

REPORT ON THE FINAL GENERAL DISCUSSION

The final discussion at the end of the workshop was chaired by Prof. Irene Lemos to whom our sincere thanks are due.

The discussion took a considerably longer time than the final discussions of the previous workshops. This was partly due to the manifold questions brought up and discussed with great animation. Much time, moreover, was dedicated to deliberations on technical topics such as changes in the quality of pottery, defining a certain “Submycenaean” treatment of clays (colour, consistency, firing), or on problems connected with radiocarbon dating. The following questionnaire compiled by Professor Lemos gives an appropriate insight into the wide range of subjects:

1. Are there any regional differences between Mycenae and Tiryns?
2. Is there a gap in Laconia after the recently results of both surveys and excavations?
3. Is there a SM phase between LH III C and PG?
4. Is there a region where there is a clear distinction between LH III C Middle and Late, as well as between LH III C Late and SM?
5. What does the decline of the Mycenaean life style really imply? (Take into consideration: changes in ritual, politics, iconography, burial rites).
6. Which are the most diagnostic features which define LH III C Late and SM into different stages?
7. Pictorial pottery: why is there so little material of EIA and how can we explain its revival in the eighth century?
8. How can we explain the relationship between Athens and Cyprus in the EIA?
9. Is it still helpful to keep the term of the local Horizons / Strata / Levels?
10. How can we link the classification of our material culture to the cultural system(s) which produced it?

As at the previous workshops the participants at the final discussion were invited to reformulate their earlier statements or to elaborate further on these subjects in written versions. Some authors, indeed, responded to our invitation. Their statements are presented in the following. Most other authors incorporated their considerations into the final version of their paper.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

TOBIAS MÜHLENBRUCH

On Point 1

Tiryns, especially the Lower Citadel, offers the advantage of an excellent preservation of the postpalatial Mycenaean settlement because later on there was no major building activity on top of it. Thanks to Klaus Kilian, the settlement was excavated homogeneously. It was characterized by a new structure with important reminiscences of the palatial period. In addition we

have got the settlement in the Lower Town. In contrast, as far as we know the settlement of LH III C at Mycenae, there were less building activities without major changes of the settlement structure.

On Point 3

From an architectural point of view (see also my answer to Question 9), Klaus Kilian excavated Room 102a in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns. It was a kind of “Grubenhaus”, built into a grey layer which marked the end of the Mycenaean settlement. So he dated Room 102a to the Submycenaean period. The Submycenaean horizon is also characterized by an orientation which differs from orientation of Mycenaean and Geometric houses (KILIAN 1981, 151, 153, 193, 150 fig. 1).

On Point 4

Again judging only from the stratigraphy of the settlements (see also my answer to Question 9), in the Argolid we have got the so-called “destruction of the granary” at the end of the architectural phase LH III C Advanced in Mycenae and in Tiryns.¹ The end of the Mycenaean settlement in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns is marked by a grey layer (KILIAN 1981, 151, 153)² which divides according to Klaus Kilian the Mycenaean and the Submycenaean/Early Iron Age structures. The destruction horizon of both settlements at the end of LH III C Advanced and the grey layer in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns are important stratigraphical markers for the dividing and the definition of architectural phases.

On Point 5

This question calls for a question in reply to a question: When does the Mycenaean life style decline? Within or at the end of LH III C, or within or at the end of the Submycenaean phase, if the Submycenaean phase was a chronological one? Definitely not at the end of the palatial period, although we know about massive destruction horizons at that time.

In my opinion, the Submycenaean phase was a chronological one, and the Mycenaean life style (e.g. settlement structure, tombs, pottery, bronzes, figurines) declined at the end of LH III C. It is difficult to give one’s opinion on this topic as we have not got a lot of Submycenaean sites, and we have to bear in mind that there were of course Mycenaean traditions in the Submycenaean period (MOUNTJOY 1993, 28–30, 114–118). But I do not recognize the survival of the “Mycenaean package” in the Submycenaean period. So there must have been a change in the material culture which, generally spoken, indicates also a change of the “ideology” – following Antoine Louis Claude Destutt de Tracy simply as “teaching of ideas”. The question arises: The “Mycenaean package” declined, but what happened to the meanings attached to the “Mycenaean package”? Did the meanings survive, did the people attach (all) the previous meanings to other objects? Consider e.g. the certainly altered function of the Upper Citadel of Tiryns (MARAN 2006).

Arguments by analogy are always a little bit dangerous, but there were happenings in the last century that archaeologically would maybe produce comparable findings regarding to the end of specific material culture, symbols, values and life style – e.g. the end of the German

¹ For the synchronisation of the destruction horizons at Mycenae and Tiryns: KILIAN 1980, 184 fig. 7. – For the dating to the end of LH III C Advanced see Kilian’s synopsis of the stratigraphy of the Lower Citadel in MÜHLENBRUCH 2004.

² See also MÜHLENBRUCH 2004.

Democratic Republic and their symbols. There are too many differences between this event and the decline of the Mycenaean life style to compare them too seriously. There also was a decline of the population at the end of the Greek Bronze Age, and we know about migrations (e.g. the “Dorians”) in early Greek history. That is why I think we should include the possibility of an altered and/or altering structure of population at the end of the LH III C as one aspect in our approaches to understand the processes involved.

On Point 9

In my point of view it is very important to keep and use the terms of local horizons. In Mycenaean archaeology, we often create confusion by mixing chronological phases, architectural phases and pottery phases because we use the same terms for these different aspects. But it is not proven and even not very likely that the history of the settlements and the styles of the pottery developed simultaneously.³ So methodologically it is better to use the system of local horizons for the settlements and specific terms for the architectural and for the pottery phases and synchronize them later, although such tables are often a little bit difficult to read. An example for this subject is the synopsis of the stratigraphy of the Lower Citadel of Tiryns: Klaus Kilian and Christian Podzuweit used the local system of horizons. Both defined sub-phases, based on the architecture (Kilian) and on the pottery (Podzuweit). It is not surprising that Kilian’s sub-phases do not always correspond to Podzuweit’s. The problem is that they used, as it is usual, the same terms for their sub-phases with different definitions and meanings. Here it would have been better to use different terms for the architecture and the pottery.⁴

Bibliography

DEGER-JALKOTZY, S. – I. S. LEMOS (eds.)

2006 *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 3). Edinburgh.

DESTUTT DE TRACY, A. L. C.

1977 *Elements d'idéologie* (Faksimileneudruck der Ausgabe Paris 1801–1815). Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt.

KILIAN, K.

1980 “Zum Ende der mykenischen Epoche in der Argolis”, *JRGZM* 27, 166–195.

1981 “Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1978. 1979. Bericht zu den Grabungen”, *AA*, 149–194.

MARAN, J.

2006 “Coming to Terms with the Past – Ideology and Power in Late Helladic IIIC”, 123–150 in: DEGER-JALKOTZY – LEMOS 2006.

MOUNTJOY, P. A.

1993 *Mycenaean Pottery. An Introduction* (Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 36). Oxford.

MÜHLENBRUCH, T.

2004 *Ein dunkles Zeitalter? – Untersuchungen zur Siedlungsstruktur der Unterburg von Tiryns in der mykenischen Nachpalastzeit* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis). Heidelberg.

³ E.g. MÜHLENBRUCH 2004.

⁴ See MÜHLENBRUCH 2004.

PHILIPP STOCKHAMMER

On Point 1

Although lying close to each other, Tiryns and Mycenae show different preferences for certain ceramic vessel shapes and decoration in the palatial as well as in the post-palatial period. In LH III C, these micro-regional preferences increase, as the inhabitants of Tiryns demonstrate a special interest in certain pottery forms which either do not appear at all in Mycenae or only in very small numbers. Whereas e.g. the painted conical kylix FS 274 is documented in Tiryns in huge numbers from the beginning of the post-palatial period in LH III C Early onwards (STOCKHAMMER 2008), this shape is completely missing in Mycenae in LH III C Early and appears with only two vessels in LH III C Middle 2. The comparatively high number of monochrome carinated cups FS 240 in Tiryns in LH III C Early 2 and their rareness in contemporaneous contexts in Mycenae is another indicator of regional preferences. However, the finding together of Handmade Burnished Ware and monochrome carinated cups FS 240 in the North-Eastern Lower Town of Tiryns indicates that a connection might have existed between certain types of wares or forms and certain identity groups within the settlement. In the case of the Handmade Burnished Ware and the monochrome carinated cups one might think of an ethnic group of immigrants differentiated from the rest of the local inhabitants (STOCKHAMMER 2008). In some cases, therefore, regional and intra-site preferences may be interpreted as the realization of different social identities in material culture. With the existence of regional preferences between Mycenae and Tiryns since the palatial period in mind, it is not surprising that wavy band craters are documented on the Lower Citadel in Tiryns in significant LH III C Middle 2 contexts, whereas they do not seem to appear in Mycenae before LH III C Late after the destruction of the Granary. This chronological difference, however, has to be taken into consideration, when wavy band craters from unstratified contexts are dated with regard to their settlement stratification in the Argolid.

On Point 3

The stratigraphy and the pottery sequence of the Lower Citadel of Tiryns clearly show that there is a settlement phase stratigraphically superimposed over layers which can be attributed to LH III C Late in ceramic terminology terms. On the other hand, the diagnostic features of the Protogeometric phase are still missing in the pottery of this settlement phase. Therefore, the term Submycenaean seems to be an adequate expression of this finding situation, at least for the development of pottery in the Southern Argolid.

On Points 4 and 6

Although the excavations in the Lower Citadel and the Lower Town of Tiryns have revealed an outstanding settlement stratigraphy and a huge amount of ceramic material for LH III C, it is still surprisingly difficult to differentiate LH III C Middle 2 and LH III C Late on the basis of the pottery development. This may be due to the short duration of LH III C Late, which may have left inadequate time for the creation of a greater number of discrete vessel shapes and patterns. However, a few diagnostic features can be isolated for this phase (STOCKHAMMER this volume. – STOCKHAMMER 2008): monochrome deep bowls with a narrow reserved zone with undulating wavy line, disintegrated fine line groups and broad monochrome and reserved banding on closed vessels.

In contrast to the differentiation of the pottery between LH III C Middle 2 and LH III C Late, the division between LH III C Late and Submycenaean in Tiryns is easily undertaken based on the diagnostic feature of the monochrome deep bowl which shows either a tight

wiggly wavy line or zigzag in the narrow reserved zone and which is documented in huge numbers in the settlement.

On Point 5

From the point of view of the pottery, it seems of great interest that the few innovations of LH III C Late apparently concentrate on small or very small vessels which are often found in the context of small cist graves (e.g. Lefkandi: POPHAM – SCHOFIELD – SHERRATT 2006, 23, 71, 144 fig. 2.4:5; 204 fig. 2.31:10,11. – Mycenae: Prehistoric Cemetery Grave XXXIX: DESBOROUGH 1954, 258) or in the context of larnakes (e.g. Tiryns: see STOCKHAMMER this volume. – STOCKHAMMER 2008. – Mycenae: WACE 1921–23, 33 fig. 9b; 36. – *MDP*, 192 fig. 254:4). The correlation of innovation with certain contexts of deposition requires an explanation which is still difficult to give (cf. STOCKHAMMER 2008).

Bibliography

DESBOROUGH, V. R. D'A.

1954 “Mycenae 1939–1953 Part V. Four Tombs”, *BSA* 49, 231–298.

EVELY, D. (ed.)

2006 *Lefkandi IV. The Bronze Age. The Late Helladic IIIC Settlement at Xeropolis* (BSA Suppl. 39). London.

PODZUWEIT, C.

1983 “Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1981. Bericht zur spätmykenischen Keramik”, *AA*, 359–402.

2007(†) *Studien zur spätmykenischen Keramik* (Tiryns. Forschungen und Berichte 14). Wiesbaden.

POPHAM, M. R. – E. V. SCHOFIELD – E. S. SHERRATT

2006 “The Pottery”, 137–231 in: EVELY 2006.

STOCKHAMMER, P. W.

2008 *Kontinuität und Wandel – Die Keramik der Nachpalastzeit aus der Unterstadt von Tiryns*. Heidelberg.
<<http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/archiv/8612/>>

WACE, A. J. B.

1921–23 “Excavations at Mycenae § VII. – The Lion Gate and Grave Circle Area”, *BSA* 25, 9–126.