



Constanze Graml, Annarita Doronzio,  
Vincenzo Capozzoli (eds.)

## **Rethinking Athens Before the Persian Wars**

Proceedings of the International  
Workshop at the Ludwig-  
Maximilians-Universität München  
(Munich, 23rd–24th February 2017)

utzverlag



Constanze Graml, Annarita Doronzio, Vincenzo Capozzoli  
(Hrsg.)

## **Rethinking Athens Before the Persian Wars**

Proceedings of the International Workshop at the Ludwig-  
Maximilians-Universität München (Munich, 23rd–24th  
February 2017)

Münchner Studien zur Alten Welt  
Band 17

Ebook (PDF)-Ausgabe:

ISBN 978-3-8316-7562-3 Version: 1 vom 20.04.2020

Copyright© utzverlag 2020

Alternative Ausgabe: Hardcover

ISBN 978-3-8316-4813-9

Copyright© utzverlag 2019

Constanze Graml, Annarita Doronzio,  
Vincenzo Capozzoli (eds.)

**Rethinking Athens Before the Persian Wars**

Proceedings of the International Workshop at the  
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München  
(Munich, 23rd–24th February 2017)



## Münchner Studien zur Alten Welt

herausgegeben von

Prof. Dr. Martin Zimmermann

Prof. Dr. Jens-Uwe Krause

Prof. Dr. Karen Radner

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Band 17

This book was printed thanks to the financial support of the Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo of the Università degli Studi di Napoli »L'Orientale« and the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

Umschlagabbildung: E. Dodwell, Views in Greece I (London 1821) Plate 474

»Temple of Jupiter Olympios and River Ilissos«

[<https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/dodwell1821/0059>].



Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in  
der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische  
Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Das Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Sämtliche, auch  
auszugsweise Verwertungen bleiben vorbehalten.

Each author was responsible for securing the reproduction  
rights of the images for the individual articles.

Typesetting and layout: Vincenzo Capozzoli,  
Tommasina Matrone, Annika Busching

The English text was revised by Henry Heitmann-Gordon.

Copyright © utzverlag GmbH · 2019

ISBN 978-3-8316-4813-9

Printed in EU

utzverlag GmbH, München

089-277791-00 · [www.utzverlag.de](http://www.utzverlag.de)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	9
<b>Rolf Michael Schneider</b>	
<i>Introduction</i>	11
<b>Constanze Graml, Annarita Doronzio, Vincenzo Capozzoli</b>	
<b>DEALING WITH DEATH</b>	
<i>Some Thoughts on the Pre-Classical Athenian Society</i>	25
<b>Anna Maria D’Onofrio</b>	
<i>The Submycenaean and Protogeometric Cemetery on 2, Odos Irodou Attikou, Athens, Greece. Remarks on the Spatial Distribution of the Athenian Cemeteries and Burial Customs on the Transition from Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age</i>	41
<b>Marilena Kontopanagou</b>	
<i>From Amphorae to Cauldrons: Urns at Athens in the Early Iron Age and in the Orientalizing Period</i>	51
<b>Simona Dalsoglio</b>	
<i>Ladies Returned. On Cypriot-Inspired Shapes in the Early Iron Age Pottery of Attica</i>	65
<b>Jennifer Wilde</b>	
<i>A Fresh Look at the Kerameikos Necropolis: Social Complexity and Funerary Variability in the 7<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.</i>	89
<b>Annarita Doronzio</b>	
<i>The Excavations at Phaleron Cemetery 2012-2017: An Introduction</i>	103
<b>Stella Chryssoulaki</b>	

## SHAPING SPACES

*Memoryscapes in Early Iron Age Athens: the 'Sacred House' at the Site of the Academy* 115

**Alexandra Alexadridou & Maria Chountasi**

*Thucydides 2.15 on Primitive Athens: A New Interpretation* 131

**Myrto Litsa**

*Constructing Monumentality at the Athenian Acropolis in the Early 6<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.* 149

**Elisavet P. Sioumpara**

*Coming Back to the polis trochoeides. Dealing with the Topography of Archaic Athens* 167

**Vincenzo Capozzoli**

*Between Tradition and Innovation. The Late Archaic Telesterion at Eleusis Reconsidered* 189

**Ioulia Kaoura**

## ESTABLISHING COMMUNITIES

*The Making of the Greek City: An Athenian Case Study* 207

**Alain Duploux**

*Diakrioi and/or Hyperakrioi? A View of Archaic stasis in Athens: Between Aristocratic Conflict, the Intervention of the demos and the Use of the Sacred* 217

**Miriam Valdés Guía**

*Being a Heliast During the 6<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.? Remarks on the Existence of the People's Court in Archaic Athens* 225

**Alexandra Bartzoka**



*The Greek agora in the Context of Sites of Political Assembly in the Ancient Near East* 239

**Claudia Horst**

*The College of Treasurers of Athena on the Acropolis During the Archaic Period* 251

**Valentina Mussa**

*Archaic Athens and Tyranny. The Origins of the Athenian Public Finance* 265

**Marcello Valente**

*Worshipping Women, Worshipping War: (How) Did the Persian Wars Change the Cultic Veneration of Artemis in Athens?* 277

**Constanze Graml**

*A Question of Object. Class Semantics in Athenian Vase Painting (530–430 B.C.)* 297

**Wolfgang Filser**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** 313

**INDEX PERSONARUM** 357

**INDEX LOCORUM** 361



## Foreword

The Munich workshop, *Rethinking Athens – The Polis Before the Persian Wars: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, organised by a team of young scholars who also edited this book, remains unforgettable. The reasons are manifold. One was the choice of the period, the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC, in which *Wilder Ursprung* (Walter Burkert) of Greek people was one of the anthropological catalysts for the development of the *polis*, namely that of Athens. Another was the group of people invited to participate: a vivid mix of passionate young and senior academics mainly from Europe, predominantly Greece. Here, an important driving force was the generous willingness to share new data about key sites in Athens and Attica, now published in this volume. This openness not only resulted in furthering knowledge but also provided new insights into the meandering process of how the city's spatial, material, religious, political, social and economic fabric was woven and constantly rewoven over a long period of time. This process came about in quite the opposite way to clear-cut modern categories as it bound together (seemingly) conflicting concepts, such as myth with history, religion with politics, life with death, aesthetics with brutality, glory with violence, success with failure, and agreement with contradiction. Unforgettable was also the constructive discussion and Mediterranean atmosphere of the workshop propelled by a plurality of hermeneutics, original thought, productive criticism, mutual respect, and a lot of enthusiasm and fun. Fortunately for us this book will keep some of the Munich conference spirit alive, in particular Athens' heritage as an exceptional workshop of all aspects of human life.

Prof. Dr. Rolf Michael Schneider  
*Professor Emeritus for Classical Archaeology*



# Introduction

CONSTANZE GRAML, ANNARITA DORONZIO  
AND VINCENZO CAPOZZOLI

## **“Mind the Gap” or Historicity as a Heavy Burden for Pre-Classical Athens**

Is it still possible, in 2019, to rethink pre-Classical Athens? The answer is certainly yes, and we might even say that it is not only possible, but in fact necessary. New field activities (be it planned or rescue archaeology) and the continuous advancement of research, along with the progressive publication of several corpora stored for years in the *Ephorates*’ archives or even in the International Schools of Athens, require a continuous verification of the previous reconstructions in order to tell new stories of pre-Classical Athens<sup>1</sup>. It goes without saying that everyone as always will continue to do so in their own way. This is what makes the *Athenische Forschung* so exciting: the varied mass of discordant voices, affirmed, overcome

and then exhumed once more with the new perspective that every generational change brings into the discussion, obviously rooted in their own political and social ideologies. This is why the works of E. Curtius, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, W. Judeich or W. Dörpfeld regularly resurface in the general debate<sup>2</sup>. The history and archaeology of pre-Classical Athens are even more exciting because of the very nature of the available documentation: an archaeological record that is certainly scanty, but still far more consistent than the poor written sources, often ambiguous and produced long after the fact. If we wanted to compile an exhaustive inventory of hypotheses, interpretations and historical reconstructions proposed during the last century for all events and structures of pre-Classical Athens, the length of this entire volume would not suffice. This shows not only the complex nature of this dossier, but also the richness of the existing ideas, approaches and interpretative models, so much that often the Athenian archeology has been conceived as a one-off case, forgetting, among others, how much this *polis* owes to an organic and systemic relationship with the whole of Attica.

Every year we witness an impressive bibliographical production and yet one cannot help but notice that the archae-

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not the place for an exhaustive bibliography, but it is certainly necessary to mention the major works of the last two decades. Besides the studies focusing on the *agora* or the *Kerameikos* in the pre-Classical period – especially the two volumes by J. Papadopoulos (Papadopoulos 2003; *Agora* 36) – we mention the PhD thesis of L. Costaki on the Athenian road-system from the Geometric to the Roman period (still unpublished but available online: <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/thesescanada/vol2/002/NR16008.PDF>) and with a different approach, the study of L. Ficuciello on the Athenian roads (SATAA 4). Finally, with the other series of five volumes “Topografia di Atene”, the Scuola Italiana di Atene undertook the task to create a comprehensive and complete lexicon on Athens and partially on Attica (SATAA 1, 1–5). See also Valdés Guía 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Curtius 1862; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1881; Dörpfeld 1929; Judeich 1931.

ology of pre-Classical Athens is actually riddled with doubts and contradictions, also because of the long history of archaeological research that began with the construction of the “new Athens” in 1833<sup>3</sup>. Even though the documentary gap of the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. – denounced already by R. Osborne in the late 1980s<sup>4</sup> – was at least partially filled by the recent study of A. Doronzio<sup>5</sup>, the same cannot be said for the many other aspects raising similar problems. Still taking into account the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C., we must note – what is doubtless surprising – that the chronology of the so-called Kylonian Affair has never been questioned. Many scholars seem to agree on a date between 636 and 624 B.C.<sup>6</sup>, but it is necessary to remember that according to E. Lévy’s careful study<sup>7</sup>, the episode should be post-dated by nearly 30 years (597–595 B.C.). Thus, Kylon could have been a contemporary of Solon (though here too we have to decide between high and low chronology)<sup>8</sup>, with easily imaginable historical, political and institutional consequences. As it stands, the chronological problem persists and should be tackled once and for all. Similar issues are also raised by the Aristotelian mention of the ten Archons and the *staseis* following Solon’s activities<sup>9</sup>. In this regard, it would indeed be beneficial to read again L. Gernet’s wise pages with which he inau-

gurated a criticist approach to the *Athenaion Politeia*, proposing – in our opinion – a correct way of interpreting the Aristotelian text<sup>10</sup>. One could continue with the semi-mythical figure of Epimenides, whose various chronolog(ies) span more than a century are often bent to the needs of modern historical reconstruction<sup>11</sup>.

The same ambiguity lingers around the responsibility for the reorganization of the Panathenaic feast sometimes connected to Peisistratos, underestimating however, that in 566/5 B.C. the Archon was Hippokleides, perhaps the same Hippokleides tied to Miltiades the Elder<sup>12</sup>. In this respect, it is also worth reconsidering the first Parthenon. If it is true, as the latest research suggests that it was erected during the second quarter of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C., every possible connection with Peisistratos falls apart<sup>13</sup>. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine he had the time and power to order the construction of the Parthenon, while he was taking his first public steps on the Atheni-

10 Gernet 1938. See the already mentioned contribution of Flament 2007 as well Flament 2017. Cfr. also Morris 1987, 25: “What faith are we then to place in the particular stories which have survived about early Athens? Following Jacoby, I would suggest that few of the episodes before 550 BC can be trusted in any detail. There is currently a tendency to accept large parts of the Constitution of Athens as a fairly accurate summary of seventh- and early sixth-century history, after a long period of scepticism, but this may not be a welcome trend [...]. Traditions about early history were extensively manipulated in fourth-century Athens, and Aristotle or his sources often seem to misunderstand, conflate or invent their information”.

11 Same criticism in Greco 2001, 27. On the written sources related to Epimenides see recently Bernabé 2007, 105–168.

12 Hdt. 6, 127–129.

13 See the paper of Sioumpara in this volume.

3 Bastea 2000, 108–118. 146–180.

4 Osborne 1989, 297.

5 Doronzio 2018.

6 Compare for example the paper of M. Valdés Guía in this volume.

7 Lévy 1978, 513–521; Giuliani 1999, especially 36; Duploux 2006, 86.

8 In this context see the still fundamental study by Flament 2007.

9 Aristot. Ath. pol. 13, 2.

an political stage as a very young *strategos* and engaged in snatching Salamis from Megara<sup>14</sup>. On the topic of Peisistratos, two other peculiar finds from the *agora* come to mind: the so-called Building F – the house of tyrants according to some, *oikos prytanikos* according to others<sup>15</sup> –, and the nearby necropolis on the north-western slope of the Areopagus. The latter has caused much ink to be spilled regarding its modern (and not ancient!) usage, and without any strong evidence, its interrupted use pattern is related to the erection of the pre-Themistokleian walls of Athens<sup>16</sup>.

Even on this latter matter, needless to say, there is no consensus: a century after the debate between W. Judeich and W. Dörpfeld, there are still scholars who try to deny the historicity of the event in every way, like J. K. Papadopoulos<sup>17</sup>. With the exception of its conclusions – which we consider problematic –, Papadopoulos' approach is interesting as far as it raises a central issue of the archaeology of pre-Classical Athens: the relationship between archaeological records and written sources<sup>18</sup>, and, in the case of the pre-Themistokleian walls, the feasibility of compensating for the absence of the former exclusively by taking into account

and accepting the latter. Clearly, we are often faced with an “either/or approach”, meaning *either* a material-based, fully archaeological approach to ancient Athens that uses the methodology of prehistorical archaeology and focuses on theory *or* an approach with a strong historical embedding<sup>19</sup> that adopts the history of events/political history as a framework for interpreting the material remains. In this second case, the information of non-contextualised written sources is projected onto the archaeological record. This problem should not be taken lightly, since it has an even heavier impact upon the issue of the Athenian public places<sup>20</sup>. Thus, the controversy continues to rage between supporters of a single *agora*<sup>21</sup>, that of the Kerameikos, those of two *agorai*, an older one located eastward of the Acropolis (never found, but considered certain by many), of which the west one – that of the Kerameikos – was the successor<sup>22</sup>, or even those of two *agorai* “and a half”<sup>23</sup>. Furthermore, the old

19 Compare the most recent publications on Athenian topics from a historical point of view: Sviatoslav 2018; Riess 2018.

20 For R. Osborne this controversy is no more than a distraction: “In my view, the question of whether any Athenian referred to an ‘old agora’ is a distraction from the fundamental issue, which is whether Kleisthenic democracy opened up a new and distinctive location for what had become the most crucial activities of public life.” (Osborne 2007, 196). For criticism see Greco 2009, 222 f.

21 Doronzio 2011, 15–85; Doronzio 2012, 11–43; Doronzio 2018, 201–211 with previous bibliography.

22 Robertson 1998, 283–302.

23 Cfr. Greco 2009, 224 f. who suggests searching for the “agora” of Apollodoros somewhere on the Acropolis: “io credo che ci sia una possibilità di salvare la testimonianza ed è quella di mettere in rapporto dialettico l’agora di Apollodoro, non con quella archaia delle pendici

14 Hdt. 1, 59, 23–24; Aristot. Ath. pol. 14, 1.

15 On the issue see recently Doronzio 2012, 28–30 with earlier bibliography. See also Osborne 2007, 196: “Most puzzling is the so-called Building F, which is a building of some size; but it remains the case, as with the Temple of Apollo Patroos further north, that a ‘public’ function has only been ascribed to this building because of the later public buildings on the same site”.

16 See the paper of Capozzoli in this volume.

17 Papadopoulos 2008.

18 In this regard see the still useful analysis of A. Snodgrass in Snodgrass 1987, 36–66.

matter of the altar of the Twelve Gods is making a comeback: the construction of the building (or at least of the first phase of its *peribolos*) has been post-dated from the last quarter of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. to the first years after the Persian Wars, and it has even been suggested that it was relocated from one *agora* to another, i. e. from the hypothetical one to the east of the Acropolis to that of the Kerameikos<sup>24</sup>. Not only the altar of the Twelve Gods but also the *Leokoreion* is travelling, at least within the universe of our bibliography: the latter certainly has nothing to do with the quadrangular *abaton* found by the American School at the northwest corner of the *agora*<sup>25</sup>. This assumption has a major impact on the Athenian topography, since the *Leokoreion* constitutes the only certain topographical reference point for the pre-Themistokleian walls<sup>26</sup>. The latter should also give us an idea of the Athenian *forma urbis* before the building of the

great city walls of Themistokles: this is how we enter an even darker universe, in which one might feel compelled to rely on the beloved and much abused *polis trochoeides* of Herodotus, or rather of the Pythia in Herodotus<sup>27</sup>. But the urbanistic of pre-Classical Athens should not be restricted to an enigmatic wheel-shaped plan – and certainly not to a circular one as many have mistakenly translated *trochoeides*! Indeed, even assuming that it really existed and had both topographical and geometric concreteness, the *polis trochoeides* cannot tell us very much about an urban development and a spatial definition that began several centuries before the statement of the Pythia. And finally, we mention one last substantial problem, which is the lack, until the very recent publication of E. Dimitriadou (see *infra*), of an adequate cartography of pre-Classical Athens, for which we were all too often forced to rely upon the Classical age cartography.

We stop here, but this review could be much longer. Nonetheless, we can immediately point out that the whole set of events and artefacts mentioned above relate (or have been related by us modern archaeologists), without exception, to a period between the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> and the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. But what happened before? Indeed, we come to a fundamental feature of pre-Classical Athens: the absence of monumentality. Working on pre-Classical Athens requires first of all that we give up writing a *Baugeschichte*, while at the same time adopting the proper methods to study *disiecta membra*, often difficult to identify and interpret. Yet it is clear that overall pre-Classical

dell'acropoli, ma con quella del Kerameikòs [...]. Insomma, non cercherei le tracce archeologiche dell'agora archaia di Apollodoro, perché non è mai esistita, ma interpreterei la notizia come il plasma di un'eteria o di una stasis, nell'ambito della competizione politica ateniese di età classica, disponendo in opposizione dialettica Urania-Egeo-Pericle-Fidia vs. Pandemos-Teseo-Kallias-Kalamis, evitando di accusare Apollodoro di pasticci e, ancora peggio, di versare nella muta agora archaia alle pendici dell'acropoli tutti gli avanzi della tradizione che non trovano una soddisfacente collocazione, come fanno molti oggi”.

24 On the controversial archaeological remains see most recently: Neer – Kurke 2014, 527–579 with the hypothesis of a “transplantation” of the altar. See instead on the importance of the findspot of the altar on the north-west corner of the *agora*, near the southern bank of the Eridanos: D’Onofrio 2017c.

25 Santoro 2015; Monaco 2017.

26 Thuk. 6, 57, 1–4.

27 Hdt. 7, 140, 5–6.



Athens undoubtedly evokes a much more monumental feeling in its institutional, political, and urban developments than it has in its material culture or architectural productions.

## How to Approach the Archaeology of Pre-Classical Athens?

A workshop on Athens with a focus on the period prior to the Persian Wars is certainly not an original idea and ours will surely not be the last. Already 40 years ago, the symposium “*Athens comes of age: from Solon to Salamis*” tackled the topic and chose two historical aspects, Solon the lawgiver and the naval battle of Salamis as its temporal bookends. The justification of that volume, namely its aim to bridge “the disparity of the evidence in the different disciplines”<sup>28</sup>, as well as its criticism of “Athena-centricity” was definitely valid then. More recent approaches to ancient Athens have since taken up these aims and striven to embed it into the Mediterranean koine<sup>29</sup>, and to demonstrate how it influenced and was influenced by multiple agents around the Mediterranean Sea during the first Iron Age. Thus following the history-based approach, O. Palagia and E. Sioumpara’s 2017 conference “*From Hippias to Kallias. Greek Art in Athens and Beyond, 527–449 BC*” (held just three months after our workshop) sought to deemphasize the Persian Wars and also expanded the territorial frame, looking at Attica’s connections to Ionia<sup>30</sup>. And recently (June 2019), M. Meyer’s workshop “*Innovations and inventions in Athens*

ca. 530 to 470 B.C. – two crucial generations” at Vienna once again emphasized the Persian War aftermath as a terminal point<sup>31</sup>. These two conferences have two important common features: 1) they are limited to the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and there especially to the end of the century; 2) they focus mostly on artistic production, not insisting on the institutional, social, topographical and urban implications which, as we will see shortly, have been placed at the center of our analysis.

We can thus return to the question announced at the beginning of this introduction. Once the necessity of a continuous rethinking of pre-Classical Athens has been established, the main problem concerns the proper approach. In other words, the central point is not **whether** we need to rethink pre-Classical Athens but **how** this should be done. Rethinking a period “without history” (with the exception of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.) is a complex operation that sometimes calls for peculiar stances, such as that of R. Osborne for 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Athens<sup>32</sup>. From this point

---

31 <https://klass-archaeologie.univie.ac.at/news-events/einzelansicht/news/innovations-and-inventions-in-athens-ca-530-to-470-bc-two-crucial-generations>.

32 “In the past those who have sought to do archaeological history have proceeded, and not least for the eighth and seventh centuries, in an additive way, cataloguing, classifying and counting. It is rare indeed for the archaeological record to be rich enough to enable us confidently to classify according to the categories of that society itself. This does not prevent counting leading us to observe numerous interesting features of a society, but it can fatally obscure dynamics. Faced with a society, which comes to question established categories, to realise and enact the possibility of doing things differently, the counting archaeologists find problems everywhere, but no clues to their answers. For the

28 Childs 1978, iii.

29 Stahl – Walter 2009; Handberg – Gadoulou 2017; Houby-Nielsen 2009.

30 Palagia – Sioumpara 2019.

of view, it will be crucial to proceed as soon as possible to a detailed examination of the methods and theoretical approaches, as they were taken in the Athenian archaeology to date. This goes along with a full-scale reflection of the pre-Classical city's historiography, which is, in our opinion one of the major *desiderata* for the Athenian archaeology (and not only for the pre-Classical period). Looking forward, the latest remarkable novelty in research on ancient Athens is the volume of E. Dimitriadou (Original Greek version *Πρώμη Αθήνα* from 2012; published in English in 2019<sup>33</sup>). Undoubtedly, it is a very important work due to the amount of information and data finally made available to the scientific community<sup>34</sup>, with a major reflection on both data management in a dedicated database and cartography. Indeed, Dimitriadou's publication perfectly embodies the digital turn, which is diversifying the methods of archaeological research<sup>35</sup>. Needless to say, with its

extensive catalogue and the great number of newly drawn plans of Athens – freely accessible online (another great merit of the author)<sup>36</sup> – the work of Dimitriadou is an essential documentary basis for anyone interested in coming back to the subject of pre-Classical Athens.

However, even though the collection and description of these data represent a crucial moment of the analysis, they are not enough to understand the Athenian archaeology in its entirety, especially not for that pre-Classical period that A. Snodgrass has well defined as “an age of experiment”. Taking into account these premises, we decided to not establish a specific methodology *a priori*. Therefore, this volume follows a multidisciplinary and

---

historian of a society without literature an entrée into contemporary changing perceptions and classifications is offered by the artistic production. What humble pictures communicate may often be banal, and we may often misread them, but not to try to read them is to leave go of the one line of possible contact offered to us. If I am at all correct with my speculations here then these pictures may be the lifeline enabling history to be written out of archaeology.” (Osborne 1989, 321 f.).

33 Dimitriadou 2012; Dimitriadou 2019.

34 Since the volume at hand was already in its final stages, all participants hardly had the possibility to include references of the recent English version.

35 For Athens, we can name here three projects in progress. The first one is the ARISTEIA database project “The Social Archaeology of Early Iron Age and Early Archaic Greece” under the supervision of Alexandros Mazarakis Ainian: <http://aristeia.ha.uth.gr>. The online platform naturally comprises several well documented entries regarding

---

archaeological excavations in Athens. Cf. also Mazarakis Ainian 2017a; Alexandridou 2017b. A second database online, funded by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation and carried out by Dipylon (Society for the Study of Ancient Topography), enables queries for all published archaeological remains carried out in rescue excavations: <https://dipylon.org/en/2018/06/12/mapping-the-antiquities-athens/>. The third project is the «Atlas of the Athenian Funerary Evidence (11th–7th c. B.C.)», established with the objective to provide a tool for the retrieval of information related to burials and burial practices of Athens from the final Bronze until the beginning of the Archaic Age. The project, in cooperation with the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens, Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports, is directed by A. M. D'Onofrio and carried by one of the editors of this volume, A. Doronzio, with the collaboration of A. Duplouy and V. Capozzoli for the elaboration of the digital tool thanks to an agreement between the University of Naples and the Université Paris1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (<http://www.unior.it/ateneo/20096/1/atlas-of-the-athenian-funerary-evidence.html>).

36 <http://www.dig.ucla.edu/early-athens>.

to some extent “relativistic” approach<sup>37</sup>. By doing so, we intended to enhance the legitimacy of different academic (or indeed national) traditions and their specific approaches: in our view, far from being an obstacle to mutual understanding, they instead offer a distinctive opportunity to work towards inspiring new ways of comprehending complexity together. If this is the most simple and obvious reason, the *alethestate prophasis* – quoting Thucydides – shall consist of the main historical and archaeological features and patterns of pre-Classical Athens, that – as highlighted – are often bent to radically divergent interpretations. We have sought to strike a balance between the different expressions of the material culture, and art – *strictu sensu* – constitutes only a small part in the establishment of our critical process, without ever forgetting Osborne’s fundamental lesson on the importance of artistic languages in history, or rather in the “history of a fiction” of the pre-Classical Athenian world<sup>38</sup>.

---

37 For a critical analysis of the relativistic approach in archaeology we refer to: Kohl 1997 and Yoffee – Sherratt 1993, especially 13–26, 105–130.

38 Osborne 1989, 318: “If the archaeologist cannot account for his data, when that data is rich and displays not subtle and disputable changes but marked breaks and discontinuities, then his claims to be able to produce history of any sort must seem exceedingly thin. If the historian cannot produce a history which accounts for such major changes in the material world then he must seriously face up to the question of just what it is that his history purports to describe and account for: is the history gleaned from written sources not after all the history of a world but the history of a fiction of the world? The changing fictions of the world are precisely the data from which I wish to start rebuilding an explanatory framework for the understanding of what so changed life at Athens at the end of the eighth century.”

Starting from the claim that the history of pre-Classical Athens is nothing but a homogeneous history, a transversal approach based on the *longue durée* perspective seemed necessary to us. Choosing to focus on the period between the end of the Submycenaean age and 480 B.C., and thus including only a small segment of the Classical period, is obviously not a novelty. This decision fits into an old tradition of studies that perhaps finds its most explicit definition in the always relevant book of Osborne<sup>39</sup>, but can be found also in the works of E. Dimitriadou and A. Duploux<sup>40</sup>. Despite the “epistemological divide” – quoting J. K. Papadopoulos<sup>41</sup> –, implied by this choice, it is in the Iron Age that archaeologists recognize the first steps of the *polis*’ formation, which eventually found its full consolidation in the Archaic period, as R. Martin pointed out already in 1956: “quelques-uns des éléments les plus originaux de la ville grecque se façonnent, se modèlent”, or even slightly later “les deux éléments originaux de la ville grecque [...], l’acropole et l’agora, apparaissent déjà dans la structure des villes archaïques, mettant en relief leurs fonctions essentielles, religieuses, défen-

---

39 Osborne 1996.

40 Duploux 2019.

41 Papadopoulos 2018. See also Agora 36, 975 f., accentuating the danger of the epistemological divide “of two scholarly traditions: Classical archaeology and Aegean prehistory [...]. For Classical archaeologists the Early Iron Age signifies the beginning of something distinctly “Greek,” even though the decipherment of Linear B should have revolutionized the teaching of early Greek history. For Aegean prehistorians, the destruction of the Bronze Age palaces and the advent of iron represent a convenient, if artificial, stopping point.” (Agora 36, 975 f.).

sives et politiques”<sup>42</sup>. Indeed, this history is sometimes the result of communal experiences, but very often also of individual experiences – not only at the time of Peisistratos’ tyranny but already during the early Iron Age<sup>43</sup>. This last statement is crucial, since the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. seems to dominate all reconstructions of the pre-Classical Athens. Consequently, we must always remember that this century is only one of the several stages of a much longer development, and thus we cannot clearly perceive the first phases of the *polis* by looking backwards from the monumental character of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>44</sup>.

---

42 Martin 1956, 75. 80. Martin’s view was, actually, a one-off case and it was not until the 1970s, when a general revision of the traditional historical tendencies took place, which – as A. Snodgrass indicated in his introduction to *Archaic Greece* – commonly identified the Archaic period as “merely a prelude to the decisive achievements of Classical Greece”: Snodgrass 1980, 11. That is how M. Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet concluded that the Archaic period was the most important age in Greek history, since it carried out significant innovations, acting as a necessary prelude to the Classical age: Austin – Vidal-Naquet 1972, 63. See more recently Greco – Torelli 1983, 114 in particular: “in pratica sono i quartieri arcaici ad aver fissato i momenti dello sviluppo della città, condizionandola nell’epoca della sua maggiore espansione classica, piuttosto che ritenere questo condizionamento come qualcosa di trasmesso dall’età micenea a quella seguente”.

43 Cf. more recently Duplouy 2019, in particular 63–126.

44 Already Polignac 2006, 205 perfectly characterises the intrinsic weakness of this *modus facendi*, which tries to gain from the much better known urbanistic evidence of the end of the Archaic period the main features of a the historically many centuries older reality: “[...] c’est en effet en fonction de situations de l’archaïsme avancé – le VI<sup>e</sup> siècle au plus tôt, si ce n’est même plus récentes encore –, que nous élaborons notre modèle de la ville grecque, sélectionnons les

Therefore, our intention was to resist the temptation of “restricting” pre-Classical Athens only to the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and its prominent characters and, consequently, many of the following contributions are dedicated to the Iron Age and the early Archaic period.

In our volume, both well-known and new contexts and materials are revisited and their commonly acknowledged readings are challenged (cf. Capozzoli, Dalsoglio, Doronzio, and Wilde). The new perspectives become especially apparent when textual or iconographic sources are read against archaeological remains or are revealed as being result of the author’s projection of their biases onto a long gone past (cf. Mussa, Bartzoka, Graml, and Filser). Especially enriching are comparisons between Athens and other, non-synchronous cultures (cf. Horst and Valente), which allow Athenian peculiarities, such as isonomy or taxation systems, to be reconsidered. Moreover – as already mentioned – the history of Athens is also the history of a city in a close and continuous relationship with its region<sup>45</sup>.

---

traits et les catégories descriptives susceptibles de définir le fait urbain [...] et définissons ainsi un modèle au regard duquel nous élaborons notre échelle de valeurs de l’urbanisation. L’analyse des situations plus anciennes risque donc de se résumer à une simple projection rétroactive des critères identifiés dans un contexte plus tardif [...]”.

45 Cf. on this matter see the project “Lands of Meaning. A Geographical Information System Study of Space and Social Praxis in Ancient Attika, Greece, from the Mycenaean Age to the birth of Democracy (1200–480 BC)”: <https://www.pantheon.sorbonne.fr/axe-de-recherche/landsofmeaning>. Here, N. Arvanitis attempts to understand the cultural, political and symbolic dynamics within Attica, which lead to the emergence of the *polis* Athens. Another project on Attica is “The Borders of Attica”, where S. Fachard

Studying Athens by remaining within its *asty* – which is itself very hypothetical at least for the pre-Classical age –, means losing sight of the city's origins. That is precisely the reason why some contributors have left the geographical boundaries of pre-Classical Athens and consider the region outside the city more broadly (cf. Chryssoulaki, Alexandridou – Chountasi, and Kaoura). The opportunity to publish preliminary results of ongoing doctoral research or key results of recently completed dissertations in English and therefore to disseminate these results was one of our main goals. Additionally, papers from senior scholars, working in different fields and contributing their long-honed expertise on various aspects of Athens (cf. Sioumpara, Duploux, D'Onofrio, and Valdés Guía) and colleagues working at the Greek Ephorates (cf. Chryssoulaki and Kontopanagou) enriched the volume, by presenting their fascinating new discoveries and adding new pieces to the puzzle, which nevertheless remains very fragmentary in parts.

### Layout of the Contributions

Our volume is subdivided into three thematically organized sections: “Dealing with Death”, “Shaping Spaces” and “Establishing Communities”.

---

follows a geo-historical approach and focuses on issues regarding the spatial arrangements connotating the borders between greater regional policies through a comparative analysis of the settlement structure including cultural, economic, and religious aspects: <http://www.chs-fellows.org/author/sfachard/>. The official website of the project (<http://www.bordersofattica.org>) is no longer available.

### Dealing with Death

The first section explores questions linked to funerary evidence and covers the earliest chronological period discussed in our workshop.

The first contribution by Anna Maria D'Onofrio (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L'Orientale”) focuses on kinship-based burying practices. Her work investigates the mechanism of pseudo-kinship groupings and the sense of shared ancestry developed through the kinship pattern. This conceptual perspective allows questions regarding the presence of an Athenian “aristocracy” to be re-examined.

Marilena Kontopanagou (Ephorate of Antiquities of the City of Athens, Hellenic Ministry of Culture / University of Peloponnese) presents new data from the excavations of the Submycenaean and Protoegeometric cemetery on Odos Irodou Attikou – one of the first organized flat cemeteries in Attica after the Mycenaean period, resembling the Kerameikos cemetery – and gives us a glimpse at the Athenian society during the transition to the Early Iron Age through funerary material culture. Both inhumation and cremation graves (“trench and hole” form) are attested. Striking is the presence of double graves that may indicate strong ties, maybe familial, that connected the two dead buried in them.

Simona Dalsoglio (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L'Orientale”) provides a detailed overview of all attested cases of incinerations in urns in Early Iron Age Athens with a focus on the use of the cauldron and their discovery context. Aiming to detect changes in burial practices she connects the appearance of cauldrons, used as urns, with the re-appearance of inhumation, the predominant funerary rite in the Late Geometric period. In her view, the use of cauldrons as

urns is linked to the most predominant burials within the elite graves.

The article by Jennifer Wilde (State Museum of Archaeology Chemnitz) studies elite burials. She concentrates on the whole range of Cypriot-inspired vessels in the Submycenaean and Protogeometric period and their uses as prestige objects in predominantly rich female burials. With this approach, she provides new interpretive tools to assess the symbolic meaning of these pottery shapes, their role in the formation of elite burial rituals and exchange(s) between Attica and Cyprus at the beginning of the Early Iron Age.

Annarita Doronzio (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”) builds on the results of her aforementioned book to offer a revised picture of the well-known Kerameikos Cemetery during the Orientalising period. As opposed to other scholars, her analysis includes not only the well-known graves with *Opferinne*, but the whole range of graves, including rich inhumation graves with metal grave goods and child burials. Her research focus is on the often-claimed exclusion of women from the “formal burial”. This alleged lack of women’s graves is, after a review of all available data, not forthcoming, as the examples discussed show.

The exceptional new finds from the cemetery in the Phaleron Delta, amongst them the famous *Biaiothanatoi* are presented by the Head of Excavations Stella Chrysoulaki (Ephorate of Antiquities of Piraeus and Islands, Hellenic Ministry of Culture). The ongoing excavation in the area of the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Center (SNFCC) revealed burials dating from the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C., with the main phase of use in the Archaic period. Among the burials are peculiar cases, such as two pit graves of couples found holding hands and a burial of a woman who died in labour.

Moreover, horse burials are common. For the first time, the preliminary study of the 78 captives is presented in English. Due to state of the art excavation techniques, the data retrieved from this site may now answer many questions on burial practices and kinship, which remain unanswerable for the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century excavations<sup>46</sup>.

## Shaping Spaces

Expanding the focus to the developing cityscape, the second section of our volume partially still includes burial sites, but focuses on analysing spaces with an eye to their embedding in the settlement structure.

Alexandra Alexandridou (University of Ioannina) and Maria Chountasi (Ephorate of Antiquities of East Attica, Hellenic Ministry of Culture) provide a thorough re-evaluation of the well-known site of the Sacred House in the area of the Academy. Based on a re-examination of the findings, they refute a purely sacred character of the building. The initially domestic complex is understood as part of a kinship-based settlement with burials and ritual activity. Based on the embedding into this broader setting, the authors propose that the location of the Sacred House was chosen with regard to the collective memory of the entire area.

The article by Myrto Litsa (Independent Researcher) focuses on the area south of the Acropolis and tests the famous passage of Thucydides’ second book on primitive Athens with regard to several archaeological remains located there. She also relates the introduction of the cults in this area to the abundant presence of water as the most prominent agent in ancient ritual practice.

Elisavet Sioumpara (Service for the Restoration of the Acropolis Monuments [Y.S.M.A.], Hellenic Ministry of Culture /

---

46 <http://phaleron.digital-ascsa.org>.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) presents the main results of her research on the first temple on the Acropolis completely built in stone, the so-called Hekatompedon. Based on her thorough analysis of the architectural fragments, she proposes a reconstruction of the temple and its location on the Acropolis and suggests a new dating in the first quarter of the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

Vincenzo Capozzoli (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne) offers new insights on the urban layout of the Athenian civic centre before the Persian Wars, by reconsidering the Archaic funerary documentation known for this period, as well as the grave monuments reused in the Themistokleian city walls, and by taking into account the material data on the road system and the main written sources (Herodotus and Thucydides) on the so-called *polis trochoeides*.

With her study on the architecture of the late Archaic Telesterion of Eleusis, Ioulia Kaoura (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin) detects Cycladic influence in the assembly building alongside unambiguously Attic innovations. Overall, the late Archaic Telesterion emerges as a highly innovative and experimental building, since it applies architectural forms for open-air buildings such as theatres in an interior setting.

### **Establishing Communities**

The third section of the volume is devoted to the development of community, taking into account political, economic and also religious institutions.

In his paper, Alain Duplouy (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne) elaborates the idea of the *polis* as a community made through the interaction of individuals. Shifting the focus from the development of the institutions of a well-structured city-state, he concentrates on the performative aspect

of individual and group behaviours, establishing a new approach to Athenian citizenship and to the citizen community by focusing on society and lifestyles.

Miriam Valdés Guía (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) analyses the impact of *stasis* on the formation of Athenian democracy. She weighs the influence of the horizontal *stasis* between the aristocratic families over influence against territorial tensions stemming from synoecism and the vertical *stasis* regarding economic struggle and increasing debt. In her view, both these lines of conflict became acute only at the time of the Peisistratids, but the institutions of the *polis* had already been established at that time, leading to the fully developed Athenian democracy.

The institution of the Archaic Heliiaia is the topic of the paper by Alexandra Bartzoka (University of Athens / Open University of Cyprus). With her thorough analysis of the written testimonies, she argues against the uncritical projection of Classical sources back onto the Athenian People's Court of the Archaic period. She accordingly rejects an establishment under Solon and proposes Kleisthenes as the founder of the Heliiaia.

Claudia Horst's (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) contribution demonstrates that assembly structures and sites existed also beyond the Greek world. She offers a survey of a variety of public places that existed in Mesopotamia, which have not yet been analysed in relation to Greek *agorai*. Based on the multifunctionality of Greek *agorai*, she retraces examples of assembly, trading etc. in the urban contexts of Mesopotamia.

Valentina Mussa (Sorbonne Université) retraces the development of the financial administration of the cult of Athena on the Acropolis and the emerging *polis*. The coexistence of two administrative boards, the

*naukraroi* and the *tamiai*, makes it impossible for them to have developed successively.

Finances are also the focus of Marcello Valente's (Università di Torino) paper. He traces the invention of the Athenian taxation system. In antiquity, taxes were perceived as an interference in personal freedom and associated with tyranny. The Athenian taxes were expanded under the Peisistratids to fund the "national" defence against external enemies and internal affairs of public interest. Even after the end of the Peisistratids, the usefulness of such reliable public funding therefore led to the perpetuation of the tax system into the Classical period.

Constanze Graml (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) focuses on the veneration of the goddess Artemis. Since written testimony mentions her aid in the battles against the Persians, she includes pre-Persian archaeological evidence in her analysis in order to test whether the Persian Wars had an actual impact on the perception of the deity. While it becomes clear that commemorative rituals with relation to the Persian Wars were embedded in the cults for Athenian Artemis, the consideration of material down into the Hellenistic period reveals that this did not occur immediately after the Persian Wars, but only after several decades.

An image-based approach to the analysis of social hierarchy is attempted by Wolfgang Filser (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin). He analyses objects depicted in the vase images, which refer to specific activities such as sports or craftsmanship. Although the depictions mainly refer to the leisure class, hints as to the remaining Athenian population can be detected. The polyvalence of figures and objects allows the extreme poles of society to coexist in the image. While the images need not be read as documentation of real Athenian life, they have a coherence

in themselves that allows them broach the issue of social classes.

Rethinking Athens in a lively and pleasant environment and making these thoughts available in printed form would not have been possible without the help of many different people<sup>47</sup>. The keynote speakers Alain Duplouy (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), François de Polignac (École Pratique des Hautes Études), Anna Maria D'Onofrio (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale") and Elisavet Sioumpara (Service for the Restoration of the Acropolis Monuments [Y.S.M.A.], Hellenic Ministry of Culture / Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) channelled the various approaches presented at the workshop. All speakers and listeners alike were eager to discuss the various topics, connected the widespread pieces of information and certainly added new insights to the ideas presented. Feedback by Nikolaos Arvanitis (Marie Curie Fellow – Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), Luigi Gallo (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"), Henry Heitmann-Gordon (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München), Hermann J. Kienast (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen), Marion Meyer (Universität Wien), Aenne Ohnesorg (Technische Universität München), Florian Ruppenstein (Universität Freiburg), and Gunnar Seelentag (Universität Hannover) polished some key points of our approach. Of

47 Seizing the dynamic spirit of the assembled scholars working on Geometric and Archaic Athens, we founded the "Trochoeides Network – Research Network on Pre-Classical Athens", which all interested scholars are cordially invited to join. See our official web-site: <https://trochoeides.hypotheses.org/>



course, we claim exclusive rights to any of the inevitable oversights.

Ruth Bielfeldt and Rolf M. Schneider supported the idea of this event from the beginning and offered invaluable aid in many aspects. Martin Zimmermann kindly accepted our proceedings for the series “Münchner Studien zur Antiken Welt” and Ramona Ramtke of the Utz Verlag was patient and permanently helpful in the preparation process of the volume. The Deutscher Archäologenverband e.V., the universities of Munich (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität), Naples (L’Orientale) and Paris 1 (Panthéon-Sorbonne), the Herbert Lutz Gedächtnis Stiftung and the LMUMentoring program funded the travel costs of the participants and enabled the publication. Henry Heitmann-Gordon, Annika Busching, and Elise Tacconi-Garman helped make the volume at hand readable and Tommasina Matrone (Università degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”) supported the typesetting process.

*Munich, Naples and Paris 8<sup>th</sup> November 2019*

## **Dealing with Death**

# Some Thoughts on the Pre-Classical Athenian Society\*

ANNA MARIA D'ONOFRIO

The scale, structure and organization of the Athenian society during the EIA (ca. 1100–700 B.C.) remains widely conjectural<sup>1</sup>. The meagreness of the settlement data, the dearth of evidence about resources and economy, the absence of writing and also of figurative art until the late phase of the period, force researchers to address the grave contexts as the most relevant testimony to the period. Only with the 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and the flourishing of cult practices in the sanctuaries does a further field of social competition and a considerable source for archaeological analysis become available<sup>2</sup>.

From the 70s of the last century onwards, social archaeology – starting from the pio-

neering studies of the Cambridge school, based on innovative quantitative studies as well as on an anthropological perspective – has provided a theoretical approach that has produced a great deal of significant literature<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, post-processual and cognitive archaeologies, promoting an active view of the material culture, have also provided a wide range of new concepts that are of use in interpreting the evidence, including gender, agency, object biography and entanglement<sup>4</sup>. Due to the complexity of the matter, the multiplication of theoretical studies and, last but not least, its importance for the identification of the mechanism of inequality and ranking<sup>5</sup>, mortuary archaeology is gradually becoming one of the main battlefields on which to oppose culturally specific interpretive paradigms<sup>6</sup>. The

---

\* I am most grateful to the organizers of this conference for their kind invitation to present the session about burial customs. It is a theme that I have been dealing with since the 80s, with a great debt of knowledge to the school of Naples “L'Orientale”, to the Centre Louis-Gernet de recherches comparées sur les sociétés anciennes – CRCSA of Paris, and to the Cambridge school as well. It is a field of study in continuous evolution and the debate remains alive, interesting and stimulating.

1 “There is currently little agreement over EIA economic structures, and no quantitative estimates of performance.” (Morris 2007, 211). Dickinson offers a wide range of incompatible interpretations (on economy, demography, society) based on the same archaeological record (Dickinson 2006).

2 Mazarakis Ainian 2017b, 40.

---

3 D. L. Clarke and A. Snodgrass are the most representative of the “processual” season of the Cambridge school. The anthropologist E. Leach (1910–1989) inspired a new season of archaeological research, and the so-called Dark Age has become an experimental field for researches aiming at understanding the complexity of the social dynamics.

4 Langdon 2001; Langdon 2005; Whitley 2002; Whitley 2013; Whitley 2015. On the practice-theory approach, see Ekengren 2013, 179 f. The search for “identities” (age, gender, ethnicity) is a central theme in current research, see Shepherd 2013.

5 Ames 2007, 508.

6 For a critical approach to the theoretical archaeology, see Bintliff – Pearce 2011. On

difficulty remains of making the complex of information derived from the archaeological record interpretable according to the current categories of historical thought. We must try to identify the archaeological correlates of the *polis* formation mechanism, revisiting a topic widely debated in the scientific literature<sup>7</sup>.

One of the novelties that these studies have involved at the level of the study of funeral evidence is the formulation of a full (though preliminary) catalog of Athenian tombs, drawn up according to a topographical and/or chronological criterion. The “big contexts” that have been systematically excavated (with the methods current at the time) and published, such as the Kerameikos and the *agora*, have provided most of the chronologically relevant grave-groups, but a number of sites which have produced significant finds have contributed as well, though the material is known only from preliminary reports<sup>8</sup>.

The basis for this census of the tombs is the ceramic sequence, as established in the current main works on the matter. For the earlier period (Submycenaean and Transitional), the stylistic analysis of Attic ceramics proposed by Ruppenstein represents an important step forward in

defining detailed chronologies<sup>9</sup>. For the Geometric period, the studies Coldstream dedicated to the vase style have provided scholars with the fundamental chronological sequence<sup>10</sup>. For the evidence not included in Coldstream's taxonomy, the uncertainty about the precise date of not a few findings has sometimes led to the unification of phases and of different periods in the placement of the tombs along the chronological axis; as such, it remains challenging to construct a truly uniform, homogeneous data set<sup>11</sup>. The most useful

---

9 Kerameikos 18, 41–200. Unfortunately, the volume is not equipped with an iconographic apparatus of the pottery, whose typology and chronology is thoroughly discussed in the text, apart from the vases deposited in the burials 115–146, which are published in it. The evidence is articulated in “Zeitstufe” I–IV, according to the traditional Kerameikos sequence. For the controversial definition of the period and its chronology, see Dalsoglio 2014. A volume dedicated to the Submycenaean and Transitional amphorae from the same cemetery is forthcoming (Dalsoglio, [forthcoming]). Lemos reviewed the Athenian Transitional and Protogeometric evidence in the wider Aegean context (Lemos 2002).

10 Coldstream 2008. Bohen 2017 published the systematic study of the krater fragments from the Kerameikos. For the *agora* finds see Agora 36, with an updated overview of the material from Athens.

11 E.g. Whitley 1991b, Appendix: grave index 2. Graves in Athens (201–205). 2.1 Submycenaean. 2.2 Protogeometric. 2.3 9<sup>th</sup> century (EG–MG I). 2.4 Early 8<sup>th</sup> century (MG II–LG I). 2.5 Late 8<sup>th</sup> century (LG II). In this case, the MG I and MG II evidence falls in different groups. Morris' list is topographical: Appendix 2, B. Athens, 228–233 (Morris 1987). His “Classification of Attic cemeteries by age structure” (Morris 1987, 218–221) is presented according to a simplified chronology: Submycenaean. Protogeometric. Early and Middle Geometric. Late Geometric I. Late Geometric II. The dearth of evidence in some phases could suggest some problem in the

---

theoretical perspectives and methodological implications see Ekengren 2013.

7 Giangiulio 2000.

8 The Irodou Attikou cemetery is under study by M. Kontopanagou (see in this volume). The Odos Kriezis burials await publication: Morris 1987, 231 (with bibl.). A valuable collection of the evidence in the south-western *asty* is Poulou's article, but the meagreness of the data is as bleak here as in the majority of old excavations (Poulou 2013).

and most cited lists of burials, have so far been those published in the appendix to Morris, Whitley, and in the catalogue by Strömberg; for a more limited chronological span we also have Kalaitzoglou (EG I–MG I: 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C.) and Alexandridou (LG II: ca. 735–700 B.C.)<sup>12</sup>. We also have minor lists of burials related to specific phenomena, like the “kimilia” investigated by Whitley, or the Athenian graves with *orientalia* collected by Duploux or the burials with weapons re-examined by myself<sup>13</sup>. This list of lists could be enriched with the many studies dealing with specific pottery shapes or with the banquet, a major theme in the current research<sup>14</sup>. Finally, the PhD theses of Dimitriadou and Vizinou systematically collect all the mortuary evidence considered here, greatly benefitting future research<sup>15</sup>.

A very important step towards a new season of studies on the (not only) Athenian mortuary evidence has been made by Mazarakis Ainian with the realization of the web-based database ARISTEIA<sup>16</sup>.

---

established correspondence of stylistic versus chronological phase: more than 50 years after the publication of the current reference studies, it seems reasonable to put the chronological grid to test.

12 Morris 1987; Whitley 1991b; Strömberg 1993; Kalaitzoglou 2010; Alexandridou 2016.

13 Whitley 2002; Duploux 2006, 162–169; D’Onofrio 2011, 659–662.

14 Wecowski 2014; Dalsoglio – D’Onofrio 2016. Cf. *infra* n. 74.

15 Dimitriadou 2012; Dimitriadou 2017, 985–989; Vizinou 2011.

16 The ARISTEIA database gathers “all the available evidence concerning the archaeology of the Greek World in the Early Iron and Early Archaic Age, from the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium B.C. down to the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. The emphasis is on the study of

The transition from the lists to a database offers a better approach to the basic information, the ease of retrieving data quickly and according to a range of selected categories, and the ability to update the information: it will help greatly in reinvigorating the research. I hope that a further step towards the consultation of the “graves archives” of Athens will be realized with the publication of another database, centred on the burials, the “Atlas of the Athenian Funerary Evidence (11<sup>th</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> century B.C.)”, which is under construction<sup>17</sup>. This project should grant more detailed information about the exact location of the graves and their (eventual) relation with the other burials in the same context<sup>18</sup>. After the first stage of cataloguing the tombs of Athens and the initial online publication of the database, its implementation could be further enriched thanks to the detailed formulation of the data sheets of the tombs and burial areas; also the museum materials from the tombs could be treated<sup>19</sup>.

---

settlements, cemeteries and sanctuaries” (<http://aristeia.ha.uth.gr/>). Mazarakis Ainian 2017a.

17 The data entry is being produced by A. Doronzio under my own direction for the scientific aspect, financed by the University of Naples “L’Orientale”. The database project (Filemaker, RDBMS) has been carried out by A. Duploux, V. Capozzoli and A. Doronzio, as part of an agreement between the University Paris 1 Panthéon–Sorbonne and “L’Orientale”. The Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens, Service of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports, grants its precious scientific support to the project thanks to an agreement with “L’Orientale”, and I am most grateful to Eleni S. Banou for this.

18 The lists as well as the ARISTEIA PROJECT database do not contain detailed information for all entries.

19 The ATLAS project is limited to the graves from central Athens. Annarita Doronzio, who is

## Formal Burial, Formal Cemeteries and the Role of Kinship in the Burial Practice

Morris' book of 1987 "Burial and Ancient Society" put forward the theory of selectivity of the formal burial, that is of an opposition between formal and informal disposal of the dead. The energy expenditure of the funeral rite, measured through the mortuary variability (the differences among burials within a coherent funerary area), has been taken as the basic measure of inclusion or exclusion related to a position of social relevance or irrelevance – that is inequality related to ranking<sup>20</sup>. How can it be established that the low number of burials is the expression of the "selective exclusion from burial" and does not correspond rather to the low population density? When a society adopts this kind of strategy with regard to burial practice, there is no direct correspondence between the graves (number and age classes as well) and its demographic layout. According to Morris, in some periods of the Greek history, only the *agathoi* – those who enjoyed full membership – were buried in an archaeologically visible manner, while the *kakoi* – the many – did not receive the honour of a mortuary treatment that aimed at keeping the memory of the dead in the conscience of their kinship-group and of a wider community<sup>21</sup>. Snodgrass

noticed that the formal burial theory implies a high degree of social differentiation, and this phenomenon is typical of wider societies; nevertheless, he thinks that Athens – and the other settlements where the formal burial seems to have been adopted – did so by playing a role of vanguard of the new social organization<sup>22</sup>.

As Snodgrass recently pointed out, both followers and opponents of this model did not dedicate much attention to general development of the burial phenomenon that is the re-establishment of flat cemeteries<sup>23</sup>. This modality of treating the dead, gathering the graves in communal, formal burial grounds, is comparable with the Bronze Age *Gräberfelder* of Central Europe, where it represents an enduring custom<sup>24</sup>. In Athens and Attica it disappeared with the Middle Helladic period, and is attested again for the first time in the post-palatial necropolis at Perati, an example of a real/formal cemetery of the new type in which, however, the Mycenaean typology of multiple burials is maintained<sup>25</sup>. A further step towards this model

---

developing it, is focusing on the location of each grave-context and on the aspects related to the chronology.

20 Morris 1987, 97–109.

21 Morris 1987, 97–109; Dickinson 2006, 174–190. Snodgrass 2016, 191: "Not all the arguments in his book [Morris 1987] may have carried conviction, but on this point I think his case is unanswerable". On the terminology (*agathoi* and *kakoi*), borrowed from Vilfredo Pareto: Morris 1987, 1; cf. Duplouy

---

2006, 25 f. The critical discussion goes on about the "full membership of the community" of these *agathoi*, i.e. the group with citizen rights within the *polis* (contra Wecowski 2014, 250).

22 Snodgrass 1996, 204.

23 Snodgrass 2016. In the Middle Helladic period, the practice of burial in collective cemeteries (e.g. the West cemetery at Eleusis) coexisted with the use of domestic property for the same purpose (e.g. burials in the spaces between the houses in the Argolid).

24 Snodgrass 2016, 195. They represent the burial site of the communities of the villages, separated by the warriors' barrows, reserved to the elite (Kristiansen 1999).

25 Perati is described as "[...] a very late Mycenaean cemetery whose 192 chamber-tombs are densely spaced, so densely that as to make