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Chapter 6

Synthesis and Conclusions

It was argued in Chapter 1 that, in general, two major interpretive perspectives have tended to dominate the debate surrounding the Mycenaean archaeological evidence from the south-eastern Aegean. They have been referred to as the “colonialist” and the “social constructivist perspective” (see section 1.2). From the former perspective, the strong Mycenaean ‘character’ of the south-west coast of Anatolia and adjacent islands is regarded as indicative of the presence of immigrants or colonists from the Mycenaean Greek mainland. It is generally assumed that local groups were fully acculturated to Mycenaean culture. As can be derived from the regional archaeological overview in section 1.1, the ‘impact’ of Mycenaean culture was much less profound in the central and northern parts of the Anatolian west coast. Illustrative in this respect is the widespread popularity of Mycenaean-style chamber tombs in the south-eastern Aegean, which are virtually absent in the areas to the north of it, where mostly local tomb types are found. Scholars working from a “colonialist perspective” see this as a confirmation that the “zone of Mycenaean settlement”\(^1\) stayed limited to the south-west coast of Anatolia and adjacent islands. It is this inter-regional variability which has become central to the “social constructivist perspective”. From this perspective, the archaeological patterns are explained as reflecting the behaviors of different local groups combining Mycenaean traits with other cultural traditions in order to construct hybridized identities of their own. ‘Even’ in the south-eastern Aegean, it is possible to recognize other non-Mycenaean influences in the archaeological record. It is, therefore, believed that there were no immigrants from the Greek mainland present in the south-eastern Aegean during the Late Bronze Age – because the only ‘real’ Mycenaean is a Mycenaean Greek Mycenaean (see discussion in section 1.3).

As a result of the debate between the “colonialist” and the “social constructivist” approach described above, there has been a tendency to discuss the population of the south-eastern Aegean in the Late Bronze Age in terms of two opposing social blocs, with Mycenaeeans on one side and local groups (Anatolians, Rhodians, etc.) on the other. As indicated in Chapter 1, the archaeological evidence upon which this distinction is based is far

\(^{1}\) Niemeier 2005b, 203.
from conclusive. It does not allow for a distinction to be made between ‘real’ and ‘made’ Mycenaeans. In this respect, the importance of the so-called Aḫḫiyawa texts in providing historical ‘evidence’ for the presence of ‘real’ Mycenaeans in this area during the Late Bronze Age should not be underestimated. The Aḫḫiyawa texts, the interpretation of which, similar to the archaeological evidence, is not unequivocal, have been discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.

The “social constructivist” approach also fails to provide a satisfying interpretation of the archaeological evidence. As noted above, the combination of old and new traditions (i.e. Mycenaean) tends to be seen as evidence that the people ‘behind the Mycenaean pots’ were of local rather than of colonial descent. However, from a postcolonial perspective (see section 1.3), this is what one would expect to find in colonial situations, where different groups together create or establish new colonial communities and through their interactions and exchanges ‘new’ forms of (material) culture. One of the key points of postcolonial thinking, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, is that the people by whom colonial situations are made up should not be conceived of as bounded cultures with readily distinct identities (cf. Mycenaeans and locals).²

The bottom line is that the archaeological evidence neither proves nor disproves the possibility of Mycenaean settlers in the south-eastern Aegean. In order to transcend the current debate, a different way of approaching “groups” in the archaeological record has been developed in this dissertation. This approach has been termed “neo-culture history” (Chapter 2). Instead of regarding “groupism” as a permanent state of being and “groups” as the main unit of which the social world is composed, the crystallization of “groups” is seen as a temporary contextual manifestation of increased group awareness (see comments on Brubaker and group making as a project in section 2.1.2). By focusing on contexts in which “groups” are likely to have ‘emerged’ and which can be identified archaeologically, it is possible to study the expression of group identities in the material record.

It was argued in Chapters 2 and 3 that graves can be seen as suitable contexts or ‘locales’ for studying the expression of group identities in the archaeological record. The primary unit of analysis is represented by the assemblage found within a particular tomb, which is regarded as the material manifestation or the product of the activities through which group identities are constructed and manipulated. It is assumed that if material culture was used to express different group identities, this should manifest itself archaeologically in

² Knapp/van Dommelen 2010, 1.
differently constituted tomb assemblages. These differences are reflected in specific
combinations of objects of which the distribution is limited to only a number of tombs in a
particular cemetery. On the basis of these “relations of difference” the different types of
assemblages are defined. There may also be similarities cross-cutting the different groups of
assemblages. These similarities are to be understood as signaling a communal element in the
different group identities manifested in the archaeological burial record (see section 2.3). It
was proposed in Chapter 2 that there may be a connection between these “relations of
similarity” and the expression of ethnic identity, which, as discussed in Chapter 1, is usually
based on common descent and shared feelings of belongingness; commonality is central to the
definition of ethnicity. In this way, tomb assemblages can really be seen as active
constructions constituted by relations of similarity and difference between groups. By
comparing the assemblages from different cemetery sites in terms of their constituting
relations of similarity and difference, an understanding of the socio-cultural connectivity
between them may be developed, which can be considered as an important indicator of
interactions and exchanges between regions and possibly the movement of ideas and/or
people.

The aim of this study has been to establish whether by applying the neo-culture
historical approach described above, it is possible to recognize different groups in the
archaeological burial record; whether there are different group identities being constructed
and expressed via the (Mycenaean) objects found within the tombs in the south-eastern
Aegean. Additional questions include: how do the different parts of which the region is made
up compare to each other in this regard and what does this say about the relations between
them? Another target has been to assess the area’s socio-cultural connectivity with the
supposed heartland of Mycenaean culture, i.e. the Greek mainland. These topics will be
addressed in this chapter. I believe that by concentrating on these points with a neo-culture
historical perspective, it should be possible to shed a new light on the social dynamics
characterizing the societies of the south-west coast of Anatolia and adjacent islands in the
Late Bronze Age. In the next two sections, the different group identities expressed in tombs
on the Greek mainland (see section 6.1 below) and in the south-eastern Aegean (see section
6.2 below) will be discussed.
6.1 The expression of identity in tombs on the Mycenaean Greek mainland

In Chapter 3 of this dissertation I paid attention to tomb assemblages from a number of cemeteries on the Greek mainland in use during the “Palatial period of LHIIIA-B”. The graves excavated in the Agora at Athens (Attica) (see section 3.3) and at Prosymna (Argolid) (see section 3.4) played a central role in the discussion. The neo-culture historical approach was used to investigate similarities and differences between the tomb assemblages that have been uncovered at these sites. A comparison was subsequently made between the different types of assemblages identified here and the (published) materials from a number of other cemeteries situated in central and southern Greece, such as Thebes (Boeotia) (see section 3.6.1), Eleusis (Attica) (see section 3.6.2), Mycenae (Argolid) (see section 3.6.4) and Pylos (Messenia) (see section 3.6.6). The analysis revealed important inter-regional similarities and differences. Regardless of this variety, however, it has been possible to define three general groups of funerary assemblages. These have been referred to as “Greece-1”, “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” (see section 3.7). The question addressed here is what these material definitions can tell us about “groups” and the social dynamics characterizing the societies of the Greek mainland in the Late Bronze Age.

It was noted in section 3.7 that the assemblages from the Greek mainland are constituted by two different types of relations: relations of similarity and relations of difference. As discussed above (also see section 2.3), relations of similarity may be related to the expression of ethnic identity, because they signal a communal element in the different group identities manifested in the archaeological burial record. The second set of relations stresses differences between “groups”, which can be of various natures, such as religious, economic or political.\(^3\) In what follows, both constituting relations are discussed in relation to the “groups” which have manifested themselves in the funerary record of the Greek mainland.

In tombs in central and southern Greece, the relations of similarity are mainly apparent in a fairly uniform treatment of the dead. There appears to have been a prevailing ideology about death and burial in Mycenaean society.\(^4\) Several strands of evidence seem to support this. A good example is represented by the widespread custom of burying the dead in multiple

\(^3\) A similar conclusion concerning the different identities informing Mycenaean burial customs has been reached by S. Voutsaki. She argues that “mortuary ritual simultaneously created two only seemingly opposite realities: unity in the form of collective identity, and difference, in the form of internal divisions” (1998, 46).

\(^4\) Gallou 2005, 139.
graves, especially chamber tombs. It has to be pointed out, however, that not all of the
Mycenaean dead were placed in such graves. As indicated in Chapter 3, a variety of different
tomb types is attested on the Greek mainland during the LHIIIA-B Palatial period. The
chamber tomb is, however, by far the commonest. Connected with the use of chamber tombs
was a shared way by means of which the community of the living disposed of dead bodies; in
most tombs primary and/or secondary burials have been found. A cultural habit which may
be related to this is the placement of unguent containers with the dead. As argued in section
3.7, a similarity cross-cutting the different types of assemblages is that most tombs contained
a number of (small) unguent containers. During LHIIB-IIIA1, small piriform jars (Figs. 7 and
15 in Chapter 3) and rounded alabastra (Figs. 16 and 28 in Chapter 3) appear to have been the
cultural ‘norm’. Most common in LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB are small piriform jars (Figs. 20 and
38 in Chapter 3), rounded alabastra (Fig. 19 in Chapter 3) and (globular) stirrup jars (Figs. 62
and 64 in Chapter 3). Small piriform jars and alabastra may have been used as containers for
honey as well as unguents. It is generally assumed that stirrup jars were used for perfumed
oils. Based on the popularity of unguent containers in tombs, it seems clear that they must
have played a prominent role in the funeral rites performed. Because of this, the rituals for
which these vessels were used may have constituted an important communal element for the
society at large. One interpretation is that the oils and unguents were employed to anoint or
cleanse the dead body. An alternative is that they were meant as provision for use in the
afterlife. In relation to this, it has to be pointed out that we do not know whether the vessels
were filled or empty when they were left inside in a particular tomb. In the latter case, a
symbolic use may also be considered. This evidently also applies to the rest of the pottery
found in tombs.

Two other groups of objects which are present in some quantity in most Mycenaean
multiple tombs are glass and/or stone beads (Figs. 42-3 in Chapter 3) and stone conuli or
buttons (Fig. 39 in Chapter 3). The beads may have belonged to necklaces or diadems, which
were either worn by or presented to the dead. The stone conuli might have been used as
hem-weights to “make women’s heavy woollen skirts, and sometimes apparently men’s kilts,

---

5 In this light note that pit and cist-graves usually, but not always, only contain single inhumations (see for
example discussion of pit and cist-graves excavated in the Agora at Athens in section 3.3).
7 Cavanagh/Mee 1998, 119.
8 Pers. comm. V.V. Stissi (08.13).
9 See, for example, Gallou 2005, 120.
10 Mee 2010, 287.
hang well”.\textsuperscript{11} In this way, it is possible to connect both groups of objects with the presentation of the dead body.\textsuperscript{12} An alternative explanation is offered by C. Gallou. According to her, the beads and buttons may have been attached to the (decayed) shrouds into which the disarticulated bones were wrapped after cleansing (see below). This could account for the fact that in tombs these items are often found in association with secondary burials (consisting of disarticulated bones).\textsuperscript{13} Gallou’s view is based on a reconstruction by W.G. Cavanagh of the performance of secondary burial treatment. He proposes that this involved the removal of the skeletal remains from the chamber to the dromos, where they were ceremonially cleansed. After this, the disarticulated bones were perhaps wrapped into a (new) shroud and returned into the chamber.\textsuperscript{14} Besides beads and buttons, unguent containers are also often found in association with these secondary deposits. Because of this, Gallou proposes that oil, together with water and wine, may have been used for the ceremonial cleansing of the bones and for the unction of the shroud in which the skeletal remains were wrapped.\textsuperscript{15} She also points out that the same deposits also often include terracotta figurines (Figs. 47-8 in Chapter 3), of which the intention may have been to provide “divine protection” (for more on figurines, see below).\textsuperscript{16}

The advantage of Gallou’s interpretation is that it combines all aspects which in Chapter 3 were defined as traits that cross-cut the different group identities manifested in the archaeological burial record of the Greek mainland. In any case, this recurring complex of material traits (multiple graves, primary and secondary inhumations, unguent containers, jewelry beads and stone conuli) can be seen as marking the collective, possibly ethnic, identity of the people buried in chamber tombs in Late Bronze Age Greece – at least in terms of funerary representation.

The second set of relations is related to the expression of differences between “groups”. As noted above, based on the analysis carried out in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, it has been possible to identify three general groups of funerary assemblages in the archaeological burial record of the Greek mainland: “Greece-1”, “Greece-2” and “Greece-3”. They are discussed below.

The group which is best distinguishable is the “Greece-1” group. Persons buried in tombs with “Greece-1” assemblages often have large piriform jars (Figs. 2 and 26 in Chapter

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Hughes-Brock 1999, 280-2.
\item \textsuperscript{12} See, for example, Smith/Jones 2010, 444.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Gallou 2005, 120.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Cavanagh 1978, 171-2.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Gallou 2005, 120.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Ibidem, 122-3.
\end{itemize}
3), medium or large jugs (Figs. 3 and 40 in Chapter 3) and a considerable quantity of unpainted and/or tinned open vessels, especially kylikes and shallow angular bowls (Fig. 40 in Chapter 3), associated with them. This seems to suggest that the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs played an important role in the practices through which the identities that are associated with the “Greece-1” assemblages were expressed.17

What is also typical of assemblages of the “Greece-1” group is that they often contain a large number and wide variety of objects other than pottery, of which examples are weapons (e.g. swords and daggers) (Figs. 9 and 41 in Chapter 3), various kinds of jewelry (Figs. 42-5 in Chapter 3), different types of seals (Fig. 32 in Chapter 3) and non-ceramic (e.g. stone and ivory) containers (Fig. 8 in Chapter 3). As noted above, some of the categories of objects listed above also appear frequently in tombs with “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” assemblages. This applies to glass and stone beads, but also to stone conuli and terracotta figurines. There are, however, a few classes of items which are characteristic of the “Greece-1” group. These include glass relief-beads (Figs. 82 and 89), in particular examples of the curled-leaf or bracket type (Fig. 45 in Chapter 3),18 gold beads (Fig. 2 in Chapter 3), rosettes (Fig. 87 in Chapter 3) and signet rings (Figs. 56 and 88 in Chapter 3), bronze swords (Fig. 9 in Chapter 3) and non-ceramic containers, such as alabaster vases and ivory pyxides (Fig. 8 in Chapter 3). It has to be stressed that these objects do not occur (together) in every tomb with a “Greece-1” assemblage. The main point is that within a particular cemetery, they are mostly found in graves containing “Greece-1” assemblages. Some of these artifacts were manufactured from raw materials not native to Greece, such as gold, ivory and alabaster. Thus, it seems that in addition to the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs, the presentation and deposition of objects other than pottery played an important role in the practices through which the identities associated with the “Greece-1” assemblages were expressed. Since the raw materials for some of the artifacts left inside the tombs had to be imported from elsewhere (see above), these may also have been used to signal a group’s external or international relations.19 Another function might have been to show a group’s (political) connection to one of the leading regional palatial centers. According to S. Voutsaki, access to what she calls “prestige items” – “items . . . often made of exotic and rare materials”20 – was restricted and controlled by the palatial élites. She interprets their distribution pattern, which is limited mostly to tombs, as indicative of an exclusive gift exchange network between

17 See, also, Wright 2004, 99-100.
18 Hughes-Brock 1999, 291.
19 Burns 2010b, 185.
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(local) élites. This implies at least some correspondence between social organization and the image constructed in the tomb of the dead (see section 2.3). However, as noted in Chapter 2, in this PhD study the archaeological burial record is conceived of as a consciously constructed record. Hence, the general lack of ivory and gold in tombs containing “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” assemblages is, therefore, not seen here as the result of the ‘lower’ social or economic status of the persons interred, but rather as indicative of the different group identities being expressed in the funerary record.

A final comment with regard to the “Greece-1” group concerns a development visible in LHIIIB. As noted in Chapter 3, during this period, in most parts of the Greek mainland, we see a strong decrease in the number and variety of offerings other than pottery deposited within the tombs. The only exceptions appear to be the palatial centers, especially Mycenae. Voutsaki believes that the general lack of prestige items at Prosymna (see section 3.4.3) and other “lesser centres” from LHIIIB onwards shows that the access to these goods was becoming increasingly restricted to the palatial élites. From the perspective adopted here, it may also be seen as an indication that less emphasis was being placed on the display and deposition of goods other than pottery than in previous periods. We do not see parallel changes in the pottery or ceramic part of the assemblage, from which it can be inferred that the real or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs continued to play a prominent role.

The “Greece-2” group does not have any typical vase forms or objects other than pottery associated with it. There are similarities and differences with the “Greece-1” group. One of the key differences is that large piriform jars and tinned kylises and shallow angular bowls are generally absent. Similar to the “Greece-1” group, the assemblages usually include some drinking vessels and medium or large jugs. This suggests that there is a relation between the identities being expressed through the “Greece-2” assemblages and the real or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs. If the number of open vessels found can be considered as an indicator of the relative significance of drinking and/or eating in the rituals performed, then it appears to have had a less prominent role than in tombs with “Greece-1” assemblages, where open vessels are generally more numerous. In this light note that “Greece-2” tombs are also usually smaller, in terms of the length of the dromos and the size of the burial chamber, than graves with “Greece-1” assemblages, which are often among the

21 Ibidem, 204.
22 Ibidem, 203-5.
23 Ibidem, 203-5.
largest of the cemeteries of which they constituted part (see sections 3.4.4 and 3.4.7). Is it possible that there is a correlation between the absolute size of tombs and the number of open vessels found on the one hand, and, on the other, the size of the group of persons attending the funeral ceremonies?

There are no specific objects other than pottery which are typical of the “Greece-2” group. As mentioned above, several categories of items cross-cut the different groups of assemblages manifesting themselves in the archaeological burial record of Late Bronze Age Greece (see above). Other groups of artifacts include stone and glass seals and bronze weapons, such as arrow- and spearheads. Objects manufactured from exotic or rare materials, such as gold and ivory, are rare. From an economic or status-oriented perspective, this group may be called a ‘poorer’ variant of the “Greece-1” group. However, as noted above, this relies on the assumption that there was unequal access to “prestige items”. Furthermore, it implies that the different groups manifested in the archaeological burial record by definition had an equal ‘desire’ to acquire such goods and deposit them in their tombs. If we ‘restrict’ our interpretation to the expression of identity in the mortuary sphere, it seems fair to say that by the groups who expressed their identity through the “Greece-2” assemblages only relatively little emphasis was placed on the display and deposition of goods other than pottery.

The “Greece-3” group encapsulates a variety of assemblages, which have as one of their most characteristic features that the tombs in which they occur are usually relatively small compared to those associated with the “Greece-1” and “Greece-2” groups (see section 3.4.7). Another recurring trait is that open vessels and medium or large jugs (cf. small jugs or juglets mentioned below) are comparatively rare. There are several pot forms which may be considered as characteristic of the “Greece-3” group. These include the small jug or juglet (Figs. 58 and 74 in Chapter 3), the feeding bottle (Figs. 75 and 96 in Chapter 3), the askos (Fig. 98 in Chapter 3), the small mug (Fig. 61 in Chapter 3) and the carinated conical cup (Figs. 60 and 72 in Chapter 3). Based on their small size, for some of these pots, in particular for the feeding bottle and the askos, a connection with the burial of children has been suggested.24 This link can sometimes (but not always) be corroborated by the funerary remains.25 In this light note that child skeletons are less robust than adult ones and therefore tend to be less well preserved.26 It should be pointed out that the vases listed above do not constitute a fixed set. Most tombs contained only a few of the vessels mentioned. Furthermore,

25 E.g. Prosymna Tomb 18 (askos) (Blegen 1937, 58); Prosymna Tomb 34 (cist IV) (feeding bottle) (ibidem, 114); Prosymna Tomb 22 (feeding bottles, askos) (ibidem, 67)
26 Lagia 2007, 294-5 (see, also, Gallou 2005, 115).
there are also some graves which are classified here as belonging to the “Greece-3” group but do not have any feeding bottles, askoi, small mugs, etc. As indicated above, there is variety within the different groups of assemblages. Perhaps not all “groups” buried in chamber tombs used material culture to differentiate themselves from ‘others’. Even though inter-group differences may have been played down, most tombs containing “Greece-3” assemblages do have some of the communal features cross-cutting the different groups associated with them. This seems to indicate that relations of similarity emphasizing the collectively of the society at large were expressed through funeral rituals. One of the communal features appearing relatively frequently in tombs with “Greece-3” assemblages are terracotta figurines. Similar to the feeding bottle and the askos mentioned above, terracotta figurines have often been linked to child burials. Although figurines also appear in tombs containing “Greece-1” and “Greece-2” assemblages, they seem to be more closely linked to the “Greece-3” group. In this light it is interesting to note that figurines are more frequently found in “Greece-1” and “Greece-2” tombs with than without feeding bottles, askoi, small jugs, etc. As noted in Chapter 3, some of these examples may be considered as ‘mixed’ “Greece-1” or “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” groups (see sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.5). In general, apart from figurines, beads and conuli or buttons, the number and variety of objects other than pottery retrieved from tombs with “Greece-3” assemblages tends to be limited. As noted above, rather than seeing this as a sign of economic ‘poverty’, in the mortuary sphere this may be explained as an indication that no great significance was attached to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. This also fits well with the above comments that by some groups, material culture may not have been used to differentiate themselves from ‘others’.

The aim of this section has been to discuss and compare the three general assemblage groups in the archaeological burial record of Late Bronze Age Greece in terms of their constituting relations of similarity and difference. In this way, a sense of the degree to which material culture was used to express different group identities in funeral ritual has been developed. As noted above, a common element is present in most chamber tombs through the placement of such items as unguent containers, beads and conuli with the dead. Material culture is most actively used to express differences or unicity by the people expressing their identities through the “Greece-1” assemblages. This group has a unique set of objects.

---

27 E.g. Prosymna Tombs 5, 11, 20 and 48
29 Prosymna Tomb 38, for example, a “Greece-1” grave dated to LHIIIA2, yielded two askoi and two juglets, in combination with seven terracotta figurines (Blegen 1937, 128-31). Tomb 29, another “Greece-1” grave, did not contain any typical “Greece-3” vases, nor were there any figurines found inside the tomb (ibidem, 75-80).
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associated with it, including large piriform jars, unpainted and/or tinned kylikes and shallow angular bowls, gold beads and rosettes, and glass relief-beads. There are also a number of typical vase forms which can be linked to at least some of the groups using the “Greece-3” assemblages to express their respective identities. These include such pot forms as the small jug or juglet, the feeding bottle and the small mug.

6.2 The expression of identity in tombs in the south-eastern Aegean

In the previous section, the degree of deployment of material culture to express group identities in the archaeological burial record of Late Bronze Age Greece has been discussed. In what follows, the focus is on the manifestation of identity in tombs in the south-eastern Aegean. A comparison will also be made with the Greek mainland (see section 6.1 above). This section draws on the results of Chapter 5, in which I addressed similarities and differences between tomb assemblages from the south-west coast of Anatolia and adjacent islands.

6.2.1 The expression of identity in tombs on Rhodes

It has been possible to identify three different groups of assemblages in the archaeological burial record of Rhodes. They have been referred to as “Ialysos-1 (1)”, “Ialysos-1 (2)” and “Ialysos-2”. In what follows, I will look at these groups of assemblages by focusing on their constituting relations of similarity and relations of difference. A similar approach was adopted to investigate the identity groups manifesting themselves in the funerary record of the Greek mainland (see section 6.1 above). On Rhodes, relations of similarity can be seen in the widespread adoption of the chamber tomb and its use for primary and/or secondary burials (see section 4.1.1). Furthermore, there are a number of pot forms which are common in all three groups of assemblages. The small piriform jar (Fig. 3 in Chapter 4) and the rounded alabastron (Fig. 5 in Chapter 4) are typical of LHIIB-IIIA1. Both of these pot shapes, however, occur only rarely in LHIIIA2 and LHIIB. In these phases, the large piriform jar (Figs. 9-10 in Chapter 4) and the stirrup jar, of which a variety of different types has been found, are very popular. The piriform stirrup jar FS 166 from LHIIIA2 is especially distinctive (Fig. 11 in Chapter 4) (see section 4.1.2). Two other pot shapes which are present in a relatively large
number of tomb assemblages from LHIIIA2 are the incense burner or brazier with curled-up legs (Fig. 41 in Chapter 4) and the Rhodo-Mycenaean basket vase (Figs. 39-40 in Chapter 4) (see section 4.1.3).

The material traits that cross-cut the different groups of tomb assemblages on Rhodes (see above) may be seen as indicative of a collective, possibly ethnic, identity. In several respects, there appears to be a correlation with the communal identity being expressed in tombs on the Greek mainland (see section 6.1 above). In both areas, chamber tombs are used for primary and/or secondary burials and there are similarities in the pot shapes cross-cutting the different types of assemblages. The latter aspect, however, changes through time. Typical of LHIIB-IIIA1 in both areas are the small piriform jar and the rounded alabastron. While both of these vessel types stay common on the Greek mainland, they occur only rarely in tombs on Rhodes in LHIIIA2 and LHIIB. Instead we see a regional habit being developed of placing large piriform jars, (piriform) stirrup jars, incense burners and basket vases in tombs. It should be noted that stirrup jars are common in both areas. The preferred type on Rhodes is, however, the piriform stirrup jar FS 166, which is comparatively rare in tombs on the Greek mainland. The globular stirrup jar FS 171 is popular in both areas. The basket vase is a purely Rhodian pot shape. The incense burner with curled-up legs can also be considered a locally developed shape.

It was suggested in section 6.1 above that there might be a relationship between the unguent containers (small piriform jars, rounded alabastra and stirrup jars) retrieved from the tombs on the Greek mainland and the funeral rituals performed (ceremonial cleansing with oil and other unguents). Beads, conuli and figurines may also have had a role in these rituals. It is interesting to speculate whether the changes observed in its pottery repertoire (see above) might have something to do with changes in the communal burial traditions on Rhodes. In this light it has to be noted that on the Greek mainland, the large piriform jar and the incense burner are relatively rare pot shapes and appear almost only in tombs containing “Greece-1” assemblages. In other words, they are used to mark social differences instead of similarities. We are thus seeing how differences in contexts may lead to different socio-cultural meanings (see section 2.2.2 and 2.3 on the contextual constitution of meaning). It is difficult to discuss beads and conuli in a similar way. Since most cemeteries on Rhodes were illicitly excavated and we only have a somewhat complete record of the pottery, no generalizations can be made about the role of beads and conuli in the funeral rituals performed. They are relatively common at Ialysos, however, appearing in all three different groups of assemblages. The same is not true for terracotta figurines. They are very rare at Ialysos and this also seems to
apply to the rest of the island. This is a major difference with the Greek mainland, where, despite some regional variations, terracotta figurines make up a typical component of the usual burial furniture.

Social differences are also expressed in the archaeological burial record of Rhodes. As noted above, it has been possible to identify three general groups of assemblages: “Ialysos-1 (1)”, “Ialysos-1 (2)” and “Ialysos-2”. The “Ialysos-2” group is attested only in LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB. The other two groups are known from contexts dating from LHIIB-IIIA1 to LHIIIB. The three groups are discussed below.

The “Ialysos-1 (1)” group is unique since, in contrast to the other two Rhodian groups, it has not been attested outside Ialysos, to which the identity of this group appears to have been closely connected. The number of graves belonging to this group is relatively limited. They are among the largest tombs of the Ialysos cemetery. The assemblages are characterized by combinations of medium or large jugs (Fig. 18 in Chapter 5) and open vessels, including kraters, and undecorated and/or tinned kylikes (Figs. 26-7 in Chapter 5) and shallow angular bowls (Fig. 28 in Chapter 5). This seems to indicate a close link between the group identity being expressed through the “Ialysos-1 (1)” assemblages and the real or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs. Ritual vases, such as conical rhyta (Fig. 22 in Chapter 5), also regularly appear in association with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group.

A distinctive feature of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group is that the assemblages often include a variety of objects other than pottery, such as various kinds of jewelry, seals, gold beads and rosettes, bronze weapons and non-ceramic (e.g. bronze and glass) containers. Although some of these, such as glass and stone beads, can also appear in association with the other two Ialysos-groups (see above), there are several items which are (almost) only found in tombs containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” assemblages. These include glass relief-beads, in particular examples of the curled-leaf or bracket type (Fig. 34 in Chapter 5), gold beads (Fig. 120 in Chapter 5), rosettes and rings, bronze swords (Figs. 31 and 121 in Chapter 5) and bronze or copper vessels (Fig. 122 in Chapter 5). These items do not appear together in every “Ialysos-1 (1)” tomb, but their relative distribution is limited to this category of graves. What characterizes most of these artifacts is that they are made of exotic and rare raw materials, which probably had been imported from elsewhere. It thus seems that the deposition and display of goods other than pottery played an important role in the funeral rituals through which the group identity associated with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” assemblages was expressed. Rather than
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30 E.g. NT 4, 5, 31 and 50
seeing the limited number of tombs in which these items are found as an indication that they should be interpreted as markers of high social or economic status, they are considered here in relation to group identity – of which social or economic status constitutes an integral part. The assemblages are first and foremost regarded as manifestations of identity in the funerary realm; they are conceptualized as constituted by the choices made by actors to express themselves in a certain way and from this perspective the presence or absence of rare items (cf. definition of “prestige items” by Voutsaki in section 6.1 above) cannot simply be equated with a particular group’s ‘wealth’ or ‘poverty’.

It is possible for the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group to be compared to the “Greece-1” group, of which the defining characteristics have been described in section 6.1 above. In both cases, a prominent role is played by the real or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs and the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. Moreover, it seems that in general the distribution of objects made of exotic and rare materials is largely limited to these two groups. Another striking correlation is represented by the relation between these groups and glass relief-beads, especially the beads of the curled-leaf or bracket type.

There are similarities and differences between the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. Both groups are characterized by combinations of medium or large jugs (Fig. 19 in Chapter 5) and kylikes, from which it can be derived that there is a close link between the group identity expressed and the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids. Moreover, kraters and ritual vases, such as hydriae with pierced bottoms (Fig. 23 in Chapter 5), are also sometimes found in association with the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. A notable difference is, however, that “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages mostly include pattern-painted kylikes (Fig. 29 in Chapter 5). The distribution of tinned kylikes is limited entirely to graves containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” assemblages, which comprise only few painted – mainly monochrome – kylikes. Note that on the Greek mainland, tinned kylikes also appear exclusively in tombs with “Greece-1” assemblages.

In general, the assemblages associated with the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group comprise only a relatively small number of objects other than pottery, including some (glass and stone) beads and conuli. Items made of exotic and rare materials are generally absent. It thus appears that less emphasis is placed on the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. There is one category of items which can be considered as characteristic of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group: bronze weapons. It especially concerns spearheads, which often occur in combination with a
rubber’s stone. This marks a clear difference with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group, with which spearheads are generally not associated. As discussed below, identities similar to the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group are also being expressed in tombs on Kos (“Kos-2” group) (see section 6.2.2 below), Astypalaia (see section 6.2.3 below), Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 below) and the Anatolian south-west coast (“Müskebi-2” group) (see section 6.2.4 below).

There are some similarities and differences between the “Ialysos-1 (2)” and the “Greece-2” group. The clearest similarity is that in both cases the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids played an important role in the funeral rituals through which these identities were expressed. Moreover, it appears that only little significance was attached to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. However, while no combinations of objects are typical of the “Greece-2” group, there are several items which can be considered characteristic of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. These are the co-occurrence of pattern-painted kylikes, bronze weapons, especially spearheads, and rubber’s stones. This is a truly Rhodian or more generally south-eastern Aegean phenomenon (see above), for which there are no parallels on the Greek mainland. This applies to both the large number of bronze weapons and pattern-painted kylikes, of which the latter are found mainly in settlement contexts on the Greek mainland.

The “Ialysos-2” group occurs by itself as well as in graves containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages. Tombs that produce only assemblages of the “Ialysos-2” group are among the smallest of the Ialysos cemetery. A notable feature of this group is that, in contrast to the other two Ialysos-groups, it does not appear until LHIIIA2.

The assemblages consist mostly of closed pot shapes and have no or only a few open vase forms associated with them. A characteristic trait of the “Ialysos-2” group is that it usually includes one or more of the following small ceramic vessels: the small jug or juglet (Fig. 37 in Chapter 5), the feeding bottle (Fig. 17 in Chapter 4), the askos (Fig. 39 in Chapter 5), the rounded alabastron (Fig. 38 in Chapter 5), the small mug, the carinated conical cup and the stemless goblet. Kylikes, which are typical of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups, are comparatively rare, from which it can be derived that no real significance was attached to the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids. Besides some (glass and stone)
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32 In this light, note the following statement by E.B. French (1986, 279): “the tombs . . . on Rhodes, where the overall number of weapons is, by mainland standards, usually high”.
33 The only region where pattern-painted kylikes are found in tombs in large numbers is Attica (Benzi 1992, 134; Mee 1982, 18; see, also, Shelton 2000, 38, fn. 10).
34 E.g. NT 31 and 50
35 E.g. NT 19 and 28
36 E.g. NT 8, 18 and 25
beads and conuli, only a small number of other objects have been found. This seems to indicate that in the funeral rituals performed, there was only a minor role for the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. This, however, does not apply to situations in which examples of the “Ialysos-3” group are found together with assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group, which generally contain a large number and wide variety of objects other than pottery (see above). It is interesting to point out that there are similar identities being expressed in tombs at Eleona/Langada on Kos (“Kos-2” group) (see section 6.2.2 below) and Müskebi on the Anatolian south-west coast (“Müskebi-3” group) (see section 6.2.4 below).

There are some interesting similarities between the “Ialysos-2” and the “Greece-3” group (see above). Both groups usually do not include any kylikes and have one or more of the following small ceramic vessels associated with them: the small jug or juglet, the feeding bottle, the askos, the small mug and the carinated conical cup. As stated in section 6.1 above, for the Greek mainland, it has been suggested that there may be a link between some of these vessels, especially the feeding bottle and the askos, and child burials. In this light note that at Ialysos on Rhodes we know of several “Ialysos-2” assemblages which were reportedly found in association with child or adolescent burials. Another interesting parallel is that both “Ialysos-2” and “Greece-3” groups sometimes occur in combination with assemblages of a different type. A notable difference is represented by the relative popularity of terracotta figurines, which are very common in assemblages of the “Greece-3” type (see section 6.1 above), but appear only rarely in association with the “Ialysos-2” group.

Ialysos is one of the best documented cemeteries which have been excavated on Rhodes. Although many other chamber tomb cemeteries are known on the island, unfortunately, a large number of them has been illicitly excavated and/or no – or only very little – documentation has survived (see section 4.1.1). Despite the limited number of sites with which Ialysos can be compared, the available evidence shows that there are similarities and differences with the identities being expressed in tombs in other parts of Rhodes. It is important to stress that this pertains mostly to LHIIIA2, since there is hardly any well-stratified material from LHIIB-IIIA1 from sites other than Ialysos. Assemblages from LHIIIB are also few, but most do conform to the material patterns which have been established for LHIIIA2 (see below).

With a few exceptions, which are mentioned below, only one group has been recognized in the archaeological burial record outside Ialysos. The assemblages associated

37 E.g. NT 8, 18, 28, 49 and 51
with it make it evident that this group must have been familiar with the burial practices through which the identities of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups were expressed (see above). Ceramically, this manifests itself in combinations of medium or large jugs (Figs. 43-4 in Chapter 5) and considerable numbers of drinking vessels, especially plain and pattern-painted kylikes. Kraters (Fig. 45 in Chapter 5) and rituals vases (Fig. 46 in Chapter 5) also regularly appear. Such assemblages have come to light at sites, such as Kalavarda (Aniforo), Lelos, Kattavia, Passia, Pylona (Aspropilia) and Pylona (Ambelia).

It seems that the significance attached to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery was generally limited, although there are also exceptions to this rule, of which a clear example is represented by the cemetery of Pylona (Aspropilia) (LHIIIA2) in southeastern Rhodes. At this site, there are several graves belonging to this group that contained bronze vessels, bronze weapons (Figs. 51-2 in Chapter 5), stone beads and glass relief-beads (Figs. 47-9 in Chapter 5). Moreover, in one tomb, a collection of gold relief-beads was found. Bronze weapons and/or glass relief-beads have also come to light at a number of other sites on the island, such as Lelos, Passia and Pylona (Ambelia). As noted above, the same types of objects also often appear in tombs containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages.

The “Ialysos-2” group appears to be more or less limited to Ialysos. Exceptions are few, but it seems that at least at Lelos in the center of Rhodes groups existed which expressed themselves in a similar way. This manifests itself in the occurrence of combinations of such small ceramic vessels as small jugs or juglets and feeding bottles. In that sense, judging from the evidence, which is currently available, Ialysos with its rich diversity of groups represented is unique on Rhodes during the LHIIIA-B Palatial period.

6.2.2 The expression of identity in tombs on Kos

It has been possible to identify at least two groups in the archaeological burial record of Kos. They have been referred to as “Kos-1” and “Kos-2”. The identification of these groups is based on the evidence from Eleona/Langada, which is the largest cemetery on the island. Both the “Kos-1” and the “Kos-2” group appear in tomb contexts dating from LHIIB-III A1 to

38 The possibility cannot be excluded that the image we have of a number of tombs is only partial. As noted in the main text, most sites were illicitly excavated and/or have only been documented in a very summary way.

39 E.g. Tombs 2 and 7
In what follows, I will look at these groups of assemblages by focusing on their constituting relations of similarity and relations of difference.

Material traits which cross-cut the different types of assemblages are: subterranean chamber tombs were used for primary and/or secondary inhumations (see section 4.2.1) and unguent containers had been deposited in most graves. The corpus of unguent containers changed over time. Small piriform jars (Fig. 62 in Chapter 4; Figs. 8-9 in Chapter 5) and rounded alabastra (Fig. 63 in Chapter 4) are typical of LHIIB-IIIA1. Both of these pot shapes had (almost) completely disappeared by LHIIIA2 and LHIIB. In these periods, there is a general tendency to place stirrup jars (Fig. 65 in Chapter 4; Fig. 137 in Chapter 5) inside the tombs.

The material traits cross-cutting the different groups of tomb assemblages at Eleona/Langada on Kos can be seen as marking a collective, possibly ethnic, identity. There are similarities with the communal identities being expressed in tombs on the Greek mainland on the one hand (see section 6.1 above), and, on the other, on Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above). This is especially clear in LHIIB-IIIA1. During this period, in both areas, there existed a preference similar to Kos for small piriform jars and rounded alabastra. As noted above, both of these pot shapes have largely disappeared from Koan tombs from LHIIIA2 onwards. This is different from the Greek mainland, where small piriform jars and rounded alabastra stay common in tombs during LHIIIA2 and LHIIB, but similar to Rhodes, on which a comparable development in the pottery corpus can be observed. Stirrup jars, on the other hand, are very popular in tombs on the Greek mainland and Rhodes. However, the piriform stirrup jar FS 166, which is typical of Rhodes in LHIIIA2 (see section 6.2.1 above), is very rare on Kos in this period. The same applies to the large piriform jar. As noted above, the (piriform) stirrup jar and the large piriform jar – together with the incense burner and the basket vase – constitute part of the collective identity that developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2.

Three other categories of objects cross-cutting the different groups of assemblages on the Greek mainland are beads, conuli and terracotta figurines (see section 6.1 above). Similar to Rhodes, figurines are extremely rare in tombs on Kos in the LHIIIA-B Palatial period. Beads and conuli are present in some graves at Eleona/Langada, but they appear much less frequently than on the Greek mainland and Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above). This overview thus shows that in terms of the manifestation of relations of similarity in the archaeological
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40 The LHIIC material was not studied, so no claims can be made here about whether or not the patterns established in Chapter 5 continue or cease to exist after LHIIB.
burial record there are important similarities and differences between Kos and Rhodes on the one hand, and Kos and the Greek mainland on the other.

There were also differences between groups being expressed through the assemblages retrieved from the (chamber) tombs excavated at Eleona/Langada and other sites on Kos. As noted above, we identified two groups. The first one is represented by a relatively small number of “Kos-1” assemblages.\(^41\) They are characterized by combinations of medium or large jugs and open vessels, especially (pattern-painted) kylikes (LHIIB-IIIA1 to LHIIIB) (Figs. 53-4 and 138 in Chapter 5). It thus seems that the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs played an important role in the funeral rituals through which this identity was expressed.

In general, “Kos-1” assemblages include only a few objects other than pottery, indicating that no real significance was attached to the display and deposition of such items. One category of finds that can be considered characteristic of the “Kos-1” group are bronze weapons, especially spearheads (Figs. 55, 139 and 141 in Chapter 5).

Assemblages similar to the “Kos-1” group have also come to light at a number of other sites on Kos. A series of painted kylikes and a pair of bronze weapons – short sword and spearhead – have been reported from a (chamber) tomb at Pyli (LHIII A2) in the center of the island (see below). One of the two tholoi discovered near the settlement of the “Serraglio” has yielded a similar assemblage (LHIII A2). Apart from a bronze spearhead and short sword, it also produced some gold rosettes and glass relief-beads. This shows that for the identity being expressed here the display and deposition of objects other than pottery was more important than for the groups whose identities are manifested in the “Kos-1” assemblages at Eleona/Langada (see above).\(^42\)

The “Kos-1” group resembles strongly that being expressed through the “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages discussed in section 6.2.1 above. There are also some parallels from Astypalaia and Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 below) and the south-west coast of Anatolia (see section 6.2.4 below). With regards to the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group, it was argued that even though it has a number of features in common with the “Greece-2” group (use of open vessels and limited role of the display and deposition of objects other than pottery), it can best be understood as a regionally developed manifestation of identity. This is especially true for the

\(^ {41}\) E.g. ET 21; LT 15-6, 37 and 51
\(^ {42}\) Since there are no finds other than some pieces of gold jewelry published from the other tholos on Kos, no comparisons can be made with it here (see section 5.4.2.2).
defining connection between pattern-painted kylikes and bronze weapons, for which there are no convincing parallels from the Greek mainland.

Besides the co-occurrence of kylikes and bronze weapons, some tombs associated with the “Kos-1” group also resemble the identity through the “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages in a number of other ways. As noted in section 6.2.1 above, in most tombs on Rhodes, large piriform jars and/or (piriform) stirrup jars have been found. Because of this, they are regarded as constituting part of a collective identity, which was developed on the island in LHIIIA2. By contrast, both of these vessel types appear only rarely in tombs on Kos (see section 4.2.2). Piriform stirrup jars have come to light in two “Kos-1” tombs at Eleona/Langada (Fig. 1 in Chapter 6). One was found together with a large piriform jar (Fig. 2 in Chapter 6). This shows that in a small minority of “Kos-1” tombs Rhodian relations of similarity were being expressed.

As noted in section 6.2.1 above, the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages are characterized by combinations of medium or large jugs and open vessels, especially kylikes. Medium or large jugs are not common in tombs on Kos. It is, therefore, striking that the only examples found occur in combination with assemblages of the “Kos-1” type. Consider Langada Tomb 51. Besides a stirrup jug, it also yielded a large piriform jar (Fig. 2 in Chapter 6), a piriform stirrup jar (Fig. 1 in Chapter 6), a (pegtop) rhyton and a kylix with two vertical handles below the rim. Medium or large jugs and kylikes typically occur in combination with “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages. The (pegtop) rhyton from Langada Tomb 51 is the only one that has so far been found on Kos. As noted in section 6.2.1 above, ritual vessels also relatively frequently occur in “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages. At Pyli in the center of the island another jug was found (LHIIIA2) (Fig. 3 in Chapter 6). This “Kos-1” assemblage also included a large piriform jar, a large number of open vessels, among which there are a krater (Fig. 4 in Chapter 6) and four painted kylikes, and a bronze sword and spearhead (Figs. 58-9 in Chapter 5). Apart from the large piriform jar and the (stirrup) jug (Fig. 3 in Chapter 6), of which the Rhodian connection has already been discussed above, it is interesting to note that kraters are also quite common in “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages (see section 6.2.1 above). It is thus clear that a small minority of the groups who used the “Kos-1” assemblages to express their identity actively appropriated a range of ceramic vessels with a distinct Rhodian ‘character’ to it; in other words, they expressed themselves in a Rhodian way. Note that this applies mainly to LHIIIA2.

43 LT 16 and 51
44 LT 51
since there are (almost) no typical Rhodian pots from LHIIIIB. It should be pointed out, however, that some of the vessel types concerned, such as the piriform stirrup jar and the kylix with two vertical handles below the rim, also become rare – or even completely disappear – on Rhodes in LHIIIIB.

The identities of different social groups are manifested in the “Kos-2” assemblages (LHIIIA2 and LHIIIIB). What characterizes these assemblages is that they consist mostly of closed pot forms and have no or only a few open vessels associated with them. Moreover, many, but not all, “Kos-2” assemblages include one or more of the following small ceramic vessels: the small jug or juglet (Fig. 52 in Chapter 5), the feeding bottle (Fig. 147 in Chapter 5), the rounded alabastron (LHIIIA2-B), the askos, the small mug and the carinated cup (Figs. 57 and 146 in Chapter 5). As a matter of fact, in LHIIIA2 small jugs are also found in the majority of tombs containing “Kos-1” assemblages. For this reason, it was argued in Chapter 5 that, similar to the popularity of stirrup jars in this period, the widespread use of juglets in the funeral rituals performed can be seen in relation to the manifestation of relations of similarity in the archaeological burial record of Eleona/Langada. In LHIIIIB, on the other hand, small jugs are restricted mostly to tombs with “Kos-2” assemblages. It thus seems that the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids did not play an important role in the funeral rituals through which these identities were expressed. The assemblages also typically have only a small number, if any, of objects other than pottery. Stone and terracotta buttons are the most common. Hence, no real significance appears to have been attached to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. Two notable exceptions are the assemblages from Langada Tombs 21 (LHIIIIB) and 38 (LHIIB2), of which the latter includes one rock-crystal and about three-hundred glass beads (see below). Langada Tomb 21 produced a set of bronze weapons, among which there are a spearhead and a (killed) sword.

The “Kos-2” identity resembles that being expressed through the “Ialysos-2” assemblages (see section 6.2.1 above). Both groups usually include only a small number of open vessels and have one or more small ceramic vessels associated with them (for a list of shapes, see above). Objects other than pottery also tend to be rare. As discussed in section 6.2.4 below, similar identities were also being expressed by groups (“Müskebi-3”) in tombs at the cemetery of Müskebi on Anatolian south-west coast. In section 6.2.1, it was argued that there are some similarities between the “Ialysos-2” and the “Greece-3” group. Both groups usually include only a small number of open vessels. The assemblages also often comprise one or more of the small ceramic vessels listed above. An important difference, however,
concerns the popularity of terracotta figurines in tombs containing “Greece-3” assemblages. As noted above, figurines are very rare in tombs on Rhodes and Kos in general.

Interestingly, there are two tombs within the “Kos-2” group of which the assemblages have a number of typical Rhodian features associated with them: Eleona Tomb 15 and Langada Tomb 38. There was a large piriform jar found in both graves. In Langada Tomb 38 it was associated with a (globular) stirrup jar. As discussed above, these shapes – together with a number of other pot forms – can tentatively be connected with the expression of a collective identity which was developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2. An interesting structural feature of Langada Tomb 38 is that inside of it there is a dry-stone built bench.\(^45\) Raised benches are also known from a number of tombs containing “Ialysos-2” assemblages. An interesting parallel is that similar to Langada Tomb 38, in some of these “Ialysos-2” graves, there were stone and/or glass beads buried with the dead.\(^46\) At Ialysos, based on the relative size of skeletons, some of these ‘bench-burials’ were identified as children or adolescents. No (infant) bones have been reported from the bench in Langada Tomb 38.\(^47\) However, it could be postulated that since the assemblages through which the “Kos-2” and “Ialysos-2” identities are expressed usually include only a limited number of offerings other than pottery, the examples discussed here clearly deviate from this ‘norm’. It should be stressed that these ‘norms’ serve only to provide an overview of the features that most assemblages associated with a group have in common. This does not exclude the possibility of finding unique traits represented in only a small minority of the tombs classified as belonging to a particular group. Among the tombs containing “Kos-1” assemblages an example of this are the graves that had specific Rhodian features associated with them (see above).

A final comment with regards to the “Kos-2” tombs containing notable Rhodian features concerns the relative location of Langada Tomb 38 (Map 19 in Chapter 5). Next to it lie Tombs 37 and 51, both of which have previously been classified as belonging to the “Kos-1” group. As noted above, the identity expressed through the “Kos-1” assemblages strongly resembles that of the Rhodian “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. On top of that, Langada Tomb 51 produced a combination of vessels which are rare in graves on Kos but common on Rhodes (see above). This clearly demonstrates the connection between the people who buried their dead in this tomb and the island of Rhodes.

\(^{45}\) Morricone 1967, 178.
\(^{46}\) NT 28 and 51
\(^{47}\) It is important to point out that as discussed in Chapter 4, the funerary remains from Eleona/Langada were very poorly preserved. Some of the bones have, however, recently been identified in the storerooms of the Kos archaeological museum. These will be published as part of the Serraglio, Eleona, and Langada Archaeological Project (SELAP) (Vitale 2012, 407-8).
6.2.3 The expression of identity in tombs on Karpathos and Astypalaia

The total number of tombs excavated on Astypalaia and Karpathos is limited. As a result, it is not possible to generalize about whether or not there are any elements which may be regarded as expressions of a possible collective identity. Despite this, it is worthwhile to point out that some of the material traits cross-cutting the different groups of assemblages on Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above) and Kos (see section 6.2.2 above) also appear in tombs on Astypalaia and Karpathos. In the first place, the dead are usually buried in chamber tombs. There is, however, also some (indirect) evidence for cremation burials in chamber tombs on Astypalaia (Synkairos) and Karpathos (Vonies (Arkasa)). Furthermore, a Minoan-style larnax has come to light in one of the tombs excavated on Karpathos (Vonies-Arkasa) (see section 4.4). The use of larnakes has also been attested at Ialysos on Rhodes (see section 4.1.1). Another recurring feature on Rhodes and Kos is the placement of unguent containers in the tombs. The same trend can also be observed on Astypalaia and Karpathos. Typical of LHIIB-IIIA1 are small piriform jars (Fig. 97 in Chapter 4). During LHIIIA2 and LHIIB, mostly stirrup jars (Fig. 107 in Chapter 4), including examples of the piriform stirrup jar FS 166, and large piriform jars (Fig. 108 in Chapter 4) are found. This ceramic pattern resembles that of Rhodes, where, as noted in section 6.2.1 above, we noticed a similar preference for placing (piriform) stirrup jars and large piriform jars in tombs. On Kos, on the other hand, we mainly see (globular) stirrup jars being left inside the tombs; large piriform jars are very rare (see section 6.2.2 above). It was argued before that together with a number of other vase types the piriform stirrup jar and the large piriform jar can be seen as expression of a collective identity, which developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2. These other vessel types are the incense burner with curled-up legs and the Rhodian-style basket vase. It is interesting to note that of both of these vessel types there are examples from Karpathos (Figs. 112-3 and 115 in Chapter 4). They appear in separate tombs, but in combination with large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars. It is tentative to see this as an indication that on Karpathos there were groups with specific knowledge of Rhodian burial traditions. In this light, note that so far no incense burners or basket vases have been reported from Astypalaia.

---

48 NT 81
49 Note that this applies only to Astypalaia, since, as noted in section 5.4 there are no excavated tombs on Karpathos from LHIIB.
This knowledge of Rhodian and Koan burial traditions also manifests itself in the only group identity which can clearly be recognized in the archaeological burial record of both islands. On Astypalaia, this group appears in contexts dating from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIB. We know of one (possible) example from Karpathos from LM/HIIIA1. The group is, however, much better attested on the island in LM/HIIIA2 (for comments on LM/HIIIB on Karpathos, see section 5.4).

The assemblages usually include a large quantity of open vessels. Cups, (painted) kylikes (Figs. 62-3 in Chapter 5) and kraters (Figs. 104-5 in Chapter 4) are especially common, from which it may be derived that the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids played an important role in the funeral rituals performed. The assemblages generally contain only a limited number of objects other than pottery. The only real exception to this pattern is represented by bronze weapons, especially spearheads (Fig. 61 in Chapter 5) and short swords (Figs. 60 and 66 in Chapter 5). The identities expressed resemble those of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” and “Kos-2” groups, which are similarly characterized by combinations of open vessels, especially kylikes, and bronze weapons.

The archaeological burial record also shows some features that are more typical of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. Among the finds from a destroyed chamber tomb at Kambi (Diafani) in north Karpathos there are two pattern-painted kylikes (Figs. 62-3 in Chapter 5), two ritual vessels (Figs. 64-5 in Chapter 5) and a short bronze sword (Fig. 66 in Chapter 5). As noted in section 6.2.1 above, on Rhodes ritual vessels (almost) only appear in combination with “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages, which also typically have (painted) kylikes and bronze weapons associated with them. Features typical of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group are also represented in the archaeological burial record of Astypalaia. Among the finds other than pottery was a set of glass relief-beads (Figs. 154-5 in Chapter 5). As discussed in section 6.2.1 above, such beads appear mostly in association with assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” type. The only examples from Kos come from one of the tholoi discovered near the settlement of the “Serraglio”. It should be noted, however, that the assemblage from the tholos (though largely unpublished) seems to be similar to that from the tomb at Armenochori on Astypalaia, on the one hand, and that associated with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups on the other (for a discussion of this tholos assemblage, see section 6.2.2 above).
6.2.4 The expression of identity in tombs on the south-west coast of Anatolia

In south-western coastal Anatolia Mycenaean-style chamber tombs have been excavated at Müskebi, Değirmentepe and Pilavtepe. Unfortunately, none of these sites has been fully published. The observations presented below are based on the archaeological information that is currently available. I will mainly focus on the construction of group identity at Müskebi (Map 11 in Chapter 4). The main reason is that this is the only multi-tomb cemetery of which sufficient material has been published to enable a comparison between different tomb assemblages. Değirmentepe is also a multi-tomb cemetery, but based on the published information it is only possible to partially reconstruct the inventory of one of the in total eleven tombs excavated (Tomb 2 or D 33). At Pilavtepe nearby the settlement of Iasos only one chamber tomb has been localized. At the end of this section, a comparison between Müskebi on the one hand and Değirmentepe and Pilavtepe on the other will be made.

The Müskebi cemetery was mainly in use during LHIIIA2. Only few graves were in use in LHIIIB (see section 4.5). It has been possible to identify at least three different groups of assemblages in the archaeological burial record. These have been referred to as “Müskebi-1”, “Müskebi-2” and “Müskebi-3”. It seems that all three groups have a chronological time span from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIB, although there are some difficulties in the dating of the “Müskebi-1” assemblages (see section 5.2.4).

The “Müskebi-1” group has as its most characteristic feature that it includes only a single ceramic vessel. The straight-sided alabastron and the small jug are the commonest. Similar groups are not known from anywhere else in the south-eastern Aegean. Moreover, straight-sided alabastra are relatively uncommon as burial gifts on the Greek mainland during the LHIIIA-B Palatial period. The same applies to graves containing only one ceramic offering. The “Müskebi-1” group can therefore best be seen as a locally developed manifestation of group identity. It also differs significantly from the other two groups which are manifested in the archaeological burial record of Müskebi.

Regardless of the many differences that distinguish the “Müskebi-2” from the “Müskebi-3” group, they also have a number of important similarities between them. These

---

50 In the summer of 2012, a new cemetery has been discovered at Kalabaktepe, which is located nearby the previously known site of Değirmentepe (Herda 2013, 434, fn. 52). Furthermore, in the summer of 2013, several chamber tombs were excavated at a new location in the Bodrum/Ortakent district, which is also where the Müskebi necropolis is situated (http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/mycenaean-artifacts-found-in-bodrum.aspx?pageID=238&nID=51909&NewsCatID=375).
include the use of chamber tombs for primary and/or secondary burials and the fact that the assemblages with which they are associated typically comprise a combination of one or several of the following pot shapes (in descending order of popularity): stirrup jars (Fig. 68 in Chapter 5) and/or large or small piriform jars (Fig. 69 in Chapter 5).\textsuperscript{51} In this light, it is notable that with one exception (Tomb 38), in none of the “Müskebi-1” tombs any of these vessel types have been found.\textsuperscript{52}

It was proposed in Chapter 2 that features cross-cutting different groups of assemblages may be seen as manifestations of a collective, possibly ethnic, identity. From this perspective, there are (at least) two different collective identities being expressed here: one through the “Müskebi-1” assemblages; the other through the “Müskebi-2” and “Müskebi-3” assemblages. As noted above, there do not seem to be any parallels for the “Müskebi-1” group, either from the Greek mainland or elsewhere in the south-eastern Aegean. Some similarities can, however, be recognized between the collective identity that the other two groups at Müskebi have in common (see above) and the identity expressed in the majority of tombs on the Greek mainland on the one hand (see section 6.1 above), and Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above) and Kos on the other (see section 6.2.2 above). In all of these areas, chamber tombs were used for primary and/or secondary burials. Moreover, it was a common practice to leave unguent containers in tombs. There are, however, clear regional differences in the different types of vessels deposited within the tombs. This becomes especially apparent in LHIIIA2, which is also the period the Müskebi necropolis was most intensively used. Stirrup jars, small piriform jars and rounded alabastra were the most common on the Greek mainland. On Kos, on the other hand, there were almost only stirrup jars found. The tombs on Rhodes yielded mainly (piriform) stirrup jars and large piriform jars. The pattern at Müskebi thus most strongly resembles that of Rhodes (see above). A local trend is represented by the relative popularity of small piriform jars at Müskebi. As noted above, on Rhodes and Kos, this shape had largely disappeared by LHIIIA2.

Similarities with Rhodes and Kos on the one hand and the Greek mainland on the other are not only manifested in the relations of similarity, but can also be inferred from the relations of difference being expressed here. A characteristic feature of the “Müskebi-2” group is the presence of (decorated) kylikes (Figs. 70-1 in Chapter 5) and medium or large jugs (Fig. 5 in Chapter 6), from which it can be derived that in the funeral rituals performed

\textsuperscript{51} In this light it is interesting to note that exactly these vases – together with a few others – are visible in a picture of the (unexcavated) contents of a chamber tomb recently discovered in the Bodrum/Ortakent district nearby Müskebi (see fn. 50).

\textsuperscript{52} Tomb 38 yielded a globular stirrup jar.
an important role was played by the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids. Based on the available information, it seems that only little significance was attached to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. The only exception to this pattern is represented by bronze weapons, especially spearheads (Fig. 72 in Chapter 5), of which there are examples from a good many of the “Müskebi-2” tombs.

The identity expressed through the “Müskebi-2” assemblages resembles that of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group on Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above) and the “Kos-1” group on Kos (see section 6.2.2 above). As discussed in section 6.2.3 above, there are also some parallels from Astypalaia and Karpathos. The connection between these groups is especially apparent in the defining connection between (decorated) kylikes and bronze weapons, especially spearheads and/or short swords.

There is one tomb within the “Müskebi-2” group which stands out because its assemblage comprises several unique vases which have a distinctively Rhodian ‘character’ associated with them. Tomb 2 yielded a number of large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars, which, as argued above, is a combination appearing frequently in tombs on Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above), and a basket vase (Fig. 6 in Chapter 6) and a kylix with two vertical handles below the rim (Fig. 7 in Chapter 6). The latter two pot shapes are unique at Müskebi, but common on Rhodes (see section 4.1.2). The combination of these objects conveys a distinctively ‘Rhodian’ character to the identity being expressed here.

The third group identity which we can see manifesting itself in the archaeological burial record of Müskebi is represented by the “Müskebi-3” assemblages. As commented above, a feature common to both the “Müskebi-2” and the “Müskebi-3” group is that the assemblages with which they are associated typically include one or more stirrup jars and/or (large) piriform jars. With regards to the relative distribution of stirrup jar types, it is interesting to note that with one exception “Müskebi-2” tombs have yielded only examples of the globular stirrup jar FS 171. Within the “Müskebi-3” group, on the other hand, a clear preference for the piriform stirrup jar FS 166 can be detected, although there are also some tombs containing examples of both types. To speculate about the meaning of this difference of association is beyond the aims of this dissertation.

Vessel types typical of the “Müskebi-3” group are the straight-sided alabastron (Fig. 74 in Chapter 5) and the small jug (Fig. 75 in Chapter 5). As noted above, both of these pot shapes are also common in assemblages of the “Müskebi-I” type. This is markedly different

---

53 Tomb 2
54 Tombs 32 and 45
from the “Müskebi-2” group, in combination with which both pot forms only rarely occur. The small jug constitutes part of a group of small ceramic vessels, of which the distribution is limited largely to the “Müskebi-3” group. Besides small jugs, this group comprises small mugs (Fig. 124 in Chapter 4) and carinated (conical) cups (Figs. 76 and 160 in Chapter 5). There are also single examples of the rounded alabastron (Fig. 77 in Chapter 5), the feeding bottle (Fig. 159 in Chapter 5) and the askos (Fig. 78 in Chapter 5). Most tombs containing “Müskebi-3” assemblages include one or more of these pot shapes. Since kylikes are generally absent, it seems that in the funeral rituals performed only little significance was attached to the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids. The same may apply to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery, but it is important to stress that besides the pottery there is only little published information about the finds from the individual tombs. All we know of are a terracotta button from Tomb 45; a bronze razor (?) from Tomb 32; and a stone blade and gold ring from Tomb 15. The finds other than pottery from Tomb 22, which included a necklace of glass relief-beads (Fig. 82 in Chapter 5), are discussed in more detail below.

There are similarities between the “Müskebi-3” group on the one hand, and, on the other, the “Ialysos-2” group from Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above) and the “Kos-2” group from Kos (see section 6.2.2 above). These include the predominance of closed pot shapes and the presence in most tombs of a combination of one or more of the following small ceramic vessels: the small jug, the feeding bottle, the askos, the rounded alabastron, the small mug and the carinated (conical) cup. As commented in section 6.2.1 above, there are specific traits which the “Ialysos-2” group from Rhodes and the “Greece-3” group from the Greek mainland have in common – but this argument can be extended to include the “Kos-2” and the “Müskebi-3” group as well. This is especially apparent in the defining connection between these groups and the presence of small ceramic vessels. In the case of the Greek mainland, a relation between some of these vessels, especially the feeding bottle and the askos, and child burials has been suggested. As noted in section 6.2.1 above, we know of several instances in which skeletons identified as children or adolescents are associated with “Ialysos-2” assemblages. In this light, note that the archaeological burial record of Müskebi has yielded (at least) one example of a “Müskebi-3” assemblage associated with a child burial. The tomb concerned is Tomb 33 (LHIIIB). It yielded the following combination of small ceramic vessels: two juglets, a feeding bottle (Fig. 159 in Chapter 5) and two carinated (conical) cups.
A marked difference between the Greek mainland on the one hand and the south-eastern Aegean on the other is that tombs in the latter area generally do not include any terracotta figurines. As commented in section 6.1 above, such items do, however, frequently occur in “Greece-3” assemblages.

There are two graves within the “Müskebi-3” group of which the associated assemblages show similarities with groups on Rhodes: Tombs 22 (LHIIIA2) and 32 (LHIIIA2). The inventory of the former included two large piriform jars, a typical Rhodian-style incense burner with curled-up legs and a unique necklace of glass relief-beads (in the shape of curls-of-hair) (Fig. 82 in Chapter 5). As argued in section 6.2.1 above, large piriform jars and incense burners occur frequently in tombs of this period on Rhodes; together with a number of other vase forms they are seen as indicative of a collective, possible ethnic, identity, which developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2. Moreover, with some exceptions, including the tombs excavated at Armenochori on Astypalaia (see section 6.2.3 above) and Değirmentepe on the Anatolian south-west coast (see below), glass relief-beads have mainly been found on Rhodes (e.g. Ialysos, Lelos and Pylona (Aspropilia).

The assemblage of Müskebi Tomb 32 included four piriform stirrup jars FS 166 (Fig. 68 in Chapter 5), a unique large beaked jug (Fig. 9 in Chapter 6) and two incense burners with curled-up legs (Fig. 8 in Chapter 6). As discussed in section 6.2.1 above, the piriform stirrup jar FS 166 is typical of Rhodian burial practices in LHIIIA2. It constitutes part of the same set of identity-marking vessels as the large piriform jar (see above) and the incense burner, of which there are also two examples from Tomb 32. Note that this is the largest concentration of piriform jars FS 166 in a single tomb at Müskebi; in other graves only single examples were found. The beaked jug also deserves to be mentioned, because medium or large jugs (as opposed to small jugs) are very rare in the Müskebi cemetery. Such jugs are, however, very in common in tombs on Rhodes, especially in graves in which “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” identities are being expressed (Figs. 18-9 in Chapter 5). At Müskebi, most medium or large jugs have been found in combination with assemblages of the “Müskebi-2” type (Fig. 5 in Chapter 6), which, as noted above, in a number of important ways, resembles the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. It thus seems that in both of the tombs discussed above (Tombs 22 and 32) through the material culture an active connection between the burying groups and Rhodes is

---

56 There is one other tomb with an incense burner with curled-up legs which is not explicitly discussed in the main text. In Tomb 23, which is a “Müskebi-2” tomb, a medium or large jug, a stirrup jar and an incense burner were found. Besides the incense burner, the connection with Rhodes is also manifested in the “Müskebi-2” group itself, which, as noted in the text, in a number of important ways resembles the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group from Rhodes (see, also, section 6.4.1 below).
being signalled. In Tomb 2, a similar way of using material culture to indicate relations with Rhodes was observed (two large piriform jars, a piriform stirrup jar, a basket vase and a kylix with two vertical handles below the rim) (see above).

So far, in our discussion of the expression of group identity in tombs on the south-west coast of Anatolia we have concentrated mainly on the cemetery of Müskebi. Additional chamber tombs have been excavated at Değirmençtpe and Pilavtepe. Although the former, which is situated nearby the Bronze Age settlement of Miletus, is a cemetery consisting of more than eleven graves (see fn. 50), since the site is largely unpublished, only one tomb assemblage (Tomb 2 or D 33) (LHIIIB) could on the basis of the available literature be partially reconstructed. At Pilavtepe, only a single tomb has been excavated (LHIIB-IIIC). It is therefore in neither case possible to make a comparison with other tombs at the same site, which is necessary in order to be able to establish structural patterns of association and identify possible group identities. For that reason, in what follows the focus is on the similarities and differences between the assemblages from Değirmençtpe and Pilavtepe and those from elsewhere in the south-eastern Aegean.

Among the vessels that have been published from Tomb 2 or D 33 at Değirmençtpe are a large piriform jar and a number of stirrup jars. These pot forms often occur together in tombs on Rhodes. For this reason, they are regarded as constituting part of a collective identity which developed there in LHIIIA2 (see section 6.2.1 above). Similar ceramic patterns have been observed on Astypalaia and Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 above) and at Müskebi on the Anatolian south-west coast (see above).

The assemblage from Değirmençtpe Tomb 2 or D 33 also included several painted kylikes, a deep bowl and a krater. This seems to indicate that in the funeral rituals performed an important role was played by the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs. The same applies to the display and deposition of objects other than pottery. This can be inferred from the presence of a variety of different types of such objects in Tomb 2 or D 33. In it were found four bronzes, two spearheads and two short swords, a number of glass relief-beads (in the shape of curls-of-hair) and some gold rosettes.

The materials from Tomb 2 or D 33 at Değirmençtpe are similar to those typically associated with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups from Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above). Comparable assemblages have also come to light on Kos, for example at Eleona/Langada (“Kos-1” group) and Pyli (see section 6.2.2 above). There are additional

---

57 For a full overview of chamber tomb cemeteries, including recent discoveries, in south-western coastal Anatolia see fn. 50 above.
parallels from Astypalaia and Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 above), and Müskebi (“Müskebi-2” group) on the Anatolian south-west coast (see above). The relation between these different regional groups is especially clear in the defining connection between open vessels, especially kylikes, and bronze weapons. There are, however, a number of elements which distinguish the assemblage from Tomb 2 or D 33 at Değirmençepe from most of the groups listed above. It included gold rosettes, glass relief-beads and a large collection of bronze weapons. In this respect, Değirmençepe Tomb 2 or D 33 most closely resembles the assemblages associated with the “İalysos-1 (1)” group from Rhodes. This is the only group we know of in the south-eastern Aegean that comprises both gold beads and rosettes and glass relief-beads. The same combination also appears in (at least) one of the two tholoi that have been discovered on Kos, but its assemblage is largely unpublished (see section 6.2.2 above). Moreover, although bronze weapons are common in all of the regional groups discussed above, the assemblages generally do not include more than one or two pieces. The only tomb with a group of weapons that is similar in size to that from Değirmençepe Tomb 2 or D 33 is New Tomb 4 at İalysos (three bronze swords) (LHIIIA2), which has been identified as belonging to the “İalysos-1 (1)” group. Another possible example is Old Tomb 4 at İalysos (LHIIIB), which had four bronzes, three spearheads and a sword, associated with it. However, although there were also gold rosettes and glass relief-beads present in the tomb, the only extant pottery vases were two large piriform jars (see section 5.4.2).58

The chamber tomb at Pilavtepe was in use from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIC. No information has been published about the find spots of individual objects. Because of this, it has not been possible to separate out the objects other than pottery by period. The same applies to a number of ceramic vessels.

Among the pot shapes from LHIIIA2-B are a krater (Fig. 163 in Chapter 5) and three painted kylikes. This is similar to the materials we find in association with such groups as the “İalysos-1 (2)” group from Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above) and the “Kos-1” group from Kos (see section 6.2.2 above). What connects these different regional groups is a shared emphasis on the actual or symbolic consumption of liquids and/or foodstuffs in the funeral rituals performed. Another link between these groups is that they often have bronze weapons associated with them. No weapons have been reported from the tomb at Pilavtepe. It did, however, contain some glass relief-beads. This combination is particularly well known from

58 As noted in Chapter 5, it is unclear how 'complete' the assemblages from the Old Tombs excavated by Biliotti really are.
Rhodes: open vessels, especially kylikes, glass relief-beads and/or bronze weapons often occur together in “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages (see section 6.2.1 above). 59

In the tomb were also found three (globular-squat) stirrup jars from LHIIIA2-B. There were not any piriform stirrup jars FS 166 from LHIIIA2 or any large piriform jars from LHIIIA2-B. 60 As discussed above, both of these vessel types often occur in tombs on Rhodes (see section 6.2.1 above). Similar ceramic patterns have been observed on Astypalaia and Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 above), and at Müskebi on the Anatolian south-west coast (see above). A different picture emerges from the tombs on Kos, where there are almost only (globular-squat) stirrup jars found (see section 6.2.2 above). This seems to most closely resemble the finds from Pilavtepe.

In the previous sections, an overview has been given of the different group identities being expressed in tombs in the different parts of the south-eastern Aegean. They were compared with each other as well as with the groups – “Greece-1”, “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” – that have been defined on the basis of the archaeological burial record of the Greek mainland, which was discussed in section 6.1 above. It has been demonstrated that there are important similarities and differences in the ways identities are expressed by specific groups between the different parts of the south-eastern Aegean on the one hand, and between the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland on the other. Features the two areas have in common are the widespread use of chamber tombs for primary and/or secondary burials and the tendency to deposit unguent containers within the tombs. While this relates to the manifestation of relations of similarity in the archaeological burial record, also in terms of the expression of relations of difference we see similarities between the south-eastern Aegean on the one hand and the Greek mainland on the other. This is, for example, apparent in the specific traits the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and the “Greece-1” group have in common, but also through the popularity of small ceramic vessels appearing in combination with “Ialysos-2”, “Kos-2” and “Müskebi-3” assemblages on the one hand and “Greece-3” assemblages on the other. We, however, also noticed a number of differences. A striking example is represented by the combination of painted kylikes and bronze weapons which can be considered characteristic of the south-eastern Aegean in LHIIIA-B. As noted in Chapter 5, we also know of this

59 It has to be stated, however, that since we are unable to separate out the objects other than pottery from Pilavtepe by period (see above), the possibility that the glass relief-beads are from a different period than the krater and the kylikes cannot be completely ruled out. At least part of the finds other than pottery has to be assigned to LHIIIC. A clear example is represented by the bronzes from the tomb. The assemblage included a chisel, a spatula and a bodkin. They best parallels for some of these objects come from a LHIIIC context on Rhodes (Karantzali 2001, 72).

60 The large piriform jars found in the tomb, three in total, are dated to LHIIIC by P.A. Mountjoy (pers. comm. 04.02.11).
combination appearing in tombs situated elsewhere along the west coast of Anatolia, such as at Panaztepe adjacent to the Gulf of Izmir, Beşiktepe in proximity to the settlement mound of Hissarlık-Troy and Archontiki on the islet of Psara (opposite Chios). By contrast, both painted kylíkes and bronze weapons occur only rarely in tombs on the Greek mainland.

The insights gained in this section form the basis of the final part of this chapter, in which they are combined in order to construct a ‘new’ Late Bronze Age narrative for the west coast of Anatolia in general and the south-eastern Aegean in particular; one that goes beyond the opposition between Mycenaeans and locals (Chapter 1) by addressing the social dynamics which give this area its own unique character.

6.3 Synthesis: the ‘Mycenaeans’ in the south-eastern Aegean revisited

This dissertation started with a concise description of the archaeological record of the west coast of Anatolia and adjacent islands. One inter-regional contrast immediately became apparent: that between the south-eastern Aegean and the areas to the north of it. The former has a strong Mycenaean ‘character’ associated with it, which manifests itself, especially, in the large number and wide variety of Mycenaean cultural traits represented in its archaeological burial record: chamber tombs, (decorated) pottery, weapons and jewelry (see section 1.1). To the north of the south-eastern Aegean a stronger local character was retained. Mycenaean culture did not penetrate into these areas as it did in south-western coastal Anatolia. Elements of Mycenaean material culture, especially pottery, do occasionally appear, but they are less numerous and there is less variety in them. It is clear that in the formation of the archaeological records of the areas which in Chapter 1 were referred to as the “central” and “northern zones”, a more central role was played by (material) cultural traditions of local origin.

Although in many studies the variety of Mycenaean object types found in the south-eastern Aegean is discussed, a contextual approach is adopted in only a few of them.\textsuperscript{61} For this reason, questions of whether it is possible to see any differences in the ways Mycenaean objects were ‘used’, inter-contextually, have so far not been addressed. Consequently, the performative aspect of Mycenaean material culture, i.e. what role it might have played in

\textsuperscript{61} Most studies treat the finds from the south-eastern Aegean as one single data-set. The finds per cemetery are not considered per tomb or context as in this PhD study. Examples are the work by Mee (1982), Georgiadis (2003), Kelder (2004-2005) and Niemeier (2005a; 2005b).
Ch. 6. Synthesis and Conclusions

constituting social relations between people, has been largely ignored. In order to fill this void, it has been the main purpose of this dissertation to establish the degree of the deployment of Mycenaean material culture to express group identities in the archaeological burial record of the south-eastern Aegean on the one hand, and that of the Greek mainland on the other. Previous approaches have had the tendency to divide the population of the south-eastern Aegean in the Late Bronze Age in two opposing social blocs, with Mycenaeans on one side and local groups on the other. As argued in Chapter 1, this distinction is not supported by the archaeological evidence. For this reason, in this PhD study a different way of approaching “groups” in the archaeological record was proposed in order to develop a better understanding of the social dynamics characterizing the societies of the Late Bronze Age south-eastern Aegean. These social dynamics are central to this final synthesis. Points of attention are intra-regional dynamics, as well as the connections between the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland. These will be approached from two complementary perspectives, in terms of the manifestation of relations of similarity (section 6.3.1) and difference (see section 6.3.2).

6.3.1 Relations of similarity: the expression of collective identities

It was observed in section 6.1 above that constitutive of the “Greece-1”, “Greece-2” and “Greece-3” assemblages are two different types of social relations: relations of similarity and relations of difference. The first set of relations is regarded here as a way of expressing a collective, possible ethnic, identity. It connects the different groups with each other (communal). Social differences between groups which are contextually relevant and may be of a religious, economic or political nature are manifested in the second set of relations, the relations of difference (distinction). These assemblage-constituting social relations manifest themselves in specific traits of material culture that frequently occur together in the archaeological burial record.

We find several common traits in the way groups on the Greek mainland express themselves in funerary practice. Among the features most frequently encountered are the widespread use of chamber tombs for primary and/or secondary burials and the placement of unguent containers with the deceased (see section 6.1 above). This complex of traits is interpreted here as a manifestation of relations of similarity. We find the same complex in the archaeological burial record of the south-eastern Aegean, where it is first attested in LHIIB-
III A1. In this period, its distribution is limited to only a few cemeteries on Rhodes, Kos and Karpathos. Chamber tombs with unguent containers are found at many more sites in LHIIIA2-B. On the islands listed above an increase in the number of sites is recorded. Furthermore, chamber tombs are now also constructed on Astypalaia and Samos, as well as on the south-west coast of Anatolia, for example at Müskebi and Değirmentepe.

Similar to the Greek mainland, chamber tombs in the south-eastern Aegean typically have unguent containers associated with them. Illustrative in this respect is that, along the west coast of Anatolia, the distribution of stirrup jars, which are typical of LHIIIA2-B, is almost completely limited to the south-eastern Aegean, which also happens to be region in which chamber tombs were in widespread use. To the north of this area, there are no Mycenaean-style chamber tombs and the archaeological burial record, mostly consisting of cemeteries with tombs of local type (e.g. pot or pithos and cist-graves), has yielded only very few stirrup jars. This pattern of association shows that chamber tombs and stirrup jars make up a fundamental part of the funeral culture of the south-eastern Aegean. As suggested in sections 6.1 and 6.2 above, there might be a connection between the use of unguent containers and the kinds of funeral rituals typically carried out in chamber tombs (anointing of dead bodies and bones).

From the perspective which has been developed in this PhD study, the widespread use of chamber tombs – for primary and/or secondary burials – and the placement of unguent containers with the deceased are conceived of as a meaningful complex of associated traits characteristic of the archaeological burial record of the Greek mainland. It was proposed that this complex might be regarded as a material manifestation of a collective, possible ethnic, identity (see section 6.1 above). Since we see a similar complex – of associated traits – represented in the funerary record of the south-eastern Aegean (see above), this would mean that the people who buried their dead in chamber tombs here used material culture to associate themselves with the same (ethnic) collectivity as their ‘counterparts’ on the Greek mainland. I am not suggesting here that there were only persons of Mycenaean Greek descent buried in the chamber tombs in the south-eastern Aegean. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, ethnic boundaries can be ‘crossed’. It is possible for a person to change his/her ethnic affiliation by adjusting his/her behavior so as to meet the criteria of inclusion of the group he/she wants to become a member of. Since ethnic identities are not primordial but can be

---

62 E.g. Ialysos, Vati (Apsaktiras) and Koskinou
63 Eleona/Langada
64 E.g. Pigadia (Anemomili-Makeli)
65 Chronological trends of each of these islands are described in more detail in Chapters 4 and 5.
behaviorally appropriated, it is impossible to establish with certainty what proportion, if any, of the ‘Mycenaean’ graves in the south-eastern Aegean belonged to immigrants from the Greek mainland.\textsuperscript{66} What is clear, however, is that in south-western coastal Anatolia specific knowledge was in circulation of funeral or burial practices customary on the Greek mainland and that part of its population decided to express itself in a similar manner.

The (ethnic) connection between the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland, as manifested in the funeral or burial rituals performed, should, however, not be considered as immutable. As a matter of fact, it changes over time. This is especially apparent in differences in the types of ceramic vessels through which in both areas relations of similarity are expressed. A comparison of these vase types shows it is in LHIIB-IIIA1 that south-western coastal Anatolia resembles the Greek mainland most closely. During this period, when the distribution of chamber tombs was limited to only a small part of the south-eastern Aegean, in both areas there are mostly small piriform jars and rounded alabastra found. In LHIIIA2, we see a number of fundamental changes taking place in the south-eastern Aegean. In the first place, there is a strong region-wide increase in the number of chamber tomb cemeteries. Secondly, developments are noticeable in the vessel types through which relations of similarity are expressed. One such development clearly mirrors Greek mainland practices, i.e. the widespread use of stirrup jars. In other respects, we see a clear break with Greek mainland practices. This is especially clear in the (almost) complete disappearance in LHIIIA2-B of the small piriform jar and the rounded alabastron from the archaeological burial record of the south-eastern Aegean. During this period, both of these pot shapes stay common in tomb assemblages on the Greek mainland. A development which is characteristic of the south-eastern Aegean in general and Rhodes in particular is the sudden rise in popularity of the large piriform jar (LHIIIA2-B) and the piriform stirrup jar (LHIIIA2). There is no parallel to this trend on the Greek mainland. As discussed in section 6.2.1 above, the rise in popularity of these vessel types – together with a number of other pot forms\textsuperscript{67} – is attributed here to a ‘new’ collective identity which developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2. Similar trends in the pottery repertoire are also visible in other parts of the south-eastern Aegean; the same vases are found together in chamber tombs on Karpathos and Astypalaia (see section 6.2.3 above) and the south-west coast of Anatolia (Müskebi and Değirmentepe) (see section 6.2.4 above). There is one notable exception to this. At Eleona/Langada, the largest cemetery on Kos, neither the

\textsuperscript{66} Cf. discussion in sections 1.2 and 1.3 on the difficulty of distinguishing between ‘real’ Mycenaean and ‘made’ Mycenaeans in the archaeological burial record of the south-eastern Aegean.

\textsuperscript{67} E.g. incense burners with curled-up legs and basket vases
large piriform jar nor the piriform stirrup jar ever became common. Here, (globular-squat) stirrup jars (LHIIIA2-B) represent the feature the different groups of assemblages have in common (see section 6.2.2 above). It should be noted, however, that this vase type also appears frequently elsewhere in the south-eastern Aegean.

There thus seems to be a tendency in south-western coastal Anatolia in LHIIIA2 for people to identify themselves with Rhodes and the collective identity that was developed there in this period. As noted above, the only real exception to this pattern is represented by Kos. This is significantly different from the previous period, since in LHIIB-IIIA1 the emphasis had clearly been on the Greek mainland and the collective identity expressed in tombs there. It should be noted, however, that, also after LHIIB-IIIA1, Greek mainland influences remain visible in the identities expressed in chamber tombs in the south-eastern Aegean. This is, for example, apparent in the widespread use of stirrup jars (see above). Furthermore, some identity-groups in the south-eastern Aegean (e.g. “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-3”, “Kos-3” and “Müşkebi-3”) have characteristic combinations of objects in common with groups on the Greek mainland. In contrast to the combinations discussed so far, rather than marking similarities (cf. relations of similarity) the combinations referred to here are to be seen as the manifestation of relations of difference. In other words, they can be understood as signaling the contextually salient differences between groups. These differences and the group identities associated with them are discussed in more detail in section 6.3.2 below.

Before leaving this subject, I want to call attention to a phenomenon which is typical of the south-eastern Aegean in LHIIIA2-B, namely the (almost) complete disappearance from chamber tombs of the small piriform jar and the rounded alabastron. As noted above, both of these vessel types stay common in such graves on the Greek mainland in this period. Their disappearance in the south-eastern Aegean marks a clear break with communal practices customary on the Greek mainland in LHIIIA2-B. In relation to the previous discussion on the manifestation of collective identities in chamber tombs in south-western coastal Anatolia, I would argue that by LHIIIA2-B the small piriform jar and the (rounded) alabastron had (almost) completely disappeared, because they were being used to express an entirely different kind of identity. As noted in sections 4.20 and 4.21, both types of vessels – in both Mycenaean painted and local plain ware – appear frequently in this period in tombs of local, non-Mycenaean, type (e.g. pit and pithos graves) to the north of the island of Samos. This pattern thus coincides with the distribution of chamber tombs along the west coast of Anatolia, since the northernmost excavated is situated on Samos (MiloI). A reverse pattern is represented by the distribution of stirrup jars, which, as noted above, typically occurs in
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chamber tombs, but not in graves of local, non-Mycenaean, type. Although the amount of published evidence is fairly limited,\(^{68}\) it may be proposed that by placing small piriform jars and/or (rounded) alabastra, often in combination with vases of local origin, in tombs of local type identities opposed to that expressed in most chamber tombs were being constructed. In this light, it should be remembered that identities are principally defined in relation to ‘others’ (see section 2.1.1).

There is one notable exception to the pattern (lack of small piriform jars and (rounded) alabastra in chamber tombs in LHIIIA2-B) described above. At Müskebi, where only Mycenaean-style chamber tombs have been discovered (see section 6.2.4 above), a strikingly large quantity of straight-sided alabastra was found. This pattern is not paralleled anywhere else in the south-eastern Aegean. As discussed in section 6.2.4 above, this pot shape principally occurs in two groups of assemblages at this site: “Müskebi-1” and “Müskebi-3”. For the former there are no parallels from any other sites in the region. It is tentative to see the popularity of this vessel form at Müskebi as a way through which the people burying their dead with it tried to associate themselves with groups who lived further north along the west coast of Anatolia. Other ‘confirmations’ of this might be that small piriform jars were also quite common at Müskebi in comparison with other sites in the south-eastern Aegean. The same conclusion may be drawn on the basis of the – though limited – occurrence of cremation burials at the site, which is usually regarded as ‘Anatolian’ in origin.\(^{69}\) Cremations appear much more frequently in tombs of local type to the north of Samos, at sites such as Panaztepe (see section 4.16), Baklatepe (see section 4.15) and Beşiktepe (see section 4.17).

The contrast in LHIIIA2-B between the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland on the one hand, and the south-eastern Aegean and the area to the north of the island of Samos (i.e. the “central” and “northern zones” from Chapter 1) on the other clearly demonstrates how important it is to approach the archaeological record from a contextual perspective. Similar types of objects may be used by different people in different locations to construct completely different contextually-contingent meanings. Consider the following example. Besides showing connectivity with communal Greek mainland practices, the widespread use of stirrup jars in chamber tombs in the south-eastern Aegean was also a way through which the people who buried their dead in this fashion were able to distinguish themselves from

\(^{68}\) Only the cemeteries around Hissarlık-Troy have been completely published: Cemetery of Cinerary Urns in the Lower Town of Hissarlık-Troy and the necropolis of Beşiktepe.

\(^{69}\) Jung 2007, 220-1, 229.
those who lived further north along the west coast of Anatolia, who had neither chamber tombs nor stirrup jars.

6.3.2 Relations of difference: the expression of different group identities

In the previous section it was asserted that, in terms of the manifestation of relations of similarity in the archaeological burial record, we see both similarities and differences between the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland. The similarities are strongest in LHIIB-IIIA1, which also happens to be the period when the first chamber tombs appear on Rhodes and Kos. From LHIIIA2 onwards, we see the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland developing along different lines or trajectories. In this section, the focus will be on how the two areas compare to each other when it comes to expression of relations of difference within tombs. The comparative analysis carried out in section 6.2 above demonstrated that, also in this respect, the two areas have a number of important features in common. These are most clearly illustrated by the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group from Rhodes and the “Ialysos-2”, “Kos-2” and “Müskebi-3” groups from Rhodes (Ialysos), Kos (Eleona/Langada) and the south-west coast of Anatolia (Müskebi), respectively.

It was noted in section 6.2.1 above that the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group from Ialysos on Rhodes and the “Greece-1” group from the Greek mainland have several defining features in common. Among these are that the tombs in which they are found are usually among the largest of their respective cemeteries and that the assemblages, through which these identities were expressed, often have such items as tinned kylikes, gold beads and rosettes and glass relief-beads, especially examples of the bracket-type, associated with them. Most graves containing assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” type yielded pottery of both LHIIB-IIIA1 and LHIIIA2 date.70 They were not reused in LHIIB, during which we see the construction of a number of ‘new’ “Ialysos-1 (1)” tombs.71

It has to be noted that the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group cannot be regarded as a ‘duplicate’ of the “Greece-1” group. There are clearly local circumstances at play here. A striking example is represented by the large piriform jar, which, on the Greek mainland, is essential to the definition of the “Greece-1” group. On Rhodes, however, this vessel type is not used to differentiate people from one another (i.e. relations of difference), but rather to connect them,

70 E.g. NT 4, 31 and 50
71 E.g. NT 5 and 53
since large piriform jars are part of the set of ceramic vessels through which, from LHIIIA2, in tombs relations of similarity are expressed (see section 6.2.1 above). Two other pot forms which are quite typical of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group, but generally do not occur in association with assemblages of the “Greece-1” type are the krater and the rhyton or ritual vessel. Thus, we see two phenomena at work here. On the one hand, we see material culture being used as a means to forge a connection between the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and the “Greece-1” group. From a collective perspective, on the other hand, there are clearly elements represented in the “Ialysos-1 (1)” assemblages through which this group’s ties with Rhodes are emphasized.

A unique feature of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group is that its distribution is limited to the cemetery of Ialysos on Rhodes. As noted in section 6.2.4 above, one of the tombs excavated at Değirmentepe (Tomb 2 or D 33) nearby the Bronze Age settlement of Miletus bears a number of resemblances to it, but no further claims can be made until this site is completely published.

In contrast to the Ialysos-1 (1)” group from Rhodes, in different parts of the south-eastern Aegean we know of groups that have features in common with the “Greece-3” group. These are the “Ialysos-2”, the “Kos-2” and the “Müskebi-3” group from Rhodes (Ialysos) (see section 6.2.1 above), Kos (Eleona/Langada) (see section 6.2.2 above) and the south-west coast of Anatolia (Müskebi) (see section 6.2.4 above), respectively. What these groups have in common with each other on the one hand, and, on the other, with the “Greece-3” group is that they usually include only a small number of open vessels, particularly kylikes, and there are often one or more of the following small ceramic vessels found: the small jug or juglet, the feeding bottle, the askos, the small mug and the carinated conical cup. It is interesting to note that on display in the Chios archaeological museum is a comparable – but unpublished – assemblage from the cist-grave cemetery of Archontiki on the islet of Psara (see section 5.3.6).

We also see clear differences, however. In general, the different groups of assemblages from the south-eastern Aegean with features in common with the “Greece-3” group are of LHIIIA2 and/or LHIIIB date. This does not correspond to the situation as observed on Greek mainland, where this group is attested from LHIB-IIIA1 onwards (see section 6.1 above). Another difference is that the assemblages from the south-eastern Aegean often include vases which never, or only rarely, occur in combination with the “Greece-3” group. This, for example, applies to the large piriform jar and the incense burner, which we frequently find together with the “Ialysos-2” group. The “Müskebi-3” group also regularly includes (large) piriform jars, as well as straight-sided alabastra, which are again rare in tombs on Rhodes. As argued above, these vessel types have been linked here to the manifestation of relations of
similarity in the archaeological burial record of Rhodes and Müskebi (for more details, see section 6.3.1 above). This reveals how these regional groups, despite showing similarities with a specific group on the Greek mainland, are tangled up with local traditions of expressing identity in funerary ritual. A similar point was made with regards to the “Ialysos-1 (1)” group discussed above.

Another example illustrating the differences between the two areas is represented by the relative popularity of terracotta figurines. While common in association with assemblages of the “Greece-3” type (see section 6.1 above), they generally do not appear in combination with any of those from the south-eastern Aegean. Interestingly, the only instance known to me is Tomb 27 at Archontiki on Psara (see section 5.3.6),\(^\text{72}\) i.e. a cemetery located outside the supposed ‘Mycenaean’ southern zone (see section 1.1).

It should be clear by now that in the constitution of group identities in the south-eastern Aegean an important role was played by the Greek mainland. This, however, does not apply to all groups. There are several groups without any correlates from the Greek mainland. I will first pay attention to the “Müskebi-1” group, which comprises assemblages consisting of only one ceramic vessel; they either include a small jug or a straight-sided alabastron. We also often find the latter in combination with the “Müskebi-3” group. It has been suggested in section 6.3.1 above that the popularity of the straight-sided alabastron might be seen as the manifestation of a relation through which these two groups are connected to each other on the one hand and, on the other, to the different peoples that inhabited the areas to the north of the south-eastern Aegean (i.e. the area north of Samos) in the Late Bronze Age. As discussed in Chapter 4, (straight-sided) alabastra, although comparatively rare in tombs on Rhodes and Kos, are very common at sites such as Panaztepe, Archontiki (Psara) and Beşiktepe. Another similarity with these sites is that – albeit on a limited scale only – at Müskebi cremation was practiced. This might also hint at relations between the people burying their dead at Müskebi and the area north of the island of Samos, where the practice of cremation was much more commonplace. If this interpretation is correct, it demonstrates how Mycenaean-style objects may be used to express an identity of strongly local character, without any real ‘counterparts’ in the region, let alone on the Greek mainland.

The final group discussed here is represented by the following assemblages: “Ialysos-1 (2)” (see section 6.2.1 above), “Kos-1” (see section 6.2.2 above) and “Müskebi-2” (see section 6.2.4 above). Other assemblages resembling these are to be found on Astypalaia and

---

\(^{72}\) This tomb is dated to LHIIIA2. On display in the museum are among others a small jug, a feeding bottle, an askos, a small carinated cup and a terracotta figurine of the Phi-type.
Karpathos (see section 6.2.3 above), and at Değermentepe and Pilavtepe on the Anatolian south-west coast (see section 6.2.4 above). In other words, this group has the widest distribution of all groups that have been discussed in this PhD study. And since there are no parallels for it on the Greek mainland, it can be considered a truly south-eastern Aegean group. What characterizes it is the combination of drinking vessels, especially (painted) kylikes, and bronze weapons, particularly spearheads and/or short swords. The individual groups are not identical to each other, there are for example differences in the number of open vessels found, but in all cases the same pattern of association is apparent.

This group is first attested in LHIIB-IIIA1. From this period, there are (at least) two assemblages from Ialysos on Rhodes and one from Eleona/Langada on Kos. Most examples, however, come from LHIIIA2 and LHIIB, when, parallel to the number of sites with chamber tombs (see section 6.3.1 above), we also the presence of this group in the south-eastern Aegean increasing. The widespread distribution of this group provides a clear illustration of the region’s internal connectivity in LHIIIA-B. Interestingly, its distribution is not limited to the south-eastern Aegean alone. Further to the north, at Panaztepe (see section 5.3.4), we know of a number of tholos graves in which, it appears, similar identities were being expressed in LHIIIA2. Unfortunately, the site is largely unpublished. The same applies to the cist-grave cemetery of Archontiki on Psara (see section 5.3.3), where there is at least one grave from the same period in which a similar pattern of association (kylikes and bronze spearhead) has been observed. Another site that should be mentioned here is Beşiktepe (LHIIIA2) which is located nearby the citadel mound of Hissarlık-Troy (see section 5.3.5). Discovered here was a single built tomb containing an assemblage resembling the ones outlined above (e.g. “Ialysos-1 (2)”, “Kos-1” and Müskesi-2”). The “Grabhaus” at Beşiktepe yielded a good many Mycenaean-style drinking vessels, especially pattern-painted kylikes, in combination with a bronze sword.

In this section an overview has been given of the different group identities that can be seen manifesting themselves in the archaeological burial record of the south-eastern Aegean in the LHIIIA-B Palatial period. We see Mycenaean material culture being used as a means through which different groups of people, in their own distinctive way, express themselves in funerary ritual.

---

73 This is most clearly illustrated by the “Müskebi-2” tombs from Müskesi on the Anatolian south-west coast and the assemblages included in this general group from the island of Karpathos, some of which comprised more than forty open vessels (Pigadia (Anemomili-Makeli) (Chapter 5).
74 E.g. NT 37 and 74
75 ET 21
76 Tomb 42
One aspect which has not yet been addressed in this final synthesis is that most of the groups discussed here comprise some assemblages through which, by the inclusion of specific object types, a special link or connection with Rhodes is being expressed. In section 6.3.1 above, I already discussed the popularity of large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars in the south-eastern Aegean outside Rhodes in this respect. The sudden rise in popularity of these two vessel forms in LHIII A2 seems to signal a ‘reorientation’, in most parts of the south-eastern Aegean (Kos is the exception here), from a collective identity that was inspired by the Greek mainland to one most closely resembling that developed on Rhodes in this period (cf. relations of similarity). What characterizes the objects on which I will focus in the next section is that they appear in only a very limited number of graves within their respective cemeteries. They, therefore, do not serve as markers of communality, as was the role of the pot shapes discussed in section 6.3.1 above, but rather as markers of social distinction, by which individual graves through their constructed connection with Rhodes distinguish themselves from the other graves within the same group on the one hand and the rest of the cemetery to which they belong on the other. I will discuss these, what I call, Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ in the next section.

6.4.1 Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ in the south-eastern Aegean

At a number of sites outside Rhodes it has been possible to identify individual tombs through the assemblages of which, by the inclusion of specific object types, a stronger link or connection with Rhodes than in most other graves is expressed (for discussion of large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars as markers of communality, see section 6.3.1 above). As argued below, most of the ‘fingerprints’ found appear to be related to the either one of the two “Ialysos-1” groups. We will discuss them per region in the following order: Kos, Astypalaia and Karpathos, the south-west coast of Anatolia and the area north of the island of Samos.

The number of large piriform jars and piriform stirrup jars found in tombs on Kos is very limited. In section 6.3.2 above, I mentioned Langada Tomb 51 (LHIII A2). This “Kos-1” assemblage yielded examples of both (Figs. 1-2 in Chapter 6) in combination with several other vase forms which are rare on Kos, but common on Rhodes, in particular in tombs containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages: medium or large jugs, ritual
vessels and kylikes with two vertical handles below the rim. Another tomb from the same “Kos-1” group produced a piriform stirrup jar, a large domestic stirrup jar and a medium jug (LHIIIA2). These are the only two piriform stirrup jars that have been found at the cemetery of Eleona/Langada. This is also the only large domestic stirrup jar discovered at the site. As argued in Chapter 5, at Ialysos on Rhodes the distribution of this vessel type is limited almost entirely to the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group. Another similarity is the presence of a bronze spearhead in this tomb (Fig. 55 in Chapter 5), which is a feature typical of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group.

We also have Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ from a tomb situated elsewhere on the island. The assemblage from Pyli (LHIIIA2) included a large piriform jar, a linear stirrup jug (Fig. 3 in Chapter 6), a krater (Fig. 4 in Chapter 6) and two bronze weapons (Figs. 58-9 in Chapter 5). The relation between the first two pot shapes and Rhodes was mentioned in connection with Langada Tomb 51 above. The krater, however, is also very rare in tombs on Kos, but occurs relatively frequently in association with assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” type. We also often find bronze weapons in combination with “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages.

Among the “Kos-2” tombs, we also find a few that have Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ associated with them. For example, Langada Tomb 25 included a large piriform jar (Fig. 81 in Chapter 5) and a large decorated beaked jug (LHIIIA2). This overview makes clear that in the “Kos-2” group, but especially in the “Kos-1” group, there are tombs in which, by the inclusion of specific object types, a higher than usual connectivity with Rhodes is being expressed. Most of these ‘fingerprints’ are related to either one of the two “Ialysos-1” groups.

On Karpathos and Astypalaia we do not have large cemeteries, such as Eleona/Langada on Kos and Ialysos on Rhodes. Therefore, it is not possible to see whether some tombs contained more Rhodian-style items than others. Nevertheless, on both islands we do have tombs with assemblages including large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars (see section 6.2.3 above). In addition, there are a few tombs on Karpathos and Astypalaia that also have other Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ associated with them: from Pigadia (Anemomili-Makeli) come two Rhodian-style basket vases (LM/HIIIA2) (Fig. 112 in Chapter 5) and from Vonies (Arkasa) two Rhodian-style incense burners with curled-up legs (LM/HIIIA2) (Fig. 113 in Chapter 5). The two ritual vessels from Kambi (Diafani) (LM/HIIIA2) (Figs. 64-5 in
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77 LT 16
78 Another krater has been reported from one of the tholoi discovered outside the settlement of the “Serraglio”. This assemblage is, however, largely unpublished (see section 6.2.2 above).
Chapter 5) also have to be mentioned here (see section 5.2.3). The finds come from a destroyed tomb, so the assemblage is incomplete. We know of no other ritual vessels from Karpathos from this period and as noted in connection with Langada Tomb 51 above ritual vessels are quite common in tombs containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages. Another similarity between the Kambi (Diafani) assemblage and these two groups is the presence of a bronze weapon in the former (Fig. 66 in Chapter 5).

On Astypalaia we find Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ among the finds from the tombs excavated at Armenochori. Apart from large piriform jars (LHIIIA2-B) (Fig. 108 in Chapter 4) and piriform stirrup jars (LHIIIA2), its assemblage also included a unique narrow-necked jug (LHIIIB), a number of kylikes (LHIIIA2-B), a bronze spearhead and a group of glass relief-beads, comprising a rosette and three curls-of-hair (Figs. 154-5 in Chapter 5). Kylikes, medium or large jugs and glass relief-beads are common features of assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” type. Bronze spearheads are typical of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group.

There are three cemetery sites on the south-west coast of Anatolia containing tombs with Rhodian ‘fingerprints’: Müskebi, Değirmentepe and Pilavtepe (see section 6.2.4 above). At Müskebi, we have examples from tombs within the “Müskebi-2” and the “Müskebi-3” group. A “Müskebi-2” tomb with several Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ is Tomb 2 (LHIIIA2), which, apart from two large piriform jars (Fig. 69 in Chapter 5) and one piriform stirrup jar, also produced a Rhodian-style basket vase (Fig. 6 in Chapter 6) and a kylix with two vertical handles below the rim (Fig. 7 in Chapter 6). More Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ can be found in Tomb 39. This “Müskebi-2” grave contained a large piriform jar and a unique cutaway-necked jug with curved stripes (Fig. 5 in Chapter 6). The latter pot shape is very common in assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” type. Tombs with Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ from the “Müskebi-3” group comprise: Tombs 22 (LHIIIA2) and 32 (LHIIIA2). Aside from a pair of large piriform jars, the former yielded a Rhodian-style incense burner with curled-up legs and a unique necklace of glass relief-beads in the shape of curls-of-hair (Fig. 82 in Chapter 5). As noted above, such beads are especially common on Rhodes, particularly in combination with assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” type. Finally, Tomb 32 contained four piriform stirrup jars (Fig. 68 in Chapter 5), the largest single concentration of this vessel type from this site, two Rhodian-style incense burners (Fig. 8 in Chapter 6) and a large beaked jug (Fig. 9 in Chapter 6). Large (decorated) jugs, although often found in association with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” group, occur only rarely at Müskebi. The only other example, as noted above, comes from a “Müskebi-2” tomb (Tomb
39) which also has a large piriform jar associated with it.\textsuperscript{79} This overview shows that similar to Eleona/Langada on Kos, at Müskebi there are several tombs in which, through the inclusion of specific object types, a strong connectivity with Rhodes is being expressed. Whereas the large piriform jars, piriform stirrup jars, incense burners and the basket vase are related to the communal identity that developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2, the other items mentioned – medium or large jugs, kylikes with two vertical handles below the rim and glass relief-beads – mostly occur in combination with “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages.

The other two cemetery sites on the Anatolian south-west coast are Değirmentepe and Pilavtepe. At the former was discovered a tomb (Tomb 2 or D 33) containing (at least) one kylix, a krater, a large piriform jar and a number of stirrup jars, in combination with a set of bronze weapons and a group of glass relief-beads and gold rosettes. Kylikes, kraters, bronze weapons, glass relief-beads and gold rosettes are especially common in “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages; gold rosettes mostly in the former. We also have a pair of kylikes and a krater in combination with a collection of glass relief-beads from the chamber tomb excavated at Pilavtepe nearby the Bronze Age settlement site of Iasos.

The distribution of Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ is not limited to the supposed ‘Mycenaeanized’ south-eastern Aegean. Among the tombs published from the area to the north of the island of Samos, we know of at least three in which such traits can be discerned: Ephesus (Ayasoluk Hill) (LHIIIA2) (see section 5.3.2), Panaztepe (LHIIIA2) (see section 5.3.4) and Archontiki (Psara) (LHIIIA2-B) (see section 5.3.3). The (extant) assemblage from Ephesus (Ayasoluk Hill) comprised a large piriform jar, a krater and a conical rhyton. Although large piriform jars are generally common on Rhodes (cf. relations of similarity), kraters and ritual vessels almost only occur in tombs containing “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages. At Panaztepe, several small tholoi have been excavated. Although most had been disturbed and the cemetery as a whole has not yet been published we know of the following object types occurring in some of them: large piriform jars, kylikes, pattern-painted jugs and glass relief-beads.\textsuperscript{80} Kylikes, medium or large jugs and glass relief-beads frequently appear together in combination with assemblages of the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)”

\textsuperscript{79} In this light, note that there is another “Müskebi-2” grave, Tomb 23, which contained a plain jug and a Rhodian-style incense burner with curled-up legs. In general, medium or large jugs are rare at Müskebi, thereby mirroring the situation at Eleona/Langada where a similar pattern was observed. Here, we also see most medium or large jugs appearing in combination with assemblages of the “Kos-I” type (see section 6.2.2 above).

\textsuperscript{80} Another small tholos in the vicinity of Panaztepe is located at Kolophon (see section 5.4.7). It had been completely robbed. Among the extant finds, however, there was a glass relief-bead. It is tentative to speculate about whether this tholos would have had an assemblage similar to that recovered from the tholoi at Panaztepe.
type. We noted the same combination at Armenochori on Astypalaia (see above). Finally, the largely unpublished cist-grave cemetery of Archontiki on the islet of Psara has yielded one grave of which the contents included the following relevant objects: a large piriform jar, a large number of stirrup jars and kylikes, a conical rhyton and a bronze spearhead. Whereas it is through large piriform jars and (piriform) stirrup jars that we see the collective identity developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2 manifesting itself in the archaeological burial record, kylikes, ritual vessels and bronze weapons are mostly found in combination with “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages; spearheads are typical of the “Ialysos-1 (2)” group.

The above overview shows that dispersed throughout the south-eastern Aegean and beyond there are specific groups that identified with Rhodes more strongly than others. Indeed, this comes on top of the general ‘reorientation’ in most parts of the south-eastern Aegean (with the notable exception of Kos) from a collective identity inspired by the Greek mainland to one that more closely resembled that developed on Rhodes in LHIIIA2 (see section 6.3.1 above). Most of the ‘fingerprints’ discussed above can be related to either one of the two “Ialysos-1” groups (e.g. medium or large jugs, kraters, ritual vessels and glass relief-beads). In this light also note that most of the tombs considered yielded assemblages of the type characterized by the combination of open vessels, especially kylikes and bronze weapons, in particular spearheads and/or short swords (e.g. “Kos-1” and “Müskebi-2”). We find the same traits represented in the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups.

We can only speculate as to the reason why these groups decided to associate themselves so explicitly with Rhodes in this period in general and with the two “Ialysos-1” groups in particular. One scenario which will be explored in the final section of this chapter is that this might be interpreted as an indication that Rhodes was the center of a regional power, whose influence in LHIIIA2-B extended from Rhodes in the south to at least Miletus/Değirmentepe in the north. Was it through these specific groups of people that Rhodes was able to extend its influence in LHIIIA2-B? Could this be the power the Hittites called “Aḫḫiyawa”?

6.4.1 Rhodes and Aḫḫiyawa

The previous discussion has shown that in the south-eastern Aegean Mycenaean material culture was used in different ways, by different people, at different times. The evidence reveals an enormous social dynamism. On a regional level, this is, for example, reflected by the ‘switch’ in LHIIIA2 from a collective identity based, to a large extent, on the Greek
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mainland to one which resembled most closely that developed on Rhodes in this period. This collective, possible ethnic, identity was, however, not accepted by all groups, as indicated by the situation on Kos, where it seems that Rhodian connections remained the prerogative of the ‘privileged’ few (“Kos-1”). Also on the local level, it was possible for specific groups to say ‘resist’ particular frameworks of identification, of which a good example is represented the “Müskebi-1” group from Müskebi on the Anatolian south-west coast. As suggested in section 6.3.2 above, the members of this group may have used Mycenaean material culture to associate themselves more closely with the more northern parts of the west coast of Anatolia. This behavioral aspect also manifests itself in how in the south-eastern Aegean different forms of connectivity are expressed. On the one hand, we see a strong internal connectivity or connectedness through the identities expressed through, for example, the “Ialysos-1 (2)”, “Kos-1” and “Müskebi-2” assemblages. On the other hand, the assemblages show a pronounced external focus, through connections with the Greek mainland.

A good way to demonstrate that the south-eastern Aegean should be understood in terms of its own internal social dynamics rather than as an extension of the Greek mainland proper is that the relation between both areas as reflected in the tomb assemblages was not fixed but changed over time. In the south-eastern Aegean, a unique collective identity was developed (see above). It does not seem that on the Greek mainland there was any resistance to this, since the majority of vases on the basis of which this identity was formed (e.g. large piriform jar and (piriform) stirrup jar) were imported from there (see section 4.1.2). Although the Greek mainland continued to play an important role when it came to the expression of differences between groups (cf. relations of difference), the ‘roots’ or basis of these groups lay with the newly formed collective, of which the emergence can be traced back to the second half of the 14th century BC, LHIIIA2 in pottery terms. As argued in the previous sections, I believe that in the formation of this collective identity a pivotal role was played by groups of people on Rhodes. This is reflected in the extent to which this newly developed collective identity overlaps with that associated with Rhodes. Another indication of this is represented by the Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ discussed in section 6.4.1 above. Although these ‘fingerprints’ appear in different kinds of assemblages, we mostly find them in the regional groups characterized by the presence of open vessels, especially kylikes, and bronze weapons. These ‘fingerprints’ occur predominantly in assemblages that to some extent resemble the two “Ialysos-1” groups. As argued in section 6.3.2 above, assemblages characterized by the presence of open vessels, especially kylikes, and bronze weapons, some also containing Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ are found throughout the south-eastern Aegean. As noted in section
6.4.1 above, we even have examples from more northern sites, such as Panaztepe nearby the Gulf of Izmir and Archontiki on the islet of Psara adjacent to Chios. This group, even more so than that constituted by the “Ialysos-2”, “Kos-2” and “Müskebi-3” assemblages, is what the internal connectivity or connectedness of the south-eastern Aegean is based on (see above). For this reason, it may be hypothesized that in ‘creating’ this connectivity or connectedness, an important, if not leading, role was played by people on Rhodes. This may also be reflected in the extent to which from LHIIIA2, there was an overlap between the collective identity of the south-eastern Aegean and that associated with Rhodes in this period. Even though our argument is based almost completely on evidence from tombs, I believe that it shows that the south-eastern Aegean should be seen as a distinct political entity and that its center, at least in LHIIIA2, is to be situated on Rhodes. As discussed in Chapter 1, there have been quite a number of scholars who believed that Rhodes was the center of the state the Hittites called “Aḫḫiyawa”, although there is now a growing group of scholars in favor of a location on the Greek mainland (see sections 1.2 and 1.3). In the remainder of this section, I will make a brief comparison between what we know of Aḫḫiyawa and the political scenario that has been developed for the south-eastern Aegean in this dissertation.

Focusing on the period coinciding with LHIIIA2, i.e. the second half of the 14th century BC, which is when I believe Rhodes established itself as an important regional center, there are several Hittite texts containing information that could be relevant to our discussion of Aḫḫiyawa. Mention should be made of the “Ten-Year Annals” and the “Extensive Annals” of Muršili II, whose reign is dated from ca. 1321 to 1295 BC. From these documents, we learn of several local kingdoms who had switched their allegiance to the king of Aḫḫiyawa. Among them are Millawanda, which, as noted in Chapter 1, can be identified with the Bronze Age settlement of Miletus and the nearby (later) necropolis of Değirmentepe, and Arzawa, with its capital city at Apaša, later Ephesus. Other texts attributed to Muršili, which on the one hand indicate good or at least peaceful relations between the king of Ḫatti and the king of Aḫḫiyawa, and, on the other, that – in the eyes of the king of Ḫatti – Aḫḫiyawa had developed itself into a power of some importance in the region, include an oracle report, a prayer and a letter. The oracle report informs us that the king of Ḫatti had become ill and that he had summoned for the “god of Aḫḫiyawa” to be brought to him. From the prayer we learn of the banishment of someone, generally assumed to be a Hittite queen, to the “Land of Aḫḫiyawa”. The third text, which has been only fragmentarily preserved, contains the expression “we the
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brothers”. If this applies to the writer and the addressee, this would imply that the king of Ḫatti considered the king of Aḫḫiyawa as his equal.\textsuperscript{83}

Although it is impossible to know how representative the historical record is, judging from the available evidence, it is only in the reign of Muršili II that we find Aḫḫiyawa appearing \textit{relatively frequently} in the Hittite texts. Before that time, we know of one episode in western Anatolian history in which a man called Attariššiya, described as a ruler of Aḫḫiya (old writing for Aḫḫiyawa), was involved.\textsuperscript{84} In any case, what is notable here is that, as indicated by the analysis in this research, it is also during this period (i.e. LHIIIA2) that Rhodes established itself as an important center in the south-eastern Aegean. Considering that in the Annals of Muršili II mention is made of local kings siding with the king of Aḫḫiyawa, it is interesting to note that we find assemblage groups resembling the two “Ialysos-1” groups, with Rhodian ‘fingerprints’ associated with them, as far north as Panaztepe on the Anatolian west coast and Archontiki on the islet of Psara. As a matter of fact, from Ephesus, the Bronze Age capital of Arzawa (see above), of which the king – a man called Uḫḫaziti – is explicitly mentioned as having allied himself with the king of Aḫḫiyawa, we have a tomb assemblage (Ayasoluk Hill) with a number of typical Rhodian features associated with it (e.g. large piriform jar, krater and ritual vessel).

As noted in Chapter 1, it is during the subsequent LHIIIB period or the 13\textsuperscript{th} century BC that the king of Aḫḫiyawa is once called “Great King” by the then Hittite king Ḫattušili III. Historically speaking, the texts from this period in which Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned are concerned mainly with troubles caused for the Hittite king in south-western Anatolia by a Hittite renegade named Piyamaradu.\textsuperscript{85} From the so-called “Tawagalawa Letter”, we learn that Piyamaradu was the father-in-law of a man called Atpa, who at the time was in charge of Millawanda, which during this period fell under the overlordship of the king of Aḫḫiyawa.\textsuperscript{86} A final text that I want to draw the attention to is a letter sent to a king of Ḫatti, which is concerned with a gift that was to be prepared for the king of Aḫḫiyawa. In it are listed two ritual vessels, one of silver, the other of gold.\textsuperscript{87} With regards to Millawanda being under the control of the king of Aḫḫiyawa, mention has to be made of the cemetery excavated at the nearby hill of Değirmentepe, which, although largely unpublished, included a tomb (Tomb 2 or D 33) resembling the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” groups from Rhodes. Finally,

\textsuperscript{83} Ibidem, 272-3.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibidem, 271.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibidem, 274-7.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibidem, 276.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibidem, 276.
what is of interest in the text referring to the shipment of two ritual vessels to the king of Aḫḫiyawa is that ritual vessels (e.g. conical rhyta, hydriae with pierced bottom, ostrich egg rhyton) are known to have played an important role in the funeral rituals through which the identities associated with the “Ialysos-1 (1)” and “Ialysos-1 (2)” assemblages were expressed. On top of that, assemblages resembling these, including ritual vessels, have been found on Karpathos (Kambi (Diafani)), Kos (Eleona/Langada) and Psara (Archontiki), as well as in the central part of the Anatolian west coast (Ephesus (Ayasoluk)).

There will never be a full concordance between the historical and the archaeological data, but I believe that the evidence from both disciplines in this case fits the interpretation developed in this dissertation well, namely the center of Aḫḫiyawa was on Rhodes. This also offers a more satisfying explanation for the islands which are often mentioned in texts as being under the control of the Aḫḫiyawan king (see section 1.2).

Scholars working from a “colonialist perspective” (see section 1.2) believe that Rhodes and the south-eastern Aegean were controlled by one – or several – of the Mycenaean states on the Greek mainland.Regardless of whether the localization of Aḫḫiyawa, as proposed in this PhD study, is correct, I do not believe that the archaeological evidence from the south-eastern Aegean can be used to prove that the area was under the control of the Greek mainland. The correspondence between both areas in terms of the manifestation of relations of similarity and difference might be interpreted as an indication that in the south-eastern Aegean there were at least some people from the Greek mainland. In particular, however, the archaeological burial record shows that there were strong ties between groups in the south-eastern Aegean and the Greek mainland. The existence of such close relations, which can, for example, also be inferred from the large number of imported ceramic vessels (Chapter 4), however, need not mean that one was under the control of the other. It is interesting that even though from an archaeological perspective most regions of the Greek mainland appear to be very similar, with a few exceptions, the communis opinio is that, politically, it was fragmented into a number of independent palace-centered territorial states. In other words, cultural homogeneity need not equal political unity. It is therefore possible to see the south-eastern Aegean as its own independent unit within the larger Mycenaean world which was the Late Bronze Age Aegean.

In the end, the evidence is incapable of excluding either one of these scenarios. Even the existence of groups in the south-eastern Aegean without convincing ‘counterparts’ on the
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Greek mainland does not suffice as an argument to disprove external control. As a matter of fact, as noted in section 1.2, from a post-colonial perspective, one might argue that this is actually what one expects to find in a situation where new communities are created by people from colonial (i.e. Mycenaean Greek) and local descent. In any case, it should be stressed that this was also not the aim of this PhD study. Our focus has been on the different ways group identities were expressed in tombs. Since by far the majority of evidence available for the study of the Late Bronze Age in the south-eastern Aegean is funerary in nature, it is important to emphasize that this category of evidence does not unequivocally support any hypothesis of Mycenaean Greek supremacy. The story ‘told’ by these identities is that with the rise of Rhodes in LHIIIA2 as the central power in the south-eastern Aegean, it was not the alleged colonial homeland (i.e. the Greek mainland) but the local environment most people collectively identified with. Although we can only speculate as to the reason(s) why this sudden ‘reorientation’ occurred, it is striking because not only Rhodes was flourishing in LHIIIA2, but so were the palatial centers on the Greek mainland (Chapter 1). What this shows and what is also one of the main lessons to be learned from this study is that the meaning of “Mycenaean” is not fixed but contextually contingent. We see different groups of people using Mycenaean material culture to convey different meanings at different times. They used Mycenaean material culture to express themselves in their own distinctive way in funeral ritual. This applies to the Greek mainland as much as it does to the south-eastern Aegean – and beyond. In other words, there is no such thing a ‘real’ Mycenaean.