amarna suggests (Gurney 1990: 22). Throughout these two centuries and the attempts of these polities to become independent, the *Ahhiyawans* seem to help them directly or indirectly (Bryce 1999: 209-12, 244-6, 321-4). The Hittite attitude to western Anatolian polities was that they were vassal states (Mellaart 1986: 75). Nonetheless, apart from their cooperation against the Hittites, there were conflicts between them (Bryce 1999: 247).

In western Anatolia a number of autonomous entities emerged as a result of peer polity interaction, not unlike the situation in mainland Greece. From the Neolithic period the areas around the Aegean shared many socio-cultural elements. Interaction between sites is attested from the time that obsidian was exchanged (3.2) and intensified in the LBA. However, the appearance of the Hittite empire reduced the autonomy of those polities in western Anatolia by force (Mellaart 1986: 75). In that context and in their attempts to overcome this dominance, alliances were sought with the independent Mycenaean polities, whether one or more than one, either on the mainland and/or the islands. The alliances and aims must have fluctuated through time, but the Mycenaean help in the form of manpower, mercenaries or whatever was necessary for them. Thus we can understand more the anti-Hittite Mycenaean involvement in western Anatolia (Bryce 1989a: 12). The gains for the Mycenaeans would be closer interaction, new markets, booty, prestige and strong alliances, rather than land acquisition. A consequence of these Mycenaean actions was that the Hittites took over Miletos in early

LH IIIB (Bryce 1989a: 15-7), while an embargo was issued against Mycenaean ships sailing to Syria during LH IIIB, most probably after the battle of Kadesh (1275 BC) (Cline 1991a: 6-7; 1994: 71-4; Page 1959: 7-8; Stubbing 1951: 110; Yakar 1976: 126-7).

Although the socio-cultural impact of the Mycenaeans in the east Aegean/western Anatolia was deep, Mycenaean influence was not as marked in inland Anatolia (Cline 1991a: 1-6). Interaction between mainland Greece and the east Aegean was frequent, as the Mycenaean finds in the South-eastern Aegean, Chios and Psara, Liman Tepe and Panaztepe (3.5), Erythrai, Smyrna, Larisa, Çerkes Sultaniye and Pitane (Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1968: 52; Mee 1978: 125, 127, 132, 142-4; Özgünel 1983: 705-7, 709-15, 719-20, 738-9), Imvros (Andreou and Andreou 2001: 145-6; Greaves and Helwing 2001: 502), Thermi, Antissa, Perama and Kourtir on Lesbos (Lamb 1936: 212; Spencer 1995: 275), Poliochni, Ifestia and Koukonisi on Lemnos (Bernabò-Brea 1976B: 336; Messineo 1997: 244-5) and Troy (Korfmann 1986: 23; Mee 1978: 146-7; 1984: 45-8, 50-1), testify. This was not only restricted to goods, but more importantly entailed cultural, social, religious and perhaps political ideas and practices that were amalgamated with local traditions and social structures. Although more research is needed in the north-eastern Aegean, the incorporation of several Mycenaean elements in their burial practices was very important. Mycenaean pots and small finds are found inside tombs or graves at Emporio, Archontiki, Panaztepe, Çerkes Sultaniye (Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1968: 52), Pitane (Mee 1978: 143-4) and Troy, in other words in all the known cemeteries of this period (5.2.7, 5.2.8). Mycenaean elements in the burial architecture and more importantly in the introduction of multiple tombs are found at Emporio, Archontiki, Panaztepe and Troy, with the possible addition of Makara. If Ephesos is equated with Apasa, the capital of the Arzawa, then the same process can be suggested in this area, with the addition of Kolophon and Bakla Tepe, where either the tombs were impressive, tholos and built tomb, or were placed on the highest part of a hill (Bakla Tepe) and with impressive view (Selçuk). This is not a matter of fashion but of adapting parts of the Mycenaean belief system and its eschatological/metaphysical, social and political dimensions associated with the importance of the kin group/family as suggested earlier. The degree of this socio-cultural penetration depends on the extent of the interaction with the site in terms of the quality and character of the local burial

tradition. This comes as a sharp contrast to the rather limited Hittite cultural influence in western Anatolia. Mellaart and Murray (1995: 108) argue this, but also suggest that the same applied to Mycenaean influence in western Anatolia. However, the burial evidence suggests that the upper strata in the local communities were emphasizing the importance of their kin or family, while the lower strata also used Mycenaean material culture in their graves. I strongly believe that in the burial arena there was a conscious preference for the Mycenaean socio-cultural structure. Perhaps the Mycenaean represented ideologically the ideal of the autonomous polity that the western Anatolian polities wanted to achieve, in contrast to the authoritarian one the Hittite empire expressed.

10.2.3 LH IIIC: Continuity and Change

Before proceeding to the LH IIIC period some reference should be made to LH IIIB. It is a period when, the building of heavy fortification at Mycenae, Midea, Tiryns, Athens Phylakopi and Miletos reveals a parallel socio-political situation (Shelmerdine 1997: 583). Moreover a hiatus in the export of pottery from the Argolid is evident in LH IIIB2 (Sherratt 1980: 199-202) and does not indicate the abandonment of settlements either at Ialysos (Mee 1988a: 56) or Phylakopi (Barber 1987: 226; Deger-Jalkotzy 1998: 107).

The LH IIIB/C period is marked by destructions of mainland palaces and settlements at Gla, Zygouries, Tsoungiza, Pylos, Nichoria, Mycenae, Tiryns, Midea and Thebes (Desborough 1964: 221; Shelmerdine 1997: 581; Taylour 1995: 161). Many settlements were abandoned, resulting in a decrease in the population in LH IIIC (Treuil *et al.* 1995: 474). At the same time sites such as Mycenae, Tiryns, Asine, Midea Athens, Argos, Korakou, Chalandritsa, Derveni, Teichos Dymaion, Panakton, Elateia, Palaiokastro, Aigeira, Kephallonia, Lefkandi, Perati and Thebes seem to survive in this period and prosper to some extent, suggesting a kind of nucleation in the Greek mainland (Åström 1992: 27-8; Shelmerdine 1997: 581-2; Treuil *et al.* 1995: 474-5; Vasilikou 1995: 408). Nonetheless the general picture of destruction and abandonment persists in mainland Greece and it has been argued that refugees fled to the Aegean islands, reaching Cyprus and Syria-Palestine, which also suffered destructions. In the

same period the Hittite Empire and its dominance over Anatolia came to a sudden end. In the new socio-political conditions the polities were smaller, with a ruling elite having fewer resources but expressing their status through the warrior burials and their connection to war activities (Deger-Jalkotzy 1999: 130).

Migration to the Aegean islands, due to their geographical position, is a prerequisite for the explanation of the Greek colonization or *ethnogenesis* of Cyprus (Åstrom 1988: 78; Karantzali 2001: 78; Leriou 2002: 170-1; Vasilikou 1995: 409) and possibly the destructions in Cilicia and Syria-Palestine caused by the Sea Peoples, if they are equated with Aegean migrants (Dothan 1992: 97; Iakovidis 1995: 217; Sandars 1983: 63; Yakar 1993: 15, 23).

The destructions in the Eastern Mediterranean are beyond the scope of this research. However it is necessary to mention them to understand the context in which the migration hypotheses are proposed. In the Cyclades it is suggested that Phylakopi, Koukounaries, Ayia Irini, Ayios Andreas and Grotta were settled by mainlanders (Barber 1987: 227; Kardara 1977: 91-3 *contra* Schallin 1993: 175; Vlachopoulos 1999: 310). Vlachopoulos (1999: 309; Nowicki 2000: 250) proposes that a nucleation can be seen on Naxos, similar to those observed in the Argolid and Attica. On Crete there are no destructions of the magnitude seen in mainland Greece, but insecurity is evident with the foundation of refuge settlements in rather inaccessible areas (Kanta 1980: 325-6; Nowicki 2000: 233). In the South-eastern Aegean the presence of settlers was argued due to the re-use of tombs (Mee 1988a: 57), along with nucleation/internal migration for Rhodes (Benzi 1992: 224-5; 1996: 974; Macdonald 1986: 132).

During LH IIIB the South-eastern Aegean, with the notable exception of Kos, Astypalaia and perhaps Kalymnos, witnessed socio-political disruption. Fewer tombs and fewer offerings are found compared to LH IIIA2 and this is particularly seen at Ialysos and Karpathos. Perhaps the active involvement of the Hittites in western Anatolia and their control of Cyprus, Syria and Palestine might have weakened considerably the intensity of the exchanges and its networks. Hence Rhodes, especially Ialysos, Karpathos and the islands close to Miletos were affected.

The LH IIIC period in the South-eastern Aegean is quite different from the picture emerging in mainland Greece. The burial rituals, the importance of the ancestors

and the active role of the landscape continued to be as meaningful as in the previous periods. There is an overall decrease in settlements, but this is not as dramatic as in the Greek mainland, with the exception of Karpathos. Nucleation is observed in the north-west of Rhodes around Ialysos and Kalavarda, and possibly around Eleona and Langada on Kos, and the re-use of tombs can be seen in that context. The pottery has a local character with some Cretan and mainland elements and there is significant decrease in imported pots from the Greek mainland, suggesting less direct contacts and/or an increase in the local production centres. As for the warrior burials, a phenomenon not attested in all mainland Greek sites, there is no definite evidence for the LH IIIC period. Thus it seems that there was a greater degree of continuity in the South-eastern Aegean and, if migrants did arrive from mainland Greece, they were either assimilated or were so few in numbers that they did not alter the local burial practices.

The destruction of the palatial politico-economic centres in mainland Greece and in the Eastern Mediterranean did not signify the end of interaction, but opened the way to more Mycenaean pottery imports and local imitations (Sherratt and Crouwel 1987: 345). Exchanges continued between the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean as the Gelidonya and Iria shipwrecks, dating c.1200 BC, testify, but by freelance individuals rather than palatial centres (Georgiadis 2002a: 43; Sherratt 2001: 238). Although there is a general decrease in burial offerings and many crafts were no longer practiced in the palatial framework, there are places that flourished in this period. Exchanges continued and some strategic coastal settlements played a vital role, functioning as a nexus/emporion on these routes. Perati (Iakovidis 1970B: 414-6), Aplomata and Kaminia (Vlachopoulos 1999: 304-5), Ialysos, Eleona and Langada and possibly Değirmentepe, with their wealthy tombs, reflect this. Hence LH IIIC in the South-eastern Aegean was not a period of abandonment and destruction. It is a period of further development, since the markets of the Eastern Mediterranean were open, there was no more Hittite activity in western Anatolia and this region was in a strategic position in a period of active exchange routes.

At the same time there are strong indications of increased piratical activities, as the fortification of Grotta (Vlachopoulos 1999: 303) and the pictorial kraters from

Kynos (Dakoronia 1999: 124) and Seraglio (Morricone 1972/3: 359-60) depicting naval battles scene, suggest. Perhaps the occupation of coastal fortified sites or inland hilly ones was a response to that, especially in the Cyclades, Crete and the South-eastern Aegean. This is particularly seen in north-western Rhodes, which is more open to raids due to the long plain along the coast, as well as a number of smaller islands to the north and the west that could harbour pirates. Perhaps Kos is similar with more sites being inland around Seraglio.

10.3 A Synthesis

In this analysis I have tried to emphasize the burial context of the chamber tomb cemeteries in the South-eastern Aegean as a whole. I have tried to demonstrate that the landscape, the tomb, the rituals, the pottery and the small finds were part of one meaningful entity, closely associated with particular social, economic, political and cultic aspects. These are dynamic components and their importance or role fluctuated according to space and time.

Particularly in the ritual context, it was demonstrated that the landscape played an active role in the metaphysical/eschatological beliefs. Moreover the importance of the transformation of the deceased to ancestors was emphasized with all the symbolism this may have had for the local population and land. From these points it became apparent that the South-eastern Aegean had an idiosyncratic character as far as its burial practices were concerned, especially when compared to mainland Greece. Nonetheless, at a social, and most probably political, level the South-eastern Aegean was not a unity, but a certain regionalism existed.

The better understanding of the local burial tradition, which was a mixture of Mycenaean and local beliefs, allowed us to suggest that this region was autonomous, socio-politically, from the Greek mainland. The idiosyncratic characteristics were present from the appearance of the first chamber tombs in LH IIB and continued until their abandonment at the end of LH IIIC. This underlines that the introduction of the chamber tombs was not an implanted change, but a result of new socio-political

conditions that existed in the whole of the Aegean and of internal transformations in the South-eastern Aegean societies.

The importance of interactions was also highlighted during the LH III period especially in the eastern Aegean and western Anatolia. The penetration of Mycenaean characteristics was multi-faceted, not related to migration or colonization from Mycenaean palatial centres, but depended on the degree of interaction and the socio-political conditions of each individual community in any given period.

Ending I would like to emphasize the role of the burial context in understanding the local society, politics, culture, cult and identity.

Nevertheless the need for excavation of habitation areas is pressing in this region so as to have a more rounded appreciation of its local character. The present work can be developed and become part of or the initiative for further research with a local or supra-local character. A review of the Early Iron Age in the East Aegean is necessary, since only sporadic information is available, and can be seen as a chronological continuation of the current study. Moreover it will allow a comparison and a better understanding of the processes under way in both periods. The insular character as well as the role of the landscape/topography could also underlie a deeper and diachronic analysis of parts of this region in a well-planned survey. This could focus on a smaller island, such as Astypalaia, or a larger one, such as southern Rhodes. Furthermore the whole format of this current research and the main concerns related to insularity, cultural/ethnic identity, the landscape of death and burial practices could be expanded for all the Aegean islands, perhaps including Crete. The South-eastern Aegean could also form part of an even wider attempt to analyze regional Mycenaean burial practices, an ambitious and laborious project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AA</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
<i>AAA</i>	<i>Αρχαιολογικά Ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνών</i>
<i>AA</i>	<i>Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον</i>
<i>AE</i>	<i>Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς</i>
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>Annuario</i>	<i>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>British Archaeological Reports</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
<i>BSA</i>	<i>The Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
<i>IGME/ IGSR</i>	<i>Ινστιτούτο Γεωλογικών Μελετών Ελλάδος</i>
<i>IRERP</i>	<i>Izmir Region Excavations and Research Programs</i>
<i>IJNA</i>	<i>Institute Journal of Nautical Archaeology</i>
<i>IJNAUE</i>	<i>Institute Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration</i>
<i>IM</i>	<i>Instanbuler Mitteilungen</i>
<i>JAA</i>	<i>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</i>
<i>JFA</i>	<i>Journal of Field Archaeology</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JMA</i>	<i>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</i>
<i>JÖAIW</i>	<i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien</i>
<i>KST</i>	<i>Kazi Sonuçlari Toplantisi</i>
<i>MAA</i>	<i>Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry</i>
<i>OJA</i>	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>Op. Arch.</i>	<i>Opuscula Archaeologica</i>

<i>Op Ath</i>	<i>Opuscula Atheniensia</i>
<i>OSSA</i>	<i>OSSA: International Journal of Skeletal Research</i>
<i>PPS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society</i>
<i>PS</i>	<i>The Prehistoric Society</i>
<i>RDAC</i>	<i>Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus</i>
<i>SIMA</i>	<i>Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology</i>
<i>SMEA</i>	<i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilara L. 1986. "Ανασκαφική δραστηριότητα στα Ψαρά", *Τα Ψαρά*: 10-1.
- Achilara L. 1996. "Mycenaean events from Psara", *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*, E. de Miro, L. Godart and A. Sacconi (eds.), Rome: 1349-53.
- Adams W.Y. 1968. "Invasion, diffusion, evolution?", *Antiquity* 42: 194-215.
- Agelarakis A. 1987. "Report on the Mycenaean human skeletal remains at Archontiki, Psara", *OSSA* 13: 3-11.
- Agourides C. 1997. "Sea routes and navigation in the third millennium Aegean", *OJA* 16: 1-24.
- Åkerström Å. 1988. "Cultic installations in Mycenaean rooms and tombs", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 201-6.
- Aleura G., Kalopisi S., Kourou N., Lemou A., Panagiotidi M. 1985. "Ανασκαφή στην Καρδάμαινα (αρχαία Αλάσαρνα) της Κω", *ΑΕ* 1985: 1-18.
- Alexiou S. 1967. *Υστερομινωικοί Τάφοι Λιμένος Κνωσού (Κατσαμπά)*, Athens.
- Alpaslan-Roodenberg S. 2002. "Preliminary report on the human remains from the Early Bronze Age cemetery at Ilipinar-Hacilar-tepe", *Anatolica* 28: 91-101.
- Anderson K. and Gale F. 1992. "Introduction", *Inventing Places*, K. Anderson and F. Gale (eds.), Melbourne: 1-12.
- Andreou E. and Andreou I. 2001. "Η Ίμβρος στην Πρώιμη Εποχή του Χαλκού", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 81: 143-6.
- Andronikos M. 1961/2. "Ελληνικά επιτάφια μνημεία", *ΑΔ* 17 *Μελέται*: 152-210.
- Andronikos M. 1962. "Ομηρικά και Μυκηναϊκά έθιμα ταφής", *Ελληνικά* 17: 40-64.
- Andronikos M. 1968. *Totenkult*, Archaeologia Homerica, Göttingen.
- Anthony D. 1997. "Prehistoric migration as social process", *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, [BAR International Series 664], J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (eds.), Oxford: 21-32.
- Appadurai A. 2001. "Introduction: commodities and the politics of value", *The Social Life of Things*, A. Appadurai (ed.), Cambridge: 3-63.

- Arnold D. E. 1981. "A model for the identification of non-local ceramic distribution: a view from the present", *Production and Distribution: a Ceramic Viewpoint*, [BAR International Series 120], H. Howard and E.L. Morris (eds.), Oxford: 31-44.
- Arnold D.E. 1989. *Ceramic Theory and Cultural Process*, Cambridge.
- Arnold D.E. 1994. "Patterns of learning, residence and descent among potters in Ticul, Yucatan, Mexico", *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, S.J. Shennan (ed.), London: 174-84.
- Artzy M. 1991. "Conical cups and pumice, Aegean cult at Tel Nami, Israel", *Thalassa: L'Égée Préhistorique et la Mer*, [Aegaeum 7], R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), Liège: 203-6.
- Åström P. 1987. "Intentional destruction of grave goods", *Thanatos: Les Coutumes Funéraires en Égée à l'Âge du Bronze*, [Aegaeum 1], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 213-7.
- Åström P. 1988. "Relations between Cyprus and the Dodecanese in the Bronze Age", *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), Copenhagen: 76-9.
- Åström P. 1992. "Continuity, discontinuity, catastrophe, nucleation: some remarks on terminology", *Crisis Years: The 12th Century BC: From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky (eds.), Iowa: 25-30.
- Bammer A. 1986/7. "Ephesos in der Bronzezeit", *JÖAIW* 57: 1-38.
- Bammer A. 1990. "A peripteros of the Geometric Period in the Artemision of Ephesos", *AS* 40: 137-44.
- Bammer A. 1994. "Geschichte neu geschrieben: Mykene im Artemision von Ephesos", *JÖAIW* 63: 29-40.
- Barber R.L.N. 1984. "The status of Phylakopi in Creto-Cycladic relations", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.) Stockholm: 179-82.
- Barber R.L.N. 1987. *The Cyclades in the Bronze Age*, London.
- Barber R.L.N. 1999a. "Hostile Mycenaeans in the Cyclades?", *Polemos*, [Aegaeum 19], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 133-39.

- Barber R.L.N. 1999b. "Μυκηναίοι στη Φυλακωπή;", *Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου*, Lamia: 315-20.
- Barrett J. 1991. "Towards an archaeology of ritual", *Sacred and Profane*, P. Garwood, D. Jennings, R. Skeates and J. Toms (eds.), Oxford: 1-9.
- Barrett J.C. 1998. "The politics of scale and the experience of distance: the Bronze Age world system", *KVHAA Konferenser* 40: 12-25.
- Barrett J.C. 1999a. "The living, the dead and the ancestors: Neolithic and Early Bronze Age mortuary practices", *Contemporary Archaeology In Theory: A Reader*, R.W. Preucel and I. Hodder (eds.), Oxford: 394-412.
- Barrett J.C. 1999b. "The mythical landscapes of the British Iron Age", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*, W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds.): 253-65.
- Barrett J. 2000. "A thesis on agency", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 61-8.
- Bartel B. 1982. "A historical review of ethnological and archaeological analyses of mortuary practices", *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 1: 32-58.
- Barth F. 1969. "Introduction", *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, F. Barth (ed.), Boston: 9-38.
- Bass B. 1998. "Early Neolithic offshore accounts: remote islands, maritime exploitations, and the trans-Adriatic cultural network", *JMA* 11: 165-90.
- Bass G.F. 1963. "Mycenaean and Protogeometric tombs in the Halikarnassos peninsula", *AJA* 67: 353-61.
- Bass G.F. 1967 *Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck*, [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 57], Philadelphia.
- Bass G.F. 1997 "Prolegomena to a study of maritime traffic in raw materials to the Aegean during the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC", *Τέχνη: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 153-69.
- Beck L.A. 1995. "Regional cults and ethnic boundaries in 'Southern Hopewell'", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 167-87.

- Bednarik R.G. 1999. "The implications of the hominid seafaring capabilities", *Acta Archaeologica* 70: 1-23.
- Bell C. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, Oxford.
- Belli P. 1991. "Tholoi nell'Egeo dal II al I millennio", *La Transizione dal Miceneo all'Alto Arcaismo: Dal Palazzo alla Città*, D. Musti, A. Sacconi, L. Rocchetti, M. Rocchi, E. Scafa, L. Sportiello, M.E. Giannotta (eds.), Rome: 425-50.
- Bender B. 1992. "Theorising landscape, and the prehistoric landscapes of Stonehenge", *MAN* 27: 735-55.
- Bender B. 1995. "Landscape: meaning and action", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 1-18.
- Benzi M. 1982. "Tombe Micenee di Rodi riutilizzate nel TE III C", *SMEA* 23: 323-35.
- Benzi M. 1984a. "Evidence of Middle Minoan settlement on the acropolis at Ialysos (Mt. Philerimos)", *Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 93-104.
- Benzi M. 1984b. "I Micenei a Iasos", *Studi su Iasos di Caria*, [Bolletino d'Arte Supplemento 31-2], Rome: 29-34.
- Benzi M. 1988a. "Mycenaean pottery later than LH IIIA:1 from the Italian excavations at Trianda on Rhodes", *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), Copenhagen: 39-55.
- Benzi M. 1988b. "Mycenaean Rhodes: a summary", *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), Copenhagen: 59-72.
- Benzi M. 1992. *Rodi e la Civiltà Micenea*, vol. 1-2, Rome.
- Benzi M. 1993. "The Late Bronze Age pottery from Vathy cave, Kalymnos", *Wace and Blegen*, C. Zerner, P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.), Amsterdam: 275-88.
- Benzi M. 1996. "Problems of the Mycenaean expansion in the South-eastern Aegean", *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*, E. de Miro, L. Godart and A. Sacconi (eds.), Rome: 947-78.
- Benzi M. 1997. "The late Early Bronze Age finds from Vathy cave (Kalymnos) and their links with Northeast Aegean", *Η Πολιόχνη και η Πρώιμη Εποχή του Χαλκού στο Βόρειο Αιγαίο*, C.G. Doumas C.G. and V. La Rosa (eds.), Athens: 383-94.

- Benzi M. 1999a. "Mycenaean figurines from Iasos", *Gli Scavi Italiani a Iasos in Caria*, [La Parola del Passato], Rome: 269-82.
- Benzi M. 1999b. "Riti di passaggio sulla larnax dalla tomba 22 di Tanagra?", *Επί Πόντον Πλαζόμενοι, Simposio italiano di Studi Egei dedicato a Luigi Bernabò Brea e Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, V. La Rosa, D. Palermo and L. Vagnetti (eds.), Rome: 215-33.
- Benzi M., Belli P., Graziadio G., Momigliano N. and Morabito I. 2000. "Rapporto sul progetto B.A.C.I. (Bronze Age Carian Iasos): attività 1999/2000", *SMEA* 42: 340-5.
- Berking H. 1999. *Sociology of Giving*, P. Camiller (trns.), London.
- Bernabò-Brea L. 1976. *Il Poliochni Città Preistorica nell' Isola di Lemnos vol. II,1*, [Monografie della Scuola Arceologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente], Rome.
- Berti F. 1993. "Iasos di Caria", *Arslantepe, Hierapolis, Iasos, Kyme: Scavi archeologici italiani in Turchia*, Rome: 189-248.
- Betancourt P.P. 1997. "The trade route for Ghyali obsidian", *Τέχνη, Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 171-6.
- Biek L. 1983. "The ethnic factor in archaeotechnology", *The Proceedings of the 22nd Symposium on Archaeometry*, A. Aspinall and S.E. Warren (eds.), Bradford: 303-15.
- Biliotti E. 1870a. *Report on the Excavations at Ialysos from February to April 16, 1870*, Rhodes.
- Biliotti E. 1870b. *Rhodes 14th June 1870*, Rhodes.
- Biliotti E. 1871. *Rhodes 14th May 1871*, Rhodes.
- Biliotti E. and Cottret L'A. 1881. *Η Νήσος Ρόδος*, M. Malliarakis and S. Karavokyros (trns.), Rhodes.
- Binford L.R. 1972. "Mortuary practices: their study and their potential", *An Archaeological Perspective*, New York: 208-43.
- Bintliff J.L. 1977a. *Natural Environment and Human Settlement in Prehistoric Greece*, [BAR International Series 28], Oxford.

- Bintliff J. 1977b. "The history of archaeo-geographic studies of prehistoric Greece, and recent fieldwork", *Mycenaean Geography*, J. Bintliff (ed.), Cambridge: 3-18.
- Bintliff J. 1989. "Cemetery populations, carrying capacities and the individual in history", *Burial Archaeology Current Research. Methods and Developments*, [BAR British Series 211], C.A. Roberts, F. Lee and J. Bintliff (eds.), Oxford: 85-104.
- Blegen C.W., Caskey J.L. and Rawson M. 1953. *Troy: The Sixth Settlement*, vol. III, part 1, Princeton.
- Blegen C.W., Rawson M., Taylour W. and Donovan W.P. 1973. *The Palace of Nestor in Western Messenia III*, Princeton.
- Blitzer H. 1990. "Κορωνέϊκα: storage-jar production and trade in the traditional Aegean", *Hesperia* 59: 675-711.
- Bloch M. 1971. *Placing the Dead: Tombs, Ancestral Villages, and Kinship Organization in Madagascar*, London.
- Bloch M. 1982. "Death, power and women", *Death and the Regeneration of Life*, M. Bloch and J. Parry (eds.), Cambridge: 211-30.
- Bloch M. and Parry J. 1982. "Introduction: death and the regeneration of life", *Death and the Regeneration of Life*, M. Bloch and J. Parry (eds.), Cambridge: 1-44.
- Blomberg M. and Henriksson G. 2001. "Differences in Minoan and Mycenaean orientations in Crete", *Astronomy, Cosmology and Landscape*, C. Ruggles, F. Prendergast and T. Ray (eds.), Sussex: 72-91.
- Boardman J. 1999. "Greek colonization: the Eastern contribution", *La Colonisation Grècque en Méditerranée Occidentale*, G. Vallet (ed.), Rome: 39-50.
- Bosanquet R.C. 1901/2. Excavations at Palaikastro. i", *BSA* 8: 286-316.
- Boulotis C. 2000. "Σκέψεις για τα Μυκηναϊκά μηνολόγια", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 74: 9-16.
- Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of A Theory of Practice*, R. Nice (trns.), Cambridge.
- Bourdieu P. 1979. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, R. Nice (trns.), London.
- Bouzek J. 1985. *The Aegean, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interpretations in the Second Millennium BC*, [SIMA 29], Göteborg.

- Boysal Y. 1967. "New excavations in Caria", *Anadolu (Anatolia)* 11: 31-56.
- Boysal Y. 1969. *Katalog der Vasen im Museum in Bodrum I, Mykenisch-Protogeometrisch*, Ankara.
- Bradley B. 1995. "Foreword: trial and error in the study of mortuary practices: exploring the regional dimension", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: v-ix.
- Bradley R. 1998. *The Significance of Monuments: On the Shaping of Human Experience in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe*, London.
- Bradley R. 2000. *An Archaeology on Natural Places*, London.
- Branigan K. 1981. "Minoan colonialism", *BSA* 76: 23-33.
- Branigan K. 1984. "Minoan community colonies in the Aegean", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.) Stockholm: 49-52.
- Branigan K. 1993. *Dancing with Death: Life and Death in Southern Crete c.3000-2000 BC*, Amsterdam.
- Branigan K. 1998. "The nearness of you: proximity and distance in Early Minoan funerary landscapes", *Cemetery and society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 13-26.
- Braudel F. 1993. *Μεσόγειος Α/ Ο Ρόλος του Περίγυρου*, K. Mitsotaki (trns.), Athens.
- Bridges R.A. Jr. 1974. "The Mycenaean tholos tomb at Kolophon", *Hesperia* 43: 264-6.
- Broodbank C. 1989. "The longboat and society in the Cyclades in the Keros-Syros culture", *AJA* 93: 319-37.
- Broodbank C. 1993. "Ulysses without sails: trade, distance, knowledge and power in the early Cyclades", *World Archaeology* 24: 315-31.
- Broodbank C. 1999a. "Colonization and configuration in the insular Neolithic of the Aegean", *Neolithic Society in Greece*, P. Halstead (ed.): 15-41.
- Broodbank C. 1999b. "The insularity of island archaeologists: comments on Rainbird's 'islands out of time'", *JMA* 12: 235-9.
- Broodbank C. 2000. *An Island Archaeology of the Early Cyclades*, Cambridge.
- Broodbank C. and Strasser T.F. 1991. "Migrant farmers and the Neolithic colonization of Crete", *Antiquity* 65: 233-45.

- Brown J. 1981. "The search for rank in prehistoric burials", *The Archaeology of Death*, R. Chapman, I. Kinnes and K. Randsborg (eds.), Cambridge: 25-37.
- Brown J. 1995. "On the mortuary analysis: with specific reference to the Saxe-Binford research program", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 3-26.
- Brumfield E.M. 2000. "On the archaeology of choice: Agency studies as a research stratagem", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 249-55.
- Bryce T.R. 1989a. "The nature of Mycenaean involvement in Western Anatolia", *Historia* 38: 1-21.
- Bryce T.R. 1989b. "Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans: an Anatolian viewpoint", *OJA* 8: 297-310.
- Bryce T. 1999. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford.
- Bunimovitz S. 1990. "Problems in the 'ethnic' identification of the Philistine material culture", *Tel Aviv* 17: 210-22.
- Bunimovitz S. and Yasur-Landau A. 1996. "Philistine and Israelite pottery: a comparative approach to the question of pots and people", *Tel Aviv* 23: 88-101.
- Burkert W. 1996. *Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- Büyükkolancı M. 1999. "Excavations on Ayasuluk hill in Selçuk/Turkey", *Forum Archaeologiae* 10, http://mailbox.univie.ac.at/elisabeth.trinkl/forum/forum_0399/10selcuk.htm. Visited on 27/03/02.
- Cadogan G. 1984. "A Minoan thalassocracy?", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 13-5.
- Cambourogliou E. 1987. "Γεωλογική μελέτη σπηλαίου Κούμελο Αρχαγγέλου της Ρόδου", *Η Νεολιθική Περίοδος στα Δωδεκάνησα*, A. Sampson (ed.), Athens: 174-81.
- Cann J.R., Dixon J.E. and Renfrew A.C. 1968. "Appendix iv. The sources of the Saliagos obsidian", *Excavations at Saliagos near Antiparos*, [The British School of Archaeology at Athens Supplementary Volume No. 5], Oxford: 105-7.
- Cavanagh W.G. 1978. "A Mycenaean second burial custom?", *BICS* 25: 171-2.

- Cavanagh W.G. 1987. "Cluster analysis of Mycenaean chamber tombs", *Thanatos: Les Coutumes Funéraires en Égée à l'Âge du*, [Aegaeum 1], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 161-9.
- Cavanagh W. 1998. "Innovation, conservatism and variation in Mycenaean funerary ritual", *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 103-14.
- Cavanagh W. and Mee C. 1978. "The re-use of earlier tombs in the LH IIIC period", *BSA* 73: 31-44.
- Cavanagh W.G. and Mee C. 1990. "The location of Mycenaean chamber tombs in the Argolid", *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 55-63.
- Cavanagh W. and Mee C. 1995. "Mourning before and after the Dark Age", *Klados: Essays in Honour of J.N. Coldstream*, C. Morris (ed.), London: 45-59.
- Cavanagh W. and Mee C. 1998. *A Private Place: Death in Prehistoric Greece*, [SIMA 125], Göteborg.
- Chapman R. 1995. "Ten years later: Megaliths, mortuary practices, and the territorial model", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 29-51.
- Chapman J. 1997a. "Places as Timemarkers: the social construction of prehistoric landscapes in Eastern Hungary", *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, [BAR International Series 661], G. Nash (ed.), Oxford: 31-45.
- Chapman J. 1997b. "The impact of modern invasions and migrations on archaeological explanation", *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, [BAR International Series 664], J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (eds.), Oxford: 11-20.
- Chapman J. 2000. "Tension at funerals: social practices and the subversion of community structure in later Hungarian prehistory", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 169-95.
- Chapman J. and Hamerow H. 1997. "Introduction: on the move again: migrations and invasions in archaeological explanation", *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation*, [BAR International Series 664], J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (eds.), Oxford: 1-10.

- Charisis C.B., Durand P., Axiotis M. and Charisis T.B. 2000. "Ίχνη Παλαιολιθικής εγκατάστασης στη Λέσβο", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 76: 83-7.
- Charitonidis S.I. 1960. "Ο Μυκηναίος αγγειογράφος των παπύρων", *ΑΔ 16 Μελέται*: 84-90.
- Charitonidis S.I. 1961/2a. "Θαλαμοειδής τάφος Καρπάθου", *ΑΔ 17 Μελέται*: 32-76.
- Charitonidis S.I. 1961/2b. "Μάκαρα", *ΑΔ 17 Χρονικά*: 265.
- Charitonidis S. 1961/2c. "Ψαρά", *ΑΔ 17 Χρονικά*: 266.
- Charitonidis S.I. 1963. "Μυκηναϊκά εκ Ρόδου", *ΑΔ 18 Μελέται*: 133-40.
- Chatziconstantinou A. and Poupaki E. 2002. "The extraction of Travertine in Antiquity on the island of Cos, Dodecanese, Greece", *Αρχαιολογία και Περιβάλλον στα Δωδεκάνησα: Έρευνα και Πολιτισμικός Τουρισμός*, Rhodes: 25-32.
- Chatzivasiliou V.S. 1990. *Ιστορία της Νήσου Κω: Αρχαία, Μεσαιωνική, Νεότερη*, Κω.
- Cherry J.F. 1981. "Pattern and process in the earliest colonization of the Mediterranean islands", *PPS* 47: 41-68.
- Cherry J.F. 1985. "Islands out of the stream: isolation and interaction in early East Mediterranean insular prehistory", *Prehistoric Production and Exchange: The Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean*, A.B. Knapp and T. Stetch (eds.), Los Angeles: 12-29.
- Cherry J.F. 1986. "Polities and palaces: some problems in Minoan state formation", *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, C. Renfrew and J.F. Cherry (eds.), Cambridge: 19-45.
- Cherry J.F. 1990. "The first colonization of the Mediterranean islands", *JMA* 3: 145-221.
- Children G. and Nash G. 1997. "Establishing a discourse: the language of landscape", in G. Nash (ed.), *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, [BAR International Series 661], Oxford: 1-4.
- Claassen C. 1998. *Shells*, Cambridge.
- Cline E.H. 1991a. "A possible embargo against the Mycenaeans", *Historia* 40: 1-9.
- Cline E.H. 1991b. "Hittite objects in the Bronze Age Aegean", *AS* 41: 133-43.
- Cline E.H. 1994. *Sailing the Wine Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*, [BAR International Series 591], Oxford.

- Cline E.H. 1995. "Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor: Minoans and Mycenaeans abroad", *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 12], R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 265-83.
- Cline E.H. 1996. "Aššuwā and the Achaeans: the 'Mycenaean' sword at the Hattušas and its possible implications", *BSA* 91: 137-51.
- Cohen R. 1996. *Theories of Migration*, Cheltenham.
- Coldstream J.N. and Huxley G.L. 1972. *Kythera, Excavations and Studies*, London.
- Coldstream J.N. and Huxley G.L. 1984. "The Minoans of Kythera", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.) Stockholm: 107-10.
- Collett D. 1987. "A contribution to the study of migrations in the archaeological record: the Ngobi and Kololo migrations as a case study", *Archaeology as Long-Term History*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 105-16.
- Cosgrove D. 1995. "Landscapes and myths, gods and humans", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 281-305.
- Cowgill G.L. 2000. "'Rationality' and contexts in Agency", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 51-60.
- Crouwel J. 1973. "Appendix: the Parasol krater", *BSA* 68: 343-7.
- Crouwel J. 1976. "A note on two Mycenaean parasol kraters", *BSA* 71: 55-6.
- Crumley C.L. 1999. "Sacred Landscapes: Constructed and conceptualized", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*, W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds.), Oxford: 269-76.
- Crumley C.L. and Marquardt W.H. 1990. "Landscape: a unifying concept in regional analysis", *Interpreting Space: GIS and Archaeology*, K.M.S. Allen, S.W. Green and E.B.W. Zubrow (eds.), London: 73-9.
- Dabney M.K. 1999. "Locating Mycenaean cemeteries", *Meletemata: studies in Aegean Archaeology presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his 65th year*, [Aegaeum 20], P.P. Betancourt, V. Karageorghis, R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 171-5.
- Dabney M.K. and Wright J.C. 1990. "Mortuary customs, palatial society and state formation in the Aegean area: a comparative study", *Celebrations of Death and*

- Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 45-53.
- Dakoronia F. 1999. "Representations of sea-battles on Mycenaean sherds from Kynos", *Tropis V*, H. Tzalas (ed.), Athens: 119-28.
- Damm C.B. 1991. "Burying the past: an example of social transformation in the Danish Neolithic", *Sacred and Profane*, P. Garwood, D. Jennings, R. Skeates and J. Toms (eds.), Oxford: 43-9.
- Danov C.M. 1990. "Characteristics of Greek colonization in Thrace", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall*, J.-P. Descœudres (ed.), Oxford: 151-5.
- Darwin C. 1985. *The Origin of the Species*, London.
- Davaras C. 1996. "Crete", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 92-3.
- Davis J.L. 1982. "The earliest Minoans in the South-east Aegean: a reconsideration of the evidence", *AS* 32: 33-41.
- Davis J.L. 1984. "Cultural innovation and the Minoan thalassocracy at Ayia Irini, Keos", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.) Stockholm: 159-65.
- Davis J.L. 1992. "Review of Aegean prehistory i: the islands of the Aegean", *AJA* 96: 699-756.
- Davis J.L. and Bennet J. 1999. "Making Mycenaeans: warfare, territorial expansion, and representations of the other in the Pylian kingdom", *Polemos*, [Aegaeum 19], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 105-20.
- Davis J.L., Tzonou-Herbst I. and Wolpert A.D. 2001. "Addendum: 1992-1999", *Aegean Prehistory: A Review*, T. Cullen (ed.), Boston: 77-94.
- Dawkins R.M. 1904/5. "Excavations at Palaikastro, iv", *BSA* 11: 258-92.
- Dawkins R.M. 1905/6. "Excavations at Palaikastro, v", *BSA* 12: 1-8.
- Day P.M., Wilson D.E. and Kiriati E. 1998. "Pots, labels and people, burying ethnicity in the cemetery of Aghia Photia, Siteias", *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 133-49.

- Deger-Jalkotzy S. 1998. "The Aegean islands and the breakdown of the Mycenaean palaces around 1200 BC", *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus- Dodecanese- Crete 16th-6yh century BC*, V. Karageorghis and N.C. Stampolidis (eds.), Athens: 105-20.
- Deger-Jalkotzy S. 1999. "Military prowess and social status in Mycenaean Greece", *Polemos*, [Aegaeum 19], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 121-31.
- Demakopoulou K. 1990. "The burial ritual in the tholos tomb at Kokla, Argolis", *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 113-23.
- Demakopoulou K. 1997. "Crete and the Argolid in the LM I/LH IIB to IIIA1 periods. Evidence from Kokla", *La Crète Mycénienne*, [BCH Supplement 30], J. Driessen and A. Farnoux (eds.), Paris: 101-12.
- de Mita Jr. F.A. 1999. "The burden of being Mycenaean", *Archaeological Dialogues* 6: 24-7.
- Derruau M. 1991. *Ανθρωπογεωγραφία*, G. Prevelakis (trns.), Athens.
- Desborough V.R.d'A. 1964. *The Last Mycenaean and their Successors*, Oxford.
- de Wild D. 2001. "Appendix ii: textile remains on vases from tomb 1 and tomb 2c", *The Mycenaean Cemetery on Rhodes*, [BAR International Series 988], E. Karantzali (ed.), Oxford: 114-6.
- Dietz S. 1974. "Two painted duck-vases from Rhodes", *Acta Archaeologica* 45: 133-43.
- Dietz S. 1984. *Lindos IV, 1. Excavations and Surveys in Southern Rhodes: The Mycenaean Period*, Copenhagen.
- Dickinson O.T.P.K. 1982. "Cist graves and chamber tombs", *BICS* 29: 123-5
- Dickinson O.T.P.K. 1983. "Cist graves and chamber tombs", *BSA* 78: 55-67.
- Dickinson O.T.P.K. 1984. "Cretan contacts with the mainland during the period of the shaft graves", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 115-7.
- Dickinson O.T.P.K. 1992. *Η Προέλευση του Μυκηναϊκού Πολιτισμού*, A. Papadopoulos (trns.), Athens.
- Dickinson O.T.P.K. 1996. *The Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge.

- Dietler M. 1990. "Driven by drink: the role of drinking in the political economy and the case of Early Iron Age France", *JAA* 9: 352-406.
- Dobres M.-A. and Robb J. 2000. "Agency in archaeology: paradigm or platitude?", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 3-17.
- Dolukhanov P.M. 1994. "Cultural and ethnic processes in prehistory as seen through the evidence of archaeology and related disciplines", *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, S.J. Shennan (ed.), London: 267-77.
- Dothan T. 1992. "Social dislocation and cultural change in the 12th century BCE", *Crisis Years: The 12th Century BC: From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky (eds.), Iowa: 93-8.
- Doumas C. 1975. "Αστυπάλαια", *ΑΔ 30 Χρονικά*: 372.
- Douglas M. and Isherwood B. 1980. *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*, Suffolk.
- Driessen J. 1990. *An Early Destruction in the Mycenaean Palace at Knossos*, Leuven.
- Driessen J. and MacDonald C. 1984. "Some military aspects of the Aegean in the late fifteenth and early fourteenth centuries BC", *BSA* 79: 49-74.
- Driessen J. and Macdonald C.F. 1997. *The Troubled Island: Minoan Crete Before and After the Santorini Eruption*, [Aegaeum 17], Liège.
- Durkheim E. 1964. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, J.W. Swain (trns.), London.
- Easton D.F. 1984. "Hittite history and the Trojan war", *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context*, L. Foxhall and J.K. Davies (eds.), Bristol: 23-44.
- Easton D.F., Hawkins J.D., Sherratt A.G. and Sherratt E.S. 2002. "Troy in recent perspective", *AS* 52: 75-109.
- Edmonds M. 1999. *Ancestral Geographies of the Neolithic: Landscapes, Monuments and Memory*, London.
- Eliade M. 1996. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, R. Sheed (trns.), Lincoln.
- Eriksen T.H. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*, London.
- Erkanal H. 1998. "Geç tunç çağı", *KST* 19: 401-17.
- Erkanal H. 1999. "Early Bronze Age fortification systems in Izmir region", *Meletemata: studies in Aegean Archaeology presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his*

- 65th year, [Aegaeum 20], P.P. Betancourt, V. Karageorghis, R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 237-42.
- Erkanal A. and Erkanal H. 1986. "A new archaeological excavation in Western Anatolia; Panaztepe", *Turkish Review Quaterly Digest*: 67-76.
- Ersoy Y.E. 1988. "Finds from Menemen/Panaztepe in the Manisa museum", *BSA* 83: 55-82.
- Evans A. 1906. *The Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos: I. The Cemetery of Zafer Papoura, II. The Royal Tomb of Isopata*, [Archaeologia 59], London.
- Evans J.D. 1973. "Islands as laboratories for the study of culture process", *The explanation of culture change: models in prehistory*, C. Renfrew (ed.), London: 517-20.
- Evans J.D. 1977/8. "Island archaeology in the Mediterranean: problems and opportunities", *World Archaeology* 9: 12-26.
- Flemming N.C. 1983. "Preliminary geomorphological survey of an early Neolithic submerged site in the Sporadhes, N. Aegean", *Quaternary Coastlines and Marine Archaeology: Towards the Prehistory of Land bridges and Continental Shelves*, P.M. Masters and N.C. Flemming (eds.), London: 233-68.
- Flemming N.C. and Woodworth P.L. 1988. "Monthly mean sea levels in Greece during 1969-1983 compared to relative vertical land movements measured over different timescales", *Tectonophysics* 148: 59-72.
- Fossey J.M. 1985. "The ritual breaking of objects in Greek funerary contexts; a note", *Folklore* 96: 21-3.
- Foucault M. 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, A. Sheridan (trns.), London.
- French D.H. 1997. "Early Bronze Age pottery in Western Anatolia a summary 1970-1995", *Η Πολιόχνη και η Πρώιμη Εποχή του Χαλκού στο Βόρειο Αιγαίο*, C.G. Doumas and V. La Rosa (eds.), Athens: 569-95.
- French E. 1963. "Pottery groups from Mycenae: a summary", *BSA* 58: 44-52.
- French E. 1964. "Late Helladic IIIA 1 pottery from Mycenae", *BSA* 59: 241-61.
- French E. 1965. "Late Helladic IIIA 2 pottery from Mycenae", *BSA* 60: 159-202.

- French E. 1966. "A group of Late Helladic IIIB 1 pottery from Mycenae", *BSA* 61: 216-38.
- French E. 1967. "Pottery from Late Helladic IIIB 1 destruction contexts at Mycenae", *BSA* 62: 149-93.
- French E. 1969. "A group of Late Helladic IIIB 2 pottery from Mycenae", *BSA* 64: 71-93.
- French E. 1971. "The development of Mycenaean terracotta figurines", *BSA* 66: 101-87.
- French E. 1973. "Note: a possible chariot figurine with parasol", *BSA* 68: 347-8.
- French E. 1975. "A reassessment of the Mycenaean pottery at Tarsus", *AS* 25: 53-75.
- French E. 2002. *Mycenae: Agamemnon's Capital*, Gloucestershire.
- Furness A. 1956. "Some early pottery of Samos, Kalimnos and Chios", *PS* 9: 173-212.
- Furumark A. 1941. *The Mycenaean Pottery Analysis and Classification*, Stockholm.
- Furumark A. 1950. "The settlement at Ialysos and Aegean history c. 1550-1400 BC", *Op. Arch.* 6: 150-271.
- Furumark A. 1965. "The excavation at Sinda: some historical results", *Op Ath* 6: 99-115.
- Galaty M.L. 1999. *Nestor's Wine Cups: Investigating Ceramic Manufacture and Exchange in a Late Bronze Age 'Mycenaean' State*, [BAR International Series 766], Oxford.
- Gallis K. 1996. "The Neolithic world", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 23-37.
- Gallou C. 2002a. "Ες Ηλύσιον Πεδίον και πέρατα γαιής: the Mycenaean sea journey to the underworld", *The Seas of Antiquity*, M. Georgiadis and G.M. Muskett (eds.), Liverpool: 18-33.
- Gallou C. 2002b. *The Cult of the Dead in Central Greece During the Mycenaean Period*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Nottingham.
- Galloway R.B., Liritzis Y., Sampson A. and Marketou T. 1990. "Radio-isotope analyses of Aegean tephra: contribution to the dating of Santorini volcano", *Thera and the Aegean world vol. 3*, D.A. Hardy and A.C. Renfrew (eds.), London: 135-45.
- Gardin J.-C. 1994. "The role of 'local knowledge' in archaeological interpretation", *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, S.J. Shennan (ed.), M. Dumartheray and S. Shennan (trns), London: 110-22.

- Garland R. 1985. *The Greek Way of Death*, London.
- Garwood P. 1991. "Ritual tradition and the reconstruction of society", *Sacred and Profane*, P. Garwood, D. Jennings, R. Skeates and J. Toms (eds.), Oxford: 10-32.
- Gates C. 1995. "Defining boundaries of a state: the Mycenaeans and their Anatolian frontier", *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 12], R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 289-97.
- Geographical Handbook Series (GHS) B.R. 516B 1945. *Greece: Volume III Regional Geography*, London.
- Georgiadis M. 2002a. "The Mycenaean role in Late Bronze Age III exchanges assessed on the basis of four shipwrecks", *The Seas of Antiquity*, M. Georgiadis and G.M. Muskett (eds.), Liverpool: 34-48.
- Georgiadis M. 2002b. "The island archaeology in the Dodecanese during the prehistoric period", *Αρχαιολογία και Περιβάλλον στα Δωδεκάνησα: Έρευνα και Πολιτισμικός Τουρισμός*, Rhodes: 33-42.
- Georgiadis M. 2002c. "The earliest colonisation in the Aegean: the case of the Dodecanese", *Symposium On Mediterranean Archaeology 2001*, [BAR International Series 1040], G. Muskett. A. Koltsida and M. Georgiadis (eds.), Oxford: 150-6.
- Georgiou H. S. 1991. "Bronze Age ships and rigging", *Thalassa: L'Egée Préhistorique et la Mer*, [Aegaeum 7], R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), Liège: 61-71.
- Georgiou H.S. 1993. "A sea approach to trade in the Aegean Bronze Age", *Wace and Blegen*, C. Zerner, P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.), Amsterdam: 353-64.
- Georgiou H. 1995. "The role of maritime contacts in the prehistoric Cyclades", *Trade and Production in Premonetary Greece: Aspects of Trade*, C. Gillis, C. Risberg and B.L. Sjoberg (eds.), Jonsered: 33-42.
- Georgiou H. 1997. "Seafaring, trade routes, and the emergence of the Bronze Age: urban centres in the Eastern Mediterranean", *Res Maritimae: Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean from the Prehistory to Late Antiquity*, S. Swiny, R.L. Hohlfelder, H. Wylde Swiny (eds.), Atlanta: 117-24.

- Gibbs L. 1987. "Identifying gender representation in the archaeological record: a contextual study", *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 79-89.
- Giddens A. 1995. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*, London.
- Gifford J. 1983. "Core sampling of a Holocene marine sedimentary sequence and underlying Neolithic cultural material off Franchthi cave, Greece", *Quaternary Coastlines and Marine Archaeology: Towards the Prehistory of Land bridges and Continental Shelves*, P.M. Masters and N.C. Flemming (eds.), London: 269-81.
- Gillis C. 2001. "Tin-covered pottery and chemical analyses: a summary", *Archaeometry Issues in Greek Prehistory and Antiquity*, Y. Bassiakos, E. Aloupi, Y. Facorellis (eds.), Athens: 451-8.
- Gilmour G. 1995. "Aegean influence in Late Bronze Age funerary practices in the Southern Levant", *The Archaeology of Death in the Ancient Near East*, S. Campbell and A. Green (eds.), Oxford: 155-70.
- Gödeken K.B. 1988. "A contribution of the early history of Miletus: the settlement in Mycenaean times and its connections overseas", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 307-17.
- Goldstein L. 1981. "One-dimensional archaeology and multi-dimensional people: spatial organisation and mortuary analysis", *The Archaeology of Death*, R. Chapman, I. Kinnes and K. Randsborg (eds.), Cambridge: 53-69.
- Goodison L. 1989. *Death, Women and the Sun*, [BICS 53], London.
- Goodison L. 2001. "From tholos tomb to throne room: perceptions of the sun in Minoan ritual", *Potnia: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 22], R. Laffineur and R. Hägg (eds.), Liège: 77-88.
- Goody J. 1962. *Death, Property and the Ancestors: A Study of the Mortuary Customs of the Lodagaa of West Africa*, Stanford.
- Gosden C. 1999. *Anthropology and Archaeology: A changing relationship*, London.
- Gosden C. 2001. "Postcolonial archaeology: issues of culture, identity, and knowledge", *Archaeological Theory Today*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 241-61.

- Goudie A.S. 1987. "Geography and archaeology: the growth of a relationship", *Landscape and Culture: Geographical and Archaeological Perspectives*, J.M. Wagstaff (ed.), Oxford: 11-25.
- Graham A.J. 1990. "Pre-colonial contacts: questions and problems", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall*, J.-P. Descœudres (ed.). Oxford: 45-60.
- Graves-Brown P. 1996. "All things bright and beautiful? Species, ethnicity and cultural dynamics", *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones and C. Gamble (eds.), London: 81-95.
- Greaves A.M. 2002. *Miletos: A History*, London.
- Greaves A.M. and Helwing B. 2001. "Archaeology in Turkey: the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages, 1997-1999", *AJA* 105: 463-511.
- Greaves A.M. and Helwing B. 2003. "Archaeology in Turkey: the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages, 2000", *AJA* 107: 71-103.
- Gregori B. and Palumbo G. 1992. "Presenze Micenee in Siria-Palestina", *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo*, M. Marazzi, S. Tusa and L. Vagnetti (eds.), Taranto: 367-89.
- Grinsell L.V. 1961. "The breaking of objects as a funerary rite", *Folklore* 72: 475-91.
- Grinsell L.V. 1973. "The breaking of objects as a funerary rite: supplementary notes", *Folklore* 72: 111-4.
- Günel S. 1998. "Eine mykenische Figurine aus Liman Tepe", *IM* 48: 445-9.
- Gurney O.R. 1990. *The Hittites*, London.
- Güterbock H.G. 1986. "Troy in Hittite texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite history", *Troy and the Trojan War*, Mellink M.J. (ed.), Bryn Mawr: 33-44.
- Hägg R. 1984. "Degrees and character of the Minoan influence on the mainland", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 119-21.
- Hägg R. 1990. "The role of libations in Mycenaean ceremony and cult", *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 177-84.

- Hägg R. and Sieurin F. 1982. "On the origin of the wooden coffin in Late Bronze Age Greece", *BSA* 77: 177-86.
- Haggis D.C. 1997. "The typology of the Early Minoan I chalice and the cultural implications of form and style in Early Bronze Age ceramics", *Τέχνη*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 291-9.
- Hall J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Hallam E. and Hockey J. 2001. *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, Oxford.
- Halstead P. 1987. "Traditional and ancient rural economy in Mediterranean Europe: plus ça change?", *JHS* 107: 77-87.
- Halstead P. 1992. "From reciprocity to redistribution: modelling the exchange of livestock in Neolithic Greece", *Anthropozoologica* 16: 19-30.
- Halstead P. and Jones G. 1987. "Bioarchaeological remains from Kalythies Cave, Rhodes", *Η Νεολιθική Περίοδος στα Δωδεκάνησα*, A. Sampson (ed.), Athens: 135-52.
- Hamilakis Y. 1996. "Wine, oils and the dialectics of power in Bronze Age Crete: a review of the evidence", *OJA* 15: 1-32.
- Hamilakis Y. 1998. "Eating the dead: mortuary feasting and the politics of memory in the Aegean Bronze Age societies", *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 115-32.
- Hamilakis Y. 1999. "Food technologies/technologies of the body: the social context of wine and oil production and consumption in Bronze Age Crete", *World Archaeology* 31: 38-54.
- Hanfmann G.M.A. and Waldbaum J.C. 1968. "Two Submycenaean vases and a tablet from Stratonikeia in Caria", *AJA* 72: 51-6.
- Hankey V. 1984. "Archaeological comments on A.R. Millard's paper", *Trojan War: its Historicity and Context*, L. Foxhall and K. Davis (eds.), Bristol: 17-21.
- Harding A. 1975. "Mycenaean Greece and Europe: the evidence of bronze tools and implements", *PPS* 41: 183-202.
- Harding A.F. 1984. *The Mycenaeans and Europe*, London.
- Harding A. and Hughes-Brock H. 1974. "Amber in the Mycenaean world", *BSA* 69: 145-70.

- Haskell H. W. 1997. "Mycenaeans at Knossos: patterns in the evidence", *La Crète Mycénienne*, [BCH Supplement 30], J. Driessen and A. Farnoux, Paris: 187-93.
- Hassan F.A. 1981. *Demographic Archaeology*, New York.
- Hawkins J.D. 1998. "Tarkasnawa king of Mira 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel", *AS* 48: 1-31.
- Heidegger M. 2000. *Being and Time*, J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson (trns.), Oxford.
- Held S.O. 1989. "Colonization cycles on Cyprus i: the biogeographic and paleontological foundations of early prehistoric settlement", *RDAC* 1989: 7-28.
- Hertz R. 1905/6. "Contribution à une étude sur la représentation collective de la mort", *L'Année Sociologique*: 49-137.
- Higgins M.D. and Higgins R. 1996. *A Geological Companion to Greece and the Aegean*, London.
- Hiller S. 1984. "Pax Minoica versus Minoan thalassocracy, military aspects of Minoan culture", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.) Stockholm: 27-30.
- Hodder I. 1978. "The spatial structure of material 'cultures': a review of some of the evidence", *The Spatial Organisation of Culture*, I. Hodder (ed.), London: 93-111.
- Hodder I. 1981. "Pottery, production and use; a theoretical discussion", *Production and Distribution: a Ceramic Viewpoint*, [BAR International Series 120], H. Howard and E.L. Morris (eds.), Oxford: 215-20.
- Hodder I. 1984. "Burials, houses, women and men in the European Neolithic", *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, D. Miller and C. Tilley (eds.), Cambridge: 51-68.
- Hodder I. 1987a. "The contribution of the long term", *Archaeology as Long-Term History*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 1-8.
- Hodder I. 1987b. "The contextual analysis of symbolic meanings", *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 1-10.
- Hodder I. 1987c. "Converging traditions: the search for symbolic meanings in archaeology and geography", *Landscape and Culture: Geographical and Archaeological Perspectives*, J.M. Wagstaff (ed.), Oxford: 134-45.

- Hodder I. 1997. *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*, Cambridge.
- Hodder I. 1998. *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*, London.
- Hodder I. 2000. "Agency and individuals in long-term processes", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 21-33.
- Hoffman G.L. 2000. *Imports and Immigrants: Near East contacts with Iron Age Crete*, Michigan.
- Hoffman G.L. 2002. "Painted ladies: Early Cycladic II mourning figures?", *AJA* 106: 525-50.
- Holloway R.R. 1992. "Italy and the Central Mediterranean in the crisis years", *Crisis Years: The 12th Century BC: From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky (eds.), Iowa: 40-5.
- Hommel P. 1959/60. "Der Abschnitt östlich des Athena-tempels", *IM* 9/10: 31-62.
- Honea K. 1975. "Prehistoric remains on the island of Kythnos", *AJA* 79: 277-9.
- Hood M.S.F. 1960. "Tholos tombs of the Aegean", *Antiquity* 34: 166-76.
- Hood S. 1981. *Excavations in Chios 1938-1955 Prehistoric Emporio and Ayio Gala*, vol.1-2, [the British School of Archaeology at Athens, supplementary vol. 15-6], Oxford.
- Hood S. 1986. "Mycenaeans in Chios", *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984*, J. Boardman and C.E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), Oxford: 169-80.
- Hood M.S.F. and Smyth D. 1981. *Archaeological Survey of the Knossos Area*, London.
- Hope Simpson R. 1965. *A Gazetteer and Atlas of Mycenaean Sites*, [Bulletin Supplement 16], London.
- Hope Simpson R. and Lazenby J.F. 1962. "Notes from the Dodecanese", *BSA* 57: 154-75.
- Hope Simpson R. and Lazenby J.F. 1970. "Notes from the Dodecanese ii", *BSA* 65: 47-77.
- Hope Simpson R. and Lazenby J.F. 1973. "Notes from the Dodecanese iii", *BSA* 68: 127-79.
- Hoskin M. 2001. *Tombs, Temples and their Orientation- A New Perspective on Mediterranean Prehistory*, Oxford.

- Houwink Ten Cate P.H.J. 1973. "Anatolian evidence for relations with the West in the Late Bronze Age", *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean: Archaeological and Linguistic Problems in Greek Prehistory*, R.A. Crossland and A. Birchall (eds.), London: 141-61.
- Hughes-Brock H. 1999. "Mycenaean beads: gender and social contexts", *OJA* 18: 277-96.
- Iakovidis S.E. 1966. "A Mycenaean mourning custom", *AJA* 70: 43-50.
- Iakovidis S. 1969. "Τα Μυκηναϊκά έθιμα ταφής", *AAA* 2: 120-31.
- Iakovidis S.E. 1970. *Περατή: Το Νεκροταφείον*, vols. Α-Γ, Athens.
- Iakovidis S. 1977. "On the use of Mycenaean 'buttons'", *BSA* 72: 113-9.
- Iakovidis S. 1979. "The chronology of LH III C", *AJA* 83: 454-62.
- Iakovidis S. 1995. "Οι Αχαιοί στην Κύπρο μαρτυρίες και θεωρίες", *Κύπρος: Από την Προϊστορία στους Νεότερους Χρόνους*, Nicosia: 209-22.
- IGME 1983. *Νήσος Κάλυμνος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1984. *Νήσος Κάσος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1985. *Φύλλο Τήλος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1986a. *Νήσος Αστυπάλαια*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1986b. *Φύλλο Καστελλόριζο*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1992. *Νήσος Σύρνα*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1994. *Φύλλο Δυτική Κως (Κέφαλος)*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1998. *Φύλλο Ανατολική Κως*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGME 1999. *Νήσοι Λέρος-Λεβίθα-Κίναρος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGSR 1963a. *Κάρπαθος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- IGSR 1963b. *Κάρπαθος*. Γεωλογικός Χάρτης της Ελλάδος 1:50.000, Athens.
- Immerwahr S.A. 1966. "The use of tin on Mycenaean vases", *Hesperia* 35: 381-96.
- Inglieri R.U. 1936. *Carta Archaeologica dell' Isola di Rodi* 1: 50.000, Florence.
- Ingold T. 1993. "The temporality of the landscape", *World Archaeology* 25: 152-74.
- Irwin G. 1996. *The Prehistoric Exploration and Colonisation of the Pacific*, Cambridge.

- Irwin G. 1999. "Commentary on Paul Rainbird, 'islands out of time: towards a critique of island archaeology'", *JMA* 12: 252-4.
- Izmir Region Excavations and Research Programs (IRERP) 2000. "Excavations at Bakla Tepe", http://www.geocities.com/irerp_tr/frames.html. Visited on 7/2/03.
- Jacopich G. 1928. "Coo: grotta di Aspri Petra", *Clara Rhodos* 1: 99-100.
- Jacopi G. 1930/1. "Nuovi scavi nella necropoli Micenea di Jalisso", *Annuario* 13-4: 253-345.
- Jacopi G. 1932. "Sepolcreto Miceneo di Calavarda", *Clara Rhodos* 6-7: 133-50.
- Johnstone P. 1980. *The Sea-craft of Prehistory*, London.
- Jones R.E. 1986. *Greek and Cypriot Pottery: A Review of Scientific Studies*, Athens.
- Jones R.E. 1993. "Pottery as evidence for trade and colonisation in the Aegean Bronze Age: the contribution of scientific techniques", *Wace and Blegen*, C. Zerner, P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.), Amsterdam: 11-7.
- Jones R.E. and Catling H. 1979. "Archaeological science in Greece", *AAA* 12: 221-32.
- Jones R.E. and Mee C. 1978. "Spectrographic analyses of Mycenaean pottery from Ialysos on Rhodes: results and implications", *JFA* 5: 461-70.
- Jones S. 1996. "Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past", *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones and C. Gamble (eds.), London: 62-80.
- Jones S. 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing identities in the past and the present*, London.
- Jones S. and Graves-Brown P. 1996. "Introduction: archaeology and cultural identity in Europe", *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones and C. Gamble (eds.), London: 1-24.
- Kalogeropoulos K. 1998. *Die Frühmykenischen Grabfunde von Analipsis (Südöstliches Arkadiens). Mit einem Beitrag zu den palatialen Amphoren des griechischen Festlandes*, Athens.
- Kaninia E. 1993. "Παραδόσεις αρχαίων", *ΑΔ 48 Χρονικά*: 559-60.
- Kanta A. 1980. *The Late Minoan III Period in Crete, A Survey of Sites, Pottery and their Distribution*, [SIMA 58], Göteborg.

- Kanta A. 1997. "Late Bronze Age tholos tombs, origins and evolution. The missing links", *La Crète Mycénienne*, [BCH Supplement 30], J. Driessen and A. Farnoux (eds.), Paris: 229-47.
- Kanta A. 1998. "Introduction 16th-11th century BC", *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th-6th century BC*, N.C. Stampolidis, A. Karetsou and A. Kanta (eds.), Heraklion: 30-66.
- Kanta A. 2001. "The cremation of Olous and the custom of cremation in Bronze Age Crete", *Καύσεις στην Εποχή του Χαλκού και την Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου*, N.C. Stampolidis (ed.), Athens: 59-68.
- Kantzia C. 1984. "Κως", *ΑΔ 39 Χρονικά*: 329-31.
- Karageorghis V. 1987. "Torch-holders or bellows?", *Φίλια Έπη εις Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάν διά τα 60 έτη του ανασκαφικού του έργου*, volume B, Athens: 22-6.
- Karageorghis V. 1999. "Notes on some 'enigmatic' objects from the prehistoric Aegean and other East Mediterranean regions", *ΑΔ*: 501-14.
- Karali L. 1999. *Shells in Aegean Prehistory*, [BAR International Series 761], Oxford.
- Karantzali E. 1993. "Πυλώνα (θέση Ασπροπηλιά)", *ΑΔ 48 Χρονικά*: 542-3.
- Karantzali E. 1998. "A new Mycenaean pictorial rhyton from Rhodes", *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus- Dodecanese- Crete 16th-6th century BC*, V. Karageorghis and N.C. Stampolidis (eds.), Athens: 87-104.
- Karantzali E. 1999a. "Νέοι Μυκηναϊκοί τάφοι Ρόδου", *Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου*, Lamia: 285-300.
- Karantzali E. 1999b. "New Mycenaean finds from Rhodes", *Meletemata: studies in Aegean Archaeology presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his 65th year*, [Aegaeum 20], P.P. Betancourt, V. Karageorghis, R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 403-8.
- Karantzali E. 2001. *The Mycenaean Cemetery at Pylona on Rhodes*, [BAR International Series 988], Oxford.
- Karantzali E. and Ponting M.J. 2000. "ICP-AES analysis of some Mycenaean vases from the cemetery at Pylona, Rhodes", *BSA* 95: 219-38.
- Kardara C. 1977. *Απλώματα Νάξου: Κινητά Ευρήματα Τάφων Α και Β*, Athens.

- Keegan W.F. 1999. "Comment on Paul Rainbird, 'islands out of time; towards a critique of island archaeology'", *JMA* 12: 255-8.
- Kilian K. 1990. "Mycenaean colonization: norm and variety", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall*, J.-P. Descœudres (ed.). Oxford: 445-67.
- Kilian-Dirlmeier I. 1988. "Jewellery in Mycenaean and Minoan 'warrior graves'", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 161-5.
- Kinnes I. 1975. "Monumental function in British Neolithic burial practices", *World Archaeology* 7: 16-29.
- Kirk T. 1993. "Space, Subjectivity, Power and Hegemony: Megaliths and long mounds in earlier Neolithic Brittany", *Interpretative Archaeology*, C. Tilley (ed.), Providence: 181-223.
- Knapp A.B. 1992a. "Bronze Age Mediterranean island cultures and the ancient Near East, part 1", *Biblical Archaeologist* 55.2: 52-72.
- Knapp A.B. 1992b. "Bronze Age Mediterranean island cultures and the ancient Near East, part 2", *Biblical Archaeologist* 55.3: 112-28
- Knapp. A.B. 1997a. "Mediterranean maritime landscapes: transport, trade, and society on late Bronze Age Cyprus", *Res Maritimae*, S. Swiny, R.L. Hohlfelder and H. Wylde Swiny (eds.), Atlanta: 153-62.
- Knapp A.B. 1997b. *The Archaeology of Late Bronze Age Cypriot Society: The Study of Settlement, Survey and Landscape*, Glasgow.
- Knapp A.B. and Ashmore W. 1999. "Archaeological landscapes: constructed, conceptualized, ideational", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*, W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds.), Oxford: 1-30.
- Konstantinidi E.M. 2001. *Jewellery Revealed in the Burial Contexts of the Greek Bronze Age*, [BAR International Series 912], Oxford.
- Konstantinopoulos G. 1973. "Νέα ευρήματα εκ Ρόδου και Αστυπάλαιας", *AAA* 6: 114-24.

- Kontorli-Papadopoulou L. 1987. "Some aspects concerning local peculiarities of the Mycenaean chamber tombs", *Thanatos: Les Coutumes Funéraires en Égée à l'Âge du Bronze*, [Aegaeum 1], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 145-60.
- Kontorli-Papadopoulou L. 1995. "Mycenaean tholos tombs: some thoughts on burial customs and rites", *Klados: Essays in Honour of J.N. Coldstream*, C. Morris (ed.), London: 111-22.
- Kopytoff I. 2001. "The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process", *The Social Life of Things*, A. Appadurai (ed.), Cambridge: 64-91.
- Korfmann M. 1986. "Beşik Tepe: new evidence for the period of the Trojan sixth and seventh settlements", *Troy and the Trojan War*, Mellink M.J. (ed.), Bryn Mawr: 17-28.
- Koukouli-Chrysanthaki C. and Weisgerber G. 1996. "Παλαιολιθικό ορυχείο ώχρας στη Θάσο", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 60: 82-9.
- Kristalli-Votsi K. 1996. "Η ανασκαφή του Μυκηναϊκού νεκροταφείου των Αηδονιών", *Ο Θησαυρός των Αηδονιών: Σφραγίδες και Κοσμήματα της Υστερης Εποχής του Χαλκού στο Αιγαίο*, K. Demakopoulou (ed.), Athens: 21-31.
- Kristiansen K. 1984. "Ideology and material culture: an archaeological perspective", *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, M. Spriggs (ed.), Cambridge: 72-100.
- Küchler S. 1995. "Landscape as memory: the mapping of process and its representation in a Melanesian society", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 85-106.
- Kurtz D.C. and Boardman J. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*, New York.
- Lamb W. 1936. *Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos*, Cambridge.
- Lambeck K. 1996. "Sea-level change and shore-line evolution in Aegean Greece since Upper Palaeolithic time", *Antiquity* 70: 588-611.
- Lambrou-Phillipson C. 1990. *Hellenorientalia: The Near Eastern Presence in the Bronze Age Aegean ca. 3000-1100 BC*, Göteborg.
- Lambrou-Phillipson C. 1993. "The limitations of the pottery model in the identification of trading colonies", *Wace and Blegen: Pottery as evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age 1939-1989*, C. Zerner, P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.), Amsterdam: 365-7.

- Laronde A. 1990. "Greeks and Libyans in Cyrenaica", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall*, J.-P. Descœudres (ed.), Oxford: 169-80.
- Larsen C.S. 1995. "Regional perspectives on mortuary analysis", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 247-64.
- Laviosa C. 1988. "The Minoan thalassocracy, Iasos and the Carian coast", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 183-5.
- Lee E.S. 1966. "A theory of migration", *Demography* 3: 47-57.
- Leonard A.Jr. 1981 "Considerations of morphological variation in the Mycenaean pottery from the Southeastern Mediterranean", *BASOR* 241: 87-101.
- Leontaris S.N. 1970. "Η γεωμορφολογική ανάπτυξις και εξέλιξις της νήσου Κω", *Annales Géologiques des Pays Helléniques* 22: 40-61.
- Leriu N. 2002. "The Mycenaean colonisation of Cyprus under the magnifying glass: emblematic indicia versus defining criteria at Palaepaphos", *Symposium On Mediterranean Archaeology 2001*, [BAR International Series 1040], G. Muskett, A. Koltsida and M. Georgiadis (eds.), Oxford: 169-77.
- Levi D. 1969/70. "Iasos: le campagne di scavo 1969-70", *Annuario* 47-8: 461-532.
- Lewartowski K. 1995. "Mycenaean social structure: a view from simple graves", *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 12], R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 103-13.
- Lewartowski K. 1996. "Mycenaean burials in dromoi", *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*, E. de Miro, L. Godart and A. Sacconi (eds.), Rome: 749-64.
- Lewartowski K. 2000. *Late Helladic Simple Graves: A Study of Mycenaean Burial Customs*, [BAR International Series 878], Oxford.
- Lewis G.J. 1982. *Human Migration: A Geographical Perspective*, London.
- MacArthur R.H. and Wilson E.O. 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*, Princeton.
- Macdonald C.F. 1985. *The Relationship of Crete and Mainland Greece to the Islands of the South Aegean During the Late Bronze Age*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford.

- Macdonald C. 1986. "Problems of the twelfth century BC in the Dodecanese", *BSA* 81: 125-51.
- Macdonald C.F. 1988. "Rhodes during the twelfth century B.C. and its role in the Aegean", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 263.
- Maiuri A. 1926. "Jalisos scavi della missione archeologica Italiana a Rodi", *Annuario* 6-7: 83-256.
- Maiuri A. 1928a. "Jalisos e l'agro Jalisio", *Clara Rhodos* 1: 56-65.
- Maiuri A. 1928b. "Esplorazione di grotte con avanzi preistorici nell' isola di Calimno", *Clara Rhodos* 1: 104-17.
- Malinowski B. 1960. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*, New York.
- Mallwitz A. 1959/60. "Zur mykenischen Befestigung von Milet", *IM* 9/10: 67-76.
- Manning S.W. 1999. *A Test of Time*, Oxford.
- Manning S.W., Bronk Ramsey C., Doumas C., Marketou T., Cadogan G. and Pearson C.L. 2002. "New evidence of an early date for the Aegean Late Bronze Age and Thera eruption", *Antiquity* 76: 733-44.
- Marinatos N. 1997. "Minoan and Mycenaean larnakes: a comparison", *La Crète Mycénienne*, [BCH Supplement 30], J. Driessen and A. Farnoux (eds.), Paris: 281-92.
- Marinos G. and Symeonidis N. 1977. "Νησιωτικοί πληθυσμοί νάνων θηλαστικών εις το αρχιπέλαγος του Αιγαίου κατά το Τεταρτογενές", *Annales Géologiques des Pays Helleniques* 28: 352-67.
- Marketou S. 1980. "Λέρος", *ΑΔ 35 Χρονικά*: 557.
- Marketou T. 1987a. "Φιλήρημος", *ΑΔ 42 Χρονικά*: 615-6.
- Marketou T. 1987b. "Marine style pottery from the Seraglio in Kos", *BSA* 82: 165-9.
- Marketou T. 1988a. "Ίαλυσός-Ίξιά", *ΑΔ 43 Χρονικά*: 611-25.
- Marketou T. 1988b. "New evidence on the topography and site history of prehistoric Ialysos", *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), Copenhagen: 27-33.
- Marketou T. 1990a. "Μινωικό πολύθυρο", *ΑΔ 45 Χρονικά*: 496.

- Marketou T. 1990b. "Asomatos and Seraglio: EBA production and interconnections", *Hydra: Working papers in Middle Bronze Age Studies* 7: 40-8.
- Marketou T. 1990c. "Santorini tephra from Rhodes and Kos: some chronological Remarks Based on the Stratigraphy", *Thera and the Aegean world vol. 3*, D.A. Hardy D.A. and A.C. Renfrew A.C. (eds.), London: 100-13.
- Marketou T. 1991. "Τριάντα", *ΑΔ 46 Χρονικά*: 481-3.
- Marketou T. 1997. "Ασώματος Ρόδου: τα μεγαρόσχημα κτήρια και οι σχέσεις τους με το Βορειοανατολικό Αιγαίο", *Η Πολιόχνη και η Πρώιμη Εποχή του Χαλκού στο Βόρειο Αιγαίο*, C.G. Doumas and V. La Rosa (eds.), Athens: 395-413.
- Marketou T. 1998a. "Bronze LB I statuettes from Rhodes", *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus- Dodecanese- Crete 16th-6th century BC*, V. Karageorghis and N.C. Stampolidis (eds.), Athens: 55-72.
- Marketou T. 1998b. "Excavations at Trianda (Ialysos) on Rhodes: new evidence for the Late Bronze Age I period", *Rendiconti* 9: 39-82.
- Marketou T., Facorellis Y. and Maniatis Y. 2001. "New Late Bronze Age chronology from the Ialysos region, Rhodes", *MAA* 1: 19-29.
- Marthari M., Marketou T. and Jones R.E. 1990. "LB I Ceramic Connections between Thera and Kos", *Thera and the Aegean world vol. 1*, D.A. Hardy, C.G. Doumas, J.A. Sakellarakis and P.M. Warren (eds.), London: 171-84.
- Matthäus H. 1983. "Minoische kriegergräber", *Minoan Society*, O. Krzyszkowska and L. Nixon (eds.), Bristol: 203-15.
- Mauss M. 1969. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, I. Cunnison (trns.), London.
- McCaslin D.E. 1980. *Stone Anchors in Antiquity: Coastal Settlements and Maritime Trade-routes in the Eastern Mediterranean ca. 1600-1050 BC*, [SIMA 61], Göteborg.
- McGeehan Liritzis V. 1988. "Seafaring, craft and cultural contact in the Aegean during the 3rd millennium BC", *IJNAUE* 17: 237-56.
- McGeorge P.J.P. 2001. "Anthropological approach to the Pylona tombs: the skeletal remains", *The Mycenaean Cemetery on Rhodes*, [BAR International Series 988], E. Karantzali (ed.), Oxford: 82-99.

- McHugh F. 1999. *Theoretical and Quantitative Approaches to the Study of Mortuary Practice*, [BAR International Series 785], Oxford.
- McLellan D. (ed.) 2000. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*, Oxford.
- Mee C.B. 1975. *The Dodecanese in the Bronze Age*, vol. 1-2, Unpublished PhD Thesis, London.
- Mee C. 1978. "Aegean trade and settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.", *AS* 28: 121-56.
- Mee C. 1982. *Rhodes in the Bronze Age: An Archaeological Survey*, Warminster.
- Mee C.B. 1984. "The Mycenaeans and Troy", *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context*, L. Foxhall and J.K. Davies (eds.), Bristol: 45-56.
- Mee C. 1988a. "The LH IIIB period in the Dodecanese", *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), Copenhagen: 56-8.
- Mee C. 1988b. "A Mycenaean thalassocracy in the Eastern Aegean?", *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French and K.A. Wardle (eds.), Bristol: 301-6.
- Mee C. 1998a. "Anatolia and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age", *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium*, [Aegaeum 18], E.C. Cline and D. Harris-Cline (eds.), Liège: 137-48.
- Mee C. 1998b. "Gender bias in Mycenaean mortuary practices", *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 165-170.
- Mee C.B. and Cavanagh W.G. 1984. "Mycenaean tombs as evidence for social and political organisation", *OJA* 3: 45-64.
- Mee C.B. and Cavanagh W.G. 1990. "The spatial distribution of Mycenaean tombs", *BSA* 85: 225-43.
- Melas E.M. 1984. "The origins of Aegean cremation", *Ανθρωπολογικά* 5: 21-36.
- Melas E.M. 1985. *The Islands of Karpathos, Saros and Kasos in the Neolithic and Bronze Age*, [SIMA 68], Göteborg.
- Melas M. 1988a. "Exploration in the Dodecanese: new prehistoric and Mycenaean finds", *BSA* 83: 283-311.
- Melas E.M. 1988b. "The Dodecanese and W. Anatolia in prehistory: interrelationships, ethnicity and political geography", *AS* 38: 109-20.

- Melas M. 1991. "Acculturation and social mobility in the Minoan world", *Thalassa: L'Égée Préhistorique et la Mer*, [Aegaeum 7], R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), Liège: 169-88.
- Melas M. 2001. "Καύσεις νεκρών: προς μιά αρχαιολογία του φόβου", *Καύσεις στην Εποχή του Χαλκού και την Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου*, N.C. Stampolidis (ed.), Athens: 15-29.
- Mellaart J. 1986. "Hatti, Arzawa and Ahhiyawa: a review of the present stalemate in historical and geographical studies", *Festschrift for Georgios E. Mylonas*, Athens: 74-84.
- Mellaart J. 1998a. "Hacilar: 1957-1960 excavations", *Ancient Anatolia*, R. Matthews (ed.), Ankara: 53-60.
- Mellaart J. 1998b. "Beycesultan", *Ancient Anatolia*, R. Matthews (ed.), Ankara: 61-8.
- Mellaart J. and Murray A. 1995. *Beycesultan vol. III Part II*, Oxford.
- Mellink M. 1986. "The Early Bronze Age in West Anatolia", *The End of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean*, G. Cadogan (ed.), Leiden: 139-52.
- Merrifield R. 1987. *Archaeology of Ritual and Magic*, London.
- Messineo G. 1997. "Gli scavi di Efestia a Lemno: tradizione Micenea nella civiltà Tirrenica", *SMEA* 39: 241-52.
- Metcalf P. and Huntington R. 1992. *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual*, second edition, Cambridge.
- Miller D. and Tilley C. 1984. "Ideology, power and prehistory: an introduction", *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, D. Miller and C. Tilley (eds.), Cambridge: 1-15.
- Milojčić V. 1961. *Samos: Band I: Die prähistorische Siedlung unter dem Heraion: Grabung 1953 und 1955*, Bonn.
- Mizoguchi K. 1993. "Time in the reproduction of mortuary practices", *World Archaeology* 25: 223-35.
- Momigliano N. 2000. "Bronze Age Carian Iasos", *Anatolian Archaeology* 6: 12.
- Momigliano N. 2001. "Bronze Age Carian Iasos", *Anatolian Archaeology* 7: 15.
- Mommsen H. and Maran J. 2000/1. "Production places of some Mycenaean pictorial vessels: the contribution of chemical pottery analysis", *Op Ath* 25-6: 95-106.

- Moore H.L. 2000. "Ethics and ontology: why Agents and Agency matter", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 259-63.
- Morricone L. 1965/6. "Eleona e Langada: sepolcreti della Tarda Età del Bronzo a Coò", *Annuario* 43-4: 5-311.
- Morricone L. 1972/3. "Coò: scavi e scoperte nel 'Serraglio' e in località minori (1935-1943)", *Annuario* 50-1: 139-396.
- Morricone M.L. 1979/80. "Vase della collezione Akavi di Rodi", *Annuario* 57-8: 217-342.
- Morris I. 1991. "The archaeology of ancestors: the Saxe/Goldstein hypothesis revisited", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 1: 147-69.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1976. "Late Helladic IIIB 1 pottery dating the construction of the South house at Mycenae", *BSA* 71: 77-111.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1986. *Mycenaean Decorated Pottery: a Guide to Identification*, [SIMA 73], Göteborg.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1993. *Mycenaean Pottery: An Introduction*, Oxford.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1995. "Mycenaean pottery from South Rhodes", *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens I*, S. Dietz (ed.), Athens: 21-35.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1997/8. "An octopus stirrup jar from Kalymnos", *Op Ath* 22-3: 152-4.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1998. "The East Aegean– West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaeans and the kingdom of Ahhiyawa", *AS* 48: 33-68.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1999a. *Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*, vol. 1-2, Rahden/Westf.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1999b. "The destruction of Troia Vih", *Studia Troica* 9: 253-93.
- Mueller-Dombois D. 1981. "Island ecosystems: what is unique about their ecology?", *Island Ecosystems: Biological Organization in Selected Hawaiian Communities*, D. Mueller-Dombois, K.W. Bridges and H.L. Carson (eds.), Stroudsburg: 485-501.
- Mutti E., Orombelli G. and Pozzi R. 1970. "Geological studies on the Dodecanese islands (Aegean sea): geological map of the island of Rhodes (Greece) explanatory notes", *Annales Géologiques des Pays Helléniques* 22: 79-226.

- Murphy J.M. 1998. "Ideologies, rites and rituals: a view of Prepalatial Minoan tholoi", *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, K. Branigan (ed.), Sheffield: 27-40.
- Mylonas G.E. 1948. "Homeric and Mycenaean burial customs", *AJA* 52: 56-81.
- Mylonas G.E. 1951. "The figured Mycenaean stelai", *AJA* 55: 134-47.
- Mylonas G.E. 1954/5. "Μυκηναϊκά ειδώλια", *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 2: 139-52.
- Mylonas G.E. 1966. *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*, Princeton.
- Nash G. 1997. "Monumentality and the landscape: the possible symbolic and political distribution of long chambered tombs around the Black Mountains, Central Wales", *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, [BAR International Series 661], G. Nash (ed.), Oxford: 17-29.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1983. "The character of the Knossian palace society in the second half of the fifteen century BC: Mycenaean or Minoan?", *Minoan Society*, O. Krzyszkowska and L. Nixon (eds.), Bristol: 217-36.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1984. "The end of the Minoan thalassocracy", *Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 205-14.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1986. "Creta, Egeo e Mediterraneo gli inizi del bronzo tardo", *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo*, M. Marazzi, S. Tusa and L. Vagnetti (eds.), Taranto: 245-69.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1993. "The end of the Minoan thalassocracy", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 205-14.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1997. "The Mycenaean potter's quarters at Miletus", *Τέχνη: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 347-52.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1998a. "The Minoans in the South-eastern Aegean and in Cyprus", *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus- Dodecanese- Crete 16th-6yh century BC*, V. Karageorghis and N.C. Stampolidis (eds.), Athens: 29-47.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1998b. "The Mycenaeans in Western Anatolia and the problem of the origins of the Sea Peoples", *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition: Thirteen to*

- Early Tenth Centuries BCE*, S. Gitin, A. Mazar and E. Stern (eds.), Jerusalem: 17-65.
- Niemeier W.-D. 1999. "Mycenaeans and Hittites at war in Western Asia Minor", *Polemos*, [Aegaeum 19], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 141-56.
- Niemeier W.-D. 2002. "Μικρά Ασία και Αχαιοί", *Καθημερινή: Επτά Ημέρες*, Sunday March 31st, Athens: 18-22.
- Niemeier B and Niemeier W.-D. 1997. "Minoisch-Mykenisches bis Protogeometrisches Milet: Zielsetzung und Grabungen auf dem Stadionhügel und am Athenatempel", *AA*: 189-248.
- Niemeier B. and Niemeier W.-D. 1999. "The Minoans of Miletus", *Meletemata: Studies in Aegean Archaeology Presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his 65th Year*, [Aegaeum 20], P.P. Betancourt, V. Karageorghis, R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 543-54.
- Niemeyer H.G. 1990. "The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean: a non-Greek model for expansion and settlement in antiquity", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall*, J.-P. Descœudres (ed.), Oxford: 469-89.
- Nowicki K. 2000. *Defensible Sites In Crete c.1200-800 BC (LM IIIB/IIIC through Early Geometric)*, [Aegaeum 21], Liège.
- Olwig K.R. 1995. "Sexual cosmology: nation and landscape at the conceptual interstices of nature and culture; or, what does landscape really means?", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 307-43.
- O'Shea J.M. 1995. "Mortuary custom in the Bronze Age of Southeastern Hungary: diachronic and synchronic perspectives", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 125-46.
- Özgünel C. 1983. "Badi Anadolu ve içerlerinde Miken etkinlikleri", *Bellekten* 47: 697-743.
- Özgünel C. 1996. *Mykenische Keramik in Anatolien*, [Asia Minor Studien 23], Bonn.
- Pader E.-J. 1982. *Symbolism, Social Relations and the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains*, [BAR International Series 130], Oxford.

- Page D.L. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley.
- Palmer R. 1994. *Wine in the Mycenaean Palace Economy*, [Aegaeum 10], Liège.
- Panagopoulou E., Kotzamporoulou E. and Karkanas P. 1996. “Γεωαρχαιολογική έρευνα: Αλόνησος”, *ΑΔ 51 Χρονικά*: 715-9.
- Pantelidou M. 1971. “Επικασσιτερωμένα αγγεία εξ Αθηνών”, *ΑΑΑ* 4: 433-8.
- Pantelidou M.A. 1975. *Αι Προϊστορικά Αθήναι*, Athens.
- Papachristodoulou C.I. 1972. *Ιστορία της Ρόδου: Από τους Προϊστορικούς Χρόνους έως την Ενσωμάτωση της Δωδεκανήσου (1948)*, Athens.
- Papachristodoulou I. 1979. “Κως (Υπαιθρος)”, *ΑΔ 34 Χρονικά*: 457-9.
- Papadimitriou N. 2001. *Built Chamber Tombs of Middle and Late Bronze Age Date in Mainland Greece and the Islands*, [BAR International Series 925], Oxford.
- Papadopoulos J.K. 1997. “Innovations, imitations and ceramic style: modes of production and modes of dissemination”, *Τέχνη: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 449-62.
- Papadopoulou A., Karelli N., Zafeiriou N., Moschouris S. and Tsavaropoulos A. 1986. “Ανασκαφική έρευνα στα Ψαρά 1986”, *Τα Ψαρά*: 2-7.
- Papagiannopoulou A. 1985. “Were the S.E. Aegean islands deserted in the MBA?”, *AS* 35: 85-92.
- Papathanassiou M. and Hoskin M. 1996. “The Late-Minoan cemetery at Armenoi: a reappraisal”, *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 27: 53-9.
- Papathanassiou M., Hoskin M. and Papadopoulou H. 1992. “Orientations of tombs in the Late-Minoan cemetery at Armenoi, Crete”, *Archaeoastronomy* 17: 43-55.
- Papathanassopoulos G., Vichos J. and Lolos J. 1991. “Δοκός: ανασκαφική περίοδος 1981”, *Ενάλια* 3, 1/2: 26-8.
- Papazoglou L. 1981. “Μυκηναϊκός θαλαμωτός τάφος στο Κάστελλο της Κω”, *ΑΑΑ* 14: 62-75.
- Papazoglou-Manioudaki L. 1982. “Ανασκαφή του Μινωικού οικισμού στα Τριάντα της Ρόδου”, *ΑΔ 37 Μελέτες*: 139-90.
- Parker Pearson M. 1984. “Social change, ideology and the archaeological record”, *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, M. Spriggs (ed.), Cambridge: 59-71.

- Parker Pearson M. 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*, Somerset.
- Parlama L. 1984. *Η Σκύρος στην Εποχή του Χαλκού*, Athens.
- Parzinger H. 1989. "Zur frühesten Besiedlung Milets", *IM* 39: 415-31.
- Patton M. 1996. *Islands in Time: Island Sociogeography and Mediterranean Prehistory*, London.
- Pecorella P.E. 1984. *La Cultura Preistorica di Iasos in Caria*, Rome.
- Pelon O. 1976. *Tholoi, Tumuli et Cercles Funéraires- Recherches sur les monuments funéraires de plan circulaire dans l' Égée de l'âge du Bronze (III et II millénaires av. J.-C.)*, Paris.
- Perlès C. 1992. "Systems of exchange and organization in Neolithic Greece", *JMA* 5: 115-64.
- Perlès C. 2001. *The Early Neolithic in Greece*, Cambridge.
- Petersen W. 1958. "A general typology of migration", *American Sociological Review* 23: 256-66.
- Philimonos M. 1996. "Τήλος: Μεγάλο Χωριό", *ΑΔ 51 Χρονικά*: 693-7.
- Phountoulakis M. 1987. "Νεολιθικά σκελετικά ευρήματα του σπηλαίου Άγιος Γεώργιος στις Καλυθιές της Ρόδου", *Η Νεολιθική Περίοδος στα Δωδεκάνησα*, A. Sampson (ed.), Athens: 164-73.
- Pilali-Papasteriou A. 1998. "Idéologie et commerce: le cas des figurines mycéniennes", *BCH* 122: 27-52.
- Pini I. 1968. *Beiträge zur Minoischen Gräberkunde*, Wiesbaden.
- Pirazzoli P.A., Montaggioni L.F., Saliege J.F., Segonzac G., Thommeret Y. and Vergnaud-Grazzini C. 1989. "Crustal block movement from Holocene shorelines: Rhodes island (Greece)", *Tectonophysics* 170: 89-114.
- Platon L. and Karantzali E. (forthcoming). "New evidence for the history of the Minoan presence on Karpathos", *BSA*.
- Ponting M.J. and Karantzali E. 2001. "Appendix I: ICP-AES analysis of some Mycenaean vases from the Pylona cemetery", *The Mycenaean Cemetery on Rhodes*, [BAR International Series 988], E. Karantzali (ed.), Oxford: 105-13.
- Popham M.R. 1965. "Some Late Minoan III pottery from Crete", *BSA* 60: 316-42.
- Popham M. 1967. "Late Minoan pottery, a summary", *BSA* 62: 337-51.

- Popham M. 1969. "The Late Minoan goblet and kylix", *BSA* 64: 299-304.
- Popham M. 1980. "Cretan sites occupied between c.1450-1400 BC", *BSA* 75: 163-7.
- Popham M.R., Catling E.A. and Catling H.W. 1974. "Sellopoulo tombs 3 and 4, two Late Minoan graves near Knossos", *BSA* 69: 195-257.
- Popham M. and Milburn E. 1971. "The Late Helladic IIC pottery of Xeropolis (Lefkandi), a summary", *BSA* 66: 333-52.
- Preston L. 1999. "Mortuary practices and the negotiation of social identities at LM II Knossos", *BSA* 94: 131-43.
- Prevelakis G.-S.N. 2000. "Γεωγραφία και χρόνος", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 77: 24-30.
- Pulak C. 1997 "The Uluburun shipwreck", *Res Maritimae*, S. Swiny, R.L. Hohlfelder and H. Wylde Swiny (eds.), Atlanta: 233-62.
- Rainbird P. 1999a. "Islands out of time: towards a critique of island archaeology", *JMA* 12: 216-34.
- Rainbird P. 1999b. "Nesophiles miss the boat? A response", *JMA* 12: 259-60.
- Rault S. 1997. "From Anneville to Zedes: a ritual seascape? megaliths and long-distance contacts in Western Europe", *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, [BAR International Series 661], G. Nash (ed.), Oxford: 5-16.
- Reese D.S. 1983. "The use of cone shells in Neolithic and Bronze Age Greece", *BSA* 78: 353-7.
- Rehak P. and Younger J.G. 1998. "Review of Aegean prehistory vii: neopalatial, final palatial and postpalatial Crete", *AJA* 102: 91-173.
- Renfrew C. 1986. "Introduction: peer polity interaction and socio-political change", *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, C. Renfrew and J.F. Cherry (eds.), Cambridge: 1-18.
- Renfrew C. 1990. *Before Civilization: The Radiocarbon Revolution and Prehistoric Europe*, London.
- Renfrew C., Cann J.R. and Dixon J.E. 1965. "Obsidian in the Aegean", *BSA* 60: 225-47.
- Richards C. 1995. "Monumental choreography: architecture and spatial representation in late Neolithic Orkney", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 143-78.

- Richards J.E. 1999. "Conceptual landscapes in the Egyptian Nile valley", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*, W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds.), Oxford: 83-100.
- Roberts B.K. 1987. "Landscape archaeology", *Landscape and Culture: Geographical and Archaeological Perspectives*, J.M. Wagstaff (ed.), Oxford: 77-95.
- Roberts N. 1992. *The Holocene: An Environmental History*, Oxford.
- Roberts O.T.P. 1991. "The development of the brail into a viable sail control for Aegean boats of the Bronze Age", *Thalassa: Égée Préhistorique et la Mer*, [Aegaeum 7], R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), Liège: 55-60.
- Rowlands M. 1998. "The archaeology of colonialism", *Social Transformations in Archaeology: Global and Local Perspectives*, K. Kristiansen and M. Rowlands (eds.), London: 327-33.
- Rudgley R. 1998. *The Alchemy of Culture: Intoxicants in Society*, London.
- Ruipérez M.S and Melena J.L. 1996. *Οι Μυκηναίοι Έλληνες*, M. Panagiotidou (trns.), Athens.
- Runnels C. 1995. "Review of Aegean prehistory iv: the Stone Age of Greece from the Palaeolithic to the advent of Neolithic", *AJA* 99: 699-728.
- Rutter J.B. 1993. "Review of Aegean prehistory ii: the Prepalatial Bronze Age of the southern and central Greek mainland", *AJA* 97: 745-97.
- Sahlins M. 1974. *Stone Age Economics*, London.
- Sampson A. 1979. "Νεολιθικά Ευρήματα από τη Ρόδο", *AAA* 12: 24-39.
- Sampson A. 1980. "Μινωικά από την Τήλο", *AAA* 13: 68-73.
- Sampson A. 1983. "Το ΝΑ. Αιγαίο στα Νεολιθικά Χρόνια", *AE* 1983: 5-13.
- Sampson A. 1984a. "Ο οψιανός της Νισύρου και η διάδοση του στο Αιγαίο", *Ανθρωπολογικά* 5: 63-74.
- Sampson A. 1984b. "The Neolithic of the Dodecanese and Aegean Neolithic", *BSA* 79: 239-49.
- Sampson A. 1985. "Η Νεολιθική στο Χώρο του Αιγαίου", *AAA* 18: 255-68.
- Sampson A. 1987. *Η Νεολιθική Περίοδος στα Δωδεκάνησα*, Athens.
- Sampson A. 1988. *Η Νεολιθική Κατοίκηση στο Γυαλί της Νισύρου*, Athens.

- Sampson A. 1993. "Εθνοαρχαιολογικές έρευνες στη Νίσυρο και στο Γυαλί της Δωδεκανήσου", *Νισυριακά* 12: 101-38.
- Sampson A. 1996a. "The Cyclops cave at Youra Alonnissos", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 58-9.
- Sampson A. 1996b. "The Dodecanese", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 90-1.
- Sampson A. 1996c. "The Dodecanese", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 131-2.
- Sampson A. 1996d. "Παλαιολιθικές θέσεις στην Εύβοια και στις Βόρειες Σποράδες", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 60: 51-7.
- Sampson A. 1996e. "Νέα στοιχεία για τη Μεσολιθική περίοδο στον ελληνικό χώρο", *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 61: 46-51.
- Sampson A. 1996f. "Κύθνος", *ΑΔ 51 Χρονικά*: 608-10.
- Sampson A. 1998. "The Neolithic and Mesolithic occupation of the cave of Cyclope, Youra, Alonnissos, Greece", *BSA* 93: 1-22.
- Sampson A. 2002. "Transitional phases in the Aegean prehistory: dating problems and archaeological interpretation", *Αρχαιολογία και Περιβάλλον στα Δωδεκάνησα: Έρευνα και Πολιτισμικός Τουρισμός*, Rhodes: 113-8.
- Sandars N.K. 1955. "The antiquity of the one-edged bronze knife in the Aegean", *PS* 21: 174-97.
- Sandars N.K. 1961. "The first Aegean swords and their ancestry", *AJA* 65: 17-29.
- Sandars N.K. 1963. "Later Aegean bronze swords", *AJA* 67: 117-53.
- Sandars N. 1983. "North and south at the end of the Mycenaean Age: aspects of an old problem", *OJA* 2: 43-68.
- Scarre C. 1994. "The meaning of death: funerary beliefs and the prehistorian", *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*, C. Renfrew and E.B.W. Zubrow (eds.), Cambridge: 75-82.
- Schachner A. and Meriç R. 2000. "Ein Stempelsiegel des späten 2 Jahrtausends v. chr. aus Metropolis in Ionien", *SMEA* 42: 85-102.
- Schallin A.-L. 1993. *Islands Under Influence: The Cyclades in the Late Bronze Age and the Nature of Mycenaean Presence*, [SIMA 111], Jonsered.

- Schofield E. 1983. "The Minoan emigrant", *Minoan Society: Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium 1981*, O. Krzyszkowska and L. Nixon (eds.), Bristol: 293-301.
- Schofield E. 1984. "Coming to terms with Minoan colonists", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 45-7.
- Schoinas C. 1999. "Εικονιστική παράσταση σε όστρακα κρατήρα από την Αγία Τριάδα Ηλείας", *Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου*, Lamia: 257-62.
- Schiering W. 1959/60. "Südabschnitt", *IM* 9/10: 4-30.
- Shelmerdine C.W. 1997. "Review of Aegean prehistory vi: the palatial Bronze Age of the southern and central Greek mainland", *AJA* 101: 537-85.
- Shanks M. and Tilley C. 1996a. *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*, London.
- Shanks M. and Tilley C. 1996b. *Social Theory and Archaeology*, Cambridge.
- Sharples N. 1985. "Individual and community: the changing role of Megaliths in Orcadian Neolithic", *PPS* 51: 59-74.
- Shennan S.J. 1978. "Archaeological 'cultures': an empirical investigation", *The Spatial Organisation of Culture*, I. Hodder (ed.), London: 113-139.
- Shennan S. 1994. "Introduction: archaeological approaches to cultural identity", *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, S.J. Shennan (ed.), London: 1-32.
- Sherratt A. 1997. *Economy and Society in Prehistoric Europe: Changing perspectives*, London.
- Sherratt A. and Sherratt S. 1991. "From luxuries to commodities: the nature of Mediterranean Bronze Age trading systems", *Bronze Age Trade in the Mediterranean*, [SIMA 90], N.H. Gale (ed.), Jonsered: 351-86.
- Sherratt E.S. 1980. "Regional variation in the pottery of Late Helladic IIIB", *BSA* 7: 175-202.
- Sherratt E.S. 1992. "Immigration and archaeology: some indirect reflections", *Acta Cypria*, P. Åström (ed.), Jonsered: 316-47.

- Sherratt S. 2001. "Potemkin palaces and route-based economies", *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States*, [Cambridge Philological Society 27], S. Voutsaki and J. Killen (eds.), Cambridge: 214-38.
- Sherratt E.S. and Crouwel J.H. 1987. "Mycenaean pottery from Cilicia in Oxford", *OJA* 6: 325-52.
- Sjöberg B.L. 1990. "The pottery frequency fluctuations in Late Helladic tombs: a case study of three LH III sites in the Argolid", *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 65-7.
- Skerlou E. 1993. "Ηρακλής", *ΑΔ 48 Χρονικά*: 553.
- Skerlou E. 1996. "Περίχωρα της πόλης Κω", *ΑΔ 51 Χρονικά*: 689-92.
- Smith A. 1995. "The need for Lapita: explaining change in the Late Holocene Pacific archaeological record", *World Archaeology* 26: 366-79.
- Snodgrass A.M. 1973. "Metal-work as evidence for immigration in the Late Bronze Age", *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean*, R.A. Crossland and A. Birchall (eds.), London: 209-13.
- Soles J.S. 1999. "The ritual 'killing' of pottery and the discovery of a Mycenaean *Telestas* at Mochlos", *Meletemata: studies in Aegean Archaeology presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his 65th year*, [Aegaeum 20], P.P. Betancourt, V. Karageorghis, R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 787-92.
- Sørensen M.L.S. 1987. "Material order and cultural classification: the role of bronze objects in the transition from the Bronze Age to Iron Age in Scandinavia", *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*, I. Hodder (ed.), Cambridge: 90-102.
- Spencer N. 1995. "Early Lesbos between East and West: a 'grey area' of Aegean archaeology", *BSA* 90: 269-305.
- Sperling J. 1991. "The last phase of Troy VI and Mycenaean expansion", *Studia Troica* 1: 155-7.
- Spriggs M. 1984. "Another way of telling: Marxist perspective in archaeology", *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, M. Spriggs (ed.), Cambridge: 1-9.
- Spyropoulos T.G. 1972. *Υστερομυκηναϊκοί Ελλαδικοί Θησαυροί*, Athens.
- Stais V. 1895. "Προϊστορικοί συνοικισμοί εν Αττική και Αιγίνη", *ΑΕ*: 193-264.

- Stamatatou E. 2001. *Gemstones in Mycenaean Greece: their use and significance*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Liverpool.
- Steel L. 1998. "The social impact of Mycenaean imported pottery in Cyprus", *BSA* 93: 285-96.
- Stos-Gale Z.A. and Gale N.H. 1982. "The sources of Mycenaean silver and lead", *JFA* 9: 467-85.
- Stos-Gale Z.A. and Gale N.H. 1984. "The Minoan thalassocracy and the Aegean metal trade", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 59-63.
- Stubbings F.H. 1951. *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*, Cambridge.
- Tainter J.A. 1975. "Social inference and mortuary practices: an experiment in numerical classification", *World Archaeology* 7: 1-15.
- Tainter J.A. and Cordy R.H. 1977/8. "An archaeological analysis of social ranking and residence groups in prehistoric Hawaii", *World Archaeology* 9: 95-112.
- Taylour W. 1995. *The Mycenaeans*, London.
- Terrell J.E. 1999. "Comments on Paul Rainbird, 'islands out of time: towards a critique of island archaeology'", *JMA* 12: 240-5.
- Thomas C.G. 1995. "The components of political identity in Mycenaean Greece", *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 12], R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), Liège: 349-54.
- Thomas J. 1991. "Reading the body: Beaker funerary practice in Britain", *Sacred and Profane*, P. Garwood, D. Jennings, R. Skeates and J. Toms (eds.), Oxford: 33-42.
- Thomas J. 1993. "The hermeneutics of megalithic space", *Interpretative Archaeology*, C. Tilley (ed.), Providence: 73-97.
- Thomas J. 1995. "The politics of vision and the archaeologies of landscape", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 19-48.
- Thomas J. 1996. *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretive Archaeology*, London.
- Thomas J. and Tilley C. 1995. "The axe and the torso: symbolic structures in the Neolithic of Brittany", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 225-324.

- Tilley C. 1989. "Interpreting material culture", *The Meanings of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*, I. Hodder (ed.), London: 185-94.
- Tilley C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape*, Oxford.
- Tilley C. 1995. "Art, architecture, landscape [Neolithic Sweden]", *Landscape Politics and Perspectives*, B. Bender (ed.), Providence: 49-84.
- Tilley C. 1999. *Metaphor and Material Culture*, Oxford.
- Tournavitou I. 1992. "Practical use and social function: a neglected aspect of Mycenaean pottery", *BSA* 87: 181-210.
- Treuil R., Darcque P., Poursat J.-C. and Touchais G. 1996. *Οι Πολιτισμοί του Αιγαίου*, Athens.
- Trinkaus K.M. 1995. "Mortuary behavior, labor organization, and social rank", *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L.A. Beck (ed.), New York: 53-75.
- Tsountas C. 1896. "Γραπτή στήλη εκ Μυκηνών", *AE*: 1-22.
- Tsountas C. and Manatt J.I. 1897. *The Mycenaean Age: a Study of the Monuments and Culture of Pre-Homeric Greece*, London.
- Ucko P.J. 1969/70. "Ethnography and archaeological interpretation of funerary remains", *World Archaeology* 1: 262-80.
- van Andel T.H. 1989. "Late Quaternary sea-level changes and archaeology", *Antiquity* 63: 733-45.
- van Andel T.H. and Lianos N. 1984. "High-Resolution seismic reflection profiles for the reconstruction of postglacial transgressive shorelines: an example from Greece", *Quaternary Research* 22: 31-45.
- van Andel T.H. and Shackleton J.C. 1982. "Late Paleolithic and Mesolithic coastlines of Greece and the Aegean", *JFA* 9: 445-54.
- van Dommelen P. 1997. "Colonial constructs: colonialism and archaeology in the Mediterranean", *World Archaeology* 28: 305-23.
- van Dommelen P. 1999a. "Exploring everyday places and cosmologies", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives*, W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp (eds.), Oxford: 277-85.
- van Dommelen P. 1999b. "Islands in history", *JMA* 12: 246-51.

- van Gennep A. 1975. *The Rites of Passage*, M.B. Vizedom and G.L. Caffee (trns.), Chicago.
- van Wijngaarden G.-J. 1999a. "An archaeological approach to the concept of value", *Archaeological Dialogues* 6: 2-23.
- van Wijngaarden G.-J. 1999b. "The value of an archaeological approach: a reply", *Archaeological Dialogues* 6: 35-9.
- Vasilikou N. 1995. *Ο Μυκηναϊκός Πολιτισμός*, Athens.
- Vavouranakis G. 2002. "Towards an elemental approach to Early Minoan funerary architecture: The enduring bedrock", *Symposium On Mediterranean Archaeology 2001*, [BAR International Series 1040], G. Muskett. A. Koltsida and M. Georgiadis (eds.), Oxford: 39-46.
- Venetokleous D. 1930. *Ιστορία της Νήσου Ρόδου*, Alexandria.
- Verdelis N., French E. and French D. 1965. "Τίρυνς: Μυκηναϊκή επίχωσις έξωθεν του δυτικού τείχους της ακροπόλεως", *ΑΔ 20 Μελέται*: 137-52.
- Vermeule E. 1964. "The Early Bronze Age in Caria", *Archaeology* 17: 244-9.
- Vermeule E. 1965. "Painted Mycenaean larnakes", *JHS* 85: 123-48.
- Vermeule E. 1972. *Greece in the Bronze Age*, Chicago.
- Vermeule E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, Los Angeles.
- Vermeule E. and Karageorghis V. 1982. *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*, Cambridge.
- Vlachopoulos A.G. 1999. "Η Νάξος κατά την ΥΕ ΙΙΙΓ περίοδο. Η φυσιογνωμία και ο χαρακτήρας ενός ακμαίου νησιωτικού κέντρου", *Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου*, Lamia: 303-14.
- Voigtländer W. 1982. "Funde aus der Insula westlich des Buleuterion in Milet", *IM* 32: 30-173.
- Voigtländer W. 1983. "Frühe funde vom Killiktepe bei Milet", *IM* 33: 5-39.
- Voigtländer W. 1986. "Umrisse eines vor- und frühgeschichtlichen zentrums an der Karisch-Ionischen küste", *AA*: 613-67.
- Voutsaki S. 1993. *Society and Culture in the Mycenaean World: An Analysis of Mortuary Practices in the Argolid, Thessaly and the Dodecanese*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge.

9.1.5 South-eastern Aegean

The diversity in quantity and the chronological range in the rest of the sites in this region, Astypalaia, Kalymnos, Müskebi, Samos and Chios, is great (for more details refer to Appendix C.5). The unevenness is also an important point: at Müskebi from 48 tombs we have 178 vases and at Astypalaia 128 pots were recovered from only four tombs. Apart from these two sites and perhaps Kalymnos, the rest of the places have less than twenty vessels. Furthermore treating each island or area on its own would give a very uneven picture, therefore the sites will be treated as one and special reference will be given to island characteristics. After all this holistic approach is no less artificial than treating each island on its own (table 9.13). Apart from a single LH IIIA1 pot, the use of tombs and the placement of offerings started in LH IIIA2 (table 9.14). Thereafter there was a steady decline in tombs and vessels in both quantity and diversity of shapes. Nonetheless this important decrease in LH IIIB and LH IIIC might not have been so sharp, had it been possible to include the Miletos material dating to LH IIIB and LH IIIC.

Clay analysis has been conducted on the pottery from Miletos revealing two distinctive workshops that produced both Mycenaean and Anatolian ware (Gödecken 1988: 310-5). A number of pots that were deposited in the tombs at Müskebi seem to be from both Milesian workshops. Nonetheless caution should be exercised about the results of this analysis until the chemical results are properly published. One more analysis has been made on fourteen LH III samples from Perakastro suggesting a few central Cretan imports with all the rest most probably from the Peloponnese. Nevertheless the local clay sources have not been identified and their composition could have equally been local, therefore further analyses are needed for secure results (Jones 1986: 290-1, 509). Recent analysis of a LH IIIC pictorial sherd from Miletos confirms the hypothesis of an active local pottery workshop (Mommsen and Maran 2000/1: 104).

Stylistically local elements are mingled with Mycenaean and Minoan characteristics to varying degrees on every site reviewed. For Astypalaia more Minoan elements existed in LH IIIA2, but in the subsequent periods east Aegean shapes and decoration were more evident (Mountjoy 1999a: 1138-9). On Kalymnos the pottery is

- Wardle K.A. and Wardle D. 1997. *The Mycenaean World*, London.
- Wason P.K. 1996. *The Archaeology of Rank*, Cambridge.
- Watrous L.V. 1993. "Cretan relations with the Aegean and the Late Bronze Age", *Wace and Blegen*, C. Zerner, P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.), Amsterdam: 81-90.
- Wedde M. 1991. "Aegean Bronze Age ship imagery: regionalisms, a Minoan bias, and a 'thalassocracy'", *Thalassa: L'Égée Préhistorique et la Mer*, [Aegaeum 7], R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), Liège: 73-94.
- Wedde M. 1997. "The intellectual stowaway: on the movement of ideas within exchange systems: a Minoan case study", *TEXNH- Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, [Aegaeum 16], R. Laffineur and P.P. Betancourt (eds.), Liège: 67-76.
- Wells B. 1990. "Death at Dendra: on mortuary practices in a Mycenaean community", *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*, R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), Stockholm: 125-40.
- Westerdahl C. 1992. "The maritime cultural landscape", *IJNA* 21: 5-14.
- Wheeler T.S. 1974. "Early Bronze Age burial customs in Western Anatolia", *AJA* 78: 415-25.
- Whitehorn M. and Marklyn B. 1999. *Inside Relational Databases*, London.
- Whitelaw T. 1999. "Value, meaning and context in the interpretation of Mycenaean ceramics", *Archaeological Dialogues* 6: 31-5.
- Whitely J. 1991. *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece: The Changing Face of a Pre-literate Society 1100-700 BC*, Cambridge.
- Whitley J. 2002a. "Too many ancestors", *Antiquity* 76: 119-26.
- Whitley J. 2002b. "Objects with attitude: biographical facts and fallacies in the study of Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age warrior graves", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 12: 217-32.
- Whittaker R.J. 1998. *Island Biogeography: Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation*, Oxford.
- Wiener M.H. 1984. "Crete and the Cyclades in LM I: the tale of the conical cups", *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality*, R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm: 17-25.

- Wiessner P. 1989. "Style and changing relations between the individual and society", *The Meanings of Things: Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*, I. Hodder (ed.), London: 56-63.
- Williamson M. 1981. *Island Populations*, Oxford.
- Wobst H.M. 2000. "Agency in (spite of) material culture", *Agency in Archaeology*, M.-A. Dobres and J. Robb (eds.), London: 40-50.
- Wright J.C. 1987. "Death and power at Mycenae: changing symbols in mortuary practice", *Thanatos: Les Coutumes Funéraires en Égée à l'Âge du Bronze*, [Aegaeum 1], R. Laffineur (ed.), Liège: 171-84.
- Wright J.C. 1996. "Empty cups and empty jugs: the social role of wine in Minoan and Mycenaean societies", *The Origins and Ancient History of Wine*, P.E. McGovern, S.J. Fleming and S.H. Katz (eds.), Philadelphia: 287-309.
- Yakar J. 1976. "Hittite involvement in Western Anatolia", *AS* 26: 117-28.
- Yakar J. 1993. "Anatolian civilization following the disintegration of the Hittite empire: an archaeological appraisal", *Tel Aviv* 20: 3-28.
- Yalouris N. 1968. "An unreported use for some Mycenaean glass paste beads", *Journal of Glass Studies* 10: 9-16.
- Young E. 1992. "Hunter-gatherer concepts of land and its ownership in remote Australia and North America", *Inventing Places*, K. Anderson and F. Gale (eds.), Melbourne: 255-72.
- Zachariadou O. 1978. "Θαλαμοειδής τάφος στην Αρκάσα Καρπάθου", *ΑΔ* 33 *Μελέται*: 249-95.
- Zachos K.L. 1996. "The Cyclades and the Northeastern Aegean islands", *Neolithic Greece*, G. Papathanassopoulos (ed.), Athens: 85-7.
- Zapheiroopoulos N. 1960. "Σάμος", *ΑΔ* 16 *Χρονικά*: 249.
- Zervoudaki I. 1971. "Αρμενοχώρι", *ΑΔ* 26 *Χρονικά*: 550-1.