

**THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GREEK WARRIORS AND WARFARE FROM THE ELEVENTH TO
THE EARLY SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.E.**

Volume One: Text

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Archaeology

Matthew T. Lloyd

Merton College, University of Oxford

October 2014

Abstract

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GREEK WARRIORS AND WARFARE FROM THE ELEVENTH TO THE EARLY SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.E.

Matthew T. Lloyd, Merton College, University of Oxford

This thesis studies the evidence related to warfare and warriors in the Early Iron Age of Greece, from the eleventh to the early seventh century B.C.E. It argues that “warrior” identity, as expressed through burial with weapons or depictions of armed men and combat in pictorial painting and literature, is connected to violent action in order to create, maintain, and reinforce the relationship between authority and violent action. The forms that this violent action took were variable, from interregional conflict to overseas raids. This is outlined in Chapter 1, which is followed by two chapters summarizing the palatial (Chapter 2) and postpalatial (Chapter 3) background to the Early Iron Age.

Chapters 4 to 7 present the evidence. In order to provide a more thorough analysis the focus is limited to the regions of Attica, central Euboea, the Argolid, and Knossos. The study of warfare in this period has been dominated by the study of weapons; in this thesis the approach focuses on the contexts in which these weapons are found, burials (Chapter 4), sanctuaries (Chapter 5), and occasionally settlements (Chapter 6). In these chapters the particular treatment and emphasis on weapons and armour is considered based on an understanding of these contexts in the period. In Chapter 7, representations and the treatment of warriors and warfare in Early Iron Age pictorial pottery is considered, as is briefly the literary evidence from the end of this period, which form the means by which contemporary people came to understand warfare. Chapter 8 discusses the evidence, while Chapter 9 summarizes the conclusions.

This thesis shows that while warrior identity and the practice of war are closely related, in these areas of Early Iron Age Greece there are variations in the identification of men as warriors and in the intensity with which war is fought. Throughout the period, these regions express warrior identity in broadly similar ways, but with variations in duration, accessibility, and meaning. The eighth century is particularly a period of change with the intensification of warfare manifest in the destruction of settlements, but these changes are not restricted to this century, and are in many ways similar to the preceding centuries on a larger scale.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost thanks go to my supervisor, Professor Irene Lemos. Her encouragement and faith in my ability have been vital to the completion of this thesis, as well as providing the original motivation to continue my studies. Furthermore, since 2007 she has constantly encouraged me to develop new skills and experiences as an archaeologist at the excavations and study seasons at Lefkandi. While her inspiration is greatly appreciated, I remain responsible for any errors with this thesis.

One of the delights of Professor Lemos' supervision is the community of students researching the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Greece that she inspires. Amongst these, several require particular thanks: Dr Artemis Georgiou for showing me how to write a thesis in my early years as a graduate student; Caroline Thurston for co-founding the Prehistoric and Early Greece Graduate Seminars with me; Joanna Palermo and Tzveta Manolova for their willingness to discuss whatever particular archaeological conundrum has been on their mind or mine; Eleni Karouzou and Ann-Sofie Diener for their enthusiasm about Thessaly and Crete respectively, often beyond the reaches of this thesis but in directions that I hope to pursue further in the future. There are and have been many others, all of whom deserve recognition for continuing to create a vibrant working environment for students of early Greece in Oxford. My introduction to Lefkandi and to early Greek archaeology came through the tutorship of Dr Peter Haarer, who has remained supportive of my research and has offered much advice and discussion throughout the years I have known him. The support of Dr Catherine Draycott for the foundation of PEGGS and as a reference has also been of great importance. Dr Luuk Huitink generously devoted time to improving my ancient Greek; any errors in understanding, of course, remain my own.

I have benefitted from discussions and exchanges with many other students of ancient warfare. My thanks go to Dr Stephen O'Brien, Dr Katherine Harrell, and Dr Angelos Papadopoulos for discussing their research on Bronze Age warfare and society, and for providing me with copies of their theses. At the other end my ideas have been greatly influenced by conversations with Cezary Kucewicz on Archaic warfare, Roel Konijnendijk on Classical warfare, and Joshua Hall on Italy.

At the very beginning this thesis was facilitated by Christopher and Eleanor North, who provided me with a place to stay in Oxford while I researched my proposal. My thanks go to them for providing that opportunity.

Financial support for this thesis has been provided by travel grants from the Craven Committee, the Institute of Archaeology, and Merton College, which have allowed me to attend the conferences at which I met many of the scholars above and to travel to Lefkandi and other regions discussed in this thesis. Merton College have also provided me with generous book grants and a grant from the Bowman Fund which facilitated the completion of my thesis.

My continued enthusiasm and enjoyment of my research is in no small part the result of the love and emotional support of my partner Whitney. She has made me so happy that it cannot have failed to influence my work; this is besides the assistance with scanning, printing, and formatting the final document. Additional thanks must go to Whitney's parents, Sharryn and Jamie Dickson, for proofreading my thesis and sailing me around the Cyclades, respectively.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Mervyn and Sheila Lloyd. Their support throughout my life and their encouragement to pursue something that I enjoy has allowed me to continue my studies at Master's and doctoral level. Without them, my siblings John and Sarah, and my grandparents this would not have been possible.

Contents

Volume 1: Text

Abstract

Acknowledgments

CHAPTER 1: <u>AIMS AND METHODOLOGY</u>	1-43
1.1. <u>Aims of this Thesis</u>	1
1.2. <u>Approaches</u>	1
1.2.1. <u>Who were “warriors”?</u>	1
1.2.2. <u>What is “war”?</u>	6
1.2.3. <u>The death, dedications, and dwellings of warriors.</u>	9
1.2.4. <u>A regional approach</u>	12
1.2.4.1. Attica	12
1.2.4.2. Central Euboea	13
1.2.4.3. The Argolid	15
1.2.4.4. Knossos	16
1.2.5. <u>Representing war: iconography and literature</u>	16
1.3. <u>Methodology: the Evidence for Warfare</u>	19
1.3.1. <u>Weapons and armour</u>	20
1.3.1.1. Swords and daggers	20
1.3.1.2. Spears and javelins	23
1.3.1.3. Armour	25
1.3.1.4. Archery	27
1.3.1.5. Axes	28

1.3.1.6. Other objects	29
1.3.2. <u>Defensive structures</u>	30
1.3.3. <u>Battlefields and destruction levels</u>	31
1.3.4. <u>Skeletal trauma and mass graves</u>	32
1.4. <u>Previous Research</u>	34
1.5. <u>Chronology</u>	43
CHAPTER 2: <u>THE PALATIAL BRONZE AGE</u>	44-52
2.1. <u>Introduction</u>	44
2.2. <u>The Mycenaean Palaces</u>	44
2.3. <u>Their Destruction</u>	47
2.4. <u>The Palatial Bronze Age: Conclusions</u>	51
CHAPTER 3: <u>WARFARE IN THE POSTPALATIAL PERIOD</u>	53-74
3.1. <u>Introduction</u>	53
3.2. <u>Attica</u>	53
3.2.1. <u>Funerary evidence</u>	53
3.2.2. <u>Settlement evidence</u>	55
3.2.3. <u>Pictorial pottery</u>	55
3.3. <u>Central Euboea</u>	56
3.3.1. <u>Funerary evidence</u>	56
3.3.2. <u>Settlement evidence</u>	56
3.3.3. <u>Pictorial pottery</u>	57
3.3.4. <u>Weapons without contexts</u>	58
3.4. <u>The Argolid</u>	58
3.4.1. <u>Funerary evidence</u>	58
3.4.2. <u>Settlement evidence</u>	59

3.4.3. <u>Pictorial pottery</u>	62
3.5. <u>Knossos and Crete</u>	63
3.5.1. <u>Funerary evidence</u>	63
3.5.2. <u>Settlement evidence</u>	64
3.5.3. <u>Pictorial pottery</u>	64
3.5.4. <u>Weapons without contexts</u>	65
3.6. <u>Achaia</u>	66
3.6.1. <u>Funerary evidence</u>	66
3.6.2. <u>Settlement evidence</u>	68
3.6.3. <u>Pictorial pottery</u>	69
3.6.4. <u>Weapons without contexts</u>	69
3.7. <u>The Postpalatial Aegean: Conclusions</u>	70
CHAPTER 4: <u>FUNERARY EVIDENCE</u>	75-130
4.1. <u>Introduction</u>	75
4.2. <u>Attica</u>	75
4.2.1. <u>Tomb types and burial practices</u>	75
4.2.2. <u>Distribution</u>	77
4.2.3. <u>Weapons in burials</u>	81
4.2.3.1. Swords and daggers	81
4.2.3.2. Spears	82
4.2.3.3. Armour	83
4.2.3.4. Archery	86
4.2.3.5. Axes	88
4.3. <u>Central Euboea</u>	88
4.3.1. <u>Tomb types and burial practices</u>	89

4.3.1.1. Lefkandi	89
4.3.1.2. Eretria	93
4.3.2. <u>Distribution</u>	95
4.3.2.1. Lefkandi	95
4.3.2.2. Eretria	96
4.3.3. <u>Weapons in burials</u>	98
4.3.3.1. Swords and daggers	98
4.3.3.2. Spears	99
4.3.3.3. Armour	100
4.3.3.4. Archery	101
4.3.3.5. Axes	101
4.4. <u>The Argolid</u>	102
4.4.1. <u>Tomb types and burial practices</u>	102
4.4.2. <u>Distribution</u>	107
4.4.2.1. Tiryns	107
4.4.2.2. Argos	107
4.4.2.3. Other areas (Asine, Mycenae, Nauplion)	108
4.4.3. <u>Weapons in burials</u>	109
4.4.3.1. Swords and daggers	109
4.4.3.2. Spears	110
4.4.3.3. Armour	111
4.4.3.4. Archery	115
4.4.3.5. Axes	116
4.5. <u>Knossos</u>	117
4.5.1. <u>Tomb types and burial practices</u>	117

4.5.2. <u>Distribution</u>	121
4.5.3. <u>Weapons in burials</u>	124
4.5.3.1. Swords and daggers	125
4.5.3.2. Spears	126
4.5.3.3. Armour	129
4.5.3.4. Archery	129
4.5.3.5. Axes	130
CHAPTER 5: <u>SANCTUARY EVIDENCE</u>	131-137
5.1. <u>Introduction</u>	131
5.2. <u>Olympia</u>	131
5.3. <u>Delphi</u>	133
5.4. <u>Kalapodi</u>	133
5.5. <u>Other Sanctuaries</u>	134
CHAPTER 6: <u>SETTLEMENT EVIDENCE</u>	138-143
6.1. <u>Introduction</u>	138
6.2. <u>Central Euboea</u>	138
6.3. <u>The Argolid</u>	139
6.4. <u>Other Areas</u>	142
CHAPTER 7: <u>THE “ART” OF WAR</u>	143-159
7.1. <u>Introduction</u>	143
7.2. <u>Figure-Decoration</u>	143
7.2.1. <u>Before the eighth century</u>	143
7.2.2. <u>The eighth century</u>	145
7.2.3. <u>After the eighth century</u>	152
7.3. <u>Literature</u>	156

CHAPTER 8: <u>DISCUSSIONS</u>	160-251
8.1. <u>Introduction</u>	160
8.2. <u>Athens and Attica</u>	160
8.2.1. <u>The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition</u>	160
8.2.2. <u>A period of stability: the tenth and ninth centuries</u>	162
8.2.3. <u>The eighth century</u>	167
8.2.4. <u>Attica: Conclusions</u>	172
8.3. <u>Central Euboea</u>	173
8.3.1. <u>The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition</u>	173
8.3.2. <u>Lefkandi</u>	174
8.3.2.1. The hero of Lefkandi	175
8.3.2.2. The Toumba cemetery	179
8.3.2.3. Beyond the Toumba: Palia Perivolia and the East Cemetery	185
8.3.3. <u>Geometric Euboea</u>	186
8.3.3.1. Iconography and change in the late ninth to eighth centuries	187
8.3.3.2. The “heroes” of Eretria	189
8.3.4. <u>The Lelantine War</u>	191
8.3.5. <u>Central Euboea: Conclusions</u>	193
8.4. <u>The Argolid</u>	195
8.4.1. <u>The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition</u>	195
8.4.2. <u>Burials with weapons and Geometric society</u>	199
8.4.3. <u>Beyond the grave: iconography and dedications</u>	204
8.4.4. <u>The destruction of Asine</u>	207
8.4.4.1. The destruction	207
8.4.4.2. The aftermath	211

8.4.5. <u>The Argolid: Conclusions</u>	212
8.5. <u>Knossos</u>	214
8.5.1. <u>The Bronze Age to Iron Age Transition</u>	214
8.5.2. <u>The cemeteries in use: eleventh to seventh centuries</u>	217
8.5.3. <u>The abandonment of the cemeteries ca. 630 and the Period of Silence ca. 590.</u>	221
8.5.4. <u>Knossos: Conclusions</u>	223
8.6. <u>The Aegean World</u>	224
8.6.1. <u>The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition</u>	225
8.6.2. <u>Warriors and warfare between the eleventh and ninth centuries</u>	229
8.6.3. <u>The intentional destruction of grave goods</u>	235
8.6.4. <u>Warfare and society in the eighth century</u>	241
8.6.5. <u>The first hoplites: warfare in the seventh century</u>	248
CHAPTER 9: <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	251-255
9.1. <u>Conclusions</u>	251
9.2. <u>Further Research</u>	254
BIBLIOGRAPHY	256-299
<u>Abbreviations</u>	256
<u>General</u>	256
<u>Excavation Reports</u>	257
<u>Corpus vasorum antiquorum</u>	263
<u>General Works</u>	264

Volume 2: Appendices and Plates

APPENDIX A: <u>CATALOGUE OF BURIALS WITH WEAPONS</u>	1-113
A1. <u>Athens and Attica</u>	1
A2. <u>Central Euboea</u>	23
A3. <u>The Argolid</u>	38
A4. <u>Knossos</u>	52
A5. <u>Others</u>	102
APPENDIX B: <u>CATALOGUE OF WEAPONS BY SIZE</u>	114-205
B1. <u>Swords and Daggers</u>	114
B2. <u>Spearheads</u>	148
B3. <u>Axes</u>	194
B4. <u>Phalara</u>	202
APPENDIX C: <u>SELECTIVE CATALOGUE OF FIGURED SCENES</u>	206-232
C1. <u>Attic</u>	206
C2. <u>Euboean</u>	220
C3. <u>Argive</u>	226
C4. <u>Knossian</u>	231
TABLES	233-249
<u>List of Tables</u>	233
<u>Tables 1-5</u>	235
GRAPHS 1 AND 2	251
PLATES	253-299
<u>List of Plates</u>	253
<u>Plates 1-40</u>	260

Chapter 1

Introduction: Aims and Methodology

1.1. AIMS OF THIS THESIS

This thesis has two principal aims: the first is to propose a reconstruction of the practice of warfare in the Aegean from the eleventh to the early seventh centuries BCE through an examination of the archaeological evidence for warfare outlined below. The second aim is to explore the role that warriors played in Aegean society in the same period. In order to accomplish these aims a diachronic and regional approach to the evidence will be taken, focusing in particular on the regions of Attica, central Euboea, the Argolid, and Knossos in an attempt to establish potential regional differences in the practice of war, and the varying status warriors held in different areas of the Aegean. While these areas will receive particular attention, evidence will be incorporated from the wider Aegean region to follow developments in warfare more broadly in this period.

1.2. APPROACHES

1.2.1 Who were “warriors”?

There is a conceptual problem with the use of the term “warrior” in an archaeological context. The term “warrior grave” is frequently used in the literature concerning burials with weapons in LBA and EIA Greece (e.g. Popham and Lemos 1995; Papadopoulos, Th. 1999; Deger-Jalkotzy 2006); iconographic armed men are “warriors”, such as on the twelfth-century “Warrior Krater” (e.g. Schliemann 1878, 132-134; Crouwel 1991, 16); the young men buried in the late eighth-century *polyandria* of Paros were also called “warriors” (Zaphiropoulou and Agelarakis 2005). More recently scholars have questioned the

association of weapons with warriors (Whitley 2002; D’Onofrio 2011; Kramer-Hajos 2013). Therefore we must ask the question: what was a “warrior” and how can they be identified?

At its most literal, a warrior is “one who makes war”, which can be interpreted as an individual with the social right to wage war (Molloy 2012, 88). Our understanding of social rights in the Bronze and Iron Ages is dependent on material culture, such as the burials and iconography mentioned above. This approach has been undermined by cross-comparisons between ancient Greek and Anglo-Saxon burials with weapons, as in the latter case very young children are buried with weapons: “So-called warrior graves are not necessarily the graves of warriors” (Whitley 2002, 218-219). Whitley argues that “weapon burial rituals” represent a kind of masculine ideal, reaffirming the relationship between prowess in battle and political authority (2002, 220); while Tandy characterizes eighth-century men buried with weapons as “self-styled warriors” (1997, 155). But it is difficult to see how this self-styling ideology could be sustained unless it was based partially on evidence that these men had prowess in battle. As Keeley states, weapons may have symbolic significance but they are essentially used for violence (1996, 90).

Treherne presents a similar argument to Keeley, focusing on the ideology of the warrior elite in the European Bronze Age (1995). Treherne argued that the concept of ideology which has generally been used to account for “warrior burials” across Europe in the LBA was deficient. He proposed approaching burials with weapons by questioning *why* weapons were the means through which social identity was expressed and power legitimized in LBA Europe, focusing on socio-historical context and the meanings behind these objects. Harrell argues further that political legitimacy, the social right to “make war”, is not static but must be maintained through action and implementation (2009, 209). Finally, there is the further material expression of warrior status through the shaping of the male body through a

lifestyle requiring training and battle (Molloy 2012, 88-89). Thus warriors in the LBA created the masculine ideal through action.

While the core idea of burials with weapons as prestigious burials appears in both LBA and EIA, there are significant differences between the burials of the two periods. In LBA burials razors and tweezers are frequently associated with weapons (Treherne 1995, 120-122), but this is less obvious in the EIA. In many areas there is a shift in burial practices from inhumation to cremation, especially in association with weapons (Ruppenstein 2013; Whitley 2002, 227). Therefore many of the ideas about the body in association with weapons have collapsed at the end of the Bronze Age.

When we turn to the EIA we are faced with two questions: can weapons be shown to be an expression of social identity and the legitimization of power; if so why were these objects used in this way? The symbolic power of iron has been widely discussed (Morris 2000, 210-218). Weapons are among the most prominent iron objects in the EIA; even if iron itself is a symbol of power, the use of iron weapons in particular suggests that it is their function as weapons which prompted this selection.

One practice for which there is some evidence is the wearing of arms in public, literally “bearing iron” (Thuc. 1.5.3-6.3; Arist. *Pol.* 1268b25-40; Snodgrass 1980, 100). Snodgrass argues that the abandonment of this practice, which is dated to coincide with the decline in burials with weapons at the end of the eighth century, represents the decline of the aristocratic warrior ideal. However, this may not have been limited to the élite but to any independent man who knew how to use a sword or spear as almost every man depicted on LG pottery carries a sword (van Wees 1998a, 336). Van Wees suggests that the limited presence of weapons in burials is the result of only a few having the means to dispose of wealth in this way; furthermore the absence of armour can be explained if we believe that weapons

represent the clothing of daily life, not of battle, in which men were buried (1998a, 338-340). Once again, this explanation begs the question: *why* do weapons have this symbolic significance in the EIA?

Alternative terms for burials with weapons include “princely tombs” in Italy and Cyprus, while Morris has suggested that in Greece “heroic” is more descriptive than “princely” (1999). “Hero” is no less complex than “warrior”. In Lefkandi and Eretria “hero” is used to designate burials with weapons above which were constructed buildings or monuments interpreted as commemorative (Popham *et al.* 1982a; *Eretria* III). West has suggested that in the *Iliad* the best translation for “ἥρως” is often “warrior”, although the use of the word is broader in the *Odyssey* and the *Works and Days* (West 1978, 370-373). In the *Odyssey* a “hero” can be a warrior, a youth, or a bard (*Od.* 3.415; 4.21; 8.483; van Wees 2006, 367-369); meanwhile in the *Works and Days* it is an entire race of anonymous, dead men (*Op.* 156-174; West 1978, 186).

Antonaccio gives the most comprehensive account of EIA “heroes” (1995a). She places “heroes” within the confines of Greek religion; once mortal individuals, separate from the gods but deserving of worship. One category of “hero” is the “warrior”. For graves, Antonaccio suggests the term *basileus*, translated as “big man” to ensure that there is no implication of lineage as there would be if translated monarch or ruler (1995b, 15-16; 2002, 13-14). However, Antonaccio’s focus is on ancestors, not warriors, and their creation in the archaeological record. It seems best to consider these words – warrior, hero, and ancestor – almost as synonyms; they are used for the same individuals but are distinct in time. A warrior in life might become a hero in death, who in turn could become an ancestor.

There is tenuous evidence for “hero cult” in the LBA which, if verified, would support the idea that ἥρως maintains some kind of cultic meaning until the earliest certain

attestation of hero cult in the sixth century (Bravo 2009, 12). The notion of heroes as individuals who retained some kind of power after death is a strong one, and van Wees suggests that it is reflected in Homer by the contrary emphasis on the powerlessness of the dead in the *Odyssey* (2006, 371). Morris argues that, after Zeus wiped out the race of heroes as recounted in the *Works and Days*, it was possible for men to be pronounced heroes if they died a heroic death and received the heroic funerary rites (1999, 59, 66). Whitley provides the most convincing argument that burials with weapons should be connected to heroic burials (2002, 226-227), although even this fails to account for the fact that the burials in the epics do not quite match up to burials in the archaeological record.

The definition can be further refined through comparison with another term, sometimes incorrectly used for the Greek hoplite: “soldier”. A soldier is “one who serves in an army for pay”, implying professionalization unnecessary for the warrior, but appropriate for mercenaries. Besides pay, training is also usually considered to be a distinguishing factor between a soldier and a warrior. Soldiers are trained and equipped by the army of which they are an anonymous part, while the warrior trains and equips himself through his own means; the warrior’s motive for fighting is personal, individual, as are his weapons and his power, which serve as extensions of the self (Treherne 1995, 127-129). Warrior status is restricted to those with wealth and leisure time for this training (Molloy 2012, 90); warrior status is thus also expressed through the luxury and excess of this class (Treherne 1995, 129).

Our understanding of warriors is the result of interpretation of material evidence connected both to violence and to individuals. “Warriors”, in our understanding, are the expression of a concept through material culture. “Warriors” implies those who acquire or maintain their legitimacy through the threat or practice of violence or warfare. The question of an EIA warrior lifestyle will be considered, but not assumed. For the purpose of analysis the term “burial with weapons” will be used rather than “warrior tomb” or “princely tomb”.

Neither will the term “hero” be used, for while it is culturally specific to the Aegean it is not clear that this word supports the meaning ascribed to it in this period.

1.2.2 What is “war”?

It might be supposed that the relationship between warriors and warfare was a simple one. If a warrior is one who “makes war”, and is identified through weapons given to him in burial, war is surely the process enacted through these weapons. Unfortunately, war is not that simple. War is a subcategory of violence, and despite its universality the form violence takes is a culturally determined process which varies widely (Sluka 1992, 22-23). Defining war can come across as a mere terminological exercise, but it is an important way of understanding the role of violence in society (Claessen 2006, 217). The question “what was war?” is valid for any society.

Evidence for large-scale warfare, represented by the destruction of settlements, is absent in the EIA (Snodgrass 2000, 297-298). However, it is not correct to take this as evidence that there was no warfare at all, as some have supposed (Tandy 1997, 35). Snodgrass concludes, “Warfare there must have been”; while there are no destructions other evidence – such as the refuge settlements of Crete, fortifications, and burials with weapons – indicates that there was war. Lemos’ suggestion that the PG period was generally peaceful perhaps cannot hold for Athens where burials with weapons are common, but could be true of most of the Aegean for the first century or so of this period (2002, 1; see Ch.8.6.2). The form war took in the EIA Aegean must have been much smaller in scale than in the preceding and subsequent periods.

A simple definition of war may be the best place to start. Bossen, for example, defines war as *“the organised use or threat of use of lethal force by a minimum of two or more actors from one group against members of another group, which is interpreted by the actors and/or*

the analyst as part of the relations between two such groups” (2006, 91). Such a definition incorporates small-scale violence, but could be accused of being too broad for requiring the participation of as few as two members of a group.

An important part of Bossen’s definition is that war must be interpreted as war by the parties involved. We have no way of establishing how certain acts of violence were conceived by their practitioners in the EIA Aegean; our only clue comes from the Homeric epics, which as Raaflaub stated include raids by warrior bands (1999, 129), but also the siege and destruction of Troy and the vengeance slaughter of the suitors by Odysseus. Therefore, in the absence of destructions, we are left with raids as the main form of warfare in the EIA.¹

The difficulty in interpreting raiding as a form of warfare is the question of legitimacy: who determines or permits the act of violence which we see as war? Many definitions of warfare emphasize the role of legitimacy, such as O’Brien’s: “the direction of organized and legitimized potentially deadly violence by one human group towards another, with a perceived “otherness” often existing between the groups involved” (2009, 28). O’Brien is clear that legitimacy is difficult to identify and that it can be contested; the same can be said for his concept of “otherness”.

With raids, it is tempting to suggest that they may have been a form of illegitimate conflict which made non-aristocratic men rich;² or they could have been a means through which aristocratic men became wealthier. On the other hand, the figures identified as “warriors” may be interpreted as those who determined or permitted acts of violence in EIA

¹ Definitions of war such as that of Brothwell, which explicitly excludes raiding, are of limited use not only to prehistory but also to much of history (1999, 25). Brothwell wishes to define war as depersonalized; raids give the “warriors” taking part too much of a personal stake or reward (1999, 33-34). This distinction is worthwhile in distinguishing a soldier from a warrior; however, if a warrior is literally one who “makes war” then Brothwell’s distinction is somewhat defunct.

² Perhaps like mercenary service (Hale 2013).

warfare. Raiding and piracy may also explain some of the “imported” artefacts which are found in many EIA burials, including burials with weapons.

Another important distinction to be made is between the process of “warfare” investigated by anthropologists and historically situated “wars”, which are the domain of historians (Parker Pearson 2005, 22-23). Parker Pearson warns that while anthropologists and processual archaeologists favour generalizing structures which overemphasize functional explanations for warfare, such as overpopulation, the causes of historical wars are a complex mesh of interests, events, processes, and intentions – his example is the Second World War (also Wileman 2009, 2). The anthropological and materialist archaeological approaches consider war to be an inevitable consequence of certain factors, such as a strain on vital resources, without considering human agency and historically contingent events such as ideology and religion.

If war is not always inevitable, we must consider the possibility that sometimes groups chose not to go to war. This would not be visible in the archaeological record; our only recourse is literary. A number of different institutions existed to prevent warfare in historical Greece, such as kinship diplomacy (Hornblower 2007, 25-26). The oft cited passage of Plato’s *Laws* which suggests that the Greeks were invariably at war has been debunked by van Wees (Plato *Leges* 625e-626a; van Wees 2004, 2-3). At an earlier time there were those states, such as Argos, who surrendered to the Persians (e.g. Hdt. 8.150). The myth of the Trojan War includes a delegation sent to resolve the conflict and return Helen to Menelaos before the war begins, suggesting that the whole war could have been avoided.³ This seems to imply that war was considered to be a choice.

³ This embassy is referenced at *Il.* 3.205, but its purpose is not directly stated. It is described in the *Cypria* and by Herodotus (Hdt. 2.118.2-4).

This thesis starts with the hypothesis that war and warfare were important social processes in the EIA, primarily taking the form of raids and piracy rather than interregional conflict. Warriors were the legitimizing figures behind warfare, which also reinforced their social importance. However, the resurgence of settlement destructions in the late eighth century indicates the changing concept of warfare in the EIA Aegean.

1.2.3 The death, dedications, and dwellings of warriors

Chapters 4-6 of this thesis present the Early Iron Age evidence for warfare from a variety of contexts. Understanding the nature of these contexts and the processes of deposition is vital to our understanding of the practice of warfare.

Chapter 4 focuses on the funerary evidence, i.e. burials with weapons. EIA funerary contexts have been primarily studied as indicators of social status and power dynamics within the Aegean societies (e.g. Morris 1987). Social status is an important element of this study but as discussed above further questions arise from the use of weapons as indicators of a masculine ideal: why is it weapons which are put to this purpose in the grave rather than some other object?

Tarlow argued forcefully that there is more to the funeral than manifestations of power (1992). Funerals are emotive events which require the expression of grief in a culturally specific way. This may have been achieved through grave goods, ritual, or commemoration. An obvious example from the EIA is the representation of many mourners on LG pottery, which show the expression of grief through the prescription of ritual (Cavanagh and Mee 1995, 55).

While the relationship between grave goods and the individual with whom they are buried is not a simple one, if these symbols are to have any power they must have some kind

of presence beyond the funerary sphere. Parker Pearson shows the possibility of lying through grave goods by comparing the necessity of a warrior “or individual of warrior status” carrying a sword to that of a modern executive requiring a mobile phone (2003, 9); but the mobile phone of a modern executive is an entirely functional object which has changed the way in which business operates. A non-functional object has no symbolic power unless it represents something which is functional. We must not be blind to cultural specificities, but the presence or absence of certain kinds of grave goods is of great importance to our understanding of burials.

A comparable case concerning ritual is Ruppenstein’s study of the widespread adoption of cremation in the EIA (2013). Ruppenstein admirably presents the limited evidence for cremation in LH IIIC, the greater evidence from PG, and finds close parallels to suggest that the inspiration for the use of cremation in each period had different geographical origins; however, he fails to answer the question *why* cremation was adopted at these times and from these places. Tarlow’s example of the adoption of cremation in Victorian England suggests that there were many interconnected reasons which had different influence on different groups (1992, 132-134). The case in EIA Greece may be the reverse of Victorian England, for while in the latter cremation was a short, simple, and unfussy way to dispose of a body, in the former pyres were long-burning and impressive; but the concept that there are many intersecting reasons for changes in funerary rites holds for both periods.

Commemoration of the grave in the EIA predominantly took the form of vases which, in the Geometric Period, became increasingly monumental. The iconographic evidence is considered separately to the evidence of grave goods, although it also represents a response to death and, in many cases, to warfare.

Chapter 5 presents the evidence from sanctuaries. Sanctuaries, like burials, are intentionally constructed deposits which have both a social and a ritual function. The change in the deposition of objects from burials to sanctuaries in the EIA Aegean has been considered to be the result of changes in the visibility and location of conspicuous consumption in the late eighth century, without the loss of its function as competition between élite groups (Morris 1986b, 12-13). As with burial contexts, this is a functional explanation which ignores the specifics of the choice of votive. The changing pattern of the deposition of weapons undoubtedly has social connotations, but the continued use of weapons as symbols of social status indicates that their functional purpose remained important.

Funerary and sanctuary contexts are presented separately in the main part of this thesis for several reasons. The first is chronological. The evidence from sanctuaries covers only the latest part of this thesis, and in investigating warfare before the eighth century it cannot be considered. Secondly, the regional distribution of burials with weapons and that of sanctuaries at which weapons are dedicated is different. While there are weapons dedicated at the sanctuary of Athena at Sounion in Attica and pottery which depicts warfare at the Argive Heraion, it is the PanHellenic sanctuary of Olympia and the Phocian sanctuary of Apollo at Abai (Kalapodi) which receive the most significant dedications of weapons. Finally, I believe that the interpretation of burials with weapons and dedication of arms at sanctuaries as fundamentally similar acts has clouded interpretations of changes in Aegean warfare in the eighth century which are reflected in the changes in the deposition of weapons. This is not to say that Morris' interpretation is incorrect, but that in investigating warfare in this period it is unhelpful.

The evidence from settlements, which is presented in Chapter 6, must be considered in a different light. Fortifications are also intentional constructions, which may have social

and ritual significance, but their defensive function is paramount to this meaning. Settlements may be destroyed with intent, but not with the careful consideration of the grave or the dedication. A fundamental difference is our interpretation of weapons in destruction deposits. While clearing of battlefields may take place, and post-conflict activity is an important factor in any discussion of destruction, weapons which are excavated in destruction levels were probably used. Furthermore, early Greek literature describes buildings in which weapons and armour were displayed on the walls (e.g. *Od.* 19.4-13), and some of the weapons in prothesis scenes have been taken to indicate that these were internal scenes with weapons hanging from the walls (e.g. *Ath13*; Ahlberg 1971b, 42). Unfortunately, finds of weapons in these contexts are rare in this period. A bronze *phalaron* from Nichoria was found on the floor of a DA II building (ca. 975-850), but these objects are too controversial to attach great significance to this (*Nichoria* III, 280-281; see below Ch.1.3.1.3).

1.2.4 A regional approach

The majority of this thesis will focus on four specific regions: Attica, central Euboea, the Argolid, and Knossos (Plate 1a). These regions have been selected because they have produced substantial evidence for this period. Certain regions have been excluded due to the word limit (e.g. Thessaly; most of Crete); while a number of regions which have not produced enough significant evidence cannot be considered in the same level of detail (e.g. Laconia; the Corinthia). Each of these regions will be presented separately in order to indicate the interesting variations which occur across the Aegean in this period before the overall trends are considered.

1.2.4.1 Attica

The majority of evidence from the region of Attica in the EIA comes from Athens, including forty-three of the fifty burials in Appendix A1. It is debatable how far Attica can be

considered as a cultural unit in this period, but there are remarkable similarities in the burial customs and pottery styles. For example, ATT48-50 are all ‘trench-and-hole’ cremations, the common Athenian type. The handful of burials with weapons and iconographic depictions of warfare from the area of Attica are therefore considered alongside those from Athens in this thesis.

Exploration of the cemeteries of Athens began in the late nineteenth century CE; these have been published in various reports and volumes throughout the last century. The most thoroughly explored cemetery is the Kerameikos (*Kerameikos I*; *Kerameikos IV*; *Kerameikos V*; *Kerameikos XVIII*). The area of the Classical Agora, where excavations began in 1931, also revealed important EIA burials. While the full publication of these burials remains forthcoming, reports have appeared in *Hesperia*. Other EIA burials in Athens are known principally through rescue excavations.

Elsewhere in Attica the evidence is more limited. The majority of the evidence comes from reports in the area of Marathon, which are currently under study (Mazarakis Ainian 2011). In other areas burials are usually chance finds (e.g. McDonald 1961).

Athens has produced the most extensive evidence for figurative pottery from the eighth and seventh centuries, and much of this is relevant. Unfortunately, while much of this appears to have come from the Dipylon Cemetery on Piraeus Street excavated in the 1890s, it was then dispersed around the museums of Europe and many Late Geometric fragments and vases identified as Attic do not have a secure context.

1.2.4.2 Central Euboea

The island of Euboea is the second largest in the Aegean, after Crete. It is east of Attica, separated by the Euboean Gulf, including the narrow Euripus Strait. The shores of the island

along this Gulf provide much better harbours than those facing the Aegean, and many of the settlements of the island were well connected to both the opposite regions on the mainland and the wider world (Plate 9a).

The principal sites in central Euboea are Chalcis, Eretria, and Lefkandi. Chalcis, the site which lies at the closest point of Euboea to the mainland, is likely to have been of some importance from the Bronze Age; however, the modern occupation of the site has limited the scale of excavation and comparatively little is known about the EIA settlement. The few EIA burials excavated have not revealed any relevant artefacts or figure-decorated pottery (Themelis 1969).

Early excavations in Eretria uncovered the burials of the West Cemetery or Hygeionomeion (Kourouniotis 1903); but the most significant excavations were those at the West Gate in the 1960s, where the so-called Heroön was discovered (*Eretria* III). The excavation and studies of the material at Eretria are on-going, with regular publications and analyses of material.

The site of Lefkandi, of which the ancient name is unknown, was also discovered in the 1960s. Excavation of the settlement on the Xeropolis tell originally began in 1964; excavation of the cemeteries followed in the 1970s. The Toumba cemetery was excavated further in the 1980s, during which period another “Heroön” was uncovered. These excavations have only partially been published, but the information available shows the importance of this cemetery (Popham *et al.* 1982a; 1982b; Popham and Lemos 1995; *Lefkandi* II.1; *Lefkandi* II.2; *Lefkandi* III). Excavations resumed on Xeropolis in 2003.

Figurative pottery of the eighth century has been found at all of these sites, although warriors and warfare are depicted less frequently than in Athens. Euboean overseas activity means that other sites have revealed pottery from the island; notably the work of the Cesnola

Workshop and locally produced Euboean-style pottery at Pithekoussai in the bay of Naples (Coldstream 1971; 2000b).

Historians also place the “Lelantine War” between Chalcis and Eretria in this period (Thuc. 1.15.3; Parker 1997).

1.2.4.3 The Argolid

West of Attica, across the Saronic Gulf, is the Argolid. The focus of attention in studies of the Argolid is the Argive Plain, which lies on the western side of the Argolic peninsula, north of the Argolic gulf. This plain is delineated by mountains, and the settlements tend to be on the outskirts: Mycenae to the north, Tiryns, Nauplion, and Asine to the south, and Argos to the west (Plate 16a).

In the EIA the best known site in the Argolid is Argos, where numerous burials have been excavated. While some of the Geometric burials have been published (*Argos I*), much of the evidence for the PG period is only available from reports in *BCH* and *ADelt*.

Besides Argos, Tiryns is the most well-known site of the EIA as a result of the excavations of the cemetery at Philaki (Verdelis 1963). Part of this cemetery is yet to be published (Chatzipouliou 1980). Extensive excavations at Mycenae have focused on earlier periods and limited evidence for EIA burials has been found; at Nauplion the excavations have also revealed little. The burials from Asine do not contain weapons, however the destruction of the settlement at the end of the eighth century is known through excavation (*Asine I*, 437).

Significant amounts of figurative pottery are known from the Argolid, principally from Argos but also Tiryns. Some of these show armed men, but few are concerned with actual conflict with the exception of those from the Argive Heraion.

1.2.4.4 Knossos

Knossos lies about five kilometres inland from the coast of central Crete, south of Heraklion. The main area of occupation is the prehistoric tell where the Minoan palace was excavated. The tell lies in a valley; the cemeteries are located in the surrounding hills.

While the Bronze Age occupation is better known than the EIA, both cemeteries and settlement dating to this period are known at Knossos. The cemeteries have been excavated at various times, with the most extensive focused on the site of the Medical Faculty of the University of Crete in 1978, preceded by those at Fortetsa (*KNC*; *Fortetsa*). Numerous other chamber tombs have been excavated in the area around Knossos since the time of the earliest excavations in the late nineteenth century CE and have been reported in *BSA*. Furthermore, the area has been extensively surveyed on several occasions, including the on-going Knossos Urban Landscape Project (*KS*²; Evelyn 2010).

Figurative pottery occurs earlier in the EIA at Knossos than elsewhere, but nonetheless only a handful of examples show warfare. The significant number of tombs means that much of this pottery is intact and preserves its context.

1.2.5 Representing war: iconography and literature

The difficulty in using iconography and literature as a source, and not just for warfare, is the subjectivity involved in its interpretation (see e.g. Snodgrass 2013; Viggiano and van Wees 2013). But art remains the greatest way to gain an insight into the minds of ancient people. The art and literature of the EIA Aegean, which will be explored in Chapter 7, is the best way to understand what the Aegean people thought about warfare at that time.

From the eleventh to the ninth centuries there is very little iconographic evidence in the Aegean, and while writing reappears not long after figurative vase painting, known early

literature is probably no earlier than the late eighth or seventh centuries. On the other hand, myth and oral epic were active in the Aegean throughout the EIA, as the Bronze Age remnants in the Homeric epics clearly indicate. The change from an absence of pictorial representation and the beginnings of narrative literature are important watersheds and will be discussed elsewhere (Ch.7.2.2). But it is significant that a major part of the iconographic repertoire of the eighth and seventh centuries, as well as many of the surviving works of early Greek literature, were concerned with war.

An important issue is to establish how distinct literature and iconography were as art forms. For example, if vase painting was inspired by epic this may not indicate separate approaches to war but an imitation of another's reflections. The depiction of scenes showing the narrative of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* provide a *terminus ante quem* for the consolidation of these poems, and it has been argued that their cultural impact is such that they cannot have been composed long before they are illustrated in vase painting (West 2011, 16). While Ahlberg suggested that it is often not possible to show whether a scene is based on epic or reality, Snodgrass has argued convincingly through a close reading of both vases and epics that even the earliest definite scenes of myth do not represent the surviving epics (Ahlberg 1971a, 55-59; Snodgrass 1998).

The relationship of these representations to reality is still complex, but as Snodgrass said of LG vase painting, "Even if the subject-matter of all these scenes were legendary, it would be extraordinary if the artist's depiction of them was not in some way coloured by his experience of contemporary warfare" (2006a, 313). The approach is mirrored in certain analyses of oral epic poetry, which suggest that in order to be comprehensible to the contemporary audience many of the features of the poem will be updated in the telling (Morris 2001, 59-61). The iconographical and literary evidence was produced from the same cultural milieu, suggesting a similar approach (Ahlberg 1971a, 53); but the form and function

of the media in which they are executed require different treatments of the subjects (Snodgrass 1998, 62-63). Different media, combined with the different social standing of the poet and the painter, means that they should reflect different aspects of the same phenomenon.

The context in which iconography and literature would be received is also of importance. Early iconographic vases were funerary, but unlike militaristic grave goods these vases would be on public display for some time after their original production. Therefore, the scene would have been open to the interpretation of any individual that saw it, even if the commissioning family of the original grave-marker placed specific meaning in the scene depicted on the vase. Snodgrass suggests that LG vase-painters were more concerned with composition than scene, and calls these vases “objects to make up stories about” (1998, 159). Regardless of the vase-painter’s intent, if these scenes were to be understood by their wider audience then it is most likely that they were generic rather than specific. Ahlberg’s attempts to connect LG vase paintings to actual battles were fruitless, although she did believe that the scenes depicted represented battles in the lives of the deceased (1971a, 55-59, 69). It is plausible that these may have been intended to invoke actual battles but we should not think that painters were depicting specific events which they may not have witnessed; rather, as Snodgrass suggests, they used their understanding of a contemporary phenomenon to create a generic scene.

Morris proposed that the Homeric epics were the product of a conservative, aristocratic élite whose powers were waning in the eighth century, who thus needed to reassert themselves and show their actions to be the will of the gods in order to survive (2001, 81-88). This limits the social significance of these poems to a slim segment of society, which is the “heroic” section on which the poems focus. Hesiod, meanwhile, represents the view of the “Middling” farmer who rejects the splendour of the aristocracy and values hard work and

justice (Morris 1997, 11-12). The main difficulty with this view is that the archaeological evidence suggests that there was no particular expansion of the use of the rural landscape at the end of the eighth century, so the presence of a new “middling” farming class is tenuous until sometime later (Foxhall 2013).

Lyric poetry probably had cultic contexts, which renders their likelihood to depict autobiographical scenes unlikely (Budermann 2009, 9; Carey 2009a, 23; Snodgrass 1980, 194-195). Furthermore, the biographical approach of many older works of scholarship based on the lyric ‘I’ (see e.g. Fränkel 1975, 151 n.50), the first person used in many of the poems, is thoroughly questioned by modern scholarship (Budermann 2009, 16-17). However, this should not be cause for despair. Rather than utilizing poetry to understand particular historical wars, as with vase painting we should rather look for a more generic understanding of the practice and importance of warfare in the contemporary setting of these poems.

The age old question remains: what *is* the contemporary setting of these poems? The question is more vexed for Homer and Hesiod (see Ch.1.4), but it is hardly uncontroversial for the lyric poets either (see Ch.7.3). It is argued by some scholars that what lyric poets represent is not an individual poet but the collected poetic tradition of a *polis* attributed to an ‘original’ poet who is then given heroic status (Hall 2013, 6). While much of the early Greek lyric poetry which survives is considered to be post-Homeric, the genre itself is likely to have predated full-scale epic (Budermann 2009, 14-15).

1.3. METHODOLOGY: THE EVIDENCE FOR WARFARE

In order for warfare to be traced archaeologically it must have an impact on the archaeological record. The principle evidence for this impact which has been previously studied is the category of armour and weapons (e.g. Snodgrass 1964; 1999); but there are a number of different categories which have been suggested by other scholars (e.g. Ferguson

2008, 15; Wileman 2009; Johannesson and Machicek 2010). The evidence varies chronologically and geographically. The categories relevant to the study of the EIA Aegean are weapons and armour, defensive structures, destructions, human remains, and iconography and literature as outlined above.

1.3.1 Weapons and armour

1.3.1.1 Swords and daggers

Swords are close combat weapons and are considered to be the first weapon specifically designed for use against humans (Snodgrass 1999, 15-16; Wileman 2009, 13-14). The invention of the sword represents a transformation of the conception of violence (Harrell 2009, 17). Meanwhile, daggers are more likely to have alternative functions, such as ritual or hunting – while the dagger can be used to either thrust or stab, its use as a cutting weapon is limited. Unlike Bronze Age rapiers, the melee swords found in the EIA do not require as intense training to use effectively (Wileman 2009, 14). Molloy has shown through experimental archaeology that the distinction between a sword and a dagger suggested by Gordon – that a sword should be able to deliver a cutting blow – may not be applicable for many LBA swords (Gordon 1953, 68; Molloy 2010, 414-422). It is not possible to say if this criticism is applicable to EIA swords and daggers.

The swords and daggers of the EIA predominantly follow the style of the LBA *griffzungenschwert*, or Naue type II sword (Plate 22a). The only exceptions included in this thesis are Swo083, and a sword from KNS18,⁴ seventh-century swords from Knossos (Plate 21a). It is usually supposed that the *griffzungenschwert* could be used both for cutting and thrusting, and both actions were represented on LG vases (Ahlberg 1971a, 46-47). However, Molloy's experiments based on LBA replicas suggest that this interpretation is overstated and

⁴ A similar, fragmentary, example appeared in KNS29.

that *griffzungenschwerter* would not be capable of cleaving bone (2005; 2010, 421-422). Furthermore, the distinction between cutting and thrusting weapons is clouded by the fact that, unlike the LBA examples, the *griffzungenschwerter* of the EIA include both swords and daggers.

A variety of different proposals have been put forward as the means by which swords and daggers can be distinguished. Gordon suggested that the difference between the weapons could be determined by length, with 50.8 cm⁵ as the distinction between a “dirk” and a “short-sword” (1953, 67). Half a metre was the measurement apparently independently proposed by Desborough (1964, 67). Based on the *griffzungenschwerter* he studied, Snodgrass suggested a division at 45 cm (1964, 104), while Kilian-Dirlmeier proposed 30 cm, somewhat below Gordon’s dividing line between a “dagger” and a “dirk” (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 5). Snodgrass criticized this decision: “some specimens that, although complete, achieve that length barely or not at all do not really *look* like swords, however defined” (1996, 181).

Gordon appreciated that his choice of length was subjective (1953, 67). The need for an objective element is recognized by a number of scholars but rarely attempted. Kilian-Dirlmeier stated that the definition of the two should be *relative*, not absolute, as the use of swords and daggers in combat was complimentary and not alternative (1993, 5). The occurrence of swords and daggers with the same burial is rare, and is no more common than the appearance of more than one sword or more than one dagger. On the other hand, depictions of men wearing swords and daggers in LG pottery do seem to show swords and daggers together.

⁵ Converted from 20 inches.

Three measurements are important for distinguishing between swords and daggers: the length and the width of the blade, and the ratio of blade to handle. To this may be added the thickness of the blade and the presence of a midrib, which affect the use of the weapon. Unfortunately, this evidence is not always available in the publications of weapons. Therefore for this analysis I have used simply the length of the sword (blade and handle) in order to determine if there is a point at which the physical evidence suggests that a dividing line can be drawn between weapons which are “swords” and weapons which are “daggers”. The swords used are those from the regions and sanctuaries under consideration in this thesis which can be considered complete, or nearly complete; this totals 72 swords. This evidence is summarized in Table 5 and Graph 1.⁶

The range of the lengths of swords is 15-90 cm. with two peaks in the distribution: in the 30.1-35.0 and 55.1-60.0 cm ranges.⁷ However, distribution is fairly consistent throughout the range of lengths suggesting that clearly defined categories did not exist (see Graph 2). Therefore we may say that “daggers” cover a range of *ca.* 15 – *ca.* 45 cm, with the most common length around 35 cm, while “short-swords” are those above *ca.* 45 cm to *ca.* 66 cm. At this point there is a leap in the lengths of known swords. I suggest that swords between *ca.* 70 and *ca.* 90 cm be considered “medium-swords”.⁸

The longest of these swords (79.5-90 cm) are certainly a distinct set. A significant number of these swords are bent out of shape (“killed”; see Ch.8.6.3), which would have required hammering out of shape, probably by a professional smith (D’Onofrio 2011, 651-653). However, bending these swords in half or into loops requires the iron to have a level of ductility which would have reduced their effectiveness (Haarer 2000, 221). Harder iron

⁶ Full contextual information for each sword is available in Appendix B1.

⁷ This analysis owes much to the methodology outlined in Bridgeford 1993, 26-28.

⁸ The category of “long-sword” would apply to those weapons from the graves at Vergina, which regularly exceed a metre in length (*Vergina I*, 261-265).

swords would shatter, as would bronze swords, which may account for the breaking of those medium-swords which are not bent, but broken (e.g. [Swo112](#)). It is therefore possible that in order to make swords of an impressive or impractical length, smiths sacrificed the functionality of these swords.⁹ It is impossible to be certain about this point unless chemical analysis of the swords is undertaken.

Ultimately, if “sword” and “dagger” are to be useful categories a distinction of *function* must be the primary aim (Gordon 1953, 71-78). The published information does not allow for a complete analysis of the iron swords from Greece of the fashion that Bridgeford has conducted for LBA Ireland (1993); therefore conclusions here are tentative. I suggest that daggers (<45 cm) were primarily stabbing weapons used for finishing off opponents; “short-swords” (45-66 cm) were melee weapons used for thrusting and minor cuts; while for “medium-swords” (66/70-90 cm) their visibility may have been as important as their combat potential.

1.3.1.2 Spears and javelins

Spears can be long, medium, and short range weapons depending on the way in which they were used. A key question in the analysis of spears in this period is whether they are thrusting weapons or missile weapons – javelins. Snodgrass suggests that, in cases where two spearheads are found together, when one spearhead is short and the other long then the former is for throwing while the latter is for thrusting (1964, 137). Other indications of javelins are a slender head and a long socket, so that the spear is not balanced too favourably towards the head (Plate 21c).

It may be the case that when more than one spear is carried into battle at least one is to be thrown, but this need not be the case when a burial contains more than one spear.

⁹ I am indebted to Dr. Peter Haarer for discussing the functional qualities of iron with me and informing this discussion.

Snodgrass suggests, by analogy with swords, that multiple spears in a burial serve “as a demonstration of the deceased’s wealth or prowess” (1964, 115-116). But of one-hundred-and-six graves in Attica, Euboea, and the Argolid fifteen included multiple spears, compared to only two with multiple swords (EUB25 and EUB28). Multiple daggers occur in three graves in the Argolid (ARG01; ARG10; ARG12) and swords with daggers in two graves in Athens (ATT13; ATT33) and one in Argos (ARG22). The evidence from Knossos is more complicated. Several spears were published as pairs such as Spe099 and Spe119, while several pairs of spears appear to have corroded together in tombs such as KNS32. The disturbed nature of these tombs means that it is not always possible to tell if there is more than one sword or dagger with an individual burial; certainly where burial groups are discerned this does not appear to happen. Therefore, the analogy with swords indicates that weapons in burials are more likely to relate to function, in this case throwing, than to prestige. More than two spears, especially if they are of similar size and weight, are taken to indicate the wealth of the deceased (Snodgrass 1964, 137). This need not be the case, as LG pottery shows men holding up to three spears (Ath11), and it is perfectly possible that more than one or two could be thrown in combat.

A question which is rarely discussed with regards to EIA spearheads is the absence of spear butts. Only one object which was interpreted by the excavators as a butt has been included in Appendix B2 (Spe011); this was discovered without a spearhead.¹⁰ In cases such as ATT03 and ARG17, where a much smaller spear is paired with a much larger one, it seems possible that these smaller heads may in fact have been used as spear-butts, if we take Spe011 as evidence that they were certainly known in the EIA Aegean. Corroborating evidence, such as their position in the grave which might indicate that they were at the top

¹⁰ It is possible that the fragments of the spearhead in this tomb (EUB05) were misidentified as fragments of the dagger (Pers. comm. I Lemos from the forthcoming publication of the material by I. Kilian-Dirlmeier).

and bottom of a spear-shaft, is not available as ATT03 is an urn cremation and ARG17 has a subsequent burial which may have disturbed it.

Of the one-hundred-and-fifty-two spears in Appendix B2, thirty-two are bronze compared to just five of one-hundred-and-sixteen swords. With the exception of a spearhead from Knossos which is difficult to date (Spe084, PGB-LO) and the particular case of Spe013 in EUB25, these tend to date to SMyc/SMin-EPG in graves or LG in sanctuaries.

1.3.1.3 Armour

Armour includes helmets, shields, cuirasses, greaves, and other protective gear. Between the eleventh and eighth centuries, there is almost no evidence for any of this in the Aegean. It is usually suggested that some form of protective gear existed in perishable form, as it appears in LH IIIC and LG iconography (Snodgrass 1964, 37-38).

Where it exists, identifying this equipment is largely uncontroversial. The helmets from several Argive graves (ARG01, ARG15, ARG18, and ARG19) are securely identified, although the fragment in ATT33 causes minor difficulties, especially as it is not illustrated. Similarly, the cuirass in ARG15 could hardly be anything else. In the late eighth and seventh centuries, when these objects appear in sanctuaries, their functions and typologies become even clearer.

On the other hand bronze *phalara*, which begin to appear in graves from the twelfth century, remain controversial (Appendix B4). Through various studies of these objects, the most popular interpretation remains that they are shield-bosses, exemplified by Catling and Catling's reconstruction of the shield from Kourion-Kaloriziki Tomb 40 in Cyprus (*Kaloriziki*, 130-132); but this has been challenged, with Bouzek proposing these *phalara* be reconstructed as a belt (1988). It is clear that, in Snodgrass' words, the *phalara* "vary

considerably in appearance, and I do not think that any one explanation will apply to all of them” (1964, 38). It remains the case, however, that the shield-boss interpretation remains the reluctant conclusion of most scholars (Snodgrass 1973, 46-47; Lemos 2002, 124; *KNC*, 522-524).

Other interpretations include that the *phalara* are cymbals, horse-brasses, and belt-ornaments (Snodgrass 1973). Snodgrass does not discuss the suggestions that they may be helmets or breastplates. The former can be dismissed partly on the basis of size and shape. Furthermore some graves, such as ARG01, already have helmets (Lemos 2002, 124). The latter explanation finds more support than Snodgrass admits. Recent discoveries at Liatovouni in Epirus have been reconstructed as a cuirass consisting of five bronze bosses and two sets of studs (Douzougli and J. Papadopoulos 2010, 30-34).

The most practical fault of the breastplate hypothesis lies with the long spike which appears on many *phalara*, including Pha06, Pha08, Pha10, and Pha12 (Plates 4c, 17c, 21e). In these cases interpretation as a shield seems more likely. The spike of Pha09 resembles Pha01, suggesting that these may have the same function, while Pha03 resembles Pha07. These last two are closest to the smaller Kaloriziki examples, Pha04-05. Pha11 is reconstructed more similarly to Pha09 by Catling and Catling; Bouzek suggests it is more like Pha03-05 and Pha07.

Snodgrass’ main objection to the shield-boss hypothesis is that a bronze disc of 15 cm diameter would offer little protection. This can also be applied to the breastplate hypothesis. As Appendix B4 shows, 15 cm is large for a *phalaron* in this period. In addition to this, the limited distribution prior to the finds from Olympia also needs to be considered. From about 160 tombs with weapons covered by this thesis, only nine contained *phalara*. The only practical suggestions I can offer is that in an era of long-range warfare such protection may

have been sufficient, or that a fully polished bronze *phalara* might prove distracting to an opponent in battle. Less practically, displaying even this tiny amount of metal may have impressed or intimidated those incapable of doing so themselves. With any of these explanations it is unnecessary to say whether the *phalaron* represents a shield-boss or part of a breastplate.

If it is feasible that some *phalara* should be armour, then context should be the deciding factor. Those found with weapons should be considered to be shield-bosses or breastplates, those without need to be reconsidered. On the other hand typology may be a secondary means by which to suggest the function of a particular *phalaron*.

1.3.1.4 Archery

The bow is a long-range weapon which requires considerable training and skill. The level of investment in training is much higher for the bow than the javelin (Wileman 2009, 13). Snodgrass, prior to the additional evidence uncovered at Lefkandi and the Knossos North Cemetery, warned against assuming the Greeks were permanently adverse to archery (1964, 141). The literary evidence – or absence of evidence – against the bow is substantial, but drawn bows are prominent on eighth-century pottery, where they count for 32% of weapons shown in use (van Wees 1994b, 144).

The destructive power of arrows, and the potential to understand this, is great. The dual purpose of archery for hunting and warfare provide ample opportunity to experiment, as what is useful for one purpose is often not so useful for the other. For example, in hunting the arrow needs to be as lethal as possible while doing minimal damage to the prey, while in warfare the aim is to do maximum damage to the enemy while not necessarily killing them,

as the wounded in ancient warfare would be less expected to survive than in the modern world and would provide a burden to the opposing army.¹¹

Alongside the bow should be considered the sling, another long range weapon. Little archaeological evidence survives from this period of actual slings; however, they are present on the pottery and in the literature of later periods. This includes a negative reference, alongside bows, in Archilochus fr. 3 West, and their depiction on one of the LG amphorai from the Parian *polyandria* (Zaphiropoulou 2002, 284).

1.3.1.5 Axes

Axes are more often than not interpreted as tools rather than weapons. But in certain graves, particularly ARG15, they are the only object which can be interpreted as an offensive weapon. Considerable doubt remains whether or not axes should be considered weapons in EIA Greece (in favour: Snodgrass 1964, 166-7; Lemos 2002, 122; against: Boardman 1971, 8; Dickinson 2006, 158). Lemos' description of the axe as a "supplementary" weapon is perhaps the most applicable; similar to daggers and knives, axes are a difficult weapon to use in interpersonal combat, but can be effectively used to kill a wounded opponent.

The symbolic function of axes also makes their interpretation as weapons complicated (Wileman 2009, 13). The axe was the original Stone Age tool, and throughout the Bronze Age in Europe their symbolic resonance outweighs their military use (Bradley 1998, 43-96). This is mirrored in Bronze Age Crete, where the double-axe obtains a symbolic function which it maintains through the EIA (Lowe Fri 2011).¹² Therefore double-axes are unlikely to be weapons; but this remains possible for single-axes.

¹¹ See the discussion of ATT07 in Ch.4.2.3.4.

¹² Lowe Fri challenges the assumed religious function of the double-axe, but rejects the proposal its use as a weapon on the grounds that this is based on anachronistic assumptions.

The physical properties of axes can be examined to suggest whether or not it is possible to use them as weapons (see [Appendix B3](#)). The axes in [ARG15](#) ([Axe25](#), [Axe26](#)) weigh 2500 g and 4660 g respectively; in comparison the heaviest complete sword with a published weight is 556.5 g ([Swo090](#)). This would make the axes a much more cumbersome weapon than the sword, although able to do great damage as the amount of kinetic energy produced in swinging the heavier axe is increased (Evely 1993, 41).¹³ Perhaps, as Courbin suggested, they serve the specific function of breaking the hulls of enemy ships (1957, 368). However, the axes from [ARG15](#) are the largest in [Appendix B3](#) and the excavators suggested that the corrosion of [Axe26](#) may have led to an overestimation of its weight (Courbin 1957, 368). The next largest axe with a published weight is [Axe22](#), 1308 g, still more than twice as heavy as a sword, although this is a double axe so interpretation as a weapon is dubious.

If men were differently equipped with swords and axes, the lighter weight and longer range of the sword is likely to have rendered the axe a significantly inferior weapon. Without the metallurgical analysis which could undermine our assumptions about the functionality of swords we cannot show that an axe, which relied more on its weight and was unlikely to bend, could have been a superior weapon. Therefore burials with axes, but without other weapons or armour, have not been included in this thesis. Where axes occur in burials with other weapons they are considered to be *potential* weapons and *probable* tools.

1.3.1.6 [Other objects](#)

Other objects frequently found with weapons are knives and whetstones. Knives are not strictly weapons, having many other functions. Whetstones were used for sharpening of

¹³ Evely suggests that the energy produced by the greater weight of the double-axe may explain why it was sometimes preferred to the single axe. This fails to take into account why it is that the double-axe is so rarely preferred to the single. Similarly here, the advantages are the same for the use of any axe over a sword, but the disadvantages are enormous. Furthermore, Evely's proposals are based on the assumption that the double-axe is symmetrical, which is certainly not the case for [Axe17-18](#).

weapons, and thus were important for a warrior who wished to keep his sword sharp; they are not, however, essential.

1.3.2 Defensive structures

Fortifications have usually been interpreted as military architecture; however, they are a permanent part of a settlement and must be treated as such – their relationship to warfare must be considered in context (Wileman 2009, 22; Frederiksen 2011, 5). Besides the defensive purpose that they serve there are also symbolic functions to boundaries and the segregation of space (Ferguson 2008, 16; Johannesson and Machicek 2010, 18-19).¹⁴ But they can indicate the possibility of war and its potential city-destroying scope. Johannesson and Machicek emphasize that the construction of fortifications could be less an indication of war, but rather a desire to avoid conflict (2010, 18). The difficulty with this approach is that walls are less likely to prevent conflict than delay or even prolong it.

Fortifications have been interpreted as indications of unrest or an impending threat (e.g. Voutsaki 2010, 605-606). This proposition ignores the amount of time that fortifications take to build, which could be years (Loader 1998, 65-73). The decision to fortify a settlement requires carefully weighing the costs and the benefits in terms of labour, time, and resources (Wileman 2009, 17). Furthermore, to build substantial fortifications requires the mobilization and organization of a sizable workforce. The benefits of fortification must be clear to all of those involved in order to motivate construction. Those benefits include the durability of fortifications, which did not just defend against one invasion, but represent a constant commitment to the protection of the settlement.

¹⁴ Loader argues that fortifications need not necessarily have a defensive function: “this author believes that Cyclopean fortifications only assumed a defensive function after they had been built” (1998, 65 n.16). I do not find this view to be sustainable, although agree with Loader’s scepticism about the relationship between fortifications and an imminent threat.

Another form of defensive structure is the refuge settlement. These are broadly defined as difficult to access areas that were not suitable for permanent occupation but were used in times of difficulty in order to ensure survival (Nowicki 2000, 14; Frederiksen 2011, 8-9). They appear to occur mainly in the Aegean islands and Crete in the EIA, although Frederiksen suggests that they may be misidentified on the basis that the EIA settlement evidence was too meagre to find. He suggests that a refuge settlement should only be identified when evidence for a contemporary settlement is found outside the walls. A refuge settlement is distinguished from a defensible settlement, such as those found on Crete throughout the EIA, although these have also been interpreted as remote, inaccessible, and defensible. Wallace has challenged their interpretation as inaccessible or extreme locations, suggesting that this was overly influenced by their defensive locations (2010, 55-56). Some of these sites also have fortification walls, although this is dependent on the defensibility of the natural topography (Wallace 2010, 66).

1.3.3 Battlefields and destruction levels

The destruction of settlements and the remains of battlefields may be considered indications of human violence which are preserved in the material record, but this evidence is not without its difficulties. Firstly, settlements can be destroyed by non-human activity, such as earthquakes or other natural disasters. In order to reconstruct these destructions as intentional a convincing aggressor must be postulated from the available evidence, a task which is notoriously difficult in prehistoric periods (Snodgrass 2000, 297-298). Other convincing evidence may include weapons or bodies which remain in the debris.

The second difficulty with destructions and battlefields is that they are usually disturbed by post-battle activity. Therefore when destruction levels are uncovered bodies and weapons may not be discovered because either the survivors or the aggressors have cleared

the area of the dead and weapons which can be reused. Weapons which are found in destruction levels are usually fragmentary or small, such as the arrowhead at Asine and the possible spearhead in the LH IIIC Phase 1 destruction at Lefkandi (Ch.3.3.2; Ch.6.3). In later periods the armour and weapons of the defeated were taken from Greek battlefields and clearing of the battlefield is not uncommon (Pritchett 1979, 277-295).

The final difficulty is that destruction levels and battlefields simply do not appear in the archaeological record for the majority of the period covered by this thesis. This in itself may be instructive, as it may indicate that warfare was not of the scale that can destroy settlements. On the other hand this may be the result of the settlement histories of many of the sites, which often have later activity which has disturbed the EIA occupation, potentially removing any evidence of destruction. Even at Lefkandi, where the postulated destruction took place immediately before the site was abandoned, the evidence is not extensive.

Although we do not find them, it is important to consider battlefields and destruction levels when looking at warfare in prehistoric periods. The twelfth-century battlefield remains from the Tollense Valley in Germany remind us further that the metal weapons which are preserved in intentional deposits are not the only ones which may have been used in contemporary warfare (Jantzen *et al.* 2011). If we cannot find battlefields or destruction levels, we may still be able to find evidence that there were battlefields in mass graves (see below) and *skyla*, armour stripped from defeated enemies, when they are removed from the battlefield. From these, it may be possible to reconstruct more of warfare in the EIA.

1.3.4 Skeletal trauma and mass graves

The evidence of skeletal trauma, or lack thereof, is often interpreted as evidence for the participation of the individual in interpersonal conflict (Smith 2009, 107). This evidence needs to be judged with a critical eye. It is noted in several studies of warfare in the material

record that skeletal trauma can be caused by non-violent accidents, and fatalities from war wounds do not have to be the result of blows which damage the bone (Wileman 2009, 22-23; Johannesson and Machicek 2010, 15). Later medical literature suggests that infection is a more likely cause of death than a wound which would cleave bone.

A further difficulty emerges from the nature of the evidence in the EIA Aegean. Of the four regions surveyed Athens and Knossos favour cremation over inhumation for most of this period, while Lefkandi mixes cremation and inhumation. Analysis of the skeletal evidence from Argos is underway but has not been completed (Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011). Therefore skeletal trauma is not widely known from this period. The only instance is ATT07, where an arrowhead was still embedded in the shoulder of the deceased (See Ch.4.2.3.4).

Mass graves are considered to be better evidence than skeletal trauma, but other interpretations such as disease or re-burial of earlier graves are possible (Wileman 2009, 23). An incident of a mass grave had been uncovered at Paroikia on the island of Paros. This has been interpreted as a *polyandrion*, the grave of men killed in combat. According to the excavator, two cists containing the urn cremations of between one and two-hundred young men aged between eighteen and forty-five have been uncovered in the main cemetery, dated to LG IIb, the late eighth century (Zaphiropoulou 2000; 2002, 283-4; 2006, 276). Along with the number, age, and sex of the burials, the presence of skeletal trauma, including a spearhead with bone still adhering to it, the fact that many of the vases contained more than one individual, and two vases have pictorial scenes of combat suggested that this was the mass burial of soldiers (Zaphiropoulou and Agelarakis 2005, 35; Zaphiropoulou 2006).

There are many difficulties with identifying mass graves as evidence for warfare, some of which can be applied to this grave (Wileman 2009, 24). Firstly, the cause of death is

impossible to determine from the cremated remains. The nature of urn cremation means that it cannot be shown with complete certainty that the burials all took place contemporaneously, especially as the excavator believes that the figure-decorated vases belong to different phases (Zaphiropoulou 2006, 276). The *polyandrion* is also identified as the earliest burial in the cemetery; therefore this grave could be interpreted as the clearance of burials from another cemetery going into disuse.

On the supporting side, the burials did contain a number of weapons and it is reported that all of the deceased were male.¹⁵ If the identification of all of the burials as male is correct, then we may be seeing gender-based segregation of burials in LG Paros, with the female enclosure yet to be discovered. The age range indicated, eighteen to forty-five, is within the range of military service. The balance of evidence in the case of the *polyandrion* does point towards a mass grave of men killed in a war. But the evidence as reported is not secure enough to carry the weight of these conclusions.

1.4. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

War, and particularly Greek warfare, has been extensively studied both as a phenomenon in itself and as a regional peculiarity. The majority of the period covered by this thesis has been the subject of very few studies. The preceding Bronze Age and subsequent Archaic Period have been extensively studied, and these periods can assist our understanding of the Early Iron Age.

The typological study of weapons has been a vital part of the study of the archaeology of warfare. Naue provided the framework for bronze swords, which attached his name to the *griffzungenschwerter* or Naue type II (1903). Sandars developed the understanding of earlier

¹⁵ It is unclear from the reports how certain the identification of the individuals as male is, or what proportion of them has been identified as male. The report that all of the individuals have been identified as male is unconvincing without a full bone report, especially as the number of individuals excavated seems so uncertain.

Aegean swords (1961; 1963), and both of these typologies were refined by Catling (1959; 1964; 1968). Most recently, two volumes of *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* have incorporated iron finds in their Aegean typologies: Kilian-Dirlmeier on swords (1993) and Avila on spear- and arrowheads (1983). The first systematic approach to weaponry which incorporated all of the evidence known from the EIA at that point was that of Lorimer, whose work also encompassed the Bronze Age (1950). This was subsequently developed by Snodgrass, focusing particularly on the postpalatial period of the Bronze Age and the EIA (1964). Snodgrass' work was monumental, focusing on each type of weapon individually to show how changes in the material record could be used to show developments in warfare; however, the typological basis of the study lacked contextual analysis which allows a more complete understanding of the role of warfare in this period.

Snodgrass built upon his earlier work to write a narrative of Greek warfare from the Mycenaean to the Hellenistic Age (Snodgrass 1999). However, more recently studies of weapons have moved beyond typological analysis to experimental archaeology as a means of demonstrating the combat capabilities of Aegean weaponry (Molloy 2008; 2010). The theory underlying Molloy's work is that in order to understand the capabilities of weapons they must be handled and used. The difficulty arises from the fact that what a weapon *can* do is not necessarily what a weapon was used to do. Harrell, in her study of Mycenaean warfare, criticizes Molloy along with the earlier typological studies for failing to incorporate the practice of war into the broader social and political environment in which war takes place (2009, 11-12). Both Harrell and O'Brien (2009) state that previous research has isolated Mycenaean warfare from the rest of society and thus both attempt to show the essential role of warfare in Mycenaean society.

Attempts have been made to incorporate warriors, if not warfare, into EIA society. Tandy's *Warriors into Traders* looked at the changes in society in the eighth century (1997);

however, Tandy has very little to say about warriors, despite his title. Following Snodgrass, who is more sceptical about the evidence than the actual presence of warfare (2000, 297-298), Tandy believes the EIA lacks significant evidence of violence, and considers the nobility of the EIA to have masqueraded as warriors. Taking a different approach, Brouwers has interpreted warfare from Mycenaean times to the Persian Wars as the privilege of the aristocracy to the exclusion of all others (2010). He does not generally account for changes in society before and after the collapse of the palaces and between the Bronze and Iron Ages, but shows how the evidence supports an aristocratic ideal of the warrior throughout both periods and into the Archaic Period.

An important aspect of the relationship between warfare and society in the EIA is the role of the horse in warfare. Greenhalgh discussed the role of chariots and horsemen in early Greek warfare, excluding the former and redefining the latter, using primarily the evidence of the Homeric epics and iconography (1973). Brouwers has also contributed to this debate, following Crouwel and disagreeing with Greenhalgh's conclusion that the chariot as depicted in epic is implausible and suggesting that both horsemen and chariots took part in early Greek warfare (Brouwers 2007; Crouwel 1992). Brouwers' approach has its difficulties, not least of which are some dubious iconographic interpretations, but it is an interesting approach to areas of Greek warfare beyond the phalanx. Horse ownership in the EIA is certainly restricted to the élite, but neither Greenhalgh nor Brouwers fully address the difficulty of the limitations of the evidence for horses in the EIA.

The interpretation of iconographic evidence has long been an essential part of the study of warfare. It forms an integral part of the discussions of Lorimer and Snodgrass, as well as discussions of the development of the hoplite phalanx. Ahlberg has studied the revival of iconographic depiction in the Middle and Late Geometric Periods in three monographs. The most relevant discusses fighting on land and sea by gathering the depictions of fighting

from this period and subjecting each to rigorous iconographic and iconological analysis (1971a). Ahlberg concludes that fighting in the Geometric Period is loose, mobile, and generally long range, with close combat weapons used to finish the battle off. The limited LG pottery available at the time limited the scope of Ahlberg's work, although its depth is tremendous; for a fuller understanding of LG warfare the iconography needs to be combined with the material evidence.

Ahlberg's other studies looked at funerary scenes, the *prothesis* and *ekphora*, on LG pottery including depictions of chariots and armed men (1971b), and a broader look at early depictions of myth and epic (1992). The latter places too much confidence in the identification of early depictions of myth, and another study by Snodgrass approaches the evidence with a more critical eye (Snodgrass 1998). Other important works have widened the discussion of LG iconography (e.g. Rombos 1988), but none which focus on warfare as substantially as Ahlberg.

The iconography of warfare in the seventh century remains primarily the focus of more general works on warfare and articles, lacking an intensely focused study which approaches the major difficulties with iconography. Despite the lack of specialization in iconography, seventh-century vase painting is a major element in the study of warfare in that period. Lorimer used this evidence extensively to establish the date of the "hoplite revolution" (1947); her arguments are accepted by the "orthodox" school but challenged by scholars such as van Wees, who interprets many of the scenes very differently (2000). A recent review of the seventh-century iconography failed to present more recent or complex discussions of this evidence, completely ignoring the impact of new finds such as the Kalapodi wall paintings (Viggiano and van Wees 2013).

The EIA remains a neglected area of study with regards to warfare. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare* (2007) and *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World* (2013) are historical handbooks, showing little besides scepticism towards knowledge of warfare even in the Archaic Period, and very little discussion of anything before that. Much of this scepticism seems to have arisen from Hall's deconstruction of the evidence for the Lelantine War (2013, 1-8). What was once held up as the first historical battle about which we knew anything is now viewed as a barely historical construction about which we know next to nothing (Raaflaub and van Wees 2009, xx).

There is an exception to the rule that we know little about early Greek warfare (emphasis mine): "Warfare must have consisted of raids against neighbouring lands and coasts, conducted by warrior bands under the command of local or regional leaders. *Such raids are amply illustrated in Homeric epics*" (Raaflaub 1999, 129). Homer is the light on "Dark Age" warfare. But this approach is not an easy one to take; it is the result of a long period of Homeric scholarship based on establishing the reality of the Homeric world and particularly the mode of warfare described in the poems.

Finley first argued for a consistent, historical society portrayed in the Homeric epics, which reflected a reality which he dated to the tenth century (1954). A number of scholars have supported Finley on the principle of an historical Homeric society, if not on the date. The most important was Latacz, who argued that the warfare outlined in the *Iliad* was not only historical, but consistent with the massed warfare of the hoplite phalanx which he placed in the eighth century (1977). Latacz was supported by Pritchett in his five volume discussion of Greek warfare (1971-1991), while Raaflaub and van Wees have agreed that the fighting in the *Iliad* is historical, but date the epics and reconstruct the fighting differently (Raaflaub 1997; 1999; 2013; van Wees 1994a; 1994b).

Others, such as Sherratt (1990), have argued that the inconsistencies in the poem make it impossible to maintain this argument. She presents a particular case of Achilles' spear, which seems to change from a huge Mycenaean thrusting spear into an Iron Age javelin (*Il.* 19.387-91; 20.273-274, 279-280; 321-324; 413-148; 446); throughout the subsequent combat each time he throws this spear it returns to his hands and only once does a god return it to him. Alongside other cases of inconsistent weapon use and description Sherratt believes that neither the poet nor the audience were concerned with a consistent depiction of society in the epics.

This question of consistency influences the archaeological use of the epics. Morris argued that the poems should be treated as products of the period in which they took their present shape and show how they relate to and defined the culture and society of that time (1986a; 2001), in direct contrast to Sherratt, who sought to use archaeology to understand the creation and development of the epic throughout the history of the bardic tradition (1990; 2010). The debate over the date of the epics makes it difficult to adopt the approach proposed by Morris.

A clear *terminus post quem* for the final consolidation of the epics is the appearance of writing in the middle of the eighth century. Morris originally stuck very close to this date, although he was more cautious about the evidence for doing so later (1986a, 93; 2001, 65-7, 81). The debate on the dating of Homer is long and unfinished, but certain key approaches are noteworthy. Janko calculated a range of dates based on the presence of imitations and the timescale of linguistic development, with *terminus ante quos* based on later biographers of the lyric poets, suggesting dates between 750 and 725 for the *Iliad* and 743-713 for the *Odyssey* (1982).

The argument for a seventh-century date has been made principally by West (1995; 2011; 2012) with the strong support of van Wees (1994a; 1994b). West dates the *Iliad*, based on internal evidence and historical synchronisms, to between 680 and 640; van Wees suggests that Homeric warfare corresponds exactly to that depicted in the art and poetry of the early seventh century. A minor point of contention between the two arguments is whether or not this is hoplite warfare: West is convinced that some passages reflect the phalanx (1995, 209) while van Wees prefers to suggest that Homeric warfare marks a transitional phase between the warfare depicted on LG pottery and the hoplite phalanx (1994b, 147-148).

An alternative approach to the date of the epics has been proposed by Nagy (1995; 1997, 206-207), which combines well with Sherratt's arguments. Nagy emphasizes that the epics developed over a prolonged period between the second millennium and the mid-second century, moving from great flexibility to a rigid, canonical text. An important stage in this development was the first written version of the epics which Nagy suggests was that undertaken by the Peisistratids in late sixth-century Athens. Prior to this the poems had existed only in their oral forms. The importance of this scheme to the EIA archaeologist is that the eighth and seventh centuries remain significant periods for the development of the epics, but it emphasizes that they were not solely the product of these centuries. However, the difficulty with the approaches of Nagy and Sherratt is that much of the study of the epics alongside archaeology can become connecting elements of the poems to the material culture of different periods, rather than understanding the importance of epic to contemporary society or our understanding of that society.

Around *ca.* 750 the attention of historians and archaeologists turns to explaining the rise of two of the major phenomena of the Classical world: the hoplite and the *polis*. The connection between these two is exemplified in the "orthodox" view of a hoplite revolution, which connects a major shift in tactics and equipment at the end of the eighth century to the

appearance of the *polis* and its institutions; furthermore these hoplites were the men who supported the rise of the seventh-century tyrants. Lorimer's 1947 article is the paradigmatic expression of the orthodox viewpoint; meanwhile Snodgrass was one of the first to contest this orthodoxy (2006a). In the orthodox view the change to phalanx tactics predated the adoption of hoplite arms, visible in the archaeological record and iconography from *ca.* 700; later, Latacz would further support this argument with the Homeric evidence. Thus hoplite arms were developed to improve the pre-existing conditions in the phalanx after the composition of the epics (see e.g. Hanson 1989).

Another key factor of the orthodoxy, as argued especially by Hanson, is the intense and incredibly close formation of the phalanx (1989). Inspired by John Keegan's *The Face of Battle* (1976), Hanson proposed that the only way to understand hoplite warfare was from the point of view of the hoplites themselves. He proposed that the equipment of the hoplite, such as the Corinthian helmet and the shield, would only be useful in a situation where the hoplite could rely on the man next to him as the limits this equipment places on the individual is great. Subsequently, Hanson developed his theory that the emergence of the hoplite was related to the egalitarian ethos which developed as a result of private ownership of land, impossible in the Mycenaean period and unnecessary in the "Dark Ages", but forced in the late eighth century as a result of population increase (1995).

Returning to the subject again, after Latacz, Snodgrass remained convinced of a gradual development of hoplite armament until a radical change *ca.* 650-640, which might feasibly be called the dawn of the hoplite (2006d). The basis for Snodgrass' argument is the archaeological evidence from Olympia, which he holds is the most important evidence for revision of the view of the development of the hoplite. Latacz pushed the date for the establishment of the phalanx back further by arguing that this was established by the time of the *Iliad*, which he dated to the eighth century. Snodgrass attributes the success of his

arguments to dissatisfaction with the traditional view of the hoplite revolution occurring soon after the composition of the *Iliad* as established by Lorimer. Snodgrass continues to hold this “gradualist” viewpoint (2013).

A third view is the “revisionist” position, which holds that the equipment of the hoplite is not only suitable for phalanx tactics, but could be used in a number of ways (e.g. van Wees 2004). Furthermore it contests many of the readings of the ancient literature which suggest that the phalanx was something like a rugby scrum, suggesting that a much more open formation is entirely possible (Krentz 2013). This approach appears to be supported by archaeological survey, which has shown that Hanson’s proposal of population pressures leading to major agrarian reform and subsequently the hoplite reform in the late eighth century is untenable (Foxhall 2013). A major criticism of the revisionist position is that, while it contests many of the hypotheses of the orthodox view, it fails to suggest an alternative paradigm for the emergence of the *polis* (Viggiano 2013). But modern anthropological models have begun to challenge the relationship between warfare and state formation (Bossen 2006), suggesting that perhaps Greek historians should begin to disassociate the hoplite from the *polis*.

Reactions to the revisionist view have also come from experimentation with recreated hoplite equipment. Schwartz, through discussions with the UK hoplite association, has come to the conclusion that the armour was too weighty to allow much manoeuvrability in the way proposed by “revisionist” scholars of hoplite warfare (2009; 2013). Matthew, meanwhile, suggests that a number of different formations were possible for the hoplite, although the actual means of fighting for the individual hoplite would not have varied considerably throughout the Classical Period (2013). The difficulty with the work of both of these scholars is that their focus is firmly on the Classical Period, and while they may project their findings backwards it is rare that they fully engage with the issues of Early Archaic warfare.

These views on hoplite warfare were recently restated and reargued in Kagan and Viggiano (eds.) *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece* (2013). The most innovative developments are represented by Raaflaub, who questions the distinctiveness of the Greek hoplite in the Eastern Mediterranean, before ultimately deciding that it was unique, and that of Hale, who proposes that the arena in which the hoplite developed was as mercenaries abroad, not in the context of the *polis*. While the development of the hoplite remains an important question in our understanding of ancient Greek warfare, the obsession with the hoplite phalanx has obscured understanding of wider military developments in the ancient Aegean.

1.5. CHRONOLOGY

This thesis begins with the Submycenaean and Subminoan Periods in the eleventh century, continuing through the Protogeometric, Geometric/Subprotogeometric, and “Orientalizing” periods to the middle of the seventh century. Following Whitley, in order to distinguish between the widely different dates for the central Greek and Cretan Protogeometric Periods the latter is referred to as “Protogeometric A” (Whitley 2005b, 435). Absolute dates, which are subject to revision in this period, are generally avoided in favour of the relative terms derived from the study of pottery. The dates given in the publication of the material will be followed. The chronology of the period is outlined in Table 1. All dates are BCE unless references or otherwise specified.

Chapter 2

The Palatial Bronze Age

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Warriors and warfare were an important part of Aegean culture and society from the Middle Bronze Age. In order to fully comprehend the nature of warfare and of warriors in the culture and society of the EIA, their importance to the preceding Late Minoan and Mycenaean societies, and the question of the relationship between the destruction of the palaces to changes in warfare in this period, must be briefly considered.

2.2. THE MYCENAEAN PALACES

After the initial flourish of the Mycenaean civilization and the appearance of the first burials with weapons in the Middle Bronze Age, it appears that the growth of palatial authority in the period LH IIIA-B (*ca.* 1420 – *ca.* 1200) limited the importance of aristocratic warrior élites (Steinmann 2012, 210-221). There are certainly fewer burials with weapons than in the preceding or subsequent period (Cavanagh and Mee 1998, 126-127; Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 152; Steinmann 2012, 336-337). However, as Cavanagh and Mee emphasize, the picture is distorted by the fact that none of the major tholos tombs were excavated intact. But it is likely that part of this change is the result of the social changes relating to the emergence of the palaces.

Changes in sword typology indicate that the long, rapier-like swords of the earlier Bronze Age were being replaced by shorter, more portable swords (Sandars 1963, 132). It has been suggested that a similar reduction in the size of spears is the result of attempts to stretch bronze supplies further (Dickinson 1994, 206). But a changing social function and experience

of warfare is likely to have also played a role. Harrell argues that the symbolic importance of spears as reflected in LH IIIA iconography intertwines the importance of the hunt and warfare, which both function as a way in which a martial élite can provide for the community (2009, 159-160).

Towards the end of the palatial period the *griffzungenschwert* first appears in the Aegean archaeological record, probably from Italy (Jung and Mehofer 2005, 125-126). This sword, also known as a “cut and thrust” sword in order to highlight its presumed greater versatility over other Aegean types, predominates in the postpalatial period and is eventually the only bronze sword type to be produced in iron. However, Molloy’s experiments with reconstructions of Aegean Bronze Age swords suggest that while the *griffzungenschwert* was a more effective weapon than earlier types, it did little to change fighting tactics (2010, 421). It is likely that this partially explains why the apparently superior sword did not completely replace the earlier LBA sword types until the adoption of iron.

Weapons appear in several hoards in the regions under consideration in this thesis. Three hoards are more comfortably dated to the thirteenth century, and these were all excavated at Mycenae.¹⁶ The Poros Wall Hoard, which was discovered between the tholos tombs of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, has been interpreted as a founder’s hoard and contained a dagger of Sandars’ type Dii, a large double axe, several curved knives, a number of tools, and scrap or broken metal (Stubbings 1954). The Staircase Hoard was excavated in the retaining wall of the stairway leading to the northwest entrance of the palace, and included at least two short swords, three curved knife blades, double axes, and sickles; it was interpreted as possessions hidden for safekeeping before an attack on the palace (Mylonas 1962). This interpretation begs the question why someone would hide swords *before* a conflict. A hoard discovered by Tsountas in a house on the citadel contained a damaged

¹⁶ Catling has suggested that the Poros Wall hoard could date to the twelfth century (1964, 294).

griffzungenschwert, suggesting a late thirteenth- if not twelfth-century date, as well as two swords of Sander's type F, two of type G, and a dagger of type Dii. It also contained arrowheads and scrap metal.

Fortifications are an important part of the Mycenaean martial culture, defining both our image of the palaces and perhaps their atmosphere (Harrell 2009, 161). At Mycenae and Tiryns the fortifications were first constructed in LH IIIA, at Midea in LH IIIB. Extensive building projects took place at all of these citadels in the thirteenth century, including extension of the fortifications and the construction of cisterns on the citadels at Mycenae and Tiryns; the latter of these also took place on the Athenian Acropolis. A lookout tower was constructed in the south east corner of the palace at Mycenae (French 2010, 677); while at Tiryns the walls are given embrasures for archers, which are closed off later in the century (Maran 2010, 726-728). While most of these developments probably postdate 1230, the fortification walls at Midea are earlier (*Midea* I, 176).

There are few scenes of warfare in the iconographic record of the thirteenth century. Warriors, where they do appear, are presented in procession or ceremonial contexts (Papadopoulos, A. 2006, 194; Molloy 2010, 411). The exception is a single fresco from Mycenae which shows warriors in combat with "barbarians" wearing animal skins. Both Mycenaean and barbarians are depicted using swords with a similar outline to Type Gi and Fii swords.

The palatial period comes to an end with destruction, *ca.* 1200. Evidence from the Linear B tablets at Pylos seems to indicate an increase in the military activity of the region of Messenia and subsequently it is believed that there was massive depopulation of the area (Shelmerdine 1999; Eder 2006, 550). There are destructions at palatial centres on the

mainland including all of those in the Argolid, Thebes, Pylos, and others. Theories concerning the destructions abound, but it was certainly a violent time in the Aegean.¹⁷

2.3. THEIR DESTRUCTION

There has been much discussion of the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces: the chronology, the causes, and the response. Warfare has been a popular explanation, from the invasion of the Dorians and its modern equivalent the Sea People, to changes in the practice of warfare leaving the palaces vulnerable (Desborough 1972, 21-23; 201; Drews 1993). On the other hand, natural disaster and system collapse are also some of the most important theories concerning the collapse of the Aegean Bronze Age (Middleton 2010, 118-120). It is important to distinguish between the destruction of the palaces and the collapse of the palace system. While they are undoubtedly connected, the former is part of the localized Aegean response to the wider collapse in the eastern Mediterranean, while the latter is a consequence of both the destruction of the palaces and that wider collapse. The question should be not *why were the palaces destroyed*, but rather *why were they not rebuilt*; at least, not on the scale that they were previously.¹⁸

By the end of the thirteenth century there were at least three fortified citadels in the Argolid: Mycenae, Tiryns, and Midea. Walberg suggests that this was part of the defensive network of the Argolid, and that Argos would have formed the west side of this network (*Midea* I, 15). The implication of this statement is that these palaces were unified in Mycenaean period, something which is far from certain. Nonetheless, they existed in close proximity to one another for well over a century without evidence for conflict between them, and this is likely to reflect peaceful relations if not political unity.

¹⁷ A recent discussion of the different theories concerning the collapse is Middleton 2010.

¹⁸ See Ch.3.4.2 for the activities resembling palatial reconstruction at Tiryns, Midea, and possibly Mycenae.

A series of destructions occurred at Mycenae in the Late Helladic period: the first at the end of LH IIIA:1, the second in LH IIIB:2 (*ca.* 1230), and finally at the end of LH IIIB:2 (*ca.* 1200). Tiryns also suffers destruction *ca.* 1230, and again *ca.* 1200. It is unclear whether the destructions at Midea are contemporary with the former or the latter of these destructions (Åström and Demakopoulou 1996; *Midea* II, 136). Furthermore, across the Aegean world all of the other palatial centres are destroyed over a period of no more than twenty-five years (Popham 1994, 206).

The evidence from the thirteenth century has been interpreted as indication of an impending crisis. The possible increase in military activity in Messenia and the suggestion that smaller spearheads allowed bronze supplies to be stretched further implies anticipation of a human enemy. The appearance of Naue type II swords manufactured in Italy in the archaeological record of the Peloponnese may point to difficult relationships across the Ionian Sea (Jung and Mehofer 2013, 184); however, certain Italians may have been incorporated into the armies of the palaces, reflecting a need for the recruitment of mercenaries (Jung 2009, 78; Jung and Mehofer 2013, 185). The expansion of the fortifications in the Argive palaces, alongside the construction of cisterns within the walls at Mycenae, Tiryns, and Athens, suggests that these palaces were preparing for a siege. Voutsaki characterized this activity as an “arms race”, suggesting that conditions in the Argolid had become unstable (2010, 605-606). Furthermore, the hoards from Mycenae may have been attempts on the part of wealthy individuals to hide their precious belongings.

It seems unlikely that the hoards, all of which contain swords, were hidden prior to an attack on the citadels to be recovered afterwards. Studies of hoards have suggested that there are distinctions between utilitarian and votive hoards (Knapp *et al.* 1988, 235-238); but this distinction has been questioned and the deposition of hoards recognized as a much more complex phenomenon (Bradley 1998, xviii). I offer only one alternative explanation of the

Staircase Hoard at Mycenae. According to Mylonas' report, this hoard contained many bladed weapons and tools, all of which could be utilized as weapons in an emergency.¹⁹ Their discovery in a public place, rather than a house like those found in Tsountas' Acropolis hoard, does not suggest a good hiding place for a valuable hoard, while their position between the stones of the retaining wall suggest that they would be accessible in an emergency, if escaping down the staircase or if forced back when defending it.

The main difficulty with interpreting this evidence as preparation for defence is that it is teleological. The Mycenaeans did all that they could to defend their citadels, and they failed. Yet they were still in a position to command the resources to extend their fortifications (Dickinson 2006, 42). It is likely that the time taken to construct these fortifications would have been years, if not decades (Loader 1998). It is not plausible that this was a response to an impending attack. At Tiryns the embrasures for archers were closed up before the end of LH IIIB (Maran 2010, 728). While it is possible that the improved defences in the second half of the thirteenth century indicate that the palaces were aware of a rising danger, they cannot be indicative of an immediate, pressing threat but only a wider, growing danger, perhaps an awareness of troubles in the Near East.

An alternative interpretation of the evidence of fortifications and hoards is as competitive conspicuous consumption. If the tombs of the thirteenth century are less spectacular than in the previous and subsequent periods, especially in terms of burials with weapons, but there is an increase in the deposition of metals in hoards and in the construction of monumental architecture, this can be interpreted as a shift in the emphasis of the consumption of wealth from the grave to life. This interpretation is applied to the shift from

¹⁹ Knapp *et al.* suggest that this hoard contains three "vessels and stands" and one ingot; I have been unable to trace the source of this statement (1988, 247-248).

wealthy burials to dedications in sanctuaries in the eighth century,²⁰ and Bradley has applied it to the change in burial evidence and dedicatory practice in Neolithic Scandinavia (1998, 75).

In this case we can interpret the inability of Mycenaean society to prevent the destruction of the palaces not as futile gestures against an unbeatable foe but as their being taken completely by surprise. This fits the explanation proposed by a number of scholars, which seems to be the most favoured to explain the *destruction* of the palaces, that they were destroyed by an earthquake. It is certainly possible that the destructions in the Argolid at thirty year periods could be the result of repeated devastating earthquakes (Papadopoulos, G. A. 1996). The second earthquake may have been followed by heavy rain, and flash-flooding (French 2002, 135; 2010, 677; Zangger 1996, 245-246). But then we must consider why the palaces were not re-built. At Tiryns the subsequent occupation has been characterized as “squatting” (Maran 2010, 729-730). At Midea there is no occupation at all at the start of the postpalatial period (*Midea* I, 178). It is possible that the second earthquake, *ca.* 1200, was even more devastating than the first, even if it was not as powerful, as it could have worsened unseen damage to foundations (Stiros 1996, 141).

There is considerable evidence for a seismic event in the Argolid *ca.* 1200. The Havos stream at Mycenae appears to have changed its course at around this time (Maroukian *et al.* 1996). In a room by the east gate at Midea a young girl was found crushed by falling stones (Åström and Demakopoulou 1996, 39); it may be too modern a sentiment, but it is difficult to understand why a young girl would be this close to the wall in a siege or attack. Building X at Tiryns crushed a woman and child in the *ca.* 1200 destruction (Kilian 1996, 65). That these bodies were not recovered and buried suggests that this was not possible, or it was not known that they were there (Stiros 1996, 145).

²⁰ On this change in practices see Ch.8.6.4.

On the other hand, some structures which should have been damaged by the earthquakes, such as the tholos tomb of Aegisthus, show no such evidence (French 1996, 54). It is also unclear how these earthquakes could have caused the fire destructions which occur at all the citadels (Dickinson 2006, 50). Furthermore, there is no evidence for an increase in dedications to the gods, which would be the expected response of a society to natural disaster. In fact, wealth appears to be taken away from the gods in favour of arming soldiers (Shelmerdine 1999, 404).

The evidence may show that the Argive palaces were destroyed by an earthquake and not human action. But this cannot necessarily explain the destruction of all the palaces in the Aegean, nor does it explain the collapse of the palace system in the Aegean, which was influenced by the wider eastern Mediterranean context and cannot be explored in detail in this thesis. Ultimately, when the palaces were destroyed they were not able to recover, and this led to the conditions of the postpalatial period.

2.4. THE PALATIAL BRONZE AGE: CONCLUSIONS

This cursory look at the evidence for warfare in the palatial periods of the Aegean Bronze Age has highlighted a dichotomy which was mentioned in the introduction and forms the basis of this thesis: the differences and connections between *warriors*, the élite social identity which is connected to violent acts, including warfare, and *warfare*, the physical acts of violence which are more or less evident in the archaeological record.

As background to the period covered in this thesis, several important elements come into place during the Bronze Age. The practice of burial with weapons first appears, and an important question is how far there is continuity from the palatial period into the Postpalatial and EIA. The *griffzungenschwert* first appears in the Aegean, and this sword type alone of

those in use in the LBA continues to be produced in iron. Again, it must be questioned whether this is a form of continuity or if the change in metal is more significant.

The destruction of the palaces sets the tone for the immediately subsequent period, which is emphasized in the term *postpalatial*. The response of the regions which form the focus of this thesis to these destructions and the subsequent conditions in the Aegean is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Warfare in the Postpalatial Period

3.1. INTRODUCTION

After the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces major changes occur across the Aegean. These changes mean that the postpalatial period requires discussion separate from the palatial. One of the aspects of this period which comes to define the following centuries is the increase in regional variety in Greece. In this chapter I will examine the LH IIIC evidence from Attica, Euboea, the Argolid, and Knossos as background for the study of the EIA; while a complete picture of the postpalatial Mycenaean world cannot be presented for greater clarity there will be discussion of the evidence from the wider Cretan perspective and from Achaia in the northwest Peloponnese.

3.2. ATTICA

The evidence from Attica in this period comprises burials with weapons at Athens and Perati, the so-called “Coppersmith’s Hoard” from the Acropolis, and some pictorial pottery.

3.2.1 Funerary evidence

A pair of greaves was discovered in LBA01, a partially destroyed chamber tomb on the south side of the Acropolis. Mountjoy has argued that the burial dates to LH IIIC Early, although it was originally considered to date to the Geometric Period (1984). This is an isolated grave, but the south slope of the Acropolis could have been used as a cemetery in the period after the decline or disuse of the chamber tomb cemetery in the Agora in LH IIIA2 or IIIB (Mountjoy 1995, 52). The Agora tombs were re-used in the postpalatial period, but only one is freshly cut and none contain weapons (Mountjoy 1984, 143).

The best known cemetery in Attica in the postpalatial period is that at Perati, located on the east coast. The settlement to which it belongs has not been excavated. The cemetery was established in the twelfth century and does not continue into the EIA (Iakovidis 1980, 107-8). The establishment of a new cemetery in the postpalatial period is quite exceptional (Dickinson 2006, 178). Over two-hundred tombs are known from the cemetery, although over a quarter have been robbed. The majority are chamber tombs, although twenty-six are pit graves. Eight tombs were found empty, one-hundred-and-fifty with multiple burials, usually two or three. With the additional sixty-one single burials there are over five-hundred burials, including only eighteen cremations. Vases were the only grave good in just under half of all burials; just over half had vases together with other offerings. Only very few had no vases. It is noticeable that only three burials appear to have been with weapons.

All of the burials with weapons at Perati were in chamber tombs with multiple burials. This means that the weapons were often not found in association with the bodies of the deceased to whom they might have belonged. Besides being re-used, Deger-Jalkotzy suggested that LBA02 was ceremonially cleared before it was abandoned, and the sword was placed alongside a bronze dagger at the entrance to the chamber (2006, 157 n. 7). A similar practice was observed in LBA21, at Elateia, where the sword accompanied a burial found in a stone enclosure within the tomb.

The presence of a spearhead, but no sword, led Iakovidis to contest whether LBA03 represented a “warrior burial” as opposed to a hunter, going on to suggest that even the swords at Perati were for hunting rather than fighting (Iakovidis 1980, 98). As mentioned previously, hunting and warfare are related practices in the palatial period and the distinction between the two should not be drawn too sharply (Ch.2.2). Deger-Jalkotzy argues that the more frequent representation of spearheads than swords as weapons of war on pottery in this period indicates that they were not solely used for hunting (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 169, 172).

Only one of the burials in LBA04 was not disturbed by the continuous use of the tomb, which involved clearing space for later burials. Besides the re-use of tombs for multiple burial, there is evidence that tombs were opened between interments and unfleshed skeletons moved aside (Iakovidis 1980, 23); it is perhaps possible that the reason there are so few weapons remaining in other burials is that some of them were taken when the tombs were reopened. The movement of the sword in LBA02 could indicate a successful second use and a return to the original tomb. As the other finds with weapons were similar to other tombs of high rank, it is possible that weapons could have been removed and not returned, perhaps because they were still needed, or because they were lost in the battle, or reburied with another. The limitations of this evidence prevent strong emphasis from being placed on this argument. But if this is not the case then the burials with weapons at Perati are too limited to represent a continuous tradition through the postpalatial period.

3.2.2 Settlement evidence

A sword and two spearheads were discovered amongst the “Coppersmith’s Hoard” on the Athenian Acropolis. The date of this hoard is uncertain. Catling dates the sword after 1200, as it is his type Fi (Catling 1968, 98). Mountjoy suggests a date around the time of the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces, when “times were unsettled and bronze was scarce” (1995, 50-51). On the other hand, the pottery associated with this hoard was LH IIIA2 (Furumark 1941, 95). While both Sandars and Catling doubt the earlier dating, the hoard cannot certainly be placed in this period (Sandars 1963, 135-136; Catling 1964, 296).

3.2.3 Pictorial pottery

Pictorial pottery is attested in Attica during this period, but so far the repertoire does not appear to include warriors. From Athens there are a few scenes of chariots, but these do not appear to have military connotations. At Perati animal scenes and octopus stirrup-jars are not

uncommon, but there are no depictions of humans (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982, 121). In the context of LH IIIC pictorial pottery, which is usually found on kraters and in settlements, it is not unusual to have so little from a cemetery site which has produced few kraters (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982, 129). From the currently available evidence there is very little which can be said of Attic LH IIIC pictorial pottery.

3.3. CENTRAL EUBOEA

The evidence from central Euboea includes some settlement evidence from Lefkandi-Xeropolis, chance finds from around the island, and much pictorial pottery.

3.3.1 Funerary evidence

The twelfth-century cemeteries at Lefkandi have not been discovered and the only burials known from this period are intramural burials on Xeropolis. Therefore, it is not possible to say whether there were burials with weapons at Lefkandi at this time. The leg of a child just over three years-old may have been broken by a sword slash, but this is uncertain (*Lefkandi* IV, CD-7).

3.3.2 Settlement evidence

A major destruction level was recorded across most of Xeropolis at the end of Phase 1 of the postpalatial settlement, which corresponds to LH IIIC Early (*Lefkandi* IV, 40). This destruction appears to have been anticipated, on the basis of the absence of metal objects in the houses which may have been removed in advance (*Lefkandi* IV, 290); against their removal after the destruction is the evidence that this debris was left undisturbed in a number of cases (*Lefkandi* IV, 305). In this destruction level an object interpreted as a spearhead was discovered in the south room of Trial IV/V, suggesting that the destruction could have been violent (*Lefkandi* IV, 122-123, 283-284).

A further disturbance in Phase 2a was substantial enough to topple the mudbrick superstructure of some buildings, but does not appear to have caused a significant interruption in the occupation of Xeropolis (*Lefkandi* IV, 45-46, 65). The site continued to be occupied into the EIA.

3.3.3 Pictorial pottery

A number of LH IIIC Middle pictorial sherds have been excavated at Xeropolis showing warriors and other scenes relating to warfare. It is the most productive producer of postpalatial pictorial pottery besides Tiryns and Mycenae. As a site which has produced an extensive Late Helladic IIIC settlement, this is unsurprising. It may also suggest that if the cemetery belonging to this phase were located it may include burials with weapons.

Warriors are predominantly depicted on kraters, several fragments of which have been excavated from Xeropolis. On one, the torso and right leg of a warrior with a scabbarded sword is preserved, and another shows a similar figure (*Lefkandi* IV, 238-239). The hilt of this sword resembles Catling's group I (Catling 1961, 119). Other depictions include warriors in file and spears ready for action (*Lefkandi* IV, 240). There were also several chariot scenes, and although these are not explicitly related to warfare charioteers are often dressed as warriors. There are at least two krater sherds where the charioteer appears to be a warrior wearing greaves (*Lefkandi* IV, 239). Finally, a fragment from Amarynthos depicts a warrior riding in a chariot together with a charioteer (Sackett *et al.* 1966, 65; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982, 185; Mountjoy 1999, 718).

In addition to warriors, several fragments of kraters with representations of human figures in maritime activity have been discovered in the Euboean Gulf. One of these is from Lefkandi. It is only a fragment, and it cannot be assumed that this was part of a larger scene

depicting naval warfare. However, evidence from related sites, especially Kynos-Livanates, shows naval warfare for the first time (Papadopoulos, A. 2009, 75).

There are few depictions of hunting at Lefkandi, and none which include human figures. On one krater creatures which may be dogs or lions are hunting (*Lefkandi* IV, 242). As a site which probably does not have the history of fresco painting, which is considered the root of the interest the Argolid takes in the subject, there may not have been the background for depictions of hunting.

3.3.4 Weapons without contexts

Elsewhere on Euboea, two or three swords are known from LH IIIC. A *griffzungenschwert* is known from Agios Georgios in Avlonari, found with a bronze model of a four-wheeled wagon, two clay figurines, two animal figurines, and an LH IIIC triple vase (Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1994, 179; Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 167). Deger-Jalkotzy also mentions a type G sword from Euboea-Palioura, which is on display in the Chalcis Museum. While the context of these swords is unknown it is possible that they are indicative of burials with weapons in postpalatial Euboea.

3.4. THE ARGOLID

From the Argolid come much pictorial pottery and several weapons from hoards. However, no burials with weapons dated to LH IIIC are yet known. In the case of the Argolid it is especially important to consider how settlement organization and social hierarchies changed as a consequence of the collapse of the palaces.

3.4.1 Funerary evidence

As has been stated above, there are no burials with weapons known in the Argolid which date to the postpalatial period, in contrast to previous periods (Papadopoulos, Th. and Kontorli-

Papadopoulou 2001, 128, 135). It is possible that we simply do not know enough about postpalatial burials in the Argolid (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 168; Steinmann 2012, 337). Hints that burials with weapons would come to light were more postpalatial funerary evidence to be excavated are the reconstruction of several finds from Mycenae, including the Warrior Krater and a *griffzungenschwert*, as a burial (French 2006, 46), and the painted scene of warriors on a re-used shaft grave stele, connecting warrior imagery to funerary contexts (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982, 132). This evidence is limited and speculative, and it must be questioned how limited our knowledge of Argive postpalatial burials actually is.

While few tombs were built in the postpalatial Argolid, many old chamber tombs continue to be used at Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, and Asine (Sjöberg 2004, 91-127; Cavanagh and Mee 1998, 89-90). In Argos there are new chamber tombs in the Deiras cemetery dated to the end of LH IIIC, and Mycenae 1969 Tomb Γ also seems to date to this period. New cemeteries appear near Mycenae, including the cremation tumulus at Chania where the absence of weapons has been emphasized (Palaiologou 2013, 274). While no cemetery matches the extent of Perati in Attica, there does not appear to be a lack of postpalatial burials known in the Argolid. From the evidence available, I proceed from the assumption that there were no burials with weapons at this time in the Argolid.

3.4.2 Settlement evidence

Continued occupation at the former palatial sites suggests that they maintained some of their appeal, regardless of the cause of their destruction. The settlement at Tiryns even expanded in the postpalatial period (Maran 2010, 729). The reorganization and rebuilding on the sites of the palatial megara at Tiryns, Midea, and probably Mycenae suggests that the palatial past retained some importance to the postpalatial Argives (Maran 2006; *Midea* II, 198; French 2002, 136).

At Tiryns the Upper Citadel is generally cleared of rubble, the altar in the Great Court is remodelled, and the much smaller, but still substantial, Building T was constructed over the remains of the megaron (Maran 2006). Maran believes that the position of Building T and the rebuilding of the altar suggest a revival of ideas of rulership associated with the megaron, but Building T does not include the megaron hearth and the building is not decorated with frescos suggesting that something had changed with the symbols of power. Comparable structures to Building T were built in the Lower Citadel in the middle of LH IIIC, firstly building Bau VIa and then courtyard H3 and Room 127 (Mühlenbruch 2007, 245). Furthermore, there are buildings in the Lower Town beyond the citadel which may also have been the focus of élite activity, such as the columned hall in LH IIIC Early and “Megaron” W in LH IIIC Middle. Tiryns suffered two further postpalatial destructions at the end of LH IIIC Middle and at the very end of the Bronze Age.

The hoard known as the “Tiryns Treasure” included two swords. Maran interprets this treasure as *keimelia*, kingly treasure with a powerful history of gifting and guest-friendship mentioned in the Homeric epics (e.g. *Od.* 21.9-10; Maran 2006, 130-131). As described in the *Odyssey*, these treasures were primarily of precious metal: bronze, gold, and well-wrought iron. The Tiryns treasure contains antiques in the form of two early Mycenaean signet rings alongside an iron sickle. The value of the swords is likely to be for their metal, not their function. Maran suggests that the objects beneath the cauldron, which contained the most precious finds, were scrap metal (Maran 2006, 142). The swords are also unfinished, lacking rivet-holes in their handles, indicating that they were never used.

Midea is reoccupied after the beginning of LH IIIC Early after a gap of uncertain duration. Whoever reoccupies the site certainly appears to have been familiar with the layout in earlier times, as the megaron is rebuilt and reinforced (*Midea* I, 176). This rebuilding also included the replacement of the hearth with a central colonnade, as occurred at Tiryns with

Building T. But at Midea there is only one building comparable to Building T. The site was eventually abandoned before the end of LH IIIC.

The evidence is less clear at Mycenae for a number of reasons. A building over the palatial megaron was identified and removed by Tsountas, but this building has only recently been identified as a possible twelfth-century structure. Tsountas described the pottery found within this building as being “of *geometric type* with designs of animals and birds”; French suggests that these could date to LH IIIC Middle (2002, 136-138). The plan of this building does not incorporate parts of the palatial megaron in the same way as the buildings at Tiryns and Midea.

The only weapon from a probable postpalatial context at Mycenae was a *griffzungenschwert* excavated in the House of the Warrior Vase (Schliemann 1878, 144). No weapons have been securely dated to the twelfth century, partly the result of the damage done to the settlement by terracing in the Hellenistic Period and partly by poor or disrupted recording in the past (Iakovidis 2003, 117; French 2007, 175).

The architectural developments suggest some kind of recovery and continuity in the Argolid which was relatively peaceful for much of the postpalatial period. Mühlénbruch goes as far as to say that the competitive relationship between élites at Tiryns was the reason for its prosperity at this time, not its decline (2009, 315). However, the further destructions at Tiryns and Mycenae, and the abandonment of Midea, suggests that the Argolid was a far from peaceful place at this time.

3.4.4 *Pictorial pottery*

Argive postpalatial pictorial pottery is most common in LH IIIC Middle, and the favoured themes suggest turbulent times. The Warrior Stele from Mycenae is the only other form of representational art which is known to have survived after the collapse of the palaces.

The Warrior Vase from Mycenae is the best preserved pictorial vase of LH IIIC. It is a monumental krater, nearly half a metre in height and diameter. On side A, a procession of six marching warriors is depicted, with a woman to the far left raising an arm in a gesture of parting or mourning for the fate that may await the warriors. They are equipped with plumed helmets, spears, round shields with the lower end cut in a crescent, and what appear to be ration bags. On side B there are only five warriors, almost identically dressed to those on side A. However they wear “hedgehog” style helmets, carry large round shields, and do not carry ration bags. These soldiers have their spears raised, ready to thrust at an unseen enemy. French suggests that the vase was not found in situ, and may have originally come from a funerary context (French 2006, 46). This would imply a level of militarization in Argive postpalatial burials, especially if French is correct to suggest that this grave also contained the sword Schliemann excavated in the same building. But this goes against the general trend of LH IIIC pictorial pottery and its close connections to settlement contexts (Crouwel 1991, 33).

Accepting their use in non-funerary contexts, the preference for open vessels, especially kraters, for pictorial vessels, suggests a display function (Crouwel 1991, 7). Maran argues that the emphasis on warriors shows the instability of the social order in this period (2006, 142-3). These military aspects of pictorial decoration may emphasize the importance of military power at this time.

3.5. KNOSSOS AND CRETE

Twelfth-century evidence from Knossos is very limited, although it appears that there was no particular break in the settlement pattern. The controversy over the date of the destruction of the palace at Knossos means that the relationship between the palatial and postpalatial period is unclear (Rehak and Younger 1998, 160). The lack of burial evidence from Knossos means that we cannot be sure if warrior burials exist, or if they only begin in the SMin period. To have a more complete picture of postpalatial Crete, the evidence from the whole island will be incorporated.

3.5.1 Funerary evidence

The majority of LM IIIC Cretan burials with weapons come from the east, in the region of Siteia. Two tholos tombs from Mesa Moulana (LBA05 and LBA06) are part of a cemetery which remains unexcavated (Paschalidis 2009, 41; Xanthoudides 1904). While the burial in LBA05 was originally believed to date to PG or G on the basis of the krater in which the ashes were interred, greater knowledge of the pottery from LM IIIC has shown that both Moulana tholos tombs date to LM IIIC Late (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 164; Kanta 1980, 175; 2003, 180). LBA07 is another burial with weapons from Siteia which dates to LM IIIC Late. This burial included a kind of “diadem” paralleled in several Achaian burials with weapons.

Of the swords from the chamber tombs at Myrsini the *griffzungenschwert* in LBA08 has been dated to LM IIIC by Kanta and Kilian-Dirlmeier, while Catling suggested a date between 1250 and 1175 (Catling 1961, 119; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 95); meanwhile of the two swords in LBA09 the type D1g is almost certainly earlier than the twelfth century, but the type F2a has been described as having a “probable” LM IIIC context (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 167).

Tholos tomb LBA10, on the isthmus of Ierapetra, may be considered a burial with weapons as it contains a dagger (Kanta 1980, 146). Kanta argues that the affluent finds and tomb architecture indicate that this burial implies the “warrior” identity expressed in the other burials (2003, 180).

3.5.2 Settlement evidence

It is unclear whether or not the palace at Knossos was finally destroyed at the end of the thirteenth century, along with the palaces on the Mainland, or if it had already been destroyed two centuries earlier (Nowicki 2001, 24-25; Rehak and Younger 1998, 160). However, settlement continues in the area around the palace both after its destruction and into the EIA (see Ch.4.5.2). It is possible that the settlement at Knossos became more prosperous after LM IIIC.

Elsewhere on Crete there is a major change in settlement pattern. Lowland, especially coastal, sites are abandoned and new defensible settlements are founded high in the mountains. These sites may have been bases with a strong military element, resulting from the loss of centralized command after the collapse of the Mycenaean Palaces (Nowicki 2000, 224). Alternatively, these sites have been interpreted as the result of a “successful collapse”, a planned response to the collapse of the palaces (Wallace 2010). While it is usual to approach these sites as relocations under threat, it is also possible that coastal sites such as Palaikastro were the bases from which pirates could have roamed the Aegean.

3.5.3 Pictorial pottery

LM IIIC pictorial pottery does not generally have a martial theme. It has been suggested that Crete deliberately avoided military scenes in their pottery, preferring scenes of hunting and

publicising military status elsewhere, presumably in their burials (Papadopoulos, A. 2009, 77).

The krater from LBA05 is the most relevant Cretan vase, featuring on one side a figure on horseback, armed with a long spear, a shield, and a helmet, and on the other a man hunting. As mentioned above, the date of this krater was once questioned, but is now recognized as LM IIIC. Kanta has linked the krater through its function and decoration to several earlier sarcophagi suggesting that the hunting scenes had ritual significance; Papadopoulos seems to agree, noting that this is the only iconography which lasts in Crete to the end of the Bronze Age, and that it may be connected with religion (Kanta 1980, 175; Papadopoulos, A. 2009, 71, 77). While hunting scenes may have an “aristocratic flavour”, it appears as if here also pottery was not used extensively to show military status (Papadopoulos, A. 2009, 76).

3.5.4 Weapons without contexts

Several objects have been reported from Crete in this period but lack context for a full discussion. Several bronze weapons said to be from Siteia were obtained by the Ashmolean Museum and published by Catling (1968). These include a sword of Kilian-Dirlmeier’s type C (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 97); a sword of Catling’s type Fiii; a spearhead said to be the “twin” of one from LBA06 (Catling 1968, 105); and a spearhead comparable to twelfth-century examples from Enkomi on Cyprus. These weapons are all likely to date between the mid-thirteenth and twelfth centuries and with the comparison to the Moulana tombs it seems likely that they are LM IIIC.

There is a bronze *griffzungenschwert* said to be from Siteia in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Catling 1961, 117; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 99). Catling also mentions a dirk from Vrokastro without context. He tentatively suggests that it may belong to his Group

IV, which date to the later twelfth century and EIA (Catling 1961, 120). In addition to the swords from East Crete, in the Heraklion Museum there is a *griffzungenschwert* of type C1 from the Mesara plain (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 97).

3.6. ACHAIA

Achaia is an important region in the postpalatial period. While very little settlement evidence has been excavated, numerous cemeteries are known and almost all of them contain tombs with weapons, outnumbering those known in any other region of the Aegean in this period. Furthermore, in Achaia the number of identified sites in LH IIIC is greater than in LH IIIB (Papadopoulos, Th. 1979, 171-2). It is possible that Achaia was more able to prosper as it was isolated from the influence of the palaces in the preceding period, and so was less afflicted by their decline; furthermore its location adjacent to the Ionian Sea made Achaia the ideal location to pursue the interactions with Italy which provided the region with many of its Naue II swords (Eder and Jung 2005, 487; Giannopoulos 2008, 3, 170-171).

3.6.1 Funerary evidence

A number of burials with weapons from the Patras area date to the postpalatial period. One of the four LH IIIC burials in LBA11 had a sword (Papazoglou-Manioudaki 1994). LBA12 and LBA13 are chamber tombs near Monodendri. In LBA12 there was a bronze strip, which may have been part of a diadem similar to the one in LBA07. Another is found in LBA15, a chamber tomb which had been partly destroyed. Nearby, there was no diadem in LBA14 but there was a boar's tusk helmet. Three other chamber tombs in this cemetery, Θ, M, and O, may have contained spearheads.

There are burials with weapons in the chamber tomb cemetery at Voudeni; however, it is unclear to which period they belong as the cemetery has not been fully published and the

evidence spans LH IIB to LH IIIC (Kolonas 2009b). The swords from this cemetery do not appear to be *griffzungenschwerter*, which is unusual for Achaia (Moschos 2002, 29). Three tombs at Kallithea-Langanida contained weapons, but the evidence for their date is unclear as the burials have been disturbed. It is asserted that one burial with weapons from Klauss, LBA16, dates to LH IIIC (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 165). There were burials with weapons in three other chamber tombs, but although they contained LH IIIC pottery the dates are again unclear (Papadopoulos, Th. 1999, 270).

More burials with weapons come from the Dyme region. There were two or three burials with weapons in LBA17, one of nine tombs at Spaliareika near Louisika. One burial, a cremation in a bronze kalathos dated to LH IIIC Early, is classed as a “warrior burial” by Deger-Jalkotzy although the only weapons associated were knives (2006, 157-158). The cemetery at Portes-Kephalovryso, which includes LBA18, extends from Early Mycenaean to SMyc (Kolonas 2009a, 35-36). LBA18 also included a diadem.

It has been suggested that eastern and western Achaia were separate entities in the Mycenaean period (Moschos 2002, 19; Petropoulos 2007, 264-265). The eastern region, in this hypothesis, would come under the control of the Argolid. A more detailed study of the period would have to take this under greater consideration; however it appears that, like the Argolid, eastern Achaia has fewer burials with weapons at this time. Four tombs have been excavated at the site of Kallithea in Nikoleika near Agion.²¹ LBA19 contained at least one LH IIIC burial with weapons; two other daggers are likely to date from the earlier use of the tomb, which begins in LH IIB.

The regions of Arcadia and Elis have also been included in the cultural sphere of western Achaia in this period (Papadopoulos, Th. and Kontorli-Papadopoulou 2001, 135). At

²¹ Deger-Jalkotzy states that there are fourteen chamber tombs in total (2006, 160); but further exploration indicates that there are at least seventy (Petropoulos 2007, 253).

the very least this is characterized as a western Greek *koine* incorporating the Ionian Islands, Messenia, Aetolia, and extending up to Epirus and the Adriatic (Papadopoulos, Th. 1995; Eder 2003, 43); this network can be expanded further to incorporate the growing ties between the northwest Peloponnese and Italy towards the end of the Bronze Age (Eder and Jung 2005; Jung and Mehofer 2013). The twelfth-century evidence from Elis is not substantial, although a *griffzungenschwert* has been reported. More importantly, the last examples of bronze Aegean sword types Fii and Kilian-Dirlmeier's type 2b2 were discovered in two SMyc burials, AEG01 and AEG02.²² The evidence from Arcadia is also limited, although burials with weapons are known from the cemetery at Palaiokastro. In addition to LBA20 there is a spearhead which has not been attributed to a grave, and another *griffzungenschwert* (Blackman 1997; Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 161; Demakopoulou and Crouwel 1998).

Finally, some way north but still associated with an Ionian/Adriatic *koine*, there is an extraordinary cist tomb at Kouvaras in Arcarnania (Stauropoulou-Gatsi *et al.* 2012). This grave, dated to LH IIIC Late/SMyc, appears to be part of a small cemetery, although it is some 150 metres from the other located burials suggesting that it was considered special. It contained one of the latest Type F swords, although it was alongside a bronze *griffzungenschwert* decorated with gold wire.

3.6.2 Settlement evidence

The acropolis of Aigeira has been extensively explored and has important stratified LH IIIC levels. It is not a large or an important settlement, but it is associated with burials with weapons at Nikoleika, as well as providing interesting evidence for a destruction which could have been violent. The occupation levels which concern us here date to LH IIIC Early and

²² See also Ch.8.6.1.

Middle, however the last Bronze Age and earliest Iron Age levels were destroyed by Geometric foundations (Deger-Jalkotzy 2003, 54).

There are three phases of LH IIIC occupation, each of which ends with a destruction postdating the collapse of the palaces (Aram-Stern 2003; Deger-Jalkotzy 2003, 72-73). There is little to suggest that the destruction of Phase Ia was violent. The excavators interpret the destruction of Phase Ib as violent as it was caused by fire (Deger-Jalkotzy 2003, 58); however, the architecture of this phase includes a kiln, a hearth, and a bread oven, each of which could have accidentally caused a fire. The settlement is immediately reoccupied in Phase II, possibly by new settlers (Aram-Stern 2003, 16, 18-19; Deger-Jalkotzy 2003, 72). While the changes in settlement layout are not strong indicators, the discovery of objects of valuable metal in the Phase Ib destruction suggest that the builders of Phase II did not know they were there (Aram-Stern 2007, 16). It appears, therefore, that the inhabitants of the acropolis in Phase Ib were violently expelled at some point in LH IIIC Middle.

This evidence must not be overstated. The so-called Lower Saddle at Aigeira does not appear to show evidence of this violent intrusion, although it is plausible that the inhabitants of the Saddle were those expelling those of the acropolis. Aigeira, however, provides some evidence of the kind of localized violence which could have been common in the postpalatial Aegean.

3.6.3 *Pictorial pottery*

The excavations at Voudeni have revealed evidence of LH IIIC pictorial pottery (Papadopoulos, A. 2006, 218). Fragments showing human figures, horses, and possibly ships have been reported. One appears to show a spiky haired or helmeted man riding a chariot. Voudeni will be an important site for understanding Achaia in the twelfth century once it has been fully published.

3.6.4 Weapons without context

Several weapons without context are reportedly from Achaia. A bronze *griffzungenschwert* and a bronze spearhead in the National Museum are said to be from Klauss, and Papadopoulos suggests that they date to LH IIIC. The sword resembles that from LBA15, as well as two reportedly from Graditsa in Thessaly in the Ashmolean. The spearhead resembles that from LBA14. A bronze *griffzungenschwert* and a spearhead from Kangadi may have come from a twelfth century burial, although this is far from certain (Papadopoulos, Th. 1999, 271). A bronze *griffzungenschwert* is also reported from Elis. This region has a tradition of burials with weapons from LH IIIA to SMyc.

3.7. THE POSTPALATIAL AEGEAN: CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 1 it was stated that a warrior was the expression of a concept through material culture, and that this particular concept is an individual who acquires or maintains legitimacy through the practice of violence or warfare. In the postpalatial period there is evidence for both an élite self-identifying in burial as warriors, using objects with iconographic depictions of warriors, and the destruction of settlements. However, this evidence is distributed widely and it is only very occasionally that it all occurs in the same regions.

Burials with weapons are the most prominent evidence for warriors in the postpalatial period. In several regions these are absent, including Messenia, Boeotia, and around Volos in Thessaly; on the other hand, in addition to those mentioned, burials with weapons are known from Kephallonia and Phocis, which could form part of the proposed Achaian *koine*. Weapons are also known from burials at Hexalophos in Thessaly, Naxos, Kos, and Rhodes (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006; Steinmann 2012, 223-253). Deger-Jalkotzy suggests that burials with weapons were a common phenomenon throughout most of postpalatial Greece (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 167); I am in greater agreement with Steinmann, who suggests a small-scale resurgence in

LH IIIC (2012, 222-223, 337), and thus suggest that the evidence points to much more specific regional developments. The evidence from Perati indicates that there were very few burials with weapons in Attica, but they are more common in east Crete and Achaia. In east Crete, there is also evidence for the reorganization of settlements into more defensible positions. The pictorial evidence of hunting scenes suggests that in Crete warrior identity remained associated with hunting as it had been in the palatial period.

At Athens and on Euboea the limited evidence for burials with weapons is perhaps the result of limited burial evidence. However, the tiny number of tombs with weapons at Perati suggests that in this region of the Aegean burial with weapons was not common in the twelfth century, and only begins in earnest in the EIA (see Ch.4.2). Attica also lacks the pictorial pottery seen elsewhere in LH IIIC. From the evidence available, which is far from complete, it does not seem that postpalatial Athens was a particularly military society. The pictorial evidence from Lefkandi shows more interest in warriors; it is also plausible that there were burials with weapons in central Euboea. However, at present we must be cautious and focus on the positive evidence of pictorial pottery.

An important question is where the Argolid fits into this pattern. There are two possible explanations for the absence of burials with weapons in the postpalatial Argolid. The first is that the state of research does not allow us to assume that there are no burials with weapons, as argued by Deger-Jalkotzy and Steinmann. The second is that in the Argolid there are no postpalatial burials with weapons to be found, as in some other former palatial regions such as Messenia and Boeotia. It is possible that the élites of the Argolid did not display their power in burial at this time. Rather, their status was emphasized while they were alive in communal dining in the large buildings on the sites of the former palaces, where pictorial pottery such as the Warrior Vase was the centrepiece, and *keimelia* such as the Tiryns treasure could be exchanged. It is possible that these figures remained in command of

military forces but did not identify as warriors themselves. The evidence for this display of status is limited, but it is more substantial than the evidence for burials with weapons.

In contrast to the Argolid, Achaia includes a significant number of burials with weapons. All of these burials show through their grave goods that they are members of the wealthy élite whose pastimes included drinking parties, probably hunting, and war. Achaia's prominent geographical position allowed it to interact with the Ionian and Adriatic Seas, making it an important access route into the Peloponnese from Italian cultures (Giannopoulos 2008, 3). Furthermore, the diadems in LBA07, LBA12, LBA15, and LBA18 indicate a connection between east Crete and Achaia. These objects cannot be reconstructed as helmets; therefore it also appears that they are non-functional and perhaps decorative, reinforcing the idea of the warrior as a prestigious figure beyond the battlefield in these regions in the postpalatial period.

In SMyc/EPG, however, there is a single burial with weapons at Tiryns, ARG01. Rather than representing a continuing tradition from LH IIIC, I believe this burial is more akin to EIA burials with weapons such as KNS21 and EUB02, burials of males with weapons, accompanied by females and valuable metal objects which mark them out as spectacular; they are also often the first burial in the cemeteries in which they are found. ARG01, therefore, does not represent the continuation of a Bronze Age tradition, but the beginning of an EIA one.²³

In order to demonstrate that burials with weapons represent a warrior élite they must be regular but restricted, amongst the richest and the best constructed. At Perati, the numbers are too limited. Even if weapons have been removed from the tombs it seems unlikely that the grave goods of a particularly prestigious group could have just been taken from them. In

²³ See also Ch.8.4.1, Ch.8.6.1, and Crielaard 1998.

Achaia and east Crete it is plausible to reconstruct an élite warrior class. In the Argolid it does not appear that prestige lay at all in personal military achievement, but perhaps in the control of military force.

The most convincing evidence to connect burials with weapons to acts of violence is use-wear on swords. A sword from Voudeni on display in the Patras Museum shows signs of intense use; many other weapons show damage and signs of sharpening. Unlike the earlier LBA, no swords from the postpalatial period are clearly “finely crafted yet unserviceable” as opposed to “functional and workaday” (Molloy 2010, 114). Even the most decorative *griffzungenschwert* from the cist tomb at Kouvaras, with gold wire decoration, shows signs of damage which could be use-wear.

Actual evidence for violence may come from the destruction levels which appear at a number of sites throughout this period. Xeropolis, Tiryns, and Aigeira all suffer one or more potentially violent destructions in the postpalatial period. In the wider Aegean world the so-called mansion at Koukounaries on Paros suffers complete destruction by fire in LH IIIC; human remains of adults were found in the main corridor of this building, while children were found in the basement (Schilardi 1992). Phylakopi on Melos appears to have suffered destruction at around the same time. The resettlement on Crete may be a response to more threatening times, with the sea regarded as a particular threat.

Pictorial pottery is best known from the Lefkandi and the Argolid, where extensive postpalatial settlements have been excavated, published, and studied; it is possible that other sites will show the same picture in time, as appears to be the case at Voudeni. The absence is perhaps most notable on Crete. Throughout the Mycenaean period into LH IIIC Mycenae and Tiryns were two of three major producers of pictorial pottery – the third is Berbati, also in the Argolid. In the Citadel House Area at Mycenae, LH IIIC Middle is the most productive

period since LH IIB (Crouwel 1991, 4). While the proportion of pictorial pottery in the ceramic assemblage as a whole is tiny (Crouwel 2006, 22), when human figures are depicted the focus is on violent acts such as hunting and warfare indicating a society which places value on militarism. The limited use of pictorial decoration on pottery and the favouring of scenes of élite life such as hunting suggest that these vases were used as a part of élite display. That the most common shape decorated is the krater supports this proposal as it would form the centrepiece of communal dining, although it is also the best shape to allow large compositions. Furthermore, as many of these scenes appear to have been adopted from fresco painting it is only the medium, not the iconography, which has changed from the preceding period (Papadopoulos, A. 2006, 239).

The evidence for warfare is unevenly spread throughout the Aegean in the twelfth century. Weapons, in burials or otherwise, are focused in particular regions; settlements indicate differing attitudes; destructions are common. The Argolid appears to show a settled population where violence reoccurs, while in Achaia alongside élite warriors there are violent destructions. These Achaian warriors have connections in Crete, where warriors lived in defensible settlements. But this could be misrepresentation of the evidence. Although in part a reflection of the history of the regions and their excavation, this uneven spread is also the result of an emerging regionalism in the Aegean, which continues into the EIA. On the other hand, there is a major change following the twelfth century. For over three-hundred years there is no evidence of another major, violent destruction in the Aegean (Snodgrass 2000, 297-298). In the postpalatial period, across the Aegean, armies large enough to destroy settlements could still be fielded and commanded, and in some regions militarism meant social prominence. In most of the Aegean in the subsequent EIA, this does not appear to have been the case.

Chapter 4

Funerary Evidence

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The majority of known Early Iron Age weapons have come from burials. These have been excavated in many regions throughout the Aegean, especially in central Greece and Crete.²⁴ In this chapter burials with weapons, and supposed weapons, in the regions covered by this thesis will be considered in the context of the burial practices, the settlements, and the cemeteries in which they are found. The tombs are described individually in [Appendix A](#).

4.2. ATTICA

4.2.1 Tomb types and burial practices

There is remarkable consistency in the method of burial throughout the cemeteries of Athens and Attica. However, there are changes over time. Multiple burial as practiced in the LBA chamber tombs is replaced by single burial in SMyc, with only a handful of double burials scattered through the rest of the EIA. This period also sees the introduction of cremation, which by the tenth century (MPG) has become universal in the form of the ‘trench-and-hole’ cremation.²⁵

‘Trench-and-hole’ cremation has been reconstructed as follows. The deceased was first cremated before their bones and some of the grave goods were collected and placed in the urn. By MG the collection of bones could be extraordinarily careful, as in the case of

²⁴ Besides the regions covered by this thesis, burials with weapons occur at e.g. Halos (Wace and Thompson 1912, 8-21, 25-29), Liatovouni (Douzougli and J. Papadopoulos 2010, 23-62), Vrokastro (*Vrokastro* I, 123-174; *Vrokastro* II, 156-159), etc.

²⁵ Earlier examples exist, for example catalogue [ATT03](#), [ATT04](#), and [ATT08](#); however it is not until MPG that the rite is universal in Athens.

Agora grave H 16:6, where the tiny bones of a foetus were recovered (Liston and J. Papadopoulos 2004, 16). The urn could be closed with a variety of objects – a sherd or complete pot, a bronze bowl or *phalaron*, or a large stone – before being placed in a hole, in some cases with offerings. The trench was filled with the remains of the pyre, including any grave goods which had been burned on the pyre and not previously collected. In these ashes are found the remains of pots, animal bones, and often weapons. This form of burial was used for both men and women, but rarely for children for whom the normal practice was inhumation and whose graves are rare until the mid-eighth century (Morris 1987, 20); however, three EPG cremations of children are known in the Erechtheion Street cemetery (including [ATT38](#)).

In MG inhumation reappears, and by LG is once more the prevailing rite in Athens. This also coincides with an apparent decline in the number of burials with weapons. Inhumations were supine, with the body lain on its back in the grave with both arms to the side and the legs fully extended. In some cases, such as [ATT18](#), there are traces of a wooden coffin. Grave goods were placed around the body. Above the body were the remains of the funerary feast, burned sherds and animal bones. Children are more commonly found amongst adults in family plots, with *enchytrismos* the usual burial practice.

These changes in burial practice occur in common throughout Athens and Attica in the EIA. There are few exceptions, strongly suggesting a social and cultural uniformity throughout Attica which is not present in many other regions of Greece at this time. Of the fifty Attic burials in [Appendix A1](#) thirty are trench-and-hole cremations ([ATT03](#), [ATT04](#), [ATT06](#), [ATT08-17](#), [ATT19-23](#), [ATT26-30](#), [ATT36](#), [ATT37](#), [ATT39](#), [ATT40](#), [ATT48-50](#)), five or six are primary cremations ([ATT05](#), [ATT24](#), [ATT25](#), [ATT38](#), [ATT42](#), and possibly [ATT41](#)). The burial rites of three are unknown ([ATT35](#), [ATT45](#), [ATT47](#)). The remaining eleven are inhumations, divided between SMyc/EPG ([ATT01](#), [ATT02](#), [ATT07](#)) and MG-LG

(ATT18, ATT31-34, ATT44), while two further examples are “Geometric”, probably post-770 (ATT43, ATT46).

Monumental vases were used as grave markers for much of the Geometric Period at least; in LG figured decoration becomes common (see Ch.7.2.2).

4.2.2 *Distribution*

The burial grounds of Athens have been interpreted as either large cemeteries or smaller burial plots (Morris 1987, 72-4). Over time, burial plots could amalgamate into cemeteries, although some cemeteries were distinct from the beginning. In some cases, such as areas where there is substantial later disturbance – like the Agora – or if a burial is uncovered during a rescue excavation, it is often difficult to know if a grave is part of a plot or a cemetery. Certain burial plots can be easily identified where they have been delineated by a wall such as the Erechtheion Street plot (Brouskari 1980, 17) or that at Nea Ionia (Lemos 2002, 154). Dickinson seems to suggest that the larger “cemeteries” may have begun as smaller burial plots which eventually merged into grave-fields (Dickinson 2006, 185); the Kerameikos is an obvious example.

The topography of Athens in the EIA has been reconstructed around these burial plots (Plates 1b, 2a). Most EIA settlements appear to have been close, small, clusters of villages associated with burial plots (Snodgrass 1980, 31; Morris 1987, 62-3). Lemos notes that the archaeological evidence for such a relationship is absent which means that this proposal is purely speculative, although probably correct (2002, 135; 2006a, 514). An alternative proposal is that the Classical Agora was an EIA potters’ field with no contemporary habitation, surrounded by cemeteries, with habitation on the Acropolis and to the south (Papadopoulos, J. 2003). While Papadopoulos’ arguments are compelling, it is difficult to

judge a proposal based on unpublished material.²⁶ Furthermore, Papadopoulos excludes the possibility that potters lived and worked in the same place (2003, 276),²⁷ which may be anachronistic. Caution is advisable before fully accepting Papadopoulos' proposals.

The continued use of many grave plots and cemeteries throughout the EIA indicates an essential stability in Athens at this time (Whitley 1991a, 352-3). Morris suggests that burial plots represent kinship units with some kind of descent-based lineage (1987, 91). In the LG grave precinct just south of the Tholos in the Agora the skeletal evidence is said to have shown consanguinity (Young and Angel 1939, 237-242).

The most important cemetery in EIA Athens is the **Kerameikos**, which lay to the NE of the Acropolis, on either side of the river Eridanos at the site of the later gates of Athens.²⁸ The burials begin in SMyc and continue long after the EIA. Kraiker suggested that the cemetery should be divided up into plots of five to eight adults (*Kerameikos* I, 7-8). The burial grounds to the south (**Agia Triada**) and to the north (**Pompeion**) of the Eridanos are separate and should be treated as distinct cemeteries (Morris 1987, 74). However, there is no evidence for domestic or other non-funerary use of this area so it should be considered that this area was perceived as being for burial only, even if the cemeteries were separate. Burials began perhaps slightly earlier in the Pompeion cemetery, although the most recent publication shows that there were SMyc burials in Agia Triada as well (Lemos 2002, 152; *Kerameikos* XVIII, 35, 227). There are a total of six burials with weapons in the Pompeion (ATT01-06), and fourteen in Agia Triada (ATT07-ATT20), including burials found only with bronze *phalara* (see below, Ch.4.2.3.3). Burials with weapons appear in the Pompeion from SMyc to EG II and in Agia Triada from SMyc/EPG to MG I or II.

²⁶ It is clear that potters were working in the Classical Agora in the EIA; but his description of the cemeteries, based on the unpublished Agora volume, and the material from the Acropolis remain difficult to judge.

²⁷ A criticism also noted by Thomas (2005).

²⁸ Although the course of the Eridanos has changed slightly over time it is clear that the distinction between the north and south banks existed in the EIA.

The **Piraeus Street** or ‘**Dipylon**’ Cemetery is a separate burial plot near the Kerameikos. The later Dipylon Gate of Athens gave its name both to this cemetery and the vast quantities of LG pottery which came from it. This burial plot combines rich offerings with figured grave markers. There are three eighth-century inhumations with weapons (ATT32-34), and at least two other swords, one reported in 1888 (Dümmler 1888, 297), while another (Inv. G 207.1) was presented to the Ashmolean in 1896 by Arthur Evans with spearheads and an axe said to be from the same tomb (Snodgrass 1964, 96, 166). D’Onofrio suggested that this sword was probably the one in ATT32 (2011, 659), but this grave did not contain spearheads or an axe. A possible third sword was reported from the 1870s excavations alongside an iron spear (Galanakis 2011, 174 n.14).²⁹ Considering the wide dispersal of the pottery from these excavations, it is not implausible that more swords were excavated. Burials are known from LH IIIC Late/SMyC and the Geometric Period, although apparently not PG (Galanakis 2011, 193; see also Plate 1a). Therefore, it is possible that the undated or disturbed burials date considerably earlier. But the evidence more strongly points to the eighth century, not only on the grounds of the Dipylon burials with weapons, but also the MG burials with weapons in the Kriezī Cemetery, which include an inhumation.

The **Kriezī Street** cemetery lies NE of the Kerameikos. The cemetery has not been fully published, but the graves number over a hundred, spanning from SMyC to the Classical period. There are two SMyC cremations with weapons (ATT26-27) which are among the earliest burials with weapons in Athens (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 202-203; D’Onofrio 2011, 647, n. 6). There are also four EG-MG burials, including one inhumation (ATT28-31).

²⁹ Galanakis suggested that the sword mentioned here is likely to be the one in the Ashmolean museum bought by Evans (pers. comm.). He believed that it is more likely that the weapon came from the excavations by Rhoisopoulos in 1871-2 than those by Brückner and Pernice in 1893 when it would have been more difficult to export objects from excavations.

The area of the **Classical Agora** had been used for burials as early as LH IIB (*Agora* XIV, 3). In LH IIIC habitation appears to begin alongside the burials, which may continue into the EIA alongside pottery production. The burials decline in the seventh century. The excavators suggest that EIA burial plots run alongside ancient roads (Young 1949, 275-80). The continuous occupation of the Agora means that many burials have been disturbed. The distribution of graves around the edges of the Agora area may be an accidental survival. It is certainly the case that alongside surviving burials there are cuttings in the bedrock which seem to represent tombs which have been destroyed (Thompson 1950, 331; Smithson 1974, 329-30). This means that the five burials with weapons known from the Agora are not necessarily the only burials which contained weapons. Burials with weapons are found in plots beneath the South Stoa (ATT21), in sector D:16 to the NW of the Areopagus (ATT22), in R:20 on the north-eastern slope of the Areopagus, just north of the Panathanaic way (ATT23), and on the north slope of the Areopagus (ATT24-25). In the many other burial groups and scattered solitary graves which have been excavated in the Agora area there are no burials with weapons.

The burial plot on **Erechtheion Street** lies due south of the Acropolis, very near the later city walls, dating from SMyc to Geometric. The plot is surrounded by a fourth-century peribolos wall which may have its origins in PG (Brouskari 1980, 17). Two cremation burials in the cemetery contain weapons dating to LPG and MG II/LG I (ATT38-9).

Burials with weapons have also been found in isolated excavations on **various streets**: **Vasilissis Sophias/Herodes Atticus Street** (ATT35), to the far east of the city; **Agiou Markou** (ATT36) slightly northeast of Metropolis Square; at the site of the church in **Metropolis Square** (ATT37); at the junction of **Mitsaion/Zitrou Street** (ATT40), south of the Acropolis; **Kavallotti Street** (ATT42) in the same area south of the Acropolis; the Ilissos Grave (ATT43) at **Larnaka**. There are two burials which may include weapons in the

Kynosarges Hill area (ATT41) southwest of the Acropolis. The recently excavated cemetery at **Kifissia** also included one burial with a sword (ATT44).

In addition to these cemeteries and burial plots a number of excavated cemeteries did not include burials with weapons. In other cases, especially those discovered in rescue excavations, it is possible that the absence of burials with weapons is coincidental. As Papadopoulos notes, the concentration of burials lies to the northwest of the Acropolis in the thoroughly excavated Kerameikos and Agora areas (2003, 298). Between twenty and thirty areas with EIA burials have been excavated throughout Athens.

4.2.3 Weapons in burials

The most common weapons in Attic burials are swords, with thirty-two examples, closely followed by twenty-seven spearheads. Other weapons are considerably less frequent. These include eight daggers, three *phalara*, two arrowheads, and two axes. For more details, see Table 2.

4.2.3.1 Swords and daggers

Swords were found in every cemetery in which burials with weapons occur in Athens, in both cremation and inhumation graves, and throughout the period. Seventeen swords and daggers were preserved to a degree that they can be categorized. Three were daggers, Swo028, Swo038, and Swo069; five were short-swords, Swo072, Swo075, Swo076, Swo086, and Swo097; nine were medium-swords, Swo100, Swo101, Swo103, Swo108, Swo111-113, Swo115, and Swo116. Swo075 in ATT02 is the earliest iron short-sword known in the Aegean; earlier burials contained nothing longer than a dagger. Medium-swords do not occur before LPG and are more common in the Geometric Period.

The only Attic graves to contain both a sword and a dagger were ATT13 (Swo038; Swo114) and ATT33 (Swo100; the length of the dagger is not reported). There were no cases with more than one sword or dagger.

Several of these swords have been intentionally bent out of shape or “killed” (see Ch.8.6.3): Swo038, Swo114, and Swo115, as well as the swords in ATT36, ATT40, and ATT49 had all been bent around the shoulders of the cremation urn (Plate 8c); Swo108 was bent double (Plate 7a) and that in ATT37 was bent into an S shape.³⁰ All of these graves date to LPG and EG (*ca.* 950-850). Several other swords were broken, which may have been intentional but also could have been the result of corrosion: Swo012, Swo014, Swo20, Swo072, Swo076, Swo078, Swo086, Swo101, Swo111, Swo112, and those in ATT24, ATT38, and ATT48. Swo072 was both slightly bent and broken into eight pieces. The sword in ATT29 is likely to have been “killed” as it was found inside the amphora (Alexandri 1967, 22). Several swords also show traces of being burned on the pyre: Swo038, Swo101, Swo108, Swo112, Swo114, Swo115, and that in ATT37. D’Onofrio calls Swo086, Swo101, and Swo112 “remarkable exceptions” to the practice of bending swords; however, information about eight swords suggests that they were not “killed” in any way: Swo028, Swo069, Swo075, Swo097, Swo100, Swo103, and Swo116 (Plate 2c, 3e).

4.2.3.2 Spears

Seven spearheads from Attica were bronze: Spe004, Spe027, Spe035, Spe073, one of those in ATT24, and both in ATT27. These predominately date to SMyc/EPG, with the exception of ATT24 which is EG II. Nineteen were iron: Spe008, Spe019, Spe032, Spe057, Spe066, Spe083, Spe109, Spe115, Spe131, Spe149, another in ATT24, one in each of ATT06,

³⁰ Swo069 is also said to have been bent around the shoulders of the amphora, but the sword is shown unbent in the publication (as noted in D’Onofrio 2011, 660). It is incredibly difficult to unbend these swords without destroying them (Haarer, pers. comm.).

ATT28, ATT37, and ATT45, and two in each of ATT33 and ATT43. The metal of the spearhead in ATT49 was not specified.

The twenty-seven spearheads were divided between eleven graves. ATT03, ATT22, ATT24, ATT27, ATT33, and ATT43 each contained a pair. The lengths of only two of these pairs were reported. In ATT22, Spe083 is more likely to be a javelin than the accompanying Spe131 as its socket represents a greater proportion of the whole head, and it is narrower. However, as they accompany a sword (Swo114) it is possible that both are javelins.

ATT03 is a double burial. Spe004 is said to accompany a 15-16 year-old, while Spe072 is with a 20-22 year-old. However, given the tiny size of Spe004, and the miniscule socket which does not seem to suggest a javelin, it is possible that these spearheads both belong to the same weapon: Spe072 could be the head of a spear of which Spe004 was the butt (Plate 3c). Swo012, which accompanies these spearheads, is incomplete but is probably a dagger. Two of the three daggers in Attic burials were accompanied by a longer weapon, with the exception of Swo069, which verges on short-sword length. Therefore, this dagger should be accompanied by a thrusting spear.

4.2.3.3 Armour

There are three bronze *phalara* from Athens, all in Agia Triada: Pha07, Pha09, and Pha12. None of these burials contained other weapons, although ATT15 (Pha09) may contain an axe (Axe09). An iron *phalaron*, Pha10, comes from Kynosarges. Pha12 dates to SMyc/EPG while Pha07 and Pha09 are LPG; Pha10 is probably LG.

As discussed previously (Ch.1.3.1.3) the interpretation of *phalara* as shield bosses relies primarily on context. The Kerameikos *phalara* are interpreted as shield-bosses by most scholars, although doubt remains (*Kerameikos* IV, 27, 33, 41-2; Lorimer 1950, 154;

Snodgrass 1964, 47; Lemos 2002, 124-5). This doubt is based primarily on the absence of weapons from these graves, noted by Lorimer, who concluded that this could be accidental (1950, 155), and D’Onofrio, who connects the *phalara* more generally with the “sacral/sacrificial sphere” and “intra-élite diversification of funerary practices” (2011, 649-650). The Kynosarges *phalaron* was also not associated with weapons. It is necessary to explore this doubt further.

As none of the Kerameikos *phalara* are the same type as one another it is possible that different interpretations should be sought for each. Pha10 and Pha12 have the long spike which may indicate that this was the most likely type to have been a shield-boss (Plate 4c). Pha09 has a shorter spike, which could perhaps have been a breastplate or belt-attachment, but which is more difficult to classify; it also had traces of leather adhering to the underside (Plate 6a-b). Finally, Pha07 has no spike and has simply a hemispherical bulge rising from a disk, similar to examples from Liatovouni (Plate 5a-b; Douzougli and Papadopoulos 2010, 30 fig. 8). The absence of the spike means that the *phalaron* could be used in a number of different ways.

All of the Kerameikos *phalara* were used to close the mouth of a cremation urn (Plate 4d). We do not have this information for Pha10 as it was not assigned to a grave (Droop 1906, 92). It is difficult to establish the significance of the objects used to close ash urns. In the SMyc/EPG ‘trench-and-hole’ cremation burials in the Kerameikos, one has no special covering for the urn (PG Gr.14) while another, PG Gr.B (ATT04), is covered with a schist slab (Styrenius 1967, 66). Both urns are belly-handled amphorae. As ATT04 is a burial with weapons, containing an iron dagger and a bronze spearhead, one might suspect that if it were customary to cover the urn mouth with the shield of the warrior then this would have been used in this case as well, although it could be argued that only a representative sample of the warrior’s equipment was necessary for their burial. The weapons in ATT04 are the only

grave gifts besides the urn, and in ATT08 the *phalaron* is the only gift besides the urn. In the case of ATT08, unlike ATT12 and ATT15, the vaulted and spiked side of the *phalaron* was facing upwards covering the mouth of the urn. In this case the *phalaron* looks rather like a lid for the amphora. It is possible that this is the entirety of the function it served.

By LPG, however, there are many more ‘trench-and-hole’ cremations and many different objects used to close the mouth of the urn. Often this was a large stone, as in ATT22, the “warrior-craftsman”. Small vases are the most common objects used to close vases, although there is no great consistency in the types of vase (Styrenius 1967, 94). In PG Gr.48 a bronze bowl was used as the cover (*Kerameikos* IV, 44-5). The only undisturbed grave without a cover for the urn was Agora Gr.XXIII (Styrenius 1967, 93-4). Therefore, the selection of Pha07 and Pha09 to close the urns in ATT12 and ATT15 may be significant.

The apparent absence of weapons remains a problem in interpreting either of these *phalara* as a shield-boss, helmet, or breastplate. Their sizes are comparable to those from Vergina which are found in women’s graves and are interpreted as belt-attachments.³¹ It is possible that this could be an explanation for Pha07 as the form of the *phalaron* also matches examples from Vergina. This would seem to be the only case in the Athenian cemeteries in which a belt-attachment was used to close the mouth of the urn. However, the rarity of the use of *phalara* should not mean this is much of an obstacle.

The spike of Pha09 means that it cannot be easily interpreted as a belt attachment. Leather adheres to the reverse of this *phalaron*. The other finds in ATT15 included an iron chisel (Axe09) and another kind of iron tool inside the urn (Plate 6c). The chisel could be interpreted as an axe; this would mean that the tomb contained a potential weapon as well as the *phalaron* (see Ch.1.3.1.5). It is somewhat smaller than the axe from ATT22 but this need

³¹ Those from Vergina vary between 7 and 18 cm in diameter; see Appendix B4 for Pha07 and Pha09.

not rule out its use as a weapon. It seems unusual that the well-equipped warrior from the Areopagus grave would not be buried with a shield-boss while his poorly equipped near-contemporary was. But in this instance it may be possible to interpret this grave as a burial with weapons on the basis of the combination of axe and *phalaron*.

It may seem to be a difficulty that three separate interpretations have been presented for the three *phalara* which have been found in Athenian graves. As Snodgrass states: “they vary considerably in appearance, and I do not think that any one explanation will apply to all of them” (1964, 38). As for the example from Kynosarges it is perhaps to be interpreted as a shield-boss as it is similar to the Kerameikos example which best fits that explanation; however, the absence of any context to the find means that certainty is impossible.

4.2.3.4 Archery

Two Athenian graves contain arrowheads, both in Agia Triada (ATT07, ATT13).³² In addition to the arrowhead ATT07 contained only a lekythos; ATT13 contained a sword (Swo115) and a dagger (Swo038), a neck-handled amphora as the cremation urn, and other gifts showing that it clearly fits into the wider pattern of burials with weapons.

D’Onofrio argues that ATT07 represents the continuation of an LBA tradition of a simple bowman’s burial (2011, 648). This “tradition” includes four other burials across Attica: the MH tumulus II at Marathon (Vraná) containing 13 obsidian, 2 flint, and 1 bronze arrowheads (Michaud 1971, 837-840); the LH IIB phase of Agora chamber tomb VII (“Ares Tomb”), burial VIII, containing 5 bronze and 4 obsidian arrowheads (*Agora* XIII, 189); the LH IIIB Menidi tholos, which contained 17 bronze arrowheads (Avila 1983, 86, 106-7, 116); and the LH III chamber tomb I, chamber 2, at Spata, containing 32 bronze arrowheads (Avila 1983, 86-7, 91, 104, 108-9, 116). All of these burials contain many other grave goods. These

³² The English summary of Alexandri 1968 suggests that ATT28 contains an iron arrowhead; this is a mistranslation of αἰχμή ἀκοντίου (spearhead) (D’Onofrio 2011, 659).

burials are not defined by their arrowheads, and cannot be identified as a continuous tradition as they are too few over too long a period. Furthermore, these burials all included significant numbers of arrowheads, similar to EUB04 and EUB08, while ATT07 only contained one.

If ATT07 does not represent the continuation of an LBA tradition then its place in the scheme of EIA burials with weapons must be considered afresh. The arrowhead was discovered embedded in the arm of the skeleton, suggesting to the excavator that it represented the cause of death of a warrior (Plate 4a-b; von Freytag 1995, 648-9); however, the bone report by Lagia showed that the skeleton was aged between 8.5 and 11.5 years (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 277). Lagia suggested that the position of the arrowhead could have led to a haemorrhage capable of leading to the child's death and also reports perimortem fractures in the right femur and left humerus, possibly the result of violence. Against this is the suggestion that the arrowhead may have moved after deposition, but it is unlikely to move so far that it could penetrate bone. Lagia suggests that the death of a juvenile in violent conflict should lead to questions about the participation of children in violence in this period (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 279). It is much more likely that the arrowhead was the cause of death than this was a continuation of a tradition which finds no further evidence in SMyc or the Iron Age. This means that the arrowhead should not be considered an intentional grave good, and thus ATT07 is not the burial of a warrior. It is possible that the child was killed during a raid in which it was an innocent bystander rather than an active participant in conflict. The possibility that this could have been a hunting accident is less likely as the arrowhead is barbed; barbed arrowheads do more damage to their victims and are thus unsuitable against meat which is intended to be eaten.

The man in ATT13 is a different matter entirely. This is not only a burial with weapons but an exceptional one including both a dagger and a sword, which have been “killed” and wrapped around the neck of the urn. The arrowhead was found in the cremation

urn with the bones. This may suggest that it was amongst the bones when they were cremated, perhaps inside the body like the arrowhead in ATT07. Very few weapons occur inside the cremation urn. If this arrowhead was the cause of death, this would explain why it does in this case. However, given the care with which bones were collected for Athenian EIA cremations, the inclusion of this arrowhead with the bones would have to be a conscious choice. Cremation removes most of the evidence of combat trauma, but it is possible to think that ATT13 contains the weapon which killed the man buried in this grave. In which case, there are no examples of arrowheads as intentional grave goods in EIA Attica.

4.2.3.5 Axes

Two axes were found in Athenian burials: Axe09, which is very small, and Axe20. The latter of these occurs with Swo114, Spe083, and Spe131. This axe could be a supplementary part of this warrior's kit, or a valuable iron object owned by this man. Axe09, if it is an axe, must be the sole weapon of a warrior fighting with a shield (Pha09), or some other explanation is needed for the *phalaron*.

4.3. CENTRAL EUBOEA

In addition to Lefkandi and Eretria, Chalcis and Oropos are important sites on the Euboean Gulf. Neither of these has produced burials with weapons: in Chalcis the evidence is limited while most of the graves known from Oropos appear to be those of children.³³ On the other hand, burials with weapons have been discovered at the Euboean settlement of Cumae in the Bay of Naples, which lies well beyond the boundaries of this thesis (Pellegrini 1903; Coldstream 1994, 54-55).

³³ EIA burials at Chalcis: Themelis 1969. EIA burials at Oropos: Mazarakis Ainian 1998, 204-206; 2002, 165-166.

4.3.1 Tomb types and burial practices

4.3.1.1 Lefkandi

Both cremation and inhumation are represented at Lefkandi. However, as in many of the tombs there is little evidence for full inhumation or cremation, the excavators proposed a dual burial rite where token remains of bones were inhumed after cremation (*Lefkandi I*, 211). This was rejected initially by Catling, who emphasized that the grave goods were arranged as if assuming the presence of a human body and the bones which did survive may have done so due to their proximity to metal objects (1985a). After further excavation of the Toumba cemetery revealed more skeletal remains showing the corrosive effects of the soil, the theory of a complex combined cremation/inhumation rite has lost favour (Popham *et al.* 1989, 118; Lemos 2002, 162, n. 137).

There are two types of cremation burial at Lefkandi: pyres, which are either *in situ* cremations in pits or the remains of the pyres for the second type, urn cremations. Many grave goods are sometimes found in the ash deposit of pyres indicating not only that they were burned with the body, but that these pyres were intended to be final resting places (Lemos 2002, 163). Other offerings were made after the pyre had stopped burning (*Lefkandi I*, 210). The unburned oinochoai in EUB08 may have been used to pour wine onto the pyre as it burned. In the case of secondary cremations the bones were gathered and deposited in an urn; sometimes these ashes may have been wrapped in cloth (e.g. EUB02) and in others the remaining ashes were deposited in the fill (e.g. EUB08). There are four urn cremations with weapons (EUB02; EUB03; EUB07; EUB08); these resemble the Athenian trench-and-hole cremations (see above Ch.4.2.1), although EUB02 and EUB08 are more like shaft-graves. Eleven burials with weapons are pyres (EUB9-14; EUB16-17; EUB19-21).

There are two certain (EUB04; EUB18) and four probable inhumations with weapons (EUB01; EUB05; EUB06; EUB15). They are all shaft graves – rectangular rock cuttings in the conglomerate bedrock, usually with a stone cover slab (*Lefkandi I*, 198). Each of the surviving skeletons had been laid outstretched. They may have been wearing their weapons, although the sword of EUB04 would have hung from a belt, while that of EUB18 would have been slung across the body in a baldric (Catling 1985a, 21-22).

Several double burials occur throughout the use of the cemeteries. These vary between a cremation and an inhumation (e.g. EUB02; T.55), double cremation (e.g. EUB03) and double inhumation (e.g. E.45; T.49). The skeletal evidence suggests that EUB02 and EUB03 each contained a man and a woman. The shaft of EUB02 is square, but a mudbrick structure was constructed at the bottom in order to make the grave L-shaped (Plate 9b). This facilitated the combination of inhumation and urn cremation in a single shaft, with the male cremation in the small square section and the female outstretched next to him. On present evidence in SMyc-EPG Skoubris male and female graves cannot be distinguished by burial rite or grave goods, so the distinction between the male and female burials in Toumba is an indication of an important change in society. The burials were almost certainly contemporaneous as there is no evidence that the shaft was emptied and refilled. The horses also appear to have been buried simultaneously with the humans, probably as sacrifices. The bits suggest that these horses were harnessed to a chariot. It is not reported whether or not EUB03 was re-opened, but the burial urns certainly appear to be contemporaneous.³⁴

It has also been suggested that EUB05 might be a double burial (Popham *et al* 1982a, 230); this may also be true of EUB06. These graves present numerous difficulties. The skeletal evidence from EUB05, a single tooth, suggests that the deceased was a child aged

³⁴ The only double burial which clearly shows second use as opposed to contemporaneous burial is T.49 (Popham *et al* 1989, 118). This suggests that where it is not clear the assumption should be contemporaneous burial.

around ten years. There was no bone recovered from EUB06. The interpretation as a double burial is dependent on the grave goods. Lemos suggests that the grave goods in EUB05 indicate both a male and female burial (2007a, 278); this would fit with the double burials mentioned above. While they closely match those from EUB05 otherwise, the grave goods from EUB06 do not include the jewellery which Lemos associates with female burials. An alternative interpretation, prompted by Lemos' suggestion that the dagger in EUB05 (Swo057) may indicate a young man and the likely dagger in EUB06 which has not been fully published, is that these are both burials of children. The high status of children in EIA Lefkandi is suggested by earlier burials interpreted as those of children (S.10; S.16 see Lemos 2002, 164) and confirmed by later graves identified as children through skeletal analysis (T.5; T.22; T.36).

There are numerous interpretations of the double burials at Lefkandi. A contemporaneous double burial relies on a sequence of events which ensures the deceased die at similar times (Antonaccio 2002, 20). In contrast to the “hero”, his female companion was inhumed and adorned with precious metals. The phrasing of the excavators in describing the EUB02 suggests that *she* was buried with *him* (Popham et al 1982b, 173). Hughes took this description as a suggestion of suttee, the practice of wifely suicide on the grave of her husband in which the woman would normally be cremated along with her husband, although his preferred explanation was *witwentotung*, the killing of widows (1991, 46-47).³⁵ Further evidence proposed in support of ritual killing is the position of the knife next to her head and the crossing of her hands and feet, which may have been bound (Lemos 2002, 167). In

³⁵ The closer parallel with *witwentotung* is based on the different rites, cremation and inhumation, used for the man and woman respectively.

addition to this Mazarakis Ainian believed that it would be “inconceivable” for the woman to live in the building alone once the man had died (1997, 56).³⁶

Several problems with this interpretation can be raised. Hughes cannot provide any other conclusive Aegean/Greek parallels which would indicate a tradition of *suttee/witwentotung* in which the Toumba burials fall. The contemporaneity of the burials may be challenged on the grounds that the man, having been cremated, need not have been buried immediately (Antonaccio 2002, 33). It may be possible that burial rituals required burial as soon as possible, as is the case in later periods, but temporary burial and exhumation is a possibility for the cremated remains. Also, it is possible to interpret the binding of the woman as the means by which she was lowered into the shaft, like the thongs on the man’s krater. The knife may be symbolic of the enormous wealth of this burial.

There is some supporting evidence for human sacrifice from later Greek literature and myth. Hughes suggests that the sacrifice of Polyxena at the grave of Achilles was part of an epic tradition with no basis in reality, but if it does have a basis it is a tradition of sacrificing war captives, not *suttee* (1991, 61-62). There are a number of other literary parallels for sacrificing war captives, such as the Trojans Achilles kills at the funeral of Patroclus (*Il.* 23.175-176). These examples are considerably later than the woman in the Toumba building, but the abiding paradigm for ritual killing of humans in ancient Greece is war captives. It is not uncommon for war to be a means by which women and slaves are acquired, nor for these women and slaves to be ritually killed for burials (Parker Pearson 2005, 22-23, 27). Therefore if the woman in the Toumba building was ritually killed, the most likely explanation is that she was a war captive.

³⁶ Although her husband was missing rather than dead, presumably Penelope ran her household for much of the twenty years that Odysseus was absent; thus this was conceivable to Greek audiences whenever the story of the *Odyssey* was performed.

Human sacrifice has not been suggested as an explanation for later double burials in the Toumba cemetery (Antonaccio1995, 15). Lemos highlights the conspicuous destruction of wealth in some of the burials of women at Lefkandi, who may have been buried with their bride's price (2007a, 278-279). While this could apply to EUB05, if it is a double burial, it does not seem possible in the case of EUB03, which includes no grave goods besides the weapons and urns. Furthermore, the woman in EUB03 was cremated and thus treated on similar footing to her partner in burial. Therefore, it is unlikely that this woman was a captive or a sacrifice. The limited skeletal evidence from EUB05 also poses an interpretive problem. Lemos suggests that this could have been a child bride, buried with her dowry with her to the grave; however, on the association with the woman with EUB02 she may have been a war captive sacrificed along with other booty in the grave of her captor. Furthermore, even if these burials are identified as human sacrifices this does not explain why these sacrifices take place at this particular point in time in Greek history.³⁷

The only subsequent double burial in the Toumba cemetery is LPG-SPG I Tomb 55, which has not been fully published. While it is not a burial with weapons, the gold jewellery which it contains is strongly suggestive of a female burial. It was also a cremation and an inhumation, like the burials in the building. Tomb 55, along with EUB03 and Tomb 49, are incredibly unlikely to be the result of ritual killing. However, the strong evidence for ritual killing of the woman in the building makes it impossible to rule out the possibility that the same was true for the hypothetical woman in EUB05.

4.3.1.2 Eretria

A combination of inhumation and cremation also prevails in Eretria; however, the pattern here conforms more closely to other settlements where inhumation is a rite exclusively used

³⁷ But see further Ch.8.6.1.

for children while cremation is used for adults. The cremations known from the Harbour Cemetery all appear to be *in situ*, in pits; child inhumations are *enchytrismoi* in amphorai and pithoi. This cemetery is not well published, and it may be that only burials with grave goods were recorded (Crielaard 1996, 76-77). EUB23 and EUB24 were also *in situ* cremations. This kind of open-trench/pyre cremation has been likened to that practiced in Lefkandi (Coldstream 2003, 90).

Urn cremation appears to be exclusive to the West Gate Cemetery. These most closely resemble EUB08 at Lefkandi as they are all in bronze cauldrons placed in a niche at the bottom of a shaft. EUB22 and EUB26-28 all have stone lids, while EUB25 has a second bronze cauldron as a lid; the two female graves (Tombs 7 and 10) had lead lids. The jewellery in the tombs was not burned on the pyre, and it has been suggested that it was placed on the body for the *prothesis*, removed for the cremation, and then placed in the tomb (*Eretria* XVII.2, 174); however, other objects such as the swords and spearheads have been deliberately damaged and were probably cremated.

There is no certain evidence for double burial at Eretria. However, Bérard supposed that double burial might explain the presence of so many weapons in EUB25 (*Eretria* III, 32). A mythical parallel could be provided by the combination of the bones of Achilles and Patroclus in the same urn after the former's funeral (*Od.* 24.73-79). This suggestion has not been confirmed by analysis of the skeletal remains (*Eretria* XVII.2, 128), and nonetheless it would take the burial of several individuals to account for the four swords and six spearheads in this tomb. Therefore the urn must contain as many as four men to match the number of swords, perhaps providing a parallel to the Parian *polyandrion*, or an alternative explanation must be sought for the multiple swords in these burials.

Further funerary rituals may have included competitions, as it is indicated by figurative scenes on pottery and are mentioned by Hesiod in Chalcis.³⁸

4.3.2 Distribution

For the geographical relationship between Lefkandi and Eretria, see Plate 9a.

4.3.2.1 Lefkandi

There are three major cemeteries in the region of Lefkandi. The earliest is **Skoubris**, which is the furthest north, and received burials from SMyc to SPG IIIa. Only one of these burials contains a weapon, and this dates to EPG (EUB01). It is estimated that only a quarter of the Skoubris cemetery has been excavated, the smallest portion of any of the three main cemeteries at Lefkandi.

The **Toumba** and **Palia Perivolia** cemeteries received burials from MPG to SPG IIIa. The latter is closely situated to the largely unexcavated **East Cemetery**. The majority of the burials with weapons were uncovered in the Toumba cemetery, with eight burials and eight pyres containing weapons, beginning with the so-called “hero” beneath the monumental building which forms the focus of the cemetery (EUB02-18). In Palia Perivolia there were three pyres of uncertain date with spearheads (EUB19-21), and in the East Cemetery an inhumation with a sword dated SPG I/II (EUB18). Palia Perivolia and the East Cemetery lie about 100 m south of Skoubris. Toumba is about 100m west of Palia Perivolia. The South Cemetery and the two LG child burials from the harbour area do not contain relevant evidence (Lemos 2006b, 62-3).

The earliest burials of both Palia Perivolia and the Toumba cemetery date to MPG. While they are usually recognized as separate cemeteries there appears to be some kind of

³⁸ Chariot processions on amphorae have been thought to represent races; *Op.* 654-657 describes the funerary games of Amphidamas at Chalcis.

relationship between them, as they all retain a similar orientation, which seems to be based on the Toumba building (Lemos and Mitchell 2011, 635-636, 638).³⁹ The burials of Palia Perivolia have the most regular orientation of any Lefkandi cemetery, showing awareness of the Toumba Cemetery. These cemeteries do not represent isolated communities but interactive social groups. It is clear from the burial goods that the Toumba Cemetery is by far the most prestigious.

During LPG the burials in the Toumba cemetery were divided into two groups through the creation of a “passage” between the western group of burials at the foot of the Toumba and the eastern group a short distance away (Lemos and Mitchell 2011, 636). The group closest to the building included EUB03, and EUB09 while EUB04-07 and EUB15 are all in the further group. This encourages a differentiation between those cremated with weapons and those probably inhumed, although it is difficult to explain why EUB07 should be in the further group. After LPG there are no more burials with weapons in the closer group.

The settlement on the Xeropolis tell is almost certainly where the people buried in these cemeteries lived.⁴⁰ Xeropolis, which is between about 500 and 700 m away from the cemeteries, juts into the Euboean Gulf. In antiquity the isthmus which links it to mainland Euboea was flanked by two lagoons.

4.3.2.2 Eretria

While there may have been a Bronze Age predecessor of Eretria, evidence for the EIA town is limited until the main cemeteries at Lefkandi come to an end and Xeropolis begins to

³⁹ Lemos and Mitchell go on to say, advising caution: “It is possible to suggest, for example that the Palia Perivolia burial ground which is located some 80 m to the east of the Toumba cemetery could have been part of the same cemetery.” (2011, 638).

⁴⁰ Whitley has suggested that the monumental building in the Toumba cemetery was the focus of an unexcavated EIA settlement at Lefkandi which alternated with Xeropolis, although there is little evidence to support this (1991b, 347).

decline *ca.* 825 (SPG IIIa). The first major pottery phase represented at the site is MG II/SPG II (*Eretria* XX, 246), and the earliest material comes from two ninth-century graves: one is a child burial in the west quarter; the other is EUB24 in the area of the later **Sanctuary of Apollo Daphnephoros**, which may in this period be an élite habitation area (Mazarakis Ainian 1987, 3; Crielaard 1996, 76). Roughly contemporary with this is EUB23, an isolated in situ cremation burial in the area of **Bouratza**, southeast of the sanctuary of Apollo.

The settlement at Eretria appears to have been organized similarly to Athens: several scattered burial grounds associated with areas of habitation. The main area of habitation was in the south by the sea, near the **Harbour Cemetery**, also known as the **West Cemetery** or the **Hygeionomeion**. Several spearheads have been reported from the graves in the Harbour Cemetery, but they cannot be assigned to any graves and so contextual analysis is not possible.

In the **West Gate** or **Heroön Cemetery**, northwest of the sanctuary of Apollo in the area of the later West Gate of the city, there were seven cremations of adults of both sexes and nine inhumations of children and adolescents. Five of the adults were buried with weapons (EUB25-29). The other two have been identified as women. EUB22 is also probably associated with this group. This cemetery is short-lived, with all of the burials dating between *ca.* 710 and 680 (LG-EArch); thus it is more likely that this represents a powerful family plot rather than a ruling élite (Hall 2013, 134).

In addition to these burial grounds, a large number of child *enchytrismoi* were found amongst the Geometric and Subgeometric houses.

4.3.3 Weapons in burials

There are twenty-one known EIA burials with weapons at Lefkandi (EUB01-21) and eight from Eretria (EUB22-29).⁴¹ Spears are the most common weapon, with twenty-seven objects including the single spear-butt. Swords are slightly less common, with twenty-three examples from nineteen graves. Other weapons include four daggers, at least five axes, and two graves with significant numbers of arrowheads. For more details, see Table 3.

4.3.3.1 Swords and daggers

At Lefkandi swords only occurred in the Toumba and East Cemeteries, while daggers were excavated at Skoubris and Toumba. A fragment of a blade was found in a pyre in Palia Perivolia. Swords accompany individuals who are inhumed, cremated in situ, or placed in urns. Swo089 and Swo096 were short-swords; Swo102 and Swo104 were medium-swords. Burials with daggers were all probably inhumations, although little or no bone was preserved in any of them. Swo031 and Swo058 were certainly daggers; Swo057 was probably a dagger as was the weapon in EUB06. All of these weapons were iron with the exception of Swo058, which was bronze.

Swords only accompany cremations in Eretria; these mainly come from the West Gate Cemetery, but also the burials at Bouratza and the sanctuary of Apollo. The best preserved swords are all medium-swords: Swo106, Swo107, Swo109, Swo110, and Swo113. Swo077 was probably a short-sword. There were no daggers in Eretria.

There are no graves at Lefkandi which included both a sword and a dagger, nor multiple swords or daggers. In Eretria EUB25 and EUB28 contained four and two swords respectively (Swo106, Swo109, Swo110, and Swo113; Swo002 and Swo102).

⁴¹ This discounts the spearheads from the Harbour Cemetery as attribution to graves and even the number of spearheads is not available (*Eretria* XVII:2, 70).

Several swords at Eretria and Lefkandi were also bent out of shape or “killed”, like those in Attica. Swo104, Swo106, Swo107, Swo109, Swo110, Swo113, and the swords in EUB07, EUB08, and EUB22 were all bent out of shape in some way (Plate 10b, 11d, 13d). At Lefkandi these last until *ca.* 825, throughout the use of the Toumba cemetery; the three graves at Eretria all date *ca.* 700.

Several swords and a dagger were broken. Swo002 was probably intentionally destroyed as it accompanied another which was bent; this seems less certain for Swo057, Swo058, Swo067 and Swo077, but it is possible. It seems unlikely that Swo102, which accompanied an inhumation, was intentionally destroyed (Plate 13d-e). Swo096 was both bent and broken. The sword in EUB02 was broken, but also seems to have retained its scabbard when it was deposited in the grave; those in EUB14, EUB15, and probably EUB10 and EUB13 were also broken. EUB17 and EUB20 only contained a single fragment of a sword each. The sword from the disturbed grave EUB29 was fragmentary; this is probably the result of intentional destruction, along with all of the other swords in the West Gate Cemetery.

Swo031 and the dagger in EUB06 were heavily corroded, but complete. Swo089 was also complete, with traces of the wooden scabbard.

4.3.3.2 Spears

All of the spearheads and the one spear-butt in central Euboea were iron with the exception of Spe013, which was bronze. These come from eighteen separate graves.

Spearheads at Lefkandi only appear singly, never in pairs. Spe031, Spe053, Spe121, and those in EUB02, EUB07, and EUB08 were all found with swords, suggesting that they might have been javelins. Similarly Spe046, which accompanied the bronze dagger Swo058,

could have been a javelin. The forms of these spears are all fairly comparable, with sockets forming just under half the length of many (Plates 11e, 12d). However, the form of Spe031 does not suggest that this was a spear for throwing, while Spe056, Spe087, and Spe118, which did not accompany swords, do have forms which suggest that they could be javelins. The form of the spear in EUB16, which also contained no other weapons, has not been published. Furthermore, the presence of spear-butt Spe011 suggests spears for thrusting rather than throwing, at least where they accompany daggers (Swo057).

Only two spearheads from Eretria were solitary, Spe044, which accompanied a sword, and Spe049 which did not. Despite this, in form both could be javelins. Spe040 and Spe058 were found together, as was a pair in EUB22 with a sword. The four spears in EUB28 probably form two pairs, Spe041 and Spe050, which were corroded together, and Spe037 with Spe045 (Plate 15d). Of the six spears in EUB25 the bronze Spe013 is clearly the exception (Plate 14e). It has been interpreted as either a Mycenaean heirloom (*Eretria* III, 17) or contemporary northern European manufacture (Bettelli 2001), but in either case must have been for thrusting because of the breadth of the blade and the short socket.⁴² Spe085 and Spe120 were corroded together, as were Spe110, Spe114, and Spe129 (Plates 15a-b). This may suggest a pair and a triplet of spears.

Several spearheads were also discovered in the Harbour Cemetery, but it has not been possible to link these to specific graves.

4.3.3.3 Armour

Evidence for armour in Euboea is minimal. Pha02 was described by the excavators as a “*spike*” relating to bronze *phalaron* was discovered in EUB12 (Plate 13b; Popham *et al.*

⁴² Discussed further Ch.8.3.3.2.

1982a, 241).⁴³ EUB12 is already an unusual grave, containing a bronze dagger. Unlike the examples in Athens (above, Ch.4.2.3.3) this was found with other weapons and so could be interpreted as a shield.

4.3.3.4 Archery

Arrowheads were discovered in EUB04 and EUB08. The state of preservation means that it is not possible to be certain about the number of arrowheads, but EUB04 contains around ten, while in EUB08 there were about thirty-four. All of those in EUB04 and several in EUB08 were barbed, suggesting that they were intended for use in combat rather than for hunting. These are similar to LBA arrowheads. The others in EUB08 may have been used for hunting; these resemble contemporary Cretan arrowheads (Plates 12a, 22c).

The objects of antler in EUB09 have been interpreted as a composite bow (*Lefkandi I*, 226, 256-7). Catling has also suggested that there is space for a bow to at the right hand of the skeleton in EUB04 (1985a, 21). Presumably any antler in this part of the grave would have degraded along with the human bone.

No burials contained archery equipment in Eretria.

4.3.3.5 Axes

Six axes were found with other weapons, two in the same grave (Axe04 and Axe14), and all in the Toumba cemetery. Axe15 was found without other weapons and was not included in Appendix A2. A distinction should be made between the single-headed trunnion axe (Axe13, Axe14, Axe15, and Axe24) and the double-axe (Axe01; in EUB06). Axe04 and the example in EUB14 were unidentifiable. The close size of Axe13, Axe14, and Axe15 suggests that they had a comparable function, but not necessarily combat (Plate 11c); they are similar enough to

⁴³ An object in EUB06 may also be one of these spikes.

Axe09 that interpretation as weapons becomes more probable. Axe24 is huge; like Axe20 it accompanies other weapons and could have had a supplementary function in the warrior's kit.

4.4. THE ARGOLID

4.4.1 Tomb types and burial practices

Burial practices in the Argolid were relatively homogeneous throughout the EIA. Inhumation prevails to the almost total exclusion of cremation. The body of the deceased is usually contracted, with the knees drawn up to their chest. The most common type of tomb is a cist grave, a rectangular pit lined with pebbles at the base and orthostat slabs as the sides. Finally, the tomb was closed with covering slabs. There are two other major types of EIA grave. The first is the pit grave. While pit graves are common, after SMyc/EPG there are no examples which contain weapons. The second type is burial in a pithos, which first appears towards the end of PG and becomes increasingly common in the eighth century. In Tiryns the pithos comes to outnumber the cist during the Geometric period, although not in Argos until LG. In the seventh-century pithos burials and *enchytrismoι* are the only burials in the Argolid. The Argolid is unusual in that both adults and children may be buried in vases. Two pithos burials at Tiryns contained spearheads (ARG06-07).

There are very few cremations in the Argolid in this period; However, the few cremations there are undermine the otherwise very organized burial structure of the Argolid. Several SMyc cremations were dismissed by Hägg as experiments with the method, which followed no particular conventions and were not pursued at a later date (Hägg 1987, 210-11). The LH IIIC-EPG cremations beneath tumuli at Argos and Chania are explained as newcomers who already practiced cremation (Palaiologou 2013); furthermore, these occur at an experimental time in the Aegean and also are not continued after EPG. However, EPG trench-and-hole cremations from the Petropoulou/Xambla plot (Whitley 2005a, 20-1) and a

presumably Geometric cremation in a bronze cinerary urn (Morgan 2008, 27), all in Argos, indicate occasional returns to cremation in the EIA. While at present these seem to be exceptions, the situation in the Argolid is clearly more complicated than present research believes.

While the predominance of inhumation over cremation should mean that certain elements of the burial structure are easier to understand through the survival of more skeletal material, in the Geometric Period interpretation is complicated by the growing tendency towards re-use of cist graves. *Multiple re-use of tombs over time* should be distinguished from *double burials*, such as EUB02 and ARG01, where it seems most likely that the burials were contemporaneous. In multiple burials tombs receive second or subsequent interments after the initial burial for which the tomb was constructed. Unlike Crete, where urn cremation is the norm and the chamber tombs have frequently been cleared or at the very least disturbed (see below, Ch.4.5.1), it is usually possible to attribute grave goods to specific burials and thus identify the grave groupings associated with weapons. Often the grave goods from previous burials are removed and placed on the covering slabs when the second burial is interred in a cist grave, but this is not always the case. In pithoi, as well as occasionally in cists, the preceding interments are simply pushed aside to make room for the new body.

Re-use of tombs begins in the ninth century at Tiryns, where PG and SMyc cists receive EG burials (e.g. ARG03); while in Argos it is usually only Geometric graves which are reused (Hägg 1980, 119-120). Hägg argues that PG graves were not constructed with the intention of re-use; ARG03 and ARG05 were constructed before the Geometric Period but are not re-used until then. In the majority of the re-used burials those with weapons are LG, and only in ARG05 and ARG10 are the weapons with the inaugural burial.⁴⁴ This is likely to indicate that multiple burial and burial with weapons are separate phenomena, relating to

⁴⁴ The order in which burials occurred in ARG20, ARG21, ARG23, and ARG24 is unclear.

different aspects of social identity. More than half of the inhumations in cist tombs in LG were subsequent re-use of a tomb. Hägg points to the interesting factor that the large re-used cists are more commonly those *without* weapons than those with (1983, 30). This is clearly not the case in the fourteen burials listed above; on the other hand the largest cists are not re-used, including all of those with armour ([ARG15](#), [ARG18](#), and [ARG19](#)). Geometric cist graves in Argos appear to be built larger than those of previous periods, suggesting that they were intended for either multiple use or more grave goods (Hägg 1980, 120-121). Re-use completely ceases at the end of LG, when burials no longer take place in cists. Of the twenty-seven graves containing weapons in the Argolid fourteen were used for multiple burials ([ARG03](#), [ARG05](#), [ARG10-11](#), [ARG14](#), [ARG16-17](#), [ARG20-24](#), and [ARG25-26](#)).

The Geometric Period reverses the trend of SMyc, when the re-use of tombs in the Mycenaean period is gradually replaced by single burial. While single burial was acceptable in the LBA (Dickinson 2006, 183), the rapid abandonment of multiple burial in the SMyc Argolid in favour of single burials suggests substantial social and economic changes (Lemos 2002, 185). Morris argues that the most important indication of the change is that the symbolic order of the Bronze Age had collapsed (2000, 200-201). The essential factor is that, in the Argolid, a new trend had emerged. Crucially, this is different to the new trends in Attica and central Euboea as it did not include cremation; furthermore it does not appear that there was a prominent place for burials with weapons in the PG Period (See Ch.8.4.1).

Multiple uses are usually interpreted as representing kinship groups (Coldstream 2003, 146; Foley 1988, 34 [but with reservations]; Hägg 1983, 28-29; Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 86-87; Snodgrass 2000, 195 [including family plots as well as multiple burials]); a less decisive statement is made by Dickinson that this is “surely another way of drawing attention to the burial group” (2006, 195). However, in the case of Cretan multiple tombs, Kotsonas has called the assumption that multiple tombs were those of a family group “probably the

greatest factoid in the archaeology of Crete of the given period” (2011, 131; see further below Ch.4.5.1), in that it is assumed without question by most scholars. The question regarding multiple uses of tombs must be rethought in all situations, including the Argolid.

Snodgrass suggested that LG graves across Greece show that at this time attempts were being made to “reinforce the hereditary principle,” and the Argive multiple burials are one of his examples (2000, 194-196). Morris implicitly supports Snodgrass’ assertion, but also suggests that the increase in visibility of child burials in LG II Argos is the result of more rescue excavations taking place within the settlement, where children continue to be buried, than in the extra-mural areas where the burials of adults were then taking place (Morris 1987, 184-185). Furthermore, only adults aged over twenty-five years, and most commonly between thirty and forty years, were discovered in multiple burials, suggesting that age was a significant factor in the burial customs of Geometric Argos (Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011, 720-721). This separation of adult and child graves indicates that children were either not considered to be part of the family unit, or multiple burials, which exclude children, cannot represent family units.

The treatment of children varies throughout EIA Argive society. Unlike Athens and Lefkandi, in the PG Argolid the graves of children are not only present in the same burial plots with adults in all the main settlements, but are the richest of an otherwise fairly homogenous period in terms of wealth in graves (Hägg 1983, 27; Lemos 2002, 157-160). This points towards a society in which status is ascribed based on kinship, rather than achieved in life (Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 86-7); therefore it is perhaps not surprising to find that there are few burials with weapons in the PG Argolid. Morgan and Whitelaw suggest that multiple re-use of tombs is a continuation of this trend into the Geometric Period, but it is difficult to agree fully with their argument if children are excluded from these burials. In the EG and MG Periods children become far less visible, suggesting that they were

no longer considered to be full members of the society (Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011, 721). Therefore, the hereditary principle seems to have *decreased* in importance, with status becoming something which is achieved by adults rather than ascribed to children, in direct contrast to what is believed to be shown by the re-use of tombs. Morris' comment about the increased visibility of intra-mural child burials in LG suggests that this could continue to the end of the period, despite the increase in the proportion of known child burials.

Pappi and Triantaphyllou suggest that age distinction was combined with kinship groups (2011, 724). A parallel to Homeric society could be made, where one must be born into the class, but must also prove that the status is deserved, which can only be achieved in adulthood (Morris 1987, 182). Finally, it should be stressed that there is no evidence of gendered segregation in the multiple burials of the Argolid, as Whitley has noted for the chamber tombs in the Knossos North Cemetery (1998, 613; on gender see further Ch.8.4.2 in the Argolid and Ch.8.5.2 in Knossos); however, overall males have a greater representation in Geometric Argive burials than women (Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011, 722).

The resolution to the problems presented here is to understand that the act of multiple burial combined a number of overlapping social identities in the Geometric Argolid: those of an age to be buried in cist tombs could either have a new cist built for them or they might meet the conditions to be buried in a pre-existing cist; in some instances this condition may have been kinship. These were members of an aristocratic class, as many of the burials in cists had numerous metal grave goods, but this does not necessarily indicate that alternative forms of burial, e.g. pithoi, were those of a lower class (see Ch.8.4.2). In addition to this, the conditions for being buried with weapons and being buried in a multiple tomb were not mutually exclusive but nor were they necessarily combined.

4.4.2 *Distribution*

4.4.2.1 *Tiryns*

Habitation at Tiryns throughout the EIA appears to be located both on the citadel and in the surrounding area. Burials also appear to be scattered in broadly similar regions. The most important burial ground is that at **Philaki**, immediately south of the citadel. This necropolis has been excavated twice, but only the earlier excavations have been extensively published (Verdelis 1963a; Chatzipouliou 1980). The earliest burial is ARG01, which dates to SMyc/EPG; the cemetery continues to the end of G. Of the six burials with weapons the majority are Geometric cists. Another necropolis, **southwest of the citadel**, contained a single burial with weapons in a pithos (ARG07). No burials with weapons have been reported from any of the other cemeteries.

4.4.2.2 *Argos*

Burial evidence comprises the majority of the evidence from Argos in this period; it has been suggested that the site consisted of clusters of houses at the foot of the Larissa hill (Hägg 1974, 89), although much of the settlement evidence comes from the southwest area of the modern city, while the burials are more focused in the central areas (Lemos 2002, 157). Very few graves have been fully published. As the majority are known from short reports from rescue excavations across the town the fact that the burials are scattered may be the result of this random selection process.

The earliest known burial with weapons, ARG08, lay at the foot of Larissa to the W of the modern town centre and was uncovered in **Sondage 67**. In the modern town centre burials with weapons are known from the following plots: **Bonaris**, the **Kympouropoulou Plot**, the **Lynkitsou Plot**, **Makris**, and the **Museum Area** (ARG09-14). Only the Makris

Plot contained more than one burial with weapons. In these areas the most common graves are cists.

In the area of the Classical Agora and theatre three burials with weapons are known, one from the **Odeon Area** and two from the **South Cemetery** ([ARG15-17](#)). In the Geometric period the most common burials are those in pithoi, which may explain the limited numbers of burials with weapons.

In the north area of the town near Deiras, single burials with weapons are known from the **Stavropoulou Ground Plot** and the **Theodropoulou Plot** ([ARG18-19](#)). Recently excavated tombs in the **Xentaropoulou Plot** date to SMyc, G, and the Hellenistic Period ([ARG20-21](#)); the nearby Petropoulou/Xambla contained a number of PG and later tombs, but none with weapons (Piteros 1998, 111; Whitley 2005a, 20-21). There are also burials with weapons on **Gounari Street**, in the **Sklavounos** and **Nikolopoulos Plots**, and an isolated PG grave near **Derias** ([ARG22-25](#)).

4.4.2.3 Other areas (Asine, Mycenae, and Nauplion)

With the exception of Asine, comparatively little EIA material has been excavated in the rest of the Argolid. At Asine, however, there are no extant burials with weapons. The burials with weapons from Mycenae and Nauplion ([ARG26-27](#)) may be exceptions, or the limited number may be the result of limited EIA evidence.

Settlement at Asine has been uncovered in the area east of the Kastraki acropolis in use from LH IIIC to G. In the Geometric period the settlement appears to have expanded onto the Barbouna Hill and Kastraki, which may have been fortified (Ch.6.3). In the eighth century the Barbouna Hill also hosted a sanctuary to Apollo Pythaeus. The PG cemeteries are located in the Lower City and the Karmaniola Area, with a handful more scattered in the area.

The evidence from Mycenae is sporadic. It is estimated that there are 12-20 known PG burials, but none with weapons (Hägg 1974, 68). Fifteen Geometric burials have been reported from Mycenae (Foley 1988, 42; Morgan 2010, 26; Petrakos 2009, 31). While the recent burials did not contain weapons, two iron arrowheads were reported nearby. Burials appear to have occurred in plots of two or three, on both the acropolis and in the lower town. Recent excavations have shown that the Lower City was certainly occupied in the Geometric period, although there is no settlement evidence from SMyc-PG (Stewart 2011, 49). It appears that in Mycenae, settlement and cemetery were not distinct, and while habitation must have continued it was not substantial. ARG26 was in **the area of the Prehistoric Cemetery**, just east of the boundary wall (Desborough 1954, 260).

The majority of the EIA evidence from Nauplion comes from the graves in **Pronoia** (Foley 1988, 25, 26). While the majority of the twenty-eight Geometric graves cannot be more precisely dated, ARG27 is LG (Foley 1988, 43).

4.4.3 Weapons in burials

The most common weapon in the Argolid is the spear, with twenty-six examples in sixteen graves, although the twenty-one daggers are spread across seventeen graves. Swords are very rare, with only four possible examples. Arrowheads and axes are also uncommon. Argos has produced the most substantial funerary evidence for armour; however this is still minimal: four helmets, two cuirasses, and a *phalaron*. For more details, see Table 4. Twenty-two of the twenty-seven known burials with weapons in the Argolid are Geometric.

4.4.3.1 Swords and daggers

There are four burials in the Argolid which may have contained swords, all MG-LG graves in Argos: ARG18 and ARG20-22. ARG18 produced only the hilt; those in the Xantaropoulou

and Gounari Plots burials have not been fully published. It may be that all of these “swords” are, in fact, daggers. Thirteen weapons can be confidently categorized as daggers (Swo007, Swo023, Swo030, Swo032, Swo039, Swo048-051, Swo053, Swo060, Swo064, and Swo066). A further seven daggers are reported from ARG03, ARG05, ARG09, ARG10, ARG23, ARG24, and ARG27.

ARG01 (Swo023, Swo049) and ARG10 (Swo032 and one other) each contained a pair of daggers, while ARG12 had three (Swo039, Swo053, and Swo066). While ARG01 and ARG10 are multiple burials, the weapons are attributed to only one of the burials. (Plate 17a)

None of these weapons are bent out of shape,⁴⁵ but ARG03, ARG05, ARG09 and ARG27 contained only fragments. Swo007 had lost much of the blade and handle, although this is clearly a dagger; Swo023 is heavily corroded and does not appear to be complete (Plate 16b).

The dagger from ARG11 is bronze.

4.4.3.2 Spears

Two spearheads, one from Tiryns and the other from Argos, were bronze (Spe026 and Spe047). These are both early, PG at the latest, but the date of ARG25 (Spe026) is uncertain (Plate 17d, 20a).

The remaining spearheads are iron. The twenty-six or twenty-seven spearheads come from sixteen graves. ARG17, ARG19, and ARG23 each contained a pair. The spears from ARG17, Spe001 and Spe074, could represent a spearhead and spear-butt from the same weapon, as suggested for Spe004 and Spe072 (Plate 19c; see Ch.4.2.3.2). The proportions of both make it unlikely that either is a javelin; furthermore there are no other weapons in this

⁴⁵ The tip of Swo064 is bent. This minor damage undoubtedly reflects use-wear rather than intent.

grave. Snodgrass interpreted Spe001 as an arrowhead, which would make it unique in the Argolid (2000, 275, fig.96a).

ARG03 and ARG14 contained three spears each. In ARG03, Spe107 perhaps represents the thrusting spear as it is the largest, while Spe062 and Spe073 are very similar in size (Plate 17e). The proportions of all three suggest that they could be javelins. Spe137, Spe145, and Spe147 from ARG14 similarly all could be javelins, and would have been roughly the same size but for post-depositional damage (Plate 18d). Either four or five spears were found in ARG11, but no sizes were reported. These could represent two pairs.

Only half of the graves containing spearheads also include a dagger and none contained a sword. Combined with the fact that there are no weapons certainly identified as swords in the Argolid it is likely that many of these spearheads represent thrusting-spears rather than javelins, and that spears were the principal close-combat weapon in the Argolid.

4.4.3.3 Armour

Pha06 is the only *phalaron* from the Argolid. It most closely resembles Pha12, with which it is roughly contemporary, although it is much smaller (Plate 17c). It is difficult to imagine Pha06 offering much protection, but as it accompanies other weapons it could be a shield-boss.

The Argolid provides the study of the EIA Aegean with a helmet for the end of the Bronze Age (ARG01) and the beginning of the Archaic Period (ARG18). Two further helmets are known from Argive graves (ARG15 and ARG19). The Tiryns SMyc/EPG helmet is fragmentary, but resembles earlier types (Plate 17b; Snodgrass 2000, 319). The helmets from Argos are all the five-part *kegelhelm*, a conical helmet to which neck-, cheek-, and forehead-guards are attached to give extra protection (Plate 19a). The *kegelhelm*, which is

also represented by finds at Kalapodi and Olympia, was a short-lived type and does not much outlast the eighth century. The construction of the *kegelhelm* makes it vulnerable and difficult to wear, leading to the suggestion that these helmets were ineffective and served more to make an impression rather than as functional defensive armour (e.g. Mee 2011, 210).

Helmets are absent from the Aegean archaeological record after the SMyc/EPG helmet in ARG01 (Snodgrass 1964, 4). The evidence for helmets increases in MG as they are painted on pottery and with ARG08, although the ubiquitous depiction of helmets on armed figures on vases does not necessarily indicate the widespread use of metal helmets. The references to helmets in the Homeric epics, especially Meriones' boars' tusk helmet (*Il.* 10.260-265), suggest some continued knowledge of a past use of helmets, but how widely this was known is debatable.

Even if the idea of a helmet persisted through the EIA, the ineffectiveness of the *kegelhelm* suggests that physical examples may not have reached the Aegean. Dezsö proposed “stimulus diffusion” as the mechanism by which Aegean craftsmen came to imitate Assyrian helmets in the eighth century (1998, 3, 15-16). Stimulus diffusion suggests that either a finished object or a description of a finished helmet reached the Aegean in the eighth century, but without its manufacturer, or instructions on how to manufacture the helmet. This explains both the ineffectiveness of the helmets and the fact that the five-part *kegelhelm* was so short-lived – it was an experiment in creating a functional object, which the warriors of the eighth-century Argolid knew from Assyria and perhaps epic poetry. Their early experiments in creating helmets were impressive, but functionally unsuccessful. Once bronze-smiths were capable of crafting helmets such as the so-called “Corinthian” helmet from a single sheet of metal, the five-part *kegelhelm* was abandoned. Until that point, Argive warriors wore ineffective but impressive crested helmets.

A bronze cuirass was also discovered in ARG15 (Plate 19a). The main precedent for bronze body-armour in the Aegean is the late fifteenth-century Dendra cuirass.⁴⁶ ARG15, supplemented by further examples from Olympia, represents an important point in the development of Greek warfare. It is considered to be the earliest hoplite panoply (e.g. Hunt 2007, 112; Schwartz 2009, 66), which is taken as the beginning of the development of the hoplite and a new kind of warfare (Hanson 1989, 16-7, 43-4). But the introduction of armour does not mean its universal adoption, although it does provide much greater defence in hand-to-hand combat (van Wees 2004, 49-50, 167). Furthermore, the breastplate does not appear out of nowhere. The technique and quality of the corselet show that it cannot be the first example of its kind (Snodgrass 1964, 75).

There are two main proposals for the origin of this armour: Europe and the Aegean itself. Snodgrass has proposed a “double reversal of influences” to explain the complex relationship between the Aegean and European corselets, beginning with the influence of the LBA corselet from Dendra in Europe, where there is evidence for a continuing tradition through the early first millennium, before the cuirass returns to the Aegean (1964, 83; 1999, 41-2). The Urnfield culture of northern Europe is a strong candidate (Bouzek 1997, 92); it may have reached the Aegean via Italy (Coldstream 2003, 148-9). On the other hand, Catling suggested that there was continuity in the Aegean throughout the EIA (1968, 27-28); Jarva comments that the LH IIIC depictions of warriors on vases do seem to support it, to a point (1995, 28-9), but Snodgrass remains unconvinced (2000, 271). A Near Eastern origin, to match the helmet, has not received much support. This may be because it has not been considered thoroughly (Jarva 1995, 29), although wearing bronze body armour in the heat of a summer campaign in the Near East would cause great discomfort (Snodgrass 1964, 77). The

⁴⁶ Metal body armour is known from Linear B tablets, but examples are sparse (Georganas 2010, 311).

absence of physical evidence in the Aegean between the twelfth and eighth centuries lends strongest support to the proposal for a Northern European origin.

The difference in quality between the “superlative” corselet⁴⁷ and the helmet suggests some interesting historical interpretations. Snodgrass likens the structure of the helmet to contemporary Greek metalwork such as hammered tripod cauldrons, which supports Dezsö’s conclusion that this was a local product, while the “ineffectual” design⁴⁸ supports the proposition that the idea of a metal helmet, rather than a physical example, reached the Aegean first. The quality of the corselet supports the interpretation that it comes directly from a civilization more accustomed to the production of bronze armour of this quality. But Coldstream, following Courbin, insists that this is the product of a local school of armoury and compares the anatomical detail of the corselet to that of the Argive statues of Kleobis and Biton from Delphi, some one hundred-and-fifty years later.

The Argolid is not widely known for its international affairs in the late eighth century, and it may be surprising to see these major external influences here rather than, for example, Corinth, Eretria, or Chalcis, which are traditionally seen to be expanding westwards in this period (Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 90). However, there is good evidence for Argive metalwork developing in the EIA, such as the EPG structure for silver cupellation at Argos, and from the ninth-century evidence that they worked at Olympia (Lemos 2002, 138; Morgan 1990, 85-7).⁴⁹ As Morgan emphasizes, the Argolid was not isolated; indeed the materials necessary for bronze working require external contacts, and she proposes that their motivation for travel to Olympia may have been connected to this (1990, 88). Furthermore, in

⁴⁷ As described by Snodgrass (2000, 271).

⁴⁸ As described by Mee (2011, 210).

⁴⁹ A bronze figurine of an armourer crafting a helmet in the MMA (Inv.42.11.42), dated to the late eighth/early seventh century and said to be of Argive manufacture, perhaps supports this proposition (Alexander 1945, 243).

the eighth century the Argives may have interacted with Italians at the sanctuary, providing a possible area for the transmission of the Urnfield armour (Morgan 1990, 40).

A number of proposals have been made for the identity of the young man buried in ARG15 (see also below, Ch.4.4.3.5). The shape of the cuirass, which terminates at the waist, suggests that it was designed for sitting, perhaps on a horse (Snodgrass 2006d, 355-356); this is supported by an LG representation of a cuirass on an Athenian vase showing a man on horseback. Additional support comes from the interest Argive vase-painters show in depicting horses, although there are very few riders (see Ch.7.2.2; Pappi 2006). This has often been connected to Aristotle's statement that men on horseback dominated the battlefield before the hoplite era, although Argos is not one of his examples (Aris. *Pol.* 1289b, 36-37; Coldstream 2003, 149; see further Ch.8.6.2).

The essential question of the impact of such a change in defensive armour on warfare in the EIA is considered in more detail later (Ch.8.4.4). However, the importance of the emergence of this armour in the context of the Argolid must not be ignored. If defensive armour is accepted as a revolutionary concept in late eighth-century warfare then the Argolid was at a huge advantage over its neighbours if it were one of the first to possess it, and this may explain the recorded success of the Argolid in events dated to this period in later Greek literature.

4.4.3.4 Archery

Besides the possibility that Spe001 is an arrowhead there are only two obsidian arrowheads from ARG04 at Tiryns and the reported iron arrowheads from Mycenae (see above, Ch.4.4.2.3).

4.4.3.5 Axes

The only axes from the Argolid are the pair from ARG15 at Argos (Axe25 and Axe26; Plate 19b). The question of whether axes should be considered weapons is pivotal to our understanding of this grave, for on the one hand no other possible weapons were found in ARG15, but on the other it produced defensive armour. One possible explanation for the absence of other weapons is the partial destruction of this grave by the construction of a later wall.

The great weight of these axes compared to swords was discussed previously (Ch.1.3.1.5). Courbin suggested that these axes could have been used to smash the hulls of enemy ships, while the presence of firedogs shaped like ships was taken as an indication that this young man was a ship-owner or marine (1957, 368). Alongside the assumptions made about his armour (Ch.4.4.3.3), this interpretation implies significant involvement in both naval warfare and cavalry warfare in this period.

The connection between the firedogs and ship-owning is tenuous, as the decorative qualities of the firedogs, especially with obeloi representing oars, would be pleasing enough to explain this shape (Haarer 2000, 50-51). Ship-shaped firedogs also appear at Kavousi on Crete and Palaepaphos, Salamis, and Patriki on Cyprus, suggesting at the very least a communion of ideas between these places (Coldstream 2003, 146), but their rarity in a period of intensifying maritime traffic makes the assumption that they relate to ownership of ships more doubtful. We cannot rule out that this man was involved in maritime exploration; after all it is not only his firedogs but his armour which shows widespread connections. But firedogs shaped like ships do not indicate a ship-owner.

It is difficult to propose a convincing alternative to hull-smashing for a functional use of the axes. The further implications of hull-smashing axes must also be considered, as

indeed must their limited presence in the archaeological record. Few if any of the other axes in [Appendix B3](#) are as close to the size and weight of [Axe25](#) and [Axe26](#). Eighth-century pottery features several depictions of combat taking place near ships, but no depictions of these ships being sunk. The *Iliad* depicts the defence of the Greek ships when these are threatened by the Trojans, although these are not sunk and no axes are mentioned (e.g. *Il.* 13). Ship-sinking in this instance is an act of defence; similarly the iconography suggests that those with ships posed a significant threat in the eighth century.

4.5. [KNOSSOS](#)

4.5.1 [Tomb types and burial practices](#)

There are four types of tomb in use in the area of Knossos in the EIA. Chamber tombs are by far the most common and comprise the majority of tombs in [Appendix A4](#). In addition to these, several Minoan tholoi are also re-used in this period, including [KNS07](#) and possibly [KNS48](#). In SMin there are pit-caves, of which [KNS20-21](#) are of particular importance. [KNS22](#) may also be a pit-cave. While shaft graves occur in SMin, none of these contained weapons.

The re-use of chamber tombs is an important aspect to our understanding of the transition from Bronze to Iron Age at Knossos. It has been suggested that all of the chamber tombs in use in the EIA were constructed in LM (Boardman 1960, 143), that none of the chamber tombs in the North Cemetery were re-used (*KNC*, 639), and that some were Minoan while others were EIA (Coldstream 1984, 313-314; 1991a, 296). Cavanagh showed that without a doubt there was an EIA style of chamber tomb, but some could still be interpreted as re-used tombs (*KNC*, 654-655). On the other hand, the tombs which were similar to the LM tombs were consistently the richest, and geographically located near other EIA tombs (*KNC*, 656-657).

Both inhumation and cremation are practised in SMin Knossos. From PGA cremation is dominant in the North Cemetery and by the mid-tenth century (MPGA) it is universal (Coldstream 1991a, 291). Inhumation is especially common in the Agios Ioannis chamber tombs, but it is completely absent from Fortetsa (Boardman 1960, 144). Inhumations with weapons are found in KNS01, KNS23, KNS26, KNS50, KNS52, and KNS54. All of the other burials with weapons are cremations. While none appear to have been primary cremations, those in the SMin pit caves (KNS20-21) were not placed in urns; the ashes in KNS20 may have originally been interred in a cloth bag (*KNC*, 191). The evidence of pyres from the North Cemetery suggests that they were used repeatedly and were immediately outside the dromos of the chamber tombs with which they were associated (*KNC*, 667). In chamber tombs the most common urns were polychrome pithoi; however kraters and occasionally amphorai also appear to have been used as urns (e.g. KNS11, KNS52). All of the urns are ceramic. The cremation of the bones was very thorough. While personal objects such as weapons, jewellery, and the tripod from KNS21 appear to have been placed on the pyre, very few of the vase offerings appear to have been. A funerary meal probably took place, which may explain the presence of eating and drinking vessels such as skyphoi and kotylai found in the tombs.

There are three examples of double burials, all in tombs with weapons. KNS36 and KNS44 are only described as possible examples (*KNC*, 681) and their association with grave goods is unclear. KNS20-21 are SMin burials which seem to follow a similar pattern to EUB02 and ARG01, which will be discussed elsewhere (Ch.8.6.1).

Multiple re-use of tombs over time was common practice at Knossos. This should be distinguished from the re-use of LM tombs which, if it occurred, included the complete removal of almost every residual Bronze Age artefact in the tomb resulting in a complete absence of evidence for tombs in continuous use from the Bronze to Iron Ages (Coldstream

1991a, 290). Tombs with inaugural burials dated to the SMin period and later continue to be used at Knossos until *ca.* 630 (LO), although many do not have quite such a long duration.

As in the Argolid, the most common interpretation of multiple re-use is that these tombs represent family groups. On the basis that tombs only seem to receive two burials per generation, Cavanagh suggested that they must represent the narrowest of kin groups, resulting in the relatively short use of many of the tombs (*KNC*, 664). As the chamber tombs are organized into conscious groups and rows these may represent wider familial or social ties (*KNC*, 657). Unlike the Argolid, Knossian tombs include all genders and ages, suggesting ascribed status for those using the chamber tombs; however, the short use of some of the tombs may indicate that social groups were not all that stable.

The interpretation of collective tombs as family tombs was challenged immediately by Whitley (1998). He argued that the concentration of weapons and other “male” objects in certain tombs meant that age and sex categories may have been guiding principles in burial. Kotsonas agreed, calling the focus on kinship an “obsession” of western scholarship (2011). He suggests several different categories, without excluding kinship: gender, age, and status.⁵⁰ Kotsonas argued that children are under-represented at Knossos, and so age may be more of a factor than has been previously supposed. KNS33 is the only tomb reported to show any evidence of consanguinity in the burials (*KNC*, 681).

It is certainly true that some burials, such as KNS32, KNS33, and KNS41, contained an abundance of weapons. In KNS32 there was only evidence for three cremations and five pithoi, compared to thirty spearheads, one sword, and two daggers in the tomb, suggesting that there was an abundance of weapons for each individual. In KNS33 there were fifteen pithoi, four daggers, and nineteen or twenty spearheads; while in KNS41 there were forty-

⁵⁰ For example, adult males make up most of the remains from Tomb A1K1 at Eleutherna (Kotsonas 2011, 132).

seven pithoi, six or seven swords, and at least twenty spearheads. KNS41 is the shortest lived, from PGB-LO, while the others last from EPGA-LO. While none of these tombs show any skeletal evidence for female burial, skeletal remains from KNS33 may show evidence for consanguinity, suggesting that kinship was at least a factor.

The main difficulty with Whitley's proposal is he seeks to replace the monolith of kinship interpretations with an equally inflexible model based on gender. The presence of male burials in tombs without weapons, such as Tombs 121, 149A, and 160 make it clear that not all men attained this particular honour, and that there were different statuses within genders. Furthermore, the presence of a male, a probable female, and a young child⁵¹ in T.121 is convincing evidence for a family group (*KNC*, 164-165, 691). Kotsonas' emphasis on a multitude of factors governing the burials in Knossian tombs does not exclude kinship (2011, 132). As with the tombs from the Argolid a number of interconnected factors created the burial record at Knossos.

There are also fluctuations in the number of burials throughout the period, with a peak in the eighth century. Cavanagh argued that there was some role for population increase in the increase in burials, tempered by the fact that in the seventh century there was a drop-off in the number of burials (*KNC*, 660-664). Kotsonas emphasizes other factors, especially fluctuations in the social conditions which permitted burial (2011, 132). He shows that while the number of interments in many of the tombs in the seventh century decreases generally several tombs, including KNS07, KNS15, and KNS18, undergo rapid increases; the increase in burials in KNS18 especially is too huge to represent an expansion of the family group and must represent a change in burial practices (Kotsonas 2011, 133, fig.6).

⁵¹ Aged less than six, and associated with a feeding bottle.

Towards the end of the seventh century, *ca.* 630, all of the known cemeteries at Knossos are abandoned. This occurs around forty years before the entire site appears to be abandoned, and must represent changes in burial practices; furthermore a more gradual decline in the wealth and visibility of burials across Crete takes place at around the same time. The most convincing explanation is that group burial begins to be replaced by individual burial, as seen at Prinias; self-restraint, social pressures, or sanctions limited the level of display in burials, perhaps relating to a growth in communal feeling and the rise of *polis* institutions (Erickson 2010, 255-256). Burials with weapons appear to continue to the very end: Swo083 in KNS15 was associated with an LO pithos; a fragmentary dagger was with an LO pithos in KNS18; and two spearheads adhered to an LO lid in KNS37. This is in contrast to the rest of the Aegean, where burials with weapons end *ca.* 700.

Knossian burial practices undergo at least three major changes in the period under consideration. Firstly, the adoption of cremation, with urn cremation in chamber tombs swiftly becoming the preferred method; then the changes around 700 which result in a decrease in most burials, but an intensification in burials in certain tombs; finally, the abandonment of the cemeteries in the last third of the seventh century. Throughout all of these burials with weapons persist and, although it is impossible to precisely date most individual burials at Knossos, appear to remain abundant.

4.5.2 Distribution

Coldstream argued that EIA Knossos was a town with an urban nucleus, as opposed to the scattered villages of Athens and Argos, with one main cemetery, three additional plots, and few, if any, outlying villages (Coldstream 1984, 312; 2000a, 260-261, 296-297). More recent excavations have shown that in the PG and G periods there was domestic activity in the area of the Roman Villa Dionysus (*KS*², #114), three-hundred metres north of the main area of

occupation with no activity in between them, suggesting that this view needs to be reconsidered (Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 299-300). However, the Knossos Urban Landscape Project supports the interpretation of Knossos as a highly nucleated settlement throughout antiquity (Evely 2010).

The main evidence for settlement is scattered wells and pits, with the occasional wall (Coldstream 1991a, 287). Several houses and probable houses are known from various points throughout the EIA: just south of the Royal Road is an EPGA-MPGA house and possibly a Geometric room (Coldstream 1972, 64-66, 77); Minoan houses re-used in PG (Coldstream and Macdonald 1997, 244); archaeobotanical evidence from the Villa Dionysus area suggests domestic activity in PG, while the related orientation of the PG and Geometric walls suggests similar settlement arrangement, and so perhaps function, at different times (Coldstream and Hatzaki 2003, 286-287; Livarda 2012, 200-202). There is also settlement in use from LM IIIC-SMin/EPGA and thereafter represented only by pits and wells (KS^2 , #185-186), and in an eastern area where occupation resumes between SMin and MPGA after an LM IIIC break, before another hiatus precedes occupation in LO (Coldstream and Macdonald 1997, 244). Two sanctuary areas have been identified within the town, both of which probably begin in LG. The more secure is the sanctuary of Demeter on the lower slopes of the Gypsades hill (KS^2 , #286). There is limited evidence for the sanctuary of Rhea in the area of the palace, but this would conform to the pattern also seen in the Argolid of later cult sites appearing in the LBA remains (Coldstream 2000a, 296). In the Little Palace North area there is some evidence of iron working in the seventh century (Hatzaki *et al.* 2008, 232-235).

The cemeteries appear to form a ring around the known occupation areas, suggesting the limits of the EIA settlement (Coldstream 2000a, 260). The re-use of LM tombs may have motivated the choice of location for the cemetery, but as argued above this cannot be true of all tombs in use in the EIA (Coldstream 1984, 313-314). Despite some re-use, the series of

burials in the EIA never continues directly from LM IIIC (Coldstream 1991a, 290). Coldstream suggests that these tombs spread anticlockwise around the town, beginning in SMin with the North Cemetery in the north and then Fortetsa in the west, south to Gypsades in PGB, and finally to Mavro Spelio in the east in the seventh century (2000a, 294-295). The tombs are never more than 500 m away from the settlement (Coldstream 1991a, 290). There is some evidence that the chamber tombs were grouped into rows, but this may be due to the constraints of the landscape (Coldstream 1991a, 291).

The heaviest concentration of EIA tombs was in the region of the **Ambelokipi (Tekke)** to the north of the palace. Three smaller groups of tombs are known: a single tomb (KNS01, KS^2 , #50); a group of fourteen chamber tombs in the Koiladhi and Niotakis plots (including KNS02-05, KS^2 , #47); one tholos and two chamber tombs to the north (KNS06-08, KS^2 , #46). Meanwhile, the main concentration is to the south and east of these tombs in the **North Cemetery** at the **Medical Faculty Site** (MFS; KS^2 , #62). There were *ca.* 90 EIA tombs in this cemetery, including KNS20-50.

South of Ambelokipi is **Fortetsa**, where there were two groups of tombs. Three tombs lie to the south of the MFS, including KNS09-10 (KS^2 , #52). The main concentration of Fortetsa tombs are further to the south, on the east side of the acropolis (KS^2 , #151). Of the seventeen chamber tombs excavated, nine contained weapons (KNS11-19).

On the **Kephala Ridge**, the west slope of **Zapher Papoura** (KS^2 , #39), 500m east of the North Cemetery, six chamber tombs were excavated by Hogarth in 1900 of which two contained weapons (KNS48, KNS50). Another 500m north along the ridge (KS^2 , #16), three further tombs excavated by Evans and Payne appear to be connected to Hogarth's group, although it is unclear how closely (Payne 1928, 227); no finds besides pottery were reported. A tenth, outlying tomb contained a fragment of an iron sword (KNS49).

The **Mavro Spelio** tombs were LBA tombs re-used in the seventh century (*KS*², #251, Forsydyke 1927). There were no burials with weapons.

Two groups of tombs have been excavated to the south on the **Gypsades hill**. The tombs on the **Upper Gypsades** (*KS*², #331) date from MM-LM III/SMin; those on the **Lower Gypsades** (*KS*², #329) included one EIA tomb with weapons (KNS51)

The chamber tombs to the northwest of Knossos at **Atsalino** and **Mastamba**, on route to modern Heraklion, were probably related to hamlets between the EIA town and its harbour (*KS*², #18; Coldstream and Huxley 1999, 291). None of the chamber tombs at Atsalino contained weapons (Davaras 1968); that at Mastamba is reported to have contained part of a spearhead and an axe (Lembesi 1970, 292).

Further northwest, near Heraklion, eight tombs have been uncovered at **Agios Ioannis** (*KS*², #6), which may have been part of a larger group. Four contained weapons (KNS52-55). The cemetery does not last long, receiving burials only from the SMin to LPGa/PGB (Boardman 1960, 142-143).

For a period from the early sixth century there is no evidence known from Knossos, suggesting a gap in occupation until towards the end of the century (Coldstream 1984, 321).

4.5.3 Weapons in burials

There are fifty-five tombs which contain weapons in the Knossos area. It is difficult to convert this into numbers of individual burials due to the re-use of most tombs and the later disturbance of many. Only KNS20, and perhaps KNS22 and KNS26, contained only one burial. In other tombs, however, some evidence of individual burials could be seen; these are recorded in Appendix A4.

By far the most common weapons are spearheads, of which there are a hundred and seventy-five iron examples, and three of bronze. The number of swords (thirty) and daggers (forty-three) are comparatively much lower. Compared to the other regions axes are abundant – thirteen single examples and five double. But this is tiny in so many burials. Similarly, while ten tombs show some evidence of archery, none of these tombs contained as many arrowheads as EUB04 and EUB08. The three *phalara* were accompanied by other weapons.

4.5.3.1 Swords and daggers

In many of the Knossian tombs the swords and daggers were fragmentary and it is not always possible to distinguish between them. Nineteen of the seventy-three swords and daggers are preserved enough to categorize. Thirteen are daggers, Swo026, Swo035, Swo037, Swo040-043, Swo054-056, Swo059, Swo062, and Swo068; the remaining six are short-swords, Swo073, Swo080, Swo083, Swo084, Swo087, and Swo090.

While many graves contained both swords and daggers, it is not clear if there are any cases where more than one can be assigned to the same burial. Three of the daggers (Swo026, Swo055, and Swo056) and one sword (Swo087) were found in KNS18 along with three further fragmentary swords (Swo029) and two daggers, but no more than one of these was certainly assigned to a burial. This pattern persists through many of the other burials.

The only reported bronze sword is Swo084 (Plate 22a). This is dated to SMin. More interesting is the contemporaneous Swo035, an iron dagger, which is amongst the first in the Aegean (Plate 21f). Swo084 appears to have been bent out of shape and broken, as do several of the other objects in KNS21. The poor condition of many of the Knossian weapons may indicate intentional destruction, but heavy corrosion combined with the disturbance caused by re-use and looting obscures the potential to understand this. It is certainly the case that few of the swords in Knossos were found complete.

Swo083 is a different kind of sword than is usually found in the EIA Aegean, the one-edge slashing sword (Plate 20c). It is possible that Swo033 is the same type. If used in combat a slashing sword would require a considerably different fighting technique to the “cut-and-thrust” swords. While there are spearheads in KNS15, they are not associated with Swo083, and there were none in KNS29; therefore the slashing sword cannot be used to indicate that the spear was used as a thrusting weapon.

4.5.3.2 Spears

In some cases spearheads formed a pair, but in many others they were also clearly deposited individually. Spe043, Spe105, and those in KNS03-04, KNS09, KNS11, KNS14, KNS17, KNS23, KNS25, KNS27, KNS45, KNS48 and KNS55 were the only spearheads in the tomb and thus may represent spears that were not deposited in pairs. Spe128 was the only iron spearhead in KNS42. While some of these tombs were disturbed, the spearheads in KNS11, KNS14, KNS17 (Spe105), and possibly KNS25 were discovered inside urns, suggesting singular deposition. In certain graves where there is more than one spearhead the context suggests that they were deposited separately, such as the three in KNS51.

Of the eight tombs which contained two spearheads, Spe051 and Spe144 in KNS01 may have been deposited as a pair as they are corroded together; Spe099 in KNS16 were published as a pair; while those in KNS40 were found in separate pithoi, one MG and the other LG. Those in KNS02 (Spe068), KNS30 (Spe063), KNS36 (Spe141, Spe146), KNS43, and KNS54 were indeterminate.

One of the three spearheads in KNS19 was found by itself in the niche, while the other two were in the fill. In KNS51 there were three iron spearheads, one in an MG and another in an LG context. On the other hand, the fragments of at least four spearheads in KNS38 were all in the same niche, although further association is unclear. Of those in

KNS15 two of the complete spearheads and one fragmentary one were found singly in pithoi, while one PGB pithos contained a pair of spears (Spe119). The context of the six fragmentary spearheads in KNS44, including Spe067 and Spe125, was unclear.

There were six spearheads in each of KNS34 and KNS37. In KNS34, Spe097 and Spe101 were corroded together and so may have been deposited as a pair, although the chamber was very disturbed. Spe108 was not corroded to another spearhead. Similarly in KNS37, Spe075 and Spe104 were corroded together and associated with an inhumation, while Spe117, Spe136, and the remaining spearheads could not be connected to each other or a particular interment. The disturbance of KNS31 means that the number of spearheads is uncertain (eight or nine), and they certainly cannot be assigned to groups. KNS39 had also been disturbed, and contained nine spearheads.

Several of the twenty-one spearheads in KNS18 were found corroded together or in pairs: the tip of another spearhead adhered to Spe054; Spe076 and Spe093 were together; Spe079 is a pair; Spe096 was with another spear the measurements of which were not reported. As many as five spearheads were associated with one pithos (Spe076, Spe093, Spe138, and two other blades with the EG pithos); on the other hand Spe122 is the only spearhead with the MG pithos and Spe086, Spe122, Spe134, and Spe138 were solitary. There is little in the descriptions to suggest that any of these spearheads were not javelins, as they all have fairly long sockets and narrow blades (Plate 21c); however, Brock only classified two as javelins (Spe134 and Spe138).

Of the nineteen or twenty spearheads in KNS33 a number were part of a corroded mass, including Spe090, part of Spe094, and Spe111, while Spe133 and Spe150 were part of another. Spe132, Spe139, and Spe140 were all single finds, although fragmentary. Spe132

has a short socket, suggesting that it might not have been a javelin, although in every other way it resembles other javelins from Knossos.

KNS41 was in disarray; fourteen of the twenty or more spearheads were on the chamber floor; three or four were under the wall constructed through the middle of the tomb; two were in the lower niche. Spe036 is said to be “closely associated” with Spe088, and both are described as javelins (*KNC*, 120, 121).

KNS32 contained thirty spearheads. Spe064 was part of a corroded mass which included several javelin-heads including three pairs. While Spe077 seems like a normal javelin, Spe143 has a short socket compared to its length, and so may be for thrusting rather than throwing (Plates 23b).

In addition to this KNS13 contained an indeterminate number of iron spearheads which had corroded into two iron masses (Spe142), as well as a single bronze spearhead. Of the Kephala Ridge tombs both KNS48 and KNS50 contained many blades which may have been of spearheads.

Four bronze spearheads are known from Knossos (including Spe084, Spe100, and Spe135), three from MFS tombs (KNS20, KNS21, and KNS42) and one from a Fortetsa tomb (KNS13). Spe100 and Spe135, from KNS21 and KNS20 respectively, are SMin when bronze spearheads are still relatively common. These both accompany swords and look like javelins. KNS13 is lost and so the type is unknown (*Fortetsa*, 22). Spe084 is probably a javelin as well; it has been twisted out of shape, perhaps intentionally (Plate 24a). Intentional destruction of spears is apparent from pair Spe119 (Plate 20d). Several other spearheads were an unspecified metal, but by far the majority were iron.

4.5.3.3 Armour

Three bronze *phalara* come from Knossos (Pha01, Pha03, and Pha08). The first two are from SMin graves and are badly damaged. Only the spike remains of Pha01, most closely resembling the spike from Pha09 (Plate 22d). Pha08 also has a long spike and resembles Pha06, Pha10, and Pha12 (Plate 21e). The small size of Pha03, in addition to the fact that it is of the spike-less variety, like Pha07 and the Vergina *phalara*, may indicate that this is actually a belt-attachment (Plate 23c). Despite the fact that KNS32 does include other weapons it was not possible to associate any of these with Pha07. It is reasonable to interpret Pha01 and Pha08 as shield-bosses as they form part of a set of weapons in KNS21 and KNS20, including fragments of boar's tusk which may have been helmets.

KNS54 in the Agios Ioannis cemetery also contained a bronze "belt", which may have served a defensive function.

4.5.5.4 Archery

Seven tombs contained iron arrowheads: KNS15, KNS35, and KNS42 each contained one; KNS44 had two; there were three in each of KNS16, KNS18, and KNS37. In addition to this were six bronze arrowheads in the SMin tomb KNS21. These included one barbed arrowhead and five without barbs, one of which was huge (Plate 22c). The majority of the iron arrowheads were corroded to the point that their type was difficult to determine. None appear to be barbed, perhaps indicating a different function to the bronze predecessor in KNS21. The limited number of examples may suggest that many of these arrows remained in wounds when those buried in the chamber tombs were cremated. KNS35, like ATT07, includes no other weapons; however, it had been disturbed and the arrowhead was found in the same fill as Roman plaster.

Bronze facing, interpreted as the covering for a quiver, came from KNS18 and KNS33, although the latter does not contain arrowheads (Plate 40b). In the heavily disturbed KNS46 there was a fragment interpreted as a bow-tip, but no other evidence for archery.

4.5.5.5 Axes

Nineteen axes were found in Knossian tombs. Five were double axes: Axe17 in KNS32, Axe18 and Axe22 in KNS33, Axe23 and another in KNS18. The remainder were single axes: Axe02, Axe03, Axe05-08, Axe10-12, Axe16, Axe19, Axe21, one in KNS50 and another in KNS18. These vary from small and light examples to the fairly large, although the very largest are double axes. There is no compelling reason to judge either way if they are weapons or not.

Chapter 5

Sanctuary Evidence

5.1. INTRODUCTION

Weapons and armour begin to be dedicated in sanctuaries throughout Greece in the late eighth century. There are considerable difficulties with these dedications. Most were excavated in pits or disused wells where they had been discarded after being on display in the sanctuary; as a result of this chronological information relies on stylistic criteria rather than stratigraphic information, and we do not always know the context in which they were displayed. Finally, there is also the question of the dedicator. Until the appearance of dedicatory inscriptions we have no idea who dedicated the arms and armour at sanctuaries. When these do appear it is clear that the dedications include both personal arms and armour and *skyla*, those captured from enemies. This seems to be a very different phenomenon to that which we see in burials (but see Ch.8.6.4). Baitinger (2011) is a synthesis of the dedications of weapons and armour currently known from Greek sanctuaries.

5.2. OLYMPIA

The **sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia** lies in the region of Elis in the western Peloponnese, on the river Kladeos. Cult activity begins at least as early as SMyc/EPG (Eder 2001b; *Ol.Forsch.* XXXI). The first major metal dedications are bronze tripods beginning in the late tenth century, which are ultimately replaced by dedications of arms and armour in the late eighth century. Olympia was once considered to be by far the most prolific site for dedications of weapons and armour (Snodgrass 1980, 105); in this it may now be challenged by Kalapodi (see below, Ch.5.4).

Spearheads and butts are the most common offensive weapons (*Ol.Forsch.* I, 146). These are found in both bronze and iron, and in a variety of different styles; they begin in the late eighth century and continue. The earliest sword is Swo009, which was discovered in a well abandoned in the mid-seventh century, and probably dates to LG (*Ol.Forsch.* XXIX, 76). Swo091 and Swo095 are preserved enough to be categorized as short-swords; Swo099 is not well preserved but is clearly a longer example. Swo091 is bronze, while most of the other swords are iron. The majority of spearheads were bronze and in poor condition. Only Spe124 looks like a javelin, although the socket is short (Plate 24c). Spe089, Spe103, Spe112, Spe148, and Spe152 are much more likely to be thrusting spears (Plate 24b, 24d). Vast quantities of arrowheads are dedicated from the seventh century; like those in graves, these may have been dedicated in quivers which leave no archaeological trace (*Ol.Forsch.* XXIX, 5).

Dedications of armour, especially helmets, far outstrip those of offensive weapons. Dedications of helmets are likely to have begun by the end of the eighth century, followed shortly by greaves (*Ol.Forsch.* XXI, 20-21; *Ol.Forsch.* XXXIII, 4-5).⁵² Cuirasses are rare, but occur from the late eighth or early seventh century. By the last third of the seventh century shield-bands from the hoplite shield have begun to be dedicated at the sanctuary; shield-facings are known from slightly earlier than this, but only in fragments (*Ol.Forsch.* II, 231-244; *Ol.Forsch.* XVII, 93-101). Dedications of armour are often intentionally damaged, especially helmets (Jackson 1983).

⁵² A fragment of a crested helmet could date as early as the ninth century (*Ol.Forsch.* XXXIII, 2); however, the fragmentary nature of the object and the unusual appearance of an early helmet makes the early date of this dedication questionable.

5.3. DELPHI

Delphi is situated on the southwest face of Mount Parnassos in Phocis, overlooking the Corinthian Gulf. There are two sanctuaries at Delphi. The majority of the weapons dedicated in **the sanctuary of Apollo** appear to have been spears. Thirteen spearheads from deposits all over the sanctuary date to the period before *ca.* 600 (Snodgrass 1964, 118-130).⁵³ Of the ten in Appendix B2 seven are bronze and three iron; all except for Spe123 could be reasonably interpreted as javelins, although the sockets on Spe029 and Spe033 are quite short. If one of the pair of Spe034 and Spe127 is unlikely to be a javelin it is the longer of the two, although the shape of this spearhead could still be thrown.

Swo011 was discovered just to the east of the temple. Dedications of armour are uncommon at Delphi – there are several helmets and shields, but no cuirasses. Iron weapons which typologically belong to the earliest period of dedications have also been recovered from the **Sanctuary of Athena Pronaia** (*Delphi* II.5, 94). Herodotus refers to the dedications at this sanctuary, which were said to have assisted Delphi in repelling the Persians (Hdt. 8.37).

5.4. KALAPODI

The sanctuary at Kalapodi, located in Phocis at a crossroads between Locris and Thessaly, should probably be identified as **the oracle of Apollo at Abai** (Lemos 2012, 19).⁵⁴ The sanctuary shows continuous activity from LH IIIC to the Roman period; however, the succession of temples in the south shows the period from the eleventh to the early seventh century much more clearly (Lemos 2012, 19-20).

⁵³ One of these is simply “c. 525 BC or earlier” (Snodgrass 1964, 121).

⁵⁴ An alternative identification is that it was the sanctuary of Artemis of Hyampolis, but this has lost favour in the more recent excavation reports.

The earliest excavations focused on the North Temple of Apollo, from which come dedications of helmets, greaves, and shields unearthed in later contexts but which typologically belong to the late eighth or seventh centuries. At least one of the *kegelhelm* and one Illyrian helmet belong to an LG IIa pit (*Kalapodi* II, 357-358). Swords and spearheads are invariably iron; a consequence of this is that their state of preservation is largely poor. While Kalapodi appears to have received substantially higher dedications of swords than Olympia and Delphi, only four were preserved in reasonable condition – three short-swords, Swo081, Swo088, and Swo093, and one medium-sword Swo105. While most of the spearheads from Kalapodi are in poor condition, the narrow blade and long socket of most indicates that they were likely to have been javelins. Spe060 had been bent out of shape, perhaps intentionally (Plate 24e); intentional damage is more common on later dedications of swords and spearheads. Dedications of arrowheads appeared in LH IIIC-EPG contexts.

The most recent excavations have focused on the South Temple. The earliest deposit of weapons was buried with Temple 6 when it was put out of use towards the end of the eighth century. The deposit contained thirteen iron *griffzungenschwerter* and five spearheads, along with *obeloi* and other dedications, all of which had been burned, perhaps in a deliberate fire (Lemos 2012, 19). Dedications of weapons and armour continue in Temple 7, constructed at the end of the eighth century and destroyed *ca.* 580. Fragments of the polychrome wall paintings of Temple 7 have been recovered and dated to the mid-seventh century (Niemeier 2007, 42; Niemeier *et al.* 2012).

5.5. OTHER SANCTUARIES

Several other sanctuaries begin to receive dedications of arms and armour at this time, although not of the quantities represented at Olympia, Kalapodi, or even Delphi. Dedications from the regions covered by this thesis are minimal. In the late eighth and early seventh

centuries there are no known dedications of weapons at the Acropolis in Athens, the Argive Heraion, or the sanctuaries at Knossos (Baitinger 2011, 12-13). Despite the cases where dedications of weapons and armour are abundant, such as Olympia and Kalapodi, in most cases only a few actually survive; however, as the case of Delphi amply testifies, this may be the result of preservation rather than evidence of absence.

In Attica, two swords are known from a votive pit in the **sanctuary of Athena at Sounion** in Attica. Swo094 is a short-sword while Swo098 is a medium-sword, although there is not much difference in length between the two of them. While substantially complete, both of these swords were excavated broken. No weapons are known from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion. **The temple of Aphaia on Aegina** has produced a number of weapon votives, although with the exception of a fragment of a *kegelhelm* and a single bronze arrowhead of a type common in the ninth century, these appear to predominantly be sixth century (Maass 1984).

Developments in Crete are different to those in the mainland, although dedications of weapons and armour also occur, usually in the main town temples or large, regional open-air sanctuaries (Wallace 2010, 314; Prent 2005, 384). Most significantly there are temporal differences, as regular dedication of weapons and armour in Cretan sanctuaries does not begin until the late seventh century (Hoffmann 1972, 41-46; Prent 2005, 703 Table 4).

Kommos is the exception, where dedications of arms and armour are associated with both Temple A (*ca.* 1020-800) and Temple B (*ca.* 800-600), but have ceased by the subsequent Temple C. Two arrowheads and Spe005, all bronze, were associated with Temple A; in Temple B a bronze shield and Spe006 were associated with the tripillar shrine and its hearth during phase 2 (*Kommos* IV, 363). Two fragments of daggers, one bronze and one iron, were classified by the excavators as “tools” rather than weapons (*Kommos* IV, 371);

while it is not possible to say from their fragmentary state I would suggest that these are just as likely to be weapons as those in the graves at Knossos (see Ch.4.5.3.1). Seven arrowheads and eight spearheads are reported from scattered contexts around the temenos, along with knives and daggers. None of the arrowheads show evidence of barbs. The excavators suggested that the dedicants at Kommos in the eighth and seventh centuries were members of a warrior aristocracy (*Kommos* IV, 173), but the evidence for this is minimal.

Several iron weapons were discovered in the **Cave Sanctuary of Zeus at Psychro** including short-sword Swo082 (Hogarth 1899-1900b, 112; Boardman 1961, 54-55). There was also a dagger, four axe-heads, and eight unusual spearheads which may have been knives. It has been suggested that there was continuity here from the LBA (Watrous 1996, 54), but while no stratigraphic information contradicts this claim the limited finds do not support an interpretation of regular dedication of weapons.

Dedications of weapons begin to appear in the sanctuaries of the Corinthia in the late eighth century. At the **sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia**, which lies on the south-side of the Corinthian Isthmus, dedications of weapons remain limited, with minimal evidence suggesting that they began before the end of the eighth century.⁵⁵ A fragment of the cheek-guard of a *kegelhelm* and a spearhead, possibly Sicilian, are dated to the late eighth century, while an Illyrian helmet more probably dates to the seventh, but could be earlier (*Isthmia* VIII, 161-165). As at Kalapodi, alongside these dedications are fragments of wall painting, which may depict overlapping shields (Niemeier 2012, 81-82). Arrowheads, spearheads, and swords were also dedicated at the **sanctuary of Hera at Perachora** on the other side of the Corinthian isthmus. In the LG deposit associated with the temple of Hera Akraia in the harbour area there was a dagger Swo022, the hilt of a dagger Swo005, and a spearhead (*Perachora* I, 75). Of the weapons dedicated at the temple of Hera Limenia on the upper

⁵⁵ The volume on arms and armour from Isthmia remains forthcoming (*Isthmia* VIII, 161).

plateau dagger Swo016, which has been intentionally destroyed, short-sword Swo071, and possibly a spearhead date to the EIA (*Perachora* I, 190).⁵⁶ Also reported are three-dozen arrowheads, but their context makes them difficult to date; Snodgrass believed that they were Archaic (*Perachora* I, 181; Snodgrass 1964, 153).

Scattered dedications are known from several other sites, including a single arrowhead from the **temple of Athena at Koukounaries on Paros** (Schilardi 1988, 45), two similar bronze arrowheads and a single iron spearhead from the **sanctuary of Athena at Emporio on Chios**, and seven iron spearheads and several bronze arrowheads from the seventh-century **Harbour Sanctuary** at Emporio (Boardman 1967, 28, 63-4, 226-227, 229-231). As stressed above, dedications are quite rare at sanctuaries besides Olympia and Kalapodi.

⁵⁶ An addendum to this cites the iron swords from Hama as parallels (*Perachora* II, 535); these should be several centuries earlier, but there is certainly a similarity.

Chapter 6

Settlement Evidence

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The impact of warfare in settlements can be seen in various forms, but these are all rare in the Aegean between the eleventh and eighth centuries (see Ch.1.2.3, 1.3.2-3). The evidence from the regions under consideration in this thesis is almost entirely from central Euboea and the Argolid; in addition to this it is noteworthy that fortifications occur in the Aegean coast of Anatolia and the Aegean islands earlier than on the mainland (Snodgrass 2006b, 333).

6.2 CENTRAL EUBOEA

Xeropolis appeared to be a major, unfortified EIA site until further excavation challenged this understanding. On the north side of the slope a wall has been revealed which, while too narrow to act as a fortification, would certainly compliment the geographical conditions in making the site very difficult to access without the acquiescence of the occupants (Lemos 2007b, 38; 2008, 53-54; 2009, 48). Throughout much of the EIA the isthmus leading to the settlement would have been much smaller as a result of the lagoons to the northeast and northwest, while the steep south slope of Xeropolis leads straight to the sea (Frederiksen 2011, 107). Between these features and the limited scope of warfare in the EIA Xeropolis was a well-protected site.

It was originally reported that Xeropolis was sacked and abandoned *ca.* 700, although the evidence was limited (*Lefkandi* I, 369). In one LG building there was a burnt area which may have been the central roof support, burnt sherds, and other burnt timber structures in the north end (*Lefkandi* I, 14, 19). Another LG building in the trials on the east slope showed no

evidence of destruction, but was probably abandoned (*Lefkandi I*, 18-22). The limitations of this evidence have led to questions from some about the validity of assuming that the whole of Xeropolis was destroyed and abandoned when so little has been fully excavated (Hall 2013, 7); furthermore, the slim evidence for activity in the seventh and even sixth centuries suggests that it is possible that rather than being violently destroyed Xeropolis continued to decline until abandoned (*Lefkandi I*, 18, 78; Lemos 2006a, 523 n.61).

The earliest certain date for the fortifications at Eretria is 550. However, several walls which functioned as a dyke in the region of the West Gate have been dated to the seventh century and may also have served as a fortification with the river as a moat (Frederiksen 2011, 74-75, 138-139; Mazarakis Ainian 1987, 14). It is also possible that the first phase of the terrace wall on the acropolis could date to the seventh century, although evidence to support this proposition has not been reported in the most recent excavations (Frederiksen 2011, 75, 141).

A destruction contemporary with that of Lefkandi has been reported at Eretria (Mazarakis Ainian 1987, 8; Walker 2004, 91). The evidence is limited to several burned bricks, damage to House A, and the destruction of another building. House A was immediately rebuilt and reoccupied (Mazarakis Ainian 1987, 9). It is possible that these destructions are related to the Lelantine War (Ch.8.3.4; Hall 2013, 8-9; Mazarakis Ainian 1987, 18; Walker 2004, 91).

6.3 THE ARGOLID

There are fortified sites throughout the Argolid in the EIA. While fortifications were not constructed at Mycenae and Tiryns, the acropoleis of these two sites had been fortified in the LBA. These were substantial walls and it is possible that they were reused in the EIA, although there is no definitive proof that this was the case (Frederiksen 2011, 105-106;

Snodgrass 2006b, 340). Written evidence indicates that the walls of Tiryns were in use in the eighth and seventh centuries, and there is also evidence of occupation in the Lower Citadel at this time (Kilian 1988, 107). On the other hand no evidence is known from the acropolis at Mycenae, which is likely to have been abandoned at the end of LH IIIC (Mühlenbruch 2009, 117). It is possible that the citadels at these sites may have served as places of refuge in times of crisis.

At Argos it is possible that both the acropolis at Larissa and the Aspis, a low hill to the north of the settlement, were fortified in the seventh century. The date of both sets of walls is unclear. An Archaic votive deposit suggests a sixth-century date for the Aspis walls (Touchais 1976; 1980, 698); the earliest phase of the Larissa fortifications may be the seventh century. Frederiksen suggests that the Aspis would not have been fortified before the Larissa, and that it is likely that the fortifications were connected to one another in the Archaic period (2011, 130).

There are also two possible fortification walls at Asine: on the acropolis and on the Barbouna hill. The Barbouna walls are better attested and can be certainly dated to LG (*Asine* I, 147-8; Wells 1988, 262, 266). The surviving walls are on the north and northwest slopes of the hill. Reconstructions indicate that they enclosed about 9 ha, including the east slope where another section of the wall may have been excavated (Frederiksen 2011, 131-2; Wells 1988, 246). As only tombs and the sanctuary of Apollo Pythaus have been uncovered in this area it is possible that it served only as a refuge site in times of crisis (Frederiksen 2011, 132). A stretch of wall at the entrance to the acropolis, dated by twenty Geometric vases, abutted a road leading up into the acropolis (*Asine* I, 32). As the construction of this wall resembles that of the Barbouna walls they may also have been fortifications (Wells 1988, 263).

A barbed arrowhead was found in a Geometric house on the acropolis (*Asine* I, 333). It is possible that this is evidence of the destruction of the site at the end of the eighth century. The original excavations suggested that Asine was abandoned *ca.* 720-710, soon after the erection of the fortifications, as there was LG IIb pottery in the destruction level (*Asine* I, 437, Wells 1988, 265). This date is several decades too late for the account of the destruction in Pausanias (Paus. 2.36.4-5), who suggests the destruction took place in the generation before the first Messenian War in 744-724 (Hall 2013, 160-161). There are several mistakes in Pausanias' account including the assertion that the temple of Apollo Pythaeus was spared; if this building has been correctly identified in the archaeological record it appears to have been damaged, then immediately rebuilt. After the destruction of Asine the site appeared to have been abandoned for some time (*Asine* I, 64, 89-90). However, more recent excavations have shown that occupation may have continued at a reduced level in the Archaic and Classical periods (Styrenius 1998, 63).

The most prominent Geometric wall, and according to Coldstream perhaps the most massive survival from Geometric Greece, is the retaining wall of the Argive Heraion (Coldstream 2003, 145). The wall is constructed from irregular megalithic blocks of unworked conglomerate (Wright 1982, 186). The terrace cannot be interpreted as a fortification as comparison with the architecture of the Mycenaean fortifications shows (Wright 1982, 192); however, the construction of this terrace was intended to imitate the Cyclopean style of the other Argive citadels where the cult of Hera was practiced (Wright 1982, 197-198). While they may not match the sophistication of the LBA walls the Heraion terrace indicates that the eighth-century Argives were capable of large-scale communal construction.

6.4 OTHER AREAS

Thirteen city walls can be dated to the ninth and eighth centuries, while thirteen more date to the seventh (Frederiksen 2011, 201). These are distributed amongst the Aegean islands and the Aegean coast of Anatolia, with a few exceptions such as Asine and Salamis on Cyprus in the eighth century, and Eretria, Corinth, and Megara Hyblaia in the seventh. No other fortifications are known in any of the regions under consideration prior to 600.

The Acropolis of Athens, like Mycenae and Tiryns, had been fortified in the LBA. It is therefore equally possible that the Acropolis may have served as a place of refuge throughout the EIA, if it was not the main settlement. In times when the occupants of Athens did not feel threatened they occupied various areas around the slopes of the Acropolis, ready to ascend when attacked (Ch.4.2.2).

The limited evidence from the settlements under consideration means that there can only be slight evidence for destruction or fortification. The most abundant evidence comes from Lefkandi and Asine as these sites are abandoned or destroyed, meaning that later occupation could not destroy the EIA evidence (Coldstream 2003, 303; Lemos 2002, 135). On the other hand, the absence of destruction at most sites throughout the EIA indicates the small scale of warfare before the eighth century.

Chapter 7

The “Art” of War

7.1. INTRODUCTION

Figure-decoration and literature have a number of similarities when used as evidence for EIA warfare. Both are subjective depictions of war, violence, and combat both from the perspective of the individual who created them, and from the perspective of the scholar who interprets them. On the other hand, they can provide a unique insight into a society’s perspective on warfare which is not necessarily apparent in weapons, skeletal trauma, or destruction levels. However, in the EIA, the main difficulty with using iconographic and literary evidence is that they are limited to the very end of the period, with little earlier than the eighth century. Appendix C includes iconographic descriptions of the main vases referenced in this thesis.

7.2. FIGURE-DECORATION

7.2.1 Before the eighth Century

After the postpalatial period iconographic representations become very limited for the subsequent three-hundred years. Exceptions include LkS01 and ArT01, which date respectively to MPG and LPG. Both products are probably local,⁵⁷ and it is valuable to question why there was a sudden, brief, and limited interest in figurative scenes in the tenth century.

⁵⁷ Desborough originally believed that LkS01 was an import. It has since been shown to be local (Jones 1986, 629).

In Lefkandi, the most prestigious MPG burial was EUB02, in which was deposited an antique bronze figure-decorated krater from Cyprus (*Lefkandi* II.2, 81-92). It is possible that the scenes of hunters on this vase, which include archers, or other Near Eastern imports could have inspired the depiction on LkS01 (Coldstream 2006, 161). However, the scene is not a direct copy and shows some invention on the part of the artist, such as the changed context of the archers from hunting to a confrontation between humans (Lemos 2000, 13-14). No pictorial tradition was inspired by these imports, but as LkS01 shows, this “was not because they could not copy the images, but because they were not really interested in them” (Lemos 2000, 16).

The LPG fragment ArT01 appears to show two figures in combat and has been described as “more heroic than clumsy” (Langdon 2008, 78). It is difficult not to see this description as wishful thinking, but both of these scenes have been interpreted as duels by the excavators. Pappi suggests that competition for military prestige played a key role in the PG period. Desborough makes no such claims for the Lefkandi piece, suspecting it may be a Mycenaean survival. The limited evidence makes it difficult to back up Pappi’s claims.

A number of figured scenes from Knossos predate the eighth century. The earliest EIA scene is the SMin-EPG “Goat Krater” from KNS10, followed by Kno01 and Kno02 (*KNC* I, 8; Coldstream 2006, 161). There are very few explicit depictions of warfare, as Kno01-03 all depict humans in combat with animals, expressing masculine prowess through dominance of nature. The scenes with lions are especially evocative; lions would later appear in Homeric similes suggesting an association of these scenes with a particular kind of heroic combat (Langdon 2008, 251-252).

7.2.2 *The eighth century*

Similarities in theme and composition suggest that there was some kind of connection between LH IIIC and Geometric figured styles (Boardman 1998, 23-24; Coldstream 2006). The question remains how feasible such a connection is. Boardman hypothesizes figured decoration in media which do not survive; Coldstream is unconvinced but accepts that the discovery of LM larnakes in the chamber tombs of the North Cemetery point to a rediscovery of Minoan figurative decoration. While there are thematic links between the decoration of LH IIIC and Athenian LG pictorial pottery (Langdon 2008, 48-50), these themes are somewhat broad – horses, funerals, mourners, battles – and it is feasible to assume that they retained their cultural significance through the EIA. With the exception of Knossos, there is limited evidence for the discovery of Mycenaean pictorial decoration in the eighth century; furthermore the connection between only the final period of Mycenaean pictorial and the earliest Geometric suggests that these were not random discoveries of Mycenaean material. The revival of figurative decoration relied on a social context in which these scenes were valuable (Langdon 2008); as Lemos argued such a context was not present in PG, but by the eighth century the power of images was strong and important.

Depictions of warfare are limited, even in the eighth century. What evidence there is indicates that the concept of warfare was changing throughout the century. The two earliest Attic depictions, Ath01 and Ath02, both depict a beached ship alongside which a battle takes place, perhaps a raid along the coast. On Ath02 the woman and Dipylon shields in the middle of one of the ships have been interpreted as booty taken during this raid (Ahlberg 1971a, 29). The duelling men on Ath03 perhaps continue the limited tradition of depicting single combat from PG, although no preserved examples were Athenian. A recurring theme in these scenes is that neither side is superior to the other – it is impossible to tell the outcome of these battles.

In LG Ia scenes of combat occur on the enormous grave marking vases of the Dipylon Workshop, which appear to have come primarily from the Dipylon Cemetery. Combat scenes only appear on the high-footed kraters used to mark male graves, and never on the belly-handled amphorai which mark the graves of women (Coldstream 1991b, 47-48); however, male figures are often distinguished by their swords, and perhaps by gesture, although this is more common in later depictions (Snodgrass 1998, 14-15; van Wees 1998b, 20-21). In these scenes it is usually clear who the victor is, for example on Ath04 the men armed with Dipylon shields are defeated (Ahlberg 1971a, 53). The near equal presentation of battles on land and on sea indicates that the Mediterranean was not a safe place to travel in the middle of the eighth century, although it is unclear if the Athenians were under threat or threatening; probably both, as taking booty is one way in which men could maintain their warrior status (Langdon 2008, 249-250). These scenes of combat on grave markers appear to last only a generation in LG Ia, *ca.* 760-750.

The emphasis on the defeated is particularly apparent in LG Ib. The scene on Ath07 has been interpreted as a scene of post-battle disarmament of a defeated enemy (Ahlberg 1971a, 21-25). The taking of an enemy's weapons is a mark of a victorious warrior, and adds value to these arms which cannot come from those which the warrior carried himself. This scene appears at around the same time as weapons and armour begin to be common dedications in sanctuaries, indicating an interest in post-battle activity and perhaps an increasing desire to take weapons and armour from the deceased. However, the dead in earlier scenes of combat such as Ath04 are usually depicted stripped of the arms, unless they are recently deceased.

In LG II depictions of combat are less common, but armed men – warriors – continue to appear on vases, largely in funerary contexts. They are much more frequently depicted on smaller vessels such as oinochoai, where battles were represented in continuous frieze (e.g.

Ath08, Ath10). Throughout the second half of the eighth century and into the early seventh depictions of warriors processing, both on foot, in chariots, or mixed, are depicted in friezes and panels, e.g. Ath09-10 and Ath11 (Ahlberg 1971b, 165-166, 202-205; Rombos 1988, 131-151). Very little distinguishes these warriors from one another, besides the occasional shield blazon, and we can assume that they were generic depictions. This indicates that, in contrast to the occasional individuals granted warrior status in the burials of EIA Greece, in the late eighth century warriors were recognizable as a separate, homogenous class receiving special burial but not weapons in their graves.

The figure beneath the handle on Ath10 has been interpreted as a conjoined twin. There are fourteen instances of two overlapping figures interpreted as the conjoined twins Aktorione-Molione in LG pictorial pottery, predominantly Attic although one example is Argive (*Il.* 11.709-10; Snodgrass 1998, 26-32). The position of the twin-figure on Ath10 means that it would largely have been obscured from view while the vase was in use; Dahm has convincingly argued on this basis that the figure should not be interpreted as conjoined twins, but as indicating the beginning and end of the scene (2007, 726-728). This argument is supported by the dissimilarity of the twin-figure on Ath10 to other examples, such as that on Ath04. Regarding the other twin-figures, it is not relevant to the subject of this thesis whether or not they represent the conjoined twins Aktorione-Molione; as Snodgrass argued even depictions of mythical warfare will be based in the artist's experience of contemporary warfare. On the other hand, Ath10, in depicting the figure climbing into a chariot, is important in assessing the position of chariots in battle. On Dahm's analysis, there is no reason to assume that this chariot was in the middle of the battlefield, and thus the most likely Athenian depiction of a chariot in combat is rejected.

The context of most of these vessels is funerary, either as grave goods or on the monumental funerary markers which were characteristic of eighth-century Attica. These

scenes would be on public display; this would establish the deceased as a war hero, immortalized in the generic scene of battle. While these scenes cannot be identified as historical battles (Ahlberg 1971a, 66-70), they reflect contemporary conceptions of warriors and warfare. Depictions of men identified through their weapons indicate a more broad appropriation of warrior identity in the eighth century than had been apparent in the burials with weapons of previous centuries (see Ch.4), associating men with protecting and provisioning duties in their communities (Langdon 2008, 243-244). Scenes of combat peaked early in the pictorial tradition, suggesting that combat itself was either a less important or less desirable factor in the formation of warrior identity in the latter half of the eighth century in Attica. The concept of the warrior could be sustained through the symbols associated with it, particularly weapons, and there was no need to refer back to combat to reinforce its meaning.

Pictorial pottery from excavations in central Euboea is sparse, although it includes several important motifs. The only scene of combat is Ere01 and it is early; it has also been interpreted as an Attic import. Dipylon shields appear on Ere02, Ere03, and floating above a horse on LkX03. The horse was characteristic of the Euboean Geometric figured scene (Coldstream 1981, 243); LkX02 has been interpreted as an exemplary illustration of aristocratic male life, a father and son, both warriors, leading a horse (Langdon 2008, 246-247). The frieze of lions on Ere02 is an oriental motif connected to epic poetry, as suggested for Kno03 above. These scenes are fragmentary, but the identification of the vessels as kraters suggests that they formed the centrepiece for group, probably male, dining or drinking. These vases were all excavated in settlements, suggesting that in eighth-century Euboea warrior identity was expressed in life rather than in death.

The inclusion of Euboean pottery discovered overseas significantly increases the repertoire of LG pictorial scenes. The certain depictions of armed riders were discovered overseas, such as Eub03 from Vrokastro; the most conclusive example is Eub02 from Zagora.

But these figures are in a minority. The association of horses and warriors with élite groups means that they occasionally overlap on another prestige product, the fine painted vase, but they do not share a special association. The majority of figures are on foot or in chariots. The human figures from Lefkandi are all on foot, even where they are accompanied by horses. Chariot processions are depicted on Ere03 and Eub02, the latter of which includes warriors on foot. Eub03 appears to show the same thing, with the elbow of a charioteer preserved in front of a man with a helmet, shield, and pair of spears. Scenes of combat remain limited, but Euboean style pottery from Pithekoussai in the bay of Naples, where Euboeans appear to have settled in the middle of the eighth century, includes a scene of combat, perhaps at sea as it appears to depict a man falling backwards off a ship (Coldstream 2000b).

Argive eighth-century pictorial decoration is again more limited than the Athenian. Scenes of animals and birds outweigh those of humans, with a particular emphasis on horses (Pappi 2006, 230). ArA03, which also depicts men wrestling, a possible continuation of the contest theme on ArT01, features many panels showing horses and birds. The most common depiction of humans, which appear to be predominantly men, is the horse-and-man motif. These are generally one man with a horse to either side and occasionally one man with one horse. The majority of these men are unarmed, but several show arms and armour. ArT02 is a fully armed man with a Dipylon shield, while ArT03 appears to wear a breastplate. An indication that these figures were depicted with contemporary equipment is the resemblance of the helmet on ArA02 to that from ARG15. Despite the popularity of horses, there are no known eighth-century depictions of armed men on horseback. Dipylon shields, but no men, float above confronted horses on ArA01; perhaps this was intended to signify men on horseback.

The only Argive LG depiction of battle was excavated at the Argive Heraion. The figures on ArH01 have been interpreted as mythical creatures (Ahlberg 1971a, 15, 58).

Another fragment shows an archer and a lion in a boat, but it is unclear if this is a scene of combat (Ahlberg 1971a, 34). Both of these scenes incorporate themes which appear elsewhere: the lion and a monster which appears to resemble the “twin-figure”.

ArM01 is a unique example of a procession of warriors in the LG Argive figurative repertoire, in contrast to the popularity of this scene in Athens. Langdon highlighted the similarities between ArM01 and the LH IIIC Warrior krater from Mycenae, and asserted that the scene was influenced by the discovery of earlier Mycenaean iconography in the eighth century, incorporating heroizing elements such as the Dipylon shield (2008, 48-49). While the resemblance is certainly striking, the argument is largely unconvincing: the Warrior krater was excavated in a context beyond the discovery of an eighth-century vase painter, and no similar Mycenaean vessel is known from an eighth-century context; the simplest things to imitate, such as the pose and the direction of the spear, are not copied; if this were based on Mycenaean predecessors, the absence of other examples suggests that the impact of such discoveries was limited.

The identification of the Dipylon shield as “heroic” is based on an assumption that it is an anachronistic feature which recalls the LBA figure-of-eight shield (Langdon 2008, 29).⁵⁸ Similar claims have been made for chariots, although these are rarely depicted in combat (Greenhalgh 1973, 19-39). On analogy with the bronze weapons used by the heroes of epic poetry, Greenhalgh suggests that chariots were archaizing features intended to indicate that a scene was heroic. However, it is difficult to comprehend the mechanism by which the Dipylon shield could be archaizing (Ahlberg 1971a, 64-65). It is more feasible that the chariot, which had a place in the continuous oral tradition, was remembered through the EIA; on the other hand, depictions of chariots in pictorial pottery are limited. If the chariot

⁵⁸ For the casual assumption that the Dipylon and Boeotian shields never existed, see Carpenter 1991, 199, fig.297. However, examination of fig.297 shows clearly how unlike the figure-of-eight shields the Dipylon and Boeotian shields are.

were a contemporary feature of warfare, it served as transport, not a weapon (Crouwel 1992, 54). As Ahlberg points out, the suggestion that the Dipylon shield is a misremembering of the Bronze Age figure-of-eight shield is not apparent in surviving epic literature. If we accept that chariots served a transport function, which is compatible with their limited depiction in eighth-century art, then we have no reason to suppose that any archaizing features are represented in LG iconography at all. It is certainly the case that definite Bronze Age features in epic, such as the bronze weapons and the boar's tusk helmet, are not clearly represented in vase painting, which often seem to show contemporary equipment (e.g. ArA02). Other features may be stylized, such as the equipment of soldiers and the line of battle (Ahlberg 1971a, 53). If connections to the Bronze Age past, which is much better understood by us than the eighth-century Argives, are sought then we can certainly find them,⁵⁹ but without direct evidence of visible Bronze Age depictions from which inspiration could have been drawn it is preferable to think of LG pictorial as grounded in the eighth century.

In Knossos, the early revival of figure decoration mentioned above continues. However, the main area in which they appear is not pottery but metalwork, such as the sequence of bronze votive shields dedicated in the sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Ida (Coldstream 1991b, 45). These figures appear in scenes of hunting rather than of combat. On pottery figured decoration is limited to birds (Coldstream 2008, 244).

A final comment must go to two recently discovered LG amphorai from the island of Paros, beyond the geographical scope of this thesis but well within its theme. Both were discovered in the mass urn cremation grave of around 160 individuals, identified as young men, which has been identified as a *polyandrion* – the grave of soldiers killed in battle (Zaphiropoulou 2006, 271). The vase identified as earlier shows a raiding party taking a

⁵⁹ For example, the suggestion that the Heraion terrace imitates Cyclopean fortifications is much more convincing as these monuments were clearly visible in the eighth century (Wright 1982).

group of pastoralists unawares; the later one shows two rows of warriors fighting over the body of a fallen man, the subsequent removal of this man from the battlefield, and a *prothesis* scene. Both include mounted soldiers and chariots.

7.2.3 After the eighth century

Figurative art is the main way in which the development of equipment after the eighth century can be traced chronologically (Snodgrass 1999, 48-49). In this period the main workshops are the Attic and the Corinthian; in the other regions covered in this study there is little evidence for seventh-century depictions of warriors. From Euboea there is little figure decoration, and while Knossos favours depictions of birds, there is little in the way of warriors. The major question which historians have asked of the vase painting of the seventh century is the point at which the hoplite panoply and phalanx first appear (Hall 2013, 170-171; Snodgrass 1999, 50).

The Protoattic style allows greater detail to the depiction of equipment. Combat reappears on vases, with the focus on the battle rather than the conclusion. While the types of weapons in use do not change, their relative proportions do as the spear grows to far outweigh the sword and bow in importance (van Wees 1994b, 143-146). Figures in combat are usually depicted one-on-one in duels; these can involve either spears as on [Ath16](#) or swords as on [Ath18](#). The most notable development is that of the shield.

The round shield becomes almost universal in the seventh century, with the exception of the Boeotian shield, a descendent of the Dipylon shield, which has also been interpreted as heroizing (Snodgrass 1999, 55). The Boeotian shield could refer back to the Dipylon shield, of which there may have been preserved examples both real and iconographic in cemeteries, thus indicating that the scene was in the past (Ahlberg 1971a, 64). On the other hand if the reality of the Dipylon shield is accepted, then the Boeotian shield could be a development of

that type. Krentz suggests that the Boeotian shield may have originally been exclusively aristocratic, hence its association with heroes in later vase painting, while poorer men used the new, round *porpax*-shield (2013, 148). The argument that this shield is a heroizing feature is discredited by the number of scenes in which it appears where there are no heroic attributes besides this shield, and the number of heroic scenes otherwise identified which do not include a Boeotian shield.⁶⁰

In LG vase painting shields hung from a *telamon* around the necks of warriors; but in the seventh century warriors hold their shields out in front of them by a central grip, as on Ath15. Three-dimensional representations of the Dipylon shield reveal that it was convex, and this is a better shape for deflecting projectiles (Greenhalgh 1973, 67-68). It is likely that two-dimensional representations of a convex shield were a development in representation rather than in the design of round shields. The depiction of a Dipylon-like shield which is held by a central grip on Ath15 indicates the continuation and development of this type of shield.

The round shield depicted on Ath18 is one of the first on which the inside is shown, revealing the *porpax* and *antelabe*, characteristic of the hoplite double-grip shield (Lorimer 1947, 86-87). The appearance of blazons on round shields in LG art has been taken as the first appearance of the *porpax*-shield as these must be held upright and visible (Snodgrass 2006d, 354-355);⁶¹ besides the questionable assertion that in combat a warrior would be worried about the visibility of his blazon there are a number of counter arguments. Several blazons do not rely on being displayed the correct way up, such as the Dipylon-shield blazon on Ath18, unless it is also assumed that the Dipylon shield needed to be held the correct way

⁶⁰ The evidence has been gathered by Magazzu, L.J. "The Boeotian Shield: A Reassessment", a paper presented at the AIA meeting in Chicago, January 2014.

⁶¹ Claims that the hoplite shield appeared a little before 700 appear to be based on this belief (Raaflaub 1997, 50).

up as well. Furthermore the bothros shields from Tiryns, which have only a central grip, also have decoration which only works when held correctly, showing that it is not necessary for a shield to have *porpax* and *antelabe* to have this kind of decoration. The appearance of this shield is taken by some scholars to be the *terminus ante quem* for the development of full hoplite tactics, on the basis that it can only be used in phalanx formation (Schwartz 2013, 161-164), despite the fact that no attempt has been made to portray the phalanx on Ath18.

The early seventh-century “Protoargive” style includes two very important depictions of warriors on terracotta shields recovered from a bothros at Tiryns (ArT04, ArT05). These shields are designed with a single-grip, and although they are flat the single-grip shields depicted on them are convex. The weapons in use are varied; the central figure on ArT04 wields a sword, as perhaps the other male figure did, while the Amazons have spears which they hold as if to throw. The equipment of the figure on the reverse of ArT05 was originally interpreted as a shield and a pair of spears, but it is possible that he holds a bow and arrows. The context of these shields suggests that they had a place in kourotrophic rituals of seventh-century Tiryns (Langdon 2008, 81), in which case they are evidence of the socialization of young boys as warriors.

The lynchpin of discussions of seventh-century iconography and warfare is the Protocorinthian olpe known as the Chigi vase, dated *ca.* 640. While outside the geographical and chronological bounds of this thesis the Chigi vase remains of importance to the discussion of seventh-century warfare. The development of Protocorinthian figurative decoration includes significant emphasis on warfare, showing much more regular ranks than appear on contemporary Protoattic depictions. The main frieze on the Chigi vase depicts opposing ranks of heavily armed men and has been interpreted as the clash of two hoplite phalanxes, although that is disputed (Snodgrass 1999, 58; van Wees 2000, 134-139). Despite the primary reliance on iconographic evidence it is rare that the nature and function of

pictorial decoration is questioned by scholars of seventh-century warfare. Hurwit questions why the artist of the Chigi vase chose the iconographic themes of this vase (2002). The middle frieze depicts youths on horseback, a chariot, a sphinx, a lion hunt, and the Judgement of Paris, while the lower frieze shows youths hunting hares with dogs. These scenes are largely ignored in discussions of warfare (e.g. Lorimer 1947, 82-83; Matthew 2013, 26; Snodgrass 1964, 138; van Wees 2000, 134-146; Viggiano and van Wees 2013, 65-68). Hurwit proposed that the scheme could be taken as an iconographical unity if interpreted as the stages of maturation for a Corinthian male reflected through the everyday, the exotic, the heroic, and the divine, with the hunting scenes representing the preparation of youths for warfare (2002, 17-18). This account of the Chigi vase shows that infantry combat was the ultimate aim of the Corinthian élite male of the second half of the seventh century; however, its discovery in a grave in Etruscan Veii raises the question whether this relates to the Greek artist who created it, or the Etruscan context in which it was discovered.

The applicability of Hurwit's scheme to other seventh-century art is questionable. The greatest challenge is that the combat scene on the Chigi vase could have been inspired by a large scale painting, such as the depiction on the wall of the Temple of Apollo at Abai. The reconstruction of this wall painting does not go beyond the fragments which are preserved, and it is unclear whether or not the warriors in this scene were holding one or two spears (Niemeier *et al.* 2012); they do hold their spears in the "overhead" position, which may mean that they were to be thrown. It is unclear whether this was the only figurative scene on the walls of these temples; however, the fragments from Isthmia which may have included a horse's mane suggest similar imagery to the Chigi vase (Niemeier *et al.* 2012, 82).

7.3. LITERATURE

Literary evidence, like pictorial decoration, reappears in the eighth century with the invention of the Greek alphabet.⁶² However, unlike pictorial evidence it is not widespread in the eighth century; furthermore it is not until seventh-century lyric poetry that descriptions of warfare relating to specific regions become clear. The earliest evidence is Homeric, although precisely what is meant by “earliest” here is debateable. The epics, in some form or another, go back well into the Bronze Age, but they were updated and developed as they were retold, in order to make sense to the contemporary audience. On comparison with the pictorial evidence it is likely that the description of warfare is most similar to the practice of the later seventh century during the formative, PanHellenic period of the poems’ development (Nagy 1997, 206; van Wees 1994b, 145-146).

A curious disjuncture between the archaeological and literary evidence are the two Homeric examples of cremation in armour, Eëtion and Elpenor (*Il.* 6.414-420; *Od.* 12.8-15). These two examples are curiously contradictory, with Eëtion’s noble death in battle against Achilles, while Elpenor ingloriously fell off the roof of Circe’s hut where he had fallen asleep when drunk (*Od.* 10.552-561). The chronological discrepancy warns against taking this as evidence that burials with weapons had no connection to use on the battlefield, especially as Elpenor is ultimately buried with his oar, not his spear. There are no eighth or seventh-century examples of cremation in metal armour in the archaeological record, only inhumations with armour (e.g. [ARG15](#)) and cremations with weapons and perhaps perishable armour (e.g. [EUB25](#)), suggesting that this is a distorted memory of past practices. Perhaps the most interesting element is that the cremations in armour are not those of the greatest warriors – Hector, Achilles, and Patroclus (*Il.* 23.108-261; *Il.* 24.782-804; *Od.* 24.63-84) – as

⁶² The adoption of the alphabet is summarized in Hall 2013, 56-59, with references.

their armour largely continues its use-life after the death of the warrior (*Il.* 17.188-197; *Od.* 11.543-547).

Aside from these broad points, it is possible to speak of Homeric society as it applies to the poems, but associating this society as a whole to a particular period is undesirable. As Nagy states, “we need not think of any single Age of Homer, but rather, several ages of Homer” (1997, 206). The approach must come from an understanding epic, which can be tentatively associated with particular archaeological and historical evidence where such an association makes sense. Therefore, in understanding the role of captured arms in the sanctuary dedications of the eighth century, it is important to account for Hector’s promise that he will dedicate some captured arms to Apollo (*Il.* 7.81-90), but also that he appropriates the armour taken from Patroclus as his own (*Il.* 17.188-197; see Ch.8.6.4).

The remaining evidence which dates within the chronological limits of this thesis has been related to a single event in the history of Euboea – the Lelantine War (see Ch.8.3.4). While Hesiod does not directly refer to the war he performed at the funerary games of “warlike” Amphidamas of Chalcis (*Op.* 654-5), who was said by later authors to have died in a sea battle during the war (Plut. *Mor.* 153e-f; *Schol.Hes.*; Fornara 1977, 10). This association has been used to date both Hesiod and the war in regularly circular arguments (Janko 1982, 95). Such arguments also usually ignore the fact that Proclus, the fifth-century CE scholiast on Hesiod, claimed that this passage was an interpolation; others reject Proclus’ claim outright (West 1978, 319). Nonetheless, the most reliable information we can glean is that a central Euboean, Amphidamas, was considered to be “warlike”.

The reputation of Euboeans in warfare is also the concern of Archilochus. West Fr. 3 is a short section of a poem cited by Plutarch which describes the way in which the “spear-famed” lords of Euboea fought in Archilochus’ time (Plut. *Thes.* 5.3). It has largely been

assumed that Archilochus describes the Lelantine War (Forrest 1957, 163; Parker 1997, 80), but there is nothing in this poem or Plutarch's reference to it which suggests that the Euboeans are fighting one another or connects it to other evidence for the war (Lambert 1982, 219 n.28). What he describes is simply the way in which Euboeans fought: a preference for hand-to-hand combat, but with a few slings and bows (Donlan 1970, 134).

The details of Archilochus' life have been largely inferred from his poetry, both in antiquity and modern scholarship (Carey 2009b, 152-3; *SEG* 15.517), which should give some cause for concern; however, a date roughly in the middle of the seventh century is widely accepted on the basis of an eclipse in Fr. 122.1-4 which is believed to date to 648. Therefore, Archilochus attests to a period at some point in the middle of the seventh century when the Euboeans preferred close-combat to long-range fighting. The absence of arrowheads from the Eretria burials with weapons, despite their presence in the wealthy EUB08, appears to support that this was an earlier phenomenon which distinguished seventh-century Euboeans from those of the ninth century. The particular association of this trait with Euboeans suggests that it was not common to favour close-combat in the early seventh century.

Historical sources also refer back to wars which have been dated to this period. A reference in Thucydides to a major, PanHellenic war between Chalcis and Eretria is the basis of our understanding of the Lelantine War (Thuc. 1.15.3); although no other source suggests that the scale of this war was so large (Lambert 1982). On the basis of this line of Thucydides a passage of Herodotus is assumed to refer to this war (Hdt. 5.99), and Aristotle's reference to the cavalries of Eretria and Chalcis has been assumed to be associated with the war (Arist. *Pol.* 4.3.2), although neither makes direct reference to the Lelantine plain.

Much later sources refer back to wars which have been dated to this period. Strabo and Pausanias both make reference to the destruction of Asine (Paus. 2.36.4-5; 3.7.4; 4.8.3; Strabo 8.6.11; Ch.8.4.4). Strabo also refers to an inscription at the sanctuary of Artemis at Amarynthos in central Euboea which recorded the decision to ban the use of missile weapons in the Lelantine War (Strabo 10.1.12); it is possible that this inscription was a later creation (Forrest 1957, 164). These references to wars have a tendency to be vague and insubstantial, which can be accounted for by the vast gulf of time between the seventh century and the turn of the Common Era when Strabo was writing or the second century CE for Pausanias (Hall 2013, 4). Their applicability is therefore tenuous, and they are far less reliable sources for warfare in the EIA than the archaeological evidence.

Chapter 8

Discussions

8.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by discussing the peculiarities of the four regions which have been the focus of the thesis. The funerary, sanctuary, settlement, and representational evidence from each of these regions is brought together to show the regional trends in warfare. The role of warfare in the wider EIA Aegean world will then be considered.

8.2. ATHENS AND ATTICA

The evidence from Athens is overwhelmingly from grave contexts. This includes burials with weapons as well as the robust iconographic tradition which begins in the eighth century and is best known from cemeteries. Very little evidence comes from Attic sanctuaries, and no literary sources refer to Attic wars in the EIA. However, the evidence there lasts from the beginning of the EIA to the seventh century, presenting an almost continuous picture of the period.

8.2.1 The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition

There is some debate over how the pattern of burials in Athens changes between the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. There are hints of continuity in the Agora (Papadopoulos, J. 2003, 21, 315), the Kerameikos (Mountjoy and Hankey 1988), and the Dipylon Cemetery (Galanakis 2011, 184). But while many of these areas received earlier Bronze Age burials there is little evidence from LH IIIC before the final phase. In the Agora, where the majority of LBA burials are Mycenaean (LH IIB:1-LH IIIC), postpalatial activity is limited to re-use of earlier tombs and dates only to the very early twelfth century (*Agora*

XIII, 92-5, 110). The SMyc tombs are scattered and include the first tombs on Kolonos Agoraios, a child's burial.⁶³

The picture in the Kerameikos is less clear. Mountjoy and Hankey argued that some of the graves which are dated to SMyc should in fact be considered LH IIIC Late (Mountjoy and Hankey 1988). It is debatable how much of a difference this makes. The absence of stratified settlement contexts dated to SMyc led Rutter, followed by others, to abandon the term "Submycenaean" which, they believe, is ultimately contemporary with LH IIIC Late (Rutter 1978; J. Papadopoulos *et al.* 2011). But this chronological wrangling misses the most important point. The foundation of a new cemetery and the introduction of a new burial rite mark a significant change; the Kerameikos represents the beginning of a new period of Athenian history, whether this is in the closing decades of the Bronze Age or the very start of the Iron Age is largely irrelevant (Lemos 2006a, 512 n.33).

The only Athenian postpalatial burial with weapons is LBA01, despite earlier Bronze Age examples in the Agora. While there are three examples from Perati, the evidence is not substantial enough to propose that this was a genuine tradition in postpalatial Attica (see Ch.3.2.1). However, in the EIA burials with weapons are present in Athens from near the beginning. Ruppenstein dated ATT02 and ATT27 to phase IV of SMyc, and thus slightly after the foundation of the Kerameikos cemetery (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 202-203). Attempts to suggest that the practice of burial with weapons continues from the LBA into the EIA fail to account for the limited evidence in the last period of the LBA and the earliest stages of the EIA. (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 202-203 n.850; Alexandri 1967, 92-3; D'Onofrio 2011, 647; see Ch.4.2.3.4). The best evidence indicates that the beginning of the EIA saw changes in Athenian burial customs of which the appearance of burials with weapons was one of the most significant.

⁶³ J. Papadopoulos and Smithson: tomb D 7:1 is "Final Mycenaean/Submycenaean" (2002, 156).

8.2.2 A period of stability: the tenth and ninth centuries

By the end of the tenth century Athenian burial practices have become remarkably stable. The trench-and-hold cremation predominates, with some variation in practices which allow for distinctions in the social identity of the deceased. These are most clearly associated with gender and status, but this is far from the whole picture; there are clearly age distinctions in this period, indicated by the separation of adult and child burials.

It is widely assumed that male burials are so strongly connected with weapons that any burial with weapons can be assumed to be male, regardless of other considerations (Strömberg 1993, 47). There is no skeletal evidence from Athens to undermine this association. But far from all male burials receive weapons: just 5% of the whole population, or approximately one in five males, were buried with weapons (Strömberg 1993, 83; van Wees 1998a, 338). While there is a level of speculation to all of these figures it is clear that fewer than half of the men buried in Athens in the EIA received weapons as grave goods. However, the picture is not complete without consideration of that fact that burials with weapons are not distributed evenly throughout the period. Thirteen of the eighteen skeletons identified as adult males through osteological analysis in SMyc do not have weapons;⁶⁴ four out of thirteen do not have weapons in PG; nineteen out of twenty-nine do not have weapons in the Geometric Period. These figures are affected by two factors: the increased possibility of identifying sex through osteological analysis in inhumations and the decreased likelihood of burial with weapons in the periods when inhumations are common. At the peak of burial with weapons in EG all the burials identified osteologically as male had weapons; twelve of the nineteen males without weapons are LG, when burial with weapons waned.

⁶⁴ Three further SMyc male burials without weapons have been identified in the Kerameikos since Strömberg's analysis, all of which are inhumations: T.114, T.142/144, 148 (*Kerameikos* XVIII, 275-278).

Besides weapons, Strömberg did not discern any categories of object which served as sex-indicators for men. Men had a high frequency of burial in neck-handled amphorai and women in shoulder-handled amphorai, but this did not prove to be the rule which it had previously been assumed (Strömberg 1993, 79-80; *contra* Desborough 1952, 5-6). In the Geometric Period, where grave markers become more common, kraters are most commonly used to mark male graves, but at least one female grave is marked by a krater (Strömberg 1993, 81). Strömberg concludes that grave goods do not intentionally indicate sex, but that in circumstances in which grave goods are more numerous it is easier to distinguish between male and female graves. Gender distinctions are not emphasized because this is not necessary; they appear when a greater number of grave goods are deposited, but they do not need to be reaffirmed as they are stable. This increased number of grave goods is taken to indicate high social status; therefore men buried with weapons were socially important (Strömberg 1993, 108).

The difficulty in Athenian burials is that too much emphasis has been placed on weapons as indicators of masculinity. Whitley argues that gender is the defining feature of EIA burial practices, the key distinction being between cremated adult males and inhumed children (1996; 2002). Female burials fall somewhere between these two. The defining feature of male burials is their weapons, but as discussed above only a small proportion of male burials actually received weapons. Therefore, most males were not particularly distinct from females, who were also cremated. The low status of Athenian women in the Archaic period, which has been used as an indication that the rich female graves cannot be interpreted as a matriarchy (Whitley 2001, 97), should not be projected back this far. The position of women in Athenian society was redefined in the eighth century (Langdon 2008); prior to this the similar treatment in burial suggests similar status, and the occasional male burial with weapons should not lead us to deny this.

Furthermore, age does not appear to have been a defining factor in whether or not a man received weapons. PG burials with weapons which can be aged tend to be young – ATT03 and ATT04 were fifteen-to-twenty-years-old, while ATT38 was eleven-to-sixteen-years-old. The oldest identified burial with weapons is ATT22, around thirty-five-years-old. If the individual in ATT38 is the youngest, then adolescence marked the beginning of warrior-potential.⁶⁵ This would be around the age where a man could be expected to fight. Rather than signifying masculinity, weapons indicate a particular subset of elite masculinity which could be defined as “warrior” status. How this was achieved we do not know, but the use of weapons as its symbol suggests violent action, not an intrinsic connection of weapons and masculinity.

If only a limited proportion of men were buried with weapons, why were so many men not buried with theirs? Strömberg suggests that “there might have been such a need for weapons that people could not afford to bury them” (1993, 83). In this case we might expect that nobody would have been buried with weapons. Rather only certain men *achieved* burial with weapons. A possible explanation is that these were the highest ranking male elites. Morris argued that EIA Athenian society was divided into two main groups, *agathoi*, defined as “aristocrats and wealthy but non-governing peasants” and *kakoi*, “the poor”, who were excluded from formal burial from the period *ca.* 1050-750 (1987, 94-6). Morris’ distinction amongst the *agathoi* between aristocrats and wealthy peasants could be identified in male burials as those with weapons and those without.

The organization of the settlement may shed further light on the social system in Athens. If Athens was a collection of small units of houses associated with different burial clusters, and if these units each had a leader, it is possible that these “local leaders” may have

⁶⁵ Morris refers to ATT05 as the burial of a nine-year old boy, but it is unclear where this information was obtained and I can find no other reference to support it (1987, 60).

been represented in burial through their association with weapons (D’Onofrio 2011, 646). It is tempting to view those men buried with weapons as the aristocratic *agathoi*, each dominating a specific settlement with its own cemetery. The difficulty arises not from burials with weapons but the cemeteries from which they are completely absent (Plate 1a, 2b). As none of these burial grounds have been completely excavated it may be possible that further excavation would reveal the presence of men buried with weapons. Working with the evidence as it stands, however, it is possible that the burial grounds and cemeteries which contain men buried with weapons are those of the highest social groups in the whole of the region of Athens, who perhaps had some degree of dominance over the entire area. In PG this would be the Kerameikos cemeteries, Vasilissis Sophias/Herodes Atticus, and the Kriezi Street cemeteries, while in EG-MG the Areopagus plots become more important, as perhaps do the Erechtheion Street burials (Lemos 2002, 157). If weapons are a symbol of status, perhaps the *agathoi* or élites of other settlements were kept in line through violence, or the threat of violence. The early depictions of duels on MG pottery may indicate a social practice which had been in place for centuries ([Ath03](#)), although the point cannot be pressed too far.

Further nuances can be added to this picture. The Athenian evidence just from within the city covers an area of c. 474 ha in G and the Kerameikos is over 2000 m from Erechtheion Street and Vasilissis Sophias/Herodes Atticus, suggesting that these are independent units with common cultural links (Lemos 2002, 219 n.142; D’Onofrio 2011, 657). While some sites were clearly larger than others this does not necessarily mean that there was a hierarchy indicated by the size of the burying ground associated with the settlement, especially as this would be difficult to detect given the nature of the excavations through which the Athenian evidence is known (Lemos 2002, 219 n.140, n.141).

Two further questions arise from this analysis: is the status in Athenian burials achieved or ascribed, and if the former, how? The adolescent in [ATT38](#) is taken as an

indication that warrior status was ascribed in Athens (D’Onofrio 2011, 657), but children are generally separated from adults in the burial customs of this period and the difference in their treatment has been highlighted by Whitley (1996, 228). If burial with weapons is “merely” rank connected, as D’Onofrio suggests, male children would be ascribed rank at adolescence; presumably this means that he will be buried with weapons, regardless of the age at which he dies. However, the approach taken here is to emphasize the connections between weapons and their function, which accords better with Morris’ suggestion of a structure similar to that in Homer: “to be an *agathos* you must be born into the class, but it is as a grown man, through your heroic deeds, that you establish your status” (Morris 1987, 182). Therefore, the “youth” in ATT04 and the eleven-to-sixteen-year-old in ATT38 must have been capable of achieving weapon-burial status by this age. In this case it is easier to understand why only about a fifth of the male population are buried with weapons – these are the figures who have established this status, even if some do this at an age which seems young to modern scholars.

A challenge to the hypothesis of achieved status may be apparent in the recent reanalysis of the skeletal evidence from the burial of the “Rich Athenian Lady”, Agora grave H 16:6, dated *ca.* 850. Previously, the prestigious wealth exhibited suggested that she was of the highest social class; the presence of a set of five model “granaries” has been interpreted as representing the *pentakosiomedimnoi*, the highest of Solon’s property classes (Coldstream 2003, 55). Osteological analysis showed that the thirty-to-thirty-five-year-old woman was buried with a foetus or neonate at about eight months. Liston and Papadopoulos propose that this burial must be considered as a double burial, requiring more lavish expenditure as the death of the offspring has disrupted the continuity of the society (2004, 27-9); in this case the status of the foetus must have been ascribed at birth. However, the grave goods may relate to pollution and purity, spiritual and religious practices connected to death while pregnant or in childbirth. Factors besides social status explain the range and quantity of grave goods in this

burial. The deceased have achieved the status of the “special dead” through the circumstances of their death (Liston and Papadopoulos 2004, 30).

Burials with weapons should also be considered part of the category of the special dead. How this status was achieved is a much more complicated question. On analogy with the Rich Athenian Lady we might propose that it is the circumstances of the death which result in the different kinds of burial. Crielaard suggested that death on the battlefield permitted urn cremation at Lefkandi (1996, 42). More broadly, I propose that it is action and not status which resulted in a man being buried with his weapons; whether this was death or simply participation in combat for those of a certain class we cannot be more specific. But the association of masculinity with weapons is not intrinsic, it is constructed through actions.

8.2.3 The eighth century

The relative stability of Athenian burial practices in the tenth and ninth centuries comes to an end in the eighth century. It is not always viable to treat the eighth century separately from the earlier Iron Age, but it is Athens which has set this paradigm through the substantial changes which it undergoes in this century. In MG inhumation burials reappear and have become more popular than cremation by the middle of the eighth century. There is a massive increase in visible burials. One of the contributing factors to this rise is the visibility of child burials, which suggests significant changes in the recognition of children as members of the community. The inclusion of a wider section of the population in formal burial has been considered part of a PanHellenic process connected to the rise of the *polis* (Morris 1987, 173-195). These changes are part of an Aegean-wide process, but unlike other sites, such as Argos, in Athens burials with weapons begin to decline, and appear to have disappeared well before 700, apparently as early as LG I (Braüning 1995, 103; Brouwers 2010, 54; Morris

1987, 183-195; van Wees 1998a, 336).⁶⁶ On the other hand, it is in this period that pictorial pottery begins its resurgence, especially in Attica. Graves are more commonly marked by monumental vases, often with figured decoration. In these representations men are extensively depicted as warriors, wearing helmets and swords, sometimes carrying a shield and spears. It is not the importance of warriors which declines, but the contexts in which they are discovered.

Three of the four Athenian LG burials with weapons come from the Piraeus Street or “Dipylon” Cemetery (ATT32-34). The Dipylon Cemetery flourished in the eighth century with both rich graves and monumental grave markers. Of the burials with weapons in this cemetery ATT32 and ATT34 are not dated more closely than “Geometric”, but ATT33 is a “significant group” for LG Ib pottery (Coldstream 2008, 47). The rite of inhumation in at least ATT32 and ATT33 strongly suggests a date in the Late Geometric Period. Two or three more swords, as well as at least two spears accompanying them, are reported to have come from the Dipylon Cemetery, but lack their original context. If these swords date to LG then there would be considerable more burials with weapons in eighth-century Athens, although it is also possible that these weapons date to LH IIIC Late/SMyc. The evidence more strongly points to the eighth century, as all of the known Dipylon Cemetery burials with weapons are Geometric.

Other burials with weapons appear in eighth-century Attica, in Athens (ATT19, ATT39, and ATT41) and further afield (ATT44, possibly ATT42 and ATT43). But the concentration certainly appears to be in the Dipylon Cemetery. In older Athenian cemeteries burials with weapons decline in MG I and have all but disappeared by MG II. This may reflect the consolidation of power into different cemeteries; for example, cremation burials continue in the Kriezī Cemetery, although they are in bronze cauldrons. Meanwhile, the

⁶⁶ Brouwers incorrectly states that the burials of the Piraeus Street cemetery contained no weapons.

legitimate identification as a warrior, and perhaps also the legitimate use of force, was restricted to those buried in the Dipylon Cemetery. The Dipylon Cemetery is also where much of the early figurative pottery was found, including most of the Athenian depictions of combat in LG Ia (Ahlberg 1971a, 66); in addition to this some of the individuals inhumed in this cemetery received gold bands, some of which are decorated with armed men.

The presence of figural decoration of warriors indicates a changing conception of who warriors were and what it meant to be a man. Bräuning suggested that the figural vases assumed the role of the weapon in the grave to denote warrior status in Athens, which explains why these grave markers are common in Athens but absent from much of the rest of the Aegean world in the eighth century (1995, 103). But after the thirteen monumental kraters of the Dipylon series (e.g. [Ath04](#), [Ath05](#)) in the single decade of LG Ia (Coldstream 2008, 349), the use of figurative pottery as a grave marker or in other social rituals became more common within a generation (Langdon 2008, 42). Furthermore, the monumental amphorai which marked female graves indicate a widening of gender participation. The pattern of burial customs in EIA Attica shows that there must have been some relaxation of the controls over formal burial in the eighth century which led to an increase in overall burial numbers as well as the number of child burials (Morris 1987). While certain burial practices continue to be restricted, such as cremation and probably burial with weapons, many more people have figurative grave markers, including depictions of armed men, than ever before.

Figure-decorated grave markers also indicate that the area of display has moved from the inside of the grave to the outside, i.e. from the grave goods to the marker. The LG IIB pitchers by Rattle Group Painter B including [Ath11](#) show what appears to be a grave with a pair of Dipylon shields placed upon it (Coldstream 2010, 22).⁶⁷ It is unclear from where these

⁶⁷ A similarly decorated pitcher comes from the Kynosarges Cemetery, and it is tempting to connect shields placed on the grave to [Pha10](#), which was found in this cemetery.

shields come; the possible pair on Ath02 have been interpreted as booty from the battlefield, and it is possible that this pair represents booty gathered by the deceased. There are only a couple of known dedications in Attic sanctuaries to suggest that dedications are becoming more public (see Ch.5.5). As for the PanHellenic sanctuaries, Athens clearly had connections to Olympia in the eighth century, but it is not clear that they began to dedicate weapons there any earlier than at local sanctuaries. If we accept that Athens stopped burying weapons earlier than other regions we are entitled to ask where their weapons went instead. The only indication which we have is perhaps the graveside.

If a broader scope is taken on the pictorial decoration of pottery in Athens in the eighth century a much more nuanced conception of the depiction of warriors can be taken which places them in their context as strongly gendered male individuals. Unlike burials with weapons, which are always restricted even amongst the élite, in LG pictorial decoration male figures are almost always depicted with weaponry and they begin to be distinguished from female figures in their poses and actions as the style develops (Langdon 2008, 244-245; van Wees 1998b). Langdon argues that the depiction of men with swords at all events, such as funerals, dinners, and dances, which occurs in both pictorial pottery and the Homeric epics, shows that the sword has a symbolic function which is at least as important as the practical one. While this is likely, the symbolic function of weapons relies upon the practical, and this must be established and reinforced.

The LG battle scenes also reveal some evidence for the practice of warfare in the eighth century. Approaches to the scenes of fighting which attempt to identify in them historical battles are ultimately unsuccessful (e.g. Ahlberg 1971a, 66-70), but the depictions do reflect contemporary trends in warfare. Ath07, the Lambros oinochoe, depicts post-battle disarmament of a defeated enemy (Ahlberg 1971a, 21-25). The taking of an enemy's weapons indicates a victorious warrior, and adds value to these arms which cannot come

from those which the warrior carried himself. As has been mentioned, battles on sea indicate the dangers of naval travel; the Athenians were probably both perpetrators and victims of piracy, maintaining their own and others' warrior status (Ch.7.2.2). That most of these scenes occurred on the monumental, long-lasting grave markers suggests that they would be for public viewing; this would establish the deceased as a war hero, immortalized in the generic scene of battle.

Depictions of battle were short-lived, disappearing in the latter half of the eighth century. The concept of the warrior could be sustained through other means, and there was no need to refer back to combat to reinforce its meaning. Scenes of generic warriors processing – on foot (Ath12, neck), in chariots (Ath13, belly), or mixed (Ath06, main frieze) – dominate the second half of the eighth century and into the early seventh on grave markers and other funerary vessels (Ahlberg 1971b, 165-166, 202-205; Rombos 1988, 131-151). This indicates that, in contrast to the occasional individuals granted warrior status in the burials of EIA Greece, in the late eighth century warriors were recognizable as a separate, homogenous class receiving special burial but not weapons in their graves. This status does not appear to have any connection to actual military prowess, rather it harked back to that of the earlier generation, which had won its prestige on the battlefield.

The seventh century witnesses another change in the archaeological record of Athens. Burials decrease to the level at which they had been in the ninth century, children disappear from cemeteries again, and amongst what few grave goods there are there is little which is impressive. It has been proposed that this is the result of instability resulting from the historical developments of the period, a consequence of which were wars, but this cannot be verified in the archaeological record (Hall 2013, 193). At least for the first few decades of EPA, the identification of men as warriors continues.

8.2.4 *Attica: Conclusions*

At the dawn of the Iron Age in Athens there are changes in settlement and burial which suggest a new beginning: new society, new rules, and new meanings to symbols. While there are burials with weapons in the Bronze Age and from the Submycenaean period the sequence which begins in the eleventh century represents something different to those which preceded it. Then, as Athenian society changes again in the mid-eighth century, so do burials with weapons, leading ultimately to the decline and abandonment of the practice.

Langdon suggests that in both the Mycenaean and Geometric Periods representations of masculinity were narrow, focusing exclusively on the warrior to the exclusion of other social roles (2008, 243). The evidence from burials with weapons from Attica in the intervening period makes it clear that there was some continuity in this expression throughout the EIA, but that there were changes in the way in which warrior identity was recognized. Between the eleventh and ninth centuries, the exclusive nature of burials with weapons even amongst the élite suggests that this was a status which was achieved by individuals who were then permitted burial with their weapons. This changed in the first half of the eighth century, when burials with weapons became more exclusive and associated with depictions of combat; in the second half of that century, burials with weapons may have disappeared, but depictions of armed men at funerals and in processions, as well as in other situation, suggest that there was no longer any need to achieve this status through combat – it had become an élite prerogative to be a warrior. In this case it may be the opposite of van Wees' proposal that the end of burials with weapons marked the end of bearing iron; rather, the practice of carrying weapons in public might postdate burials with weapons, when the right to association with weapons had to be achieved.

In the seventh century there is a lacuna in the evidence from Athens, for which many explanations have been proposed but none can be proven. The evidence which persists is pictorial decoration on pottery, which resumes an interest in combat as opposed to warriors in procession. These depictions include the first to show the inside of the double-grip shield, used in single-combats between men armed with swords. The implications of the introduction of this shield are discussed below, Ch. 8.6.5.

8.3. CENTRAL EUBOEA

First Lefkandi and then Eretria provide the bulk of the evidence from Euboea, which almost exclusively consists of burials with weapons. Alongside this there is a limited figurative tradition of depicting armed men both from Euboea and more widespread settlements such as Zagora and Pithekoussai. In the late ninth and early eighth centuries there is a hiatus between the final burials at Lefkandi and those at Eretria; but the late eighth century is one of the suggested dates for one of the first major conflicts of Greek history, the shadowy event known as the Lelantine War.

8.3.1 The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition

Occupation continues on Xeropolis from the twelfth to eleventh centuries. The limited twelfth-century evidence makes it difficult to judge if there is continuity in the use of cemeteries; a couple of LH IIIC Late burials are known in the field of Khaliotis, but in SMyc the Skoubris cemetery is founded. Skoubris is at present the only cemetery known at Lefkandi between SMyc and MPG and it has not been fully excavated. It is possible that there is considerably more eleventh-century evidence awaiting excavation at Lefkandi.

EUB01 is the only known burial with weapons before MPG; it is also the only burial with weapons in the Skoubris cemetery. It is an exception burial for EPG Lefkandi: the

earliest known EIA shaft grave; it is large and wealthy, surpassed in grave goods by only the child burials tombs 45 and 59 (Lemos 2002, 164); it contains the earliest known import from EIA Lefkandi, a North Syrian dipper-juglet; the dagger, Swo31, has also been interpreted as an import (*Lefkandi* I, 253, 347-348; Sherratt 1994, 75 n.22). EUB01 is a grave loaded with the emerging symbolism of power in EIA Lefkandi: a weapon and a Near Eastern import. From the limited EPG evidence it may suggest that certain members of the élite were beginning to distinguish themselves from the majority though burial.

As will also be seen at Argos, a single burial with weapons is not a tradition. EUB01 is barely comparable to the burials in the Toumba cemetery, although they show similar concerns in their deposits of weapons and eastern imports. This does not mean that Swo31 lacks symbolic value – the burials from Athens (ATT03-04), Tiryns (ARG01), and Knossos (KNS20) where daggers were discovered with other weapons hint that this dagger is also important. The absence of other weapons in this grave, as well as the absence of other burials with weapons, suggests that the function of the dagger was less important than its provenance and material. It might have had a complex biography, travelling from Cyprus or further afield before it arrived in Lefkandi and as a weapon it may have been involved in any number of conflicts. But it is the only evidence for any conflict in central Euboea before MPG, and it is limited.

8.3.2 Lefkandi

There are major changes in the early tenth century at Lefkandi. While the Skoubris cemetery continues to receive burials, the Toumba and Palia Perivolia cemeteries surpass it in terms of wealth, imports, and burials with weapons. Until the second half of the ninth century, when all of these cemeteries are abandoned, the Toumba cemetery has a continuous tradition of

burial with weapons, but this begins with the most spectacular of all, the so-called hero discovered beneath the monumental apsidal building.

8.3.2.1 The hero of Lefkandi

The excavators of the Toumba building called the male burial in EUB02 a “hero” in the original report (Popham *et al.* 1982a). It seems as if the identification of the building as an “heroön” was the defining factor in identifying the man as a hero rather than the weapons with which he was furnished. The focus of the symbolic expression of status in this grave is curiously very similar to that in LBA burials with weapons (Treherne 1995, 108): warfare (the sword and spear); alcohol (the amphoroid krater in which the ashes were placed); bodily ornamentation (the razor and the cloth in which the ashes were wrapped); if we include the horses in the adjacent shaft, also riding. It is fairly safe to suggest that this man is unambiguously presented as a warrior. It may go too far to suggest that he may have received the elaborate, unparalleled scale of burial for broadly defined “military” exploits, but his personal status is tied up only with the symbolism of the warrior. Compared to the considerably smaller scale EUB01, EUB02 is effectively the beginning of the tradition of burials with weapons at Lefkandi and he is the individual through which symbolism becomes attached to the rites of his burial.⁶⁸ If any burial at Lefkandi can be described as a “warrior”, it is EUB02.

EUB02 is a double burial of a man and a woman, with an additional shaft containing four horses, still holding their bits in their mouths. The large apsidal building was constructed above these burials and then dismantled and buried, probably as part of their funeral rites and certainly as a means of commemoration (Lemos 2002, 162-168). As discussed in Ch.4.3.1.1 these burials were contemporaneous and the most popular explanation is the ritual killing of

⁶⁸ This proposal is complicated by the lack of an LH IIIC cemetery at Lefkandi. On the other hand, the scale of EUB02 makes it unavoidable that this burial was a hugely significant event in the development of Lefkandi.

the woman as a part of the funerary rites of the man, in which case it is plausible that she was a war captive. In the shaft to the north of the human burials four horses were excavated, all around six years old and have a wither's height of c. 1.2m (*Lefkandi* II.2, ix). In Mycenaean funerary ritual horses are usually associated with male burials (Lemos 2002, 166); however, in Geometric vase painting images of horses are first associated with the burials of women (Antonaccio 2002, 33, n.90). All subsequent burials in the Toumba cemetery are orientated towards this building, and possibly those in Palia Perivolia as well (Lemos and Mitchell 2011, 638). If the man is a warrior, then some or all of these features may also have an impact on our understanding of warriors and warfare in MPG Lefkandi.

The emphasis on the warrior status of EUB02 suggests that these horses represent a chariot which this man rode into battle. In later literature Euboean aristocracies were known for their cavalry (Arist., *Pol.* 4.3.2). However, the lateness of this evidence and the absence of further horse burials warn against this association. The only other horse burial at Lefkandi is the pair buried in Toumba Tomb 68. These horses also retain their iron bits. However, there is no evidence to date this burial and no human remains were associated with the horses. The further evidence for cavalry in the EIA Aegean is discussed below (Ch.8.6.2).

The building itself is a monumental apsidal structure with ill-defined floor surfaces suggesting that it was not in use for very long (*Lefkandi* II.2, 12). At some point the building was dismantled and covered with a tumulus, probably towards the end of MPG, ca. 950 (*Lefkandi* II.1, 92). There are many hypotheses regarding the function of this building.⁶⁹ The excavators, besides Calligas, insist that the burials predate the building, hence the identification as a *heroön*. Burning on the bedrock, associated with thirteen pits, was identified as the funeral pyre of the man; some of the ashes were stored in a box in the

⁶⁹ Several parallels are suggested for the plan and function of the building by Mazarakis Ainian (1997, 57-8) and Morris (2000, 222-28).

southeast corner of the central room near the shafts (*Lefkandi* II.2, 15). In addition to this the spacing of the posts either side of the burials appears to have been widened in order to accommodate the shafts (*Lefkandi* II.2, 49).⁷⁰ Morris disagreed, arguing that the assemblage and construction of the building was domestic and the destruction of the floor surfaces prevented certainty about the chronological relationship between the building and the burials (1994). Several hypotheses agree with Morris: that it was an *anaktoron* or ruler's dwelling (Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 54-7), sometimes with a secondary *heroön* function after the funeral (Crielaard and Driessen 1994, 267); or an *oikos* dwelling (Calligas 1988, 232). In these interpretations the man and woman are buried in the building having lived there or are associated with the incomplete construction. Alternatively, the building may have been planned as a mausoleum, accounting for the short-lived nature of the structure, its dismantlement, and the spacing of the posts (Lemos 2002, 145). The massive expenditure relates to the importance of the figures buried within it, and the changing nature of PG society. The area in which this building resides becomes funerary, suggesting a degree of planning on the part of the instigator. Morris dismissed the funerary topography as in the immediate vicinity as the Toumba and Palia Perivolia cemeteries postdate the building and Skoubris is *ca.* 150 m away. But the cemetery is established immediately; it is hard to account for the unusual decision to establish a new settlement area at Toumba with an extraordinary monumental building and to abandon it at the death of these two individuals. It seems most likely that there were never any living occupants, and that this building was built for funerary purposes. In either case it reflects the great wealth and importance of those buried within it; furthermore the institution of the cemetery immediately to the east of the building suggests a continued association of the élites of Lefkandi to the burials beneath the mound.

⁷⁰ Crielaard and Driessen suggested that this choice of location was based on the availability of space for the burials (1994, 259). This is counter-intuitive: it would have been possible to construct the shafts further apart, and more central to the building, to account for the posts; space in the central room is not lacking.

Interpreting the building as a mausoleum undermines the military emphasis in EUB02. If the military aspect were to be pressed a possible parallel is the varied use of booty collected after battles in later periods of antiquity, which could be either *skyla* – captured arms and armour – or wealth which could be transformed into buildings such as temples. It could be that this building was a conversion of the incredible wealth this warrior gathered in his life. It seems more likely that only certain elements of the burials directly relate to the man's warrior status: his weapons, and perhaps his companion. It is possible that all of the other burials in the building were a sacrifice to the man. Horses are indicative of wealth and the sacrifice of four of them indicates great expenditure. The dismantling of the building and the construction of the mound over it represents the continuation of the memorial of the burials. Coulton estimated that the construction of the mound would have taken 2000 man/days, or 462 man/days + 660 ox/days, a significant investment of time and energy on a large scale (*Lefkandi* II.2, 56). There must have been some organization in place for this to happen, and it is possible that the person who did so used the event as a means of establishing themselves as a successor to the Toumba couple (Antonaccio 1995b, 19).

The Toumba cemetery contains abundant evidence for the overseas contacts of the people of Lefkandi in the tenth and ninth centuries. As Antonaccio has suggested, the quantity means that these exotic goods cannot be solely the result of gift exchange; she suggests incidental trade which occurred alongside elite goods (2002, 15-16). I propose that the combination of exotica with high-profile burials with weapons should suggest that violence, perhaps piracy or raiding, played a part in the acquisition of some of these goods. This should not exclude gift exchange or trade; any overseas activity would have presented the opportunity for the acquisition of wealth, peacefully or otherwise. The alternative proposal is that which was made for EUB01: that the dagger functioned as exotica and carried more meaning from the distance that it had travelled than for its function as a weapon.

The contrasts between EUB01 and EUB02 indicate that this should not be the case. In EUB01 the dagger is one of a variety of metal objects which accompanies this burial, and the other exotic item is a juglet; in EUB02 every object connects to warrior status. The tumulus over the building and the subsequent cemetery which focuses on it suggests that EUB02 is the start of a new tradition of burials with weapons.

It is perhaps possible to describe the man as a “hero” in the sense that his achievements were not there to be surpassed, but to be used as a reference point for his successors. These achievements do not necessarily have to be genuine, but imagined or embellished exploits the glory of which would be reflected upon those buried in the cemetery at the foot of his monument. However, the burial itself and the woman and horses associated with it strongly suggest that this man was the first in a line of warriors.

8.3.2.2 The Toumba cemetery

The funeral of EUB02 was a major event for the élite of Lefkandi, with social and political consequences (Lemos 2006a, 521-523). The tumulus served as the focal point for the succeeding cemetery, with the burials of that cemetery orientated towards the building, perhaps organized into different areas depending on their association with the original double burial (*Lefkandi* II.2, 9, 98-99; Lemos and Mitchell 2011). It has been suggested that these burials continue the lineage of those within the building (Lemos 2002, 168). Certainly none date before MPG, and even these are few compared to later periods. The lack of further offerings at the tumulus suggests that veneration of an ancestor was not of much interest, even if those buried in the Toumba cemetery continued to stress their association with the building (Lemos 2006a, 523).

From LPG there is a steady stream of burials with weapons in the Toumba cemetery. They vary considerably between primary cremations, secondary cremations, and inhumations

(see Ch.4.3.1.1). Some, although not all, are associated with female burials; however, unlike the burials in the building, none of these cases are usually interpreted as ritual killings (Antonaccio 1995b, 15). From MPG there is a greater emphasis on gender differentiation in burials at Lefkandi than there had been previously. The support of anthropological analysis lends credence to the association of weapons to men; women, meanwhile, were buried with gold objects such as spirals and finger-rings, but most important are those buried with a gold pendant (Lemos 2007a; Lemos and Mitchell 2011, 636-637).

The burials with weapons in LPG are all distinguished from EUB02 in one way or another. EUB03 is a double burial reasonably securely identified as a male and a female, both of the deceased are cremated and their ashes placed into ceramic amphorai. EUB04-06 are probably all inhumations; while this is only conclusive for EUB04, the size, shape, and orientation of EUB05 and EUB06 show such a striking resemblance to EUB04 and other inhumations at Lefkandi that it is reasonable to assume that they were also inhumations.⁷¹ EUB09 and EUB10 are primary cremation pyres.

Weapons remain the defining attribute of the male burials in the Toumba cemetery throughout LPG. Besides their weapons, and excepting EUB05, there are very few grave goods other than pottery; in EUB03 and EUB07 the cremation urns are the only pottery. The social identity of these men is being defined mainly in terms of their weapons; in combination with the general absence of burials with weapons in the other cemeteries at Lefkandi in the later tenth century suggests that the élite males buried in the Toumba cemetery were warriors who had established their right to be buried in this cemetery through their identity as warriors.

⁷¹ It would also be reasonable to assume this of EUB15, despite the absence of bone, which possibly dates to LPG (Lemos 2007a, 276).

The picture changes drastically in the next century. From the beginning of SPG there are no more inhumations with weapons in the Toumba cemetery. The earliest SPG burial with weapons, EUB11, was no more elaborate than the LPG examples; but in SPG II burials with weapons were some of the most spectacular at Lefkandi. EUB12 included iron spits and a bronze grater alongside a broken krater, which may indicate a funerary meal taking place at the graveside. This burial also included a bronze dagger, perhaps an antique, and the only *phalaron* at Lefkandi. The distinctive material of the dagger suggests that the attributes of the warrior may have begun to hold intrinsic meaning at Lefkandi, rather than requiring the establishment of this status through deeds as in the preceding period. This change may be indicative of a development in Euboean overseas activities, which had moved on from violent beginnings into something more peaceful.

EUB08, the so-called “warrior-trader”, exemplifies this change in identification. The presence of a set of stone balance weights alongside a broken and melted bronze object plausibly identified as a weighing balance exemplify the identity as a “trader” (Popham and Lemos 1995, 153-4). Crielaard preferred to identify this figure as a “warrior/venturer”, the function of the balance and weights as grave goods transcending their function in trade – a privilege he did not grant to the weapons (1996, 65). It is likely that the overseas activities of all groups in the Mediterranean in the EIA came with significant dangers, some of which were human, which would justify the joint identification of all traders as warriors. But the substantial increase in wealth associated with weapons in burials suggests that there is a more significant cultural development taking place, and the weapons in this burial are more about masculine identity as a “warrior” than supporting this identity through action.

The weights in EUB08 were not part of a single set, but a kind of miscellany which could be associated with Cypriot and Near Eastern Bronze Age weight standards (Kroll 2008). Other finds in this grave also connect it to the eastern Mediterranean, which is far

from a unique element in the graves in Lefkandi but is surprisingly absent from the earlier burials with weapons, besides EUB01, EUB02, and EUB05. On the basis of these orientalia Papadopoulos suggested that the individual buried in EUB08 was a foreigner, perhaps Phoenician, or the offspring of a Phoenician parent (Papadopoulos, J. 1997, 192, 204). In addition to this EUB03 has been interpreted as an Athenian couple on the basis of the trench-and-hole style burial and the Athenian belly-handled amphora in which the male cremation was interred, and the hypothetical female in EUB05 has been identified as a Levantine bride (Coldstream 2007, 137-138).

There are difficulties with all of these identifications, perhaps chiefly that attempts to identify ethnicity through grave goods are always dubious (Hall 1997a, 128-131; Nijboer 2008, 368). At first glance EUB03 is the most convincing as Athens is both close to Lefkandi and the two sites show strong cultural connections. But on closer inspection there are flaws: the individual identified as male is in the belly-handled amphora while the female is in the neck-handled amphora – the reverse of the custom in Athens; Coldstream suggested that the bending of the sword was an Athenian custom, but this is no less common at Lefkandi and begins in LPG at both sites (2007, 138; see Ch.8.6.3). At best, it could be suggested that the cultural connections between Lefkandi and Athens at this time do not rule out “mixed” marriages.

On the interpretation as captives suggested above, the female burials in EUB02 and EUB05 would not be Lefkandiots, but as captives they would be unlikely to stimulate trading relations in the way in which Coldstream suggests. Even if the captive hypothesis is rejected there are flaws with the “Levantine bride” argument. These brides must have followed local fashions and customs (Lemos 2003, 192). Papadopoulos highlights the lack of methodological rigour in rejecting the possibility of a male foreigner but proposing foreign brides (Papadopoulos, J. 2011, 115-116). In Hall’s words: “The difficulty with archaeological

research is that it does not have direct access to the self-conscious identifications by which the ethnic group is constituted” (1997a, 131); we do not know how the identity of “Levantine” brides would have been constructed, nor how far they would have been able to express this in their burials. If the women with EUB02 and EUB05 were war captives, ritually killed or not, it is probable that they would be made to look as exotic as possible to emphasize their difference, but this is difficult to maintain for the many other women buried individually throughout the use of the cemetery.

The same argument must be applied to the proposal that EUB08 was a “foreigner”, which has been roundly rejected (Lemos 2003, 189; Papadopoulos, J. 2011, 114-117). Lemos argues that it would be unlikely that a non-Lefkandiot would be granted access to the most prestigious cemetery at Lefkandi, a proposal supported by ethnographic observations if the burial is to be identified as ethnically different through burial practices (Hall 1997a, 128). But the suggestion that there were non-Greeks at Lefkandi stands, and EUB08 supports the suggestion that these ties grew stronger in the ninth century than they had been in the tenth, perhaps making the Mediterranean safer for all involved.

Another element which is present throughout the use of the Toumba cemetery but which reaches its pinnacle in the ninth century is the use of antiques as symbols of power. This is only clear in two of the burials with weapons, EUB02 and EUB08 where the antiques also have powerful eastern connections, but the bronze dagger in EUB11 may fit into this category. The faience vessels in EUB05 may also be antiques (Antonaccio 2002, 26-27). If these objects derive their power through their age then their biographies must have been known, suggesting gift-giving as the probable medium of exchange. As well as marking the status of the individual, Antonaccio suggests that these objects were used to control and define the relationship between the people of Lefkandi, their past, and the Near East, regions which were coming under increasing scrutiny in the ninth century (Antonaccio 2002, 35).

These burials must therefore be some of the most important and privileged at Lefkandi. That they overlap with some burials with weapons shows that there was still some importance to identification as a warrior in this period, but their much wider distribution suggests that this identity was becoming less important than it had been in the first stage of the Toumba cemetery.

A final category of important objects in these burials are those identified as cheese graters in EUB08, EUB12, and EUB13. Cheese could have been a standard ration for warriors as a practical, portable, and nourishing foodstuff (West 1998, 191). But a passage of the *Iliad*, in which Hecamede prepares a drink called a *kykeon* for Nestor, Menelaos, and the injured Machaon by grating cheese into wine with barley, suggests that this practice may have had elite connotations (*Il.* 11.628-643); this *kykeon* combines restorative properties with psychoactive side effects (Ridgway 1997). West and Ridgway agree that the practice of grating cheese in Euboea is the source of the Homeric passages, rather than imitation of epic. A similar tradition is evident in seventh-century tombs in Etruria.⁷²

All of the burials with graters also contained kraters. The fifteen skyphoi, two plates, and oinochoe in EUB13 could also have played a part in the consumption of a *kykeon* as part of the funerary meal. Only one skyphos was reported from each of EUB08 and EUB12, although the substantial remains of pottery from outside graves could have been from funerary meals (*Lefkandi* I, 215). The graters are a further indication that burials with weapons are becoming more elaborate, and the warrior aspect is becoming less important than the elite lifestyle.

⁷² West suggests that the presence of these graters, and their association with kraters, indicates that in exchange for access to metalliferous regions of North Italy the Euboeans may have provided the Etruscans with the cultural practice accompanying this drink. By this time he believes that the Homeric/heroic/epic overtones had surpassed the practicalities of a battlefield analgesic. The argument is only weakened by the century gap between the last grater at Lefkandi (*ca.* 825) and the Rhodian Late Geometric kotyle from Pithekoussai T.168 (*ca.* 725-700) which begins his argument in the west.

8.3.2.3 Beyond the Toumba: Palia Perivolia and the East Cemetery

The dilution of the importance of weapons in burials suggests that being a warrior has ceased to be *the* identity for élite aristocratic males in the Toumba cemetery at the point when it is only being established in most other regions of Greece. In the other cemeteries at Lefkandi, it is difficult to show that there was ever another masculine identity besides “warrior”; the only burials which have been identified as male are those with weapons, including two with knives (Palia Perivolia tombs 16 and 31), one with an axe (Palia Perivolia tomb 13), and one with an object identified as a “mace” (Skoubris tomb 5). In these cemeteries female burials are more recognizable than male; both are outnumbered by children. The only anthropologically identified male in EIA Lefkandi outside the Toumba cemetery is EUB18, the warrior in the East Cemetery.

These cemeteries have a complex relationship with the Toumba cemetery. Palia Perivolia and the East Cemetery both begin in MPG, and it is difficult to say if they predate the Toumba building or not. The burials of Palia Perivolia have the most regular orientation of any Lefkandi cemetery, and it is likely that this relates to the Toumba building (Lemos and Mitchell 2011, 638). If we accept that the passage between the closer and further sections of the Toumba cemetery represents an intentional division between two sections of the cemetery, defined by their relationship to the Toumba building, then Palia Perivolia and the East Cemetery could be further extensions of this same cemetery.

In this case, the three pyres from Palia Perivolia which contain weapons are less problematic (EUB19-21). There is very little which can be said about these burials, which are all undated primary cremations.⁷³ The lack of any evidence for other warrior burials suggests

⁷³ An LPG date for EUB19 has been proposed on stratigraphic grounds (*Lefkandi* I, 254), but it is unclear what these grounds are. I suspect Catling and Catling have mistaken Palia Perivolia Pyre 1 for Toumba Pyre 1. See *Lefkandi* I, 107-8 for the stratigraphy; *Lefkandi* I, 421 provides an index for the dates of the cemeteries and provides no date for this pyre.

that these may have been exceptional circumstances for those buried in Palia Perivolia, which granted them warrior status but not the privilege of burial in the Toumba cemetery. But besides the weapons themselves and the spectacle of cremation as a rite there is nothing remarkable about these burials compared to those in the Toumba cemetery.

EUB18 in the East Cemetery is even more exceptional. This burial is far removed from the Toumba Cemetery, and is the furthest burial with weapons from the building. It is an inhumation, but the grave goods included a gold attachment and faience beads, which makes it wealthier than some of the burials in the Toumba cemetery. The grave dates to SPG I-II, making it the latest inhumation with weapons at Lefkandi. It is possible that this burial continues the tradition of EUB04-07, but represents a point at which inhumed warriors were being rejected from the closest cemeteries to the building in favour of those with more exotic ties across the seas.

To further understand this burial a wider perspective on Euboean burials with weapons must be taken. It is at this point that burials with weapons begin to appear more widely across Greece, including the first appearance in Eretria (EUB24). It is possible that the local explanation makes sense, but another perspective provides more information.

8.3.3 Geometric Euboea

In the third quarter of the ninth century (SPG IIIa) burials at all of the cemeteries known at Lefkandi suddenly cease. In contrast to this abandonment, habitation continues on Xeropolis throughout the eighth century, which has produced some evidence of pictorial pottery including men with arms. But the main focus in this period must turn to Eretria, where burials with weapons begin to appear sporadically from towards the end of the use of the Lefkandi cemeteries, and pictorial pottery is much more common.

8.3.3.1 Iconography and change in the late ninth to eighth centuries

The earliest burial with weapons at Eretria is EUB24, which is contemporary with EUB08 and EUB12. This burial is considerably less impressive than its contemporaries; it is a primary cremation and the sword has been destroyed, perhaps intentionally, and there is a very impressive krater amongst the pottery. But this pottery is minimal, and the grave lacks the bronze grater which distinguishes its contemporaries at Lefkandi. These discrepancies make it difficult to agree with Blandin's proposal that this period sees an exodus of those of uncertain status from Lefkandi to elsewhere on Euboea (*Eretria* XVII.1, 175). However, the location of the burial in association with the later sanctuary of Apollo suggests that it was the burial of a man of great importance in contemporary Eretria.

The evidence from both Lefkandi, where there are few burials known, and Eretria, where they are few and scattered, leave some possibility that the absence of evidence for burials with weapons in the last quarter of the ninth century is accidental. In the eighth century there are certainly burials with weapons in Eretria, culminating in another so-called "Heroön", but the majority of these are difficult to understand. The Harbour Cemetery, which was in use from the early eighth to the late seventh century, produced a number of spearheads which cannot be assigned to burials nor dated. The prevailing evidence from the rest of the Aegean suggests that these should date to the eighth rather than the seventh century. The absence of other weapons is curious, and brings to mind Archilochus' epithet "spear-famed" for the Lords of Euboea. But the association of these spearheads to prestigious graves is difficult to justify when neither the number of spearheads nor the association with the finds of precious metals are clear.

The only datable early eighth-century burial with weapons is EUB23. This is a curious grave as the anthropological analysis suggested that the burial was female, even if

this rests on shaky criteria (*Eretria* XVII.2, 17, 127). The grave goods, which include a sword, a gold diadem, and two ceramic loomweights, prompted the excavators to identify this burial as male regardless of the anthropological results. It is certainly difficult to account for the female burial with weapons given the generally strong connection between anthropologically identified males and weapons. On the other hand, one might suggest that a sword is no more inherently “male” than a loomweight is inherently “female”. An acceptable compromise could be to tentatively suggest that this might be a double burial of a man and a woman, although the quantity of bone recovered is very small (77 g). If this is a female burial with weapons, it is without known or obvious parallel and is thus difficult to interpret, especially when the basis for identifying it as such is so dubious.

The best evidence for warrior identity in eighth-century central Euboea is iconographic. Armed men are not regularly depicted on Euboean vessels, but there are some significant appearances on both the pottery from Xeropolis and Eretria and that which was distributed overseas. The majority of these depictions are on kraters, suggesting public display amongst a small, private group in the household. Significantly, these vessels were discovered in the domestic areas of the settlement, not in the cemetery. Thus we have a situation where the iconography of warriors is part of the élite network of display. However, if we are to interpret this as a “network”, the widespread distribution of these depictions must be accounted for. It is possible that as part of a wider exchange network these kraters formed links through gift exchange which were reaffirmed through communal drinking and dining in the household of the recipient. The absence of return gifts in the Euboean settlements strain this interpretation.

The subjects of these scenes are rarely combat, with the exceptions being a possible Attic import (*Ere01*) and a scene from Pithekoussai not produced in Euboea. Processions and standing figures are preferred. The inclusion of smaller figures on *LkX02* and *Eub02* may be

stylistic, but it is possible that they indicate the incorporation of children into the adult male “warrior” sphere. Langdon suggests that LkX02 depicts part of the socialization process by which young men are made warriors (2008, 246-247); Eub02 might suggest that younger men were included in processions of warriors. However, the evidence is limited.

The context of these vases is always domestic, indicating that throughout much of the eighth century there was an emphasis on warrior status amongst living men. If it continued to exist in death, the identity of a warrior must be found in the Harbour Cemetery at Eretria, or it must be assumed that these burials have not been located. This is the context in which the burials of the West Gate Cemetery appear.

8.3.3.2 The “heroes” of Eretria

The identity of the family buried in the West Gate Cemetery remains contested. The excavator interpreted the burials as war dead and their families from the Lelantine War, a hypothesis followed by a number of scholars which ultimately proves untenable (*Eretria* III, 31-32; see below, Ch.8.3.4). Alternatively these may be the burials of an élite family establishing their identity as the most powerful in Eretria (Hall 2013, 134). It was suggested above that the distribution of Euboean kraters is indicative of an international network of élite gift exchange, perhaps even guest friends, who engaged in communal drinking rituals around pictorial depictions of warriors. The burials in the West Gate Cemetery may be associating themselves with the wider network which included Vrokastro, where burials with weapons are known (*Vrokastro* II, 158), Cumae, where a particularly prestigious example is known which compares well to the Eretria burials (Coldstream 1994, 54-55), and other sites such as Pithekoussai and Zagora where such prestigious burials are not currently known.⁷⁴

⁷⁴ The cemetery at Pithekoussai is identified as that of the “middle-class” (Ridgeway 1992, 77)

One of the most peculiar aspects of the prestigious burials with weapons in this cemetery is the presence of multiple swords and spearheads. In EUB22, EUB26, EUB27, and EUB29 numbers of weapons are paralleled elsewhere, but the number of both swords and spearheads in EUB25 and EUB28 require an explanation.⁷⁵ EUB25 contained five iron spearheads and a single bronze spearhead, Spe013, originally identified as a Mycenaean heirloom (Plate 14e). The greatest number of spears depicted held by an individual on a vase is three (e.g. Eub04). While this may not seem an insurmountable challenge, it is particularly unusual when combined with the four swords. Status alone does not provide an answer – weapons have a function and meaning beyond status; perhaps a better word would be *prestige*, specifically prestige achieved on the battlefield. Multiple weapons may indicate in a very particular way how successful a warrior had been in combat.

The bronze spearhead suggests an answer. While widely accepted as a Mycenaean heirloom, Bettelli has proposed an alternative interpretation that it is a spearhead from the contemporary Urnfield culture of central Europe (2001). He suggests that the parallels between Spe013 and Aegean LBA examples are weak, and furthermore that the destruction of Spe013 along with the other weapons in the burial better suits a similar function than an interpretation as a sceptre. Spe013 may have been obtained through the gift exchange network, but there are other explanations. It is possible that it is an example of a *skylā*, arms taken from a defeated enemy on the battlefield. The network outlined above may not have always maintained peaceful relations with the Etruscans or Campanians encountered in central Italy; that Euboean elite families continue to represent themselves as warriors may not be the result of a long-held tradition for which there is little evidence in Eretria, but a response to the necessity of settling in hostile territory. The spearhead, in use by a warrior allied to the Etruscans, may have been lost on the battlefield to the Eretrian.

⁷⁵ The unlikelyhood that these were double burials was discussed in Ch.4.3.1.2.

At some point it became appropriate to dedicate weapons, both those of the individual and *skyla*, in sanctuaries rather than in the grave, but this does not appear to be the case in Eretria *ca.* 700. However, if the early weapons dedicated in sanctuaries at this time are at least in part *skyla*, it is possible that when the Eretrians buried their dead with weapons, they substituted those which they had used for those which they had taken from the defeated enemy. While this explanation is tenuous, it explains the quantity of weapons in EUB25 and EUB28, the presence of an Urnfield spear in an Eretria grave, and the appearance of burials with weapons in a new cemetery at Eretria at the time when generally throughout the Aegean these were being abandoned in favour of the dedication of arms at sanctuaries. Furthermore, this proposal highlights that these burials at Eretria attain their status in a way which does not ignore the meaning associated with the way in which they display this status – through their weapons.

8.3.4 The Lelantine War

The historical evidence for the Lelantine War has been well documented (Ch.7.3). Thucydides refers to a PanHellenic war between Chalcis and Eretria (Thuc. 1.15.3); it is assumed that this war was for control of the Lelantine plain which lay between them.⁷⁶ Other evidence has been assimilated to this war, although it is only considerably later evidence which directly recalls it. The outcome is uncertain, but while Chalcis is usually assumed to be the victor, the loss of fortune for both settlements in the later seventh century suggests that there were no winners (Parker 1997, 161-165).

A discussion of the Lelantine War from an archaeological perspective is a daunting task. The evidence attributed to the Lelantine War supports Parker Pearson's assertion that wars are a complex mesh of causes (2005, 22-23); however, the archaeological evidence is

⁷⁶ But see Popham (1980) on the ancient name of Lefkandi.

still largely used to imply that the war was an inevitable consequence of the growth and overseas activities of Chalcis and Eretria. Direct archaeological evidence which appears to support a late eighth-century date for the war is limited to the apparent destruction of Lefkandi and the burials from Eretria discussed above, but there is no archaeological evidence for whom the aggressor may have been at Lefkandi (Ch.1.3.3; Ch.6.2), and the duration of the burials at the Eretrian Heroön suggest a war lasting many decades, but with apparently few heroes on the Eretria side (Ch.8.3.3.2). However, the inevitability of war in the eighth-century context and the resulting decline of these settlements is still largely attributed to this war (i.e. Parker 1997, 156-160; Mazarakis Ainian and Leventi 2009, 215).

Recent scholarship has tended to cast doubt on the evidence for the Lelantine War, and no evidence for the war remains unquestioned (Hall 2013, 1-8; Lambert 1982).⁷⁷ Even those scholars who support the historical reality of the war contest the very reason Thucydides cites it – the number of allies on each side (Parker 1997, 151-152). A major problem is a lack of precision in dating, which prevents any certainty over the correlation of the destruction, burials, and different literary evidence.

Hall states that we do not know when or whether the Lelantine War happened; but it does not seem likely that Thucydides would have mentioned it if he did not have a good reason, as it goes against his general argument. There is not much specific information in his account, but we are alerted to the probability of conflict between Chalcis and Eretria in this period. The changing dynamic in central Euboea at the end of the eighth century does suggest that this would be a good time to date the war, especially if it is assumed that it cannot take place with the previous paradigm shift at Lefkandi in the second half of the ninth century,

⁷⁷ It is worth noting the purpose Hall gives in his introduction, to explain the practice of history and to encourage the critical assessment of traditional views or received 'facts'. His conclusion is intentionally agnostic and unsatisfying in order to serve his point. We must no more uncritically accept Hall's account than that of Thucydides – all historians have an agenda.

which would predate the joint colonial efforts of Chalcis and Eretria (Parker 1997, 58). The possibility of wider participation may seem unlikely, but we must bear in mind the vagaries of Thucydides' statement and the conditions to his statement: this was the largest war in a period of skirmishes.

The final question about the Lelantine War must be about what we want the war to be. If the war is shed of its PanHellenic status, if it cannot explain the abandonment of Lefkandi or the burials at Eretria, and if it cannot date Hesiod what remains of significance? Having disassociated Archilochus from the war previously (Ch.7.3), it is now necessary to reconsider his association, not in describing the war but in contributing to an understanding of the Euboeans as a violent group with a particular renown for warfare in the late eighth and seventh centuries. At the end of the eighth century there was either a revival or a renewed emphasis in burials with weapons at Eretria. These symbols must have their grounding in reality. There is much which we do not know about warfare in the late eighth and seventh centuries, but it is very likely that Eretria was involved in wars; we cannot accumulate all of the evidence into a single, PanHellenic war, but the reputation of the central Euboean settlements suggests that they were known for their way of war.

8.3.5 *Central Euboea: Conclusions*

While the necessity of warfare for maintaining a certain standard of living has been recognized in later periods (van Wees 2004; Langdon 2008, 248-249), it has not been recognized in the Lefkandi cemeteries where explanations of prosperity are largely peaceful, as perhaps EUB08 indicates that they eventually became. But the provision of luxuries from overseas need not have been solely the result of gift exchange or peaceful trade; the association of masculine identity with weapons suggests that the acquisition of luxuries was presented as brave, honourable, dangerous, and adventurous. However, while I disagree with

the general proposition that burials with weapons simply represent notions of gender, hierarchy, and authority without the necessity of the reality of violence, at Lefkandi this interpretation becomes possible. The interactions, the enemy, against whom the “warriors” of Lefkandi were competing, were across the sea, far beyond the conception of most of the occupants of Xeropolis; here they need not reveal the realities of their overseas activities, whether trade, piracy, or raiding, but they were presented first as warriors, and then as warrior-traders. The lack of consistency to burials with weapons in both equipment and non-military finds suggests that clear symbolism was never achieved, not only in burials with weapons but in all the Lefkandi cemeteries at this time. The presence of warriors in Palia Perivolia pyres and especially EUB18, as well as the difficulty in excluding the possibility of further warrior burials in the Skoubris cemetery, complicates the image of a warrior élite presented by those buried in the Toumba cemetery.

The evidence from eighth-century Eretria is complicated by poor reporting and the limitations of the known evidence. Pictorial pottery seems to indicate that there was some association of élite masculinity to warrior status, but this is not as profound as the evidence from Attica. There is very little which we can say about warrior status at Eretria in the EIA prior to the burials in the West Gate Cemetery. This cemetery is not only amongst the latest cemeteries including EIA burials with weapons in central Greece, but these burials receive weapons in abundance. It is possible that this is the result of an increased desire to take the weapons from defeated enemies, and increased honour connected to having done so. This is a phenomenon which is seen in the *Iliad* and is unlikely to have appeared much later than the seventh century, although it is not unproblematic to place it in the late eighth century and to connect it to grave goods. However, it explains all of the evidence from these burials in the neatest possible way.

It has been proposed that this is the period in which the Lelantine War occurred, if indeed it did occur. It is unlikely that Thucydides reports an event which he did not believe to have happened which so strongly contradicts the proposal which he is making, but we have no firm evidence by which to date this war. It is possible that Eretria and Chalcis were powerful enough to have engaged in a dispute which was much grander in scale than contemporary wars, but, unlike the situation in the contemporary Argolid, we do not have the evidence to show that it did.

8.4. THE ARGOLID

Evidence from the Argolid is limited before the Geometric Period. A handful of burials with weapons date before 900, but these pale in significance compared to the numbers in the eighth century. The single LPG figure-decorated sherd is interesting, but is difficult to interpret without a pictorial tradition surrounding it. But the evidence accumulates and in the eighth century all of the contexts covered by this thesis contribute to our understanding of warfare in the Argolid: burials with weapons, connections to sanctuaries, evidence from settlements, painted pottery, and written sources.

8.4.1 The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition

There is a sharp reduction in the number of settlements known in the Argolid from LH IIIC to SMyc, which may be the result of settlement nucleation in the postpalatial period reflected in the growth of Tiryns (Foley 1988, 23; Ch.3.4.2). It is also the case that the centres from which the most evidence has come – Argos, Mycenae, Tiryns, and Asine – show continuity, suggesting that this apparent reduction could be accidental. Nonetheless, the transition from Bronze to Iron Age in the Argolid is far from smooth.

The absence of recovered burials with weapons in the Argolid in the postpalatial period continues into the EIA. This is unlikely to be a result of absence of evidence. As suggested by Lemos, if burials with weapons were regular in the PG Argolid we should know more of them (2002, 158). Absolute numbers of burials known from the EIA in the Argolid are difficult to establish, as the evidence predominantly comes from incompletely published excavation reports. But certain trends have been established in the past, such as the sudden spike in the number of visible burials in the second half of the eighth century (Snodgrass 1980, 23 Fig. 4), while Hägg's figures for the relative numbers of each tomb type in the Argolid show that the greatest increase is in pithos burials (1998, 134 Table 1). The number of cist tombs declines everywhere except for Argos in the Geometric Period; the increase in tomb types is predominantly pithoi, but also earth-cut tombs and other pot burials. Burials with weapons do not usually appear in these tomb-types. Furthermore there are more identified adult burials in EG than there are in the periods when most of the burials with weapons are found in MG or LG; the increase is in visible child burials (Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011, Table 4). Therefore, burials with weapons increase in the Geometric Period despite the increase in burials being primarily in types which do not receive weapons – pithoi and other pot burials and the burials of children. The drastic increase in burials with weapons in the Geometric Period must be tied to the changing identity of those who were buried in cists. However, the exceptional PG burials must be understood first.

The EIA in the Argolid begins with a burial with weapons, the Tiryns warrior ARG01. This burial may be the first in the Philaki cemetery and is important in the wider Aegean picture (see below, Ch.8.6.1). Papadimitriou has argued that this burial, along with a number of others in the Argolid, shows that the region was well connected in the SMyc/EPG transitional period and redefining its relationship to the Mycenaean past (2006, 540-544). However, it is difficult to show this pattern continuing into PG. Papadimitriou re-dates

several important Argive burials and hoards, such as the Tiryns treasure, to the SMyc/EPG transition, limiting this new consciousness to a very brief period, after which it would seem to diminish until the ninth century. Such a moment of flourishing does not change the fact that much of the PG material from the Argolid could be described by Lemos as “rather dull and pedestrian”, with the exception of some jewellery (2002, 202). This was not a prosperous time in the Argolid when compared to other regions discussed in the present study. Following ARG01 there are few further burials with weapons.

If there is a continuous tradition of burials with weapons in the Argolid throughout PG then Tiryns is the place to look.⁷⁸ Following ARG01, ARG04 has been dated to MPG and ARG05 LPG/EG. It is perhaps possible that the full publication of the further excavations in the Philaki cemetery will reveal more PG burials with weapons than are currently known (Ch.4.4.2.1). At present, the evidence for burials with weapons at Tiryns at best suggests that there might have been a tradition until MG, after which there are no known burials with weapons from Tiryns, but there are many from Argos.

ARG08 and perhaps ARG25 are the only known burials with weapons from Argos which date earlier than MG. It is most likely that this absence partly reflects the poverty of Argos before the late ninth century. Two other graves were discovered alongside ARG08 – another cist containing a child burial and a pit; perhaps further excavation would reveal more burials with weapons. ARG25 was discovered in the Deiras area, amongst Bronze Age chamber tombs, and the style of the bronze spearhead strongly resembles LBA types, suggesting that this tomb was early. While these burials could be equally suggestive of a continuous tradition as the Tiryns burials, the insecure dating and the absence of EG burials with weapons at Argos makes this seem unlikely.

⁷⁸ Hall suggests that the predominance of burials with weapons in Tiryns as opposed to Argos shows that the two were competing in levels of élite display (1997b, 93). I cannot substantiate the numbers he suggests, but it is certainly the case that PG burials with weapons at Tiryns show a more continuous tradition than those at Argos.

It is significant that the Argolid continues to reject burials with weapons throughout the EIA. Even under the palaces, despite the use of violence and warfare in maintaining the authority of the palatial system, the Argolid has comparatively few burials with weapons (Harrell 2009, 178-183, 202). In the postpalatial period the emphasis on warrior iconography but probable absence of burials with weapons suggests that in contrast to elsewhere in the Aegean élites did not identify as warriors in the Argolid (Ch.3.7). ARG01 may represent an attempt to establish the connections between warriors, death, and power in the Argolid which appear elsewhere in the Aegean. It does not appear to have been successful.

An alternative possibility connects to the rejection of cremation in the Argolid. In the postpalatial period there is significant evidence for cremation at Argos and Chania and there is some evidence for its occasional use in subsequent periods. While these cremations have been characterized as intrusive and ineffectual, they show that cremation was a visible option for individuals in the Argolid in the postpalatial period. But cremation is never adopted as a majority rite in the Argolid as it is in Athens and Euboea. This must be a conscious decision on behalf of the people of the Argolid to maintain the tradition of inhumation as it was replaced elsewhere. The arrangement of this thesis, based in part on the greater quantities of evidence, has presented Athens as the norm from which other sites, including the Argolid, diverge. While it is possible to show that the Argolid *rejects* cremation, there is no reason to suppose that a continuous tradition of burial with weapons was ever a serious possibility. The significance of this rite because of its regular appearance in Athens, Lefkandi, and perhaps Crete, Thessaly, and Macedonia, but its limited presence in the Argolid, and absence in most of the rest of Greece, indicates that burial with weapons was not that common in PG. It is important to emphasize that when burials with weapons do appear in the Argolid in proportions far greater than they ever appeared at Athens or Lefkandi this is not catching up, but represents a significant social change in not only the Argolid but the wider Aegean world

which begins to place greater emphasis on the significance of weapons in the ninth and eighth centuries.

8.4.2 Burials with weapons and Geometric society

Among the attempts to explain the use of different grave types in the Argolid two approaches have shone through: one attempts to explain the variety through the social status of the deceased (e.g. Hägg 1983; Morris 1987, 183 agrees) and another which sees this diversity as representing different ethnic groups (e.g. Foley 1998). In the former burials with weapons represent the élite group, buried in larger cists reserved, in general, only for the warrior (Hägg 1998, 132-3); the latter associates them to the “warrior caste” of the Dorians, the dominant ethnic group of Argos in the historical period and an intrusive element dominating the indigenous people of the plain (Tomlinson 1972, 67-8).

Hägg argued that the increasing differentiation of graves in the Geometric Period, especially the eighth century, pointed to greater social stratification where the cist graves became bigger and wealthier while the newly introduced pithoi were smaller and less wealthy (1983, 27-28). Foley initially challenged Hägg’s distinction by pointing to the fact that not all cist graves are rich or well-built and not all pithoi are poor (1998, 140-141). Other challenges include changes in depositional practices which account for an absence of grave goods in pithoi towards the end of the eighth century. Furthermore, Pappi and Triantaphyllou tentatively suggest that the health of those buried in cists and pithoi is roughly comparable, and significantly greater than those buried in pits, which may be indicative of social stratification (2011, 720). Therefore it is possible to suggest that pithos and cist burials were distinct from pit burials, but it is not clear that such a distinction exists between cists and pithoi.

The place of children in Argive society also fluctuates in this period. As outlined previously (Ch.4.4.1), in Argos the graves of children are less visible in E-MG than they are in PG and LG. This is part of a complex renegotiation of identities in Argos in the Geometric Period, which incorporates the introduction of pithoi, multiple burial, and subsequently burials with weapons. The impetus for such changes perhaps comes from Tiryns, where all of these elements appear first. It is significant, however, that burials with weapons disappear from Tirynthian cemeteries before they appear in great numbers at Argos, as if the claim to warrior status shifts from one side of the Argolid to the other.

The burials with weapons are among the wealthiest of the eighth-century Argolid, and they are concentrated in Argos (Hägg 1983, 132-133; Pappi and Triantaphyllou 2011, 719). Hägg noted that some of the individuals buried with weapons appear to be above and beyond the social group represented by multiple burials in the cists and pithoi as they have large cists reserved solely for them (ARG15, probably ARG18, ARG19). However, ARG09 and ARG13 are LG single burials with weapons with relatively small cists, suggesting that this is not universal. The largest three are those which contain armour, suggesting that these men were well-connected beyond the Argolid (Ch.4.4.3.3). Pappi and Triantaphyllou connect these tombs to their other rich grave goods such as obeloi, bronze objects, and the finest painted pottery (2011, 719). While this certainly seems to be the case in many burials with weapons (ARG10-11, ARG13, ARG15, ARG18-20, ARG23), others are not so clearly wealthy (ARG09, ARG24). Interestingly, objects such as obeloi are not restricted to graves with weapons or to male burials, but occur in those osteologically identified as female such as South Cemetery T.1 and the LG I woman buried in ARG17, also in the south cemetery (Haarer 2000, 48-49). Eighth-century Argive tombs containing spits are usually the richest (Haarer 2000, 33-34); although ARG23, which contains no spits but contains objects of high

value, suggests that metal objects were the main indicator of wealth. Large metal objects such as the corselet and helmets should be amongst the most valuable.

The evidence in Argos does not support an interpretation of burials with weapons as “local leaders”, as could feasibly apply in Athens or Lefkandi. In the eighth century, to which fifteen of the eighteen burials with weapons from Argos can be confidently dated, approximately one in three men were buried with weapons (van Wees 1998a, 338). If these were local leaders, this would present a highly fragmented structure. These burials are all clearly of high status, but this is an élite group which adopts warrior identity, not one which is led by a single warrior.

The second approach to the variation in burial practices, the ethnic identity of the Argolid in the EIA, has been extensively discussed by Hall and needs only a few comments here (1997a, especially 122-8). Hall argues that the main distinguishing feature of ethnic groups in burial practices is rarely grave type, but rather that they are distinguished spatially through burial in a separate plot or cemetery. In the Argolid, cist, pit, and pithos burials all appear together in virtually every plot. The exception to this lack of distinction in burial practices is “Dryopian” Asine. Throughout the EIA graves at Asine are orientated in a different direction to the rest of the Argolid, the deceased are supine rather than contracted, and there are no pithos burials (Hall 1997a, 137; see also Hägg 1974, 52; 1980, 123-6; 1998). Another significant distinction at Asine is that there are no burials with weapons in the Geometric Period. Perhaps most important to note is that Hall believes that an ethnic consciousness would have been in place in the eighth century, when the majority of the burials with weapons appear in the Argolid (1997a, 65). While an ethnic consciousness may not be evident in burial practices, ethnicity is one of a number of identities to which the inhabitants of the Argolid might have appealed in the eighth century, along with membership of a social rank.

Burials with weapons have been identified as Dorians (Tomlinson 1972, 67-8), which can be challenged on the basis that these appear in non-Dorian settlements such as Mycenae and Tiryns (Hall 1997a, 69, table 3). While only one burial with weapons is known from Mycenae, [ARG25](#), and those at Tiryns come to an end in the ninth century (EG), before burials with weapons first appear in many “Dorian” sites, there are also eighth-century burials with weapons in the Ionian regions of Attica and Euboea. Burials with weapons in “Dorian” Corinth and Sparta first appear in the Geometric Period, with greater numbers in the eighth century (MG II-LG; Dickey 1992, 91-92; Raftopoulou 1998, 133-134); this offers a parallel to the circumstances in the Argolid where burials with weapons at Argos are exceptions, until MG. Clearly, burials with weapons were not considered “Dorian”.

Both ethnic and social status interpretations of burials with weapons are challenged by the evidence from Tiryns. [ARG06](#) and [ARG07](#) are pithos burials, thus suggesting that they would be either non-Dorian or non-élite burials with weapons. These graves contain no grave goods besides their weapons. In the case of [ARG06](#) it may be possible to contend that this was the weapon which killed the individual, as the spearhead was found between the ribs of the skeleton, although it is tenuous to suppose that there was no post-depositional displacement (Verdelis 1963a, 53); this explanation will not hold for the dagger in [ARG07](#). An alternative explanation may be that it is a mistake to date these graves to the Geometric Period, and that they are in fact seventh-century graves, meaning that it would not be necessary to identify them as non-élite burials with weapons. If they are to be members of the élite then they are further evidence that the social status interpretation for the use of different grave types must be abandoned.

The burial patterns of the Argolid and the place of weapons as grave goods within this pattern cannot be understood as solely the result of social status, ethnicity, or a combination of these factors. An alternative approach begins with gender; the relationship between

weapons and male burials is clearer in the Argolid than elsewhere through the better preservation of skeletal material in inhumations. It has been estimated that about a third of men in eighth-century Argos were buried with weapons, compared to a fifth in Athens throughout the EIA (van Wees 1998a, 338). However, the re-examination of the anthropological remains from Argos by Pappi and Triantaphyllou has identified a greater proportion of males than females amongst the adults buried in the Geometric Period, suggesting that this proportion of men buried with weapons may be lower and will certainly need to be recalculated when the full results of their study are published (2011, 722). It is possible that women were only granted limited access to burial rites in this period and the graves of women which were as wealthy as those of men must have been of the highest social rank (Haarer 2000, 48-49). Pappi and Triantaphyllou's study of the skeletal record of Argos is a substantial move forward in the understanding of Argive burial customs, but it is not yet complete. Without full details and a breakdown by period and individual it is impossible to be certain what proportion of LG Argive men were buried with weapons, and how far women were excluded from burial rites. From the evidence available, men dominate the recovered burial record and only a proportion of them were buried with weapons.

Of those burials which can be aged, ARG09, ARG16, and ARG17 are all between 35 and 50. Age may have played a significant factor in the use of multiple tombs (see Ch.4.4.1); the limited evidence suggests that it may also have played a part in determining burial with weapons. The men buried with weapons, and the women buried with them, are amongst the oldest in the society, usually around thirty to forty years, indicating that men and perhaps women could accumulate, or achieve, status with age. Certainly there are no child burials in the Argolid with weapons; this was an adult male prerogative. But there are adult male burials without weapons. This was a necessary, but not sufficient, factor in burial with weapons.

The use of weapons and armour as symbols of status indicates the association of militarism with social and political power in Argos. From the beginning of EG, cists get bigger, re-use of tombs begins on a large scale, and metal objects appear more regularly in burials. Pappi and Triantaphyllou also report a greater degree of trauma in EG (37% of skeletons), although it is represented by well-healed fractures and so this should not be connected with fatal violence (2011, 723). On the other hand the complete absence of trauma in MG and much lower levels (10%) in LG suggest significance to this fact in this period. It is possible that the increase in burials with weapons from MG is connected to the rising importance of violence and warfare to male identity in the Argolid. From the burial evidence it is clear that multiple factors governed social relationships in the Argolid, including rank, wealth, age, gender, and perhaps ethnicity.

8.4.3 Beyond the grave: iconography and dedications

Unlike burials with weapons, there is some evidence for pictorial depictions of armed men from throughout the Argolid. Taking the LPG fragment ArT01 in combination with the handful of burials with weapons it is possible to suggest that combat was an important part of male identity in tenth-century Tiryns, reflecting a nascent conception of warrior status (Pappi 2006, 231). However, on the present, limited evidence this proposal must remain hypothetical.

Eighth-century figural decoration from the Argolid may not have quite the same military emphasis as that of Athens; however, as with burials with weapons we must be cautious about assuming Athens is the norm from which others deviate. It is rare that men are depicted in combat on Argive pottery, with the exception of ArH01. The most frequent scenes are the men leading horses, some of whom wore armour and carried weapons (e.g. ArT02, ArT03, and ArA02). The association between warriors and horses emphasizes their

élite status, although the frequency with which unarmed men are associated with horses somewhat undermines this association. Despite the suggestion that the armour in ARG15 was designed for riding on horseback (Snodgrass 2006d, 355-356), there are no examples of horses being ridden in Argive vase-painting.

Other frequent scenes might be described as contests of strength, such as wrestling and boxing (e.g. ArA03), which may indicate that the two figures in combat on ArT01 were similarly engaged in a duel which was an important part of masculine identity in the EIA Argolid. While this is not as explicit as those depicting armed men, it shows that displays of strength were not uncommon amongst the men of the Argolid and further that it was not necessary to use weapons to threaten violence. In this light we may consider the connection between Argos and Olympia, established from the Geometric Period if not earlier.

The Argolid, especially Argos, shows strong evidence for élite competition, especially competitions involving a display of strength, in the eighth-century. We cannot be certain of the origins of the majority of the dedications of arms and armour at Olympia, but it is clear that the Argolid was well connected to the sanctuary before dedications of arms and armour first appear in the late eighth-century (Morgan 1990, 85-89). That the Argives dedicated arms and armour appears to be supported by two Archaic votive helmets on the citadel at Tiryns, probably in the area of a sanctuary to Athena ; the sanctuary of Athena on the acropolis at Halieis also received dedications of armour in the seventh and sixth centuries (Baitinger 2011, 43-44, 116; Foley 1988, 147). Tentatively, therefore, it can be suggested that some of the earliest dedications of arms and armour at Olympia may have come from the Argolid.

Local cults had alternative ways in which to express militarism. ArH01 and another scene from the Argive Heraion, showing a lion with a helmeted archer facing a ship, connects military scenes to the worship of Hera in the eighth-century Argolid. The evidence is limited

and certainly there are a number of other depictions of non-military scenes dedicated at the Heraion in the eighth century. But within the small corpus of eighth-century Argive pictorial pottery there is an element of the warrior identity which we see in the graves at Argos. The limited evidence at the Heraion may be the result of the connections of this sanctuary to Mycenae in the eighth century (Hall 1995, 600-603, 607-611).

In the early seventh century ArT04, the larger of the two shields from the bothros at Tiryns, shows combat between men and Amazons. The central man appears to be dominant but the body of another man along the ground indicates that the Amazons have drawn first blood. This shield has been connected to rites of passage enacted by boys at Tiryns in the early seventh century, perhaps connected to the terracotta masks showing gorgons uncovered in the same deposit.⁷⁹ Within the ritual sphere of the Argolid this cult represents an association between Hera, militarism, and kourotrophic rituals which introduced boys to the life of violence which they were to lead as adults (Langdon 2008, 81). While it is probable that this ritual was limited to Tiryns, Langdon suggests that the Aspis cult in Argos probably had similar rite of passage functions (2008, 80). These cults postdate Argive burials with weapons, but it is possible that they represent a continuing militarism in Argive attitudes into the seventh century, manifest in dedications of arms and armour at sanctuaries, both in the Argolid and further afield at Olympia. The depiction of combat on ArT04 is reminiscent of the earlier Argive depictions of men duelling.

Between the iconographic, cultic, and funerary evidence there is strong evidence for the importance of warrior identity in the eighth-century Argolid. Warriors played an important part in Argive society, especially in the socialization of young boys. For conclusive

⁷⁹ For a comprehensive discussion of the shield and the rites of passage associated with it, see Langdon 2008, 66-81.

evidence of the relationship between violence and power, the most important evidence is the destruction of Asine.

8.4.4 The destruction of Asine

8.4.4.1 The destruction

In the late eighth century, *ca.* 720-710, the settlement of Asine was destroyed, almost certainly by Argos. The literary evidence suggests that the motive was the assistance Asine gave to Sparta during incursions into Argive territory, and that in return Sparta allowed the Asinaians to settle in Messenia (Paus. 2.36.4-5; 3.7.4; 4.8.3; Strabo 8.6.11). The archaeological evidence shows clearly that Asine was destroyed; the identity of Argos as the attacker is beyond doubt on the basis of the appropriation of the Asinaian cult of Apollo Pythaeus in Argos immediately after the destruction (Hall 1995, 581-582). The evidence from Tiryns, Mycenae, and Nauplion does not suggest that another local aggressor is possible.⁸⁰ But in modern accounts of the destruction Sparta is usually excluded, on the basis that the levels of Argive dominance assumed by the story are inconceivable in the late eighth century (Kelly 1967; Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 83-84; Foley 1995, 82-83).

There is some contention between modern scholars on a cause to replace the Spartan incursion. Morgan and Whitelaw argue that Spartan intervention is not required, as there were “pressing local reasons” for the destruction of Asine, but they exclude Sparta without explaining why this is necessary, nor how Pausanias could have made this mistake (1991, 108). It is possible that the story was an invention to explain the name and Dryopean identity of an Asine in Messenia (Hall 1995, 582; Hdt. 8.73.2). Hall argues that Asine was destroyed because it engaged in piratical activity, supported by the fact that all the Dryopean cities of

⁸⁰ Foley suggested that this may be the result of more limited excavations at the other sites, but this view does not appear to have had much of an impact (1995, 81-81).

the Argolid – including Hermione, Troizen, and Haleies – are coast-facing and have good harbours (1995, 582-3).

Conflicting accounts of the motivation and consequences of the destruction of Asine emerge from the arguments of Morgan and Whitelaw and those of Hall. Morgan and Whitelaw argue that in the eighth century Argos gained complete control of the Argive Plain through the destruction of Asine and the construction of the Argive Heraion. Meanwhile, Hall challenges the assertion that Argos could have had complete control of the Plain before the middle of the fifth century and argues that the Heraion is more strongly associated with Mycenae, Tiryns, and the eastern Argolid than with Argos and the western Argolid (1995).⁸¹ In the case of the Heraion Hall has the most convincing arguments. While the majority of the pottery at the Heraion appears to be from Argos (Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 84), the shields from the bothros at Tiryns also have a fabric and Subgeometric style which look much more similar to that of Argos than Tiryns (Langdon 2008, 78-79). It is not necessary for cultic material to have been produced by those worshipping at the shrine, especially as LG pottery from Argos is of such high quality. Furthermore, the other types of votive at the Heraion most closely resemble those at other Hera cults at Mycenae and Tiryns (Hall 1995, 597-598). Hall also shows that several other arguments made by Morgan and Whitelaw, such as the story of Kleobis and Biton, may be later inventions. Positive evidence for a connection between Mycenae and the Heraion is a “sacred way” between them. The evidence strongly supports an association of the Heraion with Mycenae, rather than Argos.

The hegemony of Argos over the Plain is not disproven if we accept that there would be no particular reason for Argos to prevent Mycenaean activity at the Heraion. Hall argues that the material evidence and estimated population size of Argos is too meagre to allow the

⁸¹ Hall follows Kelly (1967, 427-428), although he shows some of Kelly’s reasoning to be misguided, such as the worship of Hera in Argos and the assumption that the Argive Heraion was associated with Argos.

site the scope of influence which has been attributed to it in the late eighth century (2013, 75 fig. 4.1; 161-162); however, his population estimate for Argos is not much lower than that for Eretria which was involved in settlements overseas, suggesting that a settlement did not have to be large to exercise control overseas. It should not be considered more difficult for Argos to exercise some kind of control over at least part of a region much closer to its hub than Eretria's colonies were to it. A more important argument is that no material evidence shows that Argos had any great control of a wide area in the eighth century, but this need not mean that it did not have any.

The way forward is to ask two connected questions of this event: why was it that Asine was destroyed, rather than Mycenae or Tiryns, and why was it Argos which destroyed it? It is surely not a coincidence that the eighth century sees the largest number of burials with weapons at Argos, the construction of fortifications at Asine, and the destruction of Asine. The evidence from this century indicates a growing military consciousness in Argos, and the sense that to be an élite man one should be a warrior, buried with his weapons or, slightly later, dedicating those weapons at a sanctuary. The evidence of early armour in [ARG15](#), [ARG18](#), and [ARG19](#) suggests that Argos may have had an advantage over their opponents. The prominence of burials with weapons in the eighth century and their apparent absence in earlier centuries indicates that military ideology was becoming increasingly important at Argos.

What is perhaps most surprising about the suggested limitations to Argive power in the late eighth century is that the response of Argos to the Asinaian threat is one which has been completely absent from the Aegean archaeological record for four centuries: the complete destruction of a site. It cannot be said with absolute certainty that no settlements had been completely destroyed in the EIA, but the absence of evidence to the contrary is striking. The destruction of a site indicates a level of communal organization and direction of

violence in the Argolid which has not been seen in the Aegean since the end of the Bronze Age. Furthermore, it is not the only site to offer this evidence. Asine itself was not only considered by the Argives to be a threat, but the Asinaians were able to organize the construction of defensive walls. While these walls were not the substantial, city-encircling walls of earlier and later periods, they certainly defended the Barbouna Hill and possibly the acropolis, although unsuccessfully. There was a degree of complexity in the Argolid which was beyond that of other eighth-century Aegean societies.

Asine must in some way be understood as a threat to Argos, whether a threat to its existence or merely a threat to its supremacy. This threat may be piracy, preventing Argos from acting on a Mediterranean-wide scale (Hall 1995, 582-583); or territorial, an unprovoked attack to eliminate a potential rival (Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 84). Kelly noted that Tiryns and Nauplion both escaped destruction, despite their proximity to Argos on the route to Asine, and indicating that they were friendly with Argos; Asine, meanwhile, was at a distance which may have lent a false sense of security and encouraged them to resist (1967, 430). All of these proposals must account for the fact that Argos did not resettle Asine; only Hall's explanation is not primarily territorial, and thus is the most likely. On the other hand, while Asine challenged Argos' connections to the outside world, it is possible that its fortifications were not as formidable as the still-standing LBA walls available at Mycenae and Tiryns. If the destruction of Asine was intended as a show of strength, the Argives may have accepted that their strength had limitations. The absence of burials with weapons at Asine may also indicate a lack of militarism. But this must not be pushed too far; if the Asinaians were a feeble opponent then their destruction would do no good as a show of Argive strength.

These approaches all assume that Argos was the dominant settlement of the Argive Plain, and that its relationships with the other settlements were strained. Morgan and

Whitelaw suggest this on the basis of ceramic differences, but it is questionable whether this evidence is motive enough for Argos to destroy Asine, especially when destruction of a settlement was such an extraordinary step. There is no evidence for an Argive campaign across the Argolid; only Asine, and not Tiryns, Nauplion, or Mycenae, is targeted. It is possible that Asine was considered to be a threat to the whole Argolid, and not just Argos. It may make more sense to think that the other settlements were allies of Argos, hence neither were they destroyed nor did they assist Asine.

8.4.4.2 The aftermath

The destruction of Asine must be considered as a process rather than as an event, considering its cause, the response, and the social changes which resulted (Mackil 2004, 494). The absence of reoccupation has been taken as an indication that Argive aggression was not a territorial claim, but it seems implausible that the entire settlement should have been wiped out. If we reject the story that Argive aggression was a response to Asinaian aid to the Spartans, we must similarly reject the assertion that Messenian Asine was settled by the Asinaians from the Argolid.

Many of the destroyed Classical and Hellenistic sites examined by Mackil show evidence for small-scale occupation even after the events which historical sources, such as Pausanias, claim destroyed them (2004, 499). Similarly, Asine continues to show some minor, much reduced evidence for occupation suggesting that some of the survivors were permitted to remain at the site. We should be aware that human agency plays a role in the choice to abandon a settlement (Mackil 2004, 505). It is possible that surviving Asinaians were incorporated into Tiryns, Nauplion, Mycenae, or even Argos. Furthermore, some people were probably taken as booty, although it seems unlikely that this could be the entire population. Mackil suggests that networks of *poleis* helped the survivors of destructions

escape and resettle; the evidence for maritime connections in eighth-century Asine suggests that they may have been able to flee – perhaps even as far as Messenia.

It is not long after the destruction of Asine that burials with weapons cease at Argos. It would be tempting to connect this to the destruction of Asine, perhaps as overstretch of power leading to weakness, although there is little more than coincidence to recommend this hypothesis. By the middle of the seventh century Argos is said to have destroyed Nauplion, although there is no archaeological evidence to support this assertion, and thus any set back can only have been temporary. Militarism continues to be of importance in the Argolid, despite the cessation of burial with weapons. In the seventh century Argos constructed its own fortifications. The ability to organize and mobilize forces which could destroy another settlement is one of the indications of the emerging state (Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 87). Furthermore, the main evidence for heroic rites of passage for young boys postdate the destruction of Asine and the disappearance of burials with weapons. The destruction of Asine was a turning point for the Argolid, and perhaps the rest of the Greek world, as organized human destruction of a whole settlement suddenly became a possibility again.

8.4.5 The Argolid: Conclusions

The Argolid underwent a series of societal changes and developments in the EIA which are reflected in the burial practices in the various settlements. While a handful of burials with weapons are present in SMyc-PG these are exceptions to the general rule. It is not until the ninth century that such burials become common; in the eighth century they appear to be more common than they have ever been in any region of mainland Greece.

The late appearance of burials with weapons in the Argolid indicates an entirely different phenomenon to that which is occurring in Attica and central Euboea in the eleventh and tenth centuries. While the appearance of burials with weapons in Eretria at the end of the

eighth century may be a similarly late emergence, the propensity of burials with weapons in eighth-century Argos shows a much greater emphasis on warrior identity than is seen elsewhere in central Greece in the EIA. If a “warrior” is defined as one who acquires or maintains legitimacy through the threat or practice of warfare, we should be able to see Argive power manifested in violent practices – such as the destruction of Asine. Furthermore, these burials include armour of the kind that is not seen previously in the Aegean, strongly implicating Argos in the development of this armour.

Fortifications and the destruction of settlements are present in the Argolid, but not in the other regions discussed in this thesis. This preservation may in part be an accident of survival, but clearly the Argolid was becoming highly organized in the eighth century, and perhaps highly competitive, culminating in the violent destruction of Asine. If Argos were the sole perpetrator then perhaps some dominance of the plain was asserted, although there are no strong indicators of this in the material record.

Burials with weapons disappear, along with cist graves, at the end of the eighth century; at around the same time the cemeteries at Argos become formalized into two regions, north of the town in the area of the modern hospital and to the south around the stadium. This organization of the settlement and the military organization shown by the destruction of Asine, combined with wider PanHellenic developments discussed further below (Ch.8.6.4), resulted in and reflected further social changes which diverted displays of status from the grave to other arenas, such as the sanctuary. It is also likely that as the state developed personal display of weaponry became less common or acceptable. Certainly in terms of military organization the emergence of the state is most apparent in the Argolid in the eighth century.

8.5. Knossos

Hundreds of weapons come from the cemeteries of Knossos, continuing into the seventh century, long after they have been abandoned in central Greece. But not much else provides evidence for warriors and warfare in this period. While pictorial pottery is known earlier in EIA Knossos than elsewhere in the Aegean it does not focus on warfare and Cretan sanctuaries do not appear to receive dedications of arms and armour until the late seventh century.

In order to understand developments at Knossos, it is necessary to refer to the wider Cretan picture, although some caution must be exercised in considering Crete a unified region.

8.5.1 The Bronze Age to Iron Age transition

The background to Knossos in the EIA is difficult to reconstruct. The destruction of the palace at Knossos appears to have been considerably earlier than the destructions on the mainland, but this remains controversial (Rehak and Younger 1998, 160). Nevertheless, there is very little evidence from Knossos in the intervening period between this destruction and the earliest burials in the North Cemetery in the eleventh century. Occupation at the site certainly appears to have continued, but it is not clear what form this took. Furthermore, no burials are known from the twelfth-century settlement.

The North Cemetery was founded at the beginning of SMin (*ca.* 1050; *KNC* 639), which indicates a major disjuncture if not necessarily a disaster at Knossos (Wallace 2010, 68). Catling argued that this cemetery was founded for “heroes” on their return from travels in the eastern Mediterranean in the early eleventh century, although this interpretation rests on slender evidence (1995, 128). It is most likely to represent an affirmation of the social

order, bringing stability to Knossos after the postpalatial disruption through severance of connections to the past order, through changes in burial custom and tomb type (see Ch.4.5.1). However, it does not appear to include the disruption and re-use of earlier tombs, at least not in the initial phases of the North Cemetery.

Four North Cemetery burials with weapons date to SMin (KNS20-23), while ten other tombs with SMin activity do not appear to receive burials with weapons until later. The two most important SMin burials are KNS20 and KNS21. Catling called the men interred in these burials “men at arms” and “grandees”, as they are amongst the wealthiest in the Aegean in the eleventh century, comparable to contemporary wealthy tombs on Cyprus (1995, 126). Crielaard expanded this hypothesis to include ARG01 and EUB02 in an eastern Mediterranean network which facilitated the movement of prestige goods in this period (1998, 189-191); but Whitley heavily criticized the “biographical fallacy” of interpreting KNS20 and KNS21 as the graves of warriors who made their names in Cyprus before returning home to Knossos (2002, 219-220, 223-224). Catling’s historical deductions from these graves are not implausible, but certainly go beyond the archaeological evidence; however, Whitley’s approach can also be criticized. He argues that a new symbolic order is established in Knossos in the EIA; this is almost certainly the case, but symbolic orders rely upon grounding in reality. If the men buried in KNS20 and KNS21, or at least those who followed their example, identified as warriors but were unable to behave as warriors then the symbolic order would not have held.

From the contents of KNS20 it is clear that the primary identification of the occupant was as a warrior. All of the objects in this burial are associated with warfare, and while it has been argued that the iron dagger represents connections to Cyprus (Catling 1995, 125-126), the function of this object carries meaning as well as its material and origin. The case in KNS21 is not quite so clear for a number of reasons. Several of the grave goods are neither

weapons nor armour, the cremation of a woman was also interred in the same chamber as the male burial, and the pit cave itself includes at least three individual burials. On the basis of the mixing of the bones of the man and woman buried in the same chamber, and the third, almost empty chamber which may have been intended for one of the other of them, Catling argued that these burials were contemporaneous (1995, 125). On the analogy with EUB02, it is possible that the female burial in KNS21 represents ritual killing (Crielaard 1998, 188). Furthermore, the conspicuous destruction of the tripod is also an important element of this burial. Catling argued that this tripod was Cypriot and acquired through gift-exchange (1995, 128); Whitley agrees, but emphasizes the destruction of this object alongside the man, bringing to an end its biography of long-distance travel at the end of its final owner's life (2002, 223-224). If we are willing to accept that the female burial was a ritual killing, then we must once again consider the possibility of a war captive killed alongside her captor. The tripod may also represent spoils from a raid overseas. This interpretation is the best way to unify the finds in KNS21, and to connect it to the more simple expression of warrior status in KNS20. Difficulties still remain, as there is at least one other individual interred in KNS21, also female. If we believe these burials to be contemporary then here we must have another war captive ritually killed. However, this burial is in a separate chamber to the mixed burials and so need not have been contemporary with the earlier burials.

The remaining SMin burials with weapons at Knossos are not quite so spectacular as KNS20 and KNS21. The tradition of burial with weapons, now established, continued throughout the EIA, resulting in one of the largest number of burials with weapons in the Aegean at this time.

8.5.2 *The cemeteries in use: eleventh to seventh centuries*

The multiple uses of Knossian chamber tombs make it difficult to assess the changing patterns of deposition of weapons in burials throughout the EIA. It is clear that burials with weapons continue to be interred in the chamber tomb cemeteries at Knossos throughout their use, in significant numbers, and in every large cemetery at the site. But trends over time such as variation in deposition, association with other identities in the archaeological record, and exceptional examples of burials with weapons cannot be identified. Therefore, it is necessary to approach these burials from a different perspective to those of the areas considered above.

Fluctuation in the deposition of weapons as grave goods over time is difficult to trace at Knossos. The widespread appearance of weapons in tombs throughout the EIA is undermined by those tombs where the number of weapons deposited is low, regardless of the duration of the tomb's use – e.g. in graves such as KNS05, KNS22, and KNS49, which contained only a fragment of a dagger or a spearhead. The number of tombs with heavy concentrations of weapons, such as KNS32, KNS33, and KNS41, is low (see Ch.4.5.1). But the persistent appearance of weapons across the cemeteries of Knossos and throughout the use of those cemeteries is striking. Compared to the distribution at Athens, where there are many cemeteries without burials with weapons, and Lefkandi, where the concentration is firmly in the Toumba cemetery, the only cemetery at Knossos where chamber tombs do not contain weapons is Mavro Spelio in the seventh century. Furthermore, when a tomb has received one burial with weapons, it is more likely to receive another, and more chamber tombs have multiple burials with weapons than only one (*KNC*, 576). While the continuity of the deposition of weapons in graves is certain, what cannot be certain is the continuity of their meaning. In establishing the tradition of burial with weapons at Knossos, it is likely that the living identities of the men buried in KNS20 and KNS21 were essentially violent. But if these burials established a link between masculinity and weapons then it is possible that it

was not necessary to achieve “warrior” status through deeds and that warrior status was ascribed to all men buried in chamber tombs.

The quantity of weapons from Knossos does support a connection between a significant number of male burials and weapons. In the North Cemetery, Snodgrass identified a hierarchy of male-gendered iron objects in which weapons and tools were the most common (*KNC*, 575-576). Catling proposed a similar hierarchy based on the bronze objects, which is broadly compatible with Snodgrass’ results (*KNC*, 547-550). These tombs are already a privileged élite, as there are many tombs which contained no metal objects at all, but within this élite the association of men with weapons was incredibly common. KNS32 is the pinnacle of both of these hierarchies; its place is enhanced tremendously by the thirty iron spearheads, however it contained only one sword and two daggers. It is possible that swords and daggers were much more restricted than spears and correspondingly more prestigious (see Ch.4.5.3). But swords appear in tombs at every level of Snodgrass’ hierarchy, suggesting that they were not restricted to the wealthiest tombs. Therefore, their limited presence may rather suggest that they were used less frequently than spears. This argument relies on the assumption that weapons buried with individuals directly represent those used in combat. An alternative explanation may be that swords continued to be used by the living, perhaps passed down a line of inheritance, while spears were considered appropriate grave goods. These questions must remain open, but at Knossos widespread weapon burial favours the spear, and the sword is much more limited.

It is questionable whether weapons could have maintained their symbolic power between the eleventh and the seventh centuries without reaffirmation of their function. The suggestion was made above that in the brief duration of the Toumba cemetery at Lefkandi violence or warfare might have been necessary to maintain a certain standard of living (Ch.8.3.5); in Knossos, and perhaps also Athens, the durability of the connection between

burial with weapons and elite masculine status may have been the result of such a situation existing at these sites for a prolonged period of time. It is possible that many men at Knossos carried a spear, and a few of greater status a sword, to show their rank in daily life. But it is extremely unlikely that in over four-hundred years of burial with weapons those identifying as warriors would not have been called upon to show their ability as warriors.

There is limited evidence for pictorial pottery in EIA Knossos, but what there is presents an alternative view on the evidence from burials. The huntsman depicted on Kno01 brandishes a spear. Reading this scene entirely at face value – and it is a locally produced krater, and thus must have held some relevance for the people of Knossos – it is possible that the spears buried at Knossos represent hunting, and not warfare. A spear has already been cast, and yet the hunter holds one, suggesting that he carried a pair. The exceptional burials with swords must represent violence between humans, but it is likely that spears were associated with hunting and we should consider these men “hunters” rather than “warriors”. However, there are more complexities than the limitations of the evidence. On the other side of this vase another human figure is depicted; it is probable that he is also associated with the hunt, but although he is identically dressed to the hunter, he carries a square shield, perhaps indicating that he expected to need to defend himself against human opponents. Kno02 and Kno03 depict men in combat with lions which, while inspired by Near Eastern art, represent man dominant over nature in a similar way to the scene of the hunt. These depictions represent another way of showing violent masculine prowess besides warfare. The significance of the absence of combat between humans in Knossian art of the EIA is diminished by the limited evidence for pictorial depiction at all.

The changes in burial practice in the seventh century are far less obvious at Knossos than elsewhere in the Aegean. Kotsonas argued that changes in the number of interments in seventh-century tombs indicates that the social processes regulating burial practices were

changing (2011, 133). This change in social practices could be influenced by similar factors to the developments on the mainland, where the decrease in grave goods and consolidation of burial areas is attributed to the emergence of a sense of communal identity. The rapid increase in interments in a handful of tombs, combined with a significant decrease in burials in other tombs, may reflect the consolidation of the élite classes who were buried in these tombs into a more strictly defined group. It is important to emphasize that the main change in the seventh century was the reduction in the number of tombs in use; the practice of cremation, the tomb type, and the classes of objects given as grave goods, do not drastically change as they do at certain sites on the mainland. The changes at Knossos, while not insignificant, are unlikely to be as wide-spread as that elsewhere.

The wealthiest seventh-century chamber tombs at Knossos all contain weapons (KNS07, KNS15, KNS18, KNS33, and KNS44). KNS33 has received weapons over a period of two centuries, EPGA-LO (*KNC*, 576); this goes some way to explaining the huge numbers of weapons interred within it. KNS15 has a slightly shorter duration, with weapons covering LPGA-LO, while in KNS18 they appear from PGB to LO. It is more difficult to establish duration of use in the other tombs, as KNS07 was looted, and the association between grave goods in KNS44 is unclear, although there are weapons associated with EG and EO pottery. That these burials all maintain a tradition of burial with weapons, rather than beginning or dismissing one, is instructive. As Snodgrass suggests, this recurrent feature stresses continuity, although Kotsonas has shown that this cannot reasonably be considered to be familial, as the growth in the number of internment is so steep. It seems likely that one factor was the consolidation of an élite group, perhaps reinforced by frequent intermarriage, resulting in a reduction of the necessity and desirability of separate tombs. Other tombs which include seventh-century burials may be those of groups which went against this change or which were intentionally excluded from it.

8.5.3 The abandonment of the cemeteries ca. 630 and the Period of Silence ca. 590

Burials with weapons continue until the cemeteries at Knossos stop receiving burials at the end of the seventh century. This is in direct contrast to the other regions under consideration in this thesis. As outlined above, burials with weapons remain common in the most prestigious tombs of seventh-century Knossos; it is the abandonment of the cemeteries, and not the decline in burials with weapons, which needs explaining. Perhaps the most obvious suggestion for the abandonment of cemeteries, the abandonment or destruction of the settlement, is excluded on the basis that occupation at Knossos continues for another forty years. Therefore the answer must lie with the social changes which took place in the second half of the seventh century.

The abandonment of the cemeteries at Knossos is not an isolated occurrence. Comparing the evidence from Knossos with other areas of Crete, Erikson shows that all Cretan burials of the sixth century are more difficult to see archaeologically on the basis that they have become much more simple (2010, 253). This resembles the situation nearly a century earlier on the mainland, where burials became more simple and difficult to locate at the end of the eighth century. There is evidence for such a change at Knossos, as the number of visible burials decreases in the seventh century, although not as dramatically as elsewhere and the continuity is more striking in comparison to other Aegean sites (*KNC*, 660-664). At Prinias, before the site is destroyed *ca.* 600, there is evidence that individual burials began to be favoured over group tombs; if this was also the situation at Knossos then it would represent the breaking down of the tightened élite social groups of the earlier seventh century. The difficulty with this hypothesis is that it relies on association with Prinias, which may or may not be valid – individual seventh-century burials have not been discovered at Knossos.

Based on the evidence from central Greece, an association between the decline in burials with weapons and the contemporary rise of the dedications of weapons at PanHellenic sanctuaries has been assumed. Such an association cannot hold for Crete. It does appear to be the case that dedications of armour – not weapons – became more popular as burials with weapons decline in the second half of the seventh century (Hoffmann 1972, 41-46; Prent 2005, 703 Table 4; Ch.4.5.3), and these dedications tend to appear in urban rather than extra-urban sanctuaries, with the exception of Palaikastro (Prent 2005, 384). But neither of the urban sanctuaries known in the area of Knossos received dedications of weapons.⁸² It is possible that Cretan weapons could have been dedicated at PanHellenic sanctuaries such as Olympia and Delphi from the late eighth century, continuing parallel to burial with weapons. The Cretan connection to Delphi is much stronger than to Olympia. The cult of Apollo is attributed Cretan origins in the Homeric Hymn, and there are a small proportion of early Cretan bronzes at the site, including shields (Morgan 1990, 142-146). In terms of armour, however, there is only a helmet at Delphi and a cuirass at Olympia (Prent 2005, 387). Furthermore, as Prent argues, there is no guarantee that Cretan armour was dedicated by Cretans. If dedications of armour are *skylai* then all we can say of the dedications of Cretan armour is that they were taken by those who defeated Cretans. As the votives in question are usually *armour* while burials more frequently preserve *weapons* it is important to emphasize that this signifies changing of both warfare and dedicatory practices. This change in focus is especially noticeable if the weapons at Knossos are associated with hunting rather than warfare.

It is not necessarily the case that behaviour at Knossos was the same as in other regions of Crete. The absence of dedications of weapons in Knossian urban sanctuaries is one

⁸² This absence of weapon dedications may be a result of the gods involved – Demeter, Kore, and Rhea are not generally associated with weapons as votives. Where weapon dedications do occur on Crete, the gods worshipped are usually unclear, with the exceptions of Zeus at Palaikastro and Athena at Gortyn.

indication of this difference. Furthermore, while the evidence from Knossos once led to the assumption that there was an island-wide recession in the period 600-400, more recent studies indicate that only Knossos completely lacks evidence for the period ca. 590-525 (Erickson 2010, 235-243). A number of explanations have been proposed for this period of silence. Hall, likening the situation to seventh-century Athens, suggests that conservatism and a communal focus in Cretan society made their behaviour less archaeologically visible (2013, 194-198). But this does not account for the extraordinary absence of evidence from Knossos throughout much of the sixth century.

The destruction of Prinias, ca. 600, lends support to the interpretation that Knossos too was destroyed a little later, perhaps by Lyktos or Gortyn (Erickson 2010, 238-243). As in the Argolid a century earlier, there must be specific reason for one site to both choose to and be capable of destroying another (Ch.8.4.4); later evidence suggests that Gortyn may have had Spartan help (Perlman 2000, 67-71). The absence of evidence from Knossos after ca. 590 suggests that it cannot have been immediately reoccupied or settled by those who destroyed it, although the former is perhaps possible on a much reduced scale. It seems likely that the changes in burial practice ca. 630 indicate not only social changes but a significant downsizing of the settlement, which may have made it appear weaker to a rival.

8.5.4 *Knossos: Conclusions*

While there is limited evidence for continuity between the LBA and EIA at Knossos, the prevalence of spears, many of which could have been javelins, and the limited pictorial decoration indicate that the association of hunting with warrior identity persisted. In the LBA hunting and warfare were strongly connected, and this appears to remain the case in EIA Knossos. The limited occurrence of swords and daggers support an interpretation of the evidence which includes both violence against nature and violence against other humans. The

line between hunting and warfare, both symbolically and in practice, is thin. It is possible that at Knossos hunting was training for boys who in adulthood would be expected to engage in warfare,⁸³ but the evidence is not strong enough to show this.

At Knossos this form of acquiring status is persistent. Burials with weapons begin in the eleventh century and then persist until towards the end of the seventh, a period of around four-hundred years with little change in practice over this period. Such continuity implies a level of stability at Knossos which is certainly not present in other regions for this long with the same level of prosperity; the Argolid remains reasonably consistent, but poor, throughout much of the EIA, while Athens may be stable from the eleventh to the ninth century, before major upheavals take place. At Knossos, changes are limited and when they do occur they appear to end in disaster. The seventh-century consolidation of élite burials in a few tombs is matched by the continued presence of weapons in these graves until the very end. There is no evidence that the élite males of Knossos felt that it was necessary to take their display of weapons to public spaces such as the sanctuary; where this does occur on Crete, armour and not weapons is dedicated. It is unclear what brought this social structure to an end. It was not destruction, which the social changes failed to prevent in the early sixth century. Whatever it was, Knossos remained an exception to trends on the mainland and elsewhere on Crete until the end of the seventh century.

8.6 THE AEGEAN WORLD

The approach thus far has taken each region separately, in order to highlight local developments throughout the EIA. In order to fully understand the importance of warriors and warfare in these regions and the rest of the Aegean world a synchronized view will now

⁸³ As outlined by Langdon for other regions in later periods (2008, 103-104, 240-242). This is radically altered in the late eighth century when the hunter is depicted returning with his catch rather than actively engaged in hunting – he had been domesticated (Langdon 2008, 255-256). The Knossian hunters, who are in combat with animals, represent an earlier stage, where manhood lies in the wilderness.

be taken, focusing on the regions considered in detail above, but incorporating evidence from other regions where it is appropriate or useful.

8.6.1 The Bronze Age to Iron Age Transition

In all of the regions discussed in detail in this thesis the EIA begins with the foundation of several new cemeteries. In each of these cemeteries one of the first burials is always a man buried with weapons. In the case of Tiryns, Papadimitriou has attempted to date several significant deposits to a single, Submycenaean phase, in which the Tirynthians were redefining their past and their relationship to it (2006). There is significant valid criticism for the term “Submycenaean” (Rutter 1978; Papadopoulos *et al.* 2011), but this does not mean that the transition from “LBA” to “EIA” is insignificant. The foundation of these cemeteries marks the beginning of a new era, regardless of the metallurgical developments. Morris describes this process in terms of a collapse of symbolic order and subsequent chaos, followed by redefinition (2000, 201-2). A new conception of what constitutes high-status burial emerges, including a new kind of warrior beginning in the middle of the eleventh century.

It is clear that there is no direct continuity in any one area from the burials with weapons in the twelfth century to those in the eleventh. But it is not immediately obvious why these burials should be defined so differently to the whole corpus of twelfth-century burials with weapons, and the absence of continuity explained by the limited evidence rather than the social, symbolic, and cultural changes. As concluded in Ch.3.7, the evidence for burials with weapons in the postpalatial period has been somewhat exaggerated, and while in Achaia and perhaps Crete these burials were important, elsewhere the evidence is more sporadic. The definitive example is Perati, where three weapons appear in around two-hundred tombs containing up to six-hundred burials over a period of a century or more.

Rather than being exceptional élites, these burials are too limited to have significance. While the absolute number of burials with weapons in EIA Athens remains small, the contrast with Perati is significant. The duration of the cemeteries and burials with weapons, which cover several centuries, is significantly greater than at Perati. But at the beginning of the Iron Age Athens is not typical. While the Kerameikos is a new cemetery the initial focus of this cemetery is not a burial with weapons. For the new EIA definition of “warrior”, we must look elsewhere.

The three most significant burials are ARG01, KNS20, and KNS21. These burials appear to be the earliest, or amongst the earliest, burials with weapons in their respective cemeteries, marking the beginning of a new era at Tiryns and Knossos. They share symbolism, but are far from identical: ARG01 and KNS21 are multiple burials of men and women; KNS20 and KNS21 are cremations; all three contain weapons but while ARG01 and KNS20 combine iron and bronze, in KNS21 they are all bronze. Catling highlighted the similarity of these burials to several contemporary Cypriot burials of comparable importance and construction, such as Kourion-Kaloriziki Tomb 40 (Catling 1995, 126-127), while Crielaard proposed a larger and more durable system of connections across the Mediterranean in the eleventh and tenth centuries (1998). The Cypriot burials, like their Aegean counterparts, are all amongst the richest and often the earliest of the cemeteries in which they are found (Coldstream 1989, 333). One consequence of the “symbolic chaos” was that groups reached out to look for new cultural symbols and meaning beyond their immediate spheres of contact, resulting in similar symbols in a number of élite burials in the eleventh century.

Catling and Crielaard both incorporate EUB02 into their arguments, without much account of the fact that this burial is some fifty to one-hundred years later than the Tiryns and Knossos burials. The contemporary Skoubris cemetery does not appear to have a major, founding, élite burial, unless such a burial exists in the unexcavated parts of the cemetery.

The evidence from EUB01, which is not on the same scale as KNS21 in wealth nor ARG01 and KNS20 in “warrior” equipment, suggests that Lefkandi was part of the network, but played a much smaller part until the middle of the tenth century. Similarly, while burials with weapons in Athens superficially resemble those elsewhere, two major elements are absent: antiques and imports. It is possible that Athens and Lefkandi were minor nodes in this élite network, but the material evidence for this network was rarely deposited in graves. It is more likely that no such significant event occurred until the foundation of the Toumba cemetery, beginning with EUB02. On the other hand, in terms of the burials with weapons themselves, Athenian practice shows connections to Lefkandi (see below, Ch.8.6.2-3). While at Tiryns burial with weapons does not become a tradition, at Athens and Lefkandi it starts slowly and then gains momentum, and the delayed contribution of Lefkandi to these spectacular élite burials is by far the most extravagant.

The burial at Tiryns shows significant differences to the other burials with weapons under consideration. Primarily, although there are a few burials with weapons in the Argolid in the subsequent centuries, it does not inspire a tradition in the way in which the Knossian and later Lefkandiot burials do. It is possible that the other main difference, the lack of cremation, is connected: ARG01 does not break with the past *enough*. On the other hand, the Argolid is out of the way, less able to connect to the eastern Mediterranean network, and ultimately is not as prosperous as the other sites at which burials with weapons occur.

Burial with weapons is not the only new symbolic element at the beginning of the Iron Age and it may not be the most important. Catling and Crielaard emphasize the beginning of a new cemetery, the use of cremation as a means of social distinction, and a conspicuous taste for antiques as important factors alongside weapons. Cremation, previously a minority rite, is an important element at Knossos, Athens, and Lefkandi, but not at Tiryns. Cremation is an important way in which LBA and EIA burials with weapons are distinct

(Whitley 2002, 226-7). But cremation is a developing rite in the first century of the EIA, with experiments at Lefkandi and in the Argolid, the latter of which do not come to fruition (Crielaard 1998, 189). The evidence from Athens (ATT01-02), Lefkandi (EUB04, EUB18), and Tiryns (ARG01) also makes it clear that cremation is not intimately associated with burial with weapons, but that these two phenomena both grow in popularity in EPG. Of the sites covered in this thesis it is only Athens and Knossos where the two become inseparable; however, this appears to be the case elsewhere on Crete and in northern Greece as well. Where Aegean societies were on the lookout for new symbols and meaning cremation was adopted, alongside burial with weapons. While Catling purposefully does not engage with the origins of these new symbols (1995, 127) and Whitley considers the debate futile (2002, 227), the symbolic meaning of weapons must be connected to their function.

A contrast may be found in burials with weapons in other regions of the Aegean, particularly Elis. While ARG01, KNS20, and KNS21 reach out to new symbols, AEG01 and AEG02 consciously hold on to old symbols, even though they are also in a new eleventh-century cemetery. These are the last graves known to have received bronze swords of Aegean types, consciously rejecting the intrusive *griffzungenschwert* popular in neighbouring Achaia (Eder 2001, 85). However, even in Elis there are non-Mycenaean dress-ornaments making their way into graves (Eder 1999, 263). Eder argues that these burials are the beginning of a tradition of burial with weapons at Elis, but subsequent burials are limited in western EIA Greece until the eighth century (Eder 2006, 560-561). Therefore with the evidence currently available it is impossible to know whether the Mycenaean elements of these burials persisted into the EIA or not.

The treatment of the women buried alongside these “warriors” offers compelling evidence for our understanding of the emerging symbolism of the EIA. The archetype is the latest of all, EUB02, where the woman is believed to have been ritually killed and receives

different treatment to the male burial – she is inhumed while he is cremated. ARG01 and KNS21 are thus distinguished as the female burials in these tombs are treated in the same way as the male, although in ARG01 the female receives few burial gifts. If we accept that these graves have similar symbolic meanings and furthermore that the female burial in EUB02 is likely to have been a war captive, then Catling’s argument that these individuals are “heroes returned” provides the origins of the symbols: a powerful individual becomes a symbol of masculinity, which later males of the same cemetery follow. The only sites at which this symbol is maintained are Lefkandi and Athens. It is possible that at Knossos it develops into a broader concept of masculinity which incorporates hunting, an aspect absent at the other sites. But Lefkandi maintained the association of burial with weapons, exotic objects, and female burials, while Athens has a longer tradition of burials with weapons. On the other hand, at Tiryns it appears that it was not possible to keep the tradition going.

8.6.2 *Warriors and warfare between the eleventh and ninth centuries*

In Chapter 1 it was proposed that warfare in the EIA was generally of a much smaller scale than in the preceding and subsequent periods. Raids led by “warriors” were the main form of warfare in this period. The evidence presented by this thesis suggests further limitations on this definition. After the earliest period outlined above the evidence for warfare, even on the smallest of scales, disappears from most of the Aegean. It is difficult to imagine who in the Argolid before the eighth century was in a position to organize a raid; the same is true of Lefkandi before the middle of the tenth century. Besides the areas focused on in this thesis burials with weapons appear regularly in Thessaly and Macedonia from the tenth century, but they are rare anywhere else before the eighth century. The exception is Crete, where burials with weapons are common throughout the EIA until the end of the seventh century; but as outlined above in the case of Knossos, it is possible that the emphasis on Crete was hunting rather than warfare.

From SMyc in Athens, and slightly later in Lefkandi, elite masculine identity and authority was expressed through burial with weapons. Whitley argued that these burials were analogous to Anglo-Saxon burials, holding a symbolic function, but were not necessarily the burials of “warriors” (2002, 218-220). In Anglo-Saxon burials 9% of those buried with weapons are juveniles, including one individual only twelve months old (Härke 1992, 150-155), but Anglo-Saxon weapon burials are very different to those in EIA Greece, which do not include any certainly pre-pubescent individuals, with the possible exceptions of ATT38 and EUB05. Furthermore, the symbolic function of these burials does not arise without an ideology connecting masculine aggression with political power amongst the living. From the point of view of the Mycenaean world, Harrell argues that violence functioned as a means of social and political control, expressed through the “consumption of martial culture” in burials with weapons and supported by a belligerent honour culture manifest in the *Iliad* (Harrell 2009, 210-212). The same “consumption” occurs in EIA Athens and Lefkandi, and forms the legitimizing force behind burials such as EUB02. In order to remain powerful those individuals identifying as warriors in death needed to show this status in life, through acts of violence. The symbolism of weapons arises from their function and is reinforced through practice of this function (Treherne 1995, 113-117). The limited accessibility of burial with weapons implies an achieved identity, accessible to only a handful of mature individuals, and connected to political legitimacy which arose from and was reinforced by practice in life, giving the individuals to be buried with weapons a claim to authority.

What form this violence took is difficult to recreate. At Knossos it was argued above that the emphasis could have been on hunting rather than warfare. The line between these activities is fairly thin in the LBA, when it appears that hunting was a major part of the warrior lifestyle (e.g. Papadopoulos, Th. and Kontorli-Papadopoulou 2001, 128; Harrell

2009, 211). It is possible that in Knossos the main way through which authority was legitimized was through the provision and consumption of meat.

It has been argued that at Lefkandi there is evidence for the capture of women and perhaps objects, as well as the implication that overseas violence was one of the ways in which the élites of this society maintained their power. In Athens, there is considerably less evidence for overseas violence. If we accept that the settlement comprised sporadically organized villages associated with each cemetery, and project backwards from some of the earliest depictions on pottery in MG II, we could suggest that these villages reinforced their relationship and the connections between the individuals there through duels as depicted on stands such as Ath03. On the other hand, another early pictorial scene on krater Ath02 depicts what appears to be a captured woman and a pair of Dipylon shields on the boat, indicating overseas activity and captured women, as has been suggested at Lefkandi. Therefore, if we project backwards from pottery the differences between Athens and Lefkandi are of scale and duration, not activity; however, the greater centralized control exhibited by the élite at Lefkandi may have limited the need for duels. This argument provides support for Raaflaub's assertion that EIA warfare comprised of raids by warrior bands as seen in the Homeric epics (Raaflaub 1999, 129). Those men who were permitted burial with weapons achieved their political legitimacy through acts of aggression in the form of the organization of raids, on a scale from local activity to overseas expeditions. While it seems probable that there was some kind of limitation on these bands based on social status, the greater limitation on burial with weapons suggests that it was only those with a reputation which allowed them to organize these expeditions who were permitted such a burial. Therefore, we cannot assume that the individuals involved were only those of the same social rank as their leaders. The burials with weapons which lay beyond the usual limits of these burials – the pithoi at Tiryns, and EUB18

in the East Cemetery at Lefkandi – may indicate that in rare instances, recruits were drawn from different social groups.

In the Argolid there is very little evidence before the eighth century. It is possible that the few burials with weapons from Tiryns in PG were comparable to those from Athens and Lefkandi which claimed authority through violence either locally or overseas. The impressive but ineffectual helmets emphasize that the appearance of a warrior was an important part of masculine identity in Argive society. Warrior identity was ultimately manifest through an act of extreme violence, the destruction of another settlement. It is clear that in the Argolid the practical function of weaponry and armour was as important as the symbolic masculinity.

The concern with appearance is not as clear in the EIA as it was in LBA burials with weapons. LBA warriors were regularly buried with razors and tweezers, but in the EIA burials discussed in this thesis there are only two razors, in ATT50 and EUB02, and pairs of tweezers in ATT44, KNS06, KNS15, KNS16, KNS18, KNS33, KNS37, KNS42, KNS44, and KNS51. In all of these cases except for ATT44 the burials are cremations, in which the body of the warrior is destroyed. However, this evidence fits with a modified version of Whitley's hypothesis – the warrior is made beautiful in order to be destroyed along with other beautiful things.

Several explanations have been proposed for the absence of defensive equipment in EIA burials with weapons. It is possible that shields were in limited use until the eighth century, when they are depicted widely on pottery and shield-like objects are dedicated in the Idaean Cave on Crete. Limited EIA use is indicated by the handful of *phalara* which can be reasonably interpreted as shield-bosses and the depiction of a man with a shield on Kno01. There is good evidence to suggest that Dipylon shields were constructed of wicker or hide, perishable materials which were unlikely to survive either the cremation pyre or the centuries

between burial and excavation (Ahlberg 1971a, 60; Greenhalgh 1973, 65-67). On the other hand, it is possible that shields were not an important part of the warrior's appearance; van Wees argued that shields and helmets would only be entirely invisible if they did not have metal attachments, and that weapons but not armour appear in burials because these were worn in daily life, while shields and armour were reserved for the battlefield (1998a, 339-340). The emphasis on weapons rather than armour suggests aggression rather than defence (Treherne 1995, 127-128). There remains an assumption that men must have fought with shields, despite the fact that many of those depicted in LG combat scenes fight without them. The likelihood is that the limited archaeological evidence reflects limited use of defensive equipment in the EIA. The fortification of Asine in the eighth century and Argos in the seventh suggests that this armour represents a broader interest in defence over aggression in the early Archaic Period.

Finally the role of the cavalry in EIA warfare must be addressed. Cavalry has received little attention in this thesis, broadly speaking because the evidence for it is minimal. The main argument for the importance of cavalry in EIA Greece is the assertion of Aristotle that an élite consisting of cavalry succeeded the monarchies of early Greece (Arist. *Pol.* 1297b16). Braüning follows Aristotle and supports his argument with the incredibly limited evidence of ATT22 and EUB02 (1995, 102). Meanwhile, D'Onofrio connects the length of swords to an élite which fought either from horseback or chariots (2011, 650-653). Once again, the basis is only ATT22 and EUB02; none of the other long swords are associated with horses. Greenhalgh argues that it was a conscious decision on the part of LG artists to replace men on horseback with more heroic chariots (1973), although he does not argue that these men fought from horseback; rather these horsemen rode to the battle, or between combats, while dismounting to fight – as chariots are used in the Homeric epics. An over-reliance on Aristotle has led to a belief that hoplite warfare replaced cavalry fighting, and this has been

dated to the late eighth century. The arguments for a “hoplite revolution” at the end of the eighth century cannot be confirmed by archaeology, and are usually contradicted by it (see below, Ch.8.6.5), while Aristotle’s approach is teleological and evolutionary; modern scholars who focus on this fail to acknowledge the strong evidence for cavalry alongside hoplites as late as the fifth century (van Wees 2004, 63-68). Even if we take Aristotle’s pronouncement at face value, we should not place this period of mounted conflict before the eighth century; it is more likely to post-date it. As Greenhalgh states: “It is valid to ask how much he [Aristotle] could have known about pre-hoplite warfare” (1973, 75).

The limited archaeological evidence for horses or riders undermines any suggestion that this period was dominated by cavalry. ATT22 and EUB02 are most frequently used as evidence for mounted warriors, while KNS32 and KNS42 each also contained part of a horse’s bit. From the graves examined in this thesis there is no further evidence for horses; in fact, what is most noticeable is that with the exception of EUB02 where there are horse burials, such as Lefkandi Toumba Tomb 68 and Tombs F and 79 at Knossos, they are not associated with burials with weapons. In his examination of the weapons in Thessaly, a region later famed for its cavalry, Georganas also observed that there was absolutely no evidence for cavalry in these burials either (2005, 73). While the absence of evidence does not show that there was no cavalry combat, it strongly suggests that this was the case.

The iconographic evidence also offers only limited support for LG cavalry combat, as noted by Greenhalgh. Furthermore, even seventh-century depictions of riders are limited (Rombos 1988, 168 Table 26, 182 Table 27). The occasional depiction of an armed figure on horseback should not be taken as evidence for fighting from horseback in combat. The exception is the earlier of the Parian amphorai, which depicts men on horseback brandishing spears; they are largely removed from the action, although at the centre of side B of the frieze a corpse lays in the field above a horseman. On the later amphora, which depicts battle over a

fallen warrior in the middle of combat, the horsemen are at the back of the line, again removed from the combat. If the former amphora is interpreted as a depiction of a raid, while the latter is massed combat, it appears as if horses may have been used in raids, where speed was important, and not in close-combat. This development may have occurred later than the scenes depicted on Athenian grave markers, which in certain circumstances appear to show raids but do not include horses. As for chariots, the evidence for their use is also limited in vase painting. Again, the earlier Parian amphora shows a chariot in the middle of a raid, but chariots are obscured by the fragmentary nature of Athenian pottery (Ahlberg 1971a, 16, 19). Ath10 perhaps provides an exception, but it is probable that the figure mounting the chariot is part of a different scene to the individual in combat (Dahm 2007, 726-728). It appears that the chariots and horses ridden in processions in LG pottery reflect neither contemporary nor earlier practices in combat, except perhaps as far as transport to the battlefield was concerned.

8.6.3 *The intentional destruction of grave goods*

While the metal from which Swo084 in KNS21 is made distinguished it from Swo035 in KNS20, the two weapons are treated in very similar ways. Both of these swords are twisted and broken into pieces; Catling describes Swo084 as ritually killed (KNC, 518). In KNS21 the sword is not singled out; the rod tripod is also destroyed, and the poor condition of most of the finds in the graves is explicable through intentional destruction and burning as part of the cremation of the man. It is possible that the female burials were also destroyed with the male, if we take them as sacrifices. In KNS20 the other objects are not so badly damaged and it is possible in this case that the dagger is singled out for special treatment. The act of intentionally destroying grave goods is another way in which EIA burials with weapons are distinguished from those in the LBA.

Grave goods, including swords, are known to have been intentionally destroyed in the LBA (Åström 1987). Examples are known from Messenia in the fifteenth century and it is possible that the condition of the swords in the shaft graves of Grave Circle A at Mycenae can be explained by intentional destruction.⁸⁴ The phenomenon has disappeared by LH IIIC; none of the swords in the postpalatial burials with weapons have been reported in a way which suggests intentional destruction. In the EIA the practice has been linked to cremation (Whitley 2002, 227), the intentional destruction of the body (Rebay-Salisbury 2010). While it is true that all of the intentionally destroyed weapons known from EIA Greece occurred in cremation burials, the connection is not the whole story. In some cremations the weapons do not appear to have received exceptional treatment, while in others the sword is clearly the focus of a specific rite.

The destruction of weapons has been described as ritual “killing”, a term always used in unattributed quotation marks (e.g. Whitley 2002, 223; Georganas 2005, 70). The term “killed” carries an unintentional subjective interpretation. For the sword to be “killed” it must once have been “alive”; the sword is so entwined with its owner that when *he* dies so must *it* die (Desborough 1972, 312). A more nuanced version of this approach is taken by Whitley, who explains the destruction of the deceased and the grave goods as a “blaze of glory” (2002). The favoured alternative is much simpler: the sword is bent out of shape so that it “fits” in the grave (Snodgrass 1999, 37; Smithson 1974, 341; *KNC*, 518).

The evidence encourages a more nuanced approach. The “ritual killing” of these weapons actually comprises of three separate but related acts. The most obvious examples are those from Athenian and Euboean graves which have been bent out of shape, usually into a circle but also in half, or in one instance into an “S” shape (Plates 7a, 8c, 10b, 11d, 13d). Examples like these are also known from Cyprus, Thessaly, and throughout Crete. In some

⁸⁴ This observation was made by Katherine Harrell (pers. comm).

Cretan instances, such as Spe119 (Plate 20d), although the only possible example of this practice in central Greece is the bronze spearhead from EUB25. Other swords are broken into pieces, such as those from KNS20 and KNS21. It is questionable how far this damage is intentional rather than the result of post-depositional corrosion. For example, Swo111 in ATT18 was excavated broken, but as this grave is an inhumation if we interpret this as intentional damage to the weapon then this practice is disassociated from cremation. Similarly, the preservation of wooden scabbards on a number of broken swords (e.g. the sword in EUB02) might indicate that they were not broken when they were placed in the grave. Finally, the burning of weapons and other objects along with the cremated deceased may also be a kind of intentional destruction.

There is surely a difference between the three practices of intentionally destroying weapons (bending, breaking, and burning) which may be ritual, functional, or accidental. Discussions of this phenomenon have not, in my view, resolved the varieties of this issue. Besides the different ways of intentionally destroying weapons there are also geographical and temporal differences. It is unlikely that any of the swords from the Argolid are intentionally destroyed, which is likely to be connected to the absence of cremation in the Argolid. At Knossos, while weapons are frequently discovered broken, it appears that spearhead, not swords, were those bent out of shape. Furthermore, destroyed weapons appear throughout the use of the Knossian tombs, but it is not until LPG that they appear at Athens or Lefkandi, and these cease in the late ninth century. In Athens it appears to have ended at some time prior to the resumption of inhumation; Swo086 in the EG II grave ATT23 may indicate the beginning of this trend. At Lefkandi the cemeteries come to an end at the same time as intentional destruction ceases in Athens, but the weapons in the West Gate Cemetery burials at Eretria are also intentionally destroyed, suggesting either a longer duration of this rite or a revival at the end of the eighth century. Meanwhile, weapons in poor condition,

perhaps intentionally destroyed, appear in seventh-century Knossian graves; there is also at least one seventh-century grave with intentionally destroyed weapons in Thessaly (Tziafalias 1978, 181-182).

There is an emphasis on the sword in Attica and Euboea which is not present at Knossos. Spears certainly must have been destroyed in order to fit in many of these graves, although this is not an explanation for their destruction.⁸⁵ The difference between the spear and the sword in these contexts is that the wooden shaft of the spear is easy to destroy or dispose of, especially if the deceased is being cremated, through burning or detachment of the metal parts; however, if the sword is bent out of shape then it must be the focus of a smith. Therefore, spearheads cannot receive the same level of attention as swords when it comes to the intentional destruction of weapons, with the possible exception of Spe013 and several others from regions not covered by this thesis. This argument also applies to arrowheads and *phalara* as shield-bosses, which may also have been destroyed through dismantling or the destruction of a perishable part of the object in cremation (Lemos 2002, 124; but see Ch.1.3.1.3 on *phalara*).

The best example of the emphasis on the sword is EUB08. In this burial virtually every grave good has been burned on the funeral pyre, with the exception of the cloth which wrapped the ashes, the cauldron which contained them, and two oinochoai which may have been used to quench the pyre. Even the oinochoai were smashed when they were placed into the grave. This particular act of destruction, where the objects are consumed in a “blaze of glory”, to use Whitley’s phrase, does not explain why it was necessary, in addition to all of this, for the sword to be bent out of shape.

⁸⁵ This has also been recognized in Bronze Age contexts (Tsontas 1897, 147).

It is important to address how these swords were bent out of shape. D’Onofrio suggests focusing “on the weapons themselves, on their intrinsic meaning, on their indissoluble connection to the buried individual, and on the fact that the desired warping had to be carried out by a smith, by heating and hammering, contributing to the lavishness of the funerary ceremony” (2011, 651). In order to bend an iron sword in this way it requires the iron to be ductile, otherwise the sword will snap; this ductility means that the sword is unlikely to shatter in combat, but it would be considerably less hard and efficient (Haarer 2000, 221). Haarer draws a parallel with the Icelandic *Laxdeala Saga* where the hero Kjartan must straighten his iron sword beneath his foot and thus, despite the power behind his blows, is killed. It is perhaps an improvement in iron technology which brings to an end the practice of bending weapons. On the other hand, the symbolic power of iron may also have been of importance; a deliberate show of destruction which this ductile iron would allow would be beyond the means of many in EIA Greece. It is possible that swords were destroyed simply as a means of displaying great power and control.

The usual explanations for the intentional destruction of these weapons, their connection to the deceased or fitting them in the grave, are unsatisfactory. The latter explanation is easily debunked. The argument that the sword must be bent to fit into small graves is teleological. If the issue of “fitting” the sword were a major concern, it would have been much easier to have exhumed larger graves. The near contemporary Agora graves ATT21 (LPG) and ATT22 (EG I) provide an adequate contrast. The preserved dimensions of the trench of ATT22 are *ca.* 90 cm long by *ca.* 60 cm wide, while Swo114 is 88.3 cm long, which would have fit into this trench. Swo101 in ATT21, while smaller than Swo114, was not bent and fits into the trench, which was large enough to contain it (Plate 7b). Furthermore, ATT13 contained ‘killed’ iron dagger Swo038, further suggesting that space

was not the main concern. Limited space offers no explanation for the necessity of bending some weapons out of shape and not others.

The examples of ATT21 and ATT22 also serve as illustrative examples of how the destruction of swords cannot simply relate to the connection between the sword and its owner. Some explanation is required for why the owner of Swo101 in ATT21 was not as close to his sword as the man in ATT22 was to Swo114. The distinction is not chronological; ATT13 and EUB03 are also LPG burials, but the swords in them are bent out of shape. In fact, of thirty-two burials containing swords from Athens in the EIA only seven and one dagger are bent out of shape, while nine more are broken. At Lefkandi there are three swords bent out of shape and five burnt on funeral pyres. It is only Eretria where all of the swords are treated the same and bent out of shape.

Fear of pollution may explain the destruction of these swords (Grinsell 1961, 477), especially if the deceased were killed on the battlefield as this might indicate that the weapons were bad luck. Åström suggests that weapons may be destroyed from the fear that the dead would use them (1987, 216-7). However, none of these explanations satisfactorily explain the selectivity of the destruction of weapons in Athens and Lefkandi, and the limited duration of this ritual in Athens. These burials may have required extra attention as a result of the circumstances of their death, like the rich Athenian lady who died in pregnancy, leading to the destruction of their weapons. The absence of these circumstances resulted in the lack of destruction of other swords. There are many possible circumstances: death on the battlefield; difficulties in inheritance; defeat in a dual.

The intentional destruction of weapons has important symbolic value; occurring at the pinnacle of burials with weapons, when it is most common and perhaps most prestigious. These are usually weapons of iron, which may still have been a valuable commodity in the

late tenth and early ninth century, and adds significantly to the importance of this act. It could be connected to the wealth of the participants, their social importance and their ability to manage the resource of iron. However, ritual and symbolic importance cannot be excluded from consideration. It is likely that the treatment of weapons had some association with their function; the possibilities are numerous and it is impossible to distinguish which is most likely.

The destroyed weapons at Eretria are a separate matter. The absence of evidence between the early eighth-century burial EUB23, which included a damaged sword, and the late eighth-century West Gate burials, of which EUB25 and EUB28 contained several damaged swords, suggests that this could be a new tradition. Furthermore, the arms and armour which are dedicated at Olympia and Kalapodi from the late eighth century also include objects which were intentionally destroyed, including armour and spearheads. This is considered below within the context of warfare in the late eighth and seventh centuries.

8.6.4 Warfare and society in the eighth century

Significant changes took place during the eighth century both in the social role and the practice of warfare. In Athenian vase painting, depictions of battles adjust their emphasis from the middle of the battle with no indicator of who would be victorious in MG II, to the utter defeat of one side by the *flourit* in LG Ia (Ahlberg 1971a, 72). Then, from LG Ib, combat scenes all but disappear from Athenian vase painting. Perhaps the most significant change in Athens is that the majority of figured scenes in LG Ia and later are known from grave markers. These scenes would have remained on public display for some time; they were an important part of preserving the memory of the deceased and fixing in the minds of observers the social role of the warrior.

The change in the Athenian perspective is marked and important. It is no longer the battle which matters, it is the victory. This is especially evident where the scene is post-battle disarmament of defeated warriors, as on Ath07 (Ahlberg 1971a, 21-25). Elsewhere, the later of the two amphorai from the Paros *polyandrion* shows two opposing armies fighting over the body of a dead warrior on the belly, the removal of the deceased from the battlefield on the shoulder, and his prothesis scene on the neck of the amphora. It certainly seems to reflect an emphasis on victory and defeat, but more importantly it shows concern for the body and the equipment of the battlefield dead – appropriate imagery for a *polyandrion*. The dead man on this amphora is unarmed, as are most of the deceased in Athenian LG pictorial pottery. The exceptions are those in the midst of battle who are perhaps only just dead, as on Ath04. The emphasis in LG pictorial reflect genuine concerns in the warfare of eighth-century Greece, and the changes in emphasis between the earlier and later pottery suggests that ideas were developing throughout the century. The treatment of war dead is becoming more important. In light of the destruction of Asine, it appears that this is the result of warfare growing more important, larger in scale, and integral to the development of communities in the eighth century. The burials with weapons and dedication of weapons in sanctuaries in the eighth century should be approached with this in mind.

The limited evidence of battlefield activity permits certain speculation about the biography of weapons before they are buried or dedicated. If the arms and armour in burials or sanctuaries were used, then we should question how they came to end up in a burial or a sanctuary. One approach is to consider the dedicant: either these weapons are buried with or dedicated by the man who fought with them, or they are the equipment of another man whose weapons and armour were stripped from his body after he had been killed in combat. The pictorial evidence implies that this form of booty, *skylā*, was taken from the battlefield and inscriptions indicate that dedications of personal armour were rare before the fourth century

(Pritchett 1979, 249). As the eighth century conception of warfare focused on the defeat of the enemy, it is likely that many of the dedications of weapons were *skyla*. This proposal is supported by the conception of the warrior. Both Whitley and Treherne emphasize that burials with weapons suggest a relationship between beautiful death and warrior status (Treherne 1995, 123-124; Whitley 2002, 227). In the Homeric epics this death is on the battlefield, but protected from defilement or the stripping of armour. One way in which this is made clear is the fear of mutilation (Treherne 1995, 123); another is the importance attached to cremation in armour (*Il.* 6.414-420; Pritchett 1979, 277-278). While in defeating an enemy the aim is to strip his armour and mutilate the corpse, avoiding this fate is the aim of the individual and his allies.

The later literary and epigraphic evidence for *skyla* focuses on dedications in sanctuaries, but it is possible that it is evident in the latest burials with weapons. It is not quite the case that dedications of weapons appear only as burials with weapons decline; in Argos and Corinth burials with weapons are a relatively recent phenomenon and continue as dedications at Olympia increase in the late eighth century, even though these are sites with strong connections to Olympia and may have been early dedicants of weapons and armour. At the very end of the eighth century there appears to be a revival of burial with weapons at Eretria; meanwhile sanctuary dedications, while they begin in the late eighth century, do not become prominent until the second half of the seventh century. One aspect of the change is that the focus is shifting from the private sphere of the grave to the public sphere of the sanctuary (Snodgrass 1980, 106); but this simple change masks a number of other concurrent developments in the Aegean in the religious, public, private, and military spheres.

It is important to emphasize that it is not simply a change in the trend of the disposal of weapons, but of many other metal objects which had once appeared in graves. Certain aspects remain unchanged, such as the importance of parting from valuable objects and

removing them from circulation (Morris 1986b, 12). The change from private to public dedication is interpreted as a response to communal pressures from the emerging *polis* – élites continue to consume their wealth competitively but as dedications to the gods this can be presented as being for the communal good (Morris 1986b, 12; Snodgrass 2006c, 265-266). It has been suggested that armour dedications “particularly reflect the role of the individual as citizen” (Morgan 1990, 217); the dedication of weapons has even been connected to the hoplite ideal of the citizen-warrior (Baitinger 2011, 128-9). But these dedications are still being manipulated by the élite, using exotic and valuable goods to display their power in public spaces (Morris 2000, 278-279). Arms and especially armour could be both exotic and valuable, such as the imitation of Near Eastern helmets (see Ch.4.4.3.3) and the re-emergence of the use of bronze for weapons (e.g. [Swo091](#), [Spe025](#)), perhaps recalls the heroes in epic poetry whose weapons are always and armour is often bronze. Furthermore, the function of arms and armour also makes reference to the means by which the community was protected, expanded, and potentially grew wealthier through the acquisition of booty. This is another source of power; in this case a particularly physical one.

While there is some merit to this argument, it is not perfect. In particular it masks the significant differences between the weapons and armour which appear in graves and sanctuaries. In graves armour had been scarce while weapons, especially swords, daggers, and spearheads, were common; in sanctuaries the reverse is true. Late burials with weapons, in particular [ARG15](#), indicate a change in emphasis in the conception of the warrior and the conduct of battle, not just a change in the practices of deposition. The availability of metal armour must be one of the contributing factors to the change of battlefield tactics at which the pottery evidence hints. Metal corselets and helmets were impressive objects which incorporate the function of battlefield display; Treherne’s conception of the “warrior’s beauty” can be adapted to show that this was part of the identity of the warrior, but this

identity is one which can be taken and destroyed, the armour stripped from the body to become the wealth of the victor and the body mutilated. The emphasis in the pottery on the defeat of the enemy and the stripping of his armour suggests that this display led to rivalry and aggression. This adds value to armour which is not inherent but must come from battle. It is especially effective in the case of the corselet, which is unlikely to be discarded in flight, like the helmet and shield which if abandoned made retreat much easier (Archil. Fr. 5 West; Jackson 1991, 242-243). In the case of ARG15 this individual may have retained his armour through his life, and thus been buried with it, or perhaps he was rescued from the battlefield with his armour, but not his weapons. Alternatively, the armour may have been more valued because it was captured from an enemy.

The emergence of the idea that it was valuable to capture the weapons and armour of a defeated enemy is also masked by the change in deposition. In later inscriptions and literature both the dedication of personal armour and captured armour are referenced, although the latter appears to be most common.⁸⁶ In the *Iliad*, captured armour is offered to the gods (*Il.* 7.81-90), but this is exceptional and captured armour has other functions (e.g. *Il.* 17.188-197). The inscriptions on the armour from Aphrati indicate that this armour came from booty or spoils (Hoffmann 1972, 15-16). But it is unclear whether all captured armour needed to be dedicated to the gods. The Aphrati armour may have been on display in an *andreion*, rather than a sanctuary (Prent 2005, 385-386). Certainly in later literature it appears that not all *skyla* was dedicated (Pritchett 1979, 278). Furthermore, several prothesis scenes suggest that arms and armour were hung on the walls of Athenian houses (e.g. Ath13), as is clear in the *Odyssey* (e.g. *Od.* 19.4-13); it is possible that these do not reflect only personal possessions but objects taken from the battlefield. The contexts for the deposition of *skyla* varied; it is possible that only one of them was the sanctuary.

⁸⁶ Pritchett thoroughly discusses this evidence (1979, 240-295).

The more traditional argument is that this shift in the deposition of weapons relates to state control of warfare (Baitinger 2011, 128-129; Snodgrass 1980, 99-102; Morgan 1990, 19). There are two difficulties with this proposition. The first is that there is no evidence that these dedications of armour reflect state concerns; in fact where literature can corroborate it seems as if it was the general, and not the state, who decided where the spoils were dedicated (Pritchett 1979, 286-287). The second is that it is doubtful whether or not the *polis* can ever really be described as having a “monopoly of force”; rather the situation where powerful warrior élites could gather their allies to them to go to battle continues on a larger scale (Berent 2000). Certainly it is too tenuous to relate such a proposition to the preference for dedication in sanctuaries if the main dedications are spoils taken by individuals to show their achievement in battle.

From this perspective it is possible to approach the remaining difficulties of the burials at the West Gate Cemetery at Eretria. These burials, which contain greater numbers of weapons than any previous single burials in central Greece, all of which are intentionally destroyed, have been interpreted as the burials of the heroic Eretrian dead of the Lelantine War (see above, Ch.8.3.4). While connecting archaeological evidence to that shadowy, semi-mythical war is unsound, it is possible that these Eretrian dead can be interpreted as war “heroes”. Accepting that *skyla* is being taken from the defeated in battle, and that dedication of captured weapons in sanctuaries is becoming popular but is not universal, perhaps we see here the last lingering presence of aristocratic warriors being buried with their valuables instead of dedicating them. Those burials which contain too many weapons for one man to wield contain their captured *skyla*, not their personal armour. Another tentative step forward is that if Spe013 is northern European then perhaps it was won on the battlefield in Italy, rather than traded through northern Italian intermediaries (Bettelli 2001). A final, even shakier step forward might suggest that the greater presence of spearheads in the West

cemetery is the result of these men only being able to take the more numerous, abandoned throwing spears from the battlefield, rather than the more prestigious swords won by the men buried in [EUB25](#) and [EUB28](#). As in the case of the Cretan helmets discussed above, it is possible that Italian arms and armour such as the Sicilian spearhead at Isthmia could be *skylā*, rather than indicative of Italian dedicants. Thucydides describes both peaceful and violent encounters in the establishment of different eighth-century Greek settlements in Sicily (Thuc. 6.3-4); there is no reason to suppose that if Greeks are taking the arms and armour of their opponents in the Aegean and treating them as valuable objects, they would not do so with even greater emphasis with the *skylā* they won overseas.

Activity overseas is an important part of our understanding of eighth-century warfare. Historians have highlighted the absence of evidence for literary records of battles in Greece before the fifth century (Hanson 1995, 299-300), although it is probable that this is as much a result of the lack of literary records as an actual absence of battles. Hale has suggested that the context of Greek warfare before the fifth century was mercenary service in the Near East (2013, 178-179), the earliest phase of which is in the eighth century, when Greek mercenaries are believed to have contributed to the capture of Damascus by Tiglath-pilser III in 732 (Hale 2013, 180). However, the kingdoms of Egypt and the Near East had hired mercenaries since the LBA so it is plausible that mercenary service has a longer history (van Wees 2004, 42). Furthermore, Assyrian royal correspondence records that “Ionians” raided the coast of the Levant between 738 and 732 (Hale 2013, 180). While we cannot be certain how much influence overseas warfare had on the experience of Greeks at home, there will certainly have been a flood of external goods from loot, as well as experience of tactics and the destruction of cities. Overseas activity is an underexplored element of early Greek warfare.

Our understanding of eighth century warfare is greatly enhanced by consideration of post-battle activity, *skylā*, and the meanings behind weapons and armour. Warfare was

changing not only because of technological and economic developments, but also as a result of social and cultural factors concerning honour and value. The dedication of weapons and armour in sanctuaries has been connected to the emergence of the *polis*, but while the changes in the deposition of weapons put warrior identity into the public domain there is no reason to believe that this relates to a monopolization of force on the part of the state. The emphasis is on the defeat of an enemy is connected to personal honour, which may have created a certain amount of group cohesion and no doubt contributed to the communality which encouraged the development of the *polis* as a citizen-state, but it is not a result of this development. Warfare was getting organized, because this was the best way to defeat the enemy, and defeating the enemy was what made a man a warrior. This attitude is still about the individual and it remains so into the seventh century.

8.6.5 The first hoplites: warfare in the early seventh century

The focus in discussions of seventh-century warfare remains firmly on the hoplite phalanx. The conflicting viewpoints, outlined in Ch.1.4, remain unresolved; the archaeological evidence tends to support the gradualist view held by Snodgrass. The dedications at Olympia remain the preserve of the élite, as they had been in the late eighth century. There is little to suggest that this equipment became more widely available particularly quickly; in fact the gradual increase in dedications as the century progresses points strongly towards only a gradual inclusion of a wider portion of the population in the kind of heavily-armed combat which resulted in the acquisition of *skyla*. Those who could not afford the protection offered by the panoply might have fought as light-armoured troops, but these are not represented archaeologically and were not regularly represented by early seventh-century vase painters.

Crete provides a welcome antidote to the hoplite debate. If Crete could ever be said to have developed the hoplite phalanx, it is perhaps a different kind of hoplite than found on the

mainland (Whitley 2009, 285); furthermore Crete remained famous for its light, not its heavy, infantry (Hanson 1989, 15). The limited evidence for sanctuary dedications and the continuation of burial with weapons into the seventh century in Crete – along with Thessaly, Macedonia, Achaia, and others – is connected to non-*polis* political development (Whitley 2001, 187-188). It would perhaps be possible to propose that with the destructions of Prinias and Knossos *ca.* 600 Crete finally achieved the level of organization the Argolid had achieved a century earlier with the destruction of Asine. The production of bronze armour around this time may indicate an increased demand as warfare became more intense in Crete at around this time (Whitley 2009, 284-285). But late eighth-century Knossos still shows changes in burial practice, it is just that these are not as marked as they appear in central Greece. If it is correct to propose that burials with weapons are more strongly connected to hunting than warfare in Knossos, then the different development in Crete is perhaps the result of limited warfare before the end of the seventh century. It is certainly the case that Crete shows that hoplite warfare was not a universal Greek phenomenon.

There was still a considerable degree of variety in early seventh-century warfare. The new and different shields apparent in early seventh-century vase painting and the dedications at Olympia indicate experimentation both artistic and military. Earlier experimentation may be obscured by the limitations of LG vase painting, but there are a variety of shields in use in LG art, not all clearly possessing or lacking a *telamon*. It is likely that a variety of shields remained in use until at least *ca.* 640, the point at which dedications of hoplite equipment considerably increase (Snodgrass 2013, 87-88). Even after this point there is a strong argument for the use of both the *porpax*-shield and the Boeotian shield (van Wees 2004, 50-52).

The *porpax*-shield is attributed importance for its perceived centrality in the hoplite phalanx and is viewed as something implicitly unusual and uncomfortable which needs

explaining by all sides of the hoplite argument, as if it is an anomaly which does not make sense without a rigid system of rules prescribing its use (Hanson 1989, 56; Schwartz 2013, 167). This bewilderment is perhaps the result of the minimal attention paid by these scholars to eighth-century warfare. The *porpax*-shield does not have to be perfect, it simply needs to be better than that which preceded it; that other shields remained in use alongside it for some time shows clearly that the *porpax*-shield was not considered to be perfect in the seventh-century either. The double-grip has a number of advantages such as the size of the shield and the greater ease with which one could carry a double-grip shield on horse-back (Brouwers 2007); however, the convex shape need not be a new invention to facilitate pushing (Hanson 1991, 63-84), rather it is a feature preserved from the earlier Dipylon shield in order to deflect missiles (Greenhalgh 1973, 66-67). It is likely that the *porpax*-shield developed over the seventh century (Krentz 2013, 148). The seventh century continued the necessary experimentation with armour and weaponry which began in the second half of the eighth century; after four centuries without a large-scale clash of armies, experimentation, based in part on experience of combat overseas, was the only way in which better armour and weaponry could be developed.

Types of weapons in use do not change in the seventh century, but the relative use of different weapons does change. Swords and archery become less common while spears appear much more frequently, although all of these weapons appear in seventh-century art and literature (van Wees 1994b, 143-146; 2004, 251-252). On the basis of the poetic evidence van Wees argues that spears are thrust as often as they are thrown in the early seventh century, but the artistic record focuses on spears held in the overhead position from which they are much more likely to have been thrown (Matthew 2012, 19-38). A possible explanation for the preference for the “overhead” stance is that the space around the heads of the men provided the most space for the easy depiction of the spear. Matthew argues that this

stance is “heroic”; it is probably no more heroic than the Boeotian shield, but it is certainly artistic. If axes were ever weapons, they do not appear in seventh-century iconography or poetry.

Seventh-century depictions of warfare focus on the heavily armoured individuals; there are possible connections to heroism and maturation rituals, there are certainly orientalizing features. Warfare remains an important part of male life, exemplified by the Attic stand, Ath17, which contrasts a small frieze of women carrying bowls to a frieze of men in combat and older men with spears processing. Between the development of weapons and armour, and the attention paid to these in vase painting, and the increasing numbers of dedications of weapons in PanHellenic sanctuaries, warfare was of great importance in the seventh century as a means of expressing masculine power and identity. The means by which it appears in the archaeological and literary record, as depictions on vases, dedications in major sanctuaries, and in lyric and epic poetry reflects that while participation was widening the identification as a warrior remained the preserve of a mobile, connected élite.

Chapter 9

Conclusions

9.1 CONCLUSIONS

After the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces the monopoly on the use of force held by the state disappeared from the Aegean world. The reactions of the various regions of the Aegean to the ensuing crisis were varied. In the northern Peloponnese Achaia and the Argolid appear to have had very different responses, as in the former men identifying themselves as warriors gathered war bands in order to control the region, while in the latter there seems to have remained some residual control of military power until the beginning of the Iron Age, when a single important individual was buried as a warrior. The situation in Attica and Euboea is less clear; it is possible that the important settlement at Lefkandi may have responded in a similar way to either the Argolid or Achaia and the importance of warriors on the pictorial pottery of a number of settlements along the Euboean Gulf mirrors that in Argolid. In Attica, a handful of tombs at Perati contained weapons, but unless further weapons were removed these tombs are by far the minority. The reaction on Crete was to resettle in the hills; some of these settlements survived into the EIA. The presence of a number of burials with weapons and connections to Achaia suggest that here too warriors were leading these communities.

Things were quite different in the subsequent periods. New cemeteries are founded at Athens, Tiryns, Knossos, and perhaps Lefkandi indicating a new social order. At Tiryns and Knossos some of the earliest burials were men with weapons, men who had earned the reputation necessary to reshape the community. For much of the Iron Age in Athens and at Lefkandi men of high status were identified as warriors in their burials through the inclusion of weapons, although the practice of intentionally destroying the swords in these burials

indicates that a complex symbolism lay behind these burials. In the Argolid, it appears that there were neither the resources nor the will to follow suit, but this may be the result of the limited evidence from Tiryns. Argos cannot have had a community of warriors in the eleventh and tenth centuries, but developed such a community somewhat later.

If warfare there was in the Early Iron Age, then it was small-scale, or we lack the evidence for it. These men may have led communities of warriors, or which included warriors, on raids and expeditions which brought back booty; this we might call war, if we call them “warriors”, as the organized use of deadly violence to achieve an aim, legitimized by the reputation of the warrior who gathered the war band. Some, probably those at Lefkandi and the earliest at Knossos, went further than others, such as those at Athens who show no evidence of bringing back exotica. These overseas expeditions probably developed into more commercial and social enterprises, while maintaining the veneer of “warrior” status through the necessary precaution of protecting against the piracy in which these communities had once engaged, if indeed there was much distinction between overseas travels which sought for wealth through violent or non-violent means. Once pictorial evidence resurfaces, violence is immediately associated with boats and the sea. This was a means by which to gain a reputation, legitimacy, wealth, and power in a far off world inaccessible to most. Those who did so were warriors.

The situation in central Greece changes dramatically in the late ninth century, as the evidence from the cemeteries at Lefkandi vanishes. In the eighth century, Athenian burials with weapons become less common as weapons and the scenes of combat become largely restricted to the Dipylon cemetery. In Argos there is a resurgence of warrior burials on a far greater scale than seen in the preceding period in central Greece as a new military élite emerges and expresses its power through the destruction of Asine. By this point it is clear that war has made an unambiguous return to the Aegean. But this warfare remained the privilege

of a small section of society who were buried with weapons; it is a large-scale version of the war-band of earlier centuries, which gathered recruits through the reputation of the leader, not on the coercion of the state.

Warfare remained a means by which men could become rich or powerful, but wealth could now be stripped from the battlefield directly from the corpses of the defeated. In this way it is possible that warfare became more open to those without the means to properly equip themselves for battle, as they could gain the necessary equipment through successful combat. Some of this wealth was dedicated in sanctuaries as a means of expressing the honour and virtue of the warrior while he was still alive, rather than through burial. The number of men depicted with swords on Athenian vases is far greater than the number buried with weapons; the number of men in a position to equip themselves for combat was increasing, but they remained a privileged élite into the next century.

The importance of warfare to society continued into the seventh century, when there were many developments in tactics and weaponry. Poets began to record the deeds of these men as a group, rather than as individuals, although the call for unity had to be pressed fairly strongly. Weapons rose in importance as a major votive, usually taken from the battlefield; thus wealth and piety were both reliant on combat and victory. The exception appears to have been Crete, where personal prestige came largely from the hunt rather than combat. This difference may have been a contributing factor to the different political systems which were later manifest on Crete; however it is important to distinguish between the contributing factor of warfare and the relationship between warfare and state organization.

9.2 FURTHER RESEARCH

This thesis has focused on the development of warfare in the Early Iron Age as a legitimizing force and a symbol of male identity and power in four regions of the Aegean. A number of

further avenues for research are apparent from this work, beginning with expansion of the regional focus to include other areas of the Aegean world which have been overlooked, such as the rest of Crete, the southern Peloponnese, and the whole of the northern Aegean.

A second avenue would be to contrast the role of warfare in shaping and creating male identity with the creation of female identity in the Early Iron Age. Lefkandi is a particular example of a region where male burials with weapons are contrasted to female burials with other goods, including jewellery, but this topic could be explored further elsewhere. As a subsidiary section of this, the socialization of children into warriors, or otherwise, would also provide a potent area for research in regions such as the Argolid, where skeletal evidence is becoming more available for consideration.

Finally, there is the relationship between warfare and the development of Greek political systems. The identity of the citizen as a soldier is often accredited to the eighth and seventh centuries, but the archaeological evidence does not completely support this proposal as the dedications in sanctuaries do not represent state enterprise and such enterprise is certainly not visible elsewhere. Warfare in the Early Iron Age was more of a legitimizing force than a force which needed legitimizing; if this changed in the seventh century then a closer examination of both the archaeological and historical evidence from that century is another potent avenue for further research.

Bibliography

ABBREVIATIONS

General

- AA *Archäologischer Anzeiger*
AAA *Athens Annals of Archaeology*
AD *Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον*
AJA *American Journal of Archaeology*
AM *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*
AR *Archaeological Reports*
ARC *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*
ArchKorrBl *Archaeologisches Korrespondenzblatt*
ASAtene *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente*
BCH *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
BICS *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*
BSA *Annual of the British School at Athens*
CA *Classical Antiquity*
CAJ *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*
Eph. Arch. *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*
G&R *Greece and Rome*
JdI *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*
JHS *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JMA *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*
KCh *Κρητικά Χρονικά*
Mus. Helv. *Museum Helveticum*
OJA *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*
RDAC *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*
SEG *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*
TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*
ZfE *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*

Abbreviations of ancient authors are those found in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

Excavation Reports*Agora XIII*

Immerwahr, S. A. (1971), *The Athenian Agora XIII: The Neolithic and Bronze Ages*, Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Agora XIV

Thompson, H. A. and R. E. Wycherley (1972), *The Athenian Agora XIV: The Agora of Athens. The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Centre*, Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Argos I

Courbin, P. (1974), *Tombes Géométriques D'Argos, I*, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Asine I

Frödin, O. and A. W. Persson (1938), *Asine. Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922-1930*, Stockholm: Generalstabens Litografiska Anstalts Förlag.

Delphi II.5

Demangle, R. (1926), *Fouilles de Delphes II,5. Le sanctuaire d'Athèna Pronaia. Topographie du sanctuaire*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Delphi V

Perdrizet, P. (1908), *Fouilles de Delphes V. Monuments figurés: Petits bronzes, Terres-cuites, Antiquités diverses*. Paris: A. Fontemoing.

Eretria III

Bérard, C. (1970), *Eretria Foulles et Recherches III. L'Hérôon à la Porte de L'Ouest*, Bern: Éditions Francke Berne.

Eretria XVII.1

Blandin, B. (2007), *Eretria XVII: Les Pratiques Funéraires D'Époque Géométrique à Érétrie Volume I – Texte*, Renens: Infolio.

Matthew Lloyd

Eretria XVII.2

Blandin, B. (2007), *Eretria XVII: Les Pratiques Funéraires D'Époque Géométrique à Éréttrie Volume II - Catalogue, tableaux et planches*, Renens: Infolio.

Eretria XX

Verdan, S., A. K. Pfyffer, and C. Léderrey (2008), *Eretria XX: Céramique Géométrique D'Éréttrie*, Renens: Infolio.

Fortetsa

Brock, J. K. (1957), *Fortetsa: early Greek Tombs Near Knossos*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heraeum II

Waldstein, C. (1905), *The Argive Heraeum. Volume II. Terra-Cotta Figurines, Terra-Cotta Reliefs, Vases and Vase Fragments, Bronzes, Engraved Stones, Gems, and Ivories, coins, Egyptian, or Graeco-Egyptian, Objects*, Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

Isthmia VIII

Morgan, C. (ed.) (1999), *Isthmia. Excavations by the University of Chicago Under the Auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume VIII: The Late Bronze Age Settlement and Early Iron Age Sanctuary*, Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Kalapodi II

Felsche, R. C. S., J. Riederer, and H.O. Schmitt (2007), *Kalapodi. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen im Heiligtum der Artemis und des Apollon von Hyampolis in der antiken Phokis. Band II*, Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Kaloriziki

Benson, J.L. (1973), *The Necropolis of Kaloriziki*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Kerameikos I

Kraiker, W. and K. Kübler (1939), *Kerameikos I: Die Nekropolen des 12. bis 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Kerameikos IV

Kübler, K. (1943), *Kerameikos IV: Neufunde aus der Nekropole des 11. und 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Kerameikos V

Kübler, K. (1954), *Kerameikos V: Die Nekropole des 10. bis 8. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Kerameikos XVIII

Ruppenstein, F. (ed.) (2007), *Kerameikos XVIII: Die Submykenische Nekropole. Neufunde und Neubewertung*, Munich: Hirmer Verlag München.

KNC

Coldstream, J. N. and H. W. Catling (1996), *Knossos North Cemetery: Early Greek Tombs*, London: The British School at Athens.

Kommos IV

Shaw, J.W., and M.C. Shaw (eds.) (2000), *Kommos IV. The Greek Sanctuary. Part 1: text; Part 2: Plates*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

KS²

Hood, S. and D. Smyth (1981), *Archaeological Survey of the Knossos Area*, Oxford: Thames and Hudson.

Lefkandi I

Popham, M. R., L. H. Sackett, and P.G. Themelis (eds.) (1979), *Lefkandi I: The Iron Age. The Settlement. The Cemeteries*, Oxford The British School of Archaeology at Athens.

Lefkandi II.1

Catling, R. W. V. and I. Lemos (1990), *Lefkandi II: The Protogeometric Building at Toumba. Part 1: The Pottery*, Oxford: Thames and Hudson.

Lefkandi II.2

Popham, M. R., P. G. Calligas, and L. H. Sackett (eds.) (1993), *Lefkandi II: The Protogeometric Building at Toumba. Part 2: The Excavation, Architecture, and Finds*, Oxford: The British School of Archaeology at Athens.

Lefkandi III

Popham, M. R. and I. Lemos (1996), *Lefkandi III: The Toumba Cemetery. The excavations of 1981 to 1994 (Plates)*, Oxford: The British School at Athens.

Lefkandi IV

Evely, D (ed.) (2006) *Lefkandi IV: the Bronze Age: the Late Helladic III C settlement at Xeropolis*, London: The British School at Athens.

Midea I

Walberg, G. (1998), *Excavations on the Acropolis of Midea. Results of the Greek-Swedish Excavations under the direction of Katie Demakopoulou and Paul Åström*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Midea II

Walberg, G. (2007), *Midea: the Megaron Complex and shrine area: excavations on the lower terraces 1994-1997*, Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.

Nichoria III

McDonald, W., W. D. E. Coulson, and J. Rosser (eds.), *Excavations at Nichoria in Southwest Greece. Volume III: Dark Age and Byzantine Occupation*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Ol.Forsch. I

Kunze, E., and Schleif, H. (eds.) (1944), *Olympia Forschungen. Band I*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. II

Kunze, E. (1950), *Olympia Forschungen. Band II. Archaische Schildbänder*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. XVII

Bol, P. C. (1989), *Olympia Forschungen. Band XVII. Argivische Schilde*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. XXI

Kunze, E. (1991), *Olympia Forschungen. Band XXI. Beinschienen*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. XXIX

Baitinger, H. (2001), *Olympia Forschungen. Band XXIX. Die Angriffswaffen aus Olympia*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. XXXI

Kyrieleis, H. with B. Eder and N. Benecke (2006), *Olympia Forschungen. Band XXXI. Anfänge und Frühzeit des Heiligtums von Olympia*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ol.Forsch. XXXIII

Frielinghaus, H. (2011), *Olympia Forschungen. Band XXXIII. Die Helme von Olympia*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Perachora I

Payne, H. et al. (1940), *Perachora: The Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Limenia. Excavations of the British School of Archaeology at Athens 1930-1933. Architecture, Bronzes, Terracottas*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Perachora II

Dunbabin, T. J. (ed.) (1962), *Perachora: The Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Limenia. Excavations of the British School of Archaeology at Athens 1930-1933 II. Pottery, Ivories, Scarabs, and other objects from the Votive Deposit of Hera Limenia*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Perati I

Iakovidis, S. (1969), *Περατή: το Νεκροταφείων*, Two Volumes, Athens: Library of the Archaeological Society of Athens.

Tiryns I

Frickenhau, A., W. Müller, and F. Oelmann (1912), *Tiryns. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des Instituts. Erster Band*, Athens: Friends of the German Archaeological Institute.

Vergina I

Andronikos, M. (1969), *Βεργίνα I. το Νεκροταφείων των Τύμβων*, Athens: Library of the Archaeological Society of Athens.

Vrokastro I

Hall, E. H. (1914), *Excavations in Eastern Crete: Vrokastro*, Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Museum.

Vrokastro II

Hayden, B. J., H. Dierckx, G. W. M. Harrison, J. Moody G. Postma, O. Rackham, A. B. Stallsmith (2004), *Reports on the Vrokastro Area, Eastern Crete. Volume 2: The Settlement History of the Vrokastro Area and Related Studies*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Zagora I

Cambitoglou, A, J. J. Coulton, J. Birmingham, and J. R. Green (1971), *Zagora 1. Excavation Season 1967; Study Season 1968-9*, Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Zagora II

Cambitoglou, A, A. Birchill, J. J. Coulton, and J. R. Green (1988), *Zagora 2. Excavation of a Geometric Town on the Island of Andros. Excavation Season 1969; Study Season 1969-1970. Two Volumes*, Athens: Library of the Athens Archaeological Society.

Corpus vasorum antiquorum

CVA, Athens National Museum 2

Karouzou, S. (1955), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Grèce, Fascicule 2: Athènes, Musée National, Fascicule 2*, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.

CVA, Berlin 1

Eilmann, R. and K. Gebauer (1938), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Deutschland, Band 2: Berlin, Antiquarium, Band 1*, Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

CVA, Berlin 6

Dehl-Von Kaenel, C. (1986), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Deutschland, Band 53: Berlin, Antikenmuseum, Band 6*, Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

CVA British Museum 11

Catling, H. W. and T. Mannack, T. (2010), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain, Fascicule 24: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Fascicule 4*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CVA, Copenhagen 2

Blinkenberg, C. and K. Friis Johansen (1942), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Danemark. Copenhagen. Musée National, Collection des Antiquités Classiques, Fascicule 2*, Paris: Edouard Champion.

CVA, Louvre 11

Villard, F. (1954), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. France, Fascicule 18: Paris, Louvre, Fascicule 11*, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.

Matthew Lloyd

CVA, Louvre 16

Kauffmann-Samaras, A. (1972), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. France, Fascicule 25: Paris, Louvre, Fascicule 16*, Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

CVA, Louvre 18

Kauffmann-Samaras, A. (1976), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. France, Fascicule 27: Paris, Louvre, Fascicule 18*, Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

CVA, New York 5

Moore, M. B. (2004), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. U.S.A., Fascicule 37: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fascicule 5*, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

GENERAL WORKS

Ahlberg, G. (1971a), *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.

Ahlberg, G. (1971b) *Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Ahlberg, G. (1992), *Myth and epos in early Greek art: representation and interpretation*, Jonsö: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Alexander, C. (1945), "Early Statuettes from Greece" in *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 3(10), 238-243.

Alexandri, O. (1967), "Τ' Ἐφορεία Κλασσικῶν Ἀαιοτήτων" in *AD* 22, *Χρονικά*, 37-130.

Alexandri, O. (1968a), "Νυκτερινὴ ἀνασκαφὴ σκάμματος κατὰ μῆκος τῆς ὁδοῦ Κριεζῆ" in *AAA* 1, 20-30.

Alexandri, O. (1968b), "Τ' Ἐφορεία Κλασσικῶν Ἀαιοτήτων" in *AD* 23, *Χρονικά*, 33-109.

Alexandri, O. (1972), "Ἀνασκαφα ἔτους 1971" in *AD* 27, 1972, *Χρονικά*, 85-146.

- Aram-Stern, E. (2003), "Aigeira - Acropolis: The Stratigraphy" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms. Proceedings of the international workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna, May 7th and 8th, 2001*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 15-21.
- Aram-Stern, E. (2007), "Characteristic Small Finds of LH III C from Aigeira and their Context" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms II: LH III C Middle. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna October 29th and 30th, 2004*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 15-25.
- Antonaccio, C. M. (1995a), *An Archaeology of Ancestors. Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Antonaccio, C. M. (1995b), "Lefkandi and Homer" in Andersen, Ø. And M. Dickie (eds.) *Homer's World. Fiction, Tradition, Reality*, Bergen: The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 5-27.
- Antonaccio, C. M. (2002), "Warriors, Traders, and Ancestors: the "Heroes" of Lefkandi" in Højte, J. M. (ed.) *Images of Ancestors*, Gylling: Aarhus University Press.
- Åström, P. (1987), "Intentional Destruction of Grave Goods" in Laffineur, R. (ed.) *THANATOS: Les coutumes funéraires en egee a l'age du bronze*, Liège: Université de l'Etat à Liège, 213-217.
- Åström, P. and K. Demakopoulou (1996), "Signs of an Earthquake at Midea?" in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 37-40.
- Avila. R. A. J. (1983), *Bronzene Lanzen- und Pfeilspitzen der griechischen Spätbronzezeit*, Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Baitinger, H. (2011), *Waffen Weihungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*, Mainz: Schnell und Steiner Verlag.
- Bettelli, M. (2001), "A supposed Mycenaean Spearhead from Eretria" in *Studi Micenei Ed Egeo-Anatolici*, 43.2, 189-193.
- Blackman, D. (1997), "Archaeology in Greece 1996-7" in *AR* 43, 1-125.

Blegen, C. W. (1952), "Two Athenian Grave Groups of About 900 B.C." in *Hesperia* 21, 279-294.

Boardman, J. (1960), "Protogeometric Graves at Agios Ioannis near Knossos" in *BSA* 55, 128-148.

Boardman, J. (1961), *The Cretan Collection in Oxford. The Dictaeon Cave and Iron Age Crete*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Boardman, J. (1967), "The Khaniala Tekke Tombs, II" in *BSA* 62, 57-75.

Boardman, J. (1971), "Ship firedogs and other metalwork from Kavousi" in *KCh* 23, 5-8.

Boardman, J. (1998), *Early Greek Vase Painting, 11th-6th centuries BC. A handbook*, London: Thames and Hudson.

Bossen, C. (2006), "War as practice, Power, and Processor: A Framework for the Analysis of War and Social Structural Change" in Otto, T. H. Thrane and H. Vandkilde (eds.) *Warfare and Society: Archaeological and Social Anthropological Perspectives*, Aarhus: Aarhus University, 89-102.

Bouzek, J. (1988), "An Alternative Reconstruction of the Kaloriziki Shield" in *RDAC*, 319-320.

Bouzek, J. (1997), *Greece, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations During the Early Iron Age*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Bradley, R. (1998), *The Passage of Arms. An archaeological analysis of prehistoric hoards and votive deposits*, Oxford: Oxbow Books (first edition 1990).

Braüning, A. (1995), *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung und Ausstattung des Kriegers im Grabbrauch Griechenlands zwischen dem 10. und 8. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Espelkamp: Verlag Marie L. Leidorf.

Bravo, J. J., III. (2009), "Recovering the Past: The Origins of Greek Heroes and Hero Cult" in Albersmeier, S. (ed.) *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore: Walters Art Museum, 10-19.

Bridgeford, S. D. (1993), *The Design, Manufacture and Use of Irish Late Bronze Age Swords*, Sheffield: Unpublished M.A. Dissertation.

- Brothwell, D. (1999), "Biosocial and bioarchaeological aspects of conflict and warfare" in Carman, J. and A. Harding (eds.) *Ancient Warfare: Archaeological Perspectives*, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 25-38.
- Brouwers, J. (2007), "From Horsemen to Hoplites. Some Remarks on Archaic Greek Warfare" in *BABesch* 82, 305-319.
- Brouwers, J. (2010), *Warfare and Society in Early Greece. From the Fall of the Mykenaian Palaces to the end of the Persian Wars*, Amsterdam: Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Brouskari, M. (1980), "A Dark Age Cemetery in Erechtheion Street, Athens" in *BSA* 75, 13-31.
- Brückner, A. and E. Pernice (1983), "Ein attischer Friedhof" in *AM* 18, 73-191.
- Budelmann, F. (2009), "Introducing Greek Lyric" in Budelmann, F. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-18.
- Calligas, P. G. (1988), "Hero-cult in Early Iron Age Greece" in Hägg, R., N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist (eds.) *Early Greek Cult Practice. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 229-234.
- Carey, C. (2009a), "Genre, occasion and performance" in Budelmann, F. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21-38.
- Carey, C. (2009b), "Iambos" in Budelmann, F. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149-167.
- Carpenter, T. H. (1991), *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Catling, H. W. (1956), "Bronze Cut-and-Thrust Swords in the Eastern Mediterranean" in *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* XXII, 102-125.
- Catling, H. W. (1961), "A New Bronze Sword from Cyprus" in *Antiquity* 35, 115-122.
- Catling, H. W. (1964), *Cypriot Bronzework in the Mycenaean World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Catling, H. W. (1968), "Late Minoan Vases and Bronzes in Oxford" in *BSA* 63, 89-131.

Catling, H. W. (1984), "Archaeology in Greece 1983-84" in *AR* 30, 3-70.

Catling, H. W. (1985a), "The Arrangement of Some Grave Goods in the Dark Age Cemeteries of Lefkandi" in *BSA* 80 19-23.

Catling, H. W. (1985b), "Archaeology in Greece 1984-85" in *AR* 31, 3-69.

Catling, H.W. (1995), "Heroes Returned? Subminoan Burials from Crete" in Carter, J. B. and S. P. Morris (eds.) *The Ages of Homer. A tribute to Emily Townsend*, Vermeule: Austin University of Texas Press, 123-136.

Cavanagh, W. and C. Mee (1995), "Mourning Before and After the Dark Age" in Morris, C. (ed.) *Klados. Essays in Honour of J. N. Coldstream*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 45-61.

Cavanagh, W. and C. Mee (1998), *A Private Place: Death in Prehistoric Greece*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Charitonidis, S. I. (1954), "Ἀνασκαφαὶ Ναυπλίας" in *Praktika*.

Charles, R.-P. (1963), *Étude Anthropologique des Nécropoles D'Argos*, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Chatzipouliou, E. (1980), "Αρχαία Τίρυνς" in *AD* 35, *Χρονικά*, 123-125.

Claessen, H. J. M. (2006), "War and State Formation: What is the Connection?" in Otto, T. H. Thrane and H. Vandkilde (eds.) *Warfare and Society: Archaeological and Social Anthropological Perspectives*, Aarhus: Aarhus University, 217-226.

Coldstream, J. N. (1963), "Five Tombs at Knossos." in *BSA* 58, 30-43.

Coldstream, J. N. (1971), "The Cesnola Painter: A Change of Address" in *BICS* 18, 1-15.

Coldstream, J. N. (1972), "Knossos 1951-61: Protogeometric and Geometric Pottery from the town" in *BSA* 67, 63-98.

Coldstream, J. N. (1981), "Some Peculiarities of the Euboean Geometric Figured Style" in *ASAtene*, 241-249.

Coldstream, J. N. (1984), "Dorian Knossos and Aristotle's villages" in *Aux Origines de l'Hellénisme la Crète et la Grèce*, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 311-322.

- Coldstream, J. N. (1989), "Status symbols in Cyprus in the eleventh century BC" in Peltenburg, E. (ed.) *Early Society in Cyprus*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 325-335.
- Coldstream, J. N. (1991a), "Knossos: An Urban Nucleus in the Dark age?" in Musti, D., A. Sacconi, L. Rocchetti, M. Rocchi, E. Scafa, L. Sportiello, *et al.* (eds.), *La Transizione Dal Miceneo All'Alto Arcaismo. Dal palazzo alla città Atti del Convegno Internazionale Roma, 14-19 marzo 1988*, Rome: Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche, 287-299.
- Coldstream, J. N. (1991b), "The Geometric style: the birth of the picture" in Rasmussen, T. and N. Spivey (eds.), *Looking at Greek Vases*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37-56.
- Coldstream, J. N. (1994), "Prospectors and Pioneers: Pithekoussai, Kyme and Central Italy" in Tsetskhladze, G. R. and F. De Angelis (eds.), *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation. Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, 47-59.
- Coldstream, J. N. (2000a), "Evans's Greek Finds: The Early Greek town of Knossos, and its encroachment on the borders of the Minoan Palace" in *BSA* 95, 259-299.
- Coldstream, J. N. (2000b), "Some Unusual Geometric Scenes from Euboean Pithekoussai" in Berlingò, I., H. Blanck, F. Cordano, P. G. Guzzo, and M. C. Lentini (eds.), *Damarato. Studi di Antichità Classica Offerti A Paola Pelagatti*, Milan: Electa 92-98.
- Coldstream, J. N. (2002), "Knossos: 'Geometric' tombs excavated by D. G. Hogarth, 1900" in *BSA* 97, 201-216.
- Coldstream, J. N. (2003), *Geometric Greece 900 - 700 BC*, London: Routledge (first edition 1977).
- Coldstream, J. N. (2006), "'The long, pictureless hiatus'. Some thoughts on Greek figured art between Mycenaean pictorial and Attic Geometric" in Rystedt, E. and B. Wells (eds.), *Pictorial Pursuits. Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 159-163.

Coldstream, J. N. (2007), "Foreigners at Lefkandi?" in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.), *Oropos and Euboea in the Early Iron Age. Acts of an International Round Table, University of Thessaly June 18-20, 2004*, Volos: University of Thessaly Publications, 135-139.

Coldstream, J. N. (2008), *Greek Geometric Pottery. A survey of ten local styles and their chronology*, Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press (first edition 1968).

Coldstream, J. N. and E. Hatzaki (2003), "Knossos: Early Greek occupation under the Roman Villa Dionysos" in *BSA* 98, 279-306.

Coldstream, J. N. and G. Huxley (1999), "Knossos: the Archaic Gap" in *BSA* 94, 289-307.

Coldstream, J. N. and C. Macdonald (1997) "Knossos: Area of the South-West Houses, Early Hellenic occupation" in *BSA* 92, 191-245.

Coldstream, J. N., P. Callaghan and J. Musgrave (1981), "Knossos: An Early Greek tomb on Lower Gypsadhes hill" in *BSA* 76, 141-165.

Courbin, P. (1953), "Chronique des fouilles en 1952: Nécropole géométrique" in *BCH* 77, 258-263.

Courbin, P. (1957), "Une tombe d'Argos" in *BCH* 81, 322-386.

Courbin, P. (1966), *La Céramique Géométrique de l'Argolide*, Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

Crielaard, J-P. (1996), *The Euboeans Overseas: Long-distance Contacts and Colonization as Status Activities in Early Iron Age Greece*, Amsterdam: Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Crielaard, J-P, (1998), "Surfing on the Mediterranean Web: Cypriot long-distance communications during the eleventh and tenth centuries B.C." in Karageorghis, V. and N. Stampolidis (eds.), *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th-6th cent. B.C.: Proceedings of the International Symposium Rethymnon, 13-16 May 1997*, Athens: University of Crete and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 187-206.

Crielaard, J-P and J. Driessen (1994), "The Hero's Home. Some reflections on the building at Toumba, Lefkandi" in *Topoi* 4, 251-270.

Crouwel, J. H. (1991), *The Mycenaean Pictorial Pottery (Well Built Mycenae. The Helleno-British Excavations within the Citadel at Mycenae, 1959-1969, Fascicule 21)*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Crouwel, J. H. (1992), *Chariots and Other Wheeled Vehicles in Iron Age Greece*, Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam.
- Crouwel, J. H. (2006), "Late Mycenaean pictorial pottery. A brief review" in Rystedt, E. and B. Wells (eds.), *Pictorial Pursuits. Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 15-22.
- Dahm, M. K. (2007), "Not Twins at All. The Agora Oinochoe Reinterpreted" in *Hesperia* 76 717-730,
- Dakoronia, P., S. Deger-Jalkotzy, and S. Fabrizii-Reuer (2009), "Elateia and the Mycenaean heritage" in Iakovidis, S. and D. Daniilidou (eds.) *Δώρον: τιμητικός τομός για τον καθηγητή*, Athens: Academy of Athens: Research Centre for Antiquity, 211-229
- Daux, G. (1959), "Chronique des fouilles en 1958: Argos" in *BCH* 83, 754-774.
- Daux, G. (1967), "Chronique des fouilles en 1966: Argos" in *BCH* 91, 802-849.
- Davaras, C. (1968), "Two Geometric Tombs at Atsalenio near Knossos" in *BSA* 63 133-146.
- Deilaki, E. (1973), "Αρχαιότητες και Μνημεία Αργολίδος-Κορινθίας 1971-1972" in *AD* 28, 1973, *Χρονικά*, 80-122.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (2003), "Stratified Pottery Deposits from the Late Helladic III C Settlement at Aigeira/Achaia" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms. Proceedings of the international workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna, May 7th and 8th, 2001*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 53-75.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (2006), "Late Mycenaean Warrior Tombs Lemos" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and I. Lemos (eds.) *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 151-179.
- Demakopoulou, K. and J. H. Crouwel (1998), "Some Mycenaean Tombs at Palaioikastro" in *BSA* 93, 269-283.
- Desborough, V. R. d'A. (1952), *Protogeometric Pottery*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Desborough, V. R. d'A. (1954), "Mycenae 1939-1953 Part V. Four Tombs" in *BSA* 49, 258-266.

Desborough, V. R. d'A. (1964), *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors. An Archaeological Survey c.1200 - c.1000 B.C.*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Desborough, V. R. d'A. (1972), *The Greek Dark Ages*, London: Ernest Benn Limited.

Dezsö, T. (1998), *Oriental Influence in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean Helmet Traditions in the 9th-7th Centuries B.C.: The Patterns of Orientalization*, Oxford: Archaeolopress.

Dickey, K. (1992), *Corinthian Burial Customs, ca. 1100 to 550 BC*, Bryn Mawr College: Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Dickinson, O. (1994), *The Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dickinson, O. (2006), *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age. Continuity and change between the twelfth and eighth centuries BC*, Oxford: Routledge.

Donatas, G. S. (1954), "Ανασκαφή υπό τον Ιερό ναόν της Μητροπόλεως των Αθηνών" in *Eph. Arch.*, 89-97.

Donlan, W. (1970), "Archilochus, Strabo and the Lelantine War" in *TAPA* 101, 131-142.

D'Onofrio, A. M. (2011), "Athenian burials with weapons: The Athenian warrior graves revisited" in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.) *The "Dark Ages" Revisited*, Volos University of Thessaly Press, 645-673.

Douzougli, A. and J. Papadopoulos (2010), "Liatovouni: A Molossian Cemetery and Settlement in Epirus" in *JdI* 125, 1-87.

Drews, R. (1993), *The End of the Bronze Age. Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Droop, J. P. (1906), "Dipylon Vases from the Kynosarges Site" in *BSA* 12 80-92.

Dümmler, F. (1888), "Bemerkungen zum Ältesten Kunsthandwerk auf Griechischem Boden" in *AM* 13, 273-303.

Eder, B. (1999) Ancient Elis in the Dark Ages in Froussou, E., (ed.), *Η Περιφέρεια Του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου*, Lamia: Ekdosi ID' Eforeias Proistorikon kai Klassikon Archaïotiton, 263-8

Eder, B. (2001a), *Die Submykenischen und Protogeometrischen Gräber von Elis*, Athens: The Archaeological Society at Athens.

Eder, B. (2001b), “Continuity of Bronze Age cult at Olympia? The evidence of the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age pottery” in R. Laffineur and R. Hägg (eds.), *Aegaeum 22. Potnia: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 8th International Aegean Conference / 8e Rencontre égéenne internationale. Göteborg, Göteborg University, 12-15 April 2000*. Liège: Université de Liège, 201-209.

Eder, B. (2003), “Patterns of contact and communication between regions south and north of the Corinthian Gulf in LH IIIC” in Kyparissi-Apostolika, N. and M. Papakonstantinou (eds.), *The Periphery of the Mycenaean World: Proceedings of the 2nd International Interdisciplinary Colloquium, 26-30 September, Lamia 1999*, Athens: Ministry for Culture and 14th Ephoria for Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, 37-54.

Eder, B. (2006), “The world of Telemachus: western Greece 1200-700 BC” in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and I. Lemos (eds.) *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 549-580.

Eder, B. and R. Jung (2005), “On the Character of Social Relations between Greece and Italy in the 12th/11th C. BC” in R. Laffineur and E. Greco (eds.), *Emporia. Aegeans in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean. Aegaeum 25*, Université de Liège Histoire de l'art et archéologie de la Grèce antique; Program in Aegean Scripts and prehistory, The University of Texas at Austin: Liège and Austin, 485-495.

Erickson, B. L. (2010), *Crete in Transition: Pottery Styles and Island History in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Evely, D. (2010), “Archaeology in Greece 2009-2010: Crete” in AR 56 169-200.

Evely, R. D. G. (1993), *Minoan Crafts: Tools and Techniques. An Introduction*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Ferguson, B. (2008), "War Before History" in de Souza, P. (ed.) *The Ancient World at War*, London: Thames & Hudson, 15-28.

Finley, M. (1954), *The World of Odysseus*, New York: Viking Press.

Foley, A. (1988), *The Argolid 800-600 B.C. An Archaeological Survey*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Foley, A. (1995), "Idle speculation about Argos? Some thoughts on the present state of eighth and seventh century Argive studies" in Morris, C. (ed.) *Klados. Essays in Honour of J. N. Coldstream*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 79-86.

Foley, A. (1998), "Ethnicity and the topography of burial practices in the Geometric Period", in Pariente, A. and G. Touchais (eds.), *Argos et l'Argolide: Topographie et Urbanisme*, Paris: École Française Athènes, 137-144.

Fornara, C. W. (ed.) (1977), *Translated Documents of Greece & Rome. Volume 1: Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forrest, W. G. (1957), "Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi" in *Historia* 6, 160-175.

Frederiksen, R. (2011), *Greek City Walls of the Archaic Period 900-480 BC*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

French, E. (1996), "Evidence for an Earthquake at Mycenae" in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 51-54

French, E. (2002), *Mycenae: Agamemnon's Capital: The Site in its Setting*, Stroud: Tempus.

French, E. (2006), "The Functional Contexts of Pictorial Pottery at Mycenae" in Rystedt, E. and B. Wells (eds.), *Pictorial Pursuits. Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 45-48.

French, E. (2007), "Late Helladic III C Middle at Mycenae" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms II: LH III C Middle. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna October 29th and 30th, 2004*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 175-187.

French, E. (2010), "Mycenae" in Cline, E. H. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 671-679.

Forsydyke, E. J. (1927), "The Mavro Spelio Cemetery at Knossos", *BSA* 28, 243-296.

Foxhall, L. (2013), "Can We See the "Hoplite Revolution" on the Ground? Archaeological Landscapes, Material Culture, and Social Status in Early Greece" in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 194-221.

Fränkel, H. (1975), *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. A history of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Furumark, A. (1941), *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery*, Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie Och Antikvitets Akademien.

Galanakis, I. (2011), "An Unpublished Stirrup Jar from Athens and the 1871-2 Private Excavations in the Outer Kerameikos" in *BSA* 106, 167-200.

Georganas, I. (2005), "Weapons and Warfare in Early Iron Age Thessaly" in *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 5, 63-74.

Georganas, I. (2010). "Weapons and Warfare" in Cline, E. H. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 305-314.

Giannopoulos, T. G. (2008), *Die letzte Elite der mykenischen Welt. Achaia in mykenischer Zeit und das Phänomen der Kriegerbestattungen im 12.-11. Jahrhundert v.Chr.*, Bonn: Verlag Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH.

Gordon, D. H. (1953), "Swords, Rapiers and Horse-riders" in *Antiquity* 27, 67-83.

Greenhalgh, P. A. L. (1973), *Early Greek Warfare: Horsemen and Chariots in the Homeric and Archaic Ages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grinsell, L. V. (1961), "The Breaking of Objects as a Funerary Rite" in *Folklore* 72, 475-491.

Haarer, P. S. (2000), *Obeloi and Iron in Archaic Greece*, Oxford: Unpublished DPhil Thesis.

Hägg, R. (1974), *Die Gräber der Argolis in submykenischer, protogeometrischer und geometrischer Zeit 1. Lage und Form der Gräber*, Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Hägg, R. (1980), "Some aspects of the burial customs of the Argolid in the Dark Ages" in AAA 13, 119-126.

Hägg, R. (1983), "Funerary Meals in the Geometric Necropolis at Asine?", in Hägg, R. (ed.) *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*, Stockholm: ActaAth, 89-93.

Hägg, R. (1987), "Submycenaean cremation burials in the Argolid?" in Laffineur, R. (ed.) *THANATOS: Les coutumes funéraires en egee a l'age du bronze*, Liège: Université de l'Etat à Liège, 207-212.

Hägg, R. (1998), "Argos and its neighbours: regional variations in the burial practices in the Protogeometric and Geometric Periods" in Pariente, A. and G. Touchais (eds.), *Argos et l'Argolide: Topographie et Urbanisme*, Paris: École Française Athènes, 131-135.

Hatzaki, E. M., M. Prent, J. N. Coldstream, D. Evely, and A. Livarda (2008), "Knossos, the Little Palace North Project, Part I: The Early Greek Periods" in BSA 103, 223-273.

Hale, J. (2013), "Not Patriots, Not Farmers, Not Amateurs: Greek Soldiers of Fortune and the Origins of Hoplite Warfare" in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 176-193.

Hall, J. M. (1995), "How Argive was the "Argive" Heraion? The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain, 900-400 BC" in AJA 99, 577-613.

Hall, J. M. (1997a), *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. M. (1997b), "Alternative responses within Polis formation: Argos, Mykenai and Tiryns" in Andersen, H. D., H. W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen, and A. Rathje, *Acta Hyperborea 7: Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries BC*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 89-109.

Hall J. M. (2013), *A History of the Archaic Greek World ca. 1200-479 BCE*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing (first edition 2007).

Hanson, V. D. (1989), *The Western Way of War*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hanson, V. D. (1995), *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization*, New York: Free Press.
- Härke, H. (1992), “Changing Symbols in a Changing Society: the Anglo-Saxon weapon burial rite in the seventh century” in Carver, M. O. H. (ed.), *The Age of Sutton Hoo: The seventh century in north-western Europe*, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 149-165.
- Harrell, K. (2009), *Mycenaean Ways of War: The Past, Politics, and Personhood*, Sheffield: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Hoffmann, H. (ed.) (1972), *Early Cretan Armorers*, Mainz on Rhine: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Hogarth, D. G. (1899-1900a), “Knossos: Early Town and Cemeteries” in *BSA* 6, 70-85.
- Hogarth, D. G. (1899-1900b), “The Dictaeon Cave” in *BSA* 6, 94-116.
- Hornblower, S. (2007), “Warfare in ancient literature: the paradox of war” in Sabin, P., van Wees, and M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 22-53.
- Hughes, D. D. (1991), *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge.
- Hunt, P. (2007), “Military Forces” in Sabin, P., van Wees, and M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 108-146.
- Hurwit, J. M. (2002), “Reading the Chigi Vase” in *Hesperia* 71, 1-22.
- Hutchinson, R. W. and J. Boardman (1954), “The Khaniala Tekke Tombs” in *BSA* 49, 215-228.
- Iakovidis, S. (1980), *Excavations of the Necropolis at Perati*, Los Angeles: University of California.
- Iakovidis, S. (2003), “Late Helladic III C at Mycenae” in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms. Proceedings of the international workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna, May 7th and 8th, 2001*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 117-123.

Jackson, A. (1983), "Some deliberate damage to Archaic Greek helmets dedicated at Olympia" in *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 8.2, 22-27.

Jackson, A. (1991), "Hoplites and the Gods: The Dedication of Captured Arms and Armour" in Hanson, V. D. (ed.) *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London: Routledge, 228-249.

Janko, R. (1982), *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic development in epic diction* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jantzen, D. U. Brinker, J. Orschiedt, J. Heinemeier, J. Piek, K. Hauenstein, J. Krüger, G. Lidke, H. Lübke, R. Lampe (2011), "A Bronze Age battlefield? Weapons and trauma in the Tollense Valley, north-eastern Germany" in *Antiquity* 85, 417-433.

Jarva, E. (1995), *Archaiologia on Archaic Greek Body Armour*, Rovaniemi: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen Yhdistys Societas Historica Finlandiae Septentrionalis.

Johannesson, E. G. and M. L. Machicek (2010), "War and Peace: A Reassessment of the Archaeological Traces of Warfare, Inter-Personal Violence and Peace in the Material Record" in *ARC* 25.1, 13-28.

Jones, R. E. (1986), *Greek and Cypriot Pottery. A Review of Scientific Studies*, Athens: The British School at Athens.

Jung, R. (2009), "Pirates of the Aegean: Italy - the East Aegean - Cyprus at the end of the second millennium BC" in V. Karageorghis and O. Kouka (eds.), *Cyprus and the East Aegean: Intercultural Contacts from 3000 to 500 BC. An International Archaeological Symposium held at Pythagoreion, Samos, October 17th - 18th 2008*, Nicosia: The A.G. Leventis Foundation, 72-93.

Jung, R. and M. Mehofer (2005), "A Sword of Naue II Type from Ugarit and the Historical Significance of Italian-type Weaponry in the Eastern Mediterranean" in *Aegean Archaeology* 8, 111-135.

Jung, R. and M. Mehofer (2013), "Mycenaean Greece and Bronze Age Italy: Cooperation, Trade or War?" in *ArchKorrBl* 43.2, 175-194.

Kahil, L. (1968), "Céramique géométrique et subgéométrique d'Erétrie" in *AntKunst* 11, 99-101.

Kanta, A. (1980), *The Late Minoan III period in Crete. Sites, Pottery and their Distribution*, Göteborg : Paul Aströms Förlag.

Kanta, A. (2003), “Aristocrats-Traders-Emigrants-Settlers. Crete in the Closing Phases of the Bronze Age” in Stampolidis, N and V. Karageorghis (eds.), *Ploes... Sea Routes... Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th - 6th c. BC: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, 29 September-2 October 2002*, Athens: University of Crete and A. G. Leventis Foundation, 173-186.

Keegan, J. (1976), *The Face of Battle. A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and The Somme*, London: J. Cape.

Keeley, L. H. (1996), *War Before Civilization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, T. (1967), “The Argive Destruction of Asine” in *Historia* 16.4, 422-431.

Kelly, T. (1976), *A History of Argos to 500 B.C.*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kilian, K. (1988), “Mycenaeans up to date, trends and changes in recent research” in French, E. and K. A. Wardle (eds.), *Problems in Greek Prehistory, Papers presented at the Centenary Conference of the British School of Archaeology at Athens, Manchester April 1986*, Bristol: Bristol Classics Press, 115-152.

Kilian, K. (1996), “Earthquakes and Archaeological Context at 13th Century BC Tiryns” in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 63-68.

Kilian-Dirlmeier, I. (1993), *Die Schwerter in Griechenland*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.

Knapp, A. B., J. D. Muhly, P. M. Muhly (1988), “To Hoard is Human: Late Bronze Age Metal Deposits in Cyprus and the Aegean” in *RDAC*, 233-262.

Kollia, E. (2006), “Γεωμετρικοί τάφοι στο Άργος” in *Πρακτικά Α' Αρχαιολογικής Συνόδου Νότιας και Δυτικής Ελλάδος, Πάτρα 9-12 Ιουνίου 1996*, 317-324.

Kolonas, L. (2009a), *Network of visitable Mycenaean settlements and cemeteries in the Prefecture of Patras: Chalandritsa, Katarraktis, Mitopoli, Spaliareika, Elaiochorion, Portes*, Athens: Ministry of Culture.

Kolonas, L. (2009b), *Voudeni. An Important Site of Mycenaean Achaia*, Athens: Ministry of Culture.

Kotsonas, A. (2011), “Quantification of ceramics from Early Iron Age tombs” in Verdan, S. T. Theurillat, and A. K. Pfyffer (eds.), *Early Iron Age Pottery: A Quantitative Approach. Proceedings of the International Round Table organized by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (Athens, November 28-30, 2008)*, Oxford: Archaeopress, 129-138.

Kourouniotis, K. (1903), “Ἀγγεῖα Ἐρέτριας” in *Eph. Arch.*, 1-38.

Kourouniotis, K. (1913) “Goldschmuck aus Eretria” *AM* 38, 289-328.

Kramer-Hajos, M. (2013), “Review of Bernd Steinmann, *Die Waffengräber der ägäischen Bronzezeit: Waffenbeigaben, soziale Selbstdarstellung und Adelsethos in der minoisch-mykenischen Kultur*. Philippika, 52. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012” in *BMCR* 2013.07.02 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2013/2013-07-02.html>) last accessed 15/01/2014.

Krentz, P. (2013), “Hoplite Hell: How Hoplites Fought” in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 134-156.

Kritzas, Ch. (1973), “Ἀργος” in *AD* 28, 1973, *Χρονικά*, 122-135.

Kroll, J. (2008), “Early Iron Age Balance Weights at Lefkandi, Euboea” in *OJA* 27.1, 37-48.

Lambert, S. D. (1982), “A Thucydidean Scholium on the 'Lelantine War'” in *JHS* 102, 216-220.

Langdon, S. (2008), *Art and Identity in Dark Age Greece, 1100-700 B.C.E.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latacz, J. (1977), *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios (Zetemata 66)*, Munich: C. H. Beck.

Lembesi, A. (1970), “New discoveries at Arkhanes” in *Estia* (7th Nov.)

Lemos, I. (2000), “Songs for heroes: the lack of images in early Greece” in N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes (eds.), *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 11-21.

Lemos, I. (2002), *The Protogeometric Aegean. The Archaeology of the Late Eleventh and Tenth Centuries BC*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lemos, I. (2003), “Craftsmen, Traders and some Wives in Early Iron Age Greece” in Stampolidis, N and V. Karageorghis (eds.), *Ploes... Sea Routes... Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th - 6th c. BC: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, 29 September-2 October 2002*, Athens: University of Crete and A. G. Leventis Foundation, 187-195

Lemos, I. (2006a), “Athens and Lefkandi: A Tale of Two Sites” in Deger-Jalkotzy, S., and I. Lemos (eds.), *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 505-530.

Lemos, I. (2006b), “Euboea” in Whitley, J. “Archaeology in Greece 2005-2006”, 62-63.

Lemos, I. (2007a), ““... ἐπεὶ πόρε μύρια ἔδνα ...” (*Iliad* 22,472) Homeric Reflections in Early Iron Age Elite Burials” in Alram-Stern, E. and G. Nightingale, (eds.), *Keimelion. Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur homerischen Epoche*, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 275-284.

Lemos, I. (2007b), “Euboea” in Whitley, J. “Archaeology in Greece 2006-2007”, 38-40.

Lemos, I. (2008), “Euboea” in Morgan, C. “Archaeology in Greece 2007-2008”, 51-54.

Lemos, I. (2009), “Euboea” in Morgan, C. “Archaeology in Greece 2008-2009”, 47-49.

Lemos, I. (2012), “Euboea and Central Greece in the Postpalatial and Early Greek Periods” in *AR* 58, 19-27.

Lemos, I. and D. Mitchell (2011), “Elite Burials in Early Iron Age Aegean. Some preliminary observations concerning the spatial organization of the Toumba Cemetery at Lefkandi” in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.) *The "Dark Ages" Revisited*, Volos University of Thessaly Press, 635-644.

Liston, M.A., and J. Papadopoulos (2004), “The "Rich Athenian Lady" Was Pregnant: The Anthropology of a Geometric Tomb Reconsidered” in *Hesperia* 73, 7-38.

Livarda, A. (2012), "The Archaeobotanical Evidence of the Late Bronze Age and Protogeometric occupation under the Roman Villa Dionysus, Knossos, Crete, and an overview of the Protogeometric data of Greece" in *BSA* 107, 189-209.

Loader, C. (1998), *Building in Cyclopean Masonry, With Special Reference to the Mycenaean Fortifications on Mainland Greece*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Lorimer, H. L. (1947), "The Hoplite Phalanx with Special Reference to the Poems of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus" in *BSA* 42, 76-138.

Lorimer, H. L. (1950), *Homer and the Monuments*, London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

Lowe Fri, M. (2011), *The Minoan Double Axe. An experimental study of production and use*, Oxford: Archaeopress.

Maass, M. (1984), "Aegina, Aphaia-Temple. Neue Funde von Waffen Weihungen" in *AA* 263-280

Mackil, E. (2004), "Wandering Cities: Alternatives to Catastrophe in the Greek Polis" in *AJA* 108, 493-516.

Maran, J. (2006), "Coming to terms with the past: ideology and power in Late Helladic IIIC" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and I. Lemos (eds.) *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 123-150.

Maran, J. (2010), "Tiryns" in Cline, E. H. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 722-734.

Maroukian, H., K. Gaki-Papanastassiou, and D. Papanastassiou (1996), "Geomorphologic - seismotectonic Observations in Relation to Catastrophes at Mycenae" in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 189-194.

Matthew, C. (2013), *A Storm of Spears. Understanding the Greek Hoplite at War*, Barnsley: Pen & Sword.

Mazarakis Ainian, A. (1987), "Geometric Eretria" in *AntKunst* 30, 3-24.

Mazarakis Ainian, A. (1997), *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples. Architecture, Religion and Society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100-700 B.C.)*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.

- Mazarakis Ainian, A. (1998), "Oropos in the Early Iron Age" in Bats, M. and B. d'Agostino. (eds.), *Euboica. L'Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in Occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Napoli, 13-16 Novembre 1996*. Napoli: Centre Jean Bérard. Istituto Universitario Orientale. Dipartimento del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, 179-215.
- Mazarakis Ainian, A. (2011), "A Necropolis of the Geometric Period at Marathon. The Context" in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.) *The "Dark Ages" Revisited*, Volos University of Thessaly Press, 703-716.
- Mazarakis Ainian, A. and I. Leventi (2009), "The Aegean" in Raaflaub, K. and H. van Wees (eds.) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 212-238.
- McDonald, W. A. (1961), "A Geometric Grave Group from Thorikos in Attica" in *Hesperia* 30, 299-304.
- Mee, C. (2011), *Greek Archaeology: A Thematic Approach*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Middleton, G. D. (2010), *The Collapse of Palatial Society in LBA Greece and the Postpalatial Period*, Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Michaud, J.P. (1971), "Chronique des Fouilles et Découvertes Archéologiques en Grèce en 1970" in *BCH* 95, 803-1067.
- Molloy, B. (2005), "Naue II swords and the collapse of the Aegean Bronze Age" in Briault, C. J. Green, A. Kaldelis, and A. Steliatou (eds.), *Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology 2003*, Oxford: Archaeopress, 115-117.
- Molloy, B. (2008), "Martial arts and materiality: a combat archaeology perspective on Aegean swords of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries BC" in *World Archaeology* 40.1 116-134.
- Molloy, B. (2010), "Swords and Swordmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age" in *AJA* 114, 403-428.
- Molloy, B. (2012), "Martial Minoans? War as social process, practice and event in Bronze Age Crete" in *BSA* 107, 87-142.

Morgan, C. (1990), *Athletes and oracles. The transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the eighth century BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, C. (2008), "Archaeology in Greece 2007-2008" in AR 54 1-114.

Morgan, C. (2009), "Archaeology in Greece 2008-2009" in AR 55 1-102.

Morgan, C. (2010), "Archaeology in Greece 2009-2010: The Peloponnese" in AR 56, 20-66.

Morgan, C. and T. Whitelaw (1991), "Pots and Politics: Ceramic Evidence for the Rise of the Argive State" in AJA 95, 79-108.

Morris, I. (1986a), "The Use and Abuse of Homer" in CA 5, 81-138.

Morris, I. (1986b), "Gift and commodity in Archaic Greece" in *Man* 21, 1-17.

Morris, I. (1987), *Burial and ancient society: The rise of the Greek city-state*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, I. (1994), "Review of Popham et al. 1993" in AJA 98, 573-574.

Morris, I. (1997), "The Art of Citizenship" in Langdon, S. (ed.), *New Light on a Dark Age. Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, Columbia: The University of Missouri Press 9-43.

Morris, I. (1999), "Iron Age Greece and the meanings of "princely tombs"" in Ruby, P. (ed.) *Les Princes de la Protohistoire et L'Émergence de L'État*, Naples-Rome: Centre Hean Bérard, 57-80.

Morris, I. (2000), *Archaeology as Cultural History: Words and Things in Iron Age Greece*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Morris, I. (2001), "The Use and Abuse of Homer" in Cairns, D. L. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 57-91.

Moschos, I. (2002), "Western Achaea during the LHIIIC period. Approaching the latest excavation evidence" in Greco, E. (ed.) *Gli Achei E L'Identità Etnica Degli Achei D'Occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Paestum, 23-25 febbraio 2001*, Paestum: Pandemos, 15-41.

Mountjoy, P. A. (1984), "The Bronze Greaves from Athens: A Case for a LHIIIC Date" in *Opuscula Atheniensia* XV: 11:135-146.

Mountjoy, P. A. (1995), *Mycenaean Athens*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Mountjoy, P. A. (1999), *Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*, Rahsen/Westf: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.

Mountjoy, P. A. and V. Hankey (1988), "LH III C late verses Sub-Mycenaean: the Kerameikos Pompeion cemetery reviewed" in *JdI* 77: 1-37.

Mühlenbruch 2007 in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms II: LH III C Middle. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna October 29th and 30th, 2004*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,

Mühlenbruch, T. (2009), "Tiryns - The Settlement and its History in LH III C" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and A. Bächle (eds.), *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms III: LH III C Late and the transition to the Early Iron Age. Proceedings of the international workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna, February 23rd and 24th, 2007*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 313-326.

Müller-Karpe, H. (1962), "Die Metallbeigaben der früheisenzeitlichen Kerameikos-Gräber" in *JdI* 77: 59-129.

Mylonas, G. E. (1962), "Three Late Mycenaean Knives" in *AJA* 66, 406-408.

Nagy, G. (1995), "An Evolutionary model for the Making of Homeric Poetry: Comparative Perspectives", in Carter, J. B. and S. P. Morris (eds.) *The Ages of Homer. A tribute to Emily Townsend*, Vermeule: Austin University of Texas Press, 163-179.

Nagy, G. (1997), "The Shield of Achilles. Ends of the *Iliad* and beginnings of the polis" in Langdon, S. (ed.), *New Light on a Dark Age. Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, Columbia: The University of Missouri Press, 194-207.

Naue, J. (1903), *Die Vorrömischen Schwerter aus Kupfer, Bronze und Eisen*, Munich: Verlag der K. Priv. Kunst-Anstalt Piloty & Loehle.

Niemeier, W.-D., (2007), “Kalapodi” in Whitley, J. “Archaeology in Greece 2006-2007”, 41-43.

Niemeier, W.-D., B. Niemeier, and A. Brysbaert (2012), “The Olpe Chigi and new evidence for early archaic greek wall-painting from the oracle sanctuary of Apollo at Abai (Kalapodi)” in Muglione, E. and A. Benincasa (eds.) *L'Olpe Chigi : storia di un agalma: atti del Convegno internazionale, Salerno, 3-4 giugno 2010*, Salerno: Pandemos, 79-86.

Nijboer, A. J. (2008). “A Phoenician Family Tomb, Lefkandi, Huelva and the Tenth Century BC in the Mediterranean” in Sagona, C. (ed.), *Beyond the Homeland: Markers in Phoenician Chronology*, Leuven, Paris, and Dudley MA: Peeters, 365-377.

Nowicki, K. (2000), *Defensible Sites in Crete c. 1200-800 B.C. (LM IIIB/IIIC through Early Geometric)*, Liège: Université de Liège.

Nowicki, K. (2001), “Sea-raiders and Refugees: Problems of Defensible Sites in Crete c.1200 B.C.” in Karageorghis, V. and C. E. Morris (eds.), *Defensive settlements of the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean after c. 1200 BC. Proceedings of an international workshop held at Trinity College Dublin, 7th-9th May, 1999.*, Nicosia: Trinity College Dublin and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 23-40.

O'Brien, S. (2009), *Beyond the Sharp Bronze: Warfare and Society in Mycenaean Greece*. Liverpool: Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Paidoussis, M., and C. N. Sbarounis, (1975), “A Study of the Cremated Bones from the Cemetery of Perati (LH IIIC)” in *Opuscula Atheniensia* XI, 129-160.

Palaiologou, H. (2013), “Late Helladic IIIC cremation burials of Chania of Mycenae” in Lochner, M. and F. Ruppenstein (eds.), *Cremation burials in the region between the Middle Danube and the Aegean, 1300-750 BC*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,

Papachristodoulos, I. (1969), “Εἰδήσεις ἐξ Ἀργός” *AAA* 2, 15-18.

Papadimitriou, A. (2006), “The Early Iron Age in the Argolid: some new aspects” in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and I. Lemos (eds.) *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 531-547.

Papadopoulos, A. (2006), *The Iconography of Warfare in the Bronze Age Aegean*. Liverpool: Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Papadopoulos, A. (2009), “Warriors, Hunters and Ships in the Late Helladic IIIC Aegean: Changes in the Iconography of Warfare?” in Bachhuber, C. and R. G. Roberts (eds.), *Forces of Transformation: The End of the Bronze Age in the Mediterranean* Oxford: Oxbow Books, 69-77.

Papadopoulos, G. A. (1996), “An Earthquake Engineering Approach to the Collapse of the Mycenaean Palace Civilization of the Greek Mainland” in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 205-209.

Papadopoulos, J. (1997), “Phantom Euboians” in *JMA* 10, 191-219.

Papadopoulos, J. (2003), *Ceramicus Redivivus. The Early Iron Age Potters' Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Papadopoulos, J. (2011), ““Phantom Euboians” - A Decade On” in Rupp, D. W. and J. E. Tomlinson (eds.), *Euboea and Athens. Proceedings of a Colloquium in Memory of Malcolm B. Wallace, Athens 26-27 June 2009*, Athens: Publications of the Canadian Institute in Greece, 113-133.

Papadopoulos, J., and E.L. Smithson (2002), “The Cultural Biography of a Cycladic Geometric Amphora: Islanders in Athens and the Prehistory of Metics” in *Hesperia* 71: 149-199.

Papadopoulos, J., B. N. Damiata, and J. M. Marston (2011), “Once More With Feeling: Jeremy Rutter's Pleas for the Abandonment of the Term Submycenaean Revisited” in Gauss, W., M. Lindblom, R. A. Smith, and J. C. Wright (eds.), *Our Cups Are Full: Pottery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age. Papers Presented to Jeremy B. Rutter on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* Oxford: Archaeopress 187-202.

Papadopoulos, Th. (1978), *Mycenaean Achaea Part 2: Figures*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Papadopoulos, Th. (1979), *Mycenaean Achaea Part 1: Text*, Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.

Papadopoulos, Th. (1995), "A Late Mycenaean Koine in Western Greece and the Adjacent Ionia Islands" in Morris, C. (ed.) *Klados. Essays in Honour of J. N. Coldstream*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 201-208.

Papadopoulos, Th. (1999), "Warrior-Graves in Achaeon Mycenaean cemeteries." in Laffineur, R. (ed.), *Polemos: Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze*, Liège and Austin: Université de Liège and University of Texas at Austin, 267-74.

Papadopoulos, Th, and L. Kontorli-Papadopoulou (2001), "Death, Power, and Troubles in Late Mycenaean Peloponnese. The Evidence of Warrior-graves" in Fisher, P. M. (ed.), *Contributions to the Archaeology and History of the Bronze and Iron Ages in the Eastern Mediterranean. Studies in Honour of Paul Åström*, Vienna: Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut, 127-138.

Papazoglou-Manioudaki, L. (1994), "A Mycenaean Warrior's Tomb at Krini Near Patras" in *BSA* 89, 171-200.

Pappi, E. (2006), "Argive Geometric figured style. The rule and the exception" in Rystedt, E. and B. Wells (eds.), *Pictorial Pursuits. Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 229-237.

Pappi, E. and S. Triantaphyllou (2011), "Mortuary practices and the human remains: A preliminary study of the Geometric graves in Argos, Argolid" in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.) *The "Dark Ages" Revisited*, Volos University of Thessaly Press, 717-732.

Parker, V. (1997), *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frühgriechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Parker Pearson, M., (2003), *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*, Stroud: Sutton Publishing, (first edition 1999).

Parker Pearson, M. (2005), "Warfare, violence and slaver in later prehistory: an introduction" in Parker Pearson, M. and I. Thorpe (eds.), *Warfare, Violence and Slavery in Prehistory: Proceedings of a Prehistoric Society conference at Sheffield University*, Oxford: Archaeopress, 19-33.

Parpao, E. A. (1971), "Αργολίς" in *AD* 26, 1971, *Χρονικά*, 74-84.

- Paschalidis, C. (2009), *The LMIII cemetery at Tourloti, Siteia. The 'Xanthoudidis Master' and the Octopus Style in East Crete*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Payne, H. (1928), "Early Greek Vases from Knossos" *BSA* 29, 224-298.
- Pellegrini, G. (1903), "Tombe Greche Archaiche. E Tomba Greco-Sannitica A Tholos Della Necropoli di Cuma" in *Monumenti Antichi* 13, 204-294.
- Perlman, P. (2000), "Gortyn. The First Seven Hundred Years (Part I)" in Flensted-Jensen, P., T. H. Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History presented to Morgen Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 59-89.
- Pernice, E. (1892), "Geometrische Vase aus Athen" in *AM* 17, 205-228.
- Petrakos, V. C. (2009), *To Ergon Tης Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας Κατα Το 2009*. Athens.
- Petropoulos, M. (2007), "A Mycenaean Cemetery at Nikoleika near Aigion of Achaia" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and M. Zavadil (eds.) *LH III C Chronology and Synchronisms II: LH III C Middle. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna October 29th and 30th, 2004*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 253-285.
- Philios, D. (1989), "Ανασκαφαὶ ἀρχαίων τάφων ἐν Ἐλευσίνι" in *Eph. Arch.*, 117-193.
- Piteros, C. (1998), "Δ' Εφορεία Προϊστορικών Και Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων: Ἄργος: Οδὸς Ηρακλέους" in *AD* 53, *Χρονικά* B1, 109-112.
- Popham, M. R. (1994), "Precolonization: early Greek contact with the East" in Tsetschladze, G. R. and F. D. Angelis (eds.), *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation. Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, 11-34.
- Popham, M. R. and I. Lemos (1995), "A Euboean Warrior Trader" in *OJA* 14.2, 151-157.
- Popham, M. R., E. Touloupa, and L. H. Sackett (1982a), "The hero of Lefkandi" in *Antiquity* 56, 169-174.
- Popham, M. R., E. Touloupa, and L. H. Sackett (1982b), "Further Excavation of the Toumba Cemetery at Lefkandi" in *BSA* 77, 213-248.

Popham, M. R., P. Calligas, L. H. Sackett (1989), "Further Excavation of the Toumba Cemetery at Lefkandi, 1984 and 1986, a Preliminary Report" in *AR* 35, 117-129.

Prent, M. (2005), *Cretan Sanctuaries and Cults. Continuity and Change from Late Minoan IIIC to the Archaic Period*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Pritchett, W. K. (1979), *The Greek State at War. Part III: Religion*, Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Pritchett, W. K. (1971-74-79-85-91), *The Greek State at War. 5 vols*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

Psychogiou, O. (1995), "Δ' Εφορεία Προϊστορικών Και Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων: Άργος: Οδός Γούναρη – Έργα ΔΕΥΑΑΡ" in *AD* 50, *Χρονικά* B1, 96-99.

Raaflaub, K. (1997), "Soldiers, Citizens, and the Evolution of the Early Greek Polis" in Mitchell, L. G. and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London: Routledge 49-59.

Raaflaub, K. (1999), "Archaic and Classical Greece" in Raaflaub, K. and N. Rosenstein (eds.), *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, The Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*. Washington: Harvard University Press, 129-161.

Raaflaub, K. (2013), "Early Greek Infantry Fighting in a Mediterranean Context" in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 95-111.

Raaflaub, K. and H. van Wees (2009), "Preface" in Raaflaub, K. and H. van Wees (eds.) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, xx-xxii.

Raftopoulou, S. (1998), "New finds from Sparta" in Cavanagh, W. and S. Walker (eds.), *Sparta in Laconia: The Archaeology of a City and its Countryside*, London: The British School at Athens, 125-140.

Rebay-Salisbury, K. (2010), "Cremations: fragmented bodies in the Bronze and Iron Ages" in Rebay-Salisbury, K., M. L. Sørensen, and J. Hughes (eds.), *Body Parts and Bodies Whole: changing relations and meanings*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, 64-71.

- Rehak, P. and J. G. Younger (1998), "Review of Aegean Prehistory VII: Neopalatial, Final Palatial, and Postpalatial Crete" in *AJA* 102, 91-173.
- Ridgway, D. (1992), *The first Western Greeks*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridgway, D. (1997), "Nestor's Cup and the Etruscans" in *OJA* 16, 325-344.
- Rombos, T. (1988), *The Iconography of Attic Late Geometric II Pottery*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Ruppenstein, F. (2013), "Cremation burials in Greece from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age: continuity or change?" in Lochner, M. and F. Ruppenstein (eds.), *Cremation burials in the region between the Middle Danube and the Aegean, 1300-750 BC*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 185-196.
- Rutter, J. B. (1978), "A Plea for the Abandonment of the Term "Submycenaean"" in *Temple University Aegean Symposium* 3, 58-65.
- Sackett, H. and J. H. Musgrave (1976), "A New Figured Krater from Knossos" in *BSA* 71, 117-129
- Sackett, L., V. Hankey, R. Howell, T. Jacobsen, and M. R. Popham (1966), "Prehistoric Euboea: Contributions Toward a Survey" *BSA* 61, 33-112.
- Sanders, N. (1961), "The First Aegean Swords and their Ancestry" in *AJA* 65, 17-29.
- Sanders, N. (1963). "Later Aegean Bronze Swords" in *AJA* 67, 117-153.
- Schilardi, D. U. (1988) "The temple of Athena at Koukounaries. Observations on the cult of Athena on Paros" in Hägg, R., N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist (eds.) *Early Greek Cult Practice. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 41-48.
- Schilardi, D. U. (1992). "Paros and the Cyclades after the Fall of the Mycenaean Palaces" in Olivier, J.-P. (ed.), *Mykenaiika : actes du IXe Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique de Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes*, Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 621-639.

Schilardi, D. U. (2011), “Αριστοκρατικές Ταφές από το Γεωμετρικό νεκροταφείο της Κηφισιάς” in Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed.) *The "Dark Ages" Revisited*, Volos University of Thessaly Press, 675-702.

Schliemann, H. (1878), *Mycenae: A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries at Mycenae and Tiryns*, London: John Murray.

Schwartz, A. (2009), *Reinstating the Hoplite. Arms, Armour and Phalanx Fighting in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Schwartz, A. (2013), “Large Weapons, Small Greeks: The Practical Limitations of Hoplite Weapons and Equipment” in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 157-175.

Schlörb-Vierneisel, B. (1966), “Eridanos-Nekropole. Berichte über die Grabungen 1964 und 1965 Südluch der Heiligen Strasse” in *AM* 81, 4-111.

Shelmerdine, C. (1999), “Pylion Polemics: The Latest Evidence on Military Matters” in Laffineur, R. (ed.), *Polemos: Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze*, Liège and Austin: Université de Liège and University of Texas at Austin, 403-410.

Sherratt, E. S. (1990), “Reading the texts: archaeology and the Homeric question” in *Antiquity* 64, 807-824.

Sherratt, E. S. (1994), “Commerce, iron and ideology: Metallurgical innovation in 12th-11th century Cyprus” in Karageorghis, V. (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Symposium Cyprus in the 11th Century B.C.*, Nicosia: A.G. Leventis Foundation, 59-106.

Sherratt, E. S. (2010), “The Trojan War: history or bricolage?” in *BICS* 53-2, 1-18.

Sjöberg, B. L. (2004). *Asine and the Argolid in the Late Helladic III Period*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Skias, A. N. (1898), “Παναρχαία έλευσινιακή νεκρόπολις” in *Eph. Arch.*, 29-122.

Sluka, J. A. (1992), “The Anthropology of Conflict” in Nordstrom, C. and J.-A. Martin (eds.) *The Paths to Domination, Resistance and Terror*, Berkley: University of California Press, 18-36.

- Smith, S. K. (2009), "Skeletal Evidence for Militarism in Mycenaean Athens" in Schepartz, L.A., S.C. Fox, and C. Bourbou (eds.) *New Directions in the Skeletal Biology of Greece*, Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies in Athens, 99-109.
- Smithson, E. L. (1974), "A Geometric Cemetery on the Areopagus: 1897, 1932, 1947." in *Hesperia* 43, 325-390.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1964), *Early Greek Armour and Weapons from the End of the Bronze Age to 600 BC*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1973), "Bronze "Phalara" - A Review" in *Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie* 3, 41-50.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1980), *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment*. London: J M Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1996), "Review of Kilian-Dirlmeier, Die Schwerter in Griechenland (Außerhalb der Peloponnes), Bulgarien und Albanien" in *AJA* 100, 180-81.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1998), *Homer and the Artists. Text and Picture in Early Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1999), *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*, London: John Hopkins University Press (first edition 1967).
- Snodgrass, A. M. (2000), *The Dark Age of Greece. An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to Eighth Centuries BC*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press (first edition 1971).
- Snodgrass, A. M. (2006a), "The hoplite reform and history" in *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece. Collected Papers on Early Greece and Related Topics (1965-2002)*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 310-330 (first published 1965).
- Snodgrass, A. M. (2006b), "The historical significance of fortification in Archaic Greece" in *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece. Collected Papers on Early Greece and Related Topics (1965-2002)*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 331-343 (first published 1986).

Snodgrass, A. M. (2006c), “The economics of dedication at Greek sanctuaries” In A. Snodgrass, *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece. Collected Papers on Early Greece and Related Topics (1965-2002)*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 258-268 (first published 1989-1990).

Snodgrass, A. M. (2006d), “The ‘hoplite reform’ revisited” in *Archaeology and the Emergence of Greece. Collected Papers on Early Greece and Related Topics (1965-2002)* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 344-359.

Snodgrass, A. M. (2013), “Setting the Frame Chronologically” in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 85-94.

Sotiriadis, G. (1939), “Ανασκαφαὶ Μαραθῶνος” in *Praktika*.

Spathari, E. and M. Chatzioti (1983), “Λεωφόρος Βας. Σοφίας και Ηρώδου του Αττικού 2” in *AD 38*, 1983, *Χρονικά*, 23-25.

Stais, V. (1917), “Μικρὰ εὐρήματα γινόμενα ἐν τῇ τεχνητῇ ἐπιχώσει τοῦ τεμένου της Ἀθηνᾶς” in *Eph. Arch.*, 207-213.

Stauropoulos, Ph. D. (1965), “Β’ Ἀνασκαφικαὶ ἐργασίαι καὶ τυχαῖα εὐρήματα” in *AD 20*, 1965, *Χρονικά*, 44-109.

Stauropoulou-Gatsi, M., R. Jung, and M. Mehofer (2012), “Τάφος “Μυκηναίου” Πολεμιστή στον Κουβαρά Αιτωλοακαρνανίας. Πρώτη Παρουσίαση” in Stampolidis, N., A. Kanta, and A. Giannikouri (eds.), *Athenasia. The Earthly, the Celestial, and the Underworld in the Mediterranean from the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age*, Athens: Ministry of Culture, 247-266.

Steinmann, B. F. (2012), *Die Waffengräber der ägäischen Bronzezeit. Waffenbeigaben, soziale Selbstdarstellung und Adelsethos in der minoisch-mykenischen Kultur*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG.

Stewart, D. (2011), “Archaeology in Greece 2010-2011: Peloponnese (Archaic to Roman)” in *AR 57*, 49-62.

- Stiros, S. (1996), "Identification of Earthquakes from Archaeological Data: Methodology, Criteria and Limitations" in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 129-152.
- Strömberg, A. (1993), *Male or Female? A methodological study of grave gifts as sex-indicators in Iron Age burials from Athens*, Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Stubbings, F. H. (1954), "Mycenae 1939-1953 Part VII. A Bronze Founder's Hoard" in *BSA* 49, 292-296.
- Styrenius, C.-G. (1967), *Submycenaean Studies. Examination of Finds from Mainland Greece with a Chapter on Attic Protogeometric Graves*, Lund: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- Styrenius, C.-G. (1998), *Asine. A Swedish excavation site in Greece*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Tandy, D. W. (1997), *Warriors into Traders. The Power of the Market in Early Greece*. London: University of California Press.
- Tarlow, S. (1992), "Each slow dusk a drawing-down of blinds" in *ARC* 11, 125-140.
- Themelis, P. G. (1969), "Ειδήσεις ἐξ Εὐβοίας" *AAA* 2, 26-28.
- Thomas, P. M. (2005), "Review of Papadopoulos, J. 2003" in *BMCR* 2005.03.21 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2005/2005-03-21.html>) last accessed 15/01/2014.
- Thompson, H. A. (1947), "The Excavation of the Athenian Agora, 1940-46" in *Hesperia* 16, 193-213.
- Thompson, H. A. (1950), "Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1949" in *Hesperia* 19, 313-337.
- Thompson, H. A. (1956), "Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1955" in *Hesperia* 25, 46-68.
- Tölle, R. (1963), "Figürlich Bemalte Fragmente der Geometrischen Zeit vom Kerameikos" in *AA*, 642-666.
- Tomlinson, R. A. (1972). *Argos and the Argolid. From the end of the Bronze Age to the Roman occupation*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Touchais, G (1976), “Rapports sur les travaux de l’école Française en 1975: Argos: Aspis” in *BCH* 100, 755-758.

Touchais, G. (1980), “Rapports sur les travaux de l’école Française en 1979: Argos: Aspis” in *BCH* 104, 698-699.

Treherne, P. (1995), “The Warrior's Beauty: The Masculine Body and Self-Identity in Bronze-Age Europe” in *Journal of European Archaeology* 3.1, 105-144.

Tsontas, C. (1897) *The Mycenaean Age: A Study of the Monuments and Culture of Pre-Homeric Greece*, Chicago: Argonaut Inc.

Tziafalias, A. (1978), “Ανασκαφικές Ερευνες στον Άγιο Γεώργιο Λαρισης” *AAA* 11, 156-182.

Undset, I. (1890), “Archaologische Aufsätze über südeuropäische Fundstücke” in *ZfE* 22, 1-29.

Van Wees, H. (1994a), “The Homeric Way of War: The Iliad and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)” in *G&R* 41, 1-18.

Van Wees, H. (1994b), “The Homeric Way of War: The Iliad and the Hoplite Phalanx (II)” in *G&R* 41, 131-155.

Van Wees, H. (1998a), “Greeks bearing arms: the state, the leisure class, and the display of weapons in archaic Greece” in Fisher, N. and H. van Wees (eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, London: Duckworth, 333-378

Van Wees, H. (1998b), “A brief history of tears: gender differentiation in Archaic Greece” in Foxhall, L. and J. Salmon (eds.), *When Men Were Men. Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London: Routledge, 10-53.

Van Wees, H. (2000), “The development of the hoplite phalanx. Iconography and reality in the seventh century” in van Wees, H. (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, London: Duckworth and the Classical Press of Wales, 125-166.

Van Wees, H. (2004), *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Duckworth.

- Van Wees, H. (2006), "From Kings to Demigods: Epic Heroes and Social change c.750-600 BC" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and I. Lemos (eds.) *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 363-379.
- Verdelis, N. M. (1963a), "Neue geometrische Gräber in Tiryns" in *AM* 78, 1-62.
- Verdelis, N. M. (1963b), "Ἀργος" in *AD* 18, 1963, *Χρονικά*, 57-63.
- Vermeule, E. and V. Karageorghis (1982), *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*, London: Harvard University Press.
- Viggiano, F. G. (2013), "The Hoplite Revolution and the Rise of the Polis" in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 112-133.
- Viggiano, F. G. and H. van Wees, (2013), "The Arms, Armor, and Iconography of Early Greek Hoplite Warfare" in Kagan, D. and F. G. Viggiano (eds.), *Men of Bronze. Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 57-73.
- Von Freytag, B. gen Löringhoff (1995), "Kerameikos, Tätigkeitsbericht 1992-94. Untersuchungen in Turm N," *AA*, 639-649.
- Voutsaki, S. (2010), "Argolid" in Cline, E. H. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 599-613.
- Wace, A. J. B. and M. S. Thompson (1912), "Excavations at Halos" in *BSA* 18, 1-29.
- Walker, K. G. (2004), *Archaic Eretria: A political and social history from the earliest times to 490 BC*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Wallace, S. (2010), *Ancient Crete. From successful collapse to democracy's alternative, twelfth to fifth centuries BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watrous, L. V. (1996), *The Cave Sanctuary of Zeus at Psycharo. A Study of Extra-Urban Sanctuaries in Minoan and Early Iron Age Crete*, Liège: Université de Liège.
- Wells, B. (1988), "Early Greek Building Sacrifices" in Hägg, R., N. Marinatos, and G. C. Nordquist (eds.) *Early Greek Cult Practice. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 259-266.

West, M. (1978), *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, M. (1995), "The Date of the Iliad" in *Mus. Helv.* 52, 203-219

West, M. (1998), "Grated Cheese Fit for Heroes" in *JHS* 118, 190-191.

West, M. (2011), *The Making of the Iliad*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, M. (2012), "Towards a chronology of early Greek epic" in Andersen, Ø. and D. T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 224-241.

Whitley, J. (1991a) *Style and society in Dark Age Greece. The changing face of a pre-literate society 1100-700 BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitley, J. (1991b), "Social Diversity in Dark Age Greece" in *BSA* 86, 341-365.

Whitley, J. (1996), "Gender and Hierarchy in Early Athens: The Strange Case of the Disappearance of the Rich Female Grave" in *Metis* IX, 209-232.

Whitley, J. (1998), "Review of Coldstream and Catling 1996, Knossos North Cemetery: Early Greek Tombs" in *AJA* 102, 611-13.

Whitley, J. (2001), *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitley, J. (2002), "Objects with Attitude: Biographical Facts and Fallacies in the Study of Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Warrior Graves" in *CAJ* 12, 217-232.

Whitley, J. (2005a), "Archaeology in Greece 2004-2005" in *AR* 51, 1-118.

Whitley, J. (2005b), "Style Wars: towards an explanation of Cretan exceptionalism" in Cadogan, G., E. Hatzaki, and A. Vasilakis (eds.), *Knossos: Palace, City, State*, London: British School at Athens, 433-442.

Whitley, J. (2006) "Archaeology in Greece 2005-2006" in *AR* 52 1-112.

Whitley, J. (2007) "Archaeology in Greece 2006-2007" in *AR* 53 1-121.

Whitley, J. (2009), "Crete" in Raaflaub, K. and H. van Wees (eds.) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 273-293.

- Wide, S. (1899), “Geometrische Vasen aus Griechenland” in *JdL* 14, 26-43, 78-86, 188-215.
- Wileman, J. (2009), *War and Rumours of War: The Evidential Base for the Recognition of Warfare in Prehistory*, Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Wright, J. C. (1982), “The Old Temple Terrace at the Argive Heraeum and the Early Cult of Hera in the Argolid” in *JHS* 102, 186-201.
- Xanthoudides, S. (1904), “Ἐκ Κρήτης” in *AE*, 1-56.
- Young, R. S. (1949), “An Early Geometric Grave Near the Athenian Agora” in *Hesperia* 18, 275-297.
- Young, R. S. and J. L. Angel (1939), *Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora*, Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Zangger, E. (1996), “Prehistoric Earthquakes and their Consequences, as Preserved in Holocene Sediments from Volos and Argos, Greece” in Stiros, S. and R. E. Jones, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens: IGME & BSA, 245-249.
- Zaphiropoulou, P. N. (2000), “Το Αρχαίο Νεκροταφείο της Πάρου στη Γεωμετρική και Αρχαϊκή εποχή” in *AE* 139, 283-293.
- Zaphiropoulou, P. N. (2002), “Recent finds from Paros” in Stamatopoulou, M. and M. Yeroulanou (eds.), *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, Oxford: The Beazley Archive and Archaeopress, 281-284.
- Zaphiropoulou, P. N. (2006), “Geometric Battle Scenes on Vases from Paros” in Rystedt, E. and B. Wells (eds.), *Pictorial Pursuits. Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001*, Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 271-277.
- Zaphiropoulou, P. N. and A. Agelarakis (2005), “Warriors of Paros. Soldiers' burials offer clues to the rise of Classical Greek city-states” in *Archaeology* 58.1, 30-35.