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ABSTRACT

MYCENAEAN WAYS OF WAR: THE PAST, POLITICS, AND PERSONHOOD

by Katherine M. Harrell

The remit of this thesis is to contextualise violence and martial culture in the Mycenaean world in order to understand how it is a source of legitimacy for political power during MH III-LH IIIB. A theoretical understanding of the way violence shapes cultural conceptions of space and time supports this research, which is implemented methodologically by a deconstruction of the loci in which violence and martial culture are consumed in order to understand culturally specific meanings and codes of practice. In part, this approach was implemented by a decision to weight the efforts to which the Mycenaean differentiate martial culture over relying on typological methods to amalgamate.

Based on a contextualisation of the martial data from the Shaft Graves, this thesis argues that violence is exploited at Mycenae in MH III-LH I in order to form a complex social hierarchy that relies on the act of witnessing and approving of violence and the tuition of bellicose practices for assimilation. The large numbers of swords deposited in the later graves in Grave Circle B and Grave Circle A are argued to reflect hegemonic integration rather than bilateral segregation of "elites" and "non-elites". Through LH II there is general dispersion of the consumption of martial culture throughout the Mycenaean world. In this context, death, violence and time are all heterarchical forces that are empowered but also dominated as part of extended funerary rites. Personal honour, orality and bellicosity are understood as mutually reinforcing cultural expressions.

By LH IIIA, the threat of violence becomes more associated with liminal places in the embedded landscape rather than with liminal periods of transition, namely death. The metamorphosis is due in part to the presence of historical tombs as a critical element of the political geography but also to the social pressures that proceed to rewrite concepts of proximity during the Late Bronze Age. The Mycenaean response to this is to
reaffirm the importance of autochthony and homecoming by building settlement areas and empowering them through confrontations with the threatening landscape. As these processes intensify in LH III B, the palaces seek to legitimise themselves as loci of production and consumption. In so doing, they co-opt and reinvent forms of violence, including sacrificial and numinous acts, such as the funeral feast, that had hitherto been primary components of the mortuary programme.

Keywords: Mycenaean, hegemony, warfare, violence, sword, diacritica
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Mother Earth, as the story continues, now steeped and drenched
In the blood of her offspring, gave fresh life to the seething liquid.
Unwilling that all the fruits of her womb should be lost and forgotten,
She turned their blood into human form; but the new race also
Looked on the gods with contempt. Their passionate lust for ferocious
Violence and slaughter prevailed. You'd have known they were born of blood.

(Ov. Met., I.157-62)
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Chapter One: Mycenaean Ways of War: The Past, Politics and Personhood

This thesis offers four theories on Mycenaean political development from the Shaft Grave period through to the collapse of the palaces. Primarily, the Shaft Graves represent hegemonic integration of the community as a whole rather than a bilateral elite segregation and exclusion. Secondly, the networking of three central social powers, death, violence and time, defines political negotiations in the early Mycenaean (LH I-II) period. To characterise this model of community interaction, conflict and cohesion, the concept of personal honour is introduced, which brings together violence, oral culture and family heritage. Thirdly, the monumentalisation of settlements that is characteristic of the process of palatialisation in LH IIIA is suggested to have taken place because of a change in the perception of the threat of violence in the landscape. As social interaction grows between settlements and extends beyond them, the creation of an indigenous home site counters the liminality of the journey. Finally, the LH IIIB palaces are argued to make use of historic forms of violence to legitimise the settlement as a dominant political arena. By restaging the funeral as a sacrifice and palatial feast, and by making the palace site the primary locus for the deposition of martial artefacts, the palaces are co-opting the power once consumed in the mortuary sphere. The methodological approach, an extensive analysis of the social power of violence, substantiates these arguments.

While the central conclusions of this thesis in many ways challenge the generally accepted viewpoints of Mycenaean political trajectories, the material evidence that forms the analytical dataset is not particularly new or unstudied. Indeed, despite a century of research in which archaeologists have associated bellicosity with the particular social order that we term Mycenaean, it is ironic that in discussions over forms of legitimacy and expressions of power violence has generally been left out. Nevertheless, the quotidian nature of martial culture, as "stock" elements of the mortuary programme (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006; Dickinson 1997; Heitz 2008; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1988; Laffineur 1990-91; T.J. Papadopoulos 1999; Taracha 1993; Voutsaki 1999; Whitley 2002; Wright 1997), palatial wall paintings (Brecoulaki, et al. 2008; Cassola Guida 1973; Hiller 1999; Immerwahr 1990; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1999; Laffineur 1999a; Marinatos 1988; Rehak 1992), religious cult (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990; Rehak 1984; 1999; Warren 2000), and bronze hoards (see also Bradley 1998;
Dakoronia 2007; Harding 2006; Maran 2006b; Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007), combined with the fact that these objects fail to arouse a sensory threat in the contemporary world, both contribute to the scholarly attribution of these artefacts as forms of material wealth—so-called "elite goods"—based on their composition in bronze and other precious materials (although cf. Voutsaki 1997). It is the very materiality of violence that has led to its marginalisation in the archaeological literature and the overabundance of martial culture that has resulted in its devaluing as artefacts invested with serious symbolic capital. Weaponry and armour have therefore been interpreted as having an unquestionable right to be present in the archaeological record.

The second reason why violence has been attributed a small role in the context of Mycenaean legitimacy is that archaeologists have been unclear about how violence works or what it means, with the result that violence is attributed little significance in our paradigms of political formation and the dynamics of power. Wright (1995b: 73) has even modelled the impotency of violence as a method of Mycenaean social cohesion:

Henry Wright [(1984: 47-9)] has suggested that an important part of this transformation is the recognition among peer paramountcies that competition among chiefdoms is principally destructive since it causes cyclical conflict and warfare, and that cooperation among peers can create a larger, more complex and more productive political and economic entity (though perhaps not necessarily more stable).

For this reason, scholars have focused their research on characterising the intensity and ferocity of Mycenaean warfare. Following wider trends in the discipline, both ends of the violent spectrum have been argued; on the one hand, archaeologists have questioned even the existence of acts of physical brutality,2 while on the other hand, the Linear B tablets and iconography have been interpreted as displaying certain concepts of war that are facets of modern aggression (Godart 1987; Lejeune 1972; cf. Otto, et al. 2006a: 14; Palaima 1991; Palmer 1956; 1977; Sacconi 1999; Shelmerdine

---

1 Similarly, the gross palatial consumption of pottery, especially at Pylos, was thought innocuous until the rise of the study of the feast as a locus for the negotiation of power.
2 Even in publications aimed at collating and supporting Bronze Age martial research, a dubious scholarly attitude towards Mycenaean violence can be found, for example, in Monks (2000: 136): "The overall impression of Aegean Bronze Age society is of one well versed in weaponry and warfare, but which, initially at least, lacked the technical competence. Although good imitators of foreign ideas, they often lacked the technical understanding of advances in defence-building and weapon technology devised elsewhere. Whether this is because Aegean societies were less belligerent or simply because they practised a very different form of fighting is not clear."
1999), such as Driessen’s (1999: 19) discussion of a Mycenaean Grand Strategy, with reference to “defensive militarism” and “offensive imperialism.” Neither of these polarised viewpoints has developed particularly helpful understandings about Mycenaean bellicosity however; when we interpret ancient violence against our own understandings of warfare\(^1\) we automatically incorporate notions of large scales, battles and combat operations, continual development of technology and knowledge of tactics, and a distinction between soldier and civilian. Embedded in this conceptualisation are ideas about the political interests of the state, liberty of individuals, and rules of war; likewise, we equate peace with the opposite of war (for discussion, see James 2007). Even when scholars have sought to understand Mycenaean violence, the concentration has been on the proxemics of the body, as materialised through technological evolution and associated physical practice of wielding weaponry and armour (Harding 1999a; Molloy 2006; 2008), rather than on violence as a Mycenaean cultural phenomenon. Such detailed focus on violent combat itself has been successful in revealing the physical and psychological constraints that shape embodied practice, but has not illuminated the political ramifications of violence or sought to theorise how violence and martial culture participate in wider networks of power, presumably because scholars assume that the outcomes of violence are either patently obvious or unknowable.

These ideas, both articulated and embedded, have been taken as part of the conceptual essence of warfare; archaeologists have therefore employed a variety of methods in order to analyse these issues. The most historical of approaches is the description of the evolution of weapon typology, the results of which have been used to outline the development of military technology. The co-evolution of certain types of weaponry and armour has been interpreted as indicative of specific Mycenaean military tactics (Fortenberry 1990: 202-3; Taracha 2007; Wardle 1988); likewise, study of the weaponry and examinations of the iconography have stimulated discussions on the scale of Mycenaean combat. The pictorial evidence, notably scenes such as that portrayed on the Siege Rhyton (Figure 5) (Sakellariou 1974; 1975), along with the Linear B textual evidence, have been scrutinised for information about the Mycenaean military operations and organisation, while vignettes such as the “troops marching out” scene on the Warrior Vase have been interpreted as offering a glimpse of daily life during the period of the collapse of the palaces (Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi

---

\(^{1}\) Regardless of whether we decide that the people of the past were as familiar with brutality as we are.

In the end, most characterisations of Mycenaean warfare are descriptive in nature because they aim to reconcile histories of the typological development of martial culture with social directives in Mycenaean history, as if changes in the structure and embellishment of weaponry have an impact that is both direct and self-evident on Mycenaean political transformations. Such a picture permits no recognition that historical events and cultural norms influence the use and development of armaments in a reciprocal relationship in which violence is one of numerous processes by which individuals and groups can assert and gain authority. The historical view of the efflorescence and disappearance of Mycenaean military power is one-dimensional and unsophisticated, evolutionary and based on a cursory understanding of martial artefacts removed from their cultural contexts.

Yet in depositions as finely choreographed as the palatial centres and grave monuments, where we see a diverse syntactical arrangement of political, ideological, economic and bellicose elements, how can we expect martial culture to be playing the identical representational role in every deposition over the span of Mycenaean history, regardless of the associated material culture? After over a century of archaeological research, we still have little idea about why the Mycenaeans choose to execute violence because we have not conceived of Mycenaean aggression as a political trope. I would argue that earlier studies have not had the means to explain the processes of Mycenaean political violence because they have not sought to consider the aspects of aggression or predatory behaviour that are culturally exercised, defined and mediated. To look for easily recognisable evidence of brute force and suppression is to ignore the myriad of socially meaningful expressions of dominance exerted by actors as part of their strategies to master control over political capital. Just as the ubiquity of vessels and faunal remains has been reconsidered in recent years as evidence for the practice of communal consumption, that is, feasting—its significant Mycenaean political process in which factors of status and legitimacy are contested and renegotiated

---

4 This may be evidenced by the definition of warfare offered by Kilian-Dirlmeier (2000: 825): "The famous war historian Carl von Clausewitz proposed a definition of war. He says: 'War is an act of violence with the intention of forcing the opponent to fulfil one's will' (von Clausewitz 1976: 3). In the case of the Late Bronze Age Aegean, we would be justified in adding '...using specialised instruments, in other words weapons'."
(Hamilakis 1999; 2003; 2008; Wright 1995a; 2004c; d)—developments in martial culture studies are equally due for renewed attempts at theoretical understanding. We should expect to see paradigm shifts throughout the Mycenaean period, as the social order in the palatial era is reinterpreted and restructured from its origins in the Shaft Grave period. I suggest here that the Mycenaean adopt wide-scale political violence in MH III as an effective way to build a social hierarchy and, in so doing, violence becomes a central method for expressing power and identity. In subsequent periods the expression of political violence further comes to have connotations of autochthonous and numinous authority (Whitehead 2004a: 10). It is a central tenet of this thesis that the Mycenaeans use violence as an intra-societal method of creating and reaffirming social order.

The theoretical and methodological approach

This thesis investigates how power is created, legitimated and normalised in the Mycenaean world through the expression of political violence between MH III and LH IIIB. The range of material culture associated with violence, the localised preferences for specific types of weaponry and armour, and the purposeful and patterned depositions of this material culture attest to the fact that violence is a socially meaningful practice through which values and ideas concerning power and sovereignty are articulated, challenged and legitimated. For this reason, this work proposes to consider violence as a cultural process into elements of formation, expression and aftermath in order that violence is reconceived as culturally referential and embedded in a web of socially significant ideologies. The thesis aims to understand how co-existing and related cycles of violence, political power and wider social practices are interdependent and mutually transformative through an analysis of the contexts in which power is consumed.

The terms war and warfare, indicating the political expression of violence, are employed only rarely throughout the body of this thesis—almost wholly in the discussions of previous scholarship—but war was chosen specifically for the title to underscore the remit of this work: This research is concerned with those violent performances that are part of dialogues of political power, reflecting and shaping cultural and local concepts of identity. The aim is to interpret those acts of aggression and associated material culture that help to drive cultural history in order to describe and explain the spatial and conceptual networks that bind hostility and materiality into societal interactions that hold meaning and exert power. The theoretical framework
for researching violence is explicitly anthropological in nature: “the social and cultural dimensions of violence are what gives violence its power and meaning” (Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004a: 1), and it is how violence is a cultural medium of expression that is the central tenet of the research programme. The critical questions this thesis aims to answer include: In what ways does violence further the Mycenaean political agenda? How are the poetics of violence, that is, the role of violence in tropes of power, articulated? How do these constructs help shape the Mycenaean worldview and their models of leadership?

Only by rigorously determining the protocols for how bellicosity is expressed, where it is executed and on what occasions, can we begin to more fully appreciate the impact that violence has on constructing and reinforcing the Mycenaean identity. Because violence is equally formative and destructive and has the ability to change the flow of time and remap the social landscape, people often attribute changes in social trajectories to violence, meaning that individuals see themselves as socially constructed in part from violent acts. This is perhaps most dramatically illustrated through the use of weaponry: Learning to commit acts of violence through combat tuition physically shapes the human body into specific forms and trains the mind to perceive the world differently (Tärlea 2004-05). The cultural roles of violence also help to delineate wider societal values of appropriate action, justice and leadership. As will be argued in this thesis, familiarity with the negotiation of acts of violence and reactions to aggression become a touchstone by which the Mycenaeans come to define themselves.

The method requires that we deconstruct the relationship between an act of violence and the material culture of violence in order to conceptualise violence as a process, termed “the poetics of violence” (Whitehead 2004b). The use of martial terminology needs to be clearly defined and theoretically delineated. Violence is the infliction of bodily harm (Carman 1997: 6). Here body refers to the social being, incorporating the physical body, the material culture conceptually matriculated into the body, of which armour is an example (cf. Malafouris 2008), and the mind, the resident and engineer of habitus (Bourdieu 1977). Each of these constituents is subject to physical and/or metaphysical harm and participates in executing and interpreting violence (cf. Whitehead 2004b: 57). Political violence is a culturally created manifestation of socially sanctioned violence between political groups or perceived political groups. We are generally describing communal acts of violence when we use the term warfare, although political violence has been equally undertaken by individual
action. Warfare is a political statement that furthers a political agenda; it takes place as part of a dialogue—either actual diplomacy or other non-verbal forms of message sending—between actors (Bossen 2006: 90). In many ways, violence is an ideal medium for the conveyance of political messages, as Riches (1986: 11, emphasis in the original) explains:

The potency of violence stems from the way in which its four key properties make it highly appropriate both for practical (instrumental) and for symbolic (expressive) purposes: as a means of transforming the social environment (instrumental purpose), and dramatizing the importance of key social ideas (expressive purpose), violence can be highly efficacious. So it is that the desire to achieve a very wide variety of goals and ambitions is a sufficient condition for acts of violence to be performed.

In order to sufficiently analyse the effects of political violence, equal consideration must be paid to how violence aggregates as well as to how it discriminates, for conflict, like all sources of power, has the dual nature of being both destructive and constructive, creating both dissolution and formation (Sluka 1992a: 28-30). Because the effects of acts of violence are generally easily predictable, political violence is a means to an end and not an end in itself. The theoretical framework of this thesis has been informed by anthropological conceptualisations of violence, as summarised by Sluka (1992a: 22-3):

The four interrelated approaches are:

1. a cultural perspective that focuses on the relationship between conflict and learned, shared, and transmitted systems of symbolic meanings;
2. a perspective that combines interest in conflict from both individual-subjective and group-social perspectives;
3. a perspective that combines interest in both the processes of conflict and structures that underlie them; and
4. a perspective that incorporates elements of both structure or system and power-conflict theory.

The key analytic concepts are culture, symbolism, structure, process, and power and the basic axioms are the rejection of the biological hypothesis; that conflict is a cultural universal, but is also culturally relative, varying in form, intensity, and even meaning from one society to another; the relationship between forms of social structure and forms and intensity of conflict; and recognition of the dual or ambiguous nature of conflict.

Archaeologists assume that violence occurs at arbitrary moments and can take place anywhere, leading us to presume that violence is an unpredictable, indiscriminate event that may or may not leave a visible impact on the archaeological record. This is simply not the case: Certain moments, both in linear time where sequential action effectuates a future, and in cyclical, calendrical time that renews the past, are more apt
to be occasions for violence than others. Political outcomes, culminations of historical agendas, those instances that are thresholds of change for the social order—these are the moments when archaeologists should expect political violence to be a significant social practice because it has such inceptive qualities. Earlier associations with political trajectories and violence are likely to foment subsequent political upheaval, for violence is a way of timekeeping and memory making, as acts of aggression have the capacity to physically inscribe memories on the social body (cf. Connerton 1989; Nordstrom 2004). For this reason, violence is not unpredictable for the reason that, like all social practices, violence has periods of formulation, execution and aftermath. Because the earlier contexts of violence so often structure consequent acts of hostility, this thesis is diachronic in analysis and presentation. Beginning with the Shaft Grave (MH III-LH I) period and concluding at the end of the palatial period (through LH IIIB), a diachronic approach permits us to both trace changes in the methods of application by which violence legitimises social power from the early Mycenaean period through to the end of the palatial era and to therefore gauge the impact of historic violence on the political trajectories of later periods. This thesis concludes at the fall of the palaces, because it is at this moment that the political geography across the Mycenaean world experiences a revolution. While the role of violence is of extreme interest in terms of renegotiating political and ideological schemata, the fact that the entire system of Mycenaean self-definition has transformed merits a separate and holistic analysis for the LH IIIC period.

Because violence is a potentially explosive method for contesting and renegotiating legitimacy, cultural controls always limit violence to specific circumstances and arenas for confrontation. For this reason, and on account of the fact that like the human body, the embedded landscape is capable of carrying memories inscribed in its architecture (Maran 2006a; c; Markus 1993; Thaler 2006; Wright 2006b), the physical environment is not a neutral background upon which acts of violence are located. While certain social spaces are constructed as purpose-built arenas for making conflict public and settling disagreements (cf. Cavanagh 2001; Voutsaki 1998), all places intrinsically embody attitudes towards violence in terms of a scale of appropriateness. The issue of the suitability of violence in Mycenaean social

1 Considering the degree to which the Mycenaeans draw upon their past as a source of legitimacy, for example, the use of historic tombs or the incorporation of Grave Circle A into the walls of the enceinte at Mycenae, it is even more likely that acts of historical violence are memorialised and celebrated as having a significant culturo-historical impact.
spaces is a central focus of research in this thesis; the regularity with which the material culture of violence is found in such a limited number of depositional contexts underscores the relationship between the power of place and violence. The archaeological contexts of the data analysed here are drawn from four geographic areas: the Argolid and Korinthia; the western and south-western Peloponnese, predominantly Messenia and Lakonia; northwest Greece, Macedonia, Central Greece, including the modern peripheries of Attica, Boeotia, Lokris, Thessaly, Phokis and Aetolia-Akarnania; and Achaia and the Ionian Islands. Because these four geographic regions make manifest in various proportions those material and ideological components that together are identified as Mycenaean, we should expect that violence is consumed in slightly different contexts in each of these localities. The concentration on localised practice in these three respective areas, each proffering diverse historical trajectories, underscores points of comparison that allow for an elucidation of the various ways that violence legitimises social power under the aegis of Mycenaean cultural lifeways. In light of this approach, study of Cretan material and influence is wholly excluded.

Even in those moments when violence is perceived as the "natural" course of action and can unfold in those loci where violence has the most potent impact, violence is always a social choice and therefore a meaningful act; ethnographic studies have shown that there are few, if any, scenarios in which violence is the sole course of action (Riches 1986: 8). When seeking to understand the historical trajectories of past societies, we should understand political discourse as having a myriad of syntactical arrangements, of which violence is but one source of legitimacy and social might. Other long-lived practices comprise the sanctity of lineage and the related idea of autochthony, a sense of personhood arising from identifying with a historical place, generally celebrated by the funeral, feasting and communal drinking. Palatial era organisations include monumental architectural construction, cultic practices and economic transactions involving literate recording. Societal change, and its mediation, is found in the continual rebalancing of all of these negotiations of legitimacy. In order to understand the poetics of violence, that is, violence as a social practice, we must seek to understand how violence augments the social contexts in which it is executed, so that the perception of violence and the manner for its appropriate consumption can be outlined. Questions for research into Mycenaean violence should be corollaries of our agendas for understanding cultural history: How do we account for the rise of power as expressed in the Shaft Graves? How do familial tombs sustain certain groups
into LH III? What is the purpose of the palace system, and why does it look the way it does?

The meaning of cultural phenomena like violence is made through the dialogue of action, material culture and historical and spatial context. The method utilised here is borrowed from traditional archaeological approaches to the study of expressions of power; that is, through the deconstruction of the syntactical depositions of material culture and the practices they reflect. This methodology has been successfully employed to make sense of the actions and meaning associated with Bronze Age cult (after various papers in D'Agata and Van de Moortel 2009; Renfrew 1985), among other discussions on power (cf. various papers in Maran, et al. 2006; Voutsaki 1995a; 1999; 2001b; Wright 1987; 2004c). This approach requires a theoretical model for understanding the meaning of the martial object, which is drawn from the artefact's relationship to violence, its material composition and construction, and its uselife and biography. By identifying and deconstructing patterns of consumption, made evident through the materiality and uselife of weaponry and armour, we can construct models concerning the material worth and social value of violence and the ends to which it is exercised.

Primarily, the material culture of violence needs to be differentiated from the act of violence itself. Violence has always been successfully carried out without specially designed weapons, and so the presence of armaments needs to be deconstructed in order to understand their purpose. The traditional method for doing this is to arrange diachronic typologies of the artefacts. Nevertheless, typologies cannot be embedded in a cultural framework, whereas the concept of martial culture, referring to that sub-class of material culture that relates to violence (for a similar concept in military history studies, see Wilson 2008), takes an explicitly cultural perspective. Martial culture is the physical architecture of violence; it acts as both an inhibitor and facilitator of aggressive performances. The materiality of bellicose artefacts imposes its own limits on the processes of violent interaction as well as promoting specific acts, forms and manoeuvres of violence. For this reason, the development of the sword, the first weapon in the Aegean to be used exclusively against humans (Snodgrass 1967: 15-6), reflects a transformation in the ways that Helladic peoples construe the proxemics and applications of violence. Furthermore, although both violence and martial culture are subject to political manipulation and control, martial culture is a form of capital and its value is derived in part from the
relation of the object to violence but also from the worth of the materials from which the piece is made and from its cultural biography (Bennet 2004: 96). Together, these factors compose an individual and distinct(ive) object, which is another reason that the artefact typology is an inappropriate tool by which the material culture of violence can be evaluated in terms of value. As will be explained in a subsequent chapter, martial culture and violence shape time and space in slightly different ways: The cultural context in which the martial artefact is found is a product of localised and historical conditions that heighten the significance of the consumption of material and ideological capital. For this reason, martial culture does not represent a direct and extra-cultural means by which hierarchy is imposed and maintained; rather it is employed in a cultural process, governed by regular traditions and patterns of consumption. In this thesis the term martial culture is utilised because it emphasises both the material culture and the system of social interactions associated with it. Like the social order that violence creates, Mycenaean martial culture is diverse, subject to hierarchical arrangement, and part of a wider and more complex web of political interaction. Martial culture is a neutral term and does not presuppose any natural hierarchy amongst the various types of bellicose artefacts, meaning that outliers and exceptions can have as much significance as those objects that conform to relatively stable patterns of deposition. For all of these reasons, martial culture is considered to interact in complex ways with violence, as these artefacts embody historical ideas of personhood and are the instruments by which the Mycenaeans touch, connect to and shape conceptions of their past and future.

Thesis chapter overview

This introduction has presented a number of themes that will be elucidated and contextualised in subsequent chapters. The following chapter (Chapter 2) presents an overview of the theoretical and methodological approaches to the archaeological study of warfare, in which there is a presentation of the sources of data that form the corpus of Mycenaean martial culture. The methodology chapter (Chapter 3) seeks to more fully explain the types of analyses offered in this thesis, based on the chronological and spatial depth that forms the context of violence. This approach entails outlining the social process of violence, providing an explanation of how violence and martial culture works, how each can be used in political message sending, and how they participate in networks of power. Chapters four through seven are a presentation of the cultural history of violence in the Mycenaean world. Chapter four considers the Mycenae Shaft
Graves (MH III-LH I) exclusively; this rich body of data preserved in a well-articulated manner suggests that violence is a seminal act of formation. Chapter five, MH III-LH II, takes into account the types of social trends that are simultaneous with the Shaft Graves and those taking place subsequently. The rise of complex burials and the locus of the funeral as a moment for social re-negotiation indicate that the presence of martial culture and the threat of violence at the tomb play a significant role in sustaining these changing ideologies. The anthropological paradigm of an honour culture is posited as a suitable model to explain the correlation of conflict, lineage and orality, using the Iliad as a case study. Chapter six, LH IIIA, posits that the threat of violence at certain moments in time, namely death, becomes superseded by the threat of violence in liminal areas of the landscape, directly leading to its fragmentation—a revolution in the Mycenaean political geography. Chapter seven, LH IIIB, concludes that the palaces fight for legitimacy and extend their hegemony by co-opting older expressions of power for their own consumption.

Beyond challenging certain accepted paradigms of Mycenaean political history and offering evidence for alternate models, the overriding conclusion that the analysis of this data propounds is that through the centuries of Mycenaean cultural history, violence and martial culture remain potent in terms of their associations with authority, historical legitimacy, and conceptions of the Mycenaean identity. As such compelling tools in forming Mycenaean political structuration, violence and martial culture are always used with the utmost care, attention, and purpose.
Chapter Two: Historical Approaches for Understanding Mycenaean Martial Culture and Bellicosity

This chapter seeks to present a brief overview of the variety of anthropological, sociological and archaeological approaches to the study of warfare, in order to highlight the significant factors that have been discussed as reasons for war in past societies and in polities undergoing formative political processes. This chapter subsequently outlines the specific areas of research taken by scholars of the Aegean Bronze Age, with the intention of presenting a synopsis of the theoretical background, methodological approaches and conclusions made with regards to Mycenaean martiality. Depending on the artefact type, there are a variety of theoretical standpoints and research methods that have been historically applied to the dataset; as part of the wider examination in this précis, there is an overview of the taxa of material evidence used to study Mycenaean warfare. This chapter concludes by arguing that it is not the pertinence of studying bellicosity itself that is outdated and obstructive, but rather our conceptual and procedural approach.

A brief synopsis of the anthropological, sociological, and archaeological approaches to the practice of warfare

Archaeologists have recourse to an extensive literature concerned with the history, archaeology, anthropology and sociology of warfare. The subject of war has been a topic for cross-cultural consideration for decades or more on account of the fact that warfare has been one of the few historically recognised methods of agent-driven change (for brief overviews see Carman and Harding 1999b; Otto, et al. 2006a; Parker Pearson 2005). Anthropological studies have been concerned with cultural or cross-cultural motivations, both psychological and environmental, for warfare, along with the social construction of the warrior, which to some extent has bordered on the humanistic inquiry of the state of the human soul and our propensity to do evil (for overviews, see Ferguson 1984a; Ferguson 1984b; 1990; Ferguson and Farragher 1988; Ferguson and Whitehead 1992; Haas 1990; Otterbein 1970; 1972; 1994; 1997; 1999; 2000; 2004; Otto, et al. 2006a; b; Thorpe 2005). These anthropologies draw on two traditions: ethnographic accounts of non-western warfare and military histories (Keegan 1994; overviews in Keeley 1996: 15-24; Parker Pearson 2005: 22-33; Thorpe 2005: 3-18). Both sources of literature underscore the exotic nature of bellicose practices of non-western peoples, attention to which at times overshadows more recognisable aspects of non-western warfare. Historians and archaeologists have taken
the evidence and retrojected it on the human past, with the result that the first scholarly attempt at characterising ancient warfare presents this phenomenon as immediate, ritualised, and not particularly gruesome (Turney-High 1949). Keeley (1996: 12) charts the rise of the perspective of the pacified past as beginning with Rousseau’s noble savage and being heavily influenced by Turney-High’s argument, a conclusion based on “gaug[ing] the military efficacy of a practice by how closely it resembled that of the modern military, rather than by its effects.”

More recent attempts at characterising warfare have focused on cultural and cross-cultural motivations for warfare, a theoretical question that to a certain extent has sprung from a scholarly attempt to explain why war exists when violence is so abhorrent (cf. Layton 2005; Otterbein 1968; 1970; 1972; 1994; 1997; 1999; 2000; 2004). Ferguson (1984a; b; 1990; 1997; Ferguson and Farragher 1988; Ferguson and Whitehead 1992; see also Thorpe 2005: 5-6), a figurehead in this area of research, favours a materialist cause for explaining warfare; he argues that societies wage wars in their disputes over rights to resources. This approach can be proffered in conjunction with evolutionary-biological models of warfare in which conflict exists between group members competing for the same resources, in which warfare acts as a super-structural agent of natural selection (Brothwell 1999; with references in Thorpe 2005: 3-5). The argument suggests that humanity cannot help fighting wars and that a propensity for violence is coded in our DNA (cf. Nystrom 2005), but for those scholars who consider the diversity in human action to override genetic predisposition, this argument is unacceptable.

The materialist perspective too has been critiqued on many points; on humanistic grounds many scholars cannot give credence to the idea that regardless of the cost to human life, wars have always been and continue to be fought because of material interests. Other assessments cite the conclusion that materialism fuels warfare as inaccurate, while some scholars disagree that a mono-causal argument for warfare is an apt analysis; still others question whether attempts to distil universal causes for warfare is a meaningful activity. In all of these debates, the antiquity of human violence is a contested issue and the archaeological evidence has been heavily scrutinised in order to trace the origins and nature of our aggression (for a nuanced discussion of the causes for, and impact of, warfare and violence, see Otto, et al. 2006a).

In contrast, sociological analyses of warfare have rather ignored the humanistic agonism and have been more inclined to consider warfare as part of state formation
systems theory (Carneiro 1970; Dawson 1996; 1999; 2001), for which ethnographic accounts and historical narratives have been dissected as case studies. One theoretical stance on warfare is to see conflict as part of the political evolution of simple societies. This theory is not mutually exclusive of the materialist perspective; rather the materialists consider the earliest appearances of conflict to be rooted in the past and in societies progressing through the band, tribe, chiefdom and state evolutionary scheme (Bossen 2006: 89; Carneiro 1970; Parker Pearson 2005: 22). As societies progress through this scale, military power becomes an increasingly independent force, which means the causes for warfare are more social in nature than materialistic. From this perspective, engaging in warfare is unavoidable because a certain intensity of conflict is embedded in the diverse levels of social complexity. For this reason, looking more closely at patterns of aggression can offer little insight into answering overarching questions about violence, as the phenomenon of warfare is essentially a straightforward consequence of how we organise ourselves. The great variety of ways in which warfare is carried out across the spectrum of world cultures are attributable to the contextualisation of warfare in each individual society or are simply left unaccounted for (Thorpe 2005: 6).

Archaeologists studying warfare have the range of these philosophical standpoints to measure and consider in addition to the ideas found in our own corpus of literature. Warfare studies became au courant again in archaeology with the publication of Keeley’s (1996) War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage, a rebuttal against the lack of interest in the topic in the decades after the World Wars. Keeley’s polemic argues against a conception of the peaceful past and articulates evidence for a model for warfare in prehistory that can be characterised as widespread, brutal, and common. Thorpe (2005: 1) explains scholarly reaction to Keeley: New World archaeologists find Keeley’s arguments persuasive against the backdrop of changing constructions of the Maya, whereas Old World archaeologists consider the assertion as unsurprising in light of decades of excavations that have uncovered considerable amounts of warrior iconography and androcentric material culture. In the end, the legacy of Keeley’s attempt to forefront the antiquity of violence may have

---

6 Note that such theoretical approaches consider materiality and habitus to be segregated concepts, a viewpoint that this thesis opposes.

7 As Parker Pearson (2005: 23) summarises the diversity of approaches: “It is telling that anthropologists talk of warfare—a process or activity—whereas historians tend to talk of wars—specific historically situated events.”
simply created a debate over the existence of warfare in the past, as much of the successive literature has been concerned with the empirical evidence for violence (various papers in Arkush and Allen 2006; various papers in Carman and Harding 1999a; Golitko and Keeley 2007; Guilaine and Zammit 2005; Keeley, et al. 2007; Osgood 1998; 2005b; various papers in Osgood, et al. 2000; Parker Pearson 2005: 24; various papers in Parker Pearson and Thorpe 2005).

Studies of Mycenaean martial culture both replicate these wider archaeological trends and follow internal developments native to the sub-discipline (Driessen 1999; the most diverse of approaches collected in Laffineur 1999b). Historically, Mycenaean warfare has been conceptualised based on the model presented by Homer; that is, the promise of easily gained wealth lure the Mycenaeans to conduct wars against one another and against outside polities such as Minoan Crete (Krzyszkowska 1999), around which a warrior hero ideal developed to not only authorise this behaviour but also to control and embody it (Driessen and Schoep 1999). The result of normalising this course of action is that competition and antipathy ground the social relations of the palatial elites (the most provocative viewpoint offered by Kopcke 2004; rebuttal in Palaima 2007). Wider anthropological trends have been incorporated into this model; for example, materialistic interests as motivations for warfare have been particularly espoused (cf. Krzyszkowska 1999), and the efflorescence of weaponry in the Shaft Graves has been taken as evidence for a sociological view of warfare as being endemic to a rise to statehood (Acheson 1999; Bennet and Davis 1999; Deger-Jalkotzy 1999; Dickinson 1972; 1977; 1989).

Such is a typical perspective that authors espouse when they wish to contextualise Mycenaean warfare; as part of this system of analysis, the method employed de rigueur to understand Mycenaean warfare as a phenomenon is the typological study, undertaken in order to organise large bodies of archaeological evidence that has been and continues to be uncovered. The taxa of Mycenaean weaponry and armour, including swords, spears, daggers, arrows, helmets, body armour and shields, are wide-ranging in individual form and development but they also all undergo centuries, and in some cases millennia, of architectural transformation.

---

8 Here the term war has also been envisioned to be synonymous with raid, whereby the Mycenaeans invaded other polities with the specific intention to wreak havoc and seize booty. The constructs of raid and war as singular and mutually exclusive types of organised violence are part of wider trends to classify and describe forms of Mycenaean violence—and associated martial culture—rather than analyse and explain it. Keeley (1996) discusses this type of preconception of ancient forms of warfare.
There is a general trend towards increased elaboration, specialisation and proliferation in the entire corpus of Mycenaean martial culture, a typological history that the iconographic elements are used to supplement, because they have been interpreted as following the same course of development. The poetics of typological preference and change as informed by agency and cultural choice have not been elaborated; rather there is an implicit assumption that typological studies are easily and unconditionally situated into a wider politics of martial practice (Avila 1983; Buchholz and Wiesner 1977; 1980; Fortenberry 1990; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Littauer 1972; 2002b; Littauer and Crouwel 1983; Molloy 2006; 2008; Papadopoulos 1998; Snodgrass 1964; 1998; Vutiropulos 1991; Wedde 1999). Nevertheless, it is argued here that typological studies have created a multiplicity of boundaries that typecast and inhibit our understanding of the legitimising role played by martiality, which entail their review, assessment and critique.

**Typologies of arms, armour and bodily harm**

Research has highlighted the evolution and singularity of the weapons of close combat, namely the sword, dirk (Karo 1933; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993b; Sandars 1961; 1963; Weinstein 1981) and dagger (Foltiny 1980; Papadopoulos 1998; Taracha 1991; Xenaki-Sakellariou 1984), the weaponry of distance, including the spear, javelin (Avila 1983; Höckmann 1980a; 1987; Karo 1933; Reinholdt 1993; Taracha 1994), and bow and arrow (Avila 1983; Reboreda Morillo 1996; Tölle-Kastenbein 1980), and protective technology, that is, body armour, helmets and the shield (Alexiou 1954; Andrikou 2007; H. Borchhardt 1977; J. Borchhardt 1977; Catling 1970; 1977a; b; Dezsö 1998; Fortenberry 1991; Korres 1969; Snyder and Andrikou 2001; Varvarighos 1981; Yalouris 1960).

In studies of Mycenaean warfare, the sword is singular for a variety of reasons (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990). Firstly, it is the only weapon designed to exclusively kill human prey (Snodgrass 1967: 15-6). The introduction of the Type A sword to the mainland in late MH III and its resulting immediate popularity has been understood as one of the material identifiers of the changing political structure of this period (Dickinson 1972: 39-40, 52; Fortenberry 1990: 146-7). Mycenaean swords are also much more typologically intricate compared with other weaponry: The various types are visibly distinct, especially in areas such as the hilt, shoulders, midrib and overall form and length. Similarly, while at times diverse classes of swords are used concurrently, there is a much stronger diachronic element to the evolution of the
sword than with other taxa of martial culture. Moreover, the materiality of swords has always attracted scholarly interest; blades are not uncommonly embellished with precious metals, inlay and ornate rivets, hilts and pommels. Finally, blades appear to suffer more intentional destruction before deposition than other types of weapons, again underscoring their singular nature.

Early studies centre on the inception and geographic and chronological spread of the weapon from the innovation of the Type A blade on Crete in MM II through to mainland examples in MH III and beyond (Fortenberry 1990: 146-7; Karo 1933: 200-1; Sandars 1961: 18-22). Little attention has been paid to the context of deposition of swords except to note that they commonly appear as part of the mortuary furniture; often these graves are termed "warrior burials" because of the presence of a blade, especially in LH IIIC (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 95; Deger-Jalkotzy 2006; Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 56-74; Whitley 2002). While there is general agreement that the transformations in structure of the Mycenaean sword through various types reflect a development towards blades that balance structure and strength—a process which continues through the LH period until the arrival of the Naue Type II cut-and-thrust sword from central Europe—there has been dispute and re-characterisation of the architectural details, such as the exact nomenclature of the subtypes in the Type C and/or horned swords (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 41-58; Sandars 1963: 119-25). The role of swords in combat has also been debated; the ornate embellishment of the early blades has been interpreted as indicating that these pieces are not primary weapons of battle, a trend that shifts as the weapons grow in utility and reliability through the centuries (Dickinson 1977: 68; Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 56-8; Fortenberry 1990: 165; Sandars 1963: 128). This transition progresses in coordination with the development of swords that are less beautiful in design but more practical in form and function. By extension, the embellishment of Mycenaean swords has been used as an indicator of the ferocity of violence executed by the Myceneans. The jewelled weaponry of the Shaft Graves has been interpreted as having a more ornamental role, designed to adorn the body. In contrast, the generally stouter, "undecorated functional types of sword and spear" (Dickinson 1999b: 24) that appear in the LH III period are taken as indicators of an increasingly perilous political order, in which the duties of the warrior have devolved from the ceremonious early period with the result that violence

---

9 Nevertheless, the increased deposition of spears throughout LH IIIA-B also suggests that spears are the primary armament (Fortenberry 1990: 165).
has now become brutal and commonplace, almost as a matter of course (see also Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 66-7; Fortenberry 1990: 167, 171-2; Kopcke 1995: 90). Similarly, although assertions have been proffered about the cultural value of Mycenaean blades (Hood 1980; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990; Vermeule 1975), the criteria that scholars use to measure their value range from scales based on our own standards to culturally specific indicators (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 58; Tărlea 2004-05). Even within a single scholar’s theoretical stance there is variation: For example, Voutsaki (2001a: 199) calls the Shaft Grave swords “skeuomorphs” but contends that they hold serious political and ideological worth (see also 1997; 1999).

Table 1: Lengths of daggers as defined by scholars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Length of Dagger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (1953: 67)</td>
<td>≤35.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snodgrass (1964: 104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catling (1964: 110)</td>
<td>≤25 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åström and Åström (1973: 426, no. 1)</td>
<td>≤39 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough (1964: 67)</td>
<td>≤30 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylonas (1973: 310)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripathi (1988: 72-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortenberry (1990: 143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papadopoulos (1998: 3)</td>
<td>≤45 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the heavy emphasis on swords, Mycenaean daggers have not been analysed to the same extent. These pieces are considered to follow the same forms in development and are regarded as somewhat of a footnote to the swath cut by the Mycenaean sword; indeed, most scholars of Mycenaean weaponry define a dagger simply in terms of its length (Table 1), an indiscriminate measure of the line of distinction between the sword and dagger. Fortenberry (1990: 145) captures the sentiment:

While the dagger was the first and, during the Early and Middle Bronze Ages the most ubiquitous weapon/tool, its importance in terms of the development of Bronze Age warfare rests mainly in its function as a prototype for advances later carried out in full-length swords.

Other offensive weapons such as the spear and the javelin do not share the elaboration of forms notable of the sword, making the typologies of these weapons less complex (Avila 1983; Fortenberry 1990: 191-218; Höckmann 1980a; b; 1987).

---

10 Describing the changes in typology after LH/LM II, Fortenberry (1990: 218) notes: “Following this period of extravagance spearheads, just as swords, become increasingly utilitarian and plain, evidence not only for a change in their function, but also for a change in the type of people using them.”
Spearheads are considerably less idiosyncratic than swords and arrowheads; most taxa are reworkings or alterations of a basic form (Fortenberry 1990: 191-2). Furthermore, the use of spears is decidedly diverse, making them less diagnostic for archaeologists wishing to understand bellicosity. The weapon occurs in settlements and the mortuary sphere, as part of both the hunting and martial packages. The question of how it is used in warfare throughout the Mycenaean period has often been discussed, although our understanding of the efficacy and symbolic importance of the spear have been coloured by the contemporary usage of swords but also by the reliance on spears in the Greek historic period and in Homer (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 56-7; Fortenberry 1990: 197-9; Lorimer 1950: 272, 274; Sandars 1963: 128). Similarly, the exact length of the spear as well as the specifics of its handling are sources of debate in terms of segregating spears from javelins, the spear's lighter weight counterpart designed for throwing, which to date is not a confirmed typological class (Fortenberry 1990: 196-7). For early scholars, the javelin is defined by shortness in length, much as daggers are differentiated from swords (Catling 1964: 118, 133; Snodgrass 1964: 116 note 5). Overall, the schematics of the spear, which lacks the ornamentation of the Mycenaean sword, and its more unceremonious deposition in the archaeological record, both underscore the scholarly conclusion that the spear holds little of the symbolic potency embodied by the blade (Fortenberry 1990: 191).

A weapon of even lower status is the bow and arrow (Avila 1983; Fortenberry 1990; Reboreda Morillo 1996; Tölle-Kastenbein 1980). Archaeological discussions of this weapon have centred on the typology of the arrow and reconstructing the Mycenaean bow; however, this has been a less exhaustive area for research, as the bow and arrow is the longest-lived weapon in the Aegean and some Mycenaean arrow typologies date back to the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. Throughout the Bronze Age, styles of arrowheads do not die out whenever newer types are introduced; rather a multiplicity of forms exists concurrently. There is no indication that the Mycenaean develop or adopt the composite bow at any point in the LBA and it seems likely that the form of the bow, and probably the method of its production, remains unchanged for centuries. Flint, obsidian and sometimes bronze are the most common fabrics, although little has been researched concerning the varying use of materials of arrowheads. There is an implicit assumption that the bow and arrow—and the archer by extension—is of meagre importance, an idea that stems from the utilitarian form and grade of material of the weapon, simple method of production and limited
iconographic depictions of archery (Mackie 1996: 50-3 with references; Snodgrass 1967: 17-8).

A number of elements of the Mycenaean panoply are solely represented in the iconography, including chariots, shields, the slingshot, and the hedgehog helmet. Archaeologists have therefore turned to these martial representations to forward typological research, even as the iconography is understood as being unreliable in preserving accurate schematics of martial culture (H. Borchhardt 1977; J. Borchhardt 1977; Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Catling 1977a;b; Driessen and MacDonald 1984; Fortenberry 1990; Höckmann 1980a; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Monks 2000). The aim has been to correlate pictorial data with any and all archaeological remains, tracing the changing form through the imagery and discussing the physical repercussions.

Mycenaean body armour includes shields, corselets, greaves and arm- and handguards, and helmets. While all of these elements have been studied typologically, particular attention has been paid to shields and helmets, on account of their more noticeably developed variation (H. Borchhardt 1977; J. Borchhardt 1977; Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Catling 1977a;b; Driessen and MacDonald 1984; Fortenberry 1990; Höckmann 1980a; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Monks 2000). Shields are known only from pictorial imagery; stylistically there are the figure-of-eight and the rectangular tower shapes from MH III-LH I and round shields from LH IIIB-IIIC. These items are most likely manufactured of organic materials, namely hide, wood, and leather, although possibly with metal trim (H. Borchhardt 1977: 6-7; Cassola Guida 1973: 17-8, fig. 1.1; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992: 5-23; Fortenberry 1990: 5-8; Lorimer 1950: 134-6; Snodgrass 1964: 226; 1967: 19). The chronological gap in LH IIIA-early LH IIIB in the evolution of shields is noteworthy, but may be answered by the contemporary developments in body armour (Fortenberry 1990: 202-3; Lorimer 1950: 196; Taracha 2007; Wardle 1988). In the early Mycenaean period armour is not portrayed; warriors are depicted bare-chested but bearing the large tower or figure-of-eight shields. As the imagery of the early large shields fades away, a new form of protection is developed: the heavy plate armour represented by the Dendra and Theban corselets. Later palatial styles of armour are unclear and perhaps diverse; the evidence from iconography like the Pylos
Battle Fresco (Py no. 10)\textsuperscript{11} may represent a cloth aegis and greaves, although panoplies like the Dendra cuirass may have extended use in the south-western Peloponnese as recorded by the Linear B tablets (Figure 2). In transitional LH IIIB-IIIC, the shield reappears in the Argolid, although the LH IIIC escutcheon is small and round.

The helmet appears to be the one of the most individual and expressive elements in the Mycenaean panoply. Helmets are composed of a variety of basic shapes, materials and adornments. There is diverse evidence for helmetry: boars’ tusks in various states of assembly represent the remains of the boar’s tusk type; a submycenaean bronze-clad helmet from Tiryns is a single example of a metal shako; and the iconographic evidence depicts a variety of styles, including the boar’s tusk, pointed and hedgehog varieties (Alexiou 1954; J. Borchhardt 1977; Cassola Guida 1973: 80-1; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992: 5-23; Dezső 1998; Fortenberry 1990: 101-42; Varvarighos 1981). Ceramic figurines of helmeted individuals riding horseback or driving chariots have also been uncovered (Crouwel 1981; French 1971; Hood 1953; Konsolaki-Yannopoulou 1999; Tzonou-Herbst 2002), but to date ceramic figurines have not been subject to extensive research in terms of understanding Mycenaean bellicosity (although see French 2003). A cursory review of the evidence suggests that there is no straightforward development in helmet typology; there is only a general chronological sequence with the boar’s tusk as part of the early Mycenaean panoply while later fitted caps and the hedgehog type are palatial/post-palatial in date (J. Borchhardt 1977; Cassola Guida 1973: 80-1; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992: 5-23; Dezső 1998; Fortenberry 1990: 101-42). Figures wearing a helmet appear not only in martial and hunting scenes but also in cultic depictions (Cassola Guida 1975); moreover they appear to be worn both by men and women (Rehak 1984; 1999).

Although we have a large body of archaeological evidence for both weaponry and armour, there is little from the record of human remains to complete our knowledge of the bodily effects of Mycenaean combat, for as of yet, osteological analyses of Bronze Age skeletal remains are not particularly widespread (although cf. Smith 2009; Triantaphyllou 2009; Voutsaki, et al. 2007). In contrast to Bronze Age Europe, which has yielded mass graves with victims of warfare or slaughter and skeletons bearing the arrow- or spear points still imbedded in the bone (Bishop and

\textsuperscript{11} Numeration of wall paintings as assigned by Immerwahr (1990).
Knüsel 2005; Craig, et al. 2005; Guilaine and Zammit 2005; Harding 1999b; Knüsel 2005; Orschiedt 2005; Osgood 2005a; b; Taylor 2005), such ignominious deaths have not been uncovered from Mycenaean Greece. The usual technique for understanding the bodily harm of violence is to compare skeletal evidence with a predefined list of types of trauma (cf. Arnott 1999). Arnott (1999) notes that the one of the most common injuries, and generally the most unambiguous, are those sustained by the head; these wounds often occur on the left-hand side of the skull from a right-handed opponent (also Smith 1995). There are also “parry fractures” on the forearms from hand-to-hand combat. Due to the inconclusive (Bouwman, et al. 2008; Brown, et al. 2000; Musgrave, et al. 1995) or dubious (Angel 1973; Arnott 1999) findings that are oftentimes derived from Mycenaean remains, the best approach is a context-driven one, wherein the skeletal remains are examined in conjunction with the grave goods (Smith 2009). For this reason, some attention has been given to the remains found in the Shaft Graves (Angel 1973; Bouwman, et al. 2008; Brown, et al. 2000; Musgrave, et al. 1995; Triahtaphyllou 2009), and more recently whole Bronze Age necropoleis have been examined osteologically (Angel 1971; Bisel and Angel 1985; Triahtaphyllou 1998; 1999; 2001; 2009; Triahtaphyllou, et al. 2006; Voutsaki, et al. 2006). An oft-cited analysis about the martiality of the people of the Shaft Graves comes from Angel’s (1973) findings concerning the male Shaft Grave skeletons; Angel determined them to be approximately 5 cm taller than the general population and on the whole more robust due to better diet and less arduous lifestyle (see also Arnott 1996; 1999; Triahtaphyllou 2009). Angel (1973: 382, 393, pls. 245, 249; also Arnott 1999: 500-1) notes that these skeletons also bear marks of combat trauma with head wounds and vertebral fractures; one example of this is the arthritis found in the lower back of a man 40-50 years of age from the Shaft Graves (59 Myc.). Arnott (1999: 500) asserts that the heavy build, healed injuries, and rich burial indicate his combatant status, and his arthritis resulted from carrying a shield or heavy athletic training. Nevertheless Triahtaphyllou (2009) has recently reanalysed this corpus of skeletal material and found none of the skeletal damage apparent to Angel. It must be concluded therefore that the skeletal evidence indicative of interpersonal violence is contradictory at best (Smith 2009).

Recent scholarly attention has focused on the actual kinetics of Mycenaean combat: for example, the effectiveness of a spear in contest with a sword, a scene found depicted in the glyptic arts (Figures 6, 9) (Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida...
and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Dickinson 1999b: 25; Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 58; Papadopoulos 2007; Tärlea 2004-05). Corollary studies of weaponry typology have been conducted in which the experimental and experiential approach have been used to gain insight into the use of Mycenaean arms (Harding 1999a; Molloy 2004; 2006; 2008). Such research has been practical in terms of understanding differences between typological categories, namely by quantitatively and qualitatively measuring material strength and weakness. This method has also allowed scholars to experience the physical interrelationships of swordplay, drawing attention to routines of bodily exertion and exhaustion, which has to some extent helped in understanding cultural choice. Generally, however, these précis are intellectual experiments, agones between weapon and weapon, weapon and armour, or weapon and human flesh, where the only limits are the tensile strength of the armament (for related studies, see Bridgford 1993; 1997; 1998; 2001; Kienlin 1995; Kienlin and Ottaway 1998; Kristiansen 1984; 2002; Roberts and Ottaway 2003; Wall 1987). Although experimental archaeology grants some insight into the psychology of combat, we remain on tenuous ground with regards to interpretation (see Shay 1995; 2002 for an ethnographic approach to the psychologies of decision making of the Homeric heroes).

Typologies of transport and territories

The research on the technology of transport is extensive; however, the way chariots have been discussed in the literature has been limited to a few circumscribed debates, in parts because of the nature of the archaeological evidence (Åkerström 1978; Anderson 1961; 1965; 1975; Burns 1993; Conter 2003; Crouwel 1981; 1995; 1999; 2005; Detienne 1968; Foltiny 1959; Greenhalgh 1973; 1980; Günntner 1995; Harding 2005; Hill 1974; Hope Simpson 2002; Kilian 1980; 1982; Littauer 2002a; b; Littauer and Crouwel 1973; 1983; 1996; 2002). While images of chariots are rather prevalent, there are in fact no archaeological remains of chariots from the Mycenaean period, which has to a certain extent inhibited typological studies. The Shaft Grave stelai have representations of men riding in wheeled vehicles pulled by equids (Heurtley 1921-23; Mylonas 1951; Younger 1997), and chariot imagery continues in various media through into LH IIIC and beyond. Chariots are depicted on the Shaft Grave

---

12 The fact that scholars have not questioned whether chariots are used by the Mycenaean underscores the differences in the way that archaeologists consider various types of martial culture. Although swords both physically exist in the archaeological record and clearly evolve, featuring structural developments to correct weaknesses in the tang (e.g. Type A and B blades, Sandars 1961; Weinstein 1981), many scholars continue to doubt whether such items are used.
stelai (Heurtley 1921-23; Hiller 1999; Mylonas 1951; Younger 1997), in frescoes from the palaces (Cameron 1967; Hiller 1999; Immerwahr 1990; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1999; Lamb 1921-23), sealstones (Carter 2000; Hiller 1999; Pini 1989; Stürmer 1982), pottery (Lewartowski 1992; Morris 2006; Steel 1999), and clay figurines (Crouwel 1981; French 1971; Konsolaki-Yannopoulou 1999; Tzonou-Herbst 2002; Weber-Hiden 2004); however generally only certain iconographic elements, namely those pieces that preserve the most detail of chariot architecture, have been thoroughly studied.

Figure 1: LH IIIB fresco fragment from Tiryns west slope preserving details of chariot architecture (Rodenwaldt 1912: taf. X).

Other scholars have examined horse remains (Kosmetatou 1993; Payne 1990; Reese 1995), accoutrements (Harding 2005; Littauer 2002a; Littauer and Crouwel 1973) and the Mycenaean road systems (Hope Simpson 2002; Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006; Jansen 1997; Lavery 1995) in order to facilitate an understanding of archetypal chariotry (Figure 1) (Conter 2003). A further source of information about chariots is the Linear B tablets, which record these vehicles and their various component parts in great numbers (Chadwick 1967; 1976: 159-79; Driessen 1988; 1990; 2000; Hooker 1980; Owens 1999; Ruijgh 1976; Snodgrass 1965; Uchitel 1988; Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 361-9). From these data certain details have been preserved that are archaeologically invisible, such as the colouring of the carriage and the fact that chariots are broken down into constituent elements when not utilised. Conceptual discussion has centred on the role of chariot warfare in terms of advancing Mycenaean history, specifically the fall of the palaces (cf. Dickinson 1999b; Drews 1988; 1993; Littauer
and Crouwel 1996). While some scholars consider the chariot to have been a means of transport to and around the battlefield, as they are utilised in Homer, others regard them as veritable weapons of war (Conter 2003: 25-46). A historical suggestion for the rise of Mycenaean domination, articulated by the Shaft Grave deposits, is that it is due in part to the supremacy of chariot-riding archers (Drews 1988; 1993). In addition to the riposte made by Littauer and Crouwel (1996), Dickinson (1999b) also gives a thorough critique of Drews; he underscores the general lack of localised evidence for the model that Drews promulgates and the overall tenuous nature of many facets of the argument, including the logistical issues of effectively employing a Mycenaean chariot in the rocky Greek landscape.

In contrast with the remains for chariots, there is abundant primary evidence for fortifications. Nevertheless, although fortification architecture has been surveyed by studies of warfare (Demakopoulou and Divari-Valakou 1999; Driessen 1999; Fortenberry 1990; Iakovidis 1999; Monks 2000) most of the information is often simply drawn from large overviews of Cyclopean masonry (Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006; Iakovidis 1983; Karageorghis 1998; Küpper 1996; Loader 1995; 1998; Scoufopoulos 1971; Wright 1978). Surveys of Cyclopean architecture concentrate on cataloguing remains in terms of dimension and scale in order to track the development of industrial methods and building programmes, and so attempts by archaeologists to situate this evidence within wider frameworks for understanding Mycenaean bellicosity are problematic. Because the central focus of architectural studies has been building techniques and chronological sequencing, the resulting data from these surveys have been liable to be strung together to create a portrayal of the citadels which forefronts the monumentality of these structures and the numerous construction phases which only increase in scale. This evidence is interpreted as the result of agent perception, with local residents combating the sense of external threat and foreigners feeling intimidation by the might of the citadel walls. Nevertheless, using descriptions of Cyclopean masonry to explain how the citadels are active participants in the recreation of the martial environment is methodologically questionable, as the resulting interpretative issues suggest: The monumentality of the citadels is taken as an indication that the Mycenaean right-to-rule is inherently illegitimate and subject to contestation, a contradictory viewpoint to our understandings of palatial rulership and appanage (cf. Dickinson 2006: 36). The final word is that an appropriate contextual study of the citadels has not yet been fully undertaken and so we have little idea about
how these structures are instrumentalised (for theoretically informed approaches to concepts of space, see Maran 2006a; Maran 2006c; Palaima and Wright 1985; Wright 2006a; b).

In summary, it is evident that the general approach to these overviews of martial culture is similar: Weaponry is grouped into typologically related classes so that the evolution of each armament is traced through its chronological and spatial boundaries. Object taxa are segregated so that types of weaponry and armour are distanced from each other in the process of the analysis (Buchholz and Wiesner 1977; 1980; Crowley 2008; Dickinson 1994; 2006; Fortenberry 1990; Kostourou 1972; Monks 2000; Snodgrass 1964; 1998). On the whole there is a reliance on the transparency of the materiality of the object to reveal pertinent information rather than a propensity to study the object in context; similarly, concepts of value of the object and its role in creating legitimacy are deemed to be self-evident and so are not theoretically defined. Nevertheless, while the use of object typology is a historical and ubiquitous method with which archaeologists have approached the study of warfare in the Mycenaean world, it would be presumptuous to assume that Mycenaean weapons derive the full thrust of their symbolic potency from their typology alone. If this were the case, we would expect to see the sword, the weapon with the most intense architectural development, to be a much more powerful icon when it is at its most robust stage of evolution, that is, the Naue Type II blade in the LH IIIB-IIIC period. On the contrary, however, the sword is emblematic of authority and legitimacy even in the early Mycenaean period (MH III-LH I), when it is in its most delicate form, the Type A. 13 Because the value of martial culture is clearly a synthetic and complex cultural arrangement, it may be argued that martial culture derives its meaning both from its materiality but also from the contexts in which bellicosity is asserted.

**Pictorial and textual studies of martial culture and bellicosity**

While most types of martial culture are examined typologically, the iconographic record has traditionally been assessed contextually, although in limited, predetermined ways. The use of the art historical approach is so established in studies of iconography in Aegean prehistory that it is not surprising that bellicose

---

13 Indeed, the extent to which the sword is fetishised in the early Mycenaean period—the multiplicity of contemporary forms (Types A and B, the Schlachtmesser), the ornate and jewelled decoration of the blades, their representation in the iconographic record, and their association and deposition with other forms of material and ideological wealth—may be indicative that the sword is at the height of its political might in the era when it is structurally weakest (see also Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990).
representations are examined this way too. The methodology entails an analysis of the iconic composition, each element of which is catalogued and cross-referenced, in order to create a symbolic vocabulary with which images of power, commonly political or ideological, are syntactically composed (for one example, see the deconstruction of the lion as an icon, Thomas 1999; 2004). At times representations come into conflict with what is thought of as "reality"; that is, depictions are considered to portray modified or simplified real life elements because of preferences of the audience, the limits imposed by the artistic medium and/or minimal crafting intention to reproduce scale schematics of martial culture (see Conter 2003: 12-46 for a discussion of chariot iconography). Because of this, many components of weaponry and armour can be misconstrued from the iconographic evidence, such as the design of chariots and the proportional length of the spear. Regardless of this caveat however, the method has provided more insight into cultural conceptions of warfare over straightforward typologising because the art historical approach conceives of scenes as composite ideographs (for examples, see Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990; Morris 1990).

The most common method for contextualising violence is to rely on the scenes of combat (Borgna 1992; Brecoulaki, et al. 2008; Cain 1997; Carter 2000; Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Döhl 1980; Driessen 1999; Fortenberry 1990; Hiller 1999; Kilian 1980; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1999; Laffineur 1999a; Marinatos 1988; Mayer 1990; McCallum 1987; Monks 2000; Morris 2006; Papadopoulos 2007; Rehak 1992; 1999; Rodenwaldt 1921; Sakellariou 1974; 1975; Snodgrass 1964; 1967; Stürmer 1982; Thomas 2004; Younger 1988). The depictions are deconstructed icon by icon, the arms and armour that have correlates in the archaeological record are highlighted, and their context of use is extrapolated from the image. The full corpus of Mycenaean bellicose iconography is fairly limited in scope, repetitive in choice of scene, and not continuous through time (Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Hiller 1999; Papadopoulos 2006; 2007). Generally martial depictions stay within the bounds of a limited repertoire and a handful of seemingly set scenes, which appear in a variety of media with little variation. A cursory examination of bellicose images reveals a range of common depictions: men in battle dress; lion hunting; chariot driving; city sieges;

---

14 It is hardly a coincidence that this is the same approach for understanding Bronze Age warfare in Homer (cf. Frazer 1983; Singor 1995; Stagakis 1985; van Wees 1992; 1994; 1997); see Bennet (2004), Vlachopoulos (2007) for the relationship between pictorial art and epic.
duelling and combat (Table 2). In contrast, the types of iconographic evidence are more inconsistent through time: stelai and metal vessels are contemporary with the MH III-LH I period; glyptic appears from MH III to LH III, while frescoes, terracotta figurines and pictorial pottery are datable to the palatial and post-palatial periods (Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Hiller 1999).

When it comes to studying the different pieces of iconography, not all types of evidence are considered as holding equal significance for archaeologists. This is because the depiction on the artefact is weighed against a variety of art historical criteria that are presumed to provide an index of the object's import and relevance, although whether this ascribed significance pertains to an object in its Mycenaean context or as a source of information for academics is not always made manifest and thus is at times confused. The invariable result of this technique for understanding iconography and the ambiguity in interpretation of the data is that archaeologists conflate certain objects of visual appeal as having a disproportionately greater impact while disregarding the value of other pieces for expressing legitimacy through violence.

There are numerous criteria that scholars use to create a hierarchy of iconography, including consideration of the context of an artefact, although like the iconography these depositions are always ordered according to scales of worth. The result of this complex structuration is that much of the pictorial data are under-studied, especially those images that are repetitive, such as the figure-of-eight shield frieze and the chariots on pictorial pottery. The initial touchstone of discrimination is the material with which the object is made. Images inscribed in precious metals and gemstone fabrics, those items termed "elite goods", for example, the gold seal rings and silver vessels of the Shaft Graves, occupy the highest tier; because they are implicitly considered to be part of a wider political discussion, these objects are critiqued in terms of their social intention and value (Carter 2000; Crowley 1989; Davis 1995; Döhl 1980; Laffineur 1990b; 1992; 1999a; Pini 1989; Sakellariou 1974; 1975; Stamatatou 2004; Stürmer 1982; Thomas 2004; Wohlfel 1997; Younger 1988; 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure wearing arm/brand/shield</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure wielding weaponry</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chariot driving</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City siege</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duelling and/or combat</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure admiring a sea</td>
<td>MH III L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Form蚂 donors in Mycenaean mortuary iconography, excluding extrascolic depictions (after Hiller 1999). Every image labeled here includes the human
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Duelling and/or combat</th>
<th>City siege</th>
<th>Figure at sea</th>
<th>Chariot driving</th>
<th>Hunting</th>
<th>Figure wearing armour or bearing weapon</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wp=Wp1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vpl=A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlp=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlp=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dlw=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owd=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rk=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntd=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gtd=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Key:
Secondary order are those pieces designated as "elite goods" because they are found in "elite" contexts, although their physical composition is not composed of particularly rare elements: for example, carved stelai (Heurtley 1921-23; Mylonas 1951; Younger 1997); wall paintings (Brecoulaki, et al. 2008; Kilian-Dirlmeier 2000; Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1999; Kritseli-Providi 1982; Lang 1969; Marinatos 1988; Marthari 2000; McCallum 1987; Rehak 1992) and pictorial pottery (Karageorghis 2000-1; Morris 2006; Steel 1999). When found in non-elite, non-palatial contexts these pieces are not heavily studied, for example, the figure-of-eight shield fresco from tomb Z-97, 21.7.53 in the Prehistoric Cemetery at Mycenae (Figure 30) (Mayer 1990). Objects placed at the bottom of the scale of scholarly value—those pieces made of non-precious materials and appearing in non-elite contexts—are considered to have little to offer either in terms of elucidating political structuration or bellicose logistical details; for example, terracotta figurines of chariots or figures riding horses, made from unsophisticated materials and techniques and generally found in groups in household contexts or middens, have been ignored entirely in analyses of the iconography of martiality (Cassola Guida 1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992; Fortenberry 1990; Hiller 1999; Monks 2000; although cf. Weber-Hiden 2004).

Further discernment structures and reaffirms this hierarchy. Novelty and embellishment of depiction are considered dianoetic and are therefore well regarded, whereas repetition of stock representations are taken as reflecting an adherence to the crafting discipline over artistic inspiration. Thus the frequent use of bellicosity as a theme has had the effect of mitigating its power with scholars. The result is a proclivity for earlier iconography, as these scenes are perceived as fresh and innovative, in contrast with the later palatial vignettes, which are decidedly recycled and desiccated in meaning (Hiller 1999: 325). A product of this framework is that as soon as a new type of iconographic scene appears, that of the soldiers marching out as depicted on the Warrior Vase, the impact of war is construed as real again, meaning that warfare is of direct relevance to the socio-political conditions of the time (cf. Drews 1988; 1993). Similarly, bellicose scenes are indexed so that ferocity is taken as an indication of potency. In those depictions that do not show explicit violence, such as the repetition

---

15 Nevertheless further research on the materiality of these objects has suggested that some of the raw materials may have come from a distance, which may have added value to the final products (Helms 1988; 1993); for example, the limestone of the Shaft Grave stelai has been sourced as originating from Loutraki-Perachora (Ch. Maggidis pers. comm.; Wace 1921-23a; Younger 1997) and the study of the paint colours and minerals used in wall paintings suggests that they have diverse/exotic origins (Brysbaert 2006; 2007; 2008a; b).
of figure-of-eight shields on the Shaft Grave blades (National Archaeological Museum #404, 456, Figure 13) and in the Mycenaean Cult Centre wall paintings (My nos. 14-5) (Immerwahr 1990: 99, 121, 140, 193), this value of the martial iconography is tempered by designating the figure-of-eight shield as an element of adornment rather than an expression of political or religious dominance and power (Muskett 2007: 52).

In part because of the long-lived yet limited range of depictions in the iconography, archaeologists have come to believe that by the palatial period, Mycenaean warfare itself is outdated (Hiller 1999: 324). The appearance of martial scenes from the citadels and especially the megarons is interpreted as a palatial change in the social history in which Mycenaean rulers entertain heroic self-aggrandisement as part of claims to legitimacy and identity; however the reaffirmation of ideology through practice—and vice versa—have become estranged from reality, as the collapse of the palaces indicates (Kopcke 1995; for strong views, see Kopcke 2004; with refutation in Palaima 2007). The long-lived nature of the bellicose image in Mycenaean art and its use in a variety of media suggest an obsession with creating and sustaining the warrior-elite persona; Homeric values intimate that heroes will die in maintaining it. The images offer a projection of strength, glory and fearlessness, with the focus on individual valour; for that reason, late Mycenaean society is interpreted as centred on the elite and the palatial lifestyle (Kopcke 2004; Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007; Wagner-Hasel 2007). This model has repercussions for how we portray the Mycenaean political leaders interacting with subordinates; it has been suggested that there is little interaction between the two groups except in their respective roles of oppressor and vassal (Kopcke 1995; 2004). In the end, however, the paradigm simply allows archaeologists to legitimise their disproportionate attention on citadels, palaces and prestige objects but as an argument for the effects of violence it is based on unsound interpretations of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armor and weapons</th>
<th>162 corset</th>
<th>163 suit of armor</th>
<th>191 helmet</th>
<th>230 spear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TUNica</td>
<td>ARMa</td>
<td>GALea</td>
<td>HASTa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 arrow</td>
<td>232 axe?</td>
<td>233 dagger?</td>
<td>254 javelin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGitta</td>
<td>PUGio</td>
<td>JACulum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 chariot</td>
<td>241 chariot body</td>
<td>242 chariot cab</td>
<td>243 wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIGae</td>
<td>CURRUS</td>
<td>CAPSUS</td>
<td>ROTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: List of Linear B ideograms for martial culture (Palmer 2008: 65, fig. 2.3a).
One corpus of archaeological evidence that to some extent mediates the conceptualisation of a warrior-elite is the Linear B tablets. The study of the Linear B records has long been contextualised in terms of relating the written subject matter, the art of literate recording itself, and wider palatial systems (Bennet 1988; 2001; Cosmopoulos 2006; Foster 1981; Hooker 1987; Killen 1985). There are only a handful of tablets, nearly all from Pylos, that explicitly discuss martial culture (also Figure 2): the PY Sa and TI S1 groups account for chariot wheels; the PY Sh records tally body armour; PY An 207.12 mentions a bow-maker; other weapons are preserved on PY Jn 829.3; and PY Ta 716.2 records two swords (Bernabé and Luján 2008: 206-10, 213-7 with references; see also Palmer 2008: 65, fig. 2.3a; Shelmerdine 1999: 403-5). There are also a number of tablets that have indirect implications for studies of Mycenaean warfare. These include the donations of the lawagetas (PY Un 718), a figure whose role is hypothetically martial in nature (De Lorenzi 1968; Fox and Harrell 2008; Heubeck 1961; 1969; Nikoloudis 2006; Palaima 1999; Szemerényi 1972; van Effenterre 1968; 1977; Wyatt 1994-5), the o-ka tablets (PY An 657, 519, 654, 656, 661) (Deroy 1968; Lang 1990; Palmer 1956; Risch 1958; Uchitel 1984), tablets that record obligations of military service (Shelmerdine 2008c: 146-7), the rower tablets (PY An 1, An 610, Ad 684) (Deger-Jalkotzy 1998-9; Perpillou 1968; Wachsmann 1999) and do-e-ra tablets, which describe the women who work for the palaces who have traditionally been identified as war captives because of their designators, i.e. “women of Miletus” (Chadwick 1988; Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 50; Efkleidou 2004; Hiller 1988; Killen 1988; Lejeune 1959; Lencman 1966; Nosch 2003; Olivier 1964; 1987; Tegyey 1988). These data, together with the tally of martial elements recorded on the earlier Knossos tablets, have been scrutinised for information about the production and control of armaments and armour by the palaces (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 49-56).

While there have been a few studies which have used the Linear B tablets to understand and characterise Mycenaean martiality in innovative ways (cf. Deger-Jalkotzy 1999; Palaima 1999), in general the bellicose schemes in to which the textual data have been interpreted are limited and at times conflicting. Because the tablets are focused predominantly on the co-organisation of material goods and individuals, it has been argued that a central function of the palaces is to coordinate these arrangements in order to attain wider control over capital, land and residents (Driessen 1999; Godart 1987; Lejeune 1972; Palaima 1991; Palmer 1977; Sacconi 1999). In this way the texts
that explicitly record armaments and armour are a testament to palatial control over goods and personnel. Similarly, many researchers have reflected on the material content and implied rule over the capital of the palaces in order to question the nature of the end of the Mycenaean period (Baumbach 1983; Cassola Guida 1996; Hooker 1982; Palaima 1995; Perna 1999; Sacconi 1985 with references; 1999; Shelmerdine 1987); Shelmerdine (1999: 405, emphasis in the original) notes, "what really surprises is that there are not more references in the large Pylos archive to army troops[...]"); Nevertheless, strong interpretations of a palatial arrangement for human service are at odds with the notion of a self-regarding warrior elite (cf. Driessen and Schoep 1999: 396), a divide usually bridged by envisioning an application of a medieval sense of duty to the spirit of community action and group identity for recognition of kleos in return (cf. Thomas 1995: 349). Shelmerdine's comment underscores the general archaeological tendency to look at logistical evidence—the quantitative scale—as the preferred data for violence.

The "synthetic" study

In general, there is little dialogue between typological, iconographic and textual analyses. Each of these methods remains almost wholly independent, except for the reliance on iconographic details of martial culture to fill in gaps in the typological studies. In contrast, iconographic and textual examinations remain relatively autonomous. Overall, the typological aim to classify, delineate and define material culture regardless of its context has undermined attempts to create an integrated analysis of violence as a social process. Most overviews of Mycenaean warfare as a practice simply amalgamate the results from all types of study in order to make overall conclusions (cf. Driessen 1999; Monks 2000); typological studies are presumed to speak on the role of aggression while contextual studies of iconography and text are used to explain social history and development of legitimacy through violence. Yet as has been noted, typologies have not been successful at elucidating the process of violence while contextual studies are preferential towards certain types of data over others. What is apparent is that depending on the corpus of material that forms the dataset of the investigation, scholars have sought answers to different questions and have approached their analyses using diverse methods. This has led to difficulty when researchers try and collate their findings with other studies. For this reason, historical syntheses reflect a number of inherent methodological biases; because each sub-specialism follows traditional research agendas, not all the data are
conceptualised or approached in the same way. Various types of data are presented as compatible when the datasets themselves are collected through individual methods, which are at times inappropriate, and are liable to interpretation by a top-down approach. An example of the result of this process is the analysis of terracotta figurines: Although they are iconographic evidence, they are wholly excluded from bellicose studies because they do not provide the types of evidence for martial practices we traditionally seek in the iconographic record. Moreover, we have classed terracotta figurines into the category of material culture that is unrelated to and unhelpful for martial study (although cf. Weber-Hiden 2004). For these reasons, published accounts aimed at offering unified theories on the impact of violence in the Mycenaean period generally provide little more than a summary of the typological development of martial culture, combined with an iconographic deconstruction along traditional art historical lines and tallies of the palatial stake in martiality, as evidenced through the Linear B documents (Fortenberry 1990; various papers in Laffineur 1999b; Monks 2000). It can be concluded that these syntheses are problematical in two ways: Primarily, summarisation of data is mistaken for analysis; and secondly, chronological and spatial qualities are lost in these amalgamations because contextual constructs and criticism have not formed core concerns of primary research.

**Conclusion**

Although studies of warfare were at one time deemed integral to a fundamental understanding of Mycenaean society as a whole, they have become a discrete sub-speciality in Mycenaean archaeology as concepts of social organisation in the last half century have left the Homeric warrior-elite model behind for the more theoretically complex. In the past warfare was assumed to be the predominant, if not the only approach of inter-societal change, whereas current considerations favour multi-causal agent- and environmentally-driven models for explaining Mycenaean formative and deconstructive periods, in which bellicosity often plays little or no role. Nevertheless it is readily apparent that the range of barren interpretations that have been made about Mycenaean warfare is not due to a lack of archaeological evidence; rather the schism between warfare studies and analyses of social evolution and reproduction is in large part due to the fact that while warfare is thought to be a primary method of change, the methods by which warfare have been examined do not elucidate how this process unfolds (for example, see de Fidio 2008: 91-6 for a discussion on the Mycenaean hegemony on Crete after LM IIIA:1). Historical
syntheses of Mycenaean warfare therefore present stereotypical characterisations of the role of bellicosity because the relationship between martial culture and the practice of creating or asserting legitimacy has not been theoretically defined.

On top of the conceptual fallacies, archaeologists have privileged certain taxa of archaeological evidence as more edifying of bellicose practices, to some extent owing to the belief that the iconography and Linear B tablets require contextualisation while the archaeological remains of weaponry and armour are self-explanatory; that is, the cultural significance of martial artefacts and their respective contexts are directly intelligible. The dichotomy of approaches results in the sentiment that the true characterisation of Mycenaean warfare lies at some point between two polar ends: On the one hand, Mycenaean iconography and typologies of martial culture suggest the omnipotence of violence, while on the other hand we question the genuine socio-political impact of Mycenaean warfare.

Post-modern biases are at work too: Because violence, especially violence carried out with an expressly political—that is, state-based—intent, is characteristic of the modern world, archaeological inquiry has become focused on tracing a continuous advancement of martial culture that only expands in diversity and complexity. On the rare occasions when change is attributed to violence in current studies, how violence works as a process is not described, meaning that this method remains an extra-social force instead of agent-driven. The result is a model of Mycenaean warfare that operates independently from human agency and functions simply so that proto-states and states can assert their legitimacy in the most universal and powerful terms (for example, de Fidio 2008: 91-6). Nevertheless, scholarly analysis often concludes that Mycenaean martial culture is too ornate for the bloody horrors of war, meaning that we also consider these objects to be ineffective, or at least overblown, political instruments.16 Such acts of strict categorisation, which are so intertwined with our theoretical constructs, is the result of research problems focused on determining the function of material culture but not its purpose.

Nevertheless there are many reasons why archaeologists should be scrutinising bellicosity as a mechanism of Mycenaean societal change. The highly elaborate martial

---

16 For example, the analysis of martial culture in the volume *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age* (Shelmerdine 2008d) is found in Chapter 11, “Mycenaean Art and Architecture” (Crowley 2008: 276-7). Even if this chapter is more appropriately considered a synopsis of Mycenaean crafting and architecture, the fact that martial culture is studied in the section “Weaponry, Armor, Clothing, and Jewelry” underscores how martial culture is perceived.
culture and the preponderance of these objects in social contexts associated with political power indicate that bellicosity is a real and legitimising force throughout the Mycenaean period; as such, the expression of martial power forms a critical component in the formation and maintenance of the Mycenaean identity. The task at hand is not to disable the original pertinence of studying warfare itself, but to begin to understand the impact of Mycenaean violence in a truly analytical—and not presumptive—way. A more fulfilling methodology must be developed that has the ability to contend with central questions about constructs of power and personhood from late MH III to the collapse of the palaces. It is therefore pressing that the elements that archaeologists associate with warfare, such as scale and logistics, be made culturally relevant, and violence is conceptualised as being intrinsic to Mycenaean political development and organisation. I take as foundational the idea that the Mycenaeans are familiar with the horrifying effects of violence and choose to execute it anyway; indeed, they exploit its power to build social hegemony and control.
Chapter Three: The Poetics of Violence: Towards a Framework of Archaeological Inquiry

Archaeologists have sought to understand and characterise warfare in the Mycenaean world because the practice is a recognisably cultural expression with a large corpus of associated material culture (Driessen 1999: 12). Syntheses of violence, in contrast, are not summarily undertaken. Violence, as the human intention to do harm, is an expression of agency many regard as located at the limits of our resolution of scientific analysis. Because there is a concentration on the violent act itself—along with the associated immaterial spectrum of human emotions, aspirations and inclinations—scholars consider violence in the past to be unpredictable, meaning that violence is taken to be too transient and haphazard to form anything other than random scatter in the background of the dataset (Carman 1997: 2-10; Driessen 1999: 12).

To counter this argument, I propose that we move to theorise and contextualise the social discourse that forms the expressive element of violence. That is, we utilise a definition of violence that allows it to be a culturally relative construct, for which there is precedent in the related disciplines of anthropology and sociology (the works of Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Merry 2009; Nordstrom and Martin 1992; Riches 1986; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004b; Sluka 1992a; Whitehead 2004b; c have had the most influence on the theoretical conceptualisations of this thesis). By understanding violence as a form of political discourse, Aegean prehistorians are afforded the theoretical tools to begin to ask more refined and analytical questions about the role of violence in the Mycenaean world, meaning that we are able to interpret acts of violence on a large scale. For this reason, this thesis is centred on researching the effects and transformative power of violence, rather than warfare, as violence is a culturally relative process and more flexible construct (Merry 2009: 4-5).

In order to discern the role played by violence in the past, we need to understand the extent to which and the methods by which bellicosity is a legitimising force; that is, we need to ask how it is used in ways that were culturally sanctioned. Only through theoretical characterisation can it be possible to illuminate the web of social interaction that entwines political violence with social practice, ideology and identity. Because the articulation of the meaning of violence and how this changes through time and space are related, a single method allows us to examine them in
mutual fashion. We must break down each stage of the poetics of violence and contextualise them (Whitehead 2004b).

To begin, in light of the fact that violence can be successfully executed without weapons means that it is imperative that we consider violence and martial culture as discrete but related concepts. Certainly martial culture structures the process of violence and reaffirms its role as a social mediator because it is inextricably linked to human practice. Nevertheless, martial culture is an independent force through which agency can be expressed; that is, martial culture cannot be conflated with violence because both violence and martial culture have their own patterns of production and consumption that are interrelated but distinct. The theorisation of martial culture will be explicated subsequently.

**Praxis for understanding violence, legitimacy and power**

The practice of violence is materialist in essence (Driessen 1999: 12-3). An act of violence is the infliction of harm on any or all of those elements that make up the social body (Carman 1997: 2-10): the corpus, which inhabits the world; the mind, which perceives, relates and shapes it; and the artefacts that populate and sustain it. Violence may be superficially identified as a “natural” process as it is of-the-body (cf. Bourdieu and Wacquant 2004: 273); nevertheless Riches (1986: 11) lists the significant attributes of violence that emphasise the fact that violence is an inherently social act (also Robben 2004):17

The capacity of violence as a social and cultural resource draws on four basic properties, which I believe have cross-cultural validity. […]

1. The performance of violence is inherently liable to be contested on the question of legitimacy.
2. The discrepancy in basic understandings amongst those implicated in the performance of a violent act, or in experiencing a violent image, is likely to be minimal: in its key sense, as the ‘contestable giving of physical hurt’, violence is unlikely to be mistaken as such.
3. The practice of violence is highly visible to the senses.
4. The performance of violence to a moderate degree of effectiveness requires relatively little by way of specialized equipment or esoteric knowledge. The manipulative and strength resources of the human body, and knowledge that these resources are capable of destroying physical objects, are sufficient to enable a minimally successful act of hurt against another human being.

---

17 Merry (2009: 22) explains violence thus: “Paradoxically, violence is both solidly observable and infinitely open to interpretation. The physical substrate of violence is about pain, injury and death but its conversion into a social offense depends on culturally embedded understandings of gender, family, community, and nation. It is both physical and cultural at the same time.”
Because "other means are normally available to achieve the desired ends" (Riches 1986: 8), an act of violence always has a cultural reference and is expressed in socially meaningful terms. For this reason, the application of violence continually needs legitimisation because violence is an intrinsically contestable act (Merry 2009: 18), and is therefore subject to sanction (cf. Bossen 2006; Whitehead 2004a: 5). Overall, the fact that every execution of violence relies on its role as a form of social dialogue to make it legitimate underscores the fact that violence is a cultural phenomenon (cf. Haywood 2006; Sluka 1992b; Taylor 2004).  

As a performance that requires social commentary and approval, violence is capable of being executed for predictable reasons as part of rational political interplay by actors; as Riches (1986: 14, emphasis in the original) explains:

One presumes that the successful communication of political opposition [through violence] will be better achieved through some acts of violence than through others. The selection of 'appropriate' violence here may require judgements of some subtlety—which gives the lie to the view that violence is mindless or irrational. For example, the 'opposing side' will have arrived at its own internal compromises about what is acceptable and what is unacceptable in violence, so intending perpetrators will be obliged to estimate exactly where this line of legitimacy has been drawn; their violence can then be all the more effective for having been pitched precisely on the 'wrong' side of the line.

The motivations for committing violence are of highest importance for contextualising violence in its social setting (Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Riches 1986). Violence is normally associated with the chaos of the process of change, which at times is reason alone for initiating agents to make use of it. When violence is executed as part of wider transformative processes—both violent and non-violent concatenations—the message of violence can signal support for or against contemporary political schemata (Sluka 1992b). As general indicators of social upheaval, these are the types of violent acts that we may term rebellious.

In terms of structuration, whether as its impetus or adjuvant action, violence plays a variety of roles at different stages of the social discussion. Violence, like fire, has the twin impact of being both destructive and inceptive.

Conflict is a primary source or stimulus for social change, for, when it cannot be handled by institutionalized mechanisms of dispute settlement, the opposing

---

18 Because physical abuse leaves bodily traces of a lasting nature, including broken and healing skin, dried blood, broken bones, areas of bruising and scarring, even violence carried out in "private", such as domestic violence, is subject to revelation to and judgment by the wider community (also Carman 1997: 6, 16-9 for the level of violence in civil wars; Merry 2009; Venkatesh 2000: 170).
parties will be forced to create new strategies either to resolve the conflict or
avoid the situation which produces it (Seymour-Smith 1986: 51).

As a form of conflict violence can begin and end dialogue, it can unite social groups or
disintegrate them, it offers a way by which societies can form common identities or
emphasise differences, and through all of these acts violence can create social cohesion
or annihilate it (Sluka 1992a: 28). In essence, an act of violence is intrinsically and
concurrently two social tools: a method of hierarchically arranging persons through
domination (Merry 2009: 3; Sidanius and Pratto 1999: 31-59); and a message sent as
part of political negotiation (Riches 1986). Both aspects of violence have short-and
long-term structural repercussions and cultural effects, while motivations for executing
violence revolve around culturally based initiatives requiring either or both of these
outcomes. Determining the content of the political message that is violence is less easy
to characterise on a cross-cultural level, but there are a few summaries that can be
made.

The primary result of violence is human domination. As a social instrument
violence is an act of negotiation of hierarchy by distinguishing the dominance of one
party over the subjugation of another (Merry 2009: 3; Sidanius and Pratto 1999: 31-
59). This twofold structure of the dominating group and the subjugated group is but
the central framework of the order created by violence however, for violence does not
just differentiate between aggressor and victim. Rather violence creates a multi-tiered
system of social structuration, because witnesses interpret violence as a socially
meaningful act and their levels of approval or condemnation dichotomise them as well,
creating the so-called "Riches’ triangle" (Stewart and Strathern 2002; Whitehead
2004b: 62). Witnesses are compelled to decide whether they support or sanction the
act of violence and whether they support or condemn the aggressor.

The tension in the relationship between the performer, victim and witnesses
consists of two elements: an element of political competition and an element
of consensus about the nature of the violent act. I deduce the element of
competition from the fact that the act of violence never fails to be one of
contested legitimacy (Riches 1986: 9).

Thus violence creates aggressors, supporters of the aggressors, witnesses and
sympathisers of the victims, and victims, a process that can take place both at the
individual level and in the interactions of extended groups. In this situation, executing
violence is one method to assert oneself—and one’s victim—as political actors
announced can have a serious social dynamic because learning how to use violence as a political tool can be culturally considered as a function of the bodily maturing process. The performance of violence itself entails entering a state of contested legitimacy and liminality and finding resolution through aggressive action. Conceptually, it can parallel the process of becoming, that is, the maturation of the cultural body materialised in physical form (Coughlin and Venkatesh 2003: 49; Merry 2009: 11).

Like all social processes, violence has its own chaine opératoire with stages of production through formulation, and consumption by means of execution, engagement, mediation and repercussion. Its efficacy lies in the fact that as a process, violence renegotiates social relations by connecting agency to the material world. As illustrated above, and as an example of its inceptive qualities, the execution of violence can compel people to enter a system of hierarchy regardless of personal volition, meaning that violence is an effective method of creating political agents through the force of hegemony (Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 757). Violence also integrates kin and non-kin together into the diacritical order, also an instance of violence as an integrative force (Venkatesh 1997; Venkatesh and Levitt 2000). The result of political violence can restructure group interaction altogether by destroying certain bonds while forging new ones at the same time. The fact that violence is such an effective, indeed, a primary method of role reversal means that agents have often been willing to make use of it throughout history. Violence exerted against humans often leaves material and ideological capital, including the political order itself, intact but in a state of flux and subject to seizure, meaning that after violence is stabilised the material manifestations of regime change may not be particularly evident (Nordstrom 2004; various papers in Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004b; Whitehead 2004a). For this reason, and in spite of the fact that violence offers agents an alacritous, directed and efficacious way to renegotiate the flow of power, because the archaeological evidence is generally confined to resolving change through an analysis of the patterns of the deposition of material culture, identifying violence is a difficult task, especially without the aid of historical accounts or the physical detritus of human atrocities (Driessen 1999: 13).

The practice of violence, like all social processes, is cyclical, so that it effectuates its repetition in future encounters (Merry 2009: 157; Whitehead 2004a: 13), which heightens the material impact (Fagan 1996: 53; Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 780). Whether acting directly by bringing about disparity or as part of wider social
communiqués over the nature of a cultural transformation, violence is a potent method of social discourse, and as such, is likely to be reproduced (Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 782-3). Because violence quickly and efficiently dissolves non-violent forms of social interaction, and re-establishes these ties with violence as the interacting medium between people, when violence ends, such damaged threads are rarely easily mended (Venkatesh 2000: 139-40, 179). Nordstrom explains (2004: 239):

There is thus a series of linkages in issues of violence: political violence sets in place a number of economic and cultural infrastructures that foment postwar crime; political violence as well provokes a rise in domestic violence, which in turn corresponds to crime and civil violence...increased crime and civil violence tend to provoke cries for authoritarian control, often stimulating police and military oppression.

Furthermore, although a violent act is inherently contestable, violence draws on numerous reasons to sanction it as a legitimate enterprise, especially on account of its inceptive aspects and its ability for agents to gain both from the force of dominance as well as from other forms of social power. The term power, as that function of society that allows for human action, is drawn from the discussion of Foucault (1982; situated in archaeological theorisation by Thomas 2008: 28). Violence constrains the ability of the victim to act and it facilitates the achievement of the aggressor's goals, and so as an expression of power violence offers legitimacy to agents (Venkatesh 2000: 166). To a certain extent, it is the efficacy of violence in allowing the agent to act through the process of domination that also provides some of the legitimacy behind violence (cf. Hodder 2004; Knapp and van Dommelen 2008: 25). On the level of proxemics, violence may garner legitimacy through its identification as a "natural" practice by being a bodily process. With cultural emphasis on the relationship between the maturity of youths and the tuition of violence as a political instrument, this association becomes further embedded. Combining the two processes together has various benefits; primarily, violence is made a cultural—and therefore legitimate—practice by grounding it in pullulative traditions. A common moment in the contestability of violence, especially with acts executed by a neophyte, is whether the wider society accepts the aggressor as having completed social maturity and is therefore capable of wielding the power associated with violence as a form of capital. The result is that violence can quickly become a way by which people move up and down through a hierarchical system. When allowed to measure and test individuals against a social standard in this way, violence is controlled, even as it is allowed to exist (cf. Weber, et
al. 2004). As a political tool, violence is commoditised as a form of capital, meaning that power is exerted through the act of both summoning or halting acts of aggression, expressed as an act of control over the process of violence itself (Venkatesh 2000: 166).

When communities accept the power of violence to transform their social structure, methods of political discourse and definition of self, there is a direct impact on habitus and the ordering of forms of capital as theorised by Thomas (2008: 28): “Clearly, the reproduction of the habitus will be intimately implicated in the power relations of a given society. We might go so far as to say that the habitus is one of the many things that power produces.” In the institutionalisation of violence, its performance becomes a mirror in which a society realises self-expression, cultural definition and identity (Fagan 1996: 45, 71; Venkatesh 1997: 89-90). Embedding violence, especially formative acts, in the past is another method of creating legitimacy and expressing the social power of violence through historical precedent (Venkatesh 2000: xv-xvi). A violent past sustains the potency of violence into the contemporary period and allows for the threat of violence to manifest and carry meaning. Violence that has such latent potency that it does not need to be carried out, for the mere shadow of aggression can stimulate a response and change behaviour, is coercion in action (Merry 2009: 4). The threat of violence, like the execution of violence, is an extension of the political discourse of historic violence, which exists by making a syntactically arranged material impact and impacting habitus (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 20-6). The materialisation of the threat of violence brings the discussion to martial culture, a central form of Mycenaean capital, which draws preeminent aggressive potency through commination.

**Praxis for understanding martial culture**

As underscored in the background chapter, interpretations of Mycenaean martial culture have ranged from their description as “elite goods” (Acheson 1999: 97), that is, objects设计ing political legitimacy and authority (Acheson 1994; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990), to labels like “skeuomorphs” (Voutsaki 2001a: 199), a term that suggests that martial culture is a representation of violence and power but not an expression of them. Nevertheless the invention and consumption of weaponry utilised exclusively for the bodily harm of humans is not a natural consequence of violence but

---

19 Cf. Arendt’s (2004: 241) lucid conceptual definition of legitimacy: “Legitimacy, when challenged, bases itself on an appeal to the past, while justification relates to an end that lies in the future.”
is an intentional concession of legitimacy to violence as a method of cultural discourse. Martial culture cannot therefore be characterised as an accoutrement in contests of legitimacy (Deger-Jalkotzy 1999), but rather as a physical component of the system that incorporates violence into social intercourse, and for this reason, the prescribed use of martial culture is one method of social dialogue, as Markus (1993: 23) theorises:

Power has to do ultimately with resources. Since these are finite the only freedom is to divide them in different proportions. It is the cake-slicing operation—more here is less there—so beloved of operational research scientists in their zero-sum games. Its results are seen in hierarchical structures, control, surveillance, decision processes and in differential consumption.

Set into Markus’s (1993: 23) model, violence is a method of metaphorical cake slicing, and the outcomes are a diacritical human and material order.

Through the embodiment of bellicosity, martial culture participates in the dynamics of power by threatening violence, but as physical goods, martial culture has a distinct chaîne opératoire and so they are objects that are consumed for other reasons. One predominant incentive for the extra-violent consumption of martial culture is that the pieces embody space and time, both profound Mycenaean cultural expressions, which are often collapsed into the single but multifaceted concept of autochthony. Through participation in acts of reproduction, namely in sustaining indigenous networks, martial culture is part of a wider realisation of the Mycenaean identity (cf. Voutsaki 1998: 44-5). As a subset of material culture, martial culture by nature both stabilises systems of social constructs and order and is the instrument with which innovation is introduced (various papers in Tilley, et al. 2006). That is, martial culture contributes to and reinforces the hierarchies created by violence by linking human agency with the material world and acting as a means by which the Mycenaean identity is formulated and expressed. Martial culture thus derives its value from a number of ideological, material and aggressive factors, epitomised by the fact that the exhibition of weapons remains a compelling act for centuries, a sound indicator that martial culture does not lose its potency through overexposure (Harrell forthcoming).

The legitimacies of martial culture and violence, although mutually reinforcing, also draw upon diverse sources of power to create and express meaning. From the outset, the development and use of weaponry offers further legitimisation to violence as a social resource. This is because weapons are an investment in the system of violence, although as material goods they structure the proxemics of aggression by
allowing specific bodily gestures and precluding others (Harding 1999a; Molloy 2006; 2008). Using weaponry effectively is a trope of social knowledge and narrative expressed through the kinetics of body language (Peatfield 1999: 71-2), including the physical proximity of individuals, facial countenance, speed, obdurate strength, flexibility, skill in swordsmanship, and reflexive and predictive movements as part of the bellicose terpsichore. All of these physical exertions communicate cultural expressions of fear, surrender, cowardliness, bravery, exhaustion, determination and even beauty (cf. Treherne 1995). In this way, martial culture manipulates the poetics of violence by patterning and channelling it; the creation and display of martial culture itself is visual control over violence as well as a statement of personal and communal identity (Deger-Jalkotzy 1999). Such interaction with violence makes martial culture a form of capital, meaning that, like the execution of violence itself, these objects are subject to sanction and control (Cook, et al. 2007).

The moderation of the production, consumption and deposition of martial culture as a resource has a structural and material impact on social relations. The wider effects of the patterned consumption of martial culture mean that in situations of violence, the employment of weaponry further elaborates and maintains the social hierarchy established by violence due to the use of weapons as cultural mediators. To this end, the development of armaments requires a system of culturally appropriate training and use designed to both prevent stochastic aggression and protect the armaments themselves from heedless damage (Tărlea 2004-05). Because it is a function of re-patterning the power relations of the material world, the process of arms training creates and imbeds diacritical structuration of both the combatants and the weapons. Learning fighting techniques allows individuals to ascend through the social order by means of combat, the method of armed fighting in which martial training and choreography are exploited. Such tuition also provides the means to distinguish individuals based on their fighting ability. As material objects, martial culture participates in the dialogue of cultural norms regarding the concept of ownership and the ability of material goods to confer legitimacy to “owners”. The bearer of arms, martial capital, holds a role in mediating the future discourse that will be played out through violence, an aspect of material culture and habitus that underscores the extensive relationship that martial culture has with time and place.

As part of the cultural environment and lifeways, martial culture bridges the past with the present and future and participates in constructing the fabric of space.
Indeed the archaeological practice of relative dating and sequencing ceramic chronologies, of particular relevance in Aegean prehistory, underscores the idea that material objects embody a reference to time (cf. Taracha 1993). The ways in which Mycenaean martial culture alludes to and monitors time are embedded in various aspects of the materiality of the object and generally encompass variously interwoven temporal cycles, both cyclical and linear. On a primary level, artefacts incorporate time and history into their fabric by means of their construction: Material embellishment underscores the investment of time that pieces require for assembly (Muskett 2007: 58). It is evident that much of the Mycenaean panoply from the Shaft Grave period and beyond entails significant spans of time to produce in terms of sourcing the raw materials, specialist knowledge of construction, and craftsmanship and embellishment. Through acts of creation, objects themselves come to reflect a specific era of time; the chronological element of the weapons typology has underscored this point (cf. Taracha 1993). Moreover, the materiality of armaments and armour references another, more historical aspect of time drawn from their role in mediating the longue durée and cultural trajectories through violence. Weapons both publicise aggression by drawing upon past executions of violence in order to convey a sensory threat to witnesses, but they also embody violence, acting as an investment in future acts of aggression.

Similarly, martial culture conveys aspects of place through its materiality. The exotica adorning the finest Mycenaean weaponry intimates foreign place of origin; even the typologies of armaments can be considered native or imported (Hood 1980; Laffineur 1990-91; Vermeule 1975; general overview in Voutsaki 1999: 103-5). On a wider level, Mycenaean armaments are distinctive in form, structure and depositional context, as are the representations of martial culture in the iconographic record;²⁰ that is how scholars have come to consider these objects as embodying the cultural construct we term Mycenaean. Martial culture, like all forms of material culture, can look old, out of place, or regional; furthermore the physicality of martial culture assimilates it into the built environment. Martial culture "belongs" in certain socially determined contexts and not others. Weaponry, and martial culture in general, is dangerous when it appears in incongruous contexts, such as in the hands of the unqualified, both because the armament is subject to mishandling and can exact bodily

²⁰ Whitehead (2004a: 18) notes that "representations are part of violence, not just 'about' it."
harm. Likewise, martial display is restrained to certain locales that are perceived as the appropriate loci to handle and control the chaos of violence, for example, the tomb in the early Mycenaean period (MH III-LH IIIA) and the hunts taking place outside settlements in LH IIIA-IIIB. In summary, martial culture plays its own salient role in the dialogue of social reproduction that in part relies on the means to construct time and space and through martial skill and ability. In terms of archaeology, the result is that martial capital is not likely to be dispersed at random; rather, those who control it will limit its consumption and usage in order to build networks of power, as Markus (1993: 23) posits: “because of the inevitable link between resources and power, and their highly asymmetrical distribution, to build means to create asymmetries.”

The dataset itself also suggests a contextual approach of critical evaluation. One distinct characteristic of Mycenaean material culture is the circumscribed deposition for many classes of artefact (Voutsaki 2001a: 203). For the early (MH III-LH II) material, this is in part because most of our excavations have uncovered graves; nevertheless, during the palatial period we have rich archaeology from funeral, palatial, settlement and cultic areas and yet certain objects continue to inhabit only a few restricted contexts, weaponry being a foremost example. We have limited primary and secondary evidence for craft production of armaments, and we rarely see these objects appear in what may be identified as casual domestic contexts, which would illuminate certain uselife practices. Rather, the fact that so much of martial culture is found in carefully structured depositions suggests that we must consider the role of these objects as social markers that build power networks by creating legitimacy (Voutsaki 2001a: 195). That is, martial culture is already arranged to underscore the relationship between martial power and other forms of social power, if methods are in place to analyse the data with these corollaries in mind.

The archaeological dataset of martial culture is of course difficult to assess in terms of appropriate sampling material, but the amount and range of data both reaffirm the likelihood that valid practices may be uncovered. The quantity of objects found in similar contexts suggests that the patterns of deposition are reliable and indicative of meaningful intent. In general the eras from which we have profuse amounts of martial culture and those when we have a lesser quantities are those same periods for which we
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21 Or, drawn from our own corpus of theory: "Archaeology no longer considers artefacts as unintended and coincidental debris, shadows of broad social structures and systems—preserved remains are seen as the result of specific and momentary action, not as a passive record of general conditions and long-term processes" (Wolpert 2004: 128).
have abundant or reduced evidence for the exertion of Mycenaean political power as a whole. The range of data, from weaponry, armour, iconographic depictions, and subsidiary accoutrements,\(^{22}\) and the ways the data overlap in terms of pictorial representation and archaeological remains, indicate that violence and martial culture are primary methods of cultural intercourse and political action. The rest of this thesis is aimed at elucidating how this process works and its social and material consequences.

If we wish to understand the role of violence in legitimising social power, then we must consider martial culture in terms of the context in which it is consumed in culturally meaningful ways. The comparative element is fundamental to this programme of research; social practices like violence conform to human motivations and so levels of material variation and uniformity help us to analyse relative meaning (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: x). Primarily, we must recognise that the Mycenaens have alternative strategies for exercising legitimacy and so the application of violence is always an expression of power; it is therefore subject to cultural limitation, control and mediation (Venkatesh 2000: 136). This thesis focuses particularly on three dominant sources of Mycenaean legitimacy, namely: recalls to the past; the touchstone of Mycenaean identity and the recourse of violence. These sources of power have been chosen for a number of reasons; primarily, each of the three holds resonance from the Shaft Graves through to the fall of the palaces. They are recognisably potent from MH III to LH IIIB and beyond, even while contemporary political and social structures are undergoing extraordinary transformation. For this reason, I argue that these sources of power are the most fundamentally Mycenaean in nature as they govern our most expressive and potent archaeological depositions. Secondly, although they are often found together in concerted depositions, each is an independent and heterarchical form of power, meaning that at times they are mutually empowering, while at others, they are in conflict. Thirdly, it is evident that each of these sources of power is subject to contemporary interpretation and revalidation and cannot be characterised as fixed concepts at any point from MH III to LH IIIB. That is, each form of social power requires persistent re-legitimisation and is subject to reinvention (see also Wolpert 2004: 136).

The methods employed in this thesis are to examine depositional patterns of martial culture and to analyse these against one another in the context of spaces of

\(^{22}\) For example, auxiliary horse trappings used as part of chariotry.
power. For this reason, the conceptualisation of space is a critical element in this examination. Here the concept of space is always construed as embodied, because the built environment cannot be considered as a blank canvas upon which the Mycenaecans enacted their social agenda (cf. Boyd 2002; Ingold 1993; Maran 2006a; c; Voutsaki 1998; 2001a; Wright 2006b). Like martial culture, land and architecture are material capital, meaning that exerting control over the built environment is an exercise of power (Markus 1993; 2006). The physical environment, most notably the citadels but also tombs and non-palatial architecture, is a social actor in the human drama, on account of the fact that the built environment both constrains and enables the Mycenaecans to pursue their own interests, although not simply on account of physicality (Venkatesh 1997; 2006: 174). Rather, places and the built environment are a materialised social order (Fagan 1996: 41): People do not have free access to all areas of the built environment and must therefore navigate around forbidden spaces and use public areas in diacritical ways. That is, control of space translates into domination over others and cannot be perceived as neutral in our theoretical models (Venkatesh 1996: 56). That the Mycenaecans actively create their built environment with the intention of investing their architecture with social power is visible in the history of the places that they inhabit and where they inter their dead.

Because the landscape embodies legitimacy through built architecture and in being a space for performative action, it is a social actor. The built environment connects the Mycenaecans with their past in numerous ways. Space preserves the past by grounding action and it is a focal point through which time, past and present, are unified. The built environment sustains all the impact of the past through sensory fulfilment. Construction of the built environment and landmarks both revivify the past and allow the contemporary generation to realise their aims and identities (Venkatesh 2000: 114). The physical link to history has the effect of granting authority to the specific acts that spaces facilitate while sanctioning those behaviours that the built environment restricts. As such, the built environment is always invested with an attitude towards violence: Certain spaces sanction violence within their confines; others promote it, while still others may be perceived as neutral ground. On a physical level the range in quality of the architecture invests the atmosphere with a sense of danger or security (Venkatesh 2000: 4). Violence takes place in space and the message

---

21 Martial culture, as furniture of the built environment, does the same.
of violence can be powerful enough that the aggression becomes embedded in social memory, which is played out in space (Venkatesh 2000: 4). On a social level, the physical environment has the capability to recall memories of past violence, which may threaten to reoccur. That is, through the materiality of spatial context, acts of violence exert influence on the construction and reaffirmation of personhood.

It is evident then that for the practice of violence to be understood in its social context, how it is consumed in space must be understood. On a primary level the built environment is an expression of ownership and dominance, typified by the staggering size of the strongholds in the Argolid (Maran 2006c) and the re-construction of space as exemplified by the funerary architecture (Bennet 1995; 1998-9; 1999a; b; 2001), and is therefore an articulation of the ideologies of dominance and hegemony. These zones have been previously published and studied, and I rely on previous interpretations of these contexts, namely the grave, the citadel and palace space, area of cult, as well as Mycenaean political geography on a regional scale, to discuss power relations and the role that violence plays in this discourse.

Primary analysis begins with correlating martial culture in its depositional context in order to trace distinct patterns of consumption, which preserve social preference and norms of practice; these in turn can be compared with non-martial material culture. Patterns in consumption are monitored over wider geographic spreads in which regional practices are played out. It is reasonable to suppose that the role of bellicosity in the Argolid and the Korinthia, south-western Peloponnese and other parts of Greece develop differently considering that the social pressures and cultural histories of each of these regions are inherently dissimilar.

The use of chronological development as a central means of organising the data is outlined by Whitley (1991: 195):

This study should also bear out the worth of Bloch's (1981) suggestion that ideologically significant patterns are best deciphered through a consideration of the longue durée, and that regard for cultural specificity is as important as the correct application of quantitative methods in interpreting these patterns. Future archaeologists working in this field should attach as much importance to time-scale, sequence and cultural context as they have recently to methodological rigour or theoretical sophistication.

Furthermore, I argue that the reliance of the Mycenaeans upon their past to legitimise action necessitates a historical approach for a conceptualisation of the impact of violence on the development of the Mycenaean polities. Through contextualisation,
we can consider pan-Mycenaean and localised practices, the ways in which violence provides both a stabilising and destructive force in social institutionalisation, and the generation of Mycenaean hierarchy and domination over the landscape. The methodology allows us to verify identified trends, see them played out across the Mycenaean world and develop through time.

In terms of number of artefacts, martial culture is overall extremely plentiful. The collected dataset, termed the Corpus of Mycenaean Material Culture (CMMC), is a nearly wholly complete collection of published martial culture, over 2,000 pieces. This is a total representing approximately five hundred bronze swords and spearheads, one hundred daggers along with a thousand or so arrowheads and a number of other preserved weapons. In addition there are pieces of armour like the Dendra panoply and the Theban cuirasses, boars’ tusk helmets and greaves, and iconographic evidence from sealstones, the Shaft Grave stelai, metal vessels, assorted pieces in ivory, frescoes, pictorial pottery and terracotta figurines. Subsidiary remains include monumental architecture, the diverse evidence for chariotry, limited skeletal data and the Linear B tablets, all of which offer numerous manifestations through which the impact and strength of violence may be discussed.

CMMC has been collected and recorded along with various contextual parameters. It represents the amalgamation of several earlier compendia, of which Fortenberry (1990), with nearly 1100 objects, is the most complete. Fortenberry’s (1990) catalogue is restricted to the weaponry itself, and so iconographic evidence was gathered predominantly from the Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel, Cassola Guida (1973; Cassola Guida and Zucconi Galli Fonseca 1992), Sakellariou (1971; 1974; 1975), Crouwel (1981; 1988; 1991), Pliatsika (2004), Shelmerdine (1996), Immerwahr (1990), Demakopoulou (2006), Younger (1997), Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982), Åkerström (1987), Poursat (1977), and Konsolaki-Yannopoulou (1999), among others. Weaponry and armour excavated and/or rediscovered in museums subsequent to 1990 have been published in Kilian-Dirlmeier (1993b), Papadopoulos (1998), Andrikou (2007), and assorted other précis. Loader (1998), Iakovides (1983; 1999), Küpper (1996), Wright (1978) and Hope Simpson and Hagel (2006) are primary sources for understanding Cyclopean architecture. In general the data collection was guided by wider, more inclusive parameters, and so CMMC represents a salient number of objects of loose date and circumspect provenance as well as pieces that are in fragmentary condition and may not represent martial remains.
There are few completely singular objects, suggesting that CMMC is likely to be of reliable content, although the degree to which CMMC is a representative sample is wholly unknown. CMMC represents nearly all known published martial objects, which is probably a high proportion of all excavated bellicose pieces still in existence. Nevertheless as will be highlighted in subsequent chapters, it is evident that there are severe lacunae at certain periods in time and from various sites that underscore the fact that CMMC can only be characterised as the result of the ravages of time and early archaeological techniques rather than any sort of representative sample. For this reason, the analytical approach is generally qualitative rather than quantitative.

This is not to say that number does not hold significance however; indeed it is the sheer scale of some of the depositions of martial culture that makes the Mycenaean evidence so remarkable. Moreover it is within the remit of this study to understand and characterise the various reasons for depositing single objects in certain contexts and whole collections or groups in others. Because strict utilisation of the finite quantity of objects is methodologically unsound, I seek instead to examine and illuminate the repetition of symbols (compare with Voutsaki 1995a, who researches the diversity of symbols), making use of Wright's (2004c: 66) assertion that the reiteration of ideographs is one common way that agents build networks of power. To paraphrase, I have generally interpreted caches of multiples of the same object as manifestations of complex ideological values, rather than simply as representations of cumulative worth.

In order to study patterns in the consumption of violence, the primary level of analysis is the artefact and martial depiction itself and the physical remains of object biography, understood from the manufacture of the piece, its uselife and final deposition. Understanding artefact biography in terms of practice illuminates how material objects facilitate and constrain human action. At this level the fabrics and composition of artefacts hold significance; aspects of design, decoration and craftsmanship all style cultural norms in regards to the object. Such traces help to determine the purpose of the piece, and so it is at this level that outliers in the data hold as much meaning in the analysis as those pieces that conform to established typologies. The material construction of martial culture has already been discussed to a certain extent in the literature, the cultural worth of the boar and the hunt and their embodiment in the collection of boar's tusks and assembly of the boar's tusk helmet being a salient example (Cultraro 2004; Morris 1990). A further method of distinguishing artefact biographies is by examining use. Material use, of which the
practice of bending blades is the most visible, helps to determine normative processes that preserve acts of conformity or resistance by individuals in staging and fulfilling political directives. It is at this level of analysis that examinations of the comparative functionality of weaponry, generally identified through typological and experimental studies (Harding 1999a; Molloy 2006; 2008), can offer insight when they are compared and contextualised, because as many variants of the same weapon are contemporary, dissecting patterns of consumption is one method for understanding conceptual differences between weapon types. The purpose is to understand the cultural choice of martial culture and the norms that direct its consumption by looking at the syntactical arrangement of elements of martial culture (Harding 2006).

*Martial culture in space: (Re)creating and asserting legitimacy*

In order to identify the practice of violence and the norms that govern it, aspects of artefact biography, individuality and typology must be weighed against the context of consumption. The second level of analysis is intent on interpreting martial culture in its spatial context in order to understand how violence is executed within specific cultural arenas to become politically meaningful. The importance of context in social space in understanding the webs of meaning which martial culture in part creates cannot be overestimated: There is a strong connection between the social meaning of violence and the physical arenas in which it is carried out (Heinz 2006; Maran 2006a; c; Markus 2006; Thaler 2006; Wright 2006b). Furthermore, the interrelation of violence and the built environment, that is, the inhabited landscape which people and material culture populate, has particular potency in historical studies of the Mycenaean: We have come to determine that the largest Mycenaean habitation sites are expressly militaristic in outlook (Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006: 23).

Situating martial culture in its spatial context requires two corollary methods of engagement. There are, on the one hand, the internal patterns of consumption, the relationship between the finds spots of martial culture, which require characterisation. The contexts of martial data need to be elucidated, such as where concentrations of weapon and armour types occur and the concurrence of iconographic depictions interred with armaments. Certain research questions naturally arise from seeking to understand the dataset at this level: For example, although the long Höckmann Type H spearheads have been argued to have been developed in connection with the Dendra panoply (Höckmann 1980a: 298-300; 1980b: 58-61), the corselet and weaponry, besides reflecting two distinct methods of engaging with violence in terms of bodily
proxemics (Fortenberry 1990: 202-3; Taracha 2007; Wardle 1988), are not found together in the same tomb. It may be noted that, on a practical level, this type of data correlation helps to locate and assert the validity of trends in a way that counteracts the loose dating and provenance of many of the objects, without losing the significance of artefact biography.

On the other hand, the bellicose data, with its internal trends, must be situated against the wider, non-martial assertions of power that circulate on various levels of geographic scale (Wolpert 2004: 138-9). A primary question is how the patterns of consumption of martial culture from settlements compare to the depositions in tombs, and how such relationships reflect regional developments (cf. Merry 2009: 19). Because such practices are best illuminated in light of comparative data, we must take the fact that both conflict and cooperation are equally present during processes of social negotiation into consideration. The situations of application and the applied potency of violence can only be determined when non-martial data that exemplify the expression of political and social power, such as the archaeological remains of monumental building programmes, palatial feasting and elaborate burial, are examined alongside. Individual practice and regional histories are illuminated through the independent grouping of areas with related political histories. In essence this research agenda aims to characterise the relevance of bellicosity on the formation of the political geography of the Mycenaean world—a central concern for interpreting variation across space and a fundamental tenet in understanding the Mycenaean identity (Thomas 1995). Thus four main geographic areas will be studied: the Argolid and Korinthia; the western and south-western Peloponnese; northwest Greece, Macedonia, Central Greece; and Achaia and the Ionian Islands. For the most part, these regions seem to have distinct political independence and as subsystems they offer comparable data due to their local trajectories of development as reconstructed through archaeology.

The spatial parameters: The Argolid and Korinthia; the western and south-western Peloponnese; northwest Greece, Macedonia, Central Greece; and the Ionian Islands and Achaia

The Mycenaean settlements in the Argive plain have provided approximately half of the known objects that represent the stock of Mycenaean martial culture. While Mycenae is undeniably the preeminent settlement in this region throughout the Mycenaean period, the ostentatious wealth and size of the other sites in the area are testament to the fact that Mycenae does not have absolute control over materials,
labour and social legitimacy. Indeed, as has been argued (Dabney and Wright 1990: 50; Demakopoulou 2007; Voutsaki 1995a: 61-2; 2001b: 183), in the early Mycenaean period, the Argolid appears to be a heterarchy of sites in which the supremacy of Mycenae is in no way uncontested or supreme. In terms of this investigation, the Argolid is of utmost interest because of the proximity of so many significant sites for which the overall hierarchical structure is unclear, both in terms of inter- and intra-settlement. The paths to complexity in the region appear to be co-evolutionary but also localised. The paramount Argive settlements that provide us with martial culture are Mycenae, Tiryns, Midea and Berbati, while Dendra, Prosymna, and other scatters from the Korinthia south to Nauplion furnish funerary data.

Moving west, sites in the western and south-western Peloponnese, namely Messenia and Lakonia, witness a period of active competition amongst many settlements with the ultimate dominance of a single centre. In the earlier MH III-LH II period there is intense competition amongst sites over pre-eminence in display of material wealth and control of labour (Bennet 1995; 1999a; 2001), while hegemonic control is enacted by Ano Englianos site throughout LH IIIB. It is thus evident that the dialogue of mediation that exists in the west is different in aim and materialisation from that which has been theorised regarding the largest settlements in the Argolid. The sites that have provided the highest amounts of martial culture are predominantly mortuary in nature, including Koukounara, Routsi, Peristeria, Vapheio and Volimidhia; a range of data is furnished from the sites of Nichoria and Ano Englianos.

In contrast, the Mycenaean settlement history of other parts of Greece, including and northwest Greece, Macedonia, and Central Greece, including Attica, Boeotia, Lokris, Thessaly, Phokis and Aetolia-Akarnania, is less well defined in comparison with various areas around the Peloponnese. It appears however that that site development is in general more localised than elsewhere, suggesting that patterns of dominance in this area are also distinctive (Aravantinos 1995; Dakouri-Hild 2001a; Iakovidis 2001; Papadopoulos 1978; Symeonoglou 1973; Tartaron 2004). The foremost sites in this region, Thebes and Orchomenos, which supply the greatest number of martial artefacts found in the area, participate in the Mycenaean cultural koiné in terms of material culture and architecture, but how exactly these sites construct localised political discussions is unknown. Mortuary remains also come from various sites in this region, including Athens. The final geographic region, the Ionian
Islands and Achaia, is temporally restricted to the LH IIIB period and represents assorted funerary scatter.

**Martial culture through time: reflexive action and change**

The third level of analysis is what Whitehead (2004b: 66) identifies as the poetics of violence, the study of the historical unfolding of violence as a practice. Being a process, violence brings together the past, present and future, as do all social actions; nevertheless, the material and sensory nature of violence can be potent enough to punctuate time in extraordinary ways. Violence can stimulate a dialogue with the past by renegotiating social organisation, meaning that aggression is a catalyst for the unfolding of certain futures at the expense of others. Acts of violence can be isolated, exceptional events, that is, they single out a moment in time, but they can also result in retaliatory action creating a cycle of violence, creating a sequence of time. The historical past is a controlling force, a stabilising force: The antiquity of violent practice lends legitimacy for its continuation into the future. The transformation or abandonment of violent practice is a disruption of time and the links with the past. Changes in practice allow for innovation in the methodology of execution and, at times, for new ideologies of violence to be nurtured. The long-lived nature of the practice of violence thus becomes an avenue for social change: As shall be described, the cohesive nature of violence, first exploited during MH III-LH I to yield formative processes, are re-enacted and reinterpreted in LH IIIB in politically adroit performances that legitimise the practice of palatial domination. These effects, both short- and long-term, all reaffirm the potency of acts of violence as a method of social discourse, a means of marking the passage of time, and a process through which identity is constructed.

The ultimate frame of analysis of this thesis is the temporal component, with the aim being to structure a culture history of the impact of violence on the formation of Mycenaean political schemata. The chronological development of Mycenaean violence offers both comparative data and a framework through which we may discern how the Mycenaeans both create social institutions through violence and normalise aspects of their identity. Furthermore, the Mycenaean concept of time, and the past especially, is a force of legitimacy that has its own impact on how violence is consumed. The past is not a neutral sequence of events leading up to the present but exists in social memory, and so it has the ability to be recalled and appealed to in order to shape human action (Karagianni in preparation). The bonds between past and
present are more than just a temporal link; rather, the Mycenaeans create and re-create their past through social action, which in turn expresses identity and entails codes of behaviour that help to stabilise the present. That is, the process of being Mycenaean connects people with their past and helps construct a future. For all of these reasons, this thesis analyses the data from a diachronic perspective, partitioning cultural intervals into the Shaft Grave, MH III-LH II on the Greek mainland generally, LH IIIA and LH IIIB periods.

**The temporal parameters: Absolute and relative chronology**

This thesis follows the high chronology outlined by Shelmerdine (2001: 332; 2008a: 4, fig. 1.1).

### Table 3: Absolute and relative chronology of this thesis (Shelmerdine 2001: 332; 2008a: 4, fig. 1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Date</th>
<th>High Chronology</th>
<th>Low Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH I</td>
<td>2000-1900</td>
<td>2000-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH II</td>
<td>1900-ca. 1780</td>
<td>1900-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH III</td>
<td>ca. 1780-1680</td>
<td>ca. 1700-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>ca. 1680-1600</td>
<td>1600-1510/1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH II A</td>
<td>1600/1580-1520/1480</td>
<td>1510/1500-1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH II B</td>
<td>1520/1480-1425/1390</td>
<td>1440-1390+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH III A: 1</td>
<td>1425/1390-1390/1370</td>
<td>1390+ -1370/1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH III A: 2</td>
<td>1390/1370-1340/1330</td>
<td>1370/1360-1340/1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH III B</td>
<td>1340/1330-1190/1180</td>
<td>1340/1330-1185/1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH III C</td>
<td>1190/1180-1065/1060</td>
<td>1185/1180-1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submycenaean</td>
<td>post-1050</td>
<td>post-1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

This chapter has presented the process of methodological inquiry that structures the subsequent analyses of martial data in Chapters 4 to 7. The approach is governed by theoretical understandings of the practice of violence and martial culture, taken as separate but conceptually related expressions of human agency. CMMC is probed on a number of intersecting levels: on the primary order, artefact biography elucidates the practice of violence as well as other forms of cultural use. Wider patterns in the deposition of martial culture can be measured in terms of internal arrangements that reveal diacritical consumption and ideological associations; these data can then be situated in the wider political context in order to understand the full implications of bellicosity. As they are grouped, these constructs cannot be labelled as
snapshots in time, but are rather taken as indicative of aspects of historical advancement. The following chapters focus on a relatively discrete set of activities in each era in order to characterise salient movements in each period; nevertheless the discussions at work should not be considered finite or mutually exclusive. Ultimately, the subsequent chapters present the chronological development of trends that are both repercussions of historical trajectories and eras of reinvention.
Chapter Four: The Shaft Graves: The Efflorescence of a New World Order

"Henry Wright [(1984: 47-9)] has suggested that an important part of this transformation is the recognition among peer paramountcies that competition among chiefdoms is principally destructive since it causes cyclical conflict and warfare, and that cooperation among peers can create a larger, more complex and more productive political and economic entity (though perhaps not necessarily more stable)" (Wright 1995b: 73).

Explication for the sudden emergence of the Shaft Graves against the incongruous background material that forms the archaeological record of the Middle Helladic has been the subject of archaeological inquiry for decades (most recently, Touchais, et al. 2010). Archaeologists have traditionally located the motivations for political development in social practices, especially the exhibition of control over and consumption of various types of capital (Pauketat 2007; Yoffee 2005). In the past decades, the theoretical characterisation of social transformation has moved from a model in which the networks of symbols are determined to have formative powers (Renfrew 1972) to one in which agency and material expression are considered to be linked and embedded in a wider social landscape (Baines and Yoffee 1998: 233-40; Wright 2004c: 64-7; Yoffee 2005: 33-41). It is human action that offers meaning to the formation of habitus, bridges time and space and recreates worldview.

It is now generally agreed that against the low levels of visibility for aspects of life and livelihood in the MH (Voutsaki 1998), there are numerous areas in which society is undergoing extensive change in MH III. The mortuary evidence is the most visible (Boyd 2002; Georgousopoulou 2004); however, the changes in funerary practices are the result of structural reordering that is taking place amongst living populations, which are themselves increasing (Wright 2008b: 241). Mortuary ritual transforms in this period: The dead are buried in extramural cemeteries and are interred with large amounts of material wealth as part of extended and elaborate funerals involving secondary burial (Voutsaki 1998: 44). These changes are accompanied by a reformation in ideological perceptions of the world and the place of individuals in the new cosmos. Besides the reconceptualisation of the value of material wealth, the emphasis on lineage becomes marked, and constructs of purity and pollution are changing (Voutsaki 1998: 46). Political organisation is also undergoing transformation, although characterising this process and identifying impetuses of
change have been a source of discussion for some time (most recently Parkinson and Galaty 2007; various papers in Touchais, et al. 2010; Wright 2008b: 242-3).

A cursory examination of the martial culture from the Shaft Graves indicates that, like mortuary customs, the social practice of violence is also developing in MH III. Indeed, it is evident from the Shaft Grave martial culture that violence has become a significant cultural expression that engages the fortunes of the community as a whole.

Figure 3: Drawing of grave Gamma, Grave Circle B (French 2002: fig. 6). Note the number of armaments visible beside and above skeleton 1.
The earlier inconsistent patterns of deposition of weaponry that exemplify the MH period such as the Argos E5 child burial with a sword (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 32 with references) become stabilised in MH III, when we see the regular dedication of armaments in the Shaft Graves as part of wider formalisation of the poetics of social intercourse that form the impetus for transformation (Figure 3), evidence for which is indicated by two corollary developments. Primarily, the practice of violence has fundamentally changed in terms of the contexts of execution owing to the expansion of the role of violence. Performing violence now means participating in the revolutionary political dialogue through message sending, magnifying and indeed, transforming a nascent mainland practice suggested by the MH tomb at Thebes and the Kolonna warrior grave (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1986; 1995; 1997). To be precise, there are accepted situations in which violence is allowed, or even encouraged, to take place, a phenomenon that is evident in the patterns of deposition of martial culture, which change in terms of scale, method and participants at this time.

There is a tremendous increase in the deposition of arms and armour beginning in MH II (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 32; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1986; 1995; 1997). Although these increases are part of a wider intensification in the interment of material culture taking place at this time, the great variety of armaments and armour, the speed at which new types are being developed, and the specialism of weaponry all indicate that aggression is being enacted on a larger scale and by a more varied means than ever before (Table 4). In MH III, new types of old weapons are gaining currency, such as the Buchholz Type IV arrowhead (Fortenberry 1990: 221), and the socketted spearhead (Hockmänn Types C and D), both forms that continue through until the end of the Mycenaean period (Fortenberry 1990: 198). Nevertheless, the most revolutionary development is the sword, the first instrument constructed specifically for human prey (Snodgrass 1967: 15-6). The earliest blades are the Type A swords, adopted from Crete; however the blade quickly becomes a part of indigenous traditions. The diversity in form, including the array of decoration, midrib design and length of Type A blades, which decrease in average length from Grave Circle B through Grave Circle A (approximately 15 cm) (Fortenberry 1990: 147), all indicate that this type received considerable attention on the mainland (Snodgrass 1967: 16).

The methods by which violence is being executed are changing alongside general intensifying trends; this is reflected in the variety of new and specialised types that are found at this time, of which the sword and related blade weapons are the most
consequential developments. Within a short time there are derivatives of the Type A blade, namely the Type B sword and the Schlachtmesser, a single edged sword, both testifying to mainland use and construction. Furthermore, the level of variation of hafting methods displayed in Type B swords underlines the fact that these weapons have been tried, tested and improved (Târlea 2004-05: 126; Weinstein 1981). Similarly, the iconography of violence, best evidenced by the Shaft Grave seals and funerary stelai, underscores the fascination of interpersonal combat between swordsmen and spear bearers (CMS I, nos. 11, 12 and 16, possibly also the Shaft Grave stelai V, VIII, IX, XI, and 14, Figures 6, 9, 52) that has come to the forefront at this time.

**Table 4:** Itemised list of new forms of armour and weaponry in the formative Mycenaean period. Objects date mostly between MH III-LH I, although some pieces must have developed earlier, as examples appear from MH II. Starred items are found in Kolonna warrior grave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armour/Transport</th>
<th>Armaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure-of-eight shield</td>
<td>Type A sword*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower shield</td>
<td>Type B sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar’s tusk helmet*</td>
<td>Schlachtmesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box chariot</td>
<td>Type III dagger*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type IV dagger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type B spearhead*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type C spearhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type D spearhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type IV arrowhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, it is evident that there is a meaningful shift in the participants in violence in MH III, even against the backdrop of MH I-II, when martial culture was not deposited in clearly defined patterns in the mortuary furniture. From the earliest Shaft Grave interments (Alpha, Zeta, Iota, Lambda, Nu, possibly Delta, Figure 3) through to the latest graves in Grave Circle A, weaponry is a staple deposition, most especially in the graves of mature men (Acheson 1999: 99; Dietz 1991; Heitz 2008: Tables 1, 3; Iakovides and French 2003: 18, 51; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1986). Likewise, there is also an unprecedented focus on the act of witnessing violence, a community activity as demonstrated by the large numbers of pictorial imagery of aggression (Table 5). Such evidence comes from the graves of both men and women (Grave Circle A, IV and III) and is seen in the glyptic arts (CMS I, nos. 11, 12 and 16, Figures 6, 9), vessels for serving and cult (the Battle Krater and Siege Rhyton, Figures 5, 15), and funeral stelai (I, IV, V, VIII, XI, 14, Figure 52).
Besides these indications that violence is developing in terms of scale, methods, and participants through MH III-LH I, there is a plethora of evidence to demonstrate that the purpose of violence is an explicitly political expression. Primarily, the disproportionate number of martial objects interred in the Shaft Graves, loci that scholars accept as participating in the process of political dialogue, suggests that martial culture is part of the wider social trope (Dickinson 1972; 1997; Dietz 1991; Graziado 1991; Heitz 2008; Laffineur 1995; Tournavitou 1995; Vermeule 1975; Voutsaki 1999; Wolpert 2004). Furthermore, the lasting deposition of martial culture, especially the Type A sword, from the earliest graves in Grave Circle B through to the ultimate depositions in Grave Circle A, even as the act of depositing grave goods in the Shaft Graves undergoes transformation during this time, also suggests that these objects have an enduring and potent role in the emerging political negotiations.

### Table 5: Itemised list of martial iconography in the Shaft Graves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave Circle</th>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Gamma</td>
<td>Stele 14 &quot;Re-Used&quot;</td>
<td>NM 13575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Stele 13 &quot;Unfinished&quot;</td>
<td>NM 13576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IV</td>
<td>Siege Rhyton</td>
<td>NAM 481</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IV</td>
<td>Battle Krater</td>
<td>NAM 957, 351, 313</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IV</td>
<td>Figure-of-eight shield rhyton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IV</td>
<td>CMS I, no. 15</td>
<td>NAM 240</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A IV</td>
<td>CMS I, no. 16</td>
<td>NAM 241</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A V</td>
<td>Stele I, &quot;Simile&quot;</td>
<td>NAM 1427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A V</td>
<td>Stele IV, &quot;Cartoon&quot;</td>
<td>NAM 1429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A V</td>
<td>Stele V, &quot;Over the Sea&quot;</td>
<td>NAM 1428</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A III</td>
<td>CMS I, no. 11</td>
<td>NAM 35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A III</td>
<td>CMS I, no. 12</td>
<td>NAM 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A III</td>
<td>Faience vessel with head of a warrior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stele VI, &quot;Horsey&quot;</td>
<td>NAM 1431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stele VII</td>
<td>NAM 1439-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stele VIII</td>
<td>NAM 1443-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stele IX</td>
<td>NAM 1447-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Stele XI</td>
<td>NAM 1452-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Museum number key:
NAM=National Archaeological Museum
NM=Nauplion Museum

The martial artefacts also resonate with their own symbolism of authority and social diacritica, as the ideological worth of these objects is heightened in part through the disproportionate use of lavish materials that are employed to adorn nearly every piece. As the exotica such as gold, silver, electrum, lapis lazuli, niello, rock crystal and
Ivory receive much of the attention paid to the Shaft Grave furniture, we have a tendency to overlook lesser displays of material wealth, but ancient audiences would have been aware of the value of such quantities of bronze and boar's tusk. Similarly the figure-of-eight shield prominently displays a wide swathe of cattle hide or leather, a material that has measured consumption in the later Mycenaean period, as recorded by the Linear B tablets (Bernabé and Luján 2008: 221-2; Trantalidou 2001). In addition to the expensive raw materials, there is also a great amount of human skill manifested through the construction of each piece, and the process of creation, born from such extensive human labours, confers each object with value and heritage (Muskett 2007: 57). Furthermore, while many of the objects or materials come from outside of the Greek mainland, the extent to which artefacts or types are adopted and incorporated as part of Mycenaean social practice adds to their intrinsic worth (cf. Bennet 2004). For these reasons, when each object is considered in terms of its composition in material goods, its level of craftsmanship, and the extent to which each piece embodies Mycenaean tastes, it is evident that the martial culture draws together multiple yet overlapping forms of capital. It may be summarised then that martial culture, through its use in contests of legitimacy and by means of its own material expression, is part of a concentration of resources that help to realise a burgeoning exercise of human power at Mycenae, a site where such anthesis has no precedent.

In spite of this evidence, the importance of violence as a factor in the socio-political developments of MH III-LH I has not been thoroughly investigated, even though conflict and the emergence of political domination lie at the heart of the most energetic and flexible model of the institutionalisation of a diacritical order: that of factionalism as proposed by Wright (Brumfiel 1994; Wright 2001; 2004c). Unfortunately, previous analyses of Shaft Grave martial culture have led to the same cursory conclusions; namely, scholars have attributed the efflorescence of the wealth in the Shaft Graves to the political exploits of a newly emerging elite, who are renegotiating networks of power in order to accumulate material wealth and ideological capital. Even so, I dispute the application of this model for being too polarised and simplified in outlook and therefore untenable in operation, a result in part attributable to the use of the term elite. This construct is utilised as a catchall label to describe dynamic individuals, few in number, who monopolise or work to dominate cultural capital for their benefit. In so doing, they are characterised as formative individuals who influence and govern the political transformations of their polities.
They are archaeologically recognisable through their material wealth, and their combined affluence and political import result in the scholarly interpretation that they are members of the upper echelon, indeed, that they created social hierarchy to facilitate their voracious accumulation of capital (Barrett and Damilati 2004: 150). Instead of drawing strength from its flexible application in terms of avoiding concrete and intractable concepts, the designation elite smothers the full articulation of individual power networks and presents them as crystalline paths directing centralisation, ideas about arrangements, resources and agency that come pre-packaged together (see also Lesure 1999: 23-4).

In contrast, the research proffered by anthropology, sociology and ethnography suggests that the relationship between agents, social capital and the networks of power that together construct habitus are heterarchically arranged in complex patterns that furthermore vary through time. It is likewise evident that the same conclusions can be made of MH III culture and the Shaft Graves (Voutsaki 1999: 109; Wolpert 2004). The fact that individuals are obtaining and circulating foreign goods at this time indicates that they seek to not only intensify but also widen their corpus of available capital. Nevertheless, it is the final consumption of social practices and deposition of material remains that suggest that consensus is built and sustained through the practice of enculturation of non-native ideologies and physical resources. That the Shaft Graves are the material manifestations of multifaceted transformations in social practice, worldview, and concepts of identity is underscored by two characterisations of these depositions: on the one hand, Wolpert (2004: 139) argues, "the staggering consumption in the shaft graves was not the mechanism for social change; rather it points out that narratives were being renegotiated and retold and contested, and this is where social change resided." Wolpert's emphasis on looking beyond the material objects in order to make sense of the depositions is a reminder that

---

24 One good example of the use of the term elite in implicit relation to wealth, archaeological visibility, political trajectory and social dominance comes from French (2002: 36), who gives a brief précis of the emergence of early settlements and their involvement in the formation of palaces. In this introductory passage, which prefaces the descriptions of Grave Circle A and the mortuary remains of LH I-II at Mycenae, French posits: "It is hard to see exactly how Mycenae itself relates to this model of society [that of palatialisation]. The site has become the leading one of the Argolid and possibly of the whole of southern Greece but its own internal structure is unclear, particularly the nature of the elite who are so obvious in the archaeological record."

25 As articulated by Georgousopoulou (2004: 209): "the absence of hierarchical structures does not mean the levelling of any vertical differentiation. Such a view would perceive power in terms only of control and subordination, arguably an oversimplification of social strategies, and would assume that power operates only on one level and resides in fixed places."
these remains are not self-evident but require a theoretical understanding of the social context for their formation (also Georgousopoulou 2004: 208; Wright 2004c: 68). Nevertheless, Voutsaki (1998: 44-5, emphasis in the original) argues that the performance of deposition is transformative in itself, a conceptualisation of funerary practices in terms of the dynamics of power that is equally applicable to any social practice:

Mortuary practices, then, have been interpreted either as symptoms of external cultural influences or as a reflection of social reality...I see mortuary ritual as creating rather than mirroring social reality, as shaping people's perception of the world and of their position in it. It is my suggestion that mortuary ritual creates social reality by creating the spatial and temporal schemes that divide and order the cultural universe, by defining identity at both the personal and the group level, and by creating differentiation by means of ostentatious and competitive gestures.

That is, the act of depositing wealth is clearly a new phenomenon at this time, and one that gains momentum through the consumption of Grave Circle A. This cycle creates its own feedback loop in impacting not only the construction of the new world order but also the norms for depositing keri smata itself, as evidenced in the changes in the depositional patterns of martial culture from Grave Circle B through to Grave Circle A. Trying to make sense of all the related aspects of the deposition of the wealth in the Shaft Graves requires a focus on reconstructing social practices, which allows us to penetrate the motivation, actions and intentions of agents in regards to their relationship with the material world.

In light of the depth of meaning of the archaeological evidence, and in contrast to viewpoints that see the MH III-LH I period as the era when a bilateral, segregated and discrete hierarchy is established, I seek a more sophisticated framework of social organisation to characterise the changing world order as materialised in the Shaft Graves. To this end, I suggest instead that the political configuration beginning in MH III is a multi-tiered, complex vertical structure in which violence plays a fundamental role as a method by which agents in many orders exercise their connections to or over various forms of social capital. Through such practices, the Mycenaeans fashion their worldview in which material, human and ideological aspects of culture require appropriate control and maintenance by means of action through time. This structure, a vertical hierarchy, is an embodiment of the agonies found in factional leadership as it draws on older existing clan and kinship systems that established and maintained social negotiation networks throughout the earlier MH period and utilises violence as a form
of political discourse to incorporate, bond, empower and sanction members (Wright 2004c: 73). The integration of violence directly in the centre of this model is supported by the archaeological record, which indicates that the forms of violence being executed beginning in MH III are innovative in terms of scale, method and participants; furthermore, martial culture operates the political dialogue through material expression. By drawing on traditional practices of interaction but also incorporating new elaborations of violence the early Mycenaeans are recharacterising gender and leadership roles, creating a new vision of self- and group identity (Wright 2004c: 73).

For explanation, the model of factionalism is preliminarily described in order to highlight the types of social interactions in which conflict is likely to arise, for it is in these disputes that violence acts as a mediating, and indeed, transformative factor (cf. Wright 2004c: 68). In characterising trajectories of change, the motivations and aspirations of agents are in some ways measurable against the contemporary social dynamic. For this reason, we must be explicit about the methods by which emerging social practices both rearrange older networks of negotiation but also reconcile with them in order to draw in power and resources. Only through such contextualisation in the developing social negotiations of MH III-LH I will the role of violence, and its embodiment in the Shaft Graves, be illuminated.

**Social capital: Formation, ideology and practice**

"Coursing throughout these models and giving them meaning in a dynamic manner are the ideological underpinnings of the evolving society where authority finds ways to authenticate itself in ritual... by emphasizing the importance of acquisition of symbolic and conceptual information in the formation of complex societies" (Wright 1995b: 65).

One salient problem with many of the theoretical explanations for the occurrence of the Shaft Graves is that the patterns of *habitus* and historical worldviews of the earlier MH period are not allowed to play a meaningful role. Similarly, the position that the impetus for emergence comes from a rearrangement in the control of resources means that there must be capital that can be instrumentalised, but in general scholars have focused on those means that are most archaeologically visible (Dickinson 1972; 1997; Dietz 1991; Graziado 1991; Heitz 2008; Hiller 1989; Laffineur 1995; Tournavitou 1995; van Leuven 1989; Vermeule 1975; Voutsaki 1999; Wolpert 2004). Such issues arise from the general lack of material evidence from the MH period; nevertheless we must assume that Middle Helladic peoples have highly developed
historical ideologies that govern social interaction within and amongst settlements. These patterns in custom are not likely to be easily swept away or subsumed by changes in material consumption visible in the Shaft Graves; indeed, the weight of the past in legitimising power is a resource that is drawn upon until the end of the palatial era. For this reason, we cannot hope to understand the extent and forms of change made manifest in the Shaft Graves without discussing these pre-existing structures in order to identify the methods by which they are reified and reconfigured to come to define the early Mycenaean period.

The contemporary archetype of Middle Helladic society, the framework against which we see changing MH III practices, is a model of kinship, which binds individual members together to form a household and households together to form communities, as defined by Venkatesh (1997: 85), who emphasises the significance of historical place:

...‘community’ retains both a functional and a symbolic designation. It references an objective entity, namely, the physical boundaries and structures that constitute the [settlement]. It also denotes a common subjectivity based on shared experiences, symbols and sentiments. Each of these bases of affiliation afford legitimacy to the person who speaks in a representative capacity.

The archaeological visibility of MH communities is faint and scholars hypothesise that they consist of just a handful of families with settlement populations of no more than 100 people (for a site-by-site overview, see Wright 2008a: 145-7; Wright 2008b: 241). Low levels of structuration by means of gender and seniority exist in terms of ordering members of a household and establishing community leadership (Wright 2004c: 67). The effect of social proximity cannot be overestimated, as Georgousopoulou (2004: 208-9) emphasises; the friction and tensions arising from having little privacy are soothed through communal performances that underscore group identity and belonging.

The resources available to MH communities to exert power are physical objects but also ideological components and even the human body, labour and output, meaning that there may be little to distinguish between the social life of things and the social life of agents, for they lead parallel lives (Gosden and Marshall 1999; Hoskins 1998; Venkatesh 2000: 68, 105). As such, every resource, thing, person or cultural capital, is, in practice, a commodity because they all hold value as political entities and are therefore subject to monopolisation and control. Having specialised power over a
resource is also an investment in an individual's future as it widens a person's social interactions (Venkatesh 2006: 135-7). The result is that the person becomes tied to the fortune of the capital, which again reaffirms the relative values of people and material culture as connected spheres and because such a relationship widens social networks (Venkatesh 2000: 84; 2006: 40, 104). Even extensive contacts with other agents are a resource upon which individuals can draw upon in moments of contested legitimacy (Venkatesh 2000: 100-4; 2006: 85). Yet there are social inhibitors that limit or mediate the domination of the strong over the weak. For example, bilateral gender roles arrange for resources to be accessed by men and women differentially, even if women are structurally subjugated in the system (the differential access to certain foods is perhaps one such example, cf. Tzedakis and Martlew 1999; Tzedakis, et al. 2008: 220-30). Likewise, multiple arenas for display and aggrandisement (Schoep and Knappett 2004: 22, 31), the need for ultimate legitimacy to be recognised by communities as a whole (Short 1996a: 31; Venkatesh 1997: 85; 2000: 3; 2006: 276), and the preference for precedent over novelty (Venkatesh 1997: 95; 2000: xv-xvi, 120, 286-7) all prevent the monopoly of prestige and/or material wealth by one individual or group (Wolpert 2004: 129).

It is worth exploring how the personal relationships of individuals in these kinds of close-knit societies influence how they perceive their place in the world, as motivations are shaped by such performances of identity (Fagan 1996: 71; Short 1996a: x; Short, et al. 2006; Venkatesh 1997: 97; 2000: 69, 84, 168). Indeed, concepts of the individual in MH society are indivisible from group personhood and ideas of native affinity (Venkatesh 2000: 84, 106), those bonds connecting the social landscape (Venkatesh 2006: 144), the past and historical forerunners (Georgousopoulou 2004: 208-9), all of which leave impressions in terms of how agents interpret their abilities to act. There may be a very real sense that social development is measured against the trajectories of embedded cycles of action that began in the past and require maintenance through the contemporary present (Venkatesh 2000: xv-xvi, 241, 286-7). Such are the networks of obligation that bind people, from family members to the wider community, and which feed off individual human motivations and aims towards role fulfilment. Cultural values need to be related to and appraised against each other; ideas of equilateral recompense are stabilised and sustained through the remembrance of past interaction and the possibility of future networking (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 47; Venkatesh 2000: 105, 163; 2006: 136-7). Group members see themselves, their
networks of access and system of resources, whether material or ideological, as a succinct self-circulating whole in which members are not equal in terms of their abilities to exercise control, for there are always factors that mediate one’s access to capital or identity performance (Venkatesh 2006: 146-7). That is, when one person acquires, it is through the bodily loss or the deficit of future gains on the part of someone else. This proximity in which individuals live and relate to one another means that ideologically, the system is internalised as a zero-sum game, in which alternate futures of interaction are compared with one another (Layton 2005: 46; Markus 1993: 23; Venkatesh 2006: 146-7). Nevertheless, the relational aspect of proximity also reaffirms the feedback networks of community, because one cannot extend or supersede contemporary power networks without broadening the community-wide ability to exercise rights of access (Venkatesh 2006: 102, 146-7).

Because the complications of human motivation are in large part embedded in proximity and agnatic networks, these relationships lie at the heart of group organisation, both within the household and within the wider community, a central research agenda is to build a model that interprets both how faction leaders control emerging practices to rearrange kinship but also reconcile with it. Besides being nearly impossible to eradicate, the system of kinship mediates access to capital and is a source of legitimacy and power, and is thus more likely to become enmeshed in the emerging social complexity rather than suffer dissolution (Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Venkatesh and Levitt 2000; 2001; Wright 2004c: 71). Transformation is enacted through the means by which agents negotiate the consequences of their influence and control and the debts and favours they are willing to incur and allow (Venkatesh 1994: 159; 2000: 106, 284-5; Voutsaki 1999: 110).

Leadership and membership in a faction

"If the purpose of the prestige network is to differentiate the chief and his lineage from other lineages by demonstrating the former’s access to external resources, this argument can be equally applied to cognitive resources" (Wright 19995b: 70).

A central benefit of the model of factionalism for the political Shaft Grave phenomena is that the faction is a native form of social organisation that is not however culturally institutionalised in the ways that chiefdoms are (see also Fagan 1996: 40; Pauketat 2007; Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 22; Short, et al. 2006). Nevertheless, we

---

26 Similarly Wright (1995b: 64; 2001: 182) asserts that emerging leaders capitalise upon foreign goods and ideas not only to inject additional wealth into a society, but also to provide legitimacy and worth through their novelty (Helms 1988).
must not suppose that faction leaders are not labouring to monopolise the use of social capital in order to become institutionalised (Wright 2004c: 73). It has been posited that those members of the community who exhibit outstanding achievement and success, such as in the hunt, are good candidates for early leaders (Wright 2004c: 70-3; 2008b: 238-42). Yet leaders who rely on extraordinary ability may not be able to sustain their leadership because they reside so far outside the structures of group identity. One salient problem for the truly exceptional is succession, as there may not be an acceptable heir who exhibits an equivalent level of mental agility, physical strength and resources and interpersonal skills for leadership. Rather I would posit that transformative leadership involves the active demonstration that one’s success is drawn from the embodiment of group identity and performance. Leaders who envision their communities as resources that can be mobilised may stimulate institutionalisation, not through aggrandising their superior wealth or prestige as rewards for their exceptionality, but as the result of their embodiment of fundamentally Mycenaean characteristics and expected role-playing (see also Archer 2002). That is, leaders are indebted to the characteristic fostering of their society that provides individuals with the knowledge and abilities that culminate in such outreach and growth. Ideologically, the role of leadership is thus centred on service rather than on differentiation due to material wealth; indeed, from this perspective, the true appeal and value of exotic goods and acquired wisdom may not just lie in their otherworldliness but in the human hope arising from the knowledge that such items are obtainable through the embodiment of Mycenaean personhood and ways of doing things (cf. Wolpert 2004: 136).

There are numerous motivations for early leaders, who must prioritise them in order to initiate long-term change. Wright (2004c: 71) posits the maintenance and growth of a membership base as the foremost priority of faction leaders as they capitalise upon their ability to be instrumental as a social negotiator (also Venkatesh 2000: 101). There are two common ways of building faction membership. The first is to provide supporters with goods and services, material or otherwise, that they would not normally have access to, while the second is to provide the same goods and services as standing social relations, but to do so more effectively (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 39-59; Venkatesh 1997: 89-90). The cohesiveness of a faction is centred on the charisma of early leaders (Wright 2008b: 238-42), namely the ability of the leader to target needs and convey a number of benefits to prospective members, including obtaining
and dispersing material goods, but also offering the means to ideological fulfilment, a factor that is at least as important as physical wealth (Venkatesh 2000: 154, 173, 188-9). In so doing, leaders use the means at their disposal to accomplish negotiations, including calling in earlier debts that have been transacted through kinship ties (Wright 2004c: 71), which serve to reinforce the agnatic order, rather than reduce its powers of structuration.

While competition exists between a faction and wider norms of practice, as well as between factions (Wright 2004c: 71), nevertheless, there are other instances of friction that demand resolution on the part of leader. Namely, faction leaders do not control every type of social capital; rather they command one or a number of resources and labour to cement their existing control, to preserve their monopolies from seizure by rivals and to accumulate more capital (Fagan 1996: 69). This process can be fraught with problems for aggrandisers. On the one hand, there are those types of capital that defy monopolisation simply because many community members can draw upon them; for example, the limited expression of cult in the MH period suggests that access to the divine can be characterised as immediate and is therefore less amenable to direct control (cf. Whittaker 2002: 151; Zeimbeki 2009). Furthermore, there are those aspects of fortune that always prevent universal domination of political schemes by the powerful, including death, injury, the inevitable conflicts of interest between equals, superiors and subordinates, ecological events or non-events, the struggle involved in designating an heir, and the predicaments created by the natural abilities and disabilities of human actors. The timing of certain events can corrode the appeal of faction leaders in the view of followers if subordinates read such tidings as a result of an inability to protect or provide on the part of the leadership. Rather than conceiving of the process as overtly exploitative and ultimately avaricious however, Wolpert (2004: 134) characterises these contentions by noting that,

Constructing status was not always an antagonistic process, and political relations were not always perceived as consisting of imposition and subordination, a struggle pitting an elite against commoners. Rather more common was 'hegemony-without-hierarchy,' the misrepresentation of inequality without wilful deceit.

---

²⁷ Of course part of the transience of factions is centred on their ability to provide provisions and protection more effectively than agnatic structures, which continue to exist because of their regular ability to sustain (cf. Wright 2008b: 242-3), Turnbull's (1972) ethnographic account of the complete breakdown of the structure and role of the family due to the collapse of the Ik through starvation being a blunt and harrowing illustration.
Legitimacy is not a state, therefore, but a process of conditional realisation. In their struggle for legitimacy, factions are subject to change and dissolution and are more likely to see internal disruption or transformation during the political manoeuvring towards the domination of resources (Brotherton 2006; 2008; Brotherton and Barrios 2002; 2004; Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 781; Short 1996a: ix; Venkatesh 2000: 135-6; Venkatesh and Levitt 2001; Venkatesh and Murphy 2007). As a result, the role of faction leader also changes over time as methods of material and ideological fulfilment of members reach full capacity; leaders must decide how they intend to intensify their access to resources in order to satisfy demand. Movement towards long-term solutions is the road to institutionalisation, at which point faction networks are part of the fabric of social reality and their existence is not inherently illegitimate. In those scenarios where the process towards permanent social stratification has not successfully eradicated all rival factions, we should expect to see a complex polity in which individual institutions draw on diverse forms of capital and offer various recourses to legitimacy (Venkatesh 2006: 246). In comparable fashion, such growth is invariably a process of transformation for the structure of the faction itself, as early ideologies and methods of interaction give way to more cohesive and sustainable forms (Fagan 1996: 69).

There is an equal amount of complexity involved in the individual decision to affiliate oneself and, depending on the requirements of membership, one’s relations, with a faction (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 30, 47; Venkatesh 1997: 89-90; 2000: 163). Material goods are one factor; however those motivations that cause community members to identify themselves with a faction are not necessarily new types of wealth, but rather the unlocking of potential access to resources to which they were not admitted in the past (Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 757; Venkatesh and Levitt 2001). Furthermore, supporters seek sustained access to capital as a form of investment and permanency in the system. Members are also looking for the intangible benefits of faction membership; that is, they see faction affiliation as providing them with the ability to realise cultural identities (Coughlin and Venkatesh 2003: 49; Padilla 1992; Venkatesh 2000: 53). The theoretical models of Wright (2004c) and Yoffee (Baines and Yoffee 1998; Yoffee 2005), in which symbolic capital moves downwards through a hierarchy, causing a near-constant demand for new types, may be a manifestation of

28 Of course it is likely and indeed perhaps unavoidable that by rerouting networks of fulfilment, faction supporters are rewriting expected codes of behaviour, a point that will be elucidated subsequently.
this need, in which novel forms of capital are perceived as a superior means towards role fulfilment (although see critiques in Pauketat 2007). Especially likely contenders to support change are those group members who feel stymied in their need to fulfil social performances that allow them to showcase cultural ideals through their contemporary networks; that is, those members who lie at the edges of social inclusion and sense that they are not being instrumentalised (Campbell 1987).29 We should therefore consider followers as decision makers who have many motivations and social tensions to consider, like present obligations and bonds within existing networks, compulsion to fulfil gender and identity roles, and current access or non-access to resources. At times the combination of these factors may equate to the same resolution, meaning that for some people, subscribing to a faction is a natural choice. For others, personal motivations come into conflict and the issue of joining a faction involves tension, persuasion or coercion.30 The inevitable result is that supporters approach the faction with different motivations for membership and correspondingly diverse ideas of benefits.

Recognising that all faction members are not created equal makes the faction both more stable and more friable than Wright (2001; 2004c) has suggested. Agents are certainly not one-dimensional in their motivations but neither are they entirely unpredictable in their behaviour. The conflicting obligations played out within the individual and between persons are not easily resolved and have resounding effects through time. This is because the same incentives, such as access to material wealth or role fulfilment, cause tension between agents in the system, as individuals with differing motivations and priorities encounter struggle by seeking personal realisation. At other times, matters stimulate the whole group to establish alliances and dialogue. In this way, every issue is likely to create a range of opinions on how it should be resolved, underlining the human dynamism of a faction. For example, there are various reasons why factions choose to deny individuals membership, and conflict may be the result as these prospective members seek engagement elsewhere (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 61).

To balance the causes of conflict, there are an equal number of intensely cohesive elements that create sustainability, primarily those ideological components

29 This is another motivation for not distinguishing between human and material capital.
30 As Venkatesh (2006: 103) qualifies: "Risk taking means leaving one's present network in hopes of entering another one."
that stress unification, common goals, and socialisation through a peer-based model, which can all be seen as benefits or outcomes of factionalism (Brotherton and Barrios 2002; 2004). Ideologies reinforce the goals of political structures that validate and reward the control of capital (Venkatesh and Levitt 2000; 2001). The concept of group unity is also of utmost importance because it serves to suppress individual motivations in order to superimpose factional initiatives that require members to sacrifice personal gains in the name of the group. General codes of conduct develop through obligatory relations and labour specialisation, in terms of the socially acceptable means by which position-holders exert the powers of their political role.

Differences in member aspirations and motivations become embedded in the structure of relations as the faction moves towards institutionalisation, meaning that as certain individuals find fulfilment through the operation of a faction, others encounter loss; so it is that conflict is inherent to the machinations of the system. One result is that conflict resolution can become a primary role of leadership as these decision-makers try and sustain membership by matching the appropriate benefits to those who provide service (Wright 2004c: 71). Similarly, multiple opposing factions, whose individual members have diverging motivations and aims, may become institutionalised by gaining legitimate supremacy over a resource, with the result that conflict lies at the heart of the social interactions in the ossified social structure.

The institutionalisation of violence

"In contrast to chiefdoms where decision-making is centralized in the chief and undifferentiated as to function (i.e. there are not specialized decision-making offices), in states decision-making is itself a specialized function and breeds a hierarchy of differentiated tiers within each institutional function of the state. Thus chiefdoms may be diagrammed as operating at up to three levels of control and states with three or more" (Wright 1995b: 67).

Conflicts over material goods, ideological vision, and claims to legitimacy are therefore embedded in the structure of a faction, between members of a faction and non-members, and between rival faction members. By what means then is conflict in a formative society to find resolution? Those cultural forces used for mediation allow for overall group cohesion, the instrumentalisation of networks of power and material resources. The social measure of mediation is therefore the process for social revolution (see Morris 1986: 102-3 for Homeric examples). It is with these factors in mind that I argue that cultural transformation is embedded in performances of identity, and that the material culture associated with emerging practices acquires a lasting symbolic potency that stems from their consumption in acts of formation.
Furthermore, through an analysis of the archaeological evidence as summarised above, I proffer violence as a central method of Mycenaean social order.

That is, agents participating in the rising complexity of competitive action during MH III–LH I instrumentalise violence as a predictable, immediate and accessible method to settle contests over legitimacy, power and control. This is not a bilateral system like the mutually exclusive model of elites and non-elites, or the two orders postulated in a faction; rather this is vertical stratification with multiple orders, in which domination and victimisation are part of hegemonic maintenance. The rise of violence at this time is part of group aims at diacritical cohesion, as the execution of violence brings members together through personal aggression and the act of witnessing and reaffirming (Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Reisman 2006: 149-52; Rosenfeld, et al. 1999; Sánchez Jankowski 1991; Spanos, et al. 2008; Thornberry 1998; Vigil 2003; Yablonsky 1973). Violence becomes an arena in which talent is displayed and promoted; it is how bonds of trust are formed and obligations are created and fulfilled.

The acceptance of violence as a legitimate method of social renegotiation can happen easily and quickly because aggression offers numerous benefits: firstly, it appears to be a natural way in which social relations are mediated because it is of-the-body (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2004: 273); secondly, it results in the domination of humans, meaning it offers control over capital (Merry 2009: 3; Sidanius and Pratto 1999: 31-59); thirdly, it transcends older networks of obligation and rearranges them, thereby rerouting other ties; and fourthly, violence itself becomes a resource for future use, which means, like all forms of capital, it is subject to sanction and control (Whitehead 2004b). Violence is, first and foremost, an effective intensification of the resources at hand: human; material and ideological; agents who use violence do not need to draw on external resources. Through the force of exploitation, violence creates specialisation in terms of differentiating access to the material world and those capacities that hold social worth, such as knowledge and information, skills, labour and general capabilities, and gate keeping and access to resources. A vertical hierarchy also

---

31 Of course like all so-called "natural" phenomena, violence is always mediated by cultural norms.

32 Many of the same benefits that Wright (2004c: 73) lists for feasting in terms of its efficacy in aiding the process of unification and stratification apply equally well for violence, including "[a] way that such leaders can increase their standing within their own faction, show off to and attract members of other factions (thereby diminishing competitors), forge alliances with other factions or extra-community families or groups... claim new land (which may be also disputed), and mobilize labour to carry out large projects that cannot be accomplished without a large workforce."
self-replicates through hegemony: power over capital offers legitimacy to the specialist (Venkatesh 2006: 85-6, 246; Venkatesh and Murphy 2007); individuals aim to control a form of capital because it allows them to participate in wider social networks (Venkatesh 2006: 103-4; Venkatesh and Levitt 2000; 2001), and material culture embodies human action and therefore the office of control; all of which results in a tightly woven social relational bond between individuals along vertical and horizontal arrangements (Decker and Van Winkle 1996; Kontos, et al. 2002; Short 1996b; Venkatesh 1996; 2000: 105). In contrast to models of ossified pyramidal structures that feature little interaction between echelons (cf. Kilian 1988), it is more likely that orders exhibit high levels of relations and dynamism because mutual empowerment is found through participation in social networks.\[33\]

For this reason, continuous interaction amongst various levels of the hierarchy does not undermine the power held by those in the highest orders; rather, these types of situations are an opportunity in which favours can be extended or coercion can be exerted (Venkatesh 2006: 137). A primary reason for the delegation of responsibility is simply logistical, for no single individual can control everything, and so the majority of activities that operate political schemata, maintain economic standards and uphold ideological roles must be delegated by default (cf. Morris 2000: 117; referencing Walzer 1983: 11). Nevertheless there are other benefits to the assignation of responsibility, because commission offers role fulfilment for both leader and subordinate (Venkatesh 2000: 189). To exercise delegation is an expression of power as it is specialised decision-making, which, as Wright (1995b: 67) notes, is its own office in complex systems (Venkatesh 2000: 188). The act of delegation is itself an investment of trust by a leader in a subordinate and therefore creates a bond of obligation between the two, a factor that is instrumental in sustaining social relations between orders. The charge of duty is an opportunity for members to demonstrate their skills and abilities and to find role fulfilment (Venkatesh 2000: 136).

Because of these vertical social bonds, interaction and differentiation through violence serves the lowest tiers equally as well as it does those leaders who stand at the apex, namely through offering all the normative values that define leadership (for the early Mycenaean period, see Deger-Jalkotzy 1999; also Venkatesh 2000). Primarily,

---

33 One outcome of the operation is that simply being able to use the system to one's advantage is a form of social capital (Coleman and Hoffer 1987; Short 1996b: 227; Venkatesh 2006: 254), which may underscore differences between visitors and those native to the settlement, heightening a sense of self-definition and historical affinity.
violence embodies action: It allows individuals to create their own success because of the nature of social action in delivering futures. Violence is always a dialogue with nonviolence, and, as a social choice, is an exercise of power (Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 781); it is alluring because it is so efficacious in materialising certain events and arrangements while extinguishing other possibilities. Aggression is highly visible to the senses, and so it is likely to be noticed and carefully monitored by witnesses, and the results of such outbreaks are deeply internalised; it is therefore a learned behaviour and cultural expression. Youths learn the bodily practices of violence and are taught to become responsible by watching themselves and others around them mature into adults who continue to participate, and indeed, are embedded in the system. For the young members at the lowest tiers of stratification, benefits of membership can be more ideological than tangible (Padilla 1992; Venkatesh 2000: 53). Their role in the hierarchy is manifold: They engage in physical action including the choreography of combat and the appropriate employment of weaponry and armour as well as in the development of mature decision making and understanding of the ideology of the social order.

Secondly, violence demands interpretation and mediation, so that every act is deemed either acceptable or inappropriate in light of its social context and the social standing of the performers. For this reason, both the execution of violence and restraint in aggressive action can be interpreted as either political strength or as the only recourse of the powerless. The execution of violence physically structures how young members are assimilated into the higher orders; acts of violence committed by neophytes are an effective method of joining the group, claiming affiliation, or receiving extended responsibilities on account of the fact that violence attracts the attention of superiors (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 178). Situated in the appropriate context, acts of violence are understood to showcase leadership skills and are a means by which those individuals in the lower echelons can distinguish themselves in order to earn greater responsibilities.

Direct interaction between leaders and followers is an opportunity for all parties to exercise their political identities, which vary in degree of control (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 172; Venkatesh 2000: 154, 188-9). Leaders execute violence on a myriad of occasions, most notably, against subordinates or their enemies as retaliation against exhibited behaviours that leaders seek to end, which is to say that
violence is used to institute or rebuild control (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 173). Aggrandisers also use violence to reaffirm the hierarchy and re-instil the pertinence of smooth operation between orders; likewise, they execute violence against competitors in order to subjugate and assimilate them into the system (Coughlin and Venkatesh 2003: 45-6). In these situations, violence may be a second course of action, executed only after individuals do not respond to diplomatic entreaty; violence is therefore a relational choice because it provides an alternate discourse with which to engage opposing political bodies (Venkatesh 2000: 136). Leaders may also promote general violent tendencies amongst subordinates as a way of identifying promising young members (Venkatesh 2000: 176-7). Violence is therefore a testing grounds through which subordinates certify that they are responsible to their leaders and are willing to protect their comrades, becoming affiliates who understand that their actions reflect the perception of the group (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 172-3). Finally, leaders underscore or heighten their power by using violence to showcase their own abilities that qualify them for the role of leader (Levitt and Venkatesh 2000: 782-3); this may be part of their charisma (Wright 2004c: 70-3; 2008b: 238-42). For this reason, aggrandisers who order violence to be executed by someone else on their behalf demonstrate that they direct and control the resource of violence.

Whenever members initiate violence, therefore, a cycle is created (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 175). Social aggression is the mechanisation of reconstitution: although counterintuitive that individuals choose to enter into an exploitative and hegemonic system, members who execute violence in order to gain status have the effect of reifying the structure by wanting to ascend through it (Fagan 1996: 45, 71). Similarly, those in the upper echelons perform their identities through violence and associated expressions of leadership. Cultural acceptance of violence and vertical hierarchies is a means to an end, that is, towards identity fulfilment and material expression, and not an end in itself. Violence becomes the mirror for the reflection and creation of normative values, in which elements of justice, sacrifice, discernment and the comparative proportions of worth of social networks and material goods are established and related to one another. For this reason, violence is a process of enculturation and the means by which individuals are measured.

---

A political structure that legitimates this type of violence is the definition of statehood presented by Weber (Weber, et al. 2004).
The hierarchy created by violence is only elaborated and made more complex through the consumption of martial culture (Decker and Van Winkle 1996: 22-3; Spanos, et al. 2008). Like humans, weaponry and armour are stratified in terms of how they are employed and the skills involved for their manipulation; martial culture is thus a physical embodiment of the operation of the system. Martial culture represents both the institution and the individual, in which personal abilities are supported by group access to resources; control or ownership of martial capital offers agents the ability to exercise power and claim legitimacy. The display of martial culture, especially arms and armour, is at the same time an assertion of the idea that the hierarchical system enables individuals to gain access to material wealth, social responsibility and control and embodiment of identity and leadership values through active participation and sacrifice; that is, martial culture represents both upward mobility but also attainment.

**The poetics of violence: Violence as a formative process**

"Since competition is fundamental to this model it is likely that these groups were always entangled in conflict. Again we must seek archaeological evidence that supports the notion of conflict developing, and we can reason that such evidence would be manifest only when it assumed a magnitude that would leave a visible clue in the archaeological record. Such conflict would result, for example, when chiefs attempted to consolidate territories that impinged on the borders of another chiefdom" (Wright 1995b: 72-3).

So explicated by the theoretical motivations for developing a hegemony, we may now turn to the archaeological remains. Besides the direct evidence we have that martial culture is a culturally preferred physical indicator of social identity in MH III (Acheson 1999; Voutsaki 1999: 115), that violence is considered to be a community practice is underscored by the representations of violence in the Shaft Graves. Archaeologists have argued that a significant factor in understanding Aegean art is the idea of "viewer completion" (Bennet 2007a: 12; Renfrew 2000: 140-3); that is, Aegean art needs a viewer in order to fulfil the image and for message sending to take place. The niello inlaid daggers are one such type of reflexive artefact; their scenes are invisible when the blades are sheathed and so these objects must be displayed in order to be understood. Indeed, that they require physical handling is reaffirmed by the fact that they bear scenes on both sides of the blade (Figure 4). The scene on the Siege Rhyton (Figure 5), on which the walls of the city are crowded with viewers who, like us, are watching the mêlée below, also brings the act of witnessing violence to the forefront. Moreover, the vehement reactions of the spectators on the Siege Rhyton
suggest that the resolution of the fighting, whatever it may be, affects the whole community, meaning that witnessing violence is a reflexive performance. Indeed, there is not a single aspect of the Shaft Grave martial culture to suggest that any element of its production or consumption is a private affair. Some scholars doubt the scale of violence in the Mycenaean world, considering the Shaft Grave weaponry to be too exalted to have often been in the hands of the everyday Mycenaean (Acheson 1999: 97; Deger-Jalkotzy 1999: 122; Dickinson 1972; 1999a: 105; Shear 2004: 8-9); I suggest that people participate in numerous ways. The act of seeing, of witnessing violence, is as important as the execution of violence itself (see also Mackie 1996: 51, for a discussion on visual observation as direct engagement). To witness is to be a part of political change through participation, meaning that people have the chance to have a voice. Watching violence is also, therefore, a cultural expression.

Figure 4: Inlaid “Lion Hunt” dagger from Shaft Grave IV (National Archaeological Museum #394) featuring pictorial decoration on both sides. Photograph taken by the author.

This is not to say that witnessing violence is an undifferentiated form of assimilation, indeed, the very nature of violence has the material effect of diacritically integrating persons and resources. We may therefore ask about the execution of violence, the forms it takes and how such acts construct and reaffirm a hierarchy. The archaeological evidence for a power hierarchy is not preserved for us in a direct manner; rather we need to understand the way in which the system incorporates members and recreates relationships in order to make sense of the material remains. Both the physical strength and skills needed to execute violence and the diplomatic and decision-making abilities used to moderate the execution of violence come with the physical vigour and mental capacity of adult maturity. For this reason, a vertical
structure utilises the bodily maturing process in order to assimilate youths into the system, using the various echelons of stratification to inculcate cultural ideologies and practices (Spanos, et al. 2008; Venkatesh and Murphy 2007). Considering the number of weapons that the Mycenaean employ, it is likely that weapons training and instruction of combat choreography take place over an extended period of time (Tărlea 2004-05: 132) in which the very tuition of certain techniques and weapons usage is hierarchically arranged based on student mastery. In this way bodily practices mirror wider political schemata, the assimilation of the two in the mind and body of neophytes allows and prepares them to be agents in the system.

Figure 5: Drawing of the Siege Rhyton (Morgan 1988: pl. 191).

When violence is a method of stratification, martial culture is a tangible representation of one's place in the hierarchy (for a similar deconstruction of iconography and social interaction on Crete, see Koehl 1986). Because of the amount of skill the sword requires and the specialised manner in which it is used, it has no antecedents in MH culture, unlike daggers, spears and arrowheads, which developed in the Early Bronze Age or earlier. It is extremely probable that the sword, the first weapon exclusively designed for the execution of humans (Snodgrass 1967: 15-6),
comes at the pinnacle of specialised combat training (Tarlea 2004-05: 137) because it is physically and psychologically superior to contemporary armaments (Molloy 2006; 2008). Mycenaean swords have been critiqued by scholars for being too long and unwieldy (Driessen and MacDonald 1984: 56; Fortenberry 1990: 148; Karo 1933: 204-6; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Sandars 1961: 17), and therefore have been designated to be poor weapons, but there are good reasons for thinking that the Mycenaeans understood, and indeed, appreciate these “drawbacks” (Muskett 2007: 58; Tarlea 2004-05: 130, 133).

**Figure 6:** Drawing of CMS I, no. 16 (Sakellariou 1964: I, no. 16).

The proficient swordsman wields the blade deftly to prevent damage and expertly to inflict physical harm. Swordsmen aim to kill: In the iconography the point of blade entry is generally at the throat (CMS I, nos. 11, 12 and 16, **Figures 6, 9**), or the underarm (CMS V, no. 643, **Figure 7**). As Tarlea (2004-05: 128, 132) explains, the narrowness of Type A swords makes injuring vital organs difficult and therefore requires expertise in making a fatal thrust. A swordsman must be in extremely close proximity to the enemy to execute the final stroke. Combat scenes are focused on the agonistic pair, as opposed to scenes of hunting in the Shaft Graves, which is a group activity (CMS I, no. 15, the Lion Hunt dagger, **Figures 4, 8**). Even in mêlées with many combatants, for example, in the “Battle of the Glen” seal (CMS I, no. 16, **Figure 6**), sword fighting scenes are composed dyads, underlining the idea that swordsmen are alone and must rely on their own abilities and strength to master their opponent (Tarlea 2004-05: 132).

---

13 Although Dickinson (1977: 56, 68) notes that the frequency of their deposition speaks of the blade’s use-life.

16 CMS V, no. 643 is of contemporary date from Gouvalari in the south-western Peloponnese.
Much has been made about the fact that swordsmen rarely wear anything to protect themselves, but there may be benefits to the lack of armour that we have not thus far appreciated (Fortenberry 1990: 36; Tärlea 2004-05: 133). If sword fighting requires lightness of movement to make strong lunges inwards and balance swift recoils, then carrying armour, especially the substantial body shields of the era, is a distinct disadvantage. Furthermore, the exertions of the exposed body are easier to follow and interpret by witnesses, including aspects of footwork, lunging or thrusting capabilities, one's ownership of space and hand dexterity.

Similarly, visual indicators are easily understood: Blood and wounds cannot be hidden on exposed skin (see also Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 139). How the bare swordsman dominates space and assimilates his own physical exposure with fearlessness and

Note that swordsmen also rely on paying careful attention to the enemy's movements in order to coordinate efficacious attacks; in effect, the heavily shielded defendants on the Mycenae seals are hiding themselves from view. The fact that swordsmen in every case are ready to issue the fatal thrust is testament to the skills they possess (Tärlea 2004-05: 132).
readiness to fight are psychological signals that are liable to be read and interpreted by the enemy and witnesses.

Considering all of these aspects of swordsmanship, there is a distinct sensation of aggressiveness on the part of the swordsman and defensiveness by those who do not wield swords, as the iconography suggests. It may be concluded the Mycenaeans plainly regard the sword as a weapon that requires the pinnacle in self-reliance, physical skill and psychological strength to master, and for this reason, in every circumstance where a swordsman is fighting someone who is not bearing a sword, that is, a junior, the swordsman clearly has the upper hand (Figure 9) (Tärlea 2004-05: 135). Furthermore, swords are associated with men’s burials, especially those individuals in their thirties and forties, underscoring the idea that they “belong” in the hands of the mature (Tärlea 2004-05: 139; Triantaphyllou 2009; Voutsaki 1999: 115; Voutsaki, et al. 2007: 95-7). 38

Figure 9: Drawing of CMS I, no. 11 (Sakellariou 1964: I, no. 11).

By conclusion, the sword as a weapon represents differentiated access to violence, a power that is capitalised upon through the construction of specialised types like the Schlachtmesser. Blades therefore become objects of desire in their own right. Because of all the ideographic aspects of swords, it may not be a coincidence that in some of the earliest graves in Grave Circle B (Zeta, Iota) where there are only one or two martial objects, the grave goods include a Type A sword. In other graves (Lambda, each of the two skeletons in Nu) where other weapons are interred, such as spearheads, daggers, and/or arrowheads, these objects may only be present to complete the panoply (cf.

38 Triantaphyllou’s (2009; Voutsaki, et al. 2007:95-7) preliminary publications of the reanalysis of the Grave Circle B skeletal material note that, contrary to what Angel (1973) found, many of the adult skeletons in Grave Circle B show the types of bodily wear consistent with poor diet and living conditions during youth, evidence that appears to bear weight in the argument made here.
Fortenberry 1990: 200). Nevertheless, through Grave Circle B and into Grave Circle A there is a remarkable increase in the consumption of martial culture, most especially swords. There are three salient leaps in the figures, the first, with 4-5 in number of blades, then Gamma and VI, with 8-9 blades, and finally the overwhelming numbers in IV and V, with over 40 blades (Table 6). Clearly, the process of consumption is itself transforming. How can we account for the gross aggregation of martial culture in the later graves of Grave Circle B and in Grave Circle A? I argue that the ideology of the sword makes it invaluable as an instrument of diacritica, and therefore it is the hierarchical training structure that mediates the consumption of the blade.

Table 6: Summary figures for the numbers of blades in the Shaft Graves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave Circle</th>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>No. of Blades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Zeta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the elaboration of a violent hierarchy on the part of martial culture, the tiers of the hierarchy are materialised through these objects. For this reason, the consumption of martial culture is intimately associated with visions of the self and constructions of personhood. It is thus not unexpected that the martial culture in the Shaft Graves is exceptional (Dickinson 1977: 53; Laffineur 1992: 107; Muskett 2007: 57); however the extent to which a disproportionate number of the weapons, especially the swords, is one-of-a-kind is in fact a surprising consideration. Blades especially are made singular through such a combination of methods that they are

---

39 Muskett (2007: 50-1) notes: "The characterisation of elite male individuals as warrior is apparent in both Grave Circles at Mycenae, where weapons accompanied the majority of male burials. This trend is most striking in Graves Z, Iota, and N, and the single burial in Grave II as well as the multiple burials in Graves IV and V, characterised by the inclusion of large numbers of weapons, greatly in excess of what might be expected to have been included as the personal property of the deceased."

40 Sword and daggers are combined here to avoid confusion with the varying definitions for the length of a dagger.
recognisable from a distance but are entirely unmistakeable when examined in detail. Such individualism is brought out through a variety of approaches and includes both decorative programmes on the body but also those aspects that we define as “structural”. Variances in constructive and ornamental elements underscore the fact that these blades are perceived as singular objects (Muskett 2007: 58).

In overview, the Shaft Grave blades are rarely of the same length, feature unique scabbards and have beautifully crafted hilts composed of a variety of different coloured precious materials and embellished through incision or repoussé (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 20). The bronze body of each blade is finely worked as well; they feature a spectrum of incised decorative elements at the shoulders and/or down the midrib, a diversity of midrib profiles and varying numbers of rivets, which are then sometimes capped with precious metal (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 17-26). Such evidence is still plainly visible despite the fact that many of the blades from the Grave Circles are not completely intact.

Figure 10: Drawing of gold pommel with lion and panther from Shaft Grave IV (Hood 1994: fig. 174). Actual size.

It is the preponderance of extensively decorated hilts, often of precious materials, that is most striking on the Shaft Grave blades (Hood 1994: 175-84). Gold is a common element of such hilts, but many pieces are composites of various materials for the hilt, hilt plates and pommel. Other hilts feature chased designs such as the popular mainland spiral, double spiral or trefoil. One gold pommel from Grave Circle A IV displays a lion attacking a panther (Figure 10), while another hilt has inlaid lapis lazuli and rock crystal (Figure 11). The few fragmentary remains of scabbards from Grave Circle A indicate that they too are composed of a variety of materials (Table 7);
the frames are formed of wood and even linen and they bear gold foil repoussé spirals, dots and other designs on the surface. It is likely that the ornate hilts function to complete a full decorative programme once the sword is placed in the scabbard; nevertheless it may be the case that the brightness of the metal of the hilt, rivets and pommel draws the attention of the eye, allowing witnesses to follow the hand movements that govern the blade during swordplay.

Figure 11: Blade hilt with lapis lazuli and rock crystal, featuring griffins biting the sword shoulders (National Archaeological Museum #294, 405). Photograph taken by the author.

Although a scabbard hides the bronze blade when it is sheathed, the Shaft Grave swords nevertheless display a remarkable variety in form and decoration on their bodies, even in those aspects that we would consider “structural”. Such evidence reaffirms the idea that, like the niello daggers, and even the swordsmen themselves, the swords require visual examination for their value to be substantiated. This variation

41 From a crafting perspective this supposition makes it likely that either swords and scabbards were created by the same crafter, or perhaps more likely, by a group of crafters working in tandem.
includes the number of rivets used to attach the hilt to the tang and shoulders of the blade, which range between three and five in number in the Type A examples. Such deviation is remarkable considering how the Type A form has been criticised as having a tang that is too short to provide solid support for the especially long rapier blade (Fortenberry 1990: 148; Karo 1933: 204-6; Sandars 1961: 17; Târlea 2004-05: 126), because rather than zones of strength, the rivets are instead areas of weakness where the bronze tears. The elaboration continues; many of these rivets are also capped with gold, silver or electrum foil.

Table 7: Scabbard materials by National Archaeological Museum number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linen</th>
<th>Wood</th>
<th>Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>with decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>with decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413+453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although few of the Shaft Grave swords preserve their full and original size, they show a general diachronic trend towards shortening of the blade lengths; this is evident in the 15 cm average difference in the Type A blades from Grave Circle B to Grave Circle A (Fortenberry 1990: 147-8). This reduction continues even through the Type B blades, which are much shorter in comparison with the Type A.

Table 8: Shaft Grave blades with decoration on the body of the blade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Blades (National Archaeological Museum Catalogue Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure-of-eight shield</td>
<td>404 (Figure 13), 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiral</td>
<td>404, 751, 8572, 8686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double spiral</td>
<td>402, 726, 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple groove</td>
<td>750, 729, 8668, 8573, 8666, 727, 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple and double groove</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double groove</td>
<td>415, 430, 730, 766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavy groove</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>417, 8710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatrefoil</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral groove</td>
<td>8586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braided pattern</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse groove</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No midrib</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevertheless, there is still a significant amount of variation amongst swords of the same type, even within swords deposited in the same grave (Figure 12). It seems that the variation grows over time even with the general downsizing trend; early swords from the same graves in Grave Circle B are generally within 5-10 cm of one another in length, whereas the numerous blades in Grave Circle A IV and V are much more varied, with differences over 20 cm. By inference from these statistics, it may be suggested that the methods of production of the bronzesmith included making a new mould for every sword, a process certainly not designed to save time.

![Blade Length Graph](image)

**Figure 12:** Variations in blade length from Grave Circle B through Grave Circle A.

The midrib is another structural element that indicates that its design is in no way fixed.⁴² Midrib profiles are triangular, rounded, diamond, and rounded-diamond (Figure 15) (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 17-25, abb. 4-7). The angles at which the midrib erupts from the surface of the blade range from shallow to steep; at times they taper all the way to the edges of blade, whereas in other examples the midrib is discrete

---

⁴² The fact that sword NMA 928 from Grave Circle A VI simply does not have a midrib underscores the idea that what we consider to be the basic framework of sword construction needs rethinking. This piece remains uncategorised in terms of typology.
from the plane of the blade. Within these general profiles the blades feature different combinations of beading or incising in order to create channels. Embellishment is also found on the body of the blade, especially along the midrib or near the shoulders. Over 30 of the approximately 85 swords in the Shaft Graves feature serious ornamentation along the midrib, including incised figure-of-eight shields, horses, spirals, double spirals, patterns of grooves in various numbers and thicknesses, wavy grooves, griffins, quatrefoils and braids (Table 8). It must be emphasised that such fine detail requires a relatively close inspection of the blades; the craftsmanship is not visible beyond a metre or two of distance, at most. Certainly the most famous examples of body decoration are the inlaid daggers, "peinture en métal" which compose hunting and Nilotic scenes. Hood (1994: 176) notes that the figure-of-eight shields in blade NMA 404 from Shaft Grave IV were first cast in the blade and then accented with subsequent chasing and gilding (Figure 13). These great discrepancies in midrib form, combined with the high levels of variation in the body length, make it likely that swords are cast individually perhaps with single-use mould, and the decorative elements along the midrib suggest that the blades are made one at a time. The distinctiveness of the weapons reemphasise the idea that primarily, the Mycenaeans consider witnessing violence to be a social expression, and secondly, that what the Mycenaeans appreciate and value are displays of martial skill.  

Figure 13: Blade (National Archaeological Museum #404) with figure-of-eight shields running down the midrib (Cassola Guida 1973: tav. XIV).

Individualism in martial accoutrements is not just a feature of weapons; although we have no examples of preserved specimens, all the depictions of helmets in the Shaft Graves are unique (Fortenberry 1990: 122-3; cf. Korres 1969 for Homeric examples; Morgan 1988: 114). Although the helmets are characterised as representing a single typological class—like the blades—that of the boar’s tusk helmet, they are best described as individual creations. Six such helmets are preserved on the Battle Krater

---

41 Vermuele (1975: 13) notes: "There is a sense that weapons are partly alive, with pictures on the blade and animals biting the hilt."
(Figure 14), but each shako is recognisable by the number of tiers of plate and through its own special configuration of crests, which can be pointed, circular or tasselled. The same is true for the Shaft Grave seals (Figures 6, 9), where no helmet is alike, either to each other or to the ones displayed on the Battle Krater. We may presume that real life helmets would have been even more recognisable due to the colour variation in the tusks and crests, which may be of animal hair and may have even been dyed (Cassola Guida 1973; Fortenberry 1990: 103-8). It may not be a coincidence that these helmets are especially unique and distinguishable; they can be seen over the top of the shield, meaning individuals can be singled out at all times (see also Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007: 287).  

Vermeule (1979: 45) attributes the Mycenaean funerary emphasis on the head, such as the Shaft Grave death masks, as "celebrat[ing] the idea that the head is the seat of life and personal identity, and that if it can be made more lasting the individual may be helped to withstand the darkening of time."
Figure 15: Midrib profiles from Type A swords from Grave Circle B (upper) and Grave Circle A (lower) (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 23-4, abb. 6, 7).
To summarise, while there are a limited number of martial typologies evident in the Shaft Graves, the remains attest to the fact that the Mycenaeans go to extraordinary lengths to mark each piece as individual. Nevertheless, the deliberate singularity of the Shaft Grave martial culture in some ways contradicts the nature of their gross accumulation and deposition. Neither do the objects reconcile well with the idea that they are simply elements of repetition of symbolic capital (cf. Wright 2004c: 77-80), for the objects are neither copies nor do they show a clear chronological trajectory towards "bigger and better". Moreover, Bennet (2004) has highlighted the fact that along with distinctiveness in form and decoration, the Shaft Grave objects, martial culture included, almost certainly have individual artefact biographies, which are recounted as part of the funeral (see also Palaima 2003: 201); to this end, Vermeule (1975: 15) suggests that the blades probably have their own names by which they are identified (also Laffineur 1999a: 315). Through its artefact biography and individuality, each piece of martial culture plays its own role in the funeral, an event that brings the whole community together even as it realises diacritical interaction. It is evident then that the martial culture contains aspects of singularity, by means of each object's form and decoration, but also community affiliation, such as the limited number of overall types and restricted loci of cultural consumption. For this reason we cannot interpret this wealth as part of elite segregation supported by the exploitation of resources from the general populace (contra Graziado 1991: 403; Laffineur 1992: 111; Voutsaki 1999: 112).

Rather I would argue that the level to which each sword can be distinguished by physical composition and pedigree underscores the idea that they are deposited in the Shaft Graves at the deaths of leaders of a vertical hierarchy in order to fulfill social obligations. It has been noted elsewhere that there is only one matching set of sword and dagger amongst all of the Shaft Grave weaponry; nevertheless the two pieces were not found together in the same grave (Vermeule 1975: 46). If the deposition in the Shaft Graves is the result of the promotion of individuals through the exchange of martial culture, and if we accept that the Mycenaean concept of "ownership" of the Shaft Grave martial culture is more complex than has previously been acknowledged, then the separation of these two blades is a culturally meaningful act. The act of giving

---

43 For example, Graziado (1991: 403) characterises the Shaft Grave depositions as the materialisation of a "progressive separation of the elite members from the lower sectors of the community."

44 National Archeological Museum #747 was found in V, #399 is from IV.
a one-of-a-kind sword to an affiliate, who has proven able to wield it, creates a bond of obligation between giver and recipient, confers responsibility to the subordinate, and is a physical embodiment of the relationship between social orders (Voutsaki 2001a: 206). Of all the connections that one may have extending along various social networks, one's role in the power hierarchy is now foremost. The bestowal and ultimate return of such a gift becomes part of the artefact biography, the oral history of past relationships and bonds of obligations, while the relation of artefact biographies at the funeral reaffirms the superimposition of the vertical system and the membership of individuals. Indeed, complexities of ownership and exchange only heighten the social worth of these objects, making their deposition an even more remarkable performance. There are benefits for the givers too, as bestowing subordinates with a physical marker that recognises their fulfilment of personal identity and group status, and rewarding them with material wealth, is a hallmark of successful leadership. Final deposition of the blades at the death of leaders offers closure to the relationships between individuals and the deceased but also sustains the system of hierarchy and exchange, as vacated leadership roles require filling and the need for swords spikes. Thus the dedication of the blade at the funeral reaffirms the power of this form of exchange, but more importantly, the act marks the transition of leadership, as junior members perform the tasks of their commanders by becoming beneficiaries. Through social action, the very deposition of these artefacts is a way of "making Mycenaeans" (cf. Bennet and Davis 1999), in which new identities are created through the ultimate transition of death and the material expressions of social status and identity. It is for all of these reasons then, that we should consider the Shaft Grave weaponry as implementing hegemonic integration rather than exclusion.

Conclusions

It has been the aim of this chapter to outline how the social practice of violence is implemented as part of the wider emergent practices in MH III, a discussion that began by positing the centrality of violence on account of the depositions of martial culture in the Shaft Graves, and concluded with suggesting that the very consumption of martial culture is governed by a social hierarchy that is structured by violence. Through these conclusions, the potency of violence as a means of instigating change,

47 As Morris (1986: 119) notes: "In all non-capitalist cultures the fundamental role of gift exchange is that of integration."
developing networks of complexity and bringing about subsequent shifts has been emphasised.

To summarise: In contrast to what is often presented in the literature, it is argued here that the formation processes that we see developing through the changing depositional practices reflected in the Shaft Graves are testament to the construction of a social hierarchy in which violence is a central method of political discourse and conflict mediation. The acknowledgement of the place of violence in social relations requires a full renegotiation of the way in which we consider the development and order of a hierarchy. It is argued here that kinship and networks of obligations bind individuals into wider systems of relations that structure patterns of consumption and conceptions of identity, all of which feed into individual motivations that affect one's propensity for violence and reactions to it as a witness.

Violence is not simply the method by which a hierarchy is differentiated, however; it is also a means by which this hierarchy is sustained and recreated in conjunction with the self-regulating but interrelated processes of institutionalisation, in part constructed through the formation of extended community roles and identity. Martial culture, the sword specifically, creates normative values, which underscore the esteem held for certain forms of violence, with martial culture as an instrument of symbolic weight. As such, martial culture functions as both an ends and a means; it elaborates a power hierarchy and instrumentalises continuous acts of reproduction.
Chapter Five: MH III to LH II: (De)Constructing the Power of Violence in Terms of Death and the Past

Many scholars agree that conflict and competition epitomise the early Mycenaean period as developing social practices become arenas for consumption and contention (see Acheson 1999; Bennet 1999a; 2007c; Bennet and Davis 1999; Boyd 2002; Dabney and Wright 1990; Dickinson 1977; 1989; Voutsaki 1995a; 1997; 1998; 2001a; b; Wright 1987; 1995b; 2006a; b; 2008b), both in terms of creating lifeways but also by defining charged physical spaces. This transformation of habitus, including the construction of the built environment, is most visible in the elaborate mortuary rituals (Cavanagh 2008; Cavanagh and Mee 1998; Mee and Cavanagh 1984). By LH I-II, the mortuary realm has established itself as a preeminent arena for social renegotiation of individual and group status (what Hamilakis 1998: 128 terms the "mnemoscape of death"). For this reason we should consider the deposition of martial culture in tombs as part of wider practices of message sending and assertions of legitimacy (Cavanagh 2008: 327-8; Wolpert 2004: 137), even as the archaeological record, and the Mycenaean funerary monument especially, remains a palimpsest of generations of human action that inevitably disturbs and destroys evidence. This chapter reviews the martial data from the early Mycenaean period (MH III-LH II) in the Argolid and the Korinthia; the western and south-western Peloponnese; and northwest and Central Greece, excluding the Shaft Graves, in order to assess independent strategies of violence, contextualise them within wider historical and social trends and compare them with the patterns of martial consumption of the Mycenae Grave Circles. The central aim of this chapter then is to develop constructions of local ideologies concerning the meaning and purpose of political violence.

Nevertheless, this is not a history of violence alone. Rather, these interpretations endeavour to explain how violence is culturally accepted into pre-existing tropes of power in each of the three study regions, for with the rise of a complex hierarchy we should not expect older MH networks of relations to disappear completely. On the contrary, familial ties, as forms of capital, become even more important and empowered. Such networks are sufficiently compelling to be both successfully incorporated into a system of violent interaction but also to operate as an opposing form of legitimacy and power against ties that bond individuals in a vertical hierarchy (Wright 2004c: 73), simply because whenever agents manipulate their
overlapping networks, they become more embedded in systems of complexity rather than less so. Accepting violence as a source of power widens the patterns of social networks, but also limits its consumption in light of alternate ideologies. Contextualised against the various regional expressions of power networks, the martial evidence therefore suggests that the role of violence is not analogous across Mycenaean Greece, despite the similar models of conflict that have been postulated for the Argolid and Messenia (Bennet 1995; 1999a; b; 2001; Voutsaki 1995a; b; 1998; 2001a; Wright 1995b; 2004c; 2008b).

What follows is an analysis that is arranged on an increasingly widening scale, beginning with initial reviews of the archaeological evidence from each of the three areas. At the regional level, the emergence of sites in Messenia and the Argolid during LH I-II has been well theorised in the archaeological literature (Bennet 1995; 1999a; b; 2001; Voutsaki 1995a; b; 1998; 2001a; Wright 1995b; 2004c; 2008b). In contrast, there has been little cohesive research on the emergence of settlements in the areas of northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece; nevertheless the limited evidence suggests that the same general trends of social organisation through settlement development, mortuary ritual and practices of consumption that are characteristic of the rest of Mycenaean Greece are part of the cultural fabric here as well (Aravantinos 1995: 614-5; Wright 2008b: 248). This chapter begins by considering northwest and Central Greece first, as the evidence from this area is sparse and generally uncontextualised. Then the martial culture from the Argive plain is analysed in light of the magnitude of the consumption in the Shaft Graves. Finally, the trajectories of the south-western Peloponnese are measured, with the depositions of the Pylos Grave Circle taken as formative. Moreover, the characteristic consumption of martial culture in Messenia lends itself to a comparison with another emerging form of social expression, that of orality and cultural narrative. Ultimately, the full scope of the funerary evidence is synthesised together to make sense of the act of mortuary performance as a social artefact. To summarise the conclusions of this chapter: The consumption of martial culture and the propensity for certain types of weapons over others indicate that acts of violence are conscripted to support preeminent forms of legitimacy—one of which is a specific trope of violence itself—which, taken together, are proffered to be the foremost methods by which the Mycenaeans express self-identity, group integration and cultural worldview.
Northwest and Central Greece (summarised in Table 9)

The martial evidence from the northwest and Central Greece during the early Mycenaean period is scattered and generally uncontextualised. In the formative MH II-LH I period these areas exhibit the low levels of martial culture that are evident elsewhere on the mainland but for the notable exceptions from the Mycenae Shaft Graves and the Pylos Grave Circle. The burials at Thebes (the MH II tomb at Odos Oedipos and the Tambiskou grave 1, MH III-LH I) are surely the wealthiest in terms of martial deposition in this area. The MH tomb contained a spearhead, arrowheads and five collections of boar's tusks totalling nearly 200 in total, while the Tambiskou grave 1 held two blades, a spearhead, boar's tusks and arrowheads. The importance of hunting, a practice that has roots in the MH period and earlier, may be indicated by the general scatter of arrowheads, which are found in low levels (between one and five) and are the most frequent martial object. Similar evidence for the practice of hunting is the collections of boar's tusks; 13 pieces were found at the MH II House of the Artisan at Eutresis and 53 are from cist grave 6 at Eleusis, which also contained a dagger with silver plated rivets, dating to MH III. Swords do not appear in the archaeological record until LH I, although after this date swords and daggers are deposited as the martial artefacts of choice.

Because the martial culture from northwest and Central Greece in LH II is, more often than not, looted and without specific context, although Aravantinos (1995: 614-5; 2003) suggests that the formative processes involving competition and consumption of material wealth that characterise other Mycenaean settlements are also taking place at Thebes, attestation of this cannot be found in the consumption of martial evidence. There are few patterns that can in fact be identified as trends and not as superficial anomalies resulting from corrupted data. Nevertheless the frequency of bladed weapons appears to be considerably higher than in the earlier period, with swords and daggers being relatively mutually exclusive. The most common weapon is the Type C sword, with a few examples of the Type D blade, along with a number of daggers. It may be salient that boar's tusks have only been found at one site in this period (Thermon) and the number of sites where arrowhead scatter has been found has also decreased, although the generally low levels of overall material remains found in archaeological excavations is perhaps more telling. Because many of the artefacts have unknown contexts, and the dataset as a whole is sparse, there is too little information
for any substantive conclusions to be made without drawing inferences from other areas of the Mycenaean world.

Table 9: Summary of martial remains from northwest and Central Greece in MH II-LH II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Boar’s tusk</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutresis, House of the Artisan</td>
<td>MH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes, Odos Oedipos, MH tomb</td>
<td>MH II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesklo, Grave 56</td>
<td>MH II-II (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis, Cist grave 6</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis, from tomb &quot;near Pyre 36&quot;</td>
<td>MH III (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona, Unknown context</td>
<td>MH III (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramesi, from mound</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes, Tambiskou grave 1</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirrha, Cist grave 18</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermon, House A-3</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapodi, CT 48</td>
<td>LH IIIA-III</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapodi, CT III</td>
<td>LH IIIA-III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapodi, CT IV</td>
<td>LH IIIA-III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirrha, Cist grave 59</td>
<td>LH I-II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirrha, Cist grave 5</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis, Cist grave Eta Pi 5</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona, from the ruins</td>
<td>LH IIIA-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Olympus, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIA-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxidi, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIA-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis, Tomb Zeta Pi 6</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis, Cist Grave Eta Pi 10</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesoyefira, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikro Vathy (Aulis), destroyed CT</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blade key:

\[\text{\#}=(\text{quantity of})\text{ jewelled sword/dagger}\]

The Argolid (summarised in Table 10)

Excluding the Shaft Grave data, the martial evidence from the Argolid in MH III-LH I is extremely sparse. The consumption of swords is nearly non-existent; after the Argos child burial (tumulus E grave 5) with an unknown type of rapier, the appearance of swords in this period is limited to the Type A blade in the Kolonna warrior grave and of course, those in the Mycenae Grave Circles. The warrior grave at Kolonna on Aegina prefigures the Mycenae Grave Circle depositions in terms of diversity and wealth of martial culture; nevertheless the inclusion of a Type A sword, two daggers, a spearhead and a boar’s tusk helmet suggests that these are personal.

48 CT is an abbreviation for "chamber tomb".
favours forming a nucleated deposition, similar to the earliest remains in Grave Circle B, rather than reflections of the vertical integration postulated for the quantities of blades in Grave Circle A.

Other MH III-LH I graves contain a single martial object at most, of which the dagger is the overwhelming choice; this may reflect associations of bladed weapons with the individual. The number of boar's tusks found in some of the graves (Kolonna warrior grave, Kazarma tholos, Mycenae chamber tomb 518, and Dendra chamber tomb 8), probably the remains of full helmets, also underscores the individualist nature of these deposits. It appears that the consumption of the niello inlaid daggers is restricted to the Shaft Graves and only after these tombs go out of use do we find inlaid daggers in other Argive contexts (Prosymna chamber tombs XIV and III), although these blades do not feature the aggressive scenes as depicted on the Shaft Grave daggers. Similarly, the Schlachtmesser experiences limited consumption; a single piece was deposited in the Cyclopean tholos at Mycenae in LH II A. This is also the only example amongst all the Schlachtmesser found anywhere to feature gold foil on the haft, a curious blending of the contemporary sword and Schlachtmesser traditions.

During LH II there is a general diffusion of numerous types of martial culture; the concentration of martial capital embodied in the Shaft Graves is without parallel; Voutsaki (1995a) interprets the general dispersion of wealth as an indication that other sites in the Argive plain are capitalising upon the systematic consumption that the Shaft Graves pioneered. The Mycenae chamber tombs contain the most diverse amount of material, including frequent boar's tusks and arrowheads, but artefacts also appear in the Dendra tholos and in numerous chamber tombs at Prosymna (cf. Voutsaki 1995a for parallel trends in other goods). In contrast to the high concentration of boar's tusk through LH I, subsequent low numbers in Mycenae chamber tombs 31, 517, 515, 55 and the tomb of Aegisthus indicate a rising interest in the individual, perhaps singular, tusks as symbolic capital.

By LH II the sword is found in other contexts outside the Shaft Graves; the sustained reliance on blades as martial capital is evidenced by the preponderance of these objects in the tomb and by an uninterrupted evolution in their typologies. There is a single example of a Type B sword in the tholos at Dendra, but otherwise the historic Type A and B blades have given way to Types C and D, which feature technological developments born of the informed use of their predecessors' weaknesses (Figure 18). Wherever swords are distributed in this period, there appears to be a
The corresponding absence of daggers in the same funerary context, which suggests that when swords are available, daggers become redundant. The idea that the daggers of the earlier MH III-LH I found outside the Mycenae Grave Circles mirror the symbolism of individuality of swords at a time when swords are not consumed outside the Shaft Graves may explain this trend. Furthermore, the deposition of swords in LH II suggests the repetitive placement of blades in the Shaft Graves, albeit on a much smaller scale, with quantities ranging between two to five examples. The blades are not uncommonly decorated with precious metals, gilded rivets or chased decoration on the midribs, a trend also carried over from the Shaft Grave swords.

![Figure 16: Martial culture from the Dendra tholos (Persson 1931: pl. XX).](image)

The wealthiest deposit of martial culture is found in the Dendra tholos; these pieces also happen to be the most ornate (Figure 16). This tomb contained a newly evolved Type C blade that is over a metre in length, a span that recalls the early Type A blades from Grave Circle B (Figure 12), and has an ornate hilt made of chased gold and ivory. The other blades are also adorned with golden hilts; ivory, glass paste and agate are utilised for ornamentation. The chased designs in the golden hilts, the various materials for the pommel and the hilt plates, and the incised decoration of the bronze
bodies of the blades all denote the earlier tradition of the Shaft Grave beautification of weaponry. The significance of such forms of decoration for new types of weapons suggests that these objects continued to reflect individual worth.

Situated in context, the patterns in the consumption of martial culture across the Argive plain suggest that violence remains a salient method by which power is renegotiated. This conclusion is drawn from twin strands of evidence: primarily, the preference for acts of violence and martial culture that have political significance—and the further elaboration of violence through evolving sword typologies—and the continued consumption of these forms of violence in a foremost social locus. Nevertheless although the consumption of martial culture is widespread, violence as a social power operates at the individual site level. In part this interpretation is substantiated by the assertion made by Voutsaki (1995a: 62), indicating that it is not possible to determine the exact site hierarchy during LH II in the Argolid. Rather, our visibility allows us only to recognise first and second tier sites, as the use of various tomb types and range of depositional patterns of the material culture indicate. Moreover, instead of evolving new forms of violence, it is the same acts of aggression that are glorified in the Shaft Graves that continue to gain symbolic currency. In other words, in light of the power that violence is demonstrated to wield in the Shaft Grave era, we might expect for different settlements in the Argive plain to develop competing forms of violence, materialised through other forms of specialised weaponry, in order to rearrange pre-existing agnatic structures and to viably compete with Mycenae in practices of consumption. Nevertheless, although we do see new weaponry in LH II, notably the Types C and D swords, these armaments are not fundamentally reworking the practice of interpersonal violence. C and D blades simply represent superior engineering of earlier prototypes, Type A and B swords (Figure 18) (Fortenberry 1990; Killian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Sandars 1961); bodily interaction between combatants remains much the same, as experimental research underscores (Molloy 2006; 2008). The sustained consumption of blades, and the association of the individual with the sword, both suggest that the violence is playing a similar role in each community as it has done for the people of the Shaft Graves, meaning that the arenas of violent conflict are situated within communities and not between them.

We may reasonably ask why the Argives would choose to execute violence in their own communities to participate in diacritical integration, and yet not extend violence outwards to incorporate other settlements. Indeed, the apparent limiting of
political violence that is taking place in LH I-II argues for the interpretation that violence has become an altogether weaker method of social organisation. Yet I would argue that the opposite explanation is in fact more viable. Quite simply, violence is not tolerated to be an all-encompassing and sole expression of legitimacy and hegemony. The rise of a vertical hierarchy, the changes in affiliation from direct kinship to complex leadership, the adoption of a complex structure of martial culture, in which every item is an ideograph for a myriad of social practices and principles, and the revision of social roles all threaten to subsume those aspects that represent the touchstone of mainland culture. The strong and sudden assertion of older forms of authority, namely complex lineage patterns, and the movement to adopt new forms of material culture and monumental construction to privilege these antique networks, suggest that the lesson of violence as a powerful and immediate manner of redirecting agnatic structures is considered too foreboding for the state of the historical world order. As Voutsaki (1995a: 62) asserts:

> These ostentatious practices do not just act as display and legitimation of the elite’s power, they also indicate that the power structure is still crucial and fragile. Nothing illustrates better this fluid and unstable situation than the spasmodic shifts in the construction and abandonment of the tholoi, the most conspicuous—and supposedly the most permanent—symbol of wealth and prestige.

Nevertheless, it is the area of Messenia that is most notable for the development and rapid adoption of the tholos tomb. At first glance, the bellicose evidence from the western and south-western Peloponnese parallels the preferences and developments as evidenced in the other study areas. Although the funerary record in Messenia is considerably disturbed, the evidence we have indicates that this region forefronts lineage and genealogy over new methods to power that began in the Argolid with the Shaft Graves. On closer inspection, however, it is apparent that there are unique forms of consumption of martial culture that feed into local power networks and contests over legitimacy.
Table 10: Summary of martial remains from the Argolid in MH III-LH II (excluding the Shaft Graves), with the warrior grave from Kolonna for comparison.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th>Schleichmesser</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Body armour</th>
<th>Boar's tusk</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolonna, Warrior grave</td>
<td>MH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>many 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos, Tumulus E grave 5</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos, Tomb Γ-71 (31)</td>
<td>MH (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine, Cist tomb 1971-3</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT IV</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Pit grave</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine, near Grave 58</td>
<td>MH II-III (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos, Tomb 90</td>
<td>MH III (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Shaft grave</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazarma, Tholos tomb</td>
<td>LH I-IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mycenae, CT 518</td>
<td>LH I-IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT XXV</td>
<td>LH I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mycenae, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 529</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mycenae, main megaron</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendra, CT 8</td>
<td>LH I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, Cyclopean tholos</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 91</td>
<td>LH IIIA-III:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Generally the remains summarised here are those with iconographic evidence, which can be reconstructed, and those that preserve bronze. Those tombs with only low-level scatter of arrowheads and/or boar's tusks remaining may have been cleaned out or robbed in the past.

50 This column gives the figure number(s) for the object(s) tallied in blue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Site and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th>Schäichmesser</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Body armour</th>
<th>Bear's tusk</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unk.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT XIV</td>
<td>LH I-III A:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;4</td>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus, Sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas</td>
<td>LH I-III A:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT XXVI</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argolid, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH II-III A:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dendra, Tholos tomb</td>
<td>LH II-III A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 78</td>
<td>LH II-III A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 81</td>
<td>LH II-III A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 82</td>
<td>LH II-III B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, from hoard south of Persea Fountain House</td>
<td>LH II-III B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT III</td>
<td>LH II-III B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2, 0</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dagger key:
- 0 = (quantity of) jewelled hilt and/or gilded rivets
- 0 = (quantity of) chased blade/midrib
- 0 = (quantity of) inlaid dagger

Iconography key:
- 1 = (quantity of) stone vessel
- 0 = (quantity of) terracotta offering table
- 0 = (quantity of) seal
- 0 = (quantity of) ivory figurine
Western and south-western Peloponnese (summarised in Table 11)

Bennet (1995: 596-7) explains how many Messenian tombs are built near or over earlier MH tumuli or funerary monuments; the monuments are heavily agnatic in outlook and organisation. Nevertheless, Vermeule (1979: 49) explains that the assertion of heritage is also conducive to new forms of social engagement:

In shared shafts, tholoi or chambers, the Mycenaean family lay together in death through several generations, a principle conducive to dynastic pride and a passion for genealogy. Genealogy often bores the immortal young, and appeals more to those who will soon face a shift from the earth’s surface to the family tree. Still, if one were to meet one’s ancestors in the tomb or in the underworld, it would be courteous as well as useful to know their names and deeds. An expertise in oral and family tradition would support the refinement of one’s manners and help bridge the generation gap.

Besides emphasising the importance of lineage, the ideological context of such tombs embodies concepts such as the control of labour and competition over prestigious display (Darcque 1987; Davis 2007: 68).

Many of the tholoi in Messenia do not preserve any martial evidence other than arrowheads and/or boar’s tusks, presumably because later tomb entry included the confiscation of objects of bronze. Nevertheless, there are a select number of tholoi that do preserve other types of martial culture, beginning with the earliest depositions of the Pylos Grave Circle. These remains in the Pylos Grave Circle are contemporary with Grave Circle B at Mycenae (MH III) and mirror the Shaft Graves in the propensity for blades. Pit 3 SE contains what appears to be a repertoire of martial objects that continue as a formula of mortuary furniture through into LH IIIB: 1; these include the Type A sword, Schlachtmesser, the dagger, arrowheads and boar’s tusks. Like the Shaft Grave swords, the Type A blades found here feature precious metal hilts and chased decoration on the bodies and midribs. On the other hand, a local practice appears to be the bending of swords, generally to a 90° angle (Figure 17), which probably occurred as part of funerary rites, although whether during primary inhumation or secondary burial is unknown. The bending of blades is a nascent practice in the Pylos Grave Circle but it continues through LH II as part of localised tradition; almost without exception, blades are not subject to this treatment outside of the western Peloponnese (Table 12). The consumption of martial culture found at Vapheio and Myrsinochori (Routsi) in LH IIA follows the earlier patterns established in the Pylos Grave Circle. Type A swords remain a strong preference, where they also continue to be bent as part of funeral rites. Schlachtmesser are deposited consistently
as well. Like the Prosymna examples in the Argolid, niello inlaid daggers begin to be consumed in other contexts after the Mycenaean Grave Circles go out of use. They are found in the western Peloponnese at Vapheio and Myrsinochori (Routsi), although unlike the Shaft Graves, these daggers do not feature scenes of combat. The other daggers found in these tombs also incorporate inlaid gold designs along the midrib and gilded rivets, which make them distinctive. The only new objects found in these later tombs are spearheads, which all together compose the personal panoply.

**Table 11: Summary of martial remains from the western Peloponnese in MH III-LH II.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th>Bent sword</th>
<th>Slachtmesher</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Boar's tusk</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, Pit 3 SE</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, Pit 1</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristeria, built tomb</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Shaft Grave below room 97</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, Pit 3 NE</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Tholos IV</td>
<td>LH I frag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, Pit 4</td>
<td>LH I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrsinochori (Routsi), Tholos 1</td>
<td>LH I-LH II</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakovatos, Tholos A</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakovatos, Tholos B</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapheio, Tholos</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrsinochori (Routsi), Tholos 2</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragana, Tholos 1</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koukounara, Akones Tholos 2</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, chamber tomb E-8</td>
<td>LH II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Tholos III</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koukounara, Gouvalari Tholos 1</td>
<td>LH II-IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sword key: ①=(quantity of) Type A sword
②=(quantity of) niello dagger
③=(quantity of) Type D sword

Dagger key: ①=(quantity of) Type A dagger
②=(quantity of) Type B dagger
③=(quantity of) Type D dagger

Iconography key: ①=(quantity of) seal
②=(quantity of) jewellery fixture

51 Boyd (2002: 148-9) identifies the Pylos Grave Circle as Tholos V.
Boar's tusks and arrowheads are frequently part of the funeral programme; from the earliest period, boar's tusks are more popular but more unstable in their number than in the Argolid. Both the boar's tusk and the bow and arrow have been attributed to the practice of hunting, which has led to a number of theories about the role of the hunter in terms of formulating skills for leadership. Nevertheless, the bow and arrow is a curious weapon; the archaeological literature concerned with Mycenaean weaponry has not portrayed the bow and arrow as a particularly esteemed armament (Avila 1983; Fortenberry 1990; Muskett 2007: 57; Reboreda Morillo 1996; Tölle-Kastenbein 1980). This is presumably because the bow and arrow dates back millennia before the Mycenaean era and is so associated with hunting that as an instrument of human harm it appears as the ignoble choice against the myriad of specialised weapons of the Late Helladic (Snodgrass 1967: 16). Except for the arrowhead itself, the bow and arrow is made of perishable and less valuable materials, which therefore limits the academic understanding of its usage. The ubiquity of arrowheads in conventional contexts also lessens the impact of this armament. In addition, the historical Greek perspective towards the bow and arrow as a rather ignominious weapon of war has been perceived to be a traditional perspective (although cf. Hall 1989 for a counter viewpoint; Mackie 1996: 50-3 with references) and the general lack of Mycenaean iconography of the bow and arrow reaffirms this. There is a real sense amongst archaeologists—and perhaps the Iron Age Greeks as well—that the bow and arrow is incapable of conferring ability or prestige and that the
The significance of this weapon is simply as an assay of human strength and skill. It is likely the case that arrowheads, ubiquitous in tombs of the region, may be representing part of the hunting package as opposed to signifying martiality. Because it is an object that is probably not privileged with an artefact biography, as referents in the tomb the arrow may have also been more loosely defined than other, more powerful pieces, like any of the bladed weapons. For this reason, perhaps the arrowheads represent less the logistical aspects of the hunt and rather play a more metaphorical role in which the arrow is considered part of concepts of release and journey, moments of transition between life and death.52

Table 12: List of bent swords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum Cat. No.</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description of Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM 2188</td>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, pit 3 (SE)</td>
<td>MH III</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Split along midrib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2186, 2005, 2013</td>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, pit 1</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bent at 90° angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peristeria, small built tomb</td>
<td>MH III-LH I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Bent at 160° angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2182</td>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, pit 3 (NE)</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Bent at 90° angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2183</td>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, pit 3 (NE)</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bent at 90° angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM 2184</td>
<td>Pylos, Grave Circle, pit 3 (NE)</td>
<td>LH I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bent and broken at 90° angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Myrsinochori (Routsi), Tholos 2, shaft 2</td>
<td>LH II-IIIA:1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Bent into S-shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Mikro Vathy (Aulis), destroyed chamber tomb</td>
<td>LH II-IIIA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Much bent and broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichoria, UMME Tholos pit 3</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Bent at 90° angle, Figure 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Museum key: CM=Chora Museum TAM=Thebes Archaeological Museum
Sword type key: 1=(quantity of) sword with silver 0=(quantity of) sword with gold

It is curious that while boar’s tusks are another significant feature of the funeral programme, the concept of the hunt is not fully defined in Messenian tombs. While

52 The fact that so many arrowheads are made of obsidian, presumably imported from Melos, may underscore their ideological component of journeys when found in the funerary realm.
arrowheads are ubiquitous, the type of weapon that we presume is utilised to take down the boar is not the bow and arrow per se, but rather the spear (Cultraro 2004; Morris 1990), which does not appear to be a consistent element of the funeral package. Indeed, it is most common in those tholoi that have a whole range of weapons and where types are represented by more than one example. Nor do spearheads co-occur with boar's tusks in any reliable fashion. Therefore, the idea that the hunt offers a salient element of the funerary programme needs focus: The most visible symbols of the chase that appear in burials are the tokens, the rewards of the exploit, rather than the means by which the awards are earned. It may be that the weapons, indicative of human violence, are best explained by this pattern as well. The propensity for old weapons—for nearly every type of weapon found in the LH II tombs in Messenia is of a historical type—suggests that these forms embody the force of legitimacy through the power of precedent rather than through immoderate violence.

Because there are a plethora of new types of each taxon of weapons developed and available in LH II, the deposition of archaic types indicates deliberate choice. All but one of the daggers, both the niello inlaid and the undecorated daggers, are Tripathi I type (Tripathi 1988), with wide bodies and low midribs; as a taxon this form is early Mycenaean in engineering. There are only two examples of the Schlachtmesser in the Argolid outside of the Mycenae Grave Circles; as a type it epitomises the Shaft Graves, where some scholars have postulated its representation on certain examples of the grave stelai (Fortenberry 1990: 187-8; Hood 1994: 99; see also Younger 1997: 232, note 26) (Figure 52). Nevertheless they are not an infrequent deposition in the western Peloponnese through LH III. Yet the most significant archaism is the preference for Type A swords; elsewhere in the Mycenaean world, Type A blades have long given way to the superior Type C blades by LH II (Figure 18). Type C blades are hypothesised to have evolved in form to combine the strengths of both the Type A and Type B; Type C blades are also unmistakable because they have flanged horns extending from the shoulders that protect the wielder's hand (Fortenberry 1990: 150; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a: 41; Sandars 1961: 119; Tărlea 2004-05: 128). There is not a single example of the contemporary Type C blade found in Messenia; their geographic spread appears to be a phenomenon restricted to other parts of Greece. Regardless of whether Type C blades are actually circulating around the western Peloponnese at this time, the archaeological evidence suggests that these contemporary blades do not offer legitimacy in the locus of the tomb in the same way as historical types. For this reason,
although the Type C blades may be superior weapons in terms of being structurally robust, their effectiveness in swordplay is not comparable to the political capital represented by Type A blades. The specialisation of Type A weapons transcends typology, however: At times these swords are bent or broken (Åström 1987).^5^

**Figure 18:** Drawing comparing Type A, B and C swords in terms of average length and shape of shoulders and hilt (Fortenberry 1990: fig. 1).

Of course, Type A blades were not always old; indeed, in the Pylos Grave Circle they are novel and formative, and it is the idea of formation and emergence of the Type A blade that I argue continues to hold resonance into LH II. Nevertheless the localised adoption of martial culture is none other than a full renegotiation of community expression, and there are, therefore, two conditions that require explanation: primarily, what do the people of the Pylos Grave Circle find so engaging about martial culture that spurred them to adopt it, and the Type A blade in particular, in the first place; and secondly, how do subsequent generations define these typological categories so that they continue to hold meaning?

The measure of our answers is drawn from the objects in their context, beginning with understanding the materiality of martial culture, which offers its own salient reasons for cultural adoption. When we consider the significant taxa of weaponry in the Pylos Grave Circle and at Peristeria, it is evident that, although each

---

^5^ This also suggests that the poetics of violence itself are a cultural artefact, subject to its own patterns of consumption, a point that will be discussed subsequently.
type is new in MH III-LH I, they each have historical precedents. Although in MH III and LH I the Type A blade, the Schlachtmesser and the Type I dagger are seen as new objects, to a certain extent they are not in fact new; rather they are all monumental forms of earlier forms. Many of the typological distinctions of the Type A blade, the Schlachtmesser, and the inlaid daggers are visible attributes; viewers can easily recognise them all for what they are. The Schlachtmesser is simply an aggrandised knife, while the Type A blade owes its development to restructuring and elongating the elements of the dagger, a process that took place on Crete in MM II (Fortenberry 1990; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a; Sandars 1961). The dagger of course has a long lineage beginning in the Early Bronze Age. While I have argued that the innovative element of the sword, its specialised function for the execution of violence against humans (Snodgrass 1967: 15-6), is the point of engagement for the people of Mycenae at the time of the Shaft Graves through which they restructured social networks, I suggest that this was just one of the aspects of attraction for the people of Pylos in this period. The careful selection of monumental types that have long pedigrees, the general lack of iconography of explicit violence and the absolute destruction of the Type A swords as part of funerary ritual all suggest that to the people of Pylos in MH III-LH I martial culture are ideographs of achieved, historic potency that nevertheless offer a means of constructing power as part of an overall assertion of the agnatic structure coming to light in this period.

If in the MH III-LH I period the weapons are perceived as ideographs of pre-existing power networks in the process of asserting themselves, then the continued deposition of antique forms of weaponry is part of the developing obsession with lineage that becomes a tangible force through LH II. Voutsaki (1995a: 60-1) characterises this development: “Thus, the emphasis on, indeed the glorification of the ancestors can be seen as an assertion of a separate mainland identity at a period when the mainland societies open themselves to strong Minoan cultural influence.” To a certain extent, the blades are fetishised because they represent a myriad of intertwined ideologies: the assimilation of Minoan and native martial artefacts; the monumentalisation of MH types as part of wider processes of aggrandisement in settlement architecture and cemeteries, and ideographs of practices that construct and validate power and leadership.

None of this is to say that martial culture, though quickly adopted in the region, becomes desiccated in meaning even more swiftly. Rather, by comparing the
two periods in time, I aim to place the complexity of social relations into sharper focus. The variety of martial objects, their individuality in design, form, and function, and the diversity in syntactical arrangement and deposition in the tomb all underscore the fact that martial culture holds many meanings and for that reason has a wide and lasting appeal (cf. Kilian-Dirlmeier 1990). I posit that the speedy adoption of new types is in part due to the fact that they are viewed as indigenous yet more elaborate elements of a pre-existing habitus, and so it is both their recognisability and their novelty that attracts. Yet as the question of the rights of lineage become more contested through LH I-II, the resource of martial culture comes to be in large part defined by the antiquity of their formative powers. Martial culture is not a static family heirloom however; rather their bent forms underscore the fact that they are objects to be used in a violent performance and that their meaning is celebrated through such action (Hamilakis 1998: 122-3). For this reason, the objects must be contextualised in their journey to the grave, the ultimate locus where they are consumed.

The poetics of violence

Violence is a social practice that relies on social proximity for domination to be exerted and oppression sustained (Markus 1993; 2006). It is in space that people interact with one another and relationships are performed, and so it is in space that violence is executed, victims are hurt and third parties bear witness. Because cultural concepts of space are never neutrally defined, the exact physical distance at which agents perceive the threat of violence is socially delineated. Correspondingly, controlling space is an expression of power over both the material and human resources that are found there (Heinz 2006; Maran 2006a; c; Markus 2006; Thaler 2006; Wright 2006b). For this reason then, it is not surprising that in LH II, when archaeologists postulate mounting pressures due to competition for legitimacy, we see contests over the nature of space as coming to the forefront.

Because aggression is interpreted by the Mycenaeans as a dangerous threat, then the rise of heterarchical strategies to command physical space, as part of the process of asserting historical claims to place and competitive consumption practices, is an understandable response to the intrinsic integration that is a significant effect of violence. Affirming agnatic structuration through building monuments in the landscape ties together aspects of historic power, affinity to the local environment, subjugation of violence and resistance to the wider hegemonic practices, while not disavowing aspects of diacritical order at the local level. We should thus see the
practice of violence as part of the arrangement of inter-settlement negotiations, whereas the construction of family tombs, whether tholoi, chamber tombs or tumuli, is part of intra-community dialogues concerned with regional settlement hierarchy, the relations between the landscape, indigenous affinity and legitimacy, and controlling violence. These two forms of legitimacy are likely to be feeding off one another: Pressures from outside the settlement instrumentalise violent trends and the touchstone of bellicose identities within communities, while allowing agnatic structures to become and remain dominant keeps levels of violence low.

Figure 19: Gold foil head of a warrior from Pylos. Photograph taken by the author.

As part of these wider renegotiations of the role of violence, and because the meaning of martial culture is not latent, the ideology of the iconography of combat appears to have been reconditioned through LH II. As a class of martial culture, iconography appears to be significantly less important than it was in the Shaft Graves. Certain taxa, namely the iconographic artefacts such as the metal vessels and funeral stelai, have disappeared completely, while the few iconographic elements from this period display martial objects as opposed to combat per se. The situation is similar across the Mycenaean world. In the western Peloponnese, martial iconography is almost non-existent. A single scene of combat is found on a seal from Gouvalari dating to MH III-LH I (CMS V, no. 643, Figure 7), which may be the most striking of any Mycenaean glyptic representation of violence, for it displays a duel between two swordsmen, in which the fighter who bears two swords has the upper hand. Nevertheless, this is a lone example of the iconography of combat in the early Mycenaean period from this area. There are other early jewellery fixtures, for
example, one in the shape of a figure-of-eight shield (LH I) and the other in the form of a helmeted warrior (MH III-LH I) (Figure 19), each from different graves at Pylos, which are gold foil appliqués for funerary shrouds. Out of the scores of appliqués that have been found in the detritus of early Messenian tombs, it is noteworthy that only a handful depicts martial culture.

Equally striking is the contrast between the high number of boar's tusk helmet remains that have been found in the various tombs compared with the single Messenian depiction of a helmet during this period, which itself is not a boar's tusk type. This example serves to remind us that, even when there is a clear affinity for boar's tusk helmets in the area, headgear is more individual than standardised, perhaps reflecting highly localised and historical preferences. In the Argolid, the few pictorial images we have are also intent on presenting martial culture, especially the boar's tusk helmet, over scenes of violence and combat; the ivory heads of warriors from Mycenae (Figure 20), the boar's tusk helmet on the offering table from the main megaron (Figure 21), and the seal with a depiction of a boar's tusk helmet on it (CMS I, no. 153, Figure 22) are such examples (Shelmerdine 1996: 487-8; Varvarighos 1981: 99-102).

Figure 20: Ivory head from Mycenae (National Archaeological Museum #2468) (Poursat 1977: no. 288).

54 Or that what this figure is wearing should not be in fact identified as a helmet.
Furthermore, the helmet on the megaron table has lost much of the ornate crests and tassels that make the shako an individual piece. Rather, the megaron helmet is a stylised motif, and in this way bears a stronger resemblance to the palatial wall paintings then to the helmets on the Shaft Grave vessels.

Figure 21: LH II image of a boar’s tusk helmet on terracotta offering table (Wace 1921-23c: pl. XXXVII).

Moreover, the scenes that do show the active consumption of martial culture are those of a sacred nature, where martial culture is one class of cultic furniture required in religious practices, for example, arrowheads and a figure-of-eight shield depicted in CMS I, no. 126 (Figure 23) and CMS I, no. 17 (Rehak 1984: 542; 1999). Nevertheless Whittaker (2002: 155) interprets these depictions as a political cooption of the numinous, that is, the qualities of sacred legitimacy (Whitehead 2004a: 10): “The occurrence of religious scenes on gold rings in LH II can then be seen as an innovation which clearly indicates an increased interest of the Mycenaean elite in conspicuously associating status and power with religion.”

To summarise, then, the aspects of violence being consumed in the LH II political sphere are those that are brought into being by the ideographic nature of martial culture. This is a significant change from the Shaft Graves, where the act of witnessing violence involves seeing combat and victimisation, as evidenced by the scenes preserved on metal vessels, niello daggers, grave stelai, and glyptic arts. It may
not be a coincidence that these images appear at the same time that political violence is undergoing a transformation in modes of application, processes of operation and cultural conception. These early depictions are part of the repetition of symbols, through which they elucidate the processes and ideologies of violence. In the subsequent era, however, when the poetics of violence appear to be well understood in terms of effect and are in fact subject to controlled legitimation, it is likely that the prevalence for martial culture, specifically weaponry and armour, become fetishised and polysemic. Their material decoration, the preference for specific taxa, and the display and consumption during funerary and cultic acts, all suggest that martial culture embodied modes of action and culturally understood tropes of meaning. For this reason, the dissolution of the ubiquity of combat iconography after the Shaft Graves may reflect a process of reigning in. I would argue however that such control is only relevant for the process of creating combat iconography, whereas the idea of witnessing violence—now symbolic—remains salient, although reconceptualised through the reaffirmation of armaments and armour as significant forms of ideographic capital.

Figure 22: Drawing of CMS I, no. 153 (Sakellariou 1964: 1, no. 153)

How then might we characterise this network of artefacts, history, performance and ideology, beyond labelling this system a Mycenaean *habitus*? In response, one approach utilised by the social sciences to the understanding of societies that balance independent, often conflicting, heterarchical power structures with tendencies to hierarchically order people and resources is to conceptualise systems of personal honour (e.g. see Albera 2006; Bromberger 2006; Herzfeld 1980; Osiek 2008; Peristiany 1966; Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers 1991; Pitt-Rivers 1966; Schlegel 1990; Schneider 1971; Vandello and Cohen 2004; Wikan 1984; Wyatt-Brown 2007: 3-4). Honour is the esteem with which one is born and it must therefore be maintained
(Sanchez Jankowski 1991: 140). In honour societies the line between personal and communal is drawn very close; every act is subject to scrutiny and interpretation by the self and on the part of others. For this reason, honour is intimately tied to shame, the state of having one’s honour defamed. One’s honour therefore requires protecting and is a serious source of conflict and violence: “Defending one’s honor in this sense has to do with reputation, precedence, and self-preservation” (Vandello and Cohen 2004: 285). Because honour is the interface in which individual and community meet and interact, violence conducted over contests of honour is inherently a dialogue that is subject to public consumption (Vandello and Cohen 2004: 286).

Figure 23: Drawing of CMS I, no. 126 (Sakellariou 1964: 1, no. 126).

Honour can be especially punctured by words, because in honour cultures the spoken word is equatable to human action, which means that dialogue, deeds, thoughts and dreams are all interpreted equally against a highly symbolic code of interaction (Vandello and Cohen 2004: 281-304). The oral tradition and its relation to familial and historical honour have been hypothesised to play a salient part in early Mycenaean culture, especially in Messenia, as the research conducted by Sherratt (1990) and others indicates (Bennet 2004; Ruijgh 1995; Shelmerdine 1996). Sherratt (1990: 809-13) is able to date certain descriptive passages to the early Mycenaean period through an analysis of the *Iliad* by means of deconstructing the “stratigraphy” of the epic. In interpreting the role of orality in the Mycenaean world, Sherratt (1990: 815-6) postulates:

[the Mycenaeans’] active self-definition, through such devices as heroic poetry, ostentatious burial and representational art, is most likely to have greatest importance in periods of social and political fluidity and change when new family or social groups emerge jostling for power and eager to establish their credentials, and when legitimation and self-propaganda of individuals or small
groups become particularly crucial issues. The generation—rather than mere maintenance—of heroic epic plays an important part in this self-definition.

In such a community the presence of an epic tradition, in which the exploits of past heroes are preserved and recounted in order to instruct and preserve, is not surprising (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 140), for honour is centred on historical legitimacy where social roles have a long heritage and social control is maintained through the constant weighing of present action against historical models of interaction, as Vermeule (1979: 49) explains: "The Mycenaean view of the importance of the family is part of the environment for the creation of epic poetry." An honour culture looks to the past for the epitome of praiseworthy behaviour, what Morris (1986: 129) denotes as "legitimation by analogy."

It is thus through the articulation of an oral tradition that honour as a system is maintained, a social order that itself may emerge in eras of change and also embodies extensive conflict, as posited by Sherratt (1990), and much of the wider scholarship on the social sciences (e.g. see Albera 2006; Bromberger 2006; Herzfeld 1980; Osiek 2008; Peristiany 1966; Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers 1991; Pitt-Rivers 1966; Schlegel 1990; Schneider 1971; Vandello and Cohen 2004; Wikan 1984; Wyatt-Brown 2007: 3-4). For this reason, and in reflexive fashion, we may envisage that many of the stories in an oral tradition are themselves focused on situations of dissidence, which thereby form the precedent by which a community determines the resolution of its disputes. Research on the Iliad, a product of oral tradition that describes a range of conflicts on a whole scale of magnitude, has revealed the diverse roles of violence, especially as a force of social integration, in an honour society. A deconstruction of the language of Homer underscores the idea that violence is perceived as part of the natural world order, and that it is how people respond to conflict that measures the touchstone of their worth: "In a seminal study, Arthur Adkins [(1960)] argued that Homer had no words to criticize violence; kakon or aischron, 'bad' or 'disgraceful,' only applied to men who showed weakness" (Morris 2000: 173). Moreover, such conflict also sows elements of cohesion through diacritical inflection or action. Mackie (1996: 137), who analyses the actions that create dishonour, notes that both verbal and physical confrontations are significant means of interaction in honour societies: "...conflict,

55 See once again Arendt's (2004: 241) lucid conceptual definition of legitimacy: "Legitimacy, when challenged, bases itself on an appeal to the past, while justification relates to an end that lies in the future."
verbal and otherwise, among boys and men frequently signifies solidarity. In folklore, as in real life, fighting can initiate friendship" (Mackie 1996: 137; Tannen 1984: 40-4).

The result of orality in generating diacritical social integration is made more evident by the social order of the Trojans and their allies, who do not exhibit competitive speech or blame one another; neither do they have an undifferentiated social hierarchy (Mackie 1996: 137). Threatte (1998: 557) attributes the lack of Trojan competition to the fact "that they are in a sessile community dwelling in a city with a hereditary king, whose son functions essentially as their military leader", an interpretation that underscores the idea that aggressive action and speech are arenas for the emergence of power in LH I-II as theorised by Aegean prehistorians.

By tying together the diverse strands of social interaction, conflict, the past and individual recognition, martial culture—like agents themselves—defines its worth in an honour society. Bennet (2004: 96) notes that in the eighth century words and images do not overlap because they are equivalent to one another (cf. J.K. Papadopoulos 1999: 638; Vlachopoulos 2007), and he argues this practice dates back into the Late Bronze Age. Sherratt (1990: 818) has discussed the fact that there is a preponderance of martial culture, pieces dating specifically from the MH III-LH II period, which form almost the entire corpus of physical evidence from the early Mycenaean period in the *Iliad*. These objects, Achilles' long heavy spear misused by throwing, Odysseus's boar's tusk helmet and Telamonian Ajax's tower shield made of bull's hide, all represent the historical agnatic systems in place that form the backdrop to the Homeric heroes' reputations. Indeed both Achilles' spear and Odysseus's boar's tusk helmet have distinguished pedigrees that are recorded (Hom. II., XIX.387-91, X.260-70). In light of the careful aggregation and deposition of martial culture in the early Mycenaean period, it seems likely that these artefacts have similar oral histories that simultaneously honour particular individuals but also tie communities together through their relation. Likewise, because it is focused on the martial object in place of explicit visual violence, the iconographic evidence too suggests that the symbolic nature of martial culture is only completed by a parallel oral tradition. Bennet's (2004) analysis of the weapons of the Shaft Graves and the characteristics of the Homeric epics stresses how familial lineage and material worth combine together to create cultural value (also Hamilakis 1998: 129); as Morris (2000: 228) explains: "In Homer, nothing adds value to an object so effectively as a distinguished antiquity, allowing its owner...to list those who previously held it, going back ideally to a god." It is thus
evident that the dynamism with which symbolic and physical violence are used as a force of diacritical cohesion in the area of Messenia has meaningful connections with the practice of recounting the tales of noble martial heroes in their quest for kleos.\textsuperscript{56}

**The tomb as a locus of conflict**

Thus far, the networks that embed violence and martial culture into wider power structures have been elucidated for practices and artefacts in an objective, isolated context. Nevertheless, the final performance with the martial culture studied here is in the tomb.\textsuperscript{57} Because martial culture has been considered to be bodily adornment, we are not surprised to find the remains of these artefacts in the grave, buried alongside the deceased. We nevertheless lack a full understanding of why martial culture is part of the mortuary furniture, what these objects are referencing and how it is that they do this. I have argued that martial culture should not be construed as elements of jewellery but rather speak to a more powerful trope. Martial evidence has hitherto been analysed alongside ideographs of the agnatic, namely family tombs, as if they are part of separate but mutually informing practices. To a certain extent, we can conceive of martial culture as ideographs of sustained, historic power and control, as symbols of trajectories that are maintained and guarded, beacons of the pre-established order that date to an earlier age. This is of course what they are; however as has been stressed, the cultural value of artefacts is never fully encompassed by an analysis of their material worth and historical associations. Material culture instrumentalises power through its consumption; as Wolpert (2004: 131, emphasis in the original) argues: “Reckoning time in the right order—that is, from the past toward the present—introduces an element of uncertainty that makes every decision important and contingent.”

For this reason, the performance of social acts that forms the rites of the funeral also constitutes a self-contained artefact or analytical unit of material culture. Like any tangible object, the depositional act has its own chaine opératoire, a singular process of creation and consumption, which informs its cultural value; in other words,

\textsuperscript{56} Vermeule (1979: 99) deconstructs the nature of psychological warfare in Homer, noting that there are only three themes that appear to be viable for degradation: “The man’s physical weakness should be exposed to public laughter; he should be humiliated in front of his fighting comrades, his ancestry must be doubted...and, most of all, the future of his body and the quality of his mind should be pictorialized in a manner certain to distress him.”

\textsuperscript{57} Certainly the archaeological record is a palimpsest of human action, reflecting a diversity of practices including artefact handling and removal during subsequent re-openings of the monument; nevertheless, most of the dataset here probably reflects the intention of permanent deposition.
the depositional act has its own uselife. Although the analysis thus far has broken down the elements of deposition of martial culture to analyse cumulative value, the effect of the deposition is inherently greater than the sum of its parts. This means that the role of violence at the gravesite transcends the material and historical worth of the martial culture and that the arenas of conflict are magnified in intensity as various social powers are encountered during the act of burial. The potency of the martial ideograph is balanced by social action at the gravesite, where the construction of family tombs and the practice of secondary burial is accompanied by the interment of related material culture in pits.

It is evident from the elaboration of funerary ritual that is developing across the Mycenaean world during MH III-LH II that the concept of death exerts a potent and chaotic force on the contemporary social fabric. Nevertheless, if the Mycenae Shaft Graves are centred on the dead, and the surviving community's fulfilment of obligations to them,\textsuperscript{58} then the mortuary evidence from LH I-II is focused on death, and the cultural delineation and acceptance of this phenomenon (Voutsaki 1998: 45). The creation of the funerary deposits in LH II is an expression of control over the supreme mastery of death, the chaos of violence, and the consuming appetite of the past (balancing life and death in the mortuary sphere is also discussed by Hamilakis 1998). Each of three forces are formally honoured and celebrated—but at the same time segregated and subjugated—by social action performed by families and extended kin by means of repetition through time: The broken Type A swords in the Pylos Grave Circle, Peristeria and Routsi, buried together in pits, appear to be part of practices that marginalise the dead and the past to the limits of the human experience. The historic weapons of the western Peloponnese and the beautification of blades in both the Argolid and Messenia function to underscore and incorporate the historical struggle, but their contemporary consumption refocuses attention on the present conflict in which time, death and violence itself all threaten to subsume the fabric of social cohesion.

Controlling death is evident in the highly elaborate practices of preparation for burial, including tomb construction, rites of cleansing and purifying the tomb and preparation of the body before interment (Voutsaki 1998: 44-6). The repeated deposition of weaponry and armour in tombs may reflect that lasting idea, in which

\textsuperscript{58} Indeed, many scholars (most recently Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007), myself included, have described and sought to explain the phenomenon of individuality in the Shaft Graves.
martial culture as a class has the power to summon death, as has already been
mentioned in reference to arrowheads (also Hamilakis 1998: 118). Further elaboration
of action at the gravesite, including eulogies and bodily and material interment, are
practiced acts that bind past, present and future, implying conquest through unity,
which itself sustains the idea of a Mycenaean hegemony. Violence masters death by
feeding it, which in turn expands the potency of death, necessitating its control through
formalisation and marginalisation.

At the same time, while martial culture, orality, artistic representation and
action all share the same symbolic ideologies, the nuances and particular materiality of
each offer areas of differences that can be exploited to form holistic tapestries of
meaning when agents channel power networks in the funerary acts and dominate them
through interment. Each element of power draws on discrete sources that, at the time
of burial, are reconfigured into complex hierarchies, emphasising both unity and
diacritical structuration. Ideologies of materiality, value, and the embodiment of space
and time by material culture are all heterarchical sources of power. Such a system
collapses the concepts of space and time; the act of travelling is actually the process of
going back in time. In Mycenaean communities, moving toward the funerary
monument in the embedded landscape is also a journey that transcends time; in terms
of space, history and culture are one and the same (see also Hamilakis 1998: 118;
Wolpert 2004: 136). Return to the grave for secondary burial at a predictable
moment after initial interment not only allows the recently deceased to complete death
and bodily transformation but is also an act that sutures the strands of time that have
been ruptured and allows the future to continue unfolding. Concepts of time also find
empowerment through the mediation of violence. The burial of objects in pits may be
when the Type A blades are bent, as part of the end of the grieving process and the
ultimate transcendence of the recently deceased uniting with the historical dead. The
use of antique taxa in the western Peloponnese and the adornment of weapons in the
Argolid according to convention limit political violence to traditional methods of
execution; the weight of the past is allowed to curtail the cascade of violence. At the
same time, the development and consumption of new types of blades, the Type C in
the Argolid, northwest and Central Greece, and the Type D, which is in use
throughout the Mycenaean world, perpetuate violence into the present and the future,
balancing the past with the propulsion of time into the contemporary world.
Cultural value of objects is embedded in the networks that bind artefact pedigree, materiality and the use of precious metals to compose the object along with ideas about travel and distance that locate the source of the raw materials and the uselife of the object (Gosden and Marshall 1999; Hoskins 1998). Bennet’s (2004) assertion that the objects entombed in the Shaft Graves have artefact biographies—an argument framed by example passages in the Iliad—is a concept that seems likely to equally describe the artefacts in other early Mycenaean tombs. Bennet suggests that the artefact biographies would have been related as part of funerary orations. Artefact pedigree forms a salient part of object worth; regardless of how ornately martial culture is constructed, the pieces require an oral tradition to sustain their lineage and, therefore, their unique and individual value. This system thus allows heterarchical sources of authority to counterbalance and empower one another. For this reason, the widespread consumption of martial culture in various contexts does not dilute the potency of these artefacts; instead, martial culture obtains highly nuanced ideographic meanings. It is possible that the martial culture in tombs offers both martial legitimacy but also acts as a referent to the numinous (Whitehead 2004a: 10), drawn from the contemporary role of martial culture in cult.  

The regional differences in practices of consumption, although not greatly diverse, are however likely to form localised identities, for such axes of value (cf. Bennet 2004) are directly exclusionary for those who are not familiar with the ideological roots of each article of symbolic capital (see also Wright 2004c: 82). The initial result is that concepts of the self are formed in comparing the Other with cultural norms of experience. That is, the Mycenaears construct personhood on a primary level simply by evaluating cultural perceptions of death, violence and time against those formed by other contemporary social and ethnic groups in the wider Mediterranean (Voutsaki 1995a: 60-1). I have suggested that systems of death, time and violence are potent forces that mutually empower but also subvert. Performing in this trope by manipulating the forms of dialogue through various combinations of social action with material culture consumes and aggrandises political, economic, martial and ideological power (cf. Mann 1986); that is, the acts of deposition are acts that define and fulfil roles of personhood. The stylistic differences between patterns of deposition in the Argolid and Messenia are subsumed by the universal Mycenaean engagement in

---

59 Equally, the association with ancestry, death and time that is bound with martial culture may inform acts of cult.
the system, while the heterarchy of violence, time and death is analogous to heterarchical settlement patterns. Balancing the intensive cohesive elements of familial tombs and integrative social structures are concepts of individual honour and esteemed lineage, a construct that is flexible enough to allow for the mutual reinforcement of self-recognition—whether of the agent or the artefact—and the social values that form the conservative backdrop of the wider community.

Conclusions

This analysis has sought to contextualise the martial culture of the MH III-LH II (early Mycenaean) period in its various loci of consumption in order to characterise the chaîne opératoire of violence. The patterns in the social engagement with violence underscore its importance as a practice, especially in the mortuary sphere. In conclusion, we should interpret the funerary programme of LH I-II as a complex and active trope of domination over various heterarchical powers of the early Mycenaean world, namely death, violence and time. The Mycenaean honour each source of power directly and individually but also through the development of a repertoire of symbolic capital, including martial culture, orality and representational art, each element of which refers to heterarchical forms of authority that overlap and relate to one another. The data from the Argive plain and the western Peloponnese indicate that while the same dialogues of cultural definition and renegotiation of power networks are taking place across the Mycenaean world, each region is using slightly different semantic elements in order to construct a localised discussion. It is significant that the subjugation of violence takes different forms in the various regions of the Mycenaean world; this invariably has an effect on the later LH III trajectories towards site hegemony and ideological constructs of dominance and hierarchy.
Chapter Six: LH IIIA: The Formation of the Palatial Landscape

While a majority of the martial culture is still found in graves, the LH IIIA-IIIB periods typify the settlement as the locus for social action and dialogues of power. Such contexts suggest that even as the practice of depositing martial culture in the mortuary sphere continues to be a Mycenaean tradition, the relationship between martial culture and the dynamics of martial power is undergoing transformation in terms of its meaning and loci of performance. Nevertheless, understanding and characterising the network of associations between violence and power is made more difficult because while the archaeological evidence for LH III is plentiful, our knowledge of the trends towards monumental settlement construction taking place in this period is better understood through the long-term, from LH IIIA to LH IIIB. This is because the social processes that begin in LH IIIA are subject to intensification through LH IIIB, which means that much of the archaeological evidence from LH IIIA, especially the architectural features, are incorporated and/or rebuilt repeatedly throughout LH IIIA-IIIB. Likewise, the continued reuse of tombs throughout LH IIIA-IIIB provides for a relatively imprecise chronology for much of the martial culture.

LH IIIA is associated with a number of developments in the Mycenaean panoply, including body armour, of which the Dendra corselet is the most extraordinary archaeological example, the long Type H spearhead, hypothesised to have developed in conjunction with body armour (Fortenberry 1990: 202-3; Höckmann 1980a: 298-300; 1980b: 58-61; Snodgrass 1964: 106; Taracha 2007: 144), and Types E, F and G swords (Fortenberry 1990: 154, 156-7; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993a). The taxa of martial iconography also expand in various directions. There are primarily the illustrious wall paintings; some of the earliest extant scenes that include martial culture are from the citadel at Thebes and the Prehistoric Cemetery at Mycenae (Immerwahr 1990: 139-40, 201; Mayer 1990). Alongside, there is the rise of the coroplastic arts, encompassing terracotta figurines (Demakopoulou and Divari-Valakou 2001; French 1971; 1981; 2003; Konsolaki-Yannopoulou 1999; Shelton 2009; Tzonou-Herbst 2002), pictorial pottery (Table 16) (Åkerström 1987; Crouwel 1988; 1991; Crouwel and Morris 1996; Demakopoulou 2006; French 2006; Immerwahr 1993; Morris 2006; Sakellarakis 1992; Steel 1999; Vermeule 1986; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982), and painted larnakes (French 1961; Immerwahr 1995; Marinatos 1997; Phialon and Farrugio 2005; Vermeule 1965; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982).
The figurines are the most widespread of the iconographic elements, both in terms of sites found and the contexts of consumption, whereas LH IIIA pictorial pottery is found at a few sites but is generally limited to the Argolid, namely Mycenae and Berbati. There is a single larnax depicting martial culture in LH IIIA (Figure 24); moreover, it is from Mycenae, for it is only in LH IIIB that we have the Tanagra larnakes. Across the Mycenaean world, there is a significant intensification in the deposition of spearheads in tombs beginning in LH IIIA; they frequently occur in numbers between two and four. In contrast, the appearance of other weapons, including daggers, swords and arrowheads, is noticeably decreased. In general, the slackening volume of weaponry is paralleled by the downward trend in other non-martial funerary items, which has been interpreted as the result of the absorption of resources in the construction of settlements (Voutsaki 1995a; 1998; 2001a).

Figure 24: LH IIIA: 2 larnax from Mycenae featuring a chariot (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: VIII.5.1).

The tholos tomb has been interpreted as a mark of permanence on the landscape (Bennet 1999a: 13-5; 2007c: 126-7; although cf. Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 42-3; Davis 2007: 67; Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 229-30; although cf. Voutsaki 1995a: 62; 2001a: 199-207, who qualifies this argument by construing them as places of contested power), but surely the tholos and chamber tomb can only be attributed as permanently housing the dead in the landscape, meaning that living populations have little claim to these spaces except to expect to inhabit the ancestral monument at death (see Boyd 2002 for the relation of meaning and social action in the mortuary sphere). Through the construction of permanent settlements through LH IIIA, it is evident that
Mycenaean sentiments concerning self-definition drawn from specific historic lineage and affiliation with the dead are giving way to redefining relationships with the landscape. It may be argued that concepts of time are not as tightly managed as they are through LH II; rather, it is the construction of scales of proximal distance that become of utmost concern during this period.

The aim of this chapter then is to offer an account of how violence, both symbolic and physical, impacts the characteristic settlement patterns that define the various regions of the Mycenaean homeland. Specific questions include: Why does the political geography of the Mycenaean world look the way it does? How can localised trajectories towards domination be characterised? What is the role of the wanax in terms of political leadership? The approach to answering these questions is centred on outlining the changing perceptions toward, ideologies of and methods for violence, which, as during all Mycenaean periods, impact greatly on the formation of community self-definition. Moreover it is this concentration on delineating the various means by which palatialisation comes to define what is Mycenaean in terms of historical precedent, that is, viewing palatialisation as a process of constructing legitimacy, that is a fundamental difference between the approach taken here (see also Palaima 2007) and those made by others such as Kopcke (2004), Sherratt (2001) and Deger-Jalkotzy (1996). In their search for answers, in contrast, these scholars measure the Mycenaean sites against the contemporary settlements in the Near East, the stability of the institution of the palaces against their abandonment at the end of LH IIIB, and the social acceptance of the heritage of the Bronze Age by Iron Age Greeks.

This chapter analyses the western and south-western Peloponnese first, because this area provides the fewest articles of martial culture and projects the most regionalised trends towards hegemony. In contrast, the Argolid and the Korinthia, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece have produced similar finds and have correspondingly analogous paths towards palatialisation. To summarise the conclusions of this chapter: The threat of violence that epitomises moments in time in LH II, namely death, has shifted to areas of space, creating a political geography in which violence is embedded. The resulting ideological and material impact is testament to the fact that the palaces are loci for acts of power aimed at maintaining legitimacy as part of the regular encounter with a threatening landscape.
Figure 25: LH IIIA:2 jug from Melathria featuring a helmeted figure, possibly armed (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: VIII.6).

Western and south-western Peloponnese (summarised in Table 13)

Similar to the early Mycenaean period, there are only a few iconographic pieces from this region, namely two pictorial pots, two terracotta figurines and an early fresco from Pylos. The pottery pieces (Table 16), a jug from Melathria (VIII.6, Figure 25)\(^{60}\) from LH IIIA:2 (Crouwel and Morris 1996: 210) and kylix fragment from Nichoria (VIII.34, Figure 26), portray a helmeted figure and frieze of helmets respectively (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 79). It is during this period that we begin to see a complete transition from the physical deposition of boar’s tusk and helmets in graves to their frequent appearance in the iconography. Boar’s tusks do not completely disappear at this time, but their appearance in graves is significantly decreased, and even those stockpiles, such as the 88 tusks from Tholos IV at Pylos and the 80 tusks from Menidi from LH IIIB, are almost wholly unworked and therefore do

\(^{60}\) Numeration of pictorial pottery (Roman numerals) as assigned by Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982).
not compose helmets. The iconography of the helmet in this period is different from its appearance in the Shaft Grave imagery, such as on the Battle Krater (Figure 14), as the intent on depicting singular helmets that epitomises the Shaft Grave art is no longer common practice. Rather, the contemporary images are stock depictions, with none of the elaborate crests, nape covers or earflaps of earlier, and with only minor variances in details from image to image. It appears that by the end of LH IIIA, the Mycenaeans themselves consider the boar’s tusk helmet to be a succinct typological class, defining an objective taxon of headgear. The kylix fragment from Nichoria (Figure 26) is a good illustration of this phenomenon; the helmets that circumnavigate the vessel are identical and serve as an ideograph of concepts rather than a display of action (see also Blakolmer 2008, who sees the lack of individuality on a wider iconographic scale).

Table 13: Summary of martial remains from the western Peloponnese in LH IIIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Bow’s tusk</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>Spear</th>
<th>Shielamesser</th>
<th>Digger</th>
<th>Unk.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myrsinochori (Routsi), Tholos 2</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraka (Olympia), CT 1</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, CT 6-8</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Stephanos, Unknown</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Melathria, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nichoria, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykeia, CT</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nichoria, UMME Tholos</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volimidhia, CT 6</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, dump in SW of palace</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, Tholos IV</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylos, NE Building, Corridor 75</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koukounara, Gouvalari tomb 8</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spear key: 
①=(quantity of) incised spear

Sword key: 
①=(quantity of) jewelled sword
①=(quantity of) sword with over-sharpened edges
Approximately contemporary to the martial depictions in pottery (LH IIIA-IIIB) is the fragmented wall painting (Py no. 4)\(^{61}\) at Pylos that was found in a dump to the southwest of the palace. Immerwahr (1990: 113, 196) interprets this depiction as an earlier battle scene like the well-known fresco in Hall 64 (see Py no. 10). This identification is drawn from the fact that the figures are wearing boar’s tusk helmets; such articles may have helped the viewer to interpret the scene as unfolding in the historic past (Bennet and Davis 1999; Harrell forthcoming). The rise in the pictorial depiction of boar’s tusk helmets, especially in the western Peloponnese, co-occurs alongside the portrayal of another historic piece of armour, the figure-of-eight shield, which also features in repetitive friezes such as the contemporary wall shield frieze from tomb Z-97, 21.7.53 in the Prehistoric Cemetery at Mycenae (Figure 30) and also at the palaces at Tiryns and Thebes (Mayer 1990; Morris 1990: 154-5).

\[\text{Figure 26: LH IIIA:2 kylix fragment from Nichoria featuring a frieze of boar's tusk helmets (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: VIII.34).}\]

Like the wider Mycenaean world, the sheer quantity of martial culture from graves in the western Peloponnese exhibits a downward trend from the early Mycenaean period. Nevertheless, the decreased appearance of martial culture in this area is particularly dramatic, both in terms of earlier consumptive practices and also compared with other Mycenaean sites. The extant funerary remains from this region may represent the vestigial depositions reflecting lasting preferences for (ornamental) blades, boar’s tusks and arrowheads. The University of Minnesota Messenia Expedition (UMME) tholos at Nichoria contained a remarkable archaising deposit (Figures 17, 27); pit 3 held two daggers and a sword adorned with gold-covered rivets, a pommel of lapis lacedaemonius and incised spirals running down midrib, bent at a 90° angle. This blade is of an unclassifiable type; it is a hybrid, with characteristics

\(^{61}\) Numeration of wall paintings as assigned by Immerwahr (1990).
of both Type A and Type B blades, as well as featuring incised spirals running along the midrib, which is distinctive of the contemporary Types C and D swords on Crete (McDonald and Wilkie 1978: 262-3). Furthermore, this sword is not the sole example of embellished weaponry; the spearhead from Tholos 2 at Myrsinochori (Routsi) bears an incised garland and parallel lines that adorn the socket and shoulders. In contrast to the early Mycenaean period, the general funerary scatter of arrowheads and/or boar’s tusks has nearly disappeared, although Tholos IV at Pylos preserves 88 boar’s tusks—an extraordinary quantity for any period in Mycenaean history. Stray arrowheads and boar’s tusks have been found in settlement areas at Malthi and Pylos where they may represent areas of production (cf. Snyder and Andrikou 2001) or perhaps feasting display (Wright 2004a: 153).

Figure 27: Nichoria UMME tholos pit 3 deposition with bent sword visible (McDonald and Wilkie 1978: pl. 5-29).

Weaponry continues to be a salient deposit in the grave. The Type E blade from chamber tomb 1 at Miraka has worn edges due to extensive sharpening (Papathanasopoulos 1970: 193, pl. 173 beta), while the two Pylian graves with significant depositions, chamber tomb E-6 and Tholos IV, both contained blades in conjunction with a spearhead in E-6, and a mass of boar’s tusks in the tholos. These depositions echo the earlier, richer deposits in tholoi at Pylos and elsewhere. The Schlachtmesser in Gouvalari tomb 8 is a surprising find; although the tomb dates to late LH II-III and all the material culture is from LH III (Boyd 2002: 111), the appearance of
a single edged sword in so late a context is unexpected. It is possible that this blade actually dates to an earlier period and has been rededicated in a LH III context as part of historical traditions of having antique weapons as mortuary furniture. To summarise then, even in light of the state of decay that typifies the remains of funerary deposits of martial culture in LH IIIA, the evidence from the western Peloponnese continues to draw on historic programmes of funerary depositions. Moreover, this area maintains such traditions in light of the changing contemporary customs in the Argolid, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece.

The relative lack of martial culture as mortuary furniture is somewhat mediated by the fact that a number of historic tombs in this region are going out of use in LH IIIA (Boyd 2002: 220, tables 11-5). This is because the political geography of Messenia is in fact being rewritten throughout LH IIIA and into LH IIIB (Bennet 1999a). Bennet (1995: 596-601, pl. LXXI) has put forth a model of systematic hegemonic domination on the part of Pylos during LH IIIA-IIIB, which encompasses a tripartite hierarchy of a slim number of sites (n=19) at the top tier, including Pylos itself, a middle echelon of smaller sites identified by UMME as under two hectares or smaller in size, and at bottom, those sites too small to be detected by surface survey (1995: 595-6). Bennet traces this hierarchy through time, noting that from the late MH onwards, Ano Englianos has always been a site where material wealth is consumed in considerable volume. The decline in the use of tholoi at sites around Ano Englianos during LH IIIA, combined with the construction of the palace settlement, are interpreted as indicative of the correlated rise in the exertion of power at Pylos, which in effect hampers and, in some cases, ends local patterns of consumption. The most lucid example of this type of hegemony is evidenced by the site of Nichoria, where a megaron structure is built during LH IIIA:1 but goes out of use during LH IIIA:2, while at the same time a new tholos at nearby Veves is constructed (Bennet 1995: 598). More dramatic is the fate of Peristeria, an entire site which goes into general disuse during LH IIIA-IIIB, even though a new settlement, Mouriatada: Elliniko, is settled during the LH IIIB period. Hope Simpson and Dickinson (1979: 167-8) suppose and Bennet (1995: 599; also 2001: 33) reaffirms that "Peristeria may have been eliminated and superseded by Mouriatada within the LH IIIB period" at the intercession of Pylos. Moreover the ascendancy of Pylos continues on its trajectory through LH IIIA and into LH IIIB; Bennet (1995: 599) dates the accession over the entire hither province to LH IIIA, but notes that it is unclear whether control over the further province came during
Regardless of the complexities of chronology resulting from the problem of obtaining specific dates from multi-generational tombs and the less available settlement data, the growing hegemony of Pylos in LH IIIA can be monitored through the dataset obtained from the various surveys and excavations in the area. Bennet (1995: 594) notes that approximately 240 place names are recorded on the Linear B tablets, and we may conjecture that this figure or higher represents that number of settlements in LH IIIA, especially if sites have been consolidated by the end of LH IIIB. The inconsistent paths of site development in terms of long-term, multi-generational tomb and monumental settlement construction, at times leading to extreme depopulation or abandonment, suggest that, throughout LH IIIA and into LH IIIB, physical displacement is not atypical. That this must have been life changing in terms of redefining personal and community identity is suggested by the overwhelming importance of native affinity and genealogy in constructing personhood that is of direct importance throughout the Mycenaean period. Leaving settlements and closing tholoi forever must have carried a significant weight in factors pertaining to livelihood and the perception of the self. Moreover, these displacements have material effects, for example, by redefining the physical boundaries of settlements; when the number of people settling around Ano Englianos increases dramatically in LH IIIA, the enceinte wall of the Ano Englianos, built in LH I, is not rebuilt but rather goes out of use (Bennet 1999a: 13).

Bennet (1995: 595-6; 2007b: 189; also Shelmerdine 2008c: 148) claims that this three-tier hierarchy is so simple in form because, unlike Crete, which has over half a millennium to develop a more complex model, the political geography of the Messenia only comes together over two swift centuries. Nevertheless, I would argue that the opposite might be more apt. Crete has additional layers of density, but these successions are likely to be crisply and highly defined, regimented and mutually exclusive, for what is more orderly is in fact more unambiguous and more tightly controlled. In contrast, the Linear B tablets present a picture of Messenia in a state of loose configuration (Bennet 2001: 32; Shelmerdine 2008c: 135), biased towards those settlements in which Pylos extends the most interest. Settlements can be assigned to a certain tier, but they remain more individual than similar, and more autonomous than organised. The three-tiered hierarchy postulated by Bennet is probably more likely to reflect a large percentage of heterarchical settlements, over whom the Palace of Nestor
has not established utter control;\textsuperscript{62} rather their relations can be characterised as mutually supporting, if not free of diacritical structuration. The fact that the palace conducts business with sites on a much more individual level when compared with Crete underlines the flexibility of this arrangement.

Throughout the Mycenaean period, the patterns of consumption of violence and martial culture are utilised to support historic forms of legitimacy, namely, the traditions of lineage, in the western Peloponnese. Nevertheless, in LH IIIA there is a visible lack of weaponry, even those objects made in materials other than bronze, and not just at the territories encompassed by Pylos but also at the Ano Englianos site as well. For this reason, the noticeable lack of martial culture across the region in this period, together with the overall displacement of human populations, the abandonment of funerary monuments and settlements, and the disuse of the citadel walls at Ano Englianos all suggest that the path towards Pylian hegemony is not waged by typical acts of egregious violence. Human displacement, especially the transference of those communities who are so bound to historical tradition, lineage, and group identity, may have been inherently more efficacious at shattering pre-existing bonds of power in order to establish new ones. The preferred method of local dominance by the Ano Englianos site is through economic control, in order to command human capital and labour. Nevertheless, the power of Pylos is neither complete nor total, as the Linear B tablets affirm, and relies as much on establishing the limits of palatial control as on expanding Pylian domination, as characterised by Shelmerdine (2008c: 145): “It [i]s plainly an unequal, if reciprocal relationship.” The process of creating hegemonic control is less typified as a blunt seizure of legitimacy, but is rather a process of building discrimination out of cohesiveness by rerouting networks of interaction through varying degrees of force.

\textit{Northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece (summarised in Table 14)}

In contrast to the negligible amount of martial material found in this area dating from the early Mycenaean period, or indeed compared with the contemporary situation in the Peloponnese, the regions of northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece have a plethora of martial culture from secure contexts in LH IIIA. The Type E blade is most common in this region; it features an improved hafting system, with the pommel cast together with the tang and blade (Fortenberry 1990: 154; Sandars 1963:

\textsuperscript{62} And indeed, perhaps does not want to and/or cannot do so.
Many of the blades of the more antique Types C and D preserve traditional decorative techniques with gold foil on the rivets, whereas Types E and F are left unadorned. Outside of Athens, where there is a curious pattern of swords and spears as mutually exclusive objects when part of the mortuary furniture, spearheads and swords are often found together in the same graves. Moreover, although this region preserves the highest number of blades, it is the propensity for spearheads that is remarkable. Quantities in graves range between one and two, but spearheads are also found in settlement contexts and even in hoards.

Due to the great decrease in the consumption of swords and the reciprocal increase in spears, it has been postulated that in LH IIIA methods of violence have changed (Fortenberry 1990: 58; Snodgrass 1964: 106; Taracha 2007: 144). This alteration in preference has been attributed to the development of heavy bronze plate armour, perhaps a proximal assimilation of the monumental shields from earlier days, which would effectively block the impact of the relatively delicate rapiers of the early Mycenaean period. For this reason, a new spearhead takes the place of the sword; this is the Höckmann Type H spearhead (see also Avila 1983: Type VIII; Höckmann 1980a; b; 1987). It is described as "bayonet" in type, a term that suggests that this spearhead is more like a dagger mounted on the end of a shaft. The Höckmann Type H spearhead is notable for its length, with one example from Agora chamber tomb XL (Tomb of the Coffins) measuring over a half metre. Nevertheless, although the Höckmann Type H spearhead has been suggested to be the weapon of choice to foil the bronze armour that appears in this period (Höckmann 1980a: 298-300; 1980b: 58-61), the fact that there is a notable lack of spearheads in the cuirass tomb at Dendra, or indeed, in any other context where armour has been found, suggests otherwise (Taracha 2007: 144; Wardle 1988: 476). 63

The excavations at Thebes, although historically haphazard, provide us with data from both settlement and funerary contexts. Theban graves have not furnished the quantities of material as elsewhere; nevertheless they have supplied evidence for the consumption of boar's tusks and a sword (Ismene chamber tomb 5). The archaeology from the settlement areas has uncovered an early wall painting; indeed the fragment depicting a figure-of-eight shield (Th no. 5) has attracted a great deal of attention because this wall painting mirrors the figure-of-eight shield frieze from

63 All of the cuirass fragments found in Mycenae chamber tombs 15 and 69, and at the MH cist grave at Thebes, were found alone and without any other pieces of martial culture.
Knossos in size and shape (KN no. 33, LM II) (Immerwahr 1990: 139-40, 201). Other iconography is limited to terracotta figurines, which are consumed in mortuary and probably settlement contexts as well. Armour, similar to the Dendra cuirass, has also been found at Thebes, although how many corselets are represented by the pieces in the “Arsenal” is unclear. The fact that armour is found in settlement areas at Thebes (cf. the LH IIIB:1 corselet from the Municipal Conference Centre plot, Andrikou 2007) as opposed to the tomb as at Dendra may indicate divergent practices concerning trajectories of consumption of these items.

Table 14: Summary of martial remains from northwest Greece, Macedonia, Central Greece and Ionian Islands in LH IIIA.
The Argolid and the Korinthia (summarised in Table 15)

Mycenae continues to dominate in terms of the number of objects and scale of depositions, although the quantity of weapons has decreased significantly and it is at this time that iconographic objects come to the fore. It may be that the bronze weaponry suffers extraction at a later date, although the frequency of arrowheads and boar’s tusks has also dropped dramatically, and as such objects are more frequently overlooked during periods of removal, this decrease is perhaps indicative of real changes in the composition of the mortuary furniture.
While deficient in spearheads, the most salient depositions of martial culture in this period are the remarkable finds from the cuirass tomb (chamber tomb 12) at Dendra (Figure 28), which consists of a bronze cuirass, the remains of a boar's tusk helmet, fragments of a dagger and two swords, a Type C and D, with gold leaf adorning their shoulder flanges and rivets (Åström 1977). Although the Dendra panoply is suggested to be a synchronic development with the long Höckmann Type H spearheads, also new in this era, experimental archaeology and the formation of this deposition itself both indicate otherwise (Taracha 2007: 144; Wardle 1988: 476). That the armour and the spear represent bisecting forms of violence is suggested by the fact the mechanics of the shoulder plates, which restrict the vertical movement of the arm. Rather, Wardle's (1988: 476) research suggests that the cuirass is made for sword fighting, a martial activity that relies on the motions of the elbow as well as the shoulder for effective parrying and riposte.

![Figure 28: The excavation of the Dendra cuirass (Åström 1977: pl. IV2).](image)

Although to modern eyes the Dendra panoply effectively isolates the individual within the bronze, the wearer is no more self-contained than the swordsman of the early Mycenaean period. Indeed, that a swordsman wearing cuirass must be in the company of others is affirmed by experimentation, which has demonstrated that one must be suited into the armour, with the shoulder and back plates wired together by
someone else (Wardle 1988: 474). Moreover, other arrangements must be made for the swords.

Figure 29: LH IIIA.1 spearheads from Dendra (Avila 1983: figs. 37-40, taf. 6).

Chamber tomb 12 furnished the remains of the dagger’s scabbard, which serves as a reminder that all blades are sheathed; nevertheless, the body of the cuirass leaves little room for the attachment of such articles. Moreover, the flexibility of the armour, most limited in the shoulders due to the constricting shape of the shoulder plates (Wardle 1988: 473), does not facilitate movement of the arm across the body to draw
a sword from its scabbard, for, even if scabbards can in fact be suspended from the cuirass, blades need to rest at the side, as at any other place they will interrupt walking. Therefore a swordsman wearing the panoply needs assistance at various stages throughout the act of violence: in preparation, by helping the swordsman to don the armour and also by handing the individual the required sword; at any point during the violence, should the swordsman fall or stumble; and at its conclusion, to undress the swordsman and sheathe the blade.

Figure 30: Figure-of-eight shield fresco from tomb Z.97, 21.7.53 of the Prehistoric Cemetery (Mayer 1990: fig. 5).

Höckmann Type H spearheads are found at Dendra (Figure 29); however they are not part of the depositions in cuirass tomb. Rather, they were deposited in pit 1 in the Dendra tholos. These are long examples, ranging from 0.40-0.57 m in preserved length, and are similar in design but feature incised decoration to allow each piece to be singled out, much like the blades from the earlier deposition. The Dendra blade from chamber tomb 7 preserves an intriguing artefact biography: the handle cracked in antiquity but has subsequently been repaired with figure-of-eight shaped staples that are riveted into the blade (Papadopoulos 1998: 22, no. 96). The graves at
Prosymna contain numerous swords (no. = 6); one Type E blade from chamber tomb XLII has incised decoration and the Type C blade from chamber tomb XXXVII bearing gold and ivory on its hilt.

**Figure 31:** LH IIIA-IIIB figure-of-eight shield fresco from the Older Palace at Tiryns (Rodenwaldt 1912: taf. V).

There are fewer swords from Mycenae than at nearby sites during this era and all of these examples come from singular contexts. There is a sole example from a mortuary deposition (chamber tomb 92), in which the remains of a boar’s tusk helmet was also found, and another example was found together with numerous female figurines above Shaft Grave III in Grave Circle A, perhaps composing an early cultic dedication to this monument (Cavanagh 2001: 130; Fortenberry 1991: no. 324; Sandars 1963: 149; Schliemann 1876: 190-1, fig. 238; Wace 1921-23b: 104). The other graves from this era are populated with spearheads, often more than one, and in one case (chamber tomb 82), with two daggers. Mycenae also preserves a frequency of graves with depositions of arrowheads, often found together as if in quivers. The ideographic role of the figure-of-eight shield is underscored by its depiction on seals found in chamber tombs 58 and 68, and by the shield frieze found in tomb Z-97, 21.7.53 of the Prehistoric Cemetery (Figure 30) (Mayer 1990).
A second shield frieze is preserved from the Argolid at Tiryns (Ti no. 10, Figure 31); this depiction is from the Older Palace. Immerwahr (1990: 139) describes the shields as “emblematic”, noting that they are small (approximately 30 cm), placed close together, and overlaying an ornate multicoloured background of spirals, waves and lines. A second earlier fresco,64 the first Tiryns boar hunt scene (Ti no. 2), depicts hunters with spears, horses and charioteers (Immerwahr 1990: 129, 202). The “Groom Fresco” (My no. 10, Figure 32), depicting grooms attending to horses, and fragments of small female charioteers both come from the area of the West Portal at Mycenae (Immerwahr 1990: 123-4, 192, 194). Immerwahr (1990: 124) posits that the arrangement of the figures on the Groom Fresco, and their portrayal against a rocky landscape, share many of the same pictorial elements found on early chariot kraters.

Figure 32: Mycenae “Groom Fresco” (Wace 1921-23c: pl. XXVII).

It is notable that the iconographic objects are from a range of contexts, predominantly settlement areas. Both Prosymna and Mycenae preserve numbers of chariot figurines, where they generally come from settlement contexts. Chariots are a popular theme in pictorial pottery as well (Table 16). The earliest chariot krater is likely to be a fragment from Aegina dating to LH IIIA:1 (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 75), but it is in LH IIIA:2 that the rise of the theme of chariots on pictorial pottery in the Argolid gains prominence. The evidence for this date is due in large part to the remains from the “Potter’s Quarter” at Berbati. Fragments from this period

---

64 Although how much earlier is unknown; see Immerwahr (1990: 139).
(VIII.1-VIII.5, Pls. 1:1, 2:1, 2:2, 2:3, 3:1, 3:2, 3:3a-b, 4:5, 5:1, 5:2, 5:3, 5:5, 6:1, 7:1, 7:3, 7:4, 9:3, 9:4, 10:1, 10:3, 11:1a-b, 13:2, 13:3, 14:1, 14:3, 14:4, 15:2, 15:3), from Berbati, Nauplion and Mycenae, preserve various elements including the driver, the passenger, the head of the horse, the chariot wheel, and the reins. A fragment of larnax from Mycenae (VIII.5.1), also dating to this period, preserves the depiction of a chariot as well, which Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982: 79) connect with the iconography of death.

Table 15: Summary of martial remains from the Argolid and the Korinthia in LH IIIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dendra, CT 12</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td>&gt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dendra, Tholos tomb</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tholos tomb</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard?</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard or rooms D-F</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E side terrace wall</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE baulk</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room C</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room E</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room C and E</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test pit II</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bothros, Treasury of</td>
<td>LH IIIA:1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atreus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of the Oil</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of Ptasas House</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyclopean Terrace</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidauros, CT 1</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae, Unknown</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2 (?)</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nauplion, CT E</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 Numeration of pictorial pottery (Pl. numbers) as assigned by Åkerström (1987).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Seal/Fresco</th>
<th>Terracotta Iconography</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Boar’s tusk</th>
<th>Body armour</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT XLII</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT XLIII</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT XXXVII</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT XXV</td>
<td>LH IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2-IIIIB:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Portal</td>
<td>LH IIIA (?)-IIIIB:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside citadel</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2-IIIIB:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, area east of storage room L</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2-IIIIB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion, CT ST</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns, Inner Forecourt</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns, Inner and Outer Forecourts</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendra, CT 7</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT XII</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 15</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 69</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 47</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 58</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 68</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 92</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 77</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 82</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Cemetery, unit Z-87, 21.7.53</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoard</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Shaft Grave II</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2-IIIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth, Unknown</td>
<td>LH IIIA-IIIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendra, CT 2 (Cenotaph)</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine, Unterburg</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, CT XIV</td>
<td>LH III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creating Mycenaean hegemonies through the threatening landscape

During LH IIIA, and at various cemetery sites around the mainland, including at Nichoria, Prosymna and Dendra, the vestigial expressions of the tradition of depositing martial culture in the tomb appear as part of cyclical power relations in terms of death, time and history. Yet the evidence for settlement data makes it clear that the force of social interaction is centred on renegotiating concepts of the landscape. Whereas in the early Mycenaean period the threat of violence is located during death and the rites of transcendence, in LH IIIA that threat is manifest in daily life in the Mycenaean encounters with place. For this reason, the arenas of conflict are no longer found in the tomb, but are rather located in the equally liminal spaces between settlements. 

Correspondingly, the concept of chaos from the threat of violence is not found at a specific moment in time, in contrast with death, but is rather located at points on the horizon (Hamilakis 2003: 239; Wolpert 2004: 136). For this reason, the Mycenaeans are not as concerned with the continual reckoning of the past, but instead are encountering the power of place. This may be why the chariot, and perhaps equally the horse, becomes a popular ideograph in this period. The idea of movement and journey, the method of encountering the landscape and measuring degrees of proximity, now finds representation in forms of locomotion.

---

66 As Laffineur (1992: 111) posits: "these changes [developing from LH IIIA:2 through LH IIIB] related to a changing conception of territory, now no longer confined to the resource area necessary for the subsistence of the corporate group at Mycenae, but extended beyond it to include a political boundary determined in relation to other centers of power in the region."
Mycenaean chariots have been thoroughly deconstructed in terms of their architectural and structural elements (Åkerström 1978; Burns 1993; Conter 2003; Littauer 1972; 2002b; Littauer and Crouwel 1983; 2002), with the result that they have been continually evaluated to be inappropriate for much of the rough Greek landscape (Hope Simpson 1998: 241; 2002: 126; Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006: 173; Jansen 2002: 103-5, no. 8). Yet the quantities of iconographic representations of chariots defy the assessments made by modern engineering models. Chariots are so popular on pictorial pottery that they compose their own genre (Immerwahr 1993: 220; Morris 2006); such scenes often fill the shoulders of kraters, a serving vessel, underscoring the idea that these images are intended to be a focal point during communal consumption (Steel 1999). Similarly chariot, horse and horse-and-rider figures are prolific amongst the types of terracotta figurines (Figure 33) (French 1981; 2003; Tzonou-Herbst 2002) and chariots appear on wall paintings in scenes of human processions at Thebes and preparations of the hunt. Within the settlement, chariot figurines and pictorial pottery with chariot scenes reaffirm a sense of place, while in tombs and other liminal spaces they echo the journey home, enfolding earlier MH-LH I traditions of full scale horse burials, as at Dendra and Marathon (Kosmetatou 1993; Payne 1990; Reese 1995), into new ideologies concerning one's place in the landscape (Vermeule 1979: 59-62). The journey continues within the monument in the form of a procession (Cavanagh 2001: 131). Such itineraries are facilitated by the development of the Mycenaean road system, which has been in part determined to serve as a means

Figure 33: LH IIIB terracotta figurine of horse and rider from Ayios Konstantinos (Konsolaki-Yannopoulou 1999: pl. XClV-a-b).

It may be no coincidence that in this period when displacement outside of the home place and journeys into liminal areas, the spaces between settlements, are perceived as encountering the threat of violence and chaos, the spear becomes the preferred weapon as it is the trademark armament of the hunt (Morris 1990: 150-1), an act that is an interpretation of the landscape (Hamilakis 2003: 239, 244). The spear is a weapon of distance, but it is not a passive armament; rather it governs space by actively positioning the enemy away from the spear bearer. Likewise, the debate over the technology of the weapon (Avila 1983; Fortenberry 1990: 197; Höckmann 1980a; b; 1987; Snodgrass 1964: 116; 1998), whether spears are thrown in the Mycenaean period as they are in the Homeric epics, simply focuses perspective on the idea that the spear is associated with space and distance (Fortenberry 1990: 191). This is a salient distinction over the violence of the sword, for which the proximity required is appreciated and valued in the early Mycenaean period. If the sword draws the enemy in, inviting them to engage in violence by creating a locus in which aggression is allowed to take place, the spear keeps them back, using the kinetics of body language to define a physical edge in the landscape. It is when these boundaries between enemy and spear bearer collide that violence erupts.

Just as earlier, when the diverse taxa of swords hold ideographic differences, we should associate localised development and consumption of variations on wider spearhead types, for many of the spearheads consumed in LH IIIA are of regional taxa (Fortenberry 1990: 203-4), as underscoring the ideology of the spear as symbolic of place and practice. It is notable that in contrast to the early Mycenaean period, it is not the boar’s tusks, those trophies of conquest, that hold the ultimate ideographic value, for although there are a few examples from the cuirass tomb at Dendra, Mycenae and Pylos Tholos IV, the use of boar’s tusk helmets and the general consumption of boar’s tusks are decreasing. Concurrently, boar’s tusk helmets are being depicted in the iconographic record, but as a stock image rather than with any intent to preserve the individuality of each piece that is the case in earlier images.

Rather, in LH IIIA the spear embodies the contemporary zeitgeist of affirming life that comes from continuous acts of reproduction (Hamilakis 2003: 242). The rise in consumption of spears during this period has been noted before, but the general interpretation of this change is centred on a loss of meaning for the weapon, for it is
used in diverse contexts (Fortenberry 1990: 199-200). Instead of presuming that the application of the spear in hunting dilutes its meaning as an ideograph; rather we should consider the implications that one role fosters the other. We should neither suppose that the rise in the deposition of spears is indicative of a surge in populist martiality, for such a construct bisects Mycenaean society and ignores the way that hunting incorporates scales of hierarchy and dependency.

Scholarly research (most especially Hamilakis 2003; Morris 1990) on the symbolic aspects of the hunt outlines the many parallels between the act of the hunt and martial violence, and in this context the relationship between hunting and control over land is especially relevant (Hamilakis 2003: 244; Morris 1990: 150; Wright 2004c: 74-5, fig. 4.2). Hunting allows individuals to move into and through these liminal areas, but in conjunction with leadership roles, it is also an act that takes responsibility for the safety of the people, domesticated animals and food harvest which the land supports by purging the area of predators (Hamilakis 2003: 239). The related leadership ideal of providing for the community is sustained through sharing the meat of the kill at feasts (Fox and Harrell 2008; Wright 2004d: 71-6), and like all exercises in power, hunting has a component of diacritical integration in which one's social status can be renegotiated (Hamilakis 2003: 239-40; Morris 1990: 151-2; also Ortega y Gasset 1972). Moreover, the context of consumption of spears suggests that their ideological significance is not less than swords, suggested by the association of both swords and spears in areas of cult, at the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros for example (Lambrinudakis 1981), and in ritual scenes portrayed in the glyptic arts (Cultraro 2004: 126). These iconographic scenes also intertwine the act of sacrifice and communal dining, both of which are part of complex ideologies encompassing diacritical interaction (Fox and Harrell 2008).

The transience of the journey, and the encounter with the dangers that the landscape holds, is only counterbalanced by the monumentalisation of the settlement and the permanence of home (Wright 2006a: 13; 2006b: 61). While the Cyclopean walls have been subject to intensive architectural historiography (Demakopoulou and Divari-Valakou 1999; Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006; Iakovidis 1983; 1999; Küpper 1996; Loader 1995; Scoufopoulos 1971), their role in the academic discussion of power and cultural history has been less explored. There is little explanation for the occurrence of Cyclopean walls at such a number of sites across the Mycenaean world or their habitual expansion and reconstruction through LH IIIB. Although we consider
the citadels to be permanent places, the history of the building programmes suggest that these structures should not be considered static plots. When the threat of violence is sensed in the distance, it raises a human alarm that requires regular surveillance until the danger has dissipated, meaning that the citadel walls are built first and foremost to protect, to safeguard the people and material goods inside. It may not be a coincidence that in the same era that the Mycenaeans begin to construct Cyclopean walls they also adopt heavy bronze armour, after centuries of preferring little or nothing on the body (Snodgrass 1964: 106; Taracha 2007: 144). Both the development of the cuirass and the fortified settlement capitalise upon their abilities to create an atmosphere by fostering an expression of distance and isolation, inside which the intangible expressions of security and history are kept alive. Casella (2001: 106) explains how strategised architecture neutralises the threat of violence:

Thus, through the segregation of interior spaces, [...] administrators fabricated an institutional landscape of order and reformation. Through this segmentation of movement in space and time, the threat of delinquency was—seemingly—eradicated and replaced by meticulously choreographed activity within the bounded institution.

The citadel walls have been interpreted as the result of select individuals overseeing a collective workforce (Bennet 2007b: 205; Grossman 1967; Killen 2006; Sjöberg 2004; Wright 1980; 2005), but such a large scale building activity, along with the repeated construction of the walls, is perhaps the most concentrated effort on the part of the Mycenaeans to cohesively construct both a physical materialisation of their existence but also the ideological identity of the group. Situating violence out in the distance means that group construction of settlements is a form of collective resistance; nevertheless, this social cohesion is not equitable. Rather, social integration is diacritically organised by means of the architecture itself (Heinz 2006; Maran 2006a; c; Markus 1993; 2006; Thaler 2006; Wright 2006b). The perimeter walls are the first point of entry and the most discriminating of architecture; they designate a sense of place by embedding material culture and human action into the fabric of the physical landscape. The walls discriminate against visitors to the site by reminding them that they are from the outside, and the continued use of gates and portals throughout the citadel when moving towards the megaron provides more opportunities for people to be singled out and left behind. By imposing such order on the settlement, this style of community construction only reaffirms the idea that the citadels themselves are contested landscapes where legitimacy must be maintained, for the authority that the
sites command is not inherent. Likewise, the idea of entering settlements in such a
diacritical manner suggests that the journey from the outside moving inwards does not
end at the gate, but rather becomes more focused in meaning once inside (see Boyd
2002: 19-23 for a similar conceptualisation of the late MH/early Mycenaean funerary
landscape).

The individual whom Aegean prehistorians presume has unlimited access to the
most nucleated and powerful loci of the settlement is the wanax (Dickinson 2006: 35;
Kilian 1988; Killen 2006; Shelmerdine 2008c: 127-9; Wright 2006b: 60). Archaeological
considerations of Mycenaean palatial rulers are often unfavourable; from the
archaeological evidence of the extended palatial settlement, scholars have
interpreted the role of the wanax and other ranking officials as intent on widening the
gap between themselves and the everyday people (Kopcke 2004; Maran and
Stavrianopoulou 2007). We have understood the continued repetition of palatial
activities as the disproportionate consumption of material goods, intended to translate
or perhaps substitute for the intangible qualities of esteem and status. Yet as Voutsaki
(1995c; 1997) argues, material wealth is a meaningless term until we understand the
ideological value of these items, derived from their chaîne opératoire. Furthermore, as
has been emphasised here and elsewhere (Bendall 2004; Bennet 2001; Cavanagh 2001;
various papers in Galaty and Parkinson 2007; Hamilakis 1998; Sjöberg 2004; Voutsaki
2001a; Wright 2004c; d), the archaeological evidence suggests that the interactions of
people in the palaces, and indeed the continued reconstruction of the palaces
themselves, operate in a much more complex fashion which serves to bind
communities together through diacritical integration rather than bipolarise them.

We should not therefore presume that leaders in LH III are saddled with
unlimited power (cf. Kopcke 2004; with response by Palaima 2007); rather in
outlining a theoretical framework, we should be "considering [political roles] in terms
of duties rather than rights" (Pomeroy 1975: 60). To begin on a practical level,
limitless power in human societies simply does not exist, and its appearance in our
models prevents us from considering the Mycenaean systematic controls aimed at
stabilising the functioning of the hierarchy and sustaining power networks through time
The very longevity of the palaces, lasting multiple generations, is testament to the
performance of their regulatory systems, in which offices of power, like the wanax, are
embedded. Moreover, these offices preserve and protect themselves through material
and ideological means (Bennet 2004: 99; Lupack 2008: 47-9) and are therefore subject to archaeological inquiry.

Leadership is best defined not by what the officers are entitled to own, 67 but rather by how it is they act with the resources they command; that is, how they negotiate power networks. The interpretations of the megaron and citadel spaces offered here suggest that power is not a latent force of office or state of being, but is rather an exercise that needs to be constructed and embodied through repetition of action throughout time. It seems more likely that, within a culture so centred on diacritical integration, so structured through repetition of meaningful action, and so mindful of its past, leaders proceed more to respond to the needs of residents instead of “trying to take the lead in setting the agenda for the[i]r communit[i]es” (Sánchez Jankowski 1991: 33). Wanakes are heads of settlements that are in the continual process of self-redefinition, which means the legitimacy of the wanax also requires perpetual maintenance.

In similar fashion, we should guard against imagining the megaron and associated structures as finished or complete historic buildings. Cavanagh (2001) has argued that the act of processing through the Mycenaean cityscape, through various points that restrict access, is an act of constructing power (also Blakolmer 2007; 2008; Connerton 1989; Eliade 2004; see Lonsdale 1995 for a similar interpretation of dancing; Maran 2006c; Wright 2006b).

![Figure 34: Procession fresco from LH IIIA Thebes (Demakopoulou and Konsala 1981: pl. 21).](image)

This model inherently suggests that the megarons are empowered through social action, an authority only in part summoned from the history of the architecture of

---

67 Whatever concepts of ownership we might suggest to exist in the Mycenaean period.
building. Rather, the human element of continuous reproduction is as significant in terms of creating an ideology as the material aesthetic itself. The role of *wanax* finds stability in terms of maintaining the legitimacy of the settlement. The open spaces in front of the megarons at Mycenae, Tiryns and Pylos are designed to impose the sight of the megaron façade on the viewer, to physically negotiate the individual’s place in the hierarchy (Cavanagh 2001: 123-4). In terms of diacritical integration, therefore, the role of watching the procession is as significant as the act of processing. Processing is a form of hegemonic discourse between community members, performed through acts of exclusion at physical landmarks in the settlement. Moreover, by using constructed monuments to play a social role in exclusion, the message of domination is normalised, for which the citadels undertake this responsibility on a variety of levels. The visual imagery, mainly from palatial wall paintings, emphasises this point (Cavanagh 2001: 131; Immerwahr 1990: 114-5; see Nordquist 2008: 108 for wall paintings as participating in normative acts). The images incorporate viewers, who watch elegant ladies pass by and move forward into the megaron space (*Figure 34*). The citadels are very much social actors in the construction of meaning as they both impart and reflect.

Furthermore, Mycenaean citadel spaces are places that receive frequent, nearly continuous, acts of reconstruction, on various scales of extent, from expansions and intensification of the Cyclopean walls at Mycenae and Tiryns to interior refurbishment. The walls and floors of various citadel structures are given repeated restoration of the wall painting programme, including renovation or continued replacement of older scenes alongside complete overhaul in the friezes with the imposition of new imagery (Immerwahr 1990; Lang 1969; McCallum 1987; Morgan 1988).

Similarly, Sherratt (2008) has argued that the wall paintings in the megarons in fact mirror contemporary wall hangings or tapestries, which adorn the walls at various times during the year, suggesting that these living spaces are regularly revitalised (also Barber 1992; Bennet 2004: 99).

In a similar fashion, the proximity of craft production areas to palatial structures may be part of the contemporary need to recreate in order to empower. The link between political control and crafting is underlined by the archaeological correlates of the proximity of workshop space to megarons or other political structures at most of the major sites (Cavanagh 2001: 130-1), including Mycenae (Taylour 1981; Wright 2006a: 25), Pylos (Bennet 1999a: 13; Shelmerdine 1987; J.C. Wright 1984), Midea (Demakopoulou 2007: 67), Tiryns (Darcue 2005; Hiesel 1990: 111-57) and
Thebes (Dakouri-Hild 2001a; b; 2005). Dakouri-Hild (2005: 181, 185) posits that the spatial configuration of the Old Kadmeion, including nearby buildings and the Cyclopean wall, suggests that situating craft production in the proximity of the seat of political power is an act of protection and de facto ownership of the material and finished goods created in the atelier by persons associated with the Old Kadmeion. Other citadels also begin to incorporate a network of production facilities in close proximity to the megaron in LH IIIA, and although the variety of special products differs from site to site (Crowley 2008), encompassing wine, cloth, perfume, and household goods in precious materials, and even the textual evidence found on tablets and stirrup jars, for writing itself is a palace-based skilled labour (Bennet 1988; 2007a), the patterns of consumption reaffirm the exclusive nature of these crafts (Voutsaki 2001a). Indeed, the social network linking the creation of fine products controlled by a hierarchical administration to sustain the groups with palatial authority in a feedback loop is a social construction that has been interpreted as the process of palatialisation itself.

Conclusions: The process of palatialisation

In a wider context, it is evident that the sense of place of the citadels fully relies on their own active self-definition in the face of the threatening landscape found outside the walls, meaning that they require external liminality and danger in order to sustain a high level of internal social organisation and protection (contra Crouwel 2008: 269-70). The network of roads throughout the eastern Peloponnesian linking settlements to one another attests to the level at which this system is embedded. Moreover, repetition of action and ideological constructs are part of a larger cycle of violence, in which the seeds of threatening behaviour are sown in the very acts of protection and command that nullify contemporary violence, thereby creating a feedback loop. Mycenaean roads require upkeep in order to maintain chariot and foot traffic (Hope Simpson and Hagel 2006: 151-6), but the act of travelling these routes, of journeying towards a settlement, is also an expressed threat that demands reciprocal performances of protection and permanence. Thus the wider Mycenaean regions are maps of conflict and the citadels are contested landscapes, loci that re-centre the world time and again. Furthermore, the drive to create these performances is a form of habitus that in turn transforms personal and community identity. Casella (2001: 111) notes that repeated movement or circulation through a political landscape is itself a process of becoming: "[individuals in performance] constituted a spatial map of
transformation. Their moral descent and redemption became physically performed in
their movements up and down the topographic elevations of the [...] site." In this
model then, the figure of the wanax is made through the fulfilment of the duties of
wanax (Bennet 2001: 34); this individual does not stand outside of the system imposing
order upon it.

In LH IIIA the proximity of neighbours and the threat of distance results in a
sense that life and livelihood require continuous renewal in terms of legitimacy and
indigenous claims to place. The realisation that the Mycenaean world is only growing
smaller, as contacts amongst Mycenaean settlements, and between the mainland and
the wider Mediterranean world, prompt a shift in worldview from measuring time to
measuring distance, concepts that are intimately related. So too, the displacement of
threatening violence from the funerary realm to settlements is not at all complete or
unconnected; rather, the trends in settlement practice carry over into the mortuary
sphere. Vermeule (1979: 66-9) notes that during LH IIIA there is a rise in the
iconography of chariots, hunting scenes and architectural elements as part of tomb
architecture or depicted on larnakes (also Zavadil 2007). Vermeule (1979: 66-8)
identifies the motifs of the chariot and hunting as underlining parallel ideologies about
death wherein one’s demise and the association of animal hunting and sacrifice
converge. Death is perceived as a journey, beginning with the progress of the
funeral, the bodily preparations and last rites, and continuing on as the dead transcend
after interment (Boyd 2002). Ideologically centred on similar ideas, the architectural
motifs suggest the idea that the tomb or larnax is the ultimate home for the deceased,
with final interment becoming an act of homecoming, culminating in a time without
end. Moreover, the funerary monuments themselves may have played a significant role
in transforming the landscape into zones of liminality, conflict and permanence.
Scholars have posited that the creation of large, visible tombs in the landscape in LH I-II
is an act of ownership of an area and an observable symbol of a family heritage (Bennet
67; Mee and Cavanagh 1990: 229-30; although cf. Voutsaki 1995a: 62; 2001a: 199-
207). These funerary monuments engender heterochronic spaces; by physically
defining all that is a good Mycenaean death, they command the materialisation of the
reciprocal designation of all that sustains life.

To summarise: The mainland is an embedded landscape, in which the past and
the present find convergence at the horizon and other liminal areas. Likewise, the
repetition of action, whether through hunting and violence, craft production, or building construction, cycles time by regulating modern history. The focus of cultural attention is in structuring life by rethinking settlement forms. In the area of Messenia the paths to domination diverge from those taken in the Argolid, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece. In this region, where violence is always historically subsumed by other practices of social integration, the main forces of hegemony appear to be situated in acts of displacement, to break the power of lineage and economic development, aimed at capitalising upon human labour.

The Mycenaean reaction to the threat of violence, located in the distance, is to use martial culture to resist and reclaim. Power is constructed through the physical activities of the community: building; crafting; protecting; processing through the citadels; hunting; and allowing or denying access. The construction of roads and the use of chariots to move out from settlements to other areas is an act that marks ownership through construction and use. Consumed in settlement areas, the repetition of images showing chariots offers those at home a means to participate in these journeys even as they remain at the settlement. Likewise, the creation of chariot and horse-and-rider terracotta figurines, as objects of cult, reifies the concept of domination of space. The citadels themselves are landmarks that centre Mycenaean geography and one’s encounter with the world; nevertheless they require regular empowerment through processions and governance of space in order to continue to hold meaning and legitimacy. Moreover, hunting becomes an intensely social arena in which individuals can negotiate their status and stage an encounter with the landscape.

It may be noted that this chapter has only framed the broadest outlines in which the threat of violence fosters the drive to build Mycenaean settlements, because the archaeology of LH IIIA is correspondingly incomplete. It is in LH IIIB, when the archaeological evidence is better preserved, that the localised expressions of martial legitimacy on the part of the palaces can be interpreted.
Table 16: Itemised list of LH IIIA pictorial pottery and larnakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Museum Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Melatiria, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>VIII.6</td>
<td>R A18, 8</td>
<td>MM 23783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ayios Stephanos, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>VIII.7</td>
<td>R A18, 8</td>
<td>MM 23793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mycenae, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>VIII.5</td>
<td>R A4, 85</td>
<td>MM 23796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mycenae, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MM 23796</td>
<td>BE 27117.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>VIII.1</td>
<td>Pl. 1:1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 2:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 5:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 5:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 5:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 6:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Pl. 15:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 13:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard or rooms D-F, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 13:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Courtyard or rooms D-F, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Pl. 15:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 3:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 4:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 7:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 9:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 9:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 10:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 10:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Dump, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 14:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, E side terrace wall, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 7:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, NE baulk, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 3:3a-b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, room C, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 14:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, room E, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 14:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, room C and E, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 11:1a-b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berbati, Test pit II, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>VIII.2</td>
<td>Pl. 7:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nichoria, LH IIIA:2</td>
<td>kyö</td>
<td>VIII.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Figure Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Museum Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIA:2- IIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 8:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIA-III B</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A15. 222 MM 23796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue number key:
Pl. numbers=Åkerström (1987)
Letters (A, B)= Crouwel (1991)
Midea numbers= Demakopoulou (2006)
Whole numbers=Platsika (2004)
Roman numerals (IX, X)= Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982)

Type key:
AK=Amphoroid Krater
J=Jug
K=Krater
Kyl=Kylix
L=Larnax
OK=Open Krater
R=Rhyton

Colour coding:
Armed figure
Martial decorative motif
Duellng and/or combat
Chariot driving

Museum key:
MM=Mycenae Museum
NAM=National Archaeological Museum
SM=Sparta Museum
Chapter Seven: LH IIIB: Violence and the Making of the Mycenaean Palaces

The LH IIIB period is synonymous with monumental palatial construction, the locations at which political, economic, and ideological activities are hosted, and the rise of social customs that involve large numbers of people: feasting; tholos building at Mycenae and Orchomenos; aspects of cult; crafting and other types of economic production as monitored in the Linear B tablets (Cavanagh 2008; Crowley 2008; de Fidio 2008; Shelmerdine 2008c; Shelmerdine and Bennet 2008). As earlier, weaponry holds particular status in regards to having a significant artefact biography and as an ideograph of Mycenaean values and heritage, which is by now its own tradition in the Mycenaean world (Laffineur 1992: 109). The ideological weight of history helps to explain the lasting influence of martiality in terms of understanding its role in the dialogues of political power (Laffimeur 1992). The significance of martial culture as polysemic capital is reaffirmed by its presence in a range of contexts: political loci and cultic space, evidenced by wall paintings (Immerwahr 1990), the sword pommel found in the Cult Centre at Mycenae (Rehak 1984: note 30), and the terracotta figurines at Ayios Konstantinos (Konsolaki 2002; Konsolaki-Yannopoulou 1999); and in other domestic contexts where pictorial pottery (Table 21) and terracotta figurines are consumed (Immerwahr 1993: 218-9; Steel 1999; Tzonou-Herbst 2002). The fact that antique pieces of martial culture are depicted in areas where we suspect political and religious power to have been most actively renegotiated suggests that martial culture plays an important role in this renegotiation, in contrast to certain interpretations that suggest that the palatial usage of martial culture lacks innovation and complexity (Hiller 1999: 327-8).

Nevertheless, as in LH IIIA, the data analysed here are a continuum rather than a finite selection and therefore resist complete segregation. Much of the evidence is loosely dated and suffers from the same need of secure contextualisation as before. Nevertheless, the archaeological evidence for martial culture during LH IIIB follows certain trends prefigured in LH IIIA, including the preponderance of spearheads, the dramatic erosion of mortuary data in the Argolid, especially at Mycenae (Voutsaki 2001a), and the consumption of certain types of iconography, namely wall paintings, terracotta figurines and pictorial pottery; nevertheless, a new form of deposition of martial culture, the hoard, comes to the forefront at this time and continues through
LH IIIC. In addition to being a suitable point of interest in terms of depositional practice, these hoards highlight a salient chronological issue in the palatial era; that is, many of the dates for martial culture are rather loosely assigned to before, after or around the time of palatial destruction.

The aim of this overview of the LH IIIB period is to understand the role of violence in the hegemonic discourse that is part of the practice of palatialisation. It is evident that violence is still a significant part of the power negotiations that are taking place as part of palatialisation; the continued consumption of weaponry, the glorification of violence in the wall paintings and the fetishised image of the horse and chariot in pictorial pottery and figurines all underscore this dynamic. Nevertheless, how can we account for the ways in which the palaces make old forms of violence new and powerful again? This chapter begins by considering the Ionian Islands and Achaia and then northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece, two regions in which martial deposits remain a popular practice but the consumption of bellicose iconography is partial towards certain media over others. Subsequently the region of the Argolid and the Korinthia is analysed, where data are found in the widest variety of contexts, including citadel spaces, workshops, settlement areas, tombs, and cultic quarters. Finally, the southern and south-western Peloponnese is considered, where the data are nearly wholly restricted to remains found at the Palace of Nestor. The central tenet argued here is that the LH IIIB palaces act as the exclusive consumers of the forms of violence, and the legitimacy that is drawn from these expressions, that were earlier expended in familial tombs.

The Ionian Islands and Achaia (summarised in Table 17)

In LH IIIB-IIIC, the regions of the Ionian Islands and Achaia provide evidence of Mycenaean habitation, mainly through the construction of tombs and deposition of grave goods, and it is in the mortuary realm that martial culture has been found. Similar to the other areas of Greece, the consumption of spearheads is notable, with numbers frequently between one and two pieces (Patras Gerokomeion Monastery chamber tomb, Kallithea chamber tombs, Mitopolis tomb, Lakkithra chamber tomb). Swords too are not infrequent in graves, where the historic forms, Types D and E, are found at Aigeira, in addition to the new Naue II blade. The Kallithea chamber tombs A and B are both the most traditional depositions, with the consumption of boar's tusks and armour, but also the most indicative of the depositional patterns of the post-palatial
world, with the provision of spearheads, especially the arrangement of two in chamber tomb B, and Naue II blades.

**Table 17:** Summary of martial remains from the Ionian Islands and Achaia in LH IIIB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Boar’s tusk</th>
<th>Body armour</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patras, Gerokomeion Monastery, CT</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallithea</td>
<td>CT B</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT A</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitis Elias, Mitopolis, Tomb</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigeira, CT</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakithtra (Kephallonia)</td>
<td>CT B, pit 2</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT A, pit 6</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaxata (Kephallonia), CT A</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polis (Ithaka), Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC (?)</td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece (summarised in Table 18)**

The regions of northwest Greece, Macedonia, and Central Greece continue to see a large proportion of martial culture deposited in tombs. The tholos at Menidi contains a great number of boar’s tusks, arrowheads, and four or more ivory sword pommels and scabbard plates, which suggests that at one time this grave held swords that were subsequently removed. Ivory pommels were also found at a chamber tomb at Spata, again suggesting that the blades were removed sometime later. Continuing a trend from LH IIIA, spearheads remain a popular component of the mortuary furniture; yet in contrast to LH IIIA, in LH IIIB there is generally only a single spearhead in the tomb, occasionally rising to three in number (the cist grave at Mazaraki Zitsas, two at Lithovouni). Swords also share a role in the mortuary furniture; they are generally found as the sole martial object in the tomb, although a Type F blade was deposited with the spearheads in the chamber tomb at Lithovouni. The amount of swords is significantly decreased from LH IIIA, although there are half a dozen examples from late LH IIIB or early LH IIIC, an increase that is part of a larger rise in the deposition of martial culture across the Mycenaean world that is dated to the end of the palaces and the subsequent post-palatial horizon.
There is quantitatively less from settlement areas than from contemporary graves; nevertheless, the artefacts found at Thebes and Orchomenos are different in type—some salient finds include armour and wall paintings—and are somewhat more perfectly dated. Similar to the remains at the Thebes "Arsenal", a corselet from the Municipal Conference Centre (MCC) has received preliminary publication (Andrikou 1995; 2007) and has been compared with the Dendra cuirass (Figure 35). The MCC armour consists of breast and back plates, with one shoulder plate tentatively identified in the mass of corroded hammered bronze also found in the deposit.

Figure 35: LH IIIB bronze corselet breast plate from Municipal Conference Centre (MCC) (Andrikou 2007: pl. CIIa).

Figure 36: LH IIIB Orchomenos boar hunt fresco (Morgan 1988: pl. 158).
Iconography is another common find at settlements. A fresco fragment from Thebes (Th no. 2), possibly from LH IIIB and found south of the Kadmeion, depicts a figure wearing a boar’s tusk helmet beside another individual, perhaps framed by a window (Immerwahr 1990: 128, 201). Orchomenos also preserves fragments of armed individuals amongst architectural elements; this scene (Or no. 1) appears to portray a battle frieze. Whether this depiction adorned the walls of an explicitly political space is unknown since it was found deposited near the Byzantine church of the Skripou (Immerwahr 1990: 125). The fragments are not complete but Immerwahr (1990: 125, 195) reconstructs a bellicose scene centred on monumental architecture, upon which the feet of warriors are preserved. Other martial elements include horse and chariot fragments and bent limbs that Immerwahr (1990: 125) suggests may be part of hand-to-hand combat. There are also some puzzling figures whose position Immerwahr (1990: 127) interprets as swimming as part of the chaos of a violent attack.

A boar hunt fresco (Or no. 3, Figure 36), with the boar and dogs, hunters wearing boar’s tusk helmets and horses, was found nearby (Immerwahr 1990: 132, 165, 195). The iconography of the chariot remains ever significant both in the funerary realm and in settlements, although overall numbers have rather eroded. Two appear on a larnax from Tanagra (Figure 37), there is a chariot figurine from Mega Monastirion, and terracotta figurines were found on the Athenian acropolis.

Weaponry has also been found in settlement areas: two arrowheads were discovered at the Thebes jewellery workshop at 38 Odos Pindarou and four spearheads in the Kadmeion floor destruction deposit. Moreover, in LH IIIB-IIIC, there are a number of hoards that appear, which include martial culture together with other items. The Orchomenos cache, from a well, epitomises the founder’s hoard. This deposition comprises a wide variety of bronze objects, including numerous blades, spearheads, arrowheads, double axe heads, pins and fibulae, knives, and vessels, many of them in fragmentary condition, that have been collected together for melting and recasting. This corpus dates to LH IIIC, but many of the items deposited here are earlier in date. Other hoards from Thebes, the Athenian acropolis (Figure 38) and Kierion, all dating from LH IIIB:(2)-LH IIIC, include spearheads, swords and arrowheads.
Figure 37: LH IIIB larnax from chamber tomb 22 at Tanagra featuring two opposing chariots and two swordsmen fighting in the centre (Demakopoulou and Konsala 1981: pl. 42).

Figure 38: Part of the LH IIIC Athenian acropolis hoard. Photograph taken by the author.
Table 18: Summary of martial remains from northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece in LH IIIB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Wall painting</th>
<th>Terracotta iconography</th>
<th>Ivory pieces</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Boar’s tusk</th>
<th>Body armour</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Thebes, Jewellery workshop, 38 Odos Pindarou</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thebes, Municipal Conference Centre (MCC) plot</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalbaki, From a tomb in the plain</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dodona, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parga, Kiperi tholos</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mazaraki Zitsas, Cist grave</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kastritsa, Cist grave</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mega Monastirion (Thessaly), CT</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanagra</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 75</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 22</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 112</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menidi, Tholos tomb</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medeon, Built tomb 29</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda Pi 11</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma Pi 1</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spata, CT</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadmion floor with destruction level</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolonaki cemetery, CT 25</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchomenos, near church of the Skripou</td>
<td>LH IIIB, end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thebes, 250m south of Kadmeia</td>
<td>LH IIIB (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Figure Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Wall painting</td>
<td>Terracotta iconography</td>
<td>Ivory pieces</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Boar's tusk</td>
<td>Body armour</td>
<td>Spearhead</td>
<td>Digger</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourkoua, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos, Hoard in a well</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>frags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes, Unknown context</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konitsa, Unknown context</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallakion, Cist grave A</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC:1</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis hoard of 1888</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likavos, Stray find, 100 m south of Nekyomanteion</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithovouni, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallakion, Unknown context</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platania, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes, Hoard</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhates (ancient Trachis), Cist grave</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieron, Hoard</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakkanoerasto, Unknown context</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parga, Aghia Kyriaki</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi, Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthochori, Metsovo, Cist grave (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH IIIB-2·IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terracotta iconography key:
1 = (quantity of) pictorial pottery
3 = (quantity of) larnax
6 = (quantity of) terracotta figurine

Ivory pieces key:
0 = (quantity of) jewellery piece
1 = (quantity of) sword fitting
The Argolid and the Korinthia (summarised in Table 19)

From LH IIIA to IIIB, an atmosphere of threatening violence permeates areas of the landscape and is resisted through the construction of monumental settlements throughout the Argolid in order to intensify a sense of belonging in a certain space (Wright 2006a: 13). The use of specific local stone, namely conglomerate, at certain parts of the Mycenae citadel, contemporary tholoi and the Lion Gate, reinforces the idea that these constructions are viewed as expressions of indigenous affinity (Wright 2006a: 16-7, fig. 1.4). Likewise, the continued historical legitimacy offered by martial culture is suggested by the deposit of a worked boar's tusk, along with terracotta figurines, in the foundation trench of the Lion Gate, interred during the expansion of the citadel at Mycenae (Wace 1921-23b: 27). Although depictions of boar's tusk helmets appear in the wall paintings at Mycenae, caches of actual boar's tusks are noticeably rare at the site; indeed, besides the collection at the Lion Gate, there are only a few complete tusks from the Room 2 of the Citadel House.

The emphasis on the monument of the Lion Gate underscores the fact that appropriate inclusion is not bilateral but diacritical, as arranged by the act of procession through various gateways and doors that systematically bar certain parties from further entry (Blakolmer 2007; Cavanagh 2001; Wright 2006b: 59-60, 62). Because both the architecture of the enceintes and the arrangement of spaces outside of the citadels perpetuate diacritical access through cultural reinforcement of restriction, such fragmentation of the landscape, both within the enceintes and outside the walls, becomes ingrained in these spaces. As theoretical approaches to the power of architecture suggest (Maran 2006a; c; Markus 1993; 2006; Thaler 2006; Wright 2006b), movement through the built environment conditions the human body through practice, so that most of human encounters with constructed spaces are intrinsic and seemingly "natural", that is, part of habitus. Regular interaction with diacritical spaces is mutually reinforcing; the power of architecture is renewed every time it governs bodily movement. Similarly, the intensification of settlement construction such as the expansion programmes at Mycenae and Tiryns is a renewal of the meaning and purpose of social places (Maran 2006c; Wright 2006b). Through performances that construct and divide the landscape, no part of the Argolid can be considered neutral or empty. The use of conglomerate at Tiryns and Argos, a raw material that requires the mining and transport across to these sites, is tantamount to advertising the construction of these monuments (Crouwel 2008: 268; Wright 1987: 183). One's encounter with a
hostile zone, that is, territory that an individual does not have permission to enter, is therefore a violation of the place and a violent encounter. As Wright (2006a: 18) has noted, consumption of conglomerate at Tiryns and Argos represents affiliation with Mycenae in some form, but whether this usage is subversive, submissive, or contested is unclear.

Figure 39: LH IIIB:2 pottery fragment from Mycenae chariot with sunshade (X.4, A5, 30) (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: X.4).

Although the construction of tholoi continues at the site of Mycenae through LH IIIB, the tomb of Clytemnestra, tomb of the Genii and the Treasury of Atreus being the most noteworthy examples (Wright 2006a: 16-7), martial culture from funerary contexts is almost nonexistent at Mycenae and is sparse throughout the Argolid. During LH IIIB, the only funerary data from Mycenae come from two tombs that opened in LH II and the martial artefacts from here recall historic trends. Both graves contained a sword, and each of them, a Type E in chamber tomb 102 and a Type F in chamber tomb 81, are decorated with gold covered rivets. Such embellishment is distinctly anachronistic—no other blades in LH IIIB are adorned with precious metals—and it is very possible that these blades are in fact LH IIIA in date. Nevertheless, they stand as the ultimate expressions of early Mycenaean ensiform heritage, which traces back to the Shaft Graves. Martial culture from the wider Argive plain is equally sparse. One terracotta figurine was found in a grave at Argos, in the Deira Cemetery (grave XXXV), two figurines are from West Yerogalero, tomb XXII at Prosymna, and an arrowhead and three spearheads were deposited in chamber tomb X, also at Prosymna, but other than these meagre finds, we have very little other martial culture from mortuary deposits firmly dated to LH IIIB.
Stray weaponry has been found at different areas of the Mycenae citadel, including a dagger from the north end of Court 6 and a Naue Type II sword from a Cyclopean house near the acropolis; however the martial culture found at settlements in this period and later are usually deposited together in a hoard. There are four hoards from approximately LH IIIB-IIIC, three at Mycenae and a fourth at Tiryns, and while the depositions themselves are likely to have been made after the collapse of the palaces, many of the martial objects found in these caches date to LH IIIB or even earlier. It is these hoards that preserve nearly all of the swords and the only LH IIIB spearhead at Mycenae.

As the hoards demonstrate, settlement areas preserve weaponry, but this context is more notable for providing martial iconography. The most common medium is terracotta, in the form of figurines and pictorial pottery. There are numerous terracotta figurines found in the various houses at Mycenae; these are generally earlier in date than the pictorial pottery (Tzonou-Herbst 2002). Terracotta figurines are likewise part of the cultic detritus of the Room of the Fresco in the Cult Centre at Mycenae and at the Ayios Konstantinos sanctuary on Methana (Figure 33), underscoring the ideological role of these artefacts (French 1981: 173; 2003).
The greatest depositions of LH IIIB martial pictorial pottery are from Berbati (Åkerström 1987), although other fragments have been found at Mycenae at various areas around the citadel (Crouwel 1988; 1991; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982). These remains are not as well understood as the Berbati corpus as much of the Mycenaic pottery is from unknown contexts, uncovered in early excavations. Pictorial pottery was also found at the Midea West Gate (Demakopoulou 2006), while the Unterburg at Tiryns revealed fragments (Slenczka 1974) along with a half dozen boar's tusks.

Common scenes on vessels feature horses and horse and chariots, although the horses, when untethered, may not be martial in character but are perhaps another variation of the quadruped animal study, a theme that is extremely popular throughout the history of Mycenaean pictorial vase painting (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 90). Non-martial interpretations have been made for the chariot scenes as well (Figure 39); based on the consumption of pictorial pottery in tombs, scholars have suggested that these scenes are ekphora or are part of funeral games, such as the chariot races held for Patroklos in the Iliad XXIII (Crouwel 1991: 15, 33; Döhl 1980: 29-31; Immerwahr 1990: 8; Steel 1999: 806; Vermeule 1965: 141-6; 1979: 61-2; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: 8). Likewise, B16 (Figure 40) portrays a hand drawing a bow, although what the arrow is aimed at is lost; however, judging from the few other scenes that depict a bow and arrow, this may be a vignette of hunting. The preferred

---

68 Even as the preference for pictorial pottery as a grave good is more commonly a Cypriot practice than an Argive one (Immerwahr 1993: 218-9).

vessel form for these depictions is the krater, a serving basin, which allows the imagery to be publicly viewed (Steel 1999: 804-5). Whatever the intended area of consumption for these vessels, whether household or funerary, such motifs of chariotry and horses have complex ideological components that form a web of associations binding together the threat of violence in the distance, travel and homecoming, and indigenous affinity, all of which are suitable metaphors for legitimising the growth of settlements and memorialising the dead as a component of the mortuary furniture.

![Figure 42: LH III B:2 fragment from Mycenae featuring two figures wearing hedgehog helmets (X1.45, 47) (Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: X1.45).](image)

The corpus of fragments that appears more explicitly martial in theme are those executed by the Painter of the Tiryns Shield Bearers or by this artist's atelier (X.1, X.2, X.4/A5, X.3-X.15, A6 a and b, A7). The fragments themselves are dispersed at Tiryns and Mycenae. The name vase (X.1, Figure 41) depicts figures bearing small round shields and spears, leading a chariot and a dog in a procession across the face of the vessel. The other pieces are highly fragmented but appear to portray elements from similar scenes. Other LH III B fragments painted by different artisans preserve the hedgehog helmet (X1.45, 47, Figure 42) (Pliatsika 2004: no. 47) and the rail chariot, both contemporary forms of armour and transport. Nevertheless, certain remains may portray older forms of martial culture. A piece found at the West Gate at Midea is too fragmented to be certain (Figure 43), but may feature a boar's tusk helmet with sweeping circular crest (Demakopoulou 2006: 40, no. 22, fig. 25).

---

70 IX, X and XI numeration of pictorial pottery as assigned by Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982).
The other prominent settlement iconography is in the form of wall painting, which has been found in the main megaron and the Cult Centre at Mycenae and in a rubbish deposit on the west slope at Tiryns. The megaron frieze at Mycenae (My no. 11, Figure 53), from the main room in the megaron, portrays a dramatic scene in which a figure driving a chariot hurls another individual off the walls of the citadel in front of a witness watching from a window (Immerwahr 1990: 122-5, 146, 165, figs. 35a, 38c, pl. 65). In contrast, the images in the Cult Centre are more sedate: from the Southwest Building are two shield frescoes (My nos. 14-5, Figure 50) (Immerwahr 1990: 99, 121, 140, 193); an image of a female figure wearing a boar’s tusk helmet and cradling a little griffin in her arms (My no. 9) (Immerwahr 1990: 121, 192); and the cult scene in the Room of the Frescoes, which depicts a female holding a sword (My. no. 6, Figure 44) (Immerwahr 1990: 109, 115, 119, 120-1, 165, 191, pls. 59-61). Furthermore there is the stucco pinax from Tsountas’ House (My no. 7, Figure 51) portraying two figures gesturing reverentially towards a figure-of-eight shield, perhaps being carried by an individual or divine character (Immerwahr 1990: 121, 140, 191-2, pls. 62-3). The well-known wall painting from the rubbish deposit at Tiryns (Ti no. 6, Figures 1, 45) depicts a boar hunt, including scenes of women in chariots, hunters, dogs, and the moment when the boar is taken down (Immerwahr 1990: 129-30, 148, 153, 166, 202-3, pls. 68-70).

Blakolmer (2008: 264) considers this fresco fragment to be representing a statuette: “By consequence, this seems to represent an almost unpainted ivory statuette of a helmeted man carrying on his part a figurine (rhyton?) of a griffin, thus being an image inside the image and moving in a procession.” Blakolmer does not explain why the individual is male, but the argument has been made that the boar’s tusk helmet is worn by both sexes and should not be used to distinguish men (Rehak 1984; 1999; Shelmerdine 1996).
**Figure 44:** Cult scene from the Room of the Frescoes (drawing from Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1996: pl. 96). Note the length of the sword in the figure’s hand. Photograph taken by the author.

**Figure 45:** Tiryns boar hunt fresco (Rodenwaldt 1912: taf. XIII). Note the hands thrusting spears into the boar’s head and neck.
Table 19: Summary of martial remains from the Argolid and the Korinthia in LH IIIB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Wall painting</th>
<th>Terra-cotta iconography</th>
<th>Ivory/Faience figure</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Boar’s tusk</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, CT 102</td>
<td>LH II-III B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth, From a pit behind the Julian Basilica</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna, West Yerogalaro, Tomb XXII</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of the Sphinxes</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of the Oil Merchant</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Poros Wall</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Cemetery area</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 42</td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>Cult Centre complex</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of the Idols/Citadel House</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Poros Wall, Trench L</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Near poros wall between the tholos tombs of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Unterburg</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unterburg, Trench N</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>West slope</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Methana, Ayios Konstantinos, Shrine Room A</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aegina, Temple of Aphaia area</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aegina, Mt. Oros</td>
<td>LH III B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argos, Deira Cemetery, grave XXXX</td>
<td>LH III B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosymna, CT X</td>
<td>LH III B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dendra, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH III B</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Figure Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Wall painting</td>
<td>Terracotta iconography</td>
<td>Ivory/Faience figure</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Boar's tusk</td>
<td>Spearhead</td>
<td>Digger</td>
<td>Sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area east of storage room 1</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern section of room A</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast baulk</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room D</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room I</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern border</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface find</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace west of the Quarter</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test pit III</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lion Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cult Centre, incl. Southwest Bldg.</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsountas' House, rear room</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citadel House, different areas</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyclopean Terrace Building, East trench, wall and drain</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From &quot;large Cyclopean house on acropolis&quot;</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East wing of palace, north end of Court 6</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megaron</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of the Shields</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 81</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of the Idols/Citadel House</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC (early)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asine, CT 1:2</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC</td>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae, Hoard from terrace wall at bottom of stairs beyond postern gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Figure Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Wall painting</td>
<td>Terracotta iconography</td>
<td>Ivory/Faience figurine</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Boar's tusk</td>
<td>Spearhead</td>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Syrinx</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Syrinx</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiryns Treasure hoard</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unterburg (area Z), grave 1/1</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small founder's hoard near poros wall between Tomb of Aegisthus and Tomb of Clytemnestra</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acropolis hoard of 1890</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wall painting key:  
1 = (quantity of) wall painting  
0 = (quantity of) pinax  

Ivory/faience figurine key:  
1 = (quantity of) ivory figurine  
0 = (quantity of) faience figurine  

Terracotta iconography key:  
1 = (quantity of) pictorial pottery  
0 = (quantity of) larnax  
01 = (quantity of) terracotta figurine

*Southern and south-western Peloponnese (summarised in Table 20)*

The martial evidence from the southern and south-western Peloponnese during LH IIIB is nearly exclusive to the Palace of Nestor site. Perhaps the most famous bellicose artefact is the wall painting in Hall 64 (Py no. 11, Figure 46), part of the so-called megaron of the lawagetas, which portrays a battle between figures protected by boar’s tusk helmets and greaves and those wearing animal skins (Bennet and Davis 1999). The figures in this scene are sword fighting, but another remnant preserves individuals with a horse and chariot (Immerwahr 1990: 128, 132, 134, 197, fig. 38d, pls. 66-7). Nevertheless, the martial culture from the Archive Complex is the most intriguing of the remains at Pylos, as this deposit appears to be part of highly structured and powerful acts of negotiation (Stocker and Davis 2004).
Table 20: Summary of martial remains from the southern and south-western Peloponnese in LH IIIB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Figure Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
<th>Arrowhead</th>
<th>Spearhead</th>
<th>Dagger</th>
<th>Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside/outside of Room 27</td>
<td>LH IIIA late-IIIB early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rooms 43, 48</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hall 64</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Archive Complex, Room 7</td>
<td>LH IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylos</td>
<td>Room 10</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Room 81</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside SW wall of SW building</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC:1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 100</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC:1</td>
<td>&gt;501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scatter in different areas of the palace</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2-IIIC:1</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT K-2</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amyklai, Unknown context</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iconography key:

① (quantity of) wall painting
③ (quantity of) pottery fragment

Room 7 (see plan, Figure 49) contains many diverse but potent ideographic remains (Figure 48), including bones from at least ten cattle, miniature kylikes, pithoi fragments, perhaps from much earlier vessels, Linear B tablets, some of which tally martial objects and others that record food offerings, perhaps for feasts, a broken type E sword and a spearhead, interpreted as the remains of a feasting deposit (Halstead and Isaakidou 2004: 146; Stocker and Davis 2004: 183-5). Stocker and Davis (2004: 190) note that both the sword and spearhead are antiques; but the history of the spearhead is especially remarkable. Avila (1983: 44-5) designates this spearhead as a Middle Bronze Age type; nevertheless, this typology is particularly unusual, even amongst MH forms. A similar example is found only in the Ionian Islands, either Corfu or Ithaka, and dates to the Middle Helladic, while the other closest examples are from Troy and date to even earlier, Early Bronze Age II (Branigan 1974: 19, Types VIII and X, nos. 447, 457, 459).
The remains in the Archive Complex are not the only pieces of martial culture that relate to feasting; pictorial evidence, namely palatial wall paintings, also links martial culture with the hunting of game for communal consumption and feasting (Bennet and Davis 1999; Halstead and Isaakidou 2004: 148; Morris 1990). A recently published archer fresco found in the area around Room 27 (Figure 47) (Brecoulaki, et al. 2008) preserves a fragment with a bow and arrow being flexed in the hands of the archer. Although the target of the weapon is not preserved, the few images of bows in its Mycenaean context have been depicted in the arena of hunting; moreover, there are no depictions of the bow in the explicitly martial fresco in Hall 64 at Pylos, which may further indicate that the bow is a weapon of the chase. Brecoulaki et al. (2008: 365) suggest that the context of the archer fresco, in the proximity of where the stores are located, may be evidence for the fact that this scene reflects the function of this area of the palace; that is, the preparation of comestibles for group consumption. Similarly, the wall paintings from Rooms 43 and 48 (Figure 49), which portray a hunting scene and the arrangements for cooking with tripods (Py no. 11), also depict the step-by-step process of preparing for a palatial feast by illustrating a hunt and the provision of food. Moreover, there are a large number of arrowheads from various contexts around the
Palace of Nestor, including a corpus of over 500 small bronze arrowheads in Room 100 in the workshop area (Blegen, et al. 2001: 35; Hofstra 2001: 94-5). Avila (1983: 66) posits that these arrowheads are intended to hunt small game based on their manufacturing technique, which emphasises speed of production and disposability, and their diminutive size.

**Structuring legitimacy: Funeral and feast**

In Bennet's (1995: 600-1, pl. LXXI; 1998-9; 1999a; 2001) reconstruction of the ascent of the Palace of Nestor site over the wider region, the period in which the further province is annexed takes place in late LH IIIA or early LH IIIB, at some point before the final construction phase of the palace. As has been suggested in the discussion of LH IIIA, the acts of consolidation in which the Palace of Nestor is engaged are aimed at undermining older power networks and realigning them, in part through dispersing settlements and hosting a population boom at the site of Ano Englianos itself.

Furthermore the historical importance of the tomb as a locus for exerting power and renegotiating status in this region has been well emphasised (Cavanagh 1998: 103-4; Wright 2006a: 16). In mortuary deposits, the weaponry summons death and the act of breaking the blade is an expression that in turn conquers violence and severs the portal by which death is summoned; in this way, the fracture is a life-affirming act. The fragmented Type E sword from the Pylos Archive Room recalls the earlier regional tradition of blades of antique taxa that are bent to mark the end of their uselife and subsequently deposited in tombs as part of funerary ritual. Moreover, the entire deposit in Room 7, composed of bones, antique martial culture, and miniature kylikes, together resemble an intact funerary deposit, where human and animal remains are often deposited together with vessels and weaponry (Gallou 2005: 127-8; Hamilakis 1998: 122). Performing a death and funeral as an animal sacrifice in LH IIIB in which the deceased animal becomes food for the attendants is a transformation of the rites of the funeral and the funerary meal into a palatial feast.
The relationship between feasting and/or drinking and the rites of the funeral has a long history in the Mycenaean world and has been much studied by Aegean prehistorians (Bendall 2004; 2007; Boyd 1994: 94; Cavanagh 1998: 106-7, 111; Dabney, et al. 2004; Hamilakis 1998; various papers in Hitchcock, et al. 2008; Hruby 2006; Isaakidou, et al. 2002; Wright 1995a; 2004a; b). Nevertheless, one way that the Palace of Nestor\(^7\) appropriates the powers of violence, history and indigenous affinity is to restage the funeral feast in a palatial setting in order to capitalise on all the symbolic narratives that unfold through such a performance. Stocker and Davis (2004: 190) interpret the evidence from the Archive Complex as the remains of a sacrifice (also Halstead and Isaakidou 2004: 146), with the sword as the instrument of sacrifice and the spearhead reflecting the hunting package, which contributes to the feast by providing the red deer also found in the feasting detritus. As mentioned, the sword is the method by which death is delivered; its subsequent fragmentation effectively closes the portal of death and allows for life and time to continue. The spearhead holds a similarly polysemic role in this context. The antiquity of the weapon, and its

\(^7\) And probably other citadels such as Mycenae, Thebes, Midea, Orchomenos as suggested by the Linear B tablets, pottery and animal remains (Hamilakis 2008; Killen 1994; Shelmerdine 2008c: 124; Shelton 2008; Walberg and Reese 2008).
associations with foreign places, reaffirm its invigorating nature in conjunction with its use in the chase and as a method of encounter with the liminal.

Figure 48: Sword and spearhead uncovered in the excavations of Archive Room 7 (Stocker and Davis 2004: fig. 3).

The sacrifice and the communal consumption then is an act of self-definition for all parties (Bendall 2004; Bennet 2007b: 205; Halstead and Isaakidou 2004: 149). In light of the diasporas taking place in this region and resettlement at Ano Englianos and other sites (Bennet 1995; 1999a; 2001), restaging a funeral feast at the Palace of Nestor—with all the associated semantics of sacrifice and provision—is not simply an act of assimilation but is an investment of ancestral power at the site of Pylos which thereby extends indigenous affinity to all who participate. The palace, as an agent, asserts itself as the site of homecoming and as the curator of ideological and material provisions for the community. The feast also offers guests the opportunity to be accepted as new members of the settlement by partaking in localised rites; in so doing, they become part of Pylian society.

Nevertheless, like all Mycenaean political dialogues, the bodily incorporation of new residents at the site of Ano Englianos is diacritically structured. Previously, the funeral is the locus that offered the opportunity in which the networks that bind the living, who are never equal in the Mycenaean worldview, and the dead are reorganised, meaning that during the process of interment individual positions are renegotiated and reaffirmed (Hayden 2009). Like the funerals of earlier days (Boyd 2002; Voutsaki
The Linear B tablets, which record the sponsorship of the wanax and lawagetas, indicate that sacrificial feasting continues to be a discourse on status (Bendall 2004: 110; also the iconographic evidence, Bennet 2007a: 13; for pottery evidence, see Hruby 2008; Shelmerdine 2008b; Wright 2006a: 39). Bendall (2004) compares the range of contexts of a Pylian feast to map where the various types of comestibles and the associated tableware are consumed. Bendall (2004: 123-4) designates a series of zones, each more exclusive than the next (Figure 49): a few thousand sit outside the palace in Court 58, eating and drinking from coarseware vessels; a few hundred take their meal within the palace at Court 63 and rooms in the Southwest Building, and use ceramic fine ware; while tens of individuals make use of gold and silver vessels inside the main megaron. In like fashion, the foods consumed in each of these three areas are not the same; those in Hall 64 and the main megaron enjoy a cuisine full of rare and exotic ingredients. The rights of access to these various dining areas can thus be compared with the similar act of processing through the citadel space, where individuals become more excluded as one moves towards the megaron; the architecture itself discriminates and regulates.

Figure 49: Plan of Pylos (Stocker and Davis 2004: fig. 1). Numbered locations indicate the sites of burned animal bones.
As part of demarcating exclusivity, there is the diacritical nature of the sensory experience that is an intrinsic aspect of a Mycenaean feasting event. Against the background reconstructed by Isaakidou (2007) and Fox (2008), where the phenomenon of enthralling the senses to signal social status has been much discussed (also Bennet 2007a: 15; Gosden 2001; Hamilakis, et al. 2002), the interactions of violence within this context add to the sensory experience. The violence of sacrifice, performed in the public arena, capitalises on the traditional Mycenaean viewpoint that to witness violence is to approve of it. Witnessing violence is not limited to using one's sense of sight however; indeed, violence is an immersing experience, in which one's hearing, smell, taste and touch are all involved. Sounds of a slaughter may include the sharpening of the blade against a whetstone, announcements or preliminary speeches, the sounds of shuffling and the noise of preparation, animal brays and shrieks; the ear even feels cursory moments of silence. The subsequent dressing of the animal for consumption discharges a heavy cloud of carnage, which assaults the senses (Hamilakis 2008: 8). Handling the carcass means encountering a range of tactile stimuli as the animal cools in temperature and the butcher works through the skin, organs and muscles (Studer and Pillonel 2007). Smell and taste can be besotted with contradictory impulses: Initially, the putrid vapours rising from the draining blood and exposed organs clog the airways and flood the palate; whereas later the smells of roasting and braised meat awaken and whet the appetite (Hitchcock 2008: 324-5). At every moment of a sacrifice the synaesthetic experience is bodily inscribing one truth through a thousand separate messages: Namely, a sacrifice is the execution of violence to transform the living into the dead as part of sustenance patterns (Hamilakis 1998: 115-9; 2008: 8-9).

Through sacrifice, violence nourishes life, and so the act of eating a sacrifice is the ultimate indication of approval for violence. For this reason, a sacrifice is a powerful tool by which the Palace of Nestor can assert its authority, for two reasons: primarily, the palace is able to magnify the meaning of violence, an ability which translates into political legitimacy; and secondly, the sacrifice and feast bodily incorporates participants. By physically sharing the violence of sacrifice amongst members of the community through the act of consumption (Hamilakis 1998: 115-9), the violence is heightened: "[outside of the palatial context], the 'life course' of a violent encounter may be short lived. The [palace] provides a mechanism that extends violence over longer periods of time and to larger numbers of participants" (Decker
and Van Winkle 1996: 25). Moreover, combining violence with the preparation and consumption of food, both similarly intense sensory experiences, is a potent method of inscribing memories onto the collective personhood (Hamilakis 2008: 15-8). As a locus that nourishes the community, the Palace of Nestor is investing the site with ancestral power and defining itself as the permanent home of all the participants; Pylos is bodily creating palatial society through the practice of feasting.

**Structuring legitimacy: Sepulchre and settlement**

Nonetheless, restaging a funerary feast at the palace is only one way that the citadels adopt aspects of the power dynamic that governs the social interaction in the mortuary sphere. Just as the detritus in the Archive Complex Room 7 consists of the same elements as a set of mortuary furniture, the deposition of martial culture in various areas around the other citadels play a similar role. There are two general types of palatial depositions: hoards and other caches of weaponry, armour, pictorial pottery and terracotta figurines; and the megaron wall paintings and other associated iconography. I would argue that although wholly diverse in media and aspects of purpose, they are manifestations of the same political impulse: to aggregate historical martial culture that was once deposited in tombs in order to legitimise the enterprise of the settlement. These depositions bring the environment of the tomb into the citadel space.

Nevertheless, it is evident that not all hoards are alike, for the actions that lead to their deposition vary. Identifying the purpose of the cache, characterising its nature, and understanding its chronology are all factors with an individual impact on the formation of a cache. Mycenaean hoards often contain antique martial objects, which have special pertinence in Mycenaean worldview; the Homeric term *keimelia* designates such a collection as “objects[,] which[,] because of their shape, design or way of manufacture[,] brought back memories of events and persons, from whom one had received them as a gift” (Maran 2006b: 131). Maran (2006b) argues that *keimelia* are a source of power because they are forms of wealth that draw upon historical legitimacy. Because the ideology of a cache is a dialogue with the cultural concept of aggregation, even those hoards that appear functional in nature, such as the Orchomenos founder’s hoard, have an individual chaîne opératoire (also Figure 38). The composition of the

---

73 Moreover, the relationship between architecture and social concepts of time heighten the formation of collective memories through the use of various spaces to emphasise the diacritical nature of the feast (Hitchcock 2008; Wright 2006b: 50).
Mycenae acropolis hoard of 1890, with a spearhead, two Type G swords and two Type D blades, three Type F blades and a Naue Type II sword, is an accumulation of historic and contemporary weaponry, similar to what has been found in funerary deposits. Indeed, some of these pieces may have been placed in tombs over the centuries (LH II-IIIIB) and then subsequently taken out and brought to the settlement (Wolpert 2004: 136). A movement of this sort is an act invested with the same intensity of meaning as the closure of tholoi in the south-western Peloponnese and the subsequent celebration of the funeral at the site of Pylos. The fact that most hoards are deposited in LH IIIC suggests that this practice in the post-palatial period is a culmination of both short- and long-term trajectories: the social changes at the end of the palatial period are dramatic enough to merit the aggregation of funerary items within the citadel; and also that the ideological impact of the embodied landscape continues to re-map concepts of space through to LH IIIC (see also Knapp, et al. 1988). For even if the hoarding of mortuary martial culture only takes place after the fall of the palaces, it seems that the desire to recreate the bellicose aspects of historical tombs is a palatial practice, as expressed through the wall paintings.

Figure 50: LH IIIB figure-of-eight shield fresco from Cult Centre Complex. Photograph taken by the author.

The martial frescoes at Pylos (Figure 46), Mycenae (Figures 44, 53), Orchomenos and Thebes present a palimpsest of bellicose objects. The figures wear boar’s tusk helmets at Mycenae, Thebes and Pylos, where they also fight with blades,
reflecting the older preference for sword fighting (Figure 46). Figure-of-eight shields are found throughout the Cult Centre at Tiryns and Mycenae (Figure 50), and the goddess figure in the Room of the Frescoes (Figure 44) holds a long sword that may represent the long, elegant blades of the MH III-LH II period, in contrast to the short contemporary types of LH IIIA-IIIB. Although the sword in the hand of the central figure on the pinax from Tsountas' House is too chipped and faded to determine its typology (Figure 51) (Rehak 1984: 536-7), the combination of the figure-of-eight shield and the sword in this depiction is distinctly archaic (Harrell forthcoming). Similarly, the state of light dress and the corresponding lack of armour that characterises the figures in the wall paintings would also strike LH IIIB viewers as belonging to an earlier era. Indeed, although frequently the subject of contemporary vase painting, none of the typical LH IIIB accoutrements, such as pointed shakos, hedgehog helmets and small round shields, are found on frescoes. Contemporary audiences would note the boar's tusk helmet, figure-of-eight shields, long swords and the manner of fighting on wall paintings, all of which had passed away long before LH IIIB, and understand the scenes as having taken place in the formative past.

The incorporation of architectural elements, windows and settlement walls, in the depictions at Mycenae (Figure 53), Orchomenos and Thebes is not insignificant; besides recalling the city siege theme, which has a long history dating back to the Shaft Graves and before, the scenes reaffirm a sense of place, specifically citadel space

Figure 51: LH IIIB pinax from Tsountas' House (Kontorli-Papadopoulou 1996: pl. XXI).
(Bennet 2007a: 12; Harrell forthcoming; Renfrew 2000: 140-3). The situation of the wall painting in the past, but also specifically at the palaces themselves, offers the settlements historical legitimacy by means of the impact of violence. The incorporation of genuine pieces of historical weaponry in the fresco scenes acts in many ways like the antique armaments in tombs. During subsequent funerals, the mortuary furniture would be revisited; these pieces embody legitimacy in terms of measuring the lineage and fortune of families (Wolpert 2004). Martial wall paintings, which are removed and repainted a number of times (Brysbaert 2008b; Immerwahr 1990: 106), may have held the same role in preserving a similar aggregation of physical artefacts inside the megaron space through which individuals are able to measure their heritage. Moreover, frescoes such as that found in Hall 64 at Pylos (Figure 46) and the Cult Centre at Mycenae (Figure 44) are in areas that are subject to regular empowerment through processions and other such performances (Wardle 2003; Wright 2006b: 62). Like the feasting detritus at Pylos, the violent scenes in palatial frescoes demarcate the palaces as the loci where acts of sustenance take place.

The sole contemporary martial artefact to be found on wall paintings is the rail chariot, an LH IIIB type, and although the specific taxon of chariot is contemporary to the period, the chariot as a general type of bellicose accoutrement is not, as the LH IIIB Mycenaean would be keenly aware. Concrete evidence for this is proffered by the stelai from Grave Circle A (Figure 52), of which the chariot is a key icon, and it is during this period that Grave Circle A is incorporated into the settlement and the stelai re-erected (Gates 1985; Laffineur 1987; 1990a). It would be apparent to the LH IIIB Mycenaeans that, as a martial object, chariots have a long and important role in their political history. Moreover, the depiction of the chariot in the megaron frieze at Mycenae (Figure 53) suggests that it is not just the personal martial accoutrements and the types of fighting that identify both the particular combatants and the historical nature of these narratives (Harrell forthcoming); perhaps it is the display of violence itself that holds meaning. While the artistic relationship between pictorial pottery and wall paintings has been much discussed (Immerwahr 1990; Marthari 2000), another inspiration for the Mycenae megaron frieze may be explored. The focus of the megaron frieze, in which the fragments preserve a scene in which a chariot driver attacks another figure, in effect jettisoning this individual off the settlement wall, is the first scene in which a chariot is used as a weapon itself, rather than a form of
transport, since the Shaft Grave period. Specifically, the Shaft Grave stelai have a similar focus on the chariot as a weapon, for example, stele V, the “Over the Sea” stele (Figure 52), depicts a charioteer armed with a sword bearing down on another swordsman who is nearly pinioned in the right side of the frame by the action (Younger 1997: 236, no. V, pl. LXXXIXa). It is in LH IIIB that Grave Circle A is physically incorporated into the citadel by extending the walls, resurfacing the mound, demarcating it with a periphery of stones, and, most importantly, re-erecting the Shaft Grave stelai (Gates 1985; Laffineur 1987; 1990a). Many of the stelai feature horses and horse and chariots as a dominant image (nos. I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XI), and the act of re-erecting the stones suggests that the LH IIIB Mycenaeans invest the images with a power that is in part drawn from seeing them. For these reasons, then, I suggest that the megaron frieze is designed to reproduce the environment of Grave Circle A by imitating the iconography of the grave stelai to emphasise the indigenous affinity of the citadel context that so defines both the spaces of the megaron and Grave Circle A.

As Pylos is recreating the funeral through the practice of sacrifice and feasting, Mycenae is physically constructing tomb space at the site of the settlement. The importance of violence and martial culture in the funerary realm has a long tradition, but during LH IIIB the deposition of such social wealth drops off dramatically, as materials and resources are consumed by and at the palaces (Voutsaki 2001b). To a certain extent, the citadels can be seen as institutions that have transferred, and in part transformed, the power, legitimacy and claims to aggregation that family tombs hold in the early Mycenaean period, a process in which violence plays a fundamental role (see also Bennet and Davis 1999). The preference for historical forms of martial culture, with the frequent depiction of swords, boar’s tusk helmets, figure-of-eight shields and archaic modes of violence, does not mean that they are desiccated in meaning as symbols (Hiller 1999: 327-8). Nor is the repetition of this iconography the actions of an established political power. Rather it is the very change in the contexts of consumption that allows martial culture to be renewed in terms of impact and potency, which forms a basis upon which the citadels create authority for specific political schemata (Maran and Stavrianopoulou 2007: 290-1).

74 Contrast the megaron frieze with the depictions of a chariot and sunshade on pictorial pottery (X.4, A5, Figure 39) (Crouwel 1991; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982).

75 This translation and, indeed, transformation of power is perhaps best expressed visually through the use of conglomerate and the prominence of the architectural element of the relieving triangle on both the Treasury of Atreus and the Lion Gate at Mycenae (Wright 2006a: 16-7, fig. 1.4).
Figure 53: Mycenaean megaron frieze (Immerwahr 1990: pl. 65).

Figure 52: Shaft Grave stele V, "Over the Sea" (National Archaeological Museum #1428) (after Younger 1997: pl. LXXXIXa).
As the palaces harness the sources of legitimacy that once sustained funerary monuments, in like manner the purpose of the citadels may have in large part overlapped with that of tombs. The institution of the palace is an interpretation of power, community identity and patterns of consumption that come together to legitimise the role of the palace in creating a worldview and fostering self-sustenance. The appearance of martial culture and weaponry at citadel sites is significant in terms of the historical precedent for such acts of accumulation as well as the ideological consequences of antique weaponry. One role that the palaces create for themselves, especially the sites in the Argolid, is the regulation and control of violence, in direct competition with its earlier consumption in tombs (compare with Bennet 2007b: 200-1, who argues that the palaces control certain material goods as well). Moreover, by limiting violence to specific contexts of consumption, the palaces are asserting themselves as dominant social mediators, meaning that palatial systems are the means by which diacritical structuration takes place. This may be why there are a number of social customs, such as certain modes of craft production, writing, and monumental settlement construction, which are associated with the palaces but are not found in other contexts or other periods (see also Darcque 1996).

**Conclusions**

The common viewpoint of the palatial era of Mycenaean history is a model in which the palaces are established, legitimate institutions with the right to hold power and centralise social organisation (de Fidio 2008: 91-105; Shelmerdine 2008c; Shelmerdine and Bennet 2008). This archetype runs counter to the picture presented by the archaeological evidence, however, where continual repetition of communal action, through feasting, monument construction, processing and craft production, all suggest that palatial authority requires maintenance and is not steadfast. Similarly, the recourse to violence is another method by which the palaces legitimise their right to consume. The citadels express the power of aggression by reinventing the contexts in which violence is executed.

It is significant that the methods of violence appear to have only subtly transformed; there is no palatial feudal revolution (see also Dickinson 1999b; Drews 1988; 1993). Trends in martial culture develop over an extended period of time; throughout LH IIIA-IIIB blades grow shorter and stockier and spearheads are more popular and display regional differences in design. The consumption of military transport, chariots, and spears continues; spearheads are a common grave good in the
tombs of the Ionian Islands, Achaia, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece and the chariot, horse, and horse and rider are frequently depicted on pictorial pottery and as terracotta figurines, as well as on wall paintings. More importantly is how the polysemy of martial culture transforms; from LH IIIA to LH IIIB, the propensity for positioning the threat of violence in space, holding discourse with the landscape through hunting, and creating a sense of indigenous affinity by constructing a defined settlement space is encountered by travels into the distance and by means of spears and martial transport. While these social interactions from LH IIIA continue into LH IIIB, the LH IIIB evidence suggests that violence is used in political narratives in ways that recall earlier mortuary customs, which is in itself a transformation of the meaning of violence.

At the site of Pylos, the violence that once formed a central method of negotiation in the mortuary sphere is performed in the palatial setting as an act of sacrifice and communal feasting. The Archive Room 7 deposit has all the salient elements that define tomb contents: vessels; bones; and antique and broken weaponry (Gallou 2005: 127-8; Hamilakis 1998: 122). By hosting a sacrifice and inviting the wider community to take part, the Palace of Nestor initiates new members, making them local residents, and at the same time, designates the site of Ano Englianos as the locus of historical legitimacy. The wider consumption of antique martial culture at palace sites, either through its depiction on wall paintings or through removing physical objects from tombs to the settlement, suggests that the citadels are incorporating the narratives of martial power from the mortuary sphere into these spaces. It has been suggested here that the vignette of the Mycenae megaron fresco, depicting the use of the chariot as a weapon, is a representation imitating the recently re-erected Shaft Grave stelai, with the intention of recreating the sacred legitimacy of Grave Circle A inside the main megaron itself. The wider consumption of antique martial culture in the citadel spaces is a deliberate realignment of these older martial power networks to incorporate the palaces as a dominant political negotiator.
Table 21: Itemised list of LH IIIB pictorial pottery and larnakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Reference Number</th>
<th>Site Found and Context</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Museum Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Corinth, from a pit behind Julian Basilica</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A2, 17</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>23796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A3, 16</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>23796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nauplion</td>
<td>LH IIIB:1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>IX.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Midea 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Midea 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Midea 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Midea 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midea, West Gate</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Midea 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.24, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.3, 31</td>
<td>NM, MM</td>
<td>54 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K/B</td>
<td>X.31, 58</td>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>1294 lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X4, A5, 30</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>23785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.5, 33</td>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>7681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.7, 36</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>A1077.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>IX.8, 46</td>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>1272A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.8, 48</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>15 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 13747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 14330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 13419 72/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 11674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 13427 72/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 12456/MM 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>BE 8048, MM 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>XI.45, 47</td>
<td>E. Wiegang Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>27108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>27117.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>11679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>LH IIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>23800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Reference Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Museum Catalogue Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae, near poros wall between the tholos tombs of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra</td>
<td>LH IIIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>IX.2, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns, Unterburg</td>
<td>LH IIIIB:2</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra, CT 22</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 6:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, area east of storage room L</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, area east of storage room L</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 7:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, eastern section of room A</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 16:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, eastern section of room A</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 16:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, eastern section of room A</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 16:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, northeast baulk</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pl. 17:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, room D</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 12:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, room I</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>Pl. 16:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, room I</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pl. 21:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, southern border</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 12:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, surface find</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 5:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, surface find</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl. 18:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, terrace west of the Quarter</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 12:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, test pit III</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 12:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 2:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 2:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump</td>
<td>LH IIIIB</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Pl. 4:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Reference Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Museum Catalogue Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 4:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 4:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 6:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 6:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 6:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 9:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 9:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 9:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 10:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 12:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 12:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 12:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 13:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 13:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 13:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 14:2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 14:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 14:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>OK Pl. 15:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 15:4a-c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 15:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 15:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 15:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>J? Pl. 16:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 16:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>K? Pl. 16:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>K? Pl. 16:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>J? Pl. 16:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 16:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 17:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 17:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 17:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>B Pl. 17:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>B Pl. 17:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 17:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>K Pl. 17:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>K? Pl. 17:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>K Pl. 18:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>? Pl. 18:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 18:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>AK Pl. 19:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIb</td>
<td>CV Pl. 19:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Reference Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Museum Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIB</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Pl 21:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIB</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Pl 22:1a-b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIB</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>Pl 22:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIB</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Pl 47:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbati, Dump LH IIIB</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Pl 49:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendra LH IIIB OV X.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K A10, 56 MM 23796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K A12, 26 MM 23796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K X.6 Nam 1217 (2058)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K IX.7, 245 ASCSA ASP 97B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K IX.9, 27 Nam 3051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K 21 MM 23793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K 243 MM 27117.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K 244 Nam 1298.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K 246 alpha MM 13565 72/31, 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB J 533 MM 24766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB K 43 MM 12908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early K X.1 Nam 1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early K X.27, 67 Nam 1303 lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early B X.30, 62 Nam 1272 lot (-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early CV 61 MM 12452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early K 69 Nam 1298.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early K 70 MM 11666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early K 264 MM BE 27103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC early CV 532 MM 13434 72/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC K 43 MM 12908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB:2-IIIC K IX.10, 270 Nam 3631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyklai LH IIIB IIIC K X.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens LH IIIB IIIC K/B X.28 Nam MISSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens LH IIIB IIIC K X.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens LH IIIB IIIC K X.41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopreza LH IIIB IIIC OK IX.3 Nam 3472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopreza LH IIIB IIIC OK IX.4 Nam MISSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB IIIC K X.20 Nam 1303 lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae LH IIIB IIIC K 266 MM 23800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.10 Nam 1512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.11 Nam 1507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.12 Nam 1508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.13 Nam 1514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.14 Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.15 Nam 1654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.16 Nam 14 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns LH IIIB IIIC K X.17 Nam 14 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Reference Number</td>
<td>Site Found and Context</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Museum Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.18</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.19</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>X.33</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.34</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.35</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.37</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>2446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>IX.6</td>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>LH IIIB-IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X.9</td>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>1509, 1510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue number key:
- Pl. numbers=Åkerström (1987)
- Midea numbers=Demakopoulou (2006)
- Whole numbers=Pliatsika (2004)
- Roman numerals (IX, X)=Vermeule and Karageorghis (1982)

Museum key:
- ASCSA=American School of Classical Studies at Athens
- BM=British Museum
- MM=Mycenae Museum
- NAM=National Archaeological Museum
- NM=Nauplion Museum
- TM=Thebes Museum

Colour coding:
- Armed figure
- Martial decorative motif
- Duelling and/or combat
- Chariot driving and/or depiction of horses
- Tiryns Shield Bearer sequence

Type key:
- ?=Unknown vessel
- AK=Amphoroid Krater
- B=Bowl
- CV=Closed vessel
- J=Jug
- K=Krater
- K/B=Krater/Bowl
- L=Larnax
- OK=Open Krater
- OV=Open Vessel
- R=Rhyton
Chapter Eight: Conclusions

In the introduction to this thesis, I pose three questions for research: How do we account for the rise of power as expressed in the Shaft Graves? How do familial tombs sustain certain groups into LH III? What is the purpose of the palace system, and why does it look the way it does? Using violence as the central method of archaeological inquiry, I have sought to construct models that forefront agent-driven change as culturally informed performances. As a result, one of the intentions of this thesis is to offer a challenge to the stereotypical view that characterises Mycenaean bellicosity and martial culture as hollow, impotent, and a representation of violence and power but not an expression of it.

Historically, archaeological scholarship has used the argumentum ad baculum to justify the ends of violence by assuming that Mycenaean violence is part of the natural order, disregarding the monumental boundaries of culture, time and space. In contrast, this thesis espouses the viewpoint that understanding violence and its effects requires a perspective that considers the poetics of violence, that is, violence as a social process, for the simple reason that aggression is always a human choice and is at all times culturally executed and defined.

For this reason, the aim of this thesis is to contextualise the poetics of violence in the Mycenaean world in order to understand how this social practice is exploited as a form of legitimacy in terms of negotiating social authority. Violence, along with recalls to the past and the touchstone of identity, are potent forms of political power with deep historical roots, playing salient roles in the social trope and having intensive impacts on the ways the Mycenaeans view their environment and themselves. By exploring how violence is utilised in terms of defining concepts of space and time, the appropriate contexts of violence have been deconstructed; in sum, the social arenas in which political violence is engaged are transformed through the centuries but are at all times structured with a formalised method of execution and embodied ideologies. Throughout the wider narrative, this work has specifically focused on illuminating the roles of agents in a social hierarchy, their choices, motivations and aims in fulfilling personal and community identities.

It has been methodologically prudent to draw a distinction between the practice of consuming martial culture and the consumption of the practice of violence. The analyses in each of the four data chapters (Chapters 4-7) have first sought to situate
martial culture in its context, in the tomb and in settlement space. This initial survey is followed by a study of the social powers in practice in each period, and how the poetics of violence and the consumption of martial culture are forces at work within the wider expressions of control, authority and hegemony.

The central theoretical tenet underlining this research, that legitimacy is a social force that is not a static weight but rather needs to be continually sustained and implemented through action, has lead to the reinterpretation of a number of Mycenaean social practices. The fundamental argument of this thesis may be summarised thus: Violence is a potent method of Mycenaean diacritical cohesion, for which the material manifestations of this arrangement include such diverse phenomena as the Shaft Graves and the political geography of the Argive plain and the southwestern Peloponnese through LH IIIB. The impact of violence in terms of its role as a method of social discourse, ideological worth and effect on habitus has a lasting and resonant impression on the formation and recreation of the Mycenaean identity from the earliest period, as shall be reviewed summarily.

**Thesis synopsis**

We should consider the martial culture in graves, goods that begin to be a salient part of the mortuary furniture in MH III, as part of political message sending, for in this early period the funerary realm is an extremely potent political space. In terms of transforming political schemata, amongst the earliest corpora of data indicating definitive changes in violent practice are the Mycenae Grave Circle depositions. These graves contain a profusion of information about the formative developments of this era, and the repetition of martial culture in the Shaft Graves underlines the idea that these pieces are political symbols. It is evident by the variety of types and scale of the martial culture that violence exerts a potent force in the creation of a new social system. The ideological mindset, in which domination over material goods and human capital is deemed equal and acceptable, supports the articulation of dominance through violence through specialised control over capital. Violence is used to intensify the resources at hand, in effect creating a vertical hierarchy in which agents participate in the roles of aggressor, victim and witness. The collection of iconographic pieces displaying combat from the Shaft Graves emphasises the duality of victim and victor as well as the Mycenaean perception that to witness violence is to approve of it. As part of intensification, violence enables participants to rearrange older MH agnatic structures, but not fully undercut them, for kinship is too valuable for utter
dissolution. Moreover the familial links identified in the Shaft Grave skeletal analyses suggest that violence goes some way to empowering these historical networks even further (Bouwman, et al. 2008; Brown, et al. 2000; Musgrave, et al. 1995).

The sword, the most preeminent of all taxa of martial culture, embodies the new political framework and related social control. The blade bears an ascribed status, in part the result of the utmost cultural value held in the skills involved in wielding the sword. In effect, the ideographic perception of the sword represents a vertical hierarchy and legitimacy through dominance. Because they are commissioned items, nearly every martial object from the Shaft Graves is individual and expressly unique, although together they clearly represent a limited number of taxonomic classes. While the earlier graves in Grave Circle B, along with the Kolonna warrior grave and the MH grave at Thebes, have been interpreted as belonging to the individual warrior grave prototype, the later tombs in Grave Circle B and those in Grave Circle A have been suggested as representing the system of vertical hierarchy in which swords travel amongst the orders of the hierarchy as part of the establishment and fulfilment of obligations, an interpretation supported by the suggested role of artefact biography and the associated meaning of the high level of individuality that many of the pieces of martial culture embody.

The theoretical constructs that underpin this model require that we leave behind a rigid concept of ancient ownership and consider the swords in the later Shaft Graves as having multiple spheres of belonging. As gifts received when the skills needed for swordsmanship have been obtained—physical skills inseparable from associated political roles and social dominance—these blades bind individuals to the collective hierarchy, strengthen the functions of and interaction between the orders, and imbue personal relationships with values like obligation, fictive kinship, honour and esteem. Indeed, it may be more reasonable to assume that the Shaft Grave swords belong to or are associated with numerous individuals rather than with just the deceased. The consumption of the swords in this way—what may be construed as their heralded birth, latent ideographic power, public bestowal, association with or belonging to individuals who operate at the pinnacle or near pinnacle of the social order—only heightens the magnificence of their final presentation and deposition in the tomb, as well as reifying all of these formative processes. The act of consuming the swords in the Shaft Graves from their commission through to their final
commemoration and burial in the tomb is a parallel development in material form of the making of Mycenaean through the practice of violence.

The early (MH III-LH II) remains from the Argolid outside of the Shaft Graves suggest that the ideology of the sword is not exclusive to the Grave Circles. Daggers are not uncommon depositions, but after the Shaft Graves go into disuse, the sword is a preferred form of mortuary furniture. The continued development of new and improved blade types underscores the continued importance of violence. The symbolic weight of the sword is a salient aspect of its perceived value, as evidenced by the ornate and jewelled decoration of the hilts and midribs found on the Dendra tholos remains, amongst others. Nevertheless, the political implications concerning regional hierarchies are too diffuse to delineate wider hegemonies in this period. The nature of witnessing violence appears to have been transformed through LH I-II in contrast to the iconography in the Shaft Graves; the remains may now be characterised as displaying martial culture rather than the execution of violence.

In contrast to patterns in the Argive plain, the data from the western and south-western Peloponnese suggest that violence is consumed in distinct ways, exhibited by the localised propensity for certain types of martial culture and a general avoidance of other taxa. During MH III-LH IIIA:1 the preferred weapons of Messenia are the Type A blades, the Schlachtmesser, and Type I daggers, at times inlaid with niello designs. There is a frequency of arrowheads and boar's tusks, but there is an absence of the iconography of combat. These preferences are especially salient during LH I-II, as evidenced by the Myrsinochori (Routsi) Tholos 2 and the Vapheio Tholos. The controlled deposition of historic types of martial culture suggests that violence is being exploited but also restricted in scope to acts that sustain the legitimacy of older agnatic networks, rather than renegotiate them. The attitude towards hunting, in which the symbolism of obtainment—the boar's tusks—is elevated over the means by which the hunt is conducted, namely spears, suggests that violence is considered in the same light. In this scheme, the effects of political violence—the projection of the established order and the continued preservation of lineage—subsume its methods. The social custom of honour, with its emphasis on upholding familial heritage and personal individuality, has been utilised to explain the dynamic in the western and south-western Peloponnese. Honour cultures heavily value the spoken word, and indeed make use of sparring dialogue in order to hierarchically arrange members. Moreover, the significance of the oral tradition is in maintaining local heritage in order
to recreate social positions and responsibilities. To this end, a case study of an honour culture that consumes antique weaponry with artefact biographies can be found in the *Iliad*. The earliest firmly dateable lines of the epic are those that describe antique pieces of martial culture and their pedigrees. Likewise, the role of aggressive language is underscored by the animosity with which the Achaeans confront each other, in contrast to the lack of hostile speech among the Trojans and their allies. Unlike the Trojans, the Argives do not have a settled or established hierarchy, and therefore use belligerent language to compete but also to build social cohesion and incorporate members.

The consumption of martial culture in the tomb is not insignificant, but should be considered a distinct historical artefact. Mycenaean funerary rites are a convergence of multiple sources of power, including the remembrance of the past, as mediated through artefacts and the oral tradition, the force of death, which is summoned by the presence of weaponry, and the subsuming chaos of violence, embodied by native methods of execution. The acts of deposition that take place during burial are liminal periods that intercede with these forces of nature, empower them by offering them meaning and expression, but also control and dominate them. History is honoured through the rituals of the funeral, the use of antique armaments and/or pieces beautified in the traditional manner, and the relation of artefact, human and community biographies. Violence is engaged with repeatedly through the reiteration of martial culture, many items of which are jewelled and exhibit high craftsmanship. The express limits on the methods and material forms of violence mediate the social contexts for the execution of aggression, sustaining and proliferating more life-affirming ways to build social cohesion and diacritical relations. The change in focus of martial iconography from portraying acts of violence to symbolising martial culture speaks of the conceptual articulation of martial culture as ideographs representing a network of related practices and ideologies. That the weapons in the tombs in the south-western Peloponnese, especially the swords, have acute symbolic potency is underlined by the fact that they are not infrequently bent, presumably as part of the intricate and extended funeral rites.

Death is confronted formally, an aspect that Voutsaki (1998: 46-7) interprets as indicative of social transformation. The elaboration of localised traditions across the Mycenaean world, the focus on the grave as an arena for performance, of which the rise of secondary burial is part, and the perception that the funeral is a forum in which
social hierarchies are negotiated all indicate that death holds significant meaning and is honoured for its influence. Sanctioning violence and the mediation of the effect of the past both work to subjugate death to the forces of life, energy and animation. Such complex perceptions of death also suggest that lifeways are becoming more salient and dear as the Mycenaeans confronted a growing social connection with other settlements on the mainland along with increased proximity to the diverse cultures of the wider Mediterranean.

The conceptualisation of the funeral monument as a space in which liminal forces are at work may be a salient pressure in the evolution of Mycenaean political geography taking place in LH IIIA. In this period, the threat of violence is sensed to be embedded in the landscape, that is, at certain liminal places, rather than at transitional moments in time. The patterns in the archaeological evidence suggest that in this period, the Mycenaeans are reinterpreting their relationship with the land in terms of ownership and dominance. In Messenia, ascension of the Pylian polity over other sites in the region takes a different trajectory than the settlements in the Argolid, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece, as the site of Pylos manoeuvres to capitalise on human labour for economic control over communities. The method of hegemony taken by Ano Englianos is in the form of economic sanctions, human displacement and re-assimilation into other settlements, through which the holds of historical indigenous affinity are dissolved. As a type of symbolic violence, this approach is presumably more suitable to undermining lineage, the long-term source of legitimacy, than waging combat. The evidence does not suggest that a fully integrative complex hierarchy is in place with Pylos at the apex, however, even by the end of LH IIIB; the number of place names preserved in the Linear B tablets, when compared with the UMME and PRAP survey data, suggest that Pylos had extensive dealings even with very small settlements (contra Bennet 1995). In contrast with Crete, which has an encompassing and well-articulated site hierarchy, the proximity with which Pylos interacts with the smaller settlements suggests a more heterarchical order in Messenia.

The changing perception of the political geography also pervades the interaction amongst communities in the Argolid, northwest Greece, Macedonia and Central Greece, where movement through the liminal landscape is balanced by the monumental construction of the home site. Concepts like distant horizons, places with low visibility and the threat of violence are bound together to reinforce the creation of settlements that are situated on sites with generations of social history. Threatening
space is encountered and subjugated through the construction and maintenance of roads, upon which Mycenaean chariots travel. The experience with the liminal is kept alive within the citadels themselves through the consumption of chariot kraters and terracotta figurines, which serve as reminders of the dangers found in the outside world and in turn fuel the spirit of conquest.

A contemporary approach to investing legitimacy in the material world that arises in this period is the procession through the citadel, an event by which the enceinte as an architectural unit is empowered and which capitalises upon the idea that movement through the landscape is a way to subjugate it (Ingold 2004; Morris 1990). Processions are also discriminating in terms of social hierarchy: Those who perform a procession are distinguished from those who witness the demonstration, while the architecture of the citadels themselves differentiate amongst those who would enter by featuring gates and doors through which only certain individuals are allowed to pass. We assume that the individuals who have access to the most politically charged of megaron spaces are the wanax, lawagetas and other titled leaders. In terms of the utility of theorisation, more insight is gained in outlining the expectations of and social values behind certain central leadership roles rather than focusing on defining the outer limits of the exercise of power of these figures (contra Kopcke 2004). In light of the fact that the Mycenaecans regard worldly power as necessitating repeated reaffirmation, we should consider the legitimacy of rulers as theoretically uncertain and requiring consistent maintenance. Such a system argues for accepted limits of authority for leadership positions.

During this period when the political geography is undergoing transformation, it is no surprise that the hunt, an act in which people move out to hold discourse with and establish dominance over the threatening forces of the world, becomes a popular pursuit and ideogram at this time. That the Mycenaean hunt remains a diacritical activity is evident: The glory of the event, as evidenced by the use of finely crafted spearheads, of local variety, the driving of chariots and the depiction of the hunt in megaron wall paintings, all suggest that like swordsmanship, the chase is a competitive opportunity in part intended for the display of a highly prized skill set (Morris 1990). Hunting, like all Mycenaean expressions of power, is another method of discriminating people into a social order.

Ideas about journeys through the liminal, perceived to be a part of the landscape, are also taken as homologous with the consummation of death and the
ideology of cult. The rise in the depiction of architectural elements on larnakes and inside chamber tombs suggests that one's demise is a liminal journey through which one must pass to find ultimate transcendence and homecoming. Evidence for this phenomenon comes from the consumption of weaponry, terracotta figurines and pottery, and larnakes with chariot or hunting decoration in the mortuary sphere and at sanctuary sites. The evidence for the consumption of martial culture in religious rites should not be interpreted as a dilution of the ideographic nature of weaponry; rather engagement with the numinous is a method of mutual empowerment. It may be that the so-called "Warrior Goddess" becomes the fountainhead of this aspect of cult (Rehak 1984; 1999).

Many of the trends that emerge in LH IIIA become intensified as patterns of habitus throughout LH IIIB, with the material world creating and sustaining human actions and ideologies. In the Argolid, where citadel construction is a frequent and repeated performance that takes place in close proximity, the landscape is not a neutral surface but is partitioned and becomes associated with varying degrees of exclusion or rights of access. In this climate, encountering hostile territory is an act of violence because there is an inherent risk and threat of aggression. It is for this reason that bellicose movements are celebrated in the pictorial arts and are consumed both in settlement and funerary contexts, where they become metaphors for the ultimate threatening encounter: confronting death and pursuing the subsequent journey into the afterlife. By building a home space that forefronts both protection and native affinity, the Argive palaces are acknowledging this fragmentation of the landscape and staking claim to their individual regions through ancestral legitimacy. The introspective nature of Mycenaean settlements in the Argolid is not due to any lack of ability to conquer and assimilate, but rather reflects acts of recreation of the historical inheritance of the living landscape. Authority of place is recreated and sustained by journeys and processions from areas of hostility into zones of safety, security and potency.

The explicit consumption of antique forms of martial culture within citadel spaces, either in the aggregation of keimelia and other objects, probably from tombs or in iconographic form as seen on palatial wall paintings, is a political act intended to capitalise upon the historic legitimacy of tombs. The act of going into funerary monuments and removing certain objects in order to relocate them at settlement spaces is a performance invested with serious social weight. Another earlier manifestation of this practice is the preservation of antique weaponry in wall paintings.
Frescoes from Mycenae, Tiryns, Thebes, Orchomenos, and Pylos portray scenes of a martial character, in which old-fashioned martial accoutrements and methods of fighting clearly intend to recall the past, while the architectural elements of many of these scenes physically locate the violence in space, at the citadels themselves. The portrayal of these scenes in various zones of power, either within the main megaron or the Cult Centre at Mycenae, serves to underscore the characterisation of these wall paintings as political in nature. I argue that they are an innovative form of tomb architecture, that is, the martial culture and scenes of historical combat play the same role in defining the citadel as a locus of indigenous power and legitimacy that they did when found in tombs.

The material remains in the Archive Complex at Pylos should be interpreted similarly. Here faunal remains, miniature vessels, antique weaponry and Linear B records are the detritus of a palatial feast; however, the palace has restaged a funeral, in which the meat of sacrificial animals sustains the attendants in the same manner that communal consumption revived the living at funerals. Like a funeral, the palatial feast is a period in which personal status can be renegotiated. The relationship between feasting and hunting, underscored by various types of palatial evidence such as wall paintings, animal remains and finds of arrowheads, ties together two methods for diacritical order. The hunt has been well theorised as an activity in which individuals can assert their dominance within the group as the performance of hunting unfolds. Moreover, its characterisation as an occupation of provision and sustenance is celebrated at a feast; the zooarchaeological remains are clear evidence for the consumption of wild game at Pylos. So too, the Linear B tablets indicate that providing foodstuffs is an important duty of high-ranking officials. The division of people into various rooms and courts to enjoy distinct meals according to Bendall’s (2004) reconstruction underscores the fact that the feast itself is an event that creates social distinction.

The violence of sacrifice holds significant ideographic power on top of the elements described above, a message that is inscribed in the body by means of the senses. The kinetics of slaughter physically assault the senses; the poetics by which animals are killed to sustain the living, and the gore of death and butchery made culturally acceptable through the preparations of the feast, are ideologically the same as the rites of a funeral. For this reason, and against the backdrop of the social discourse of the hunt and the politics of the funeral restaged to differentiate the community, the
act of consumption at such a charged event signals acceptance of the violence of social order. By hosting the sacrifice and feast, the Palace of Nestor has formally accepted new people into the native population and has established itself as a locus of indigenous power for these dispersed groups.

The interpretations offered here suggest that the roles played by violence and martial culture through LH IIIA-IIIB are fundamental to the establishment of the authority of the palaces and their claims over the control of production and consumption of material and ideological capital. The particular relationship between violence and time allows the palaces to make use of the same forms of historical legitimacy once found in the funerary realm to propagate palatial agendas towards consumption by refashioning the paths of the future. Similarly, the relationship between violence and space redraws the political geography in both the Argolid and the south-western Peloponnesian, in which the construction of home sites and the closure of earlier mortuary monuments, as competing loci of power, are engaged.

**Thesis weaknesses**

In reviewing Chapters 4-7 and the synopsis above, there are two salient weaknesses of this research that may be probed. My intention for this thesis has not been centred on creating a duality between dominance and submission, but rather to focus on the continuing dialogue among power, authority, resistance, conflict and reintegration, the components that I interpret as the methods for social change and self-definition. Nevertheless, because it has been my explicit approach to seek and explain differences in patterns of consumption, rather than build models of continuity and similarity, I have naturally dichotomised the evidence and the interpretations. To a certain extent, the chapters are neatly partitioned wholes, reflecting characterisations that are highly convenient in their self-contained syntheses. While a certain strength is drawn from presenting essay-like reflections on various themes in each of the chapters, the effect blurs the focus on longue durée and cultural history that is foundational to this work.

Secondly, and perhaps more gravely, violence itself is at times fetishised because the aim of this thesis is to utilise violence as a methodological approach to the understanding of Mycenaean power structures and so violence is both the ends and the means of conceptualisation. With violence as the tool of illumination, the areas of exploration are limited to those loci where conflict plays a role. This is most evident in the lack of models centred on building intra-site interactions, or understanding the
Mycenaeans in terms of the wider LBA Mediterranean world. Perhaps new finds of martial culture from non-traditional contexts will allow paradigms to be made on a wider scale. Nevertheless the predispositions in this research are not simply due to a lack of variation in depositions. Rather, the interpretations made here forefront the existing dataset, the Corpus of Mycenaean Martial Culture, as a microcosm of the most meaningful interactions of the Mycenaean habitus and a synecdoche of the full negotiations of power.

Suggestions for further research

I offer then some suggestions by which these biases may be rectified as well as areas for further research. One way to showcase the legacy of LBA traditions is to consider the ways in which it is simultaneously safeguarded, forgotten and rejected by later Greeks, from LH IIIC through to the rise of the historical period. Although outside the stated remit of this thesis, certain formative actions taking place in LH IIIC, dating to during or after palatial collapse, are discussed in the LH IIIB chapter, underscoring the fact that the archaeological evidence resists full aggregation and analysis in the manner presented here. Of certain interest is the characterisation of the role of violence in the fall of the palaces and the end of the Mycenaean period through the transition into the Early Iron Age. The archaeological literature has traditionally looked upon violence in the EIA as even more disruptive and chaotic than in the Mycenaean period (see de Fidio 2008: 103-5; Deger-Jalkotzy 2008; Dickinson 2006: 41-57). Understanding the process of collapse no doubt requires study of each palace individually and a conceptual analysis of the ways in which the power networks of LH IIIB are re-circuited or are made to dissolve completely. The role of violence is probably in part responsible in this, but based on the historical trajectories discussed in this thesis, I would proffer that the purpose of violence is in no way straightforward. Rather it seems likely that in the succeeding period violence continues to be exploited for its energy in creating integration and cohesion and for its effectiveness in handling the fear of exterior threat.

Similarly, the ways in which violence negotiates time and the legitimacy of the past is an intriguing issue for the whole of LH IIIC and the following Submycenaean period (cf. Morris 2000: 206-7). A theoretically based research programme needs to be undertaken in order to construct the way violence is utilised to measure time, define social space and shape cultural identities through this period of transition and emergence. One type of deposition that reflects all of these ideological concepts is the
Further consideration needs to be taken in regards to understanding the various reasons behind LH IIIC hoarding culture. Scholars have long recognised that there are a variety of types of hoards, and like other categories of depositions, the cache has been typecast as indicating a set programme of practices and ideologies (Bradley 1998; Burgess, et al. 1979; Knapp 1988; Knapp, et al. 1988; Osborne 2004; various papers in Pare 2000). There is a distinct possibility that before certain Mycenaean artefacts are deposited as a cache, some of them were taken out of earlier tombs and brought together. In light of the changing feelings towards the Mycenaean past that are taking place through LH IIIC and later, the collection of antiques is a significant component in the discourse of determining the legitimacy of the past.

A related issue to the reinterpretation of the value of martial culture and violence during the LBA-EIA transition is scholarly characterisation of the changing practice of depositing martial culture at sanctuary sites in the EIA when these items are traditionally found in tombs throughout the LBA. At the height of the deposition of martial culture in the mortuary sphere in LH II, these objects are part of the ideology of violence, chaos and mortality and are used to summon and master death, as well as to limit and control violence itself. Yet by the time that martial culture becomes a popular dedication in cult, the technology of weaponry, the ideology of sacrifice, and the role and political power of sanctuaries have all changed fundamentally in function and purpose, and even the concept of violence as a form of political discourse has undergone transformation. In light of the fact that martial culture acts as an ideograph of past, contemporary and future violence, erection of weaponry and armour in public loci should be interpreted as part of the on-going agones taking place as the EIA Greeks reinvent the fundamental principles which govern their worldview and terms of social interaction (cf. de Polignac 1994; 1996). A study of the relation between the changing depositional practices of martial culture and contemporary ideological shifts will no doubt illuminate how dialogues of power between individuals and communities, polities and sanctuaries are revolutionised at this time.

**Closing statement**

In determinate fashion, I end this thesis with a final argument for viewing violence as fundamental to the near-spontaneous florescence and subsequent transformations of Mycenaean society, and exhorting that the power and effects of violence should not be underappreciated. The repercussions of the study are aimed at adding layers of meaning and complexity to the scholarly interpretation of the
Mycenaean identity. I contest the use of the term military history to qualify this work, for in modern parlance the term refers to the relatively hidden, exceedingly specialised and choreographed interactions of armies and their leaders, and is therefore too restricted for application here. Instead what I have argued is that regardless of the scale of aggression, the consumption of violence and martial culture is carried out on a highly integrative level, in large part with the exertion of other forms of power, and is therefore a directly visible social practice. As a dominant form of public expression, it needs regular acceptance for its legitimacy to be sustained through the hegemonic participation of Mycenaean populations. For this reason, the diachronic consideration of violence in its Mycenaean context is a cultural history.

That violence is a method of human empowerment is not a new idea; nevertheless, throughout this presentation, the wider endeavour has been to demonstrate the efficacy of understanding the strength and authority of agency through the theoretical interpretation of violence, an approach that I sincerely hope proves beneficial for subsequent use. The lucid observation by one military statesman may be taken as the final explanation for the archaeological study of violence:

“but time, & persecution, brings many wonderful things to pass[...].”

(Letter from Major General George Washington to LTC Joseph Reed, dated 1 April 1776.)
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