HELLENIC REPUBLIC
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
EST. 1837

Department of History and Archaeology

MA in Greek and Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology: From the Bronze Age Palaces to the Hellenistic Kingdoms

Affects of War: Applying Assemblage-Thinking Approach to the Exploration of Personhood in Middle to Late Helladic Burial Habits

MA Dissertation

Jorgensen, Eva

Supervisor: Giorgos Vavouranakis

Athens, 2019

This dissertation was assessed by a three-person committee:

Giorgos Vavouranakis, Associate Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology
Eleni Mantzourani, Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology
Konstantinos Kopanias, Associate Professor in the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean

Abstract

This dissertation seeks to explore the concept of personhood in Helladic burial habits through assemblage theory, which is a relatively novel theory that highlights the complex relationships existing between humans and their material culture. Previous studies of Helladic mortuary rites have gradually moved from searching for individual identities towards focusing on relationality of personhood, a shift which has resulted in deconstruction of identity where the concept of the individual is at risk of being lost. Using case studies of Grave Circles A and B in Mycenae, the warrior grave of Kolonna and the Griffin Warrior grave of Pylos, arguments will be made that the Mycenaean warrior ideology was created through the process of remembering and forgetting where it arises from the dialectic relationship between individuality and dividualism. With this approach, I hope to introduce assemblage-thinking into the methodology of Helladic mortuary archaeology where a balanced account of the agency of humans and materials is offered.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to the following people who have supported me through the writing of this dissertation and without whom, I would not have been able to finish this degree.

Firstly, members of the faculty of the Archaeology department at NKUA who taught me throughout the year, both within the classroom and by taking the group on excursions across Greece: prof. Konstantinos Kopanias, prof. Dimitris Plantzos, prof. Giorgos Vavouranakis, prof. Yannis Papadatos, prof. Eurydice Kefalidou and the director, prof. Eleni Mantzourani. Special thanks must be given to the department's administrator, Anastasia Vergaki, for her welcoming attitude and eagerness to go above and beyond in assisting me with all enquiries, both personal and academic.

Secondly, dr. Katherine Harrell, who graciously shared her PhD dissertation with me and my supervisor, professor Giorgos Vavouranakis, who introduced me to assemblage theory and has been of immense support throughout both the writing of this dissertation as well as the academic year. His meticulous editing, patience and friendly disposition, along with his ability to always make time to throw ideas back and forward no matter how busy he is, has made this programme in all challenging, inspiring and fun.

Lastly, (but not least) to Katerina, who never tires of reading my texts and improving them. Thank you for the year that we have had in Athens and for introducing me to Greek culture. It has been a journey.

Athens, 19th September 2019

Contents

Introduction

There are few things which impact society in such a significant manner as death; the occurrence of a person's passing leaves both a personal and a structural void within a community which must be filled. This occurrence triggers a process which often demands specific actions from a certain group of people in order to restore social order which was left wounded by the person's passing (Boyd 2002; Voutsaki 1993). People come together, some travel long distances, in order to bid their goodbyes to the deceased and to follow them through their rites-of-passage into the afterlife while also reinforcing old social ties and renegotiating new ones, so as to establish their status within the community (Voutsaki 1993).

This remains true for interactions between the living and the dead from early prehistoric times until modernity; death, and dealing with death, has always been an important part of humanity and often provides key insights into structures and people in antiquity (Dickinson 2016). Within archaeology, mortuary evidence has proved to have been one of the most imperative analytical tools for societies in antiquity and their ideological influences; more than just typology and topography of the material culture of burials, we gain insights into their social structure, politics, identities and personhood (Boyd 2014; Harrell 2009; Voutsaki 1993).

The most famous Helladic burials are undoubtedly the Grave Circles of Mycenae. Since Schliemann's publication of the Mycenaean Shaft Graves, multiple interpretations have been given and explanations offered for their place within the Middle and Late burial habits, population demography, social stratification as well as the relationship between Southern Greece and the wider Aegean (Dickinson 1983; Voutsaki 1998). Schliemann's excavation of Mycenae was set out to uncover tangible evidence for the existence of Homeric societies, however, findings of Minoan artefacts begged the question of the degree of Minoan influence, which Evans believed to represent Minoan superiority on the mainland. This suggestion was later supported by Tsountas (1898) who also argued for cultural continuity among Helladic

cultural continuity in burial habits alongside strong Minoan influences (Voutsaki 1993).

Since then, Helladic mortuary archaeology has been centred around the 'shaft-grave phenomenon' where increased demarcation and distancing of certain individuals and burial wealth, as well as increased emphasis on multiple burials, has puzzled scholars who have sought answers about these distinct changes in burial habits throughout the Middle Helladic period and into the transition from MHIII to LHI specifically (Voutsaki 1993). Some have settled with interpreting these changes as a straight-forward representation of individualisation of familial elite seeking to distinguish themselves from the common public (Dickinson 1983). Some consider social hierarchy and wealth to go hand in hand (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1997) while others seek to elaborate how funerary strategies are used to negotiate the identities on both individual and collective levels (Georgousopoulou 2004) as representing power and wealth of certain individuals within a community (Renfrew 1972). More recently, scholars have been applying an alternative method of analysis for personhood and identity in hope of entangling individual identities with the wider context of burial habits and social complexities (Boyd 2002; Georgousopoulou 2004; Voutsaki 1998, 1993) where the presence of identity and personhood is seen as mediated through the materiality of burial rites as a complex negotiation between individuality and dividualism (Georgousopoulou 2004; Harrell 2012, 2009).

An ending of one's life leads to changes in the society's equilibrium, leading to changes in social relations which need addressing. The recent turn to Neo-materialism has been criticised for its heavy focus on materiality and embodied identities, leaving a need for further exploration of the dynamic relationship between human beings and their material culture (Boyd 2002). As a result, calls have been made for an approach which more accurately captures the nature of this relationship and how personhood and identity converges with the complex nature of the world (Crellin 2017). Assemblage theory is a theoretical approach which has recently been introduced to archaeology and highlights the complexities of the relationship between human beings and their material surroundings. As it can be argued that the emergence and representation of personhood relies on this convoluted network, assemblage

theory's centralisation of interlinked contexts of humans and their things, memory, performance and agency, should make it an advantageous approach to the exploration of this relationship.

The objective of this dissertation is to explore the concept of personhood in burials that are dated within the transition between MHIII and LHI with the application of assemblage-thinking approach. The aim is to not only investigate the nature of burial habits, in terms of their reflection of vertical hierarchy or sense of individualism, but also the role of burial habits in generating the personhood of the people who participated in the burial rituals. Moreover, by combining micro and macro approaches, the indication of the sense of self within a wider community, as it is expressed with both physical and symbolic elements of the burials, should become more discernible. With this method, I also aim to overcome previous methodological challenges expressed by Boyd where he indicates that the importance of context in early key literature is poorly documented, which has led to interpretations of evidence becoming a "…necessarily… complex process", especially when it comes to the act of secondary burials habits. However, he also mentions that "nonetheless, there is often sufficient detail to reconstruct some of the details of the more distant past" (2002: 21). In order to captivate this, I will focus on a few case studies in detail; the Mycenaean Grave Circles A and B (Boyd 2002; Cavanagh and Mee 1998; Voutsaki 1993); the Warrior Grave in Kolonna on the island of Aegina which is located in the bay between Athens and Peloponnese (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1997); and the Griffin warrior grave in Pylos, Messenia (Davis and Stocker 2017). These examples have been chosen for their distribution throughout the Southern part of mainland Greece as well as previously published material.

This dissertation is set up in four chapters: The first chapter presents an overview of the patterns and developments of Helladic burial habits throughout the mainland, from the shift between EHIII and MHI, throughout the Middle Helladic era, and into LHI.

The second chapter will provide the theoretical background to Helladic mortuary archaeology where approaches towards individuals, agency and personhood

will be highlighted. This chapter will set up the necessary tone for chapter three which will introduce and explain the framework of Assemblage Theory and how it will benefit the approach to mortuary rituals and personhood.

In the fourth chapter, I will provide case studies from Grave Circles A and B at Mycenae, the Warrior Grave at Kolonna, Aegina and the recently discovered grave of the Griffin Warrior at Pylos. I will re-examine the archaeological evidence available from previous studies by applying assemblage-thinking approach in order to view the emergence of personhood and selfhood. My argument will be that, by viewing them as fluid components of assemblages which emerge through acts of remembering and forgetting (Hamilakis 2014), explorations of personhood in antiquity can be moved beyond the binary oppositions of individualism and dividualism, which has characterised previous approaches to the subject. The conclusion of this dissertation will offer a summary of major themes of the discussion and analysis.

1. The Background of Helladic Mortuary Practices

Archaeological insight into Bronze Age societies on mainland Greece is largely owed to funerary evidence and publications of meticulous monographs and synthesis, especially those relating to Middle Helladic and Late Helladic burial customs (Boyd 2002; Dickinson 1983; Papadimitriou 2001; Wace, et al 1921). This is due to the fact that the MH period especially presents a vast number of burial monuments which bear witness to the concomitant social structures and economic conditions, allowing scholars to draw conclusions about the connections between funerary habits and social structures across multiple levels of their perspective societies (Cavanagh and Mee 1998).

Funerary practices on mainland Greece were already established before the Neolithic period, therefore showing a long tradition of established rituals (Mee 2012). However, it is believed that the mainland underwent a radical transformation between EHIII and into the MHI, as has been noticed by certain changes in burial habits where cemeteries consisting of collective tombs were largely discontinued in the MH period, and surpassed by intramural burials which, along with tumuli, became universal around the mainland (Cavanagh and Mee 1998). However, the specific chronology of these changes remains debated (Boyd 2002; Caskey 1960). This critique has been an important contribution to the discussions around the developments of Helladic burial customs, especially for regional and historical comparisons between cemeteries as they evolved throughout the Helladic Bronze Age; even though they may appear simplistic, MH mortuary practices possessed a wide disparity of forms but the reasons causing the directions of their developments has yet to be fully explained (Voutsaki 1993). Multiple interpretations have been offered where one of the most prevalent ones for the transitional phase in burial customs is the ‘ethnic’ argument maintained by Hammond (1974), who suggested that the habit of burial tumuli was brought to Greece by the Kurgans. However, Cavanagh and Mee (1998) reject these notions, pointing towards the difficulty in drawing transitional lines with chronological dating based on pottery styles (see also Boyd 2002; Dietz 1980; Nordquist 1988).

The problem with setting transitional points in chronology has also proven difficult for drawing a line between MH and Early Mycenaean periods. This is discussed in detail by Boyd (2002: 2-5), however, Cavanagh and Mee had previously claimed that „the two merge into each other: the styles of pottery overlap, and particularly in LH… whilst the types of tomb which were to become standard in the Mycenaean period, the chamber tomb and the tholos tomb, have their origins in the preceding phase" (1998: 23) leading to further difficulty for accurate dating. Owing to this, despite being dated in the LHI period, grave types such as Grave Circles A and B have frequently been discussed as being a part of MH burials due to their lengthy occupancy as well as their slow and gradual transformation, causing inconvenience in chronological treatment as well as arbitrary results (Cavanagh and Mee 1998; Dickinson 2016, 1983).

The academic debate about chronological pinpoints of transitions in Helladic funerary rites is ongoing. Considering the long tradition of mortuary ritual and to highlight the important features of MH burials, as they stand in contrast to EH and LHI in terms of continuation and discontinuation of elements, this chapter will offer a chronological discussion about developments of funerary habits ranging from EHI up to LHI.

1.1 The Transition from EHIII to MHI

The most common burial styles in the Early Helladic period were pit graves, cist and built graves, chamber tombs and tumuli (Mee 2012; Papadimitriou 2001) and most of the cemeteries were concentrated in the eastern part of the mainland: in the Argolid, Corinthia, Attica, Boeotia and Euboea, these regions account for roughly 70% of graves that have been found (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 15-21). Pullen (1994) has suggested that cemeteries were already a popular phenomenon by EHII, which Cavanagh and Mee (1998) have interpreted as a possible symbolic gesture of land property claims. Moreover, another feature attributable to this period is the increasingly conspicuous nature of burials where, according to Mee (2012: 3), the body was:

> …buried in a contracted position despite the fact that the chambers were often more than two meters in diameter. Thus, the size of the tomb did not necessarily dictate how the body would be laid out. Earlier burials were pushed out to one side, and in some cases the bones had apparently been removed and put in an ossuary. The quantity and quality of the finds varies, presumably because of differences in status.

Relative chronology for EHII and EHIII overlaps, however, what is clear is that cemeteries started to gradually disappear until the end of EHIIB, with the exception of intramural burials of infants found at Lerna, along with cists and a jar burial at Kolonna which are dated to EHIII (Dickinson 2016; Weiberg 2007). Counted within this period is also the tumulus from Atalanti in Phthiotis which contained two pithos burials (Papakonstantinou 2011: 395), indicating that the origins of the MH tumulus burial type can be dated back to EHIII. However, despite the evident continuation of tumuli, most cemeteries and settlements saw decline in practices that were not restored until MHI (Dickinson 2016).

1.2 Middle Helladic Burial Customs

The Middle Helladic period was governed by more homogeneous burial habits throughout mainland Greece; intramural and extramural graves were used equally and in the Argolid, both tumuli and flat cemeteries have been found (Dickinson 2016). Several tomb types were used: "pits, cists, and hybrid forms between the two, pot burials, and at the end of the period, shaft-graves" (Voutsaki 1993: 58). In regional terms, single burials in pit graves, cists or pithoi were the dominating burial practice from Thessaly in the North down to Messenia in the South and tumulus burials in Peloponnese and Central Greece would extend into Epirus and Thessaly in the LBA (Cavanagh and Mee 1998).

The homogeneity further applies to modes of treatment of the body but with slight variations: all burials are inhumations with the bodies found usually flexed or contracted and placed on either the right or left side, however, examples have been found where the deceased had been laid on their back (Cavanagh and Mee 1998; Voutsaki 1993). Most burials were single but evidence of multiple burials has been

found, some contemporary and others as a result of reutilisation of the same burial. In these burials, bones have been displaced or collected either to make room for a new burial or, as in some cases, they have been assembled without a successor, a type of grave referred to as a *cenotaph* (Cavanagh and Mee 1998). How this ceremony was performed remains debated; according to Voutsaki (1993), the normal disposal of the body during the Helladic MBA would have been a single burial in a contracted position, claiming that the habit of secondary burials within the same tombs did not occur in large quantities before MHIII. In contrast to Voutsaki (1993), Cavanagh and Mee (1998) suggest multiple burials to having been the popular form of ritual, which included pit and cist graves, along with tombs which contained multiple burials where adults and children were even buried together (see also Caskey 1957).

One of the most noted features of MH burials is the general absence of grave offerings (Cavanagh and Mee 1998), despite the occasional finding of deposited artefacts. Pottery is the most common type of find with shapes including jugs, cups 'dippers', bowls, storage vessels and cooking pots (Nordquist 1990: 40). Ornaments have been found in a few burials and weapons appear sparingly towards the end of the MH period, however, Voutsaki (1993) notes that the frequency of offerings is generally higher in the tumuli than in the flat cemeteries. According to Dickinson (2016), there is no convincing evidence for any general ritual such as drinking ceremonies taking place at the burial. Cavanagh and Mee had previously discussed the presence of alternative ritual behaviour such as provisions of food, remains of sacrificial animals, burning of offerings and depositions of "post-burial pottery offerings outside the grave" (1998: 33). However, the evidence is sporadic and ambiguous and usually associated with burials which are 'special' or 'rich' (Dickinson 2016: 326).

Looking at the MH mortuary patterning and social differentiation, Nordquist (1987) observes a higher representation of children in intramural cemeteries than found in extramural sites. Mostly adults are buried in tumuli and in graves with more complex structure where no or very little association between gender and amounts or types of grave goods and grave constructions has been reported. That being said, Voutsaki (1993) reports male burials in extramural graves to be slightly richer than

female graves while some female intramural graves tend to feature richer funerary gifts. Furthermore, both genders are buried with ornaments while jewellery is mostly found in female burials, but children and sub-adults often have high concentration as well.

The usage of intra- and extramural graves remained relatively even throughout the MH period until MHIII, when the usage of extramural cemeteries surpasses. Joint by trends towards increased demarcation of the funerary area, concurrent use of differentiating strategies has been observed alongside a more distinct separation between sex and age groups (Cavanagh and Mee 1998; Voutsaki 1993: 60). The boundaries between intramural and extramural burials have become further blurred at this point; cemeteries were built in areas used as waste land, such as in Asine (Nordquist 1987), or cut into areas which were formally occupied as in cases of Argos, Berbati, Kirrha Pefkakia and Asine, where 'shaft-graves' had been cut through the floors of abandoned buildings (Åkeström 1968; Cavanagh and Mee 1998). Others were located within the settlement, as in the case of Lerna where much of the area "was occupied by graves" (Caskey 1957: 144). In other cases, certain graves have been grouped into plots within settlements, as is the case with extramural cemeteries (Cavanagh 1977).

This increased differentiation has been interpreted in relation to social structure, that is, as an evolution towards heightened social complexity (Dickinson 1983) or as a stronger presence of a social elite (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1997). Viewing the case of Lerna, Nordquist rejects a linear development from an egalitarian society towards a more complex social structure and interprets the changes in funerary habits as evidence of a society which was developing "with fewer and less marked rank groups to one with larger social divisions, more marked ranking and clearer sex differences (1979: 44). Voutsaki (1993) claims that clear differentiation existed already in MHI and supports Nordquist's (1979) rejection of these changes as representing the presence of strong local elites and that MH mortuary patterning appears complex.

1.3 The Transition from MHIII to LHI

Even further changes are observed in the southern part of the mainland in the MHIII period in terms of social, economic and political transformation; the MH period had up until this point been characterised by continuation of old habits with new features only emerging at the end of MHIII, which Dickinson (1989: 133) boldly described as marking the end of the 'Third World' of the Aegean. More depositions of wealth are observed in many sites, as is maintained by Papadimitriou (2001): the shaft graves in Mycenae and shaft-like tombs in the Argolid (Morou 1981); the tombs in Corinth (Blegen et al 1964), Messenia (Lolos 1989) and Pefkakia; the cist covered by a tumulus in Thorikos, the tumuli in Marathon and Boeotia (Maran 1988), the tholoi, shaft-like graves and complex tumuli (Korres 1984); the elaborate cists with a pseudo-entrance in Elefsis (Mylonas 1975) and even the Grave Circles in Messenia (Blegen et al 1973).

Alongside changes in mortuary practices, expansions in settlements can be recognised where in MHIII, they recover from the sharp decline that occurred in EHIII; Asine and Argos expand and the Nemea region was reoccupied, however, Lerna seems to have declined (Davis 1988). Furthermore, an increase in both Mycenean and Minoan influences when it comes to local pottery production has been noticed, which is also the case for the importation of pottery from the wider Aegean.

The transition between MHIII and LHI spans roughly 150 years and is mostly evident in sharp changes in burial customs in Argolid, namely the shaft graves and the "assumed Mycenaean social structure that goes with them" (Boyd 2002: 4). Multiple burials in tombs became more popular than in MH and the practice of intramural burials continued sporadically from MHIII to LHI and mostly for children. Entering the LHI period would see the dead enjoying a more privileged status with unprecedented levels of investments in the construction of tombs and their deposits, which is evident in a few elaborate burials in shaft graves, however, the lack of burial deposits persisted in most of them (Dickinson 1977). It is here that we find the famous deposits of gold and the golden masks; bodies rather laid in extended position than contracted, and another new trend of conspicuous consumption is established in this period, showing a desire for display (Cavanagh and Mee 1998).

1.4 Conclusion

Despite an ostensible decline in burial performances and ritual, there is clear evidence for the continuation of burial habits throughout the Helladic period with burials such as the pit and cists tracing their origins back to the Final Neolithic with the MH cists retaining original features of its predecessors in terms of shape and structure (Dickinson 2016; Voutsaki 1993). With time, adult intramural burials grew in popularity throughout the mainland but had until then been mostly reserved for children. However, during the transition to LHI, extramural cemeteries became more visible along with more elaborative graves and burial ritual, which is also evident with the appearance of new types of burials such as chamber and tholos tombs. Another change taking place throughout the MH period is the gradual increase in multiple burials and secondary burial rites where graves, the shaft graves especially, were used through long periods of time. Despite the impressions of increased uniformity towards later stages of the MH, some local variations exist, suggesting that groups of people were able to exercise a degree of choice (Dickinson 2016), however, much is still left up to interpretation.

2. From Individuals to Dividual Identities: Theoretical Frameworks in Mortuary Archaeology

A significant amount of literature on Middle Helladic and Early Mycenaean burial habits exists, each offering an analytical framework under a different theme (Boyd 2002). For instance, Branigan's (1998) *Cemetery and Society* offers published roundtable discussions that took place in Sheffield and are concerned with the transformation of MBA societies on mainland Greece. These included considerations on how these transformations are depicted through burial practices (Voutsaki 1998); continuation and conservatism in mortuary ritual practices and relation to identity (Cavanagh 1998); the social meaning of conspicuous consumption (Hamilakis 1998) and a gendered approach to the status of Mycenaean women in the funerary context (Mee 1998).

According to Boyd, two interconnected and dominating topics can be identified within the history of Aegean mortuary archaeology: establishing the status and levels of individuality of the deceased and "the place of mortuary customs in the establishment and maintenance of the Mycenaean 'civilisation' or Mycenaean 'state society'" (2002: 11). However, with Neo-materialism, and the concept of object-agency, the importance of interpreting the reflection of social hierarchy and development within burial habits was challenged and calls for more nuanced approaches were made (Whitmore 2013). The past 20 years have marked a shift towards the concept of personhood and how it reflects societal structures where the concept of individuality is believed to be a part of modern essentialism and identities in the past were solely relational (Chapman and Gaydarska 2011; Fowler 2004; Hodder 1982); people were no longer considered to be individuals but made up of relational and dividual identities (Harrell 2009).

This chapter will offer an overview of relevant theoretical approaches concerning concepts of the individual and identity within Helladic mortuary archaeology, ranging from isomorphic approaches to wealth and society to the gradual developments towards more relational and contextual approaches to personhood.

2.1 Searching for Status Within the Burial Context

Initial in-depth studies of Middle Helladic burial customs aimed to analyse elements such as social differentiation by identifying the relationship between the buried individuals with aspects such as tomb construction, number and value of burial goods in order to "read" off their social status (Boyd 2002: 11). By doing so, their individuality could be established and contrasted against the society they lived in and their status within a vertical hierarchical social structure identified (Dickinson 2016, 1983).

Dickinson's summary of the major debated themes within Helladic burial customs in the 1980s still remains relevant in today's academic approach to the topic, where he argued that "the degree of elaboration of the tombs, and the quantity and value of the goods placed in them, have direct relevance to the status of the buried person" (1983: 56). His statement follows the works of Saxe (1970), Binford (1971) and Brown (1981) of the *social persona*, an approach which recognises the social status and responsibilities of the deceased by viewing the amount of their social aggregation. This concept, also known as *isomorphism,* seeks to identify cultural universality in prehistoric mortuary patterns. Coined as the 'Binford-Saxe hypothesis', it was further supported by Brown (1981) who believed the social linkage between the deceased and their status to be epitomized in the size and composition of the funerary deposit. As an example, this argument was raised by Kilian-Dirlmeier (1997) in her studies of the relationship between burial deposits in shaft-graves on Aegina and the wider mainland where she adjudged MH burials to bear testimony of an early elite presence throughout the mainland. This method had already been met with a considerable critique from O'Shea (1984), who accused it of assuming linear correlation between subsistence and complexity and that Binford's use of ethnographic case studies to support his assertion to rather weaken his argument (Voutsaki 1993). Boyd (2002) further remarks that this hypothesis is in fact not a revelation on its own terms, as the assumption of simple connection between elaborate funerary rites and the status of the deceased has always prevailed in Aegean archaeology.

In their review of Helladic burials in *A Private Place: Death in Prehistoric Greece*, Cavanagh and Mee (1998) devoted considerable attention to the discussion of identity, social status and differentiation within funerary performances. In their detailed listing of burial rites, they also recognise Hodder's (1982) previous criticism of the search for social status within burials where he claimed that while burial rituals may indeed reflect certain aspects of society, they can equally be considered to distort this relationship. As an attempt to overcome this paradox, Hodder (1982) offered an alternative explanation of *rôle:* each role is an element consisting of an individual's subordinated place within society and these roles then make up a structured whole. Hodder (1982) considered this structure whole to be society itself and archaeology's aim should be to analyse these constituent elements in order to understand the structures of a certain society. This could be done through systematic grouping of empirical data into hierarchical classes in order to reveal underlying principles which structure the society in question (Boyd 2002). However, this methodology faced criticism by Barrett (2000, 1990) who claimed the method to be rather counterintuitive as the roles and presence of individuals within this structure was masked rather than brought to light.

2.2 Discourse and Agency

The importance of the roles of individuals within the arena of mortuary rituals is highlighted in studies of early-Mycenaean funerary customs by Voutsaki (1993), Boyd (2002) and Georgousopoulou (2004) who place social roles as fluid components, which are actively maintained and manipulated by actors. In this approach, the importance of the realm of the living is highlighted by emphasising the role of performance in acting out rituals. From this arises the challenge to deconstruct the assumption of a linear model of mortuary complexity and social hierarchy to unveil underlying structures that, through actors in the past, reflect society (Boyd 2002; Wolpert 2004).

In her study of the transition of Middle Helladic to Late Helladic burials in the Argolid, Thessaly and the Dodecanese, Voutsaki (1993) attempts to steer the

discussion away from the focus on status and towards the mechanisms that guide social shifts in the funerary record and how they relate to domestic settlement developments. By focusing on the tripartite structure of mortuary ritual, *separation*, *liminality* and *reincorporation*, she identifies how the use of mortuary space is localised and the impact it has on definitions of the social person and cultural identities. This model requires engagement from living actors, which releases the mortuary evidence from being merely a passive gauge for levels of social complexities and inequalities. Instead, death constitutes an arena which does not *mirror* society but, through the performance of ritual and manipulation of material culture and landscape therein, it *creates* social reality and people's perception of it (Wolpert 2004).

Voutsaki's (1993) position that social reality is created within the mortuary arena is echoed in what Boyd refers to as 'fields of actions': past contexts of action which are "created, recreated, maintained and developed through discourse and action" (2014: 57). Boyd (2014) places specific emphasis on the importance of not treating archaeological evidence as a snapshot of time but as fragments of recursive media, that is, a particular area of space-time as occupied by practices of particular discourse. He considers the entire range of activities which are associated with the Mycenaean burial habits, from preparation of the body to laying burial offerings in the grave and engaging in conspicuous consumption, to be meaningful on their own terms and to exist in relation to one another. Therefore, Boyd's (2014) adoption of the term emphasises the importance of the continuation of time and space, not in terms of linear evolution, but through different tempos and rhythms of dramatic moments where, through funerary rituals, the imbued meanings and memories of places and actions are confronted as the present confronts the past. The production of context and social reality can thus be considered both fluid and dependent on the actors' perceptions and memories as well as their understanding of the materiality and ideology of their culture. Therefore, the participants are drawn to the funerary site because of traditions which have arisen out of interpretations of narratives which have physically manifested themselves in the cemetery.

Georgousopoulou (2004) considers funerary performances to represent an arena where seemingly simple communities can negotiate complex social identities and personas. In her case study of MH Asine in the Argolid, she notes how everyday life in Asine was closely tied, both spatially and conceptually, with the dead. This is evident by the inclusion of intramural burials in the settlement; graves existed both within, below and outside houses and no attempts were made to demarcate a distinct area for the dead. The presence of the deceased was therefore well felt among the living. As a result, she considers funerary performances as embodying potent strategies in negotiating both individual and communal identities where the treatment of death may not reflect social reality in a direct manner but can be considered to be a deliberate strategy on its own terms. As a result, the complexity of a certain society cannot be a matter of the presence or absence of certain number of objects or visible stratification or authority in the nature of the burial mounts. Instead, Georgousopoulou (2004) argues that archaeology should explore the dynamic relationship of life-stories and narratives as they appear both in everyday life as well as in the funerary context. Furthermore, by also considering how narratives of the ancestors are kept and circulated, archaeologists could gain greater insights into structures and complexities of the communities themselves, than they would by merely assessing material aggregations of burials.

The aforementioned approaches to the mortuary ritual with the importance of agency and narratives at its centre, have been influenced by Barrett's (1988) concept of *fields of discourse* which highlights the importance of the perception of agents of their own contemporary environment and how it carries the social forward through local knowledge and the meaning they put into it. Another influential reference is Robb's (2000, 2010, 1994) emphasis on materiality as key to the understanding of agency within the mortuary culture. Barrett's (1990) claim echoes the centre of a movement within social theory which sought to challenge totalising system models by shifting focus towards the concept of agency of individuals as the "socially reproductive quality of action" where actors, according to Robb's (2010: 397-498) summary of the dyadic relationship between actors and their environment:

> …act according to culturally specific, deeply instilled social and cognitive structures (rather than universal motivations) but their actions are not limited by them. Rather, actors are knowledgeable, with highly developed practical consciousness (implicit, non-discursive knowledge for negotiating the situations they encounter)… Agents exist in, and understand implicitly, their landscape of action, which represents a set of possibilities and challenges formed by the past. Thus there is a dialectical relation between structure, which allows and channels action, and action, which recreates structure.

This position extends the study of mortuary rituals beyond the grave and into the realm of the living as burial rituals can only happen through the agency of those alive, who need to arrange for and organise the event. Therefore, the deceased person is merely a by-product of the funeral and expressed identities of the buried. Additionally, these identities are formed through the interpretations of the living who were at the forefront of the funerary arrangements (Boyd 2002). Furthermore, as mortuary rituals are performed according to local adaptations and expressions of the rites, agency cannot be considered to be a universal phenomenon but is instead both culturally and contextually bound, defined within a historical setting (Robb 2010) and fields of discourse (Barrett 2001; Dobres 2000; Dobres and Robb 2000, 2005).

2.3 Relational and Symmetrical Archaeology

During the last couple of decades, the approach to mortuary customs has shifted further towards identity, be it of the dead or the living, who participate in the funerary ritual. The so-called posthumanocentric and relational approaches have attempted to deconstruct the notion of the omnipotent human agent that was so heavily emphasised in the aforementioned approaches of agency and discourse. Helladic and early-Mycenaean burial rituals are yet to see full application of relational methodology to their mortuary evidence; however, this has been attempted within Minoan funerary habits by Vavouranakis (2016) and Schoep and Tomkins (2016). Nevertheless, exploration of personhood in Helladic burial customs has been made by Harrell (2009) and will be discussed further below.

At the core of a symmetrical approach to the archaeological record is its high regard for relationships between heterogeneous elements and the context, or fields of

action, and the connections that exist there within (Boyd 2014, 2002; Robb 2010; Whitmore 2008). Moreover, through this relationship, people are believed to possess the capacity to act non-discursively and participate, making every action an involvement of long-term projects, namely "social relations of co-behaviour, public identity claims and associated attitudes, memories and emotions, and even a willingness to change oneself or allow oneself to be changed" (Robb 2010: 502). Practical skills are a product of knowledge and are laden with the meaning of identity, therefore, these actions can also be considered as projects of the self (Robb 2010). "Things are good to think with" as Knappett remarked (2005: 150-151) and so symmetrical archaeology (Whitmore 2008) has become increasingly influential in literature on agency and funerary practices (Schoep and Tomkins 2016). With key discussions revolving around "relationality, networks and personhood" (Robb 2010: 502) attention is attributed, not only to agents and their past social lives, but also to linking these agents with their material world and social contexts. In other words, the focus of agency was shifted from the agents manipulating objects towards agency of the objects themselves.

The above largely originates from Latour's (2005) Actor-Network theory, a methodological approach which views the natural world as a network of relationships which all are considered equally valid and are constantly shifting. The status of the artefact is elevated to the same level as that of a human and the relationship which is created out of the interaction between the thing and the human is of importance. Hence, nonhuman agency is relational, that is, it only exists in a scheme of networks where personhood is not constricted to one type of entity as no clear distinction is made between social and natural-biological relationships (Wilkinson 2013). Malafouris (2008) makes an analogy with pottery making; a pot can only be made through a collaboration between a potter, the clay and the wheel, therefore, each has to be considered as a part of a network of elements working together (Robb 2004). Another example of the human-thing network, and perhaps the most elaborative, is Latour's earlier example of the network creating the 'gun-man' (1994: 31):

> …the gun acts by virtue of material components irreducible to the social qualities of the gunman. On account of the gun, a good guy, the law-abiding citizen, becomes dangerous… the gun does nothing in

> itself or by virtue of its material components. The gun is a tool, a medium, a neutral carrier of will… the gun enables of course, but also instructs, directs, even pulls the trigger… Each artifact has its script, its "affordance", its potential to take hold of passersby and force them to play roles in its story.

This approach has been applied to Minoan mortuary context as a means of investigating the connection between the deceased and their burial surrounding (Schoep and Tomkins 2016; Vavouranakis 2016) where cemeteries are considered to be "places of transformation; material, social and spiritual" (Schoep and Tomkins 2016: 245). In this context, meaning arises from the dyadic interaction between humans and the artefacts utilised in the funerary rites. In their case study of Middle Minoan cemetery in Sissi, Crete, Schoep and Tomkins (2016) analyse the materiality of human remains, and the engagement with them, in order to reconstruct forms of action in the funerary context. In their highly contextual approach, they consider human and material remains to be on the same level, that is, skeletonised bodies are merely another category of the material they explore in terms of relationality to other material categories. Through this, they were able to feature the diversity and contingency in treatments of the bodies and other materials within the cemetery and how they relate to changing histories of the group that manipulated the house-tomb complexes. This manipulation was in the form of curation, modification, abandonment or destruction, which resulted from a diverse chain of events which marked the changing histories of the surrounding, therefore, marking how the living understood and perceived their world.

Viewing the transformations of the Pre- and Protopalatial tholos tombs of Apesokari in South-Central Crete, Vavouranakis (2016) emphasises how symmetrical relationship between people and their environment brought the dynamics and the ideologies of those relationships to life and how spaces were created where people could act out their different modes of being (Fowler 2004; Robb 2010). Stressing the dynamic link between the architecture of tholos tombs, which required constant repairs by people, to the landscape wherein it belonged and which it marked, Vavouranakis (2016) argued that agency results in the dynamic network created by these marks. His examination of the tholos tombs sought to gain insight into the views

and responses of local communities to the palatial phenomenon, hence emphasising the need to investigate the ontological status of the humans in antiquity.

2.3.1 The Shift Towards Personhood

When previous research on personhood is explored, a gap in the literature appears as only few studies focus specifically on the modes of personhood. In light of this, I will start with a general theoretical elaboration and an archaeological discussion on personhood before offering examples of research on Helladic burial customs.

The emphasis on relationality converges with archaeological discussions on personhood which over the past 20 years has been developing around the focus on ontological perspectives and materiality (Fowler 2004; Whitley 2012), namely how personhood is expressed and distributed through things, persons, places and materials (Fowler 2016, 2004). Originating in ethnographic details of how Western accounts of the self acts as a form of autonomous and rational individuality (Whitley 2012), the focus on personhood in archaeology has been largely introduced by Fowler (2004) who contrasts Strathern's (1988) account of Melanesian 'partible' persons and Busby's (1997) 'permeable' persons in India. He claims the concept of ownership to be inextricable from one's personhood and is primarily mediated through the act of gift-exchange. Therefore, partible personhood is considered to 'flow' as components of both social and material network which are further mediated through exchanges made between people. It can be seen as acting through the contradiction of "keeping-while-giving" (Weiner 1992: 131) where, through interaction and exchanges with other persons, people are able to detach a part of themselves which then circulates as part of them. In permeable personhood, objects do not detach from the person but act as an extension of them, permeating their inner compositions and qualities. Therefore, they are not identified as objects only, but as flows of substances.

This account of 'dividualism' (Fowler 2004; Harrell 2009) has sparked debates within archaeology about contrasts with individualism in prehistory and how people in the past may have conceptualised their social status. For example, Brück (2004) believes that conceptualisation of identity and the self was quite different than

modern views, which Fowler claims to have been altogether relational and parts of "temporary, contextual, and community concerns" (Fowler 2004: 1) where "to be in one state of personhood is always to potentially be in other" (Fowler 2004: 44). The last two decades have seen a transformation in the archaeology of burial habits, acknowledging the need for further critical reflection reaching beyond the context of objects and into ontological concerns. Hodder (2012) argues that personhood cannot be divorced from the entanglements of networks of mediated objects; the contrast of individual and dividual identities in antiquity has been eagerly debated, starting with Hodder's (2006) earlier suggestion of linear evolutionary trend in the degree of individualism replacing dividualism with increased material entanglement. Supporting his statement, Chapman and Gaydarska (2011) further claim individualism to have 'risen' with increased diversity in Neolithic populations where specialised skills lead to more individual identities. Fowler (2016, 2004) argues that any ideas of linear evolution from dividuality to individualism are amiss and maintains that personhood exists in facets within any cultural context. Lucas (2012), on the other hand, rejects the idea of this relationship and argues that treating personhood as a purely abstract concept does not carry the same ontological weight as material objects.

Ritualised transformations of the person through death and mortuary practices are imperative to the interpretation of personhood, as they often give an abundance of information about ritual and social performances for acting out beliefs about the afterlife and the safeguarding of the deceased from this world (Fowler 2016, 2004). By passing from one state of personhood to the other, dramatic changes occur to the personhood of the deceased where his or her relationship with the living is changed, often via a tripartite *rites-of-passage*; the ritual process of removal of one identity and the emergence of the other where, through mortuary rituals, the deceased is safeguarded from the realm of the living to whatever lies beyond. This process shifts their personhood from stages of *living* to the liminal state of the burial where they are enabled to successfully claim the status of an ancestor (Fowler 2004; Whitley 2012). Although this ritual would suggest a process of removal of the dead, Fowler (2004) claims mortuary rites to be a part of an *integration* of the deceased back into society or the cosmos, depending on the mode of personhood. In this way, they may be gone

but a part of them remains; they are given to the ancestors while simultaneously kept with the living.

The concept of dividualism is centred in Harrell's (2009) survey on swords in Mycenaean shaft graves from MHIII to LHII, where she studies layered meaning and the personal relationship between the object and the deceased. She considers the Mycenaean shaft graves to represent a mortuary arena where power was negotiated, therefore maintaining that the study of the weaponry deposits should move beyond their symbolism; within this context, they are fetishized and accumulated for their own sake as their biographies were not simply a deposit to follow the deceased but a vital part of the funeral. Owing to this, they would have held meaning for both the living and the deceased and the act of depositing the sword would have held a different interpretation between persons. Each sword is unique, which leads Harrell's (2014) argument that their social status was tied to the concept of ownership as well as their biographies before being deposited. They can therefore be considered as being associated with the construction of the individual self within a collective space, as it mediates an individualised identity of various allies beyond the physical body. They may thus not only represent commemoration of the departed but "also acts of bereavement for the mourner, who, by giving up a sword in which part of his soul resided, lost a part of himself" (Harrell 2014: 15).

2.4 Conclusion

Since the emergence of the Binford-Saxe hypothesis in search of the status of the social persona, nuanced ideas of the complexities of mortuary rituals have been offered where the linear evolutionary links have been broken (Georgousopoulou 2004). As Georgousopoulou (2004) notes, "complexity is not a matter of the presence or absence of objects, and simplicity is not inherent in the apparent lack of structures of authority" (2004: 212). Therefore, it risks oversight of important details (Barrett and Damilati 2004).

The focus on material agency has faced further challenges when it comes to the importance of temporal aspects such as rites-of-passage. As in the example of

Latour's (1994) gunman, focusing merely on contemporary networks of material elements leaves us with a snapshot of a moment created by actants. The same can be applied to the location of modes of personhood within a network of gift-exchange; while exploring deeper dimensions of ideology within the paradox of keeping-while-giving, ideological mechanisms behind these networks are exposed while still leaving them confound to the moment of burial. Boyd's (2014, 2002) conscious attempt to overcome this fallacy by applying temporality to his fields-of-actions of mortuary performance and Harrell's (2014, 2009) mapping of the biography and dividual elements of Mycenaean swords, are important contributions to unearthing the multiplicities of Helladic burial aspects as a whole.

With shifts of focus towards relationality and context, the individual in antiquity has been gradually deconstructed with the risk of him or her being left lost in networks of material agency and embodied ideologies. Therefore, an approach is needed where the 'person' is reinstated without running the risk of essentialism by addressing the gaps in previous research without sacrificing the efforts of previous scholars.

In the next chapter I will introduce and discuss Assemblage theory; a new approach which aims to embrace the chaotic nature of the world by moving beyond the dichotomy of the material and the ideological by addressing their 'inbetweenness' (Ingold 2015).

3. Introducing Assemblage Theory

Although material and ideological dichotomies have been dealt with in the past by both processual and post-processual scholars, assemblage-thinking approach is shown to be a promising theory when it comes to addressing the dyadic tensions between material and immaterial entities of societies, be they modern or in antiquity; without risking fallacies of setting up human identities as binaries of individuals-versus-dividuals, assemblage theory addresses the possibility of personhood being fluid enough to contain elements of both. The world is complex, messy and full of controversies and tensions (Crellin 2017), therefore, it is justified to explore it with a framework that highlights these frictions. Within archaeology, it offers a more diverse and sophisticated ontological theoretical approach by emphasising relationality in both spatial and temporal context (Whitmore 2014). By doing so, it links external and internal processes and the ability to manoeuvre between material deposits and strata, it sees personhood as a composite and flexible entity which allows a reconstitution of the social subject without allowing room for essentialist views.

3.1 Philosophical Origins of Assemblage Theory

The concept of 'the assemblage' was first introduced in Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) book *A Thousand Plateaus* where they draw from dynamical systems theory, an area of mathematics which explores ways in which material systems self-organise, as they extend its borders beyond mathematics to include social, linguistic and philosophical aspects of society which can be grouped together to form an assemblage. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) visualised assemblages as constituting two dimensions of identity: one material and one expressive, which they placed at the opposite sides of a spectrum. The degree of material and expressive elements varies between each assemblage, depending on the capacities and their roles, and mostly operates in mixtures somewhere along the material-expressive spectrum. Another dimension defines the capacities of the components for being able to become involved with other components, that is, stabilizing the identity of an assemblage by creating an internal homogeneity or through robust boundaries, or destabilising it. As an example, they

mention an assemblage comprising the bee and the orchid; the bee flies between the orchids carrying pollens. Both interact in the reproductive system of the other while each also simultaneously belongs to a different environment; they are partly autonomous and partly relational. The arena in which the bee and the orchid meet and interact is what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) would refer to as a 'rhizome'.

In his book *A New Philosophy of Society*, DeLanda stays close to Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) original definition of an assemblage as "a multiplicity which is made up of many heterogeneous terms and which establishes liaisons, relations between them, across ages, sexes and reigns… different natures" (2016: 1). He sought to "bring these definitions together, introducing and illustrating the terms required to make sense in them" (2016: 1) and to turn them into a comprehensive theoretical framework which incorporates inner processes as well as realist approaches to institutions and practices, as without the human mind, society would cease to exist.

DeLanda's (2006) most notable contribution to assemblage theory is his expansions upon Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) two-dimensional axes by introducing the third dimension, which defines the "processes in which specialized expressive media intervene… which consolidate and rigidify the identity of the assemblage…" (2006: 19), that is, the processes which drive the movement of the components along the axes, creating the process of their identities. This process is summed up by Normark (2010: 144):

> Differences are inherent in the assemblage and these cause partial deterritorialization of the emerging assemblage, such as differences in topography or other obstacles which the causeway had to tackle (features it had to bypass or cross over). However, all these territorializations were followed by reterritorializations into new territories. The abandonment of the causeway, which deteriorated into ruins and made it impossible to use as a causeway, was an extended symmetry breakage/absolute deterritorialization of the assemblage…

Assemblages are therefore considered to be in a constant state of becoming: moving along the scales of their material and expressive elements while constantly seeking to break their territorialisation in order to reterritorialize with another assemblage, which in turn can further link multiple assemblages together in other dimensions from levels

of the individual person to the levels of territorial states of social reality (DeLanda 2006; Deleuze and Guattari 1987; Normark 2010).

This is vividly illustrated in DeLanda's (2016: 69-70) example of the military phalanx as a part-to-whole relation; the whole is composed of parts comprising a fast riding horse, a man and a bow. This is a well-known example of an assemblage made up of heterogeneous elements, from what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) had previously referred to as the man-horse-bow assemblage, where troops were arranged together in groups. This assemblage could also be considered as constituting different realms of social reality: the personal, the biological and the technological. In antiquity, warriors within a nomad army could fight alone or in teams and losing a portion of the sedentary army would trigger a response from a stream of nomad warriors who would breach the gap. This would later lead to the creation of the phalanx where experienced warriors surrounded the less experienced ones, leaving them with no opportunity to escape. The phalanx has since been utilised in one form or the other throughout history; "many human-horse-bow assemblages working together, trained intensively to work together, form a whole with the emergent capacity to exploit spatial and temporal features of the battlefield" (DeLanda 2016: 71). The army can thus be considered to constitute multiple and hierarchical assemblages, where material components would also carry the political, economic, social and historical elements which all would independently operate outside the concept of the military, albeit also influencing elements such as formation and operation.

This brings us to the concept of the agency of assemblages, which is their imperative element as is indicated in the denotation of its original word in French, *agencement*, meaning an *arrangement* that also has an effect. Bennett's (2001) essential contribution *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* draws attention to the importance of the agency of assemblages. Writing from a Spinozian teleology of nature, Bennett (2001) follows Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) aspirations to describe how networks of change operate both within and beyond the person through the power of affect. In other words, assemblages are built up by heterogeneous and fluid components of both material and ideological elements which interact with each other in dyadic tension where they can further affect other components as well as be

affected by them (Bennett 2001). Bennett (2001) extends this notion of affect to objects, referring to them as *vibrant matter*; the thing-power of individual objects as they act and are acted upon in their process of attracting and interacting with other components. This process essentially places politics and ethics at the centre of affectivity as she recounts in her example of the human-food assemblage of vibrant materiality, which has been elaborated by Hamilakis (2017: 177):

> …as food substances flow in and out of bodies, and as food becomes us, transforming itself and transforming us at the same time, not only does the boundary between inside and outside become blurry, but also the binarisms of subject and object, and of active human and the passive and inert food substance, fall apart. This is a human-food assemblage, a process of becoming-food, which in its turn contributes to the process of becoming food.

In both examples by DeLanda (2016) and Bennett (2001), temporal context is an important element where history guides the flow and formation of the assemblages where, through the agency of materiality, time can be considered as becoming contained within the present moment. Therefore, it is through the act of remembering that the re-enactment of past events, such as the historical prevalence of the phalanx and the consumption of food, that the past is called forward into the present where they co-exist (Hamilakis 2017).

3.2 Assemblage Theory in Archaeology

The benefits of assemblage theory to archaeology were first realised by Chapman (2000). His concept of *enchainment* describes relations between people and how they are connected through acts of giving and receiving inalienable objects. Chapman's (2000) idea was later adopted by Lucas (2012) who called for a new theoretical framework which would overcome the dichotomies of the social and the material of previous frameworks. In his book, *Understanding the Archaeological Record*, he attempts to utilise aspects of assemblage theory in order to reconceptualise the archaeological process. He considers assemblages as containing two complementary acts of *enchainment* and *containment* where the former refers to the coding of assemblages and the latter describes their process of deterritorialization (Lucas 2012:

198). Building on Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) and DeLanda's (2006) notion of territorialisation/deterritorialisation, Lucas (2012) develops the concepts of dematerialization and rematerialisation with the agenda of describing the process of past remains being taken from their original prehistorical context and receiving a new context once unearthed in modernity.

Crellin (2017, 2013) studied how people with thoughts, feelings and families are transformed into mere bodies through cremation. She considers cremated remains to be a form of vibrant matter; after cremation, the body turns into fragmented charred bones which demand a different kind of interactions, that is, the changing in the nature of the material begs particular actions from the mourners who must handle the remains before, during and after the cremation. Therefore, an assemblage is the residue of multiple activities of the community from the historical pathway of the burial ritual, to the work of those digging the cremation pit, the outside influences of the pottery made and used in the ceremony and the renegotiation of people's relations. It is here where the machinic and enunciating parts of the assemblage contrast and merge (Lucas 2017), where old relationships are broken and new ones are formed, along with the artefacts used in this exchange.

Seeking inspiration directly from Deleuze and Guattari (1987) as well as Bennett's (2001) concept of vibrant matter, Hamilakis' approach offers an answer to Lucas' (2012) previous call for a method which overcomes problematic distinctions between the social and the material. By focusing on "entities and their relations" (2014: 167) he offers a view into the world of conspicuous consumption as a form of social ritual in antiquity through, what he calls, *sensorial assemblage theory*. According to Hamilakis, assemblages are "contingent co-presences of heterogeneous elements such as bodies, things, substances, affects, memories, information and ideas" (2017: 82), therefore, a fundamental property of all assemblages is their arrangement of material and immaterial entities as their affective and sensorial import where memory and mnemonic performances play a key role. Therefore, we must explore both bodies and material culture within their affectivity in order to view them in context as well as their 'inbetweenness' (Ingold 2015), that is, "the processes that

happen, the relationships that are forged and the possibilities that emerge in the midst of things, senses, memories and affects (Hamilakis 2017: 176).

Hamilakis (2017, 2014) follows Bennett (2001) in emphasising the political aspect of assemblages. He stresses the role of food and drink consumption in funerary rituals where food and death are closely connected, both homologically and antithetically (Hamilakis 2014; 1998). Foster (1990) had previously suggested that eating and digestion at the time of the conspicuous consumption taking place in the mortuary context, can be considered as a metaphor for death and the relations that require renegotiating: food, as vibrant matter, takes on an active role in embodying humans with a certain social group, defined by commensality (Fischler 1988; Hamilakis 1998). Hamilakis refers to this as 'gastropolitics', that is, how through politics of memory and performance, the mnemoscapes of death are an arena for the re-enactment of power relations as they offer access to ritual control which are impossible in other social spaces (Hamilakis 1998: 128). Therefore, the conspicuous consumption is an actualisation and a re-enactment of a specific past which, through its performance, produces an effective experience in the presence. As a result, temporality is considered to be not linear but polychronic, where the enactment of feasting enacts and co-exists with the presence (Hamilakis 2017, 2014, 1998).

Conspicuous consumption in ritual performance comprises all of these components; it is a re-enactment of past affective and mnemonic occasions where, through the act of feasting, past rituals are affectively experienced in the present. The event of feasting is thus sensorial on its own terms. However, in the context of funerary ritual, food substances determine and elicit responses of participants; they carry with them memories of past sensorial experiences of feasting through the creation of a sensorial assemblage. The trans-corporeal landscape being materialised by the aforementioned sensoriality creates a power which is both mnemonic and affective and governs the setting of the ritual and can thus be considered as a biopolitical entity (Hamilakis 2017).

Lucas (2017, 2012) and Fowler (2017, 2016) have expanded on Hamilakis' (2014) approach where Fowler (2017) considers funerary rites to be made of arranged

sequences, highlighting the transformation of the deceased while reflecting on their identity and personhood. Lucas (2017) further argues that assemblage-thinking approach shifts the archaeological enquiry from pure ontology into enquiries of certain modes of being-in-the-world. According to Wilkinson (2013), when looking at burial deposits, archaeologists should not only consider elements such as style and typology of the objects in question, but they must also view them within their ontological context, that is, their biographical lifespan as well as the *habitus* of their creator. Jones (2017) supports Wilkinson's (2013) statement but further suggests that doing this would require approaching the typology of the burial deposits as an assemblage, taking into account the historical tradition the objects represent and how they are embodied within the artefact themselves: the way they are carved, painted, assembled and/or broken, where they travelled and where they were buried. Furthermore, Harris (2014) upholds Hamilakis' (2017, 2014) original call for the importance of emotions and sensorial experiences and for reconsidering how relations are negotiated as he claims that, by being the outcome of particular assemblages, they become affective.

3.3 Assemblage Theory and Personhood

Accounts of relationality and enchainment, along with the ontological and contextual turn that characterises assemblage theory, set the tone for the exploration of personhood through assemblage-thinking. Death is the ultimate transformation of the person and because of this, conceptions of this transformation are intrinsic to the understanding of personhood; it is fluid and can occupy multiple categories at once (Hamilakis 2014), therefore, it is "not only relational but multi-dimensional and multi-modal" (Fowler, 2004: 406). In order to understand personhood, we must not only consider the material deposits of a funeral but also immaterial components such as "beliefs about the human body, ideas about dying, and perhaps notions of the soul or an afterlife…" (Crellin 2017: 115). As a result, Fowler (2017) believes viewing Bronze Age burials as assemblages to be the ideal method for exploring relational personhood; they consist of various heterogeneous components such as a body, architecture, various material deposits etc., which all have been deterritorialised from

other assemblages to be joined with the burial rhizome. Seldom with a single point of origin, they are the result of multiple and successive relations, processes and events comprising their own properties and effects. These relations also occur at various scales of space and time where they "intersect, and bleed into one another" (Fowler 2017: 3).

Mortuary practices can thus be considered as highly political in nature; they are technologies that possess the power to transform both the living and the dead as well as the relationships between them. Hence, viewing mortuary practices as assemblages unveils societies' ways of becoming which includes: "becoming a person, becoming dead, becoming an ancestor, becoming a certain kind of place and becoming a community that traces its history partly through mortuary practice" (Fowler 2017: 16-17). Harris (2014) further notes that a person can belong to several practices and networks at the same time and by embracing these relationships, as they are mediated with material culture, allows us to not only view the biography of the artefact but also the emotions they represent. Therefore, when a certain archaeological find is discovered within a burial, a connection can be made among the multiple contexts it belonged to where they can be linked to a single assemblage, that is, "a single affective community" (Harris 2014: 91).

The above quote from Harris (2014) begs the question of the boundaries of individualisation and dividualism in funerary rites, a concern which is addressed by Hamilakis (2014) whose aforementioned approach to mortuary evidence, as composed of sensorial assemblages, challenges their perceived nature as standing as binary oppositions between the individual and the collective. As Georgousopoulou (2004) had previously maintained, both individual and collective identities are negotiated within the mortuary arena. In doing so, the burial arena is viewed in terms of dialectics of individual engagements expressed within collective interaction, and so Hamilakis (2014) adopts Simondon's concept of *collective individuation* where each person expresses various degrees of individualism and dividualism at the same time (see Combes 2013). Within the burial context, the corpse can be seen as trapped between bounded entities of the individual and the static whole of the community as it is *temporarily individuated*; before joining the collective memory of the ancestors the

memory of the individual is highlighted through ritual performances, thus the body can be seen as still possessing agency as it retains the capacity of affecting other bodies as well as being affected by them. Therefore, in order to successfully move beyond the dichotomies of personhood as belonging within tensions of the individual and the collective, Hamilakis (2014) proposes that mortuary archaeology focuses on the emergence of personhood within tensions of sensorial *remembering* and *forgetting* where selfhood and personhood of the deceased is controlled through "mnemonic consequences" where past dead are individually forgotten but collectively remembered (2014: 155). Biopolitical aspects of processes of remembering and forgetting are most evident within acts of conspicuous consumption as a re-enactment of past affective and mnemonic occasions where, through the act of feasting, past rituals are affectively experienced in the present, which, within examples of Early Bronze Age Minoan burial habits, Hamilakis (2014: 156) portrays as:

> …the condition of corporeal and sensorial fluidity whereby co-joint and commingled, dead or alive bodies, body parts, and objects occupy temporary and transient positions, and whereby movements of bodies and objects but also movements and circulation of substances *through* bodies become paramount. This is evident… in the constant movement and rearrangement and manipulation of body parts, in the continuous interaction between the living and the dead, and in the collective rituals centred around the circulation and consumption of food and drink. Whatever notions of personhood and selfhood would have been produced and negotiated in this landscape, they would have been done in this trans-corporeal arena… This trans-corporeal selfhood, however, was mediated by the process of sensorial remembering and forgetting and the interplay between the two.

3.4 Conclusion

Assemblage theory is gradually finding its way into archaeological theory as it has demonstrated that its strength lies in its willingness to celebrate the complexities of human societies where political, ideological and temporal processes are imperative to successfully understand structures of societies in antiquity – that is, it explores not only *what* people did but also *why* they did it.

DeLanda's (2016, 2006) and Bennett's (2001) adoption of assemblage theory is believed to strongly echo relational and symmetrical approaches, and Bennett

(2001) herself has claimed to be under the influence of Latour's (2004) concept of 'actants', that is, something that acts or is allowed to act. However, in contrast to Latour's (1994) gun-man, which only exists out of the network created by the gun-and-man at the moment of shooting, DeLanda's (2016) rendering of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) horse-and-bow and Bennett's (2001) human-food assemblage dictate how independent components are joined together in action and how the composition of these components is influenced by ideological elements of history, politics and affect.

Because of the framework's abilities to move across all dimensions of society, from the micro to the macro and from the past to the contemporary, previous approaches to either locating the individual within the burial context, or attempts to deconstruct them, are not rejected but instead incorporated and expanded upon. With Fowler's (2004, 2013) design of theoretical framework for viewing personhood within the mortuary arena and Hamilakis' (2017, 2014, 1998) application of sensorial assemblage theory to Minoan mortuary culture, new possibilities for interpretations of personhood and identity have opened up for the analysis of mortuary evidence in the prehistoric Aegean.

In the next chapter, I will apply assemblage-thinking approach to the case studies of Grave Circles A and B in Mycenae, the Warrior Grave of Kolonna, Aegean and the Griffin Warrior of Pylos in order to explore new dimensions of personhood.

4. Exploring Assemblages of Personhood in Mycenae, Kolonna and Pylos

> Is there a more serious, more profound, and more unsettling disruption of daily routine, of habitus, of temporality for a close-knit community than the death of a person? How does one deal with that disruption of temporality at the emotional, affective level? How does one deal with the embodiment of death, with its sensuous and sensory impact? Indeed, when is a person really dead, since the physical presence for that person, long after stopping breathing and talking, continues to act upon others, in a haptic, olfactory, multi-sensory, and inevitably affective manner, its flesh transformed into something else? (Hamilakis 2014: 131-132).

The quoted text from Hamilakis' book *Archaeology and the Senses* shows the thinking behind the approach of assemblage theory where not only processes of continuity and change are asked but also how these processes were experienced by participants as they interacted with different elements of ritual stages, which set the scene for the presentation of affective elements of the funerary scene.

In the past few decades, these so-called 'Warrior-Graves' have attracted much attention within archaeological enquiry, at first instance as mainly discriminating between Minoan and Mycenaean influences as well as interpreting attitudes towards warfare and locating elite status of those resting within the graves (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1997; 1986). In recent years, they have become source of main enquiry about identity and personhood (Harrell 2014, 2009) and are especially interesting when it comes to questions raised about boundaries between individuality and collectivism as well as about social memory and forgetting; why were some graves re-used multiple times and others only for one individual? What does this tell us about the ritual and ideas on selfhood and attitudes towards social hierarchy? How is the biopolitical mediated through the funerary ritual?

In this chapter, we will visit the case studies of the Mycenaean Grave Circles and the Warrior graves of Kolonna and Pylos where their mortuary evidence will be

revised and an analysis of personhood made with the application of assemblage theory.

4.1 The Case Studies

4.1.1 The Grave Circles of Mycenae

The sudden appearance of shaft graves in the Middle Helladic period has been the subject of vast archaeological enquiry. As markers of continuation of MH burial customs into the LHI, Grave Circles A and B are Argive variations of the MH funerary traditions as they represent one of the major characteristics of the early Mycenaean civilisation with the occupation of GC B dating from MHIII to LHII and are the best evidence for other contemporary shaft grave circles. Meticulous accounts of Grave Circles A and B have been provided by Mylonas (1983) and Dickinson (1977) regarding the findings of the graves along with thoughts on links between the circles as well as internal connections between the graves themselves. The first graves of Grave Circle B predate Grave Circle A and it has been suggested that GC A is a continuation of a different branch of an elite from GC B. However, they are believed to have been used contemporarily for a while until burial habits in GC B discontinued.

Located 117m from the north-west corner of the Lion Gate, Grave Circle B can be found in the low rise of the ground sloping off the acropolis. The wall surrounding the shaft graves is of primitive Cyclopean style, 1.55m thick and 1.20 m high and based on chronological dating from pottery in the same stratum, it has been estimated they were built during the MH period (Mylonas 1983). It consists of 26 graves in total; 14 shaft graves with 24 persons in total and 12 cists. According to Mylonas (1983), the older graves in the circle can be ascribed to the beginning and genesis of Mycenaean culture, however, Dickinson (1977) rejects familial links between the bodies in the graves and suggests their chronology be divided into three phases, based on size and elaboration; the first phase is typical of MH burial traditions with graves being small and shallow and offerings poor and few. The second phase sees larger graves with richer deposits, some containing Cycladic imports, and female graves are introduced. Here, diadems are found across genders and ages and gendered

ideology of prowess is depicted; the women are richly dressed and heavily decorated with earrings, necklaces, bands of golden and silver pins while the men are dressed in the image of a warrior, accompanied by swords, daggers, arrowheads and clothing trimmed with gold. Traces of a boar's tusk helmet, typical of Mycenaean warfare, was found in grave Nu and a death mask of electrum in a box next to the body. During the last phase of burial, the bodies of women outnumber the bodies of men and the female burials appear richer. However, male burials are accompanied by sets of tableware, such as drinking vessels, and warrior ideology is reinforced by further deposits of weaponry.

Describing the steps used in constructing the shaft graves, Mylonas (1983: 47) details that

> …a rectangular shaft was cut in the rock, then the lining walls were built, and, sometimes, on the short sides mud brick was employed. These were to form a base for the wooden beams that stretched from wall to wall to provide the support of the roof. Over the roof, composed of flagstones or matting of dry twigs and branches, a layer of *plaesia* was placed to seal the grave from moisture, then earth was poured in to fill up the shaft.

Their dimensions ranged from 3.0m by 3.5m up to 4.5m by 6.5 with depths varying from 1m to 4m and sides ranging from 0.75m to 1.5m. Preferred mode of burial was inhumation but no fixed orientation has been found for the bodies; the grave was made ready for the body by covering the floor with pebbles and onto them the body was lowered, usually in an extended position, but sometimes the position was contracted or the body placed on its back with the legs slightly pulled up. Occasionally, a 'pillow' was formed out of pebbles to rest the head. Burial goods were laid around the body, in the first burials they were poor but later became richer and a sword is usually found laid to the right of male bodies (Mylonas 1983).

The early graves Θ, N, Π and Σ show multiple burials (Dickinson 1977); the stele, mound and fill of the shaft were removed and the roof broken. If space was needed, bones from previous occupants were brushed to the side in an unceremonial fashion and their offerings crushed, piled into the corner or thrown out of the grave. The new body was then lowered into the grave along with his or her grave offerings,

the roof reconstructed, mound piled up and a new ceremony completed. Men and women could occupy the same graves and only grave Y contained bodies of women alone. Gendered differences in the burials can be seen in the stelae; few were found over the burials containing both men and women but those over female graves were unadorned while stelae over male graves were adorned with scenes of fights against animals, usually lions (Mylonas 1983 p. 49). Graves B, I, K and Λ represent the middle period of GC B where graves become more elaborated, but the richest graves are A, Γ, Δ, E, N and O which occupy the latest period of GC B. These burials comprise greater amounts of swords and daggers, metal vessels, faience cups, golden ornaments and pins, to an extent found in GC A.

Out of the two, GC A is probably the more conspicuous. Enclosing an area of 27.5m in diameter, it is surrounded by a parapet wall made of slabs and shelly sandstone which is set vertically and placed in a double row with 1.3m space between them. A few of the burials are dated back to MH but Dickinson (1977) claims they have been either unaccounted for or ignored as they are not shaft graves and too small and poor to be considered as predecessors of the other rich graves found in the circle. Further confusion stems from the general belief that the circle was reconstructed in LHIIIB.

Six shaft graves in total were uncovered with mounds and stelae raised over each and inhumation continued to be normal practice. Remains of 19 bodies were found; twelve men, four women and two children as well as one embalmed body of a woman in grave V. No gender distinction is found in the graves as bodies of women and men, as well as women and children, are found together. A single body was found in Grave III and two to five skeletons in the others. In Grave VI the bones of an earlier burial had been unceremoniously brushed aside up against the wall to make room for a new body. The bodies were elaborately decorated with women dressed in elaborate clothing and men had a collection of swords laid next to them, most of them bearing engraved designs, however, they seem to have also been damaged, or have parts missing, which Mylonas (1983) interprets as the swords could no longer be used and were therefore laid as offerings. Among other objects are spearheads, arrowheads, broad and long blades, knives and pieces of armour and breastplates made of gold

were placed over the bodies of men. No shields have been found. In Grave I, some flakes of boars' tusks were found as well (Mylonas 1983: 31-32). Five gold masks were found in graves IV and V and in Gave III simply made masks of gold covered children's faces and their bodies were covered in gold as well. With the exception of the embalmed body in Grave V, masks were not given to women who were in return gifted with diadems, cross-shaped rosettes and bands, which were kept in position with pins, and larger pins with heads made of rock crystal which were used to keep their garments in position. The garments were also decorated with about seven hundred golden discs, six centimetres in diameter on average. Cups made of gold and silver were laid in graves of both men and women, three rhytons in Grave VI, made from a lion's head, a bull's head and fragment of a funnel-shaped rhyton with a scene of a siege of a city; other items include golden rings, beads of agate, sardonyx, amethyst, amber, golden foil cut in the shape of tripartite shrines, bracelets, earrings and an amazing amount of golden objects (Mylonas 1983: 42). In some cases, such as for grave I, vases had been heaped on top of the roof of the grave and on the roof of grave A, yellow Minyan goblets were found, as well as fragments of animal bones and pottery in the mounds over the graves, which Graziadio (1988) has suggested to be related to ceremonies performed during and after the burial to honour the deceased.

4.1.2 The Warrior of Kolonna

The island of Aegina was an important location for trading in the prehistoric Aegean. In an area outside of the south-eastern gate of town IX a shaft grave, which had earlier been covered by a tumulus, was uncovered with a man inside dressed up and adorned as a warrior. Kilian-Dirlmeier (1997) has interpreted the man to be a member of the earliest elite of the Middle Helladic period based on factors such as the grave was of single inhumation; the form of the grave as being a shaft grave; the grave was previously covered by a tumulus, giving it a sense of monumentality; its location was outside of the settlement but the grave must have been a focal point of the community; richness of grave goods and their symbolic representation in terms of decoration and quality could be considered as an indicator of contemporary social

climate and the prestige of warrior status and the lifestyle depicted on elements such as clothing and anointing the corps.

The body was laid in a contracted position with the head to the north and body turned towards west and arms laying over the chest. In front of the body lay weapons, which have been interpreted to represent a Mycenaean warriorship, and pottery was laid at the bottom of the feet. Also found in the grave was a diadem made of gold, but broken, and had been laid over the collar bones, a long bronze sword with an ivory handle, two daggers, a pointed lens, rings made of gold, arrow heads made of obsidian, a boars' tusk helmet, razor blades and a diadem. The pottery offerings comprised a kantharos, two beak pots, a small pot and a bowl. The sword is similar to sword 928 which was found in the Mycenaean GC A (Kilian-Dirlmeier 1997: 23) and the ceramic vessels are believed to have been imported from the Cyclades or influenced by their culture and the weapons from Mycenae, which is not unusual as Aegina was believed to be a trading centre between the mainland and islands in the Aegean.

4.1.3 The Griffin Warrior of Pylos

Another Early Mycenaean warrior shaft grave near the Palace of Nestor in Pylos was discovered in 2015. Dating around 1450 BCE, the grave is a single grave of a man around 30 years old, 1.7m tall, laid in an extended position with the head facing northwest and the feet to the southeast. Among the items found in the grave is a golden box-weave chain with "sacral ivy" finals; a meter long sword with the hilt coated with gold laid on his left side; a gold-hilted dagger, gold and silver cups, beads (carnelian, amethyst, amber and gold); four rings made of gold; small carved seals with etchings depicting combat, goddesses, reeds, altars, lions and the Minoan custom of men jumping over bulls; a plaque made of ivory with a representation of a griffon in a rocky landscape; a bronze mirror; fragments of a warrior's armour made of bronze; a boars' tusk helmet; a knife with a large, squared blade; two golden cups and one silver cup with a gold rim; six silver cups; bronze cups, bowls, amphora, jugs and a basin with either gold or silver trim; six decorated ivory combs.

The grave is believed to represent early intersections of Mycenaean and Minoan cultures as is represented in the Pylos Combat Agate; a sealstone also found in the warrior grave of Pylos, depicting three warriors in hand-to-hand combat where one soldier is already defeated and another is thrusting his sword into the neck of his foe which is holding a Mycenaean 'figure-of-eight' shield (Stocker and Davis 2017). The seal consists of an amygdaloid sealstone of banded agate with golden caps and measures 3.6 cm in length and is believed to represent a scene already known from a golden cushion seal from Shaft Grave III in GC A in Mycenae.

4.2 Discussion: Assemblages of Personhood

How does this tie to the concept of personhood? Let us revise previous suggestions by Fowler (2017) and Hamilakis (2014) where personhood exists within the flows of the assemblages which meet and contrast in the burial rhizome (Fowler 2017: 3). Within his or her rites of passage towards death, the deceased is in a constant liminal state of becoming where he or she ultimately gains a status of ancestry, or becomes a part of a place or history. Furthermore, the personhood of the deceased is also negotiated by the living where, through actions of remembering and forgetting, the burial becomes an arena which governs how the person is remembered and which aspects of their life and death are made to be forgotten (Hamilakis 2014). Because of this, I would like to examine the concept of personhood, not in terms of the negotiation of the dichotomies of individualism versus dividualism but in terms of negotiations of collective individuation (Combes 2013) where life-stories and narratives of the deceased are negotiated (Georgousopoulou 2004).

4.2.1 Interpreting the Assemblages

As already mentioned, when someone dies, the society breaks away from the rhythms of mundane life in order to prepare the rites of passage of the deceased and to grieve. With these actions, a new kind of temporality emerges, one of ancestry, cultural memory and continuity, and takes over. Looking at the above case studies, some similarities and differences become evident as would be expected by the observed

developments of the patterns of MH burials throughout the mainland: the burials in these case studies seem to follow the patterns of funerary rituals where extramural graves have become more popular with elaborate shaft graves which have often been thought to follow the Mycenaean ways of hierarchical social structure (Boyd 2002). However, there is a stark and obvious contrast between the Grave Circles of Mycenae and the warrior graves in Kolonna and Pylos where Grave Circles A and B have a long history of the use, and re-use, of graves whilst the warrior graves were individual and not meant to be opened ever again. This raises questions about elite presence within the communities and levels of individualism; who was chosen to be singled out and why?

These questions revert to previous arguments by Bennett (2001) and Hamilakis (2017, 2014) where *temporality*, *politics* and *affectivity* of assemblages holds key importance to their interpretation. Therefore, having viewed the literature from all three case studies, we can consider the material evidence of the preparation of the body (given that a body is found), the form and type of the grave as well as the amount and nature of burial offerings but also the mourners themselves who participate in the funerary rites. We could consider this as a part of the machinic part of the assemblage, however, in order to fully appreciate the ideological perspective guiding the nature of the performance of the funerary custom, we must also look at which beliefs, or enunciative part, could be considered to be the driving force; as ritual is a series of ceremonial actions for a certain purpose, they are based on previous knowledge and memories of past ritual performances. Furthermore, the artefacts are selected to accompany the deceased and to project a certain image of them as who they were in life, therefore, governing how the person is projected in terms of social status and as an individual. These aspects are mnemonic in a sense that any continuation or change in performance is based on a history of practice which is called forward in order to complete the ritual, however, they are also political as the narrative of the deceased (Georgousopoulou 2004), that is how they are remembered, is chosen and controlled by the living.

4.2.2 Remembering and Forgetting: Relationality and the Politics of Personhood

Funerary rituals in the early Mycenaean periods impacted the living before and long after the ceremony had taken place; despite this being far from parts of daily life, people know what to do and a grave is chosen to open up. As the previous occupant has completed their journey and are no longer a part of this world, their bones are brushed to make space and their burial offerings, which up until now have been quite few and poor, are removed from the grave, an act which could be considered to ultimately ensure the forgetting of those who were previously buried in the same grave. However, as Graziado (1988) mentions, fragments of animal bones and pottery found in the mounds could suggest that conspicuous consumption was an important aspect of remembering, even if it was only available for burials of the more affluent members of society (Dickinson 2016; Cavanagh and Mee 1998). Nevertheless, it can be considered as an arena where power relations are acted out negotiated, possibly offering access to ritual control, thus making the event both affective and political (Hamilakis 1998); the feast is prepared, the body is carried to the grave in a ceremonial manner and laid down next to the pile of bones. Items believed to represent the person, some made of local material and some imported from the neighbouring island of Crete, are laid into the grave next to the body. They have travelled a long way and gained a status on their own and contribute to the representation of the social status of their owner as they follow them into the grave. The overwhelming smell of death released from the grave lingers while the living ceremoniously eat and drink in a mnemonic commemoration of the ones gone from this world and those who have previously been laid in this very same grave. At the height of the feasting new social relations are formed as persons bond through the feeling of common ancestry, the chalices used in the feasting are ceremoniously broken as a representation of the broken ties with the one deceased and thrown into the grave. The burial is now fully filled in and a stela raised on the top. Once this ceremony is completed, it will be added to an array of memories of previous visits to the grave site as well as previous ceremonies while the person now buried is transformed, materially and ideologically, from a friend or a family member into a memory living in materiality.

This scenario represents what Hamilakis has referred to as a scene where "all these objects and artefacts… condense time and space, materialise multiple spaces and times simultaneously, embody an ancestral geography, a multi-temporal reality" (2014: 136). The laying of the objects, the bending of the swords, and breaking of the chalices, can be seen as means of "killing" the memory of the person by voiding the objects of agency by killing the objects with them, however, the habitus, of the person lives on through the impressive height of the mounds which created a visual stimulation and recollection of the person's life and the lives of those buried before them. In this way, the sensorial assemblage of multiple burial habits in the Mycenaean Grave Circles could be seen as an important tool of remembering the person and their ancestral links to the contemporary living community, an act which in itself is both political and affective.

The examples of the single inhumations of Kolonna and Pylos give a different account of the role of mnemonic performance from the Mycenaean Grave Circles; political economy and dialects of power seem present as a sense of power and wealth in forms of a segregation is highlighted in contrast to the Mycenaean Grave Circles. Burial deposits originating from both locally sourced Mycenaean elements as well as Minoan imports depict a different kind of accumulated geography and temporality. These mnemonic links which are created through long distance trading and travel meet within these graves as they accumulate clearly contrasted elements of Minoan and Mycenaean and even Cycladic cultures. Moreover, the fact that these graves have been made for an individual does not necessarily indicate representation of individualism but, in contrast to the Mycenaean Grave Circles, it can be acknowledged that individual burials operate with a different method of social memory; their links with society are broken as soon as the burial is closed and their agency voided as well.

As mentioned above, the narratives of the dead and their life-stories are created within the funerary context (Georgousopoulou 2004) where the biographies of the grave offerings become commingled with the individuals buried and can therefore be considered as associated with the construction of the self (Harrell 2014). The breakage of material deposits and bending of swords and daggers is interpreted by

Hamilakis (2014, 1998) and Davaras and Betancourt (2004) as cutting their agency as well; they are killed along with their owner. In contrast to this, I would like to argue that, like their owner, the materials may have been physically "killed" but their impact as mediators of personhood is not devoid of agency but merely changes their temperament in the enactment of memory. In other words, through choices of how the deceased is buried, which artefacts are buried with them and how they are represented was a conscious interplay of which parts of the person's life-stories were to be remembered and which to be forgotten. Thereby the complexity of personhood and identity of the dead does not only result from negotiations of that identity (Georgousopoulou 2004) but the burial arena is where social reality is created (Voutsaki 1993). From this perspective, considering the personhood of warriorship specifically, it can be said that the creation of a warrior identity in the individual graves of Kolonna and Pylos is a mode of remembering; by closing the grave their names may be forgotten but their narratives will be remembered.

The politics of the emergence of personhood with the act of remembering and forgetting allows us to move beyond the dichotomies of discussion of individual and dividual identities and allows the question regarding the degree of relationality of personhood in question. In Mycenae, despite some graves being richer than their neighbouring ones, the usage of multiple burials seems to indicate strong connotations to relational personhood. The multiple usage of many burials, and the casual swipe of bones into piles to make room for the next body, indicates levels of collective remembering where the individual is gradually forgotten. In other richer burials, the bodies lay together, indicating they belong together and despite the grave being shared, identities are not meant to be forgotten but collectively remembered in terms of the group of people sharing an elevated social status, perhaps through kinship as Voutsaki (1993) has previously suggested. This group could be considered to exist within a dynamic tension with the community as they seek not to demarcate themselves as individuals but highlight their status as a group, albeit alongside others. Therefore, by depositing artefacts such as gold, daggers and swords, they are remembered through the ideology of military prowess and war, that is, of becoming warriors (Fowler 2004).

It can be said that levels of individuality can be considered to be higher in the warrior graves of Kolonna and Pylos where the bodies have been individually laid along with their personal riches, as well as items which not only mediate their warriorhood, but through the assemblages that meet in the grave, create that personhood. Here, their name might be forgotten but through the affective assemblages of the body, the grave, the deposits and the warrior ideology they are given a new name which identifies them; the Warrior of Kolonna and the Griffin Warrior. Therefore, even though they belong to the collective ideology of elitism and war, I find it difficult to view their burial deposits purely in terms of the mediation of relational personhood, that is, as dividuals (contra Harrell 2009, 2014). However, I would in turn view the negotiation of the individual and the collective where the ideas of warrior are but a technology of 'becoming' a warrior within a collective ideology of prowess and masculinity, by which they will be remembered. Therefore, they can be seen as neither individuals nor dividuals but their graves as an arena where relationships they had in life, and narratives of their life-stories, are re-negotiated upon their death.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the construction of personhood through mortuary evidence from the Grave Circles A and B in Mycenae as well as individual warrior graves from Kolonna and Pylos through assemblage theory where the graves have been considered as a rhizome in which autonomous assemblages meet to engage, merge and contract. I have proposed the assemblages to be considered as being mnemonic, political and affective. This perspective allows us to move beyond viewing the person buried as either individuals or dividuals but instead see how materiality and ideology meet to negotiate the narratives of the person created in their lifetime and the narratives of their death. Even though an important part of a ritual, I have purposefully not emphasised the importance of conspicuous consumption (contra Boyd 2002; Hamilakis 2014) as I wish to argue that the affectivity of the burial ritual does not only lie within eating and drinking to honour the dead but also strongly within the components of the grave itself. Therefore, it is within dialogues between assemblages

of the grave and the mortuary ritual that personhood flows and can therefore move beyond the dichotomy and be considered in terms of elements remembered and forgotten (Hamilakis 2014) and identities created within the grave.

5. Conclusion

This work has sought to offer an alternative approach to personhood in Helladic burial customs. It is my position that in order to gain insights into structural and social nuances that influence concepts of selfhood and personhood, it is necessary to overcome the binary oppositions offered by tensions between individual and dividual identities. This dissertation therefore builds on the works of Voutsaki (1993), Harrell (2009), Georgousopoulou (2004) and Boyd (2002) who all seek to highlight the complex processes behind structures of personhood in Helladic funerary customs, however, I do hope that by applying assemblage theory, I have managed to expand upon their work by showing the importance of viewing the rhizomatic nature of the grave where heterogeneous components meet and act. As personhood flows among tensions of these assemblages, questions about identity, status and selfhood are no longer contained to locating status within a vertical hierarchical structure or influences of patterning. Instead, it revolves around how these aspects connect in terms of material and ideological aspects of both the individual and the society.

To reach this conclusion, I have traced the general mortuary patterning of Helladic burials form EHI to LHI in order to highlight the continuity and changes in Helladic burial customs but also to show the importance of temporal context of these developments as the Middle Helladic period had been characterized by certain conservativism until the LHI when richer and more elaborate burials became more common.

Since Schliemann's discovery of Mycenae, Helladic mortuary archaeology was centred around recognising the social status of the individuals buried, an approach which was criticised for an unproblematic approach to burial habits as a direct reflection of society. With increased emphasis on agency and relationality, the focus has gradually shifted away from the individual and towards the networks they exist within. The main purpose of this thesis has therefore been to allow the individual back into the archaeological record without losing the importance of the networks and entanglements of materiality that they exist within. Over the past few years, scholars

have been turning to assemblage theory as a means to restoring the balance between the material and the ideological as it incorporates previous work while adding temporal, political and affective dimensions to the equation, that is: individuals, connections, lived experiences, objects, environment, networks and systems which are constantly being transformed as a result of influences from external sources.

This dissertation is not written with the intention of providing a conclusive means on personhood within Helladic burial customs but as an introduction on how assemblage theory can prove to be beneficial to the subject. Therefore, only three case studies were offered to fit the purpose of this work, leaving much to explore. Future research with assemblage theory, within the context of Helladic burials, could include mortuary patterns, burial structures and landscape, explorations into gendered elements of Helladic burial customs as well as the application of sensorial assemblage-thinking approach in order to explore the rise of the Mycenaean palaces.

The exploration of personhood in archaeology is an old tale and new, however, with recent work cited in this work, new exciting possibilities have opened up which I believe are worth exploring.

Bibliography

Åkestrom, Å. (1968). A Mycenaean Potter´s Factory at Berbati near Mycenae. In *Atti e memorie del primo congress internazionale di micenologia, 48-53* (Incunabula Graeca 25). Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.

Barrett, J. C. (2001). Agency, the Duality of Structure, and the Problem of the Archaeological Record. In I. Hodder (ed), *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity (pp. 141-164).

Barrett, J. C. (2000). A Thesis on Agency. In M.-A. Dobres and J. E. Robb (eds), *Agency in Archaeology*. London: Routledge: pp. 61-68).

Barrett, J. C. (1990). Archaeology in the Age of Uncertainty. *Scottish Archaeological Review, 11*: 115-162.

Barrett, J. C. (1988). Fields of Discourse: Reconstituting a Social Archaeology. *Critique of Anthropology, 7*: 5-16.

Barrett, J. C. and Damilati, K. (2004). Some Light on the Early Origins of Them All: Generalization and the Explanation of Civilization Revisited. In J. C. Barrett and P. Halstead (eds), *The Emergence of Civilisation Revisited* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 6, pp. 145-169). Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Bennett, J. (2001). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham (NC): Duke University Press.

Bergson, H. (1991). *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books.

Binford, L. R. (1971). Mortuary Practices: Their Study and Their Potential. In J. A. Brown (ed), *Approaches to the Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*. (Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology, vol. 25, pp. 208-243). United States: Society for American Archaeology.

Blegen, C. W., Rawson, M., Taylour, L. W. and Donovan, W. P. (1973). *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia* (vol. III). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Blegen, C. W., Palmer, H. and Young, R. S. (1964). *Corinth XIII: The North Cemetery*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies.

Boyd, M. J. (2014). The Materiality of Performance in Mycenaean Funerary Practices. *World Archaeology, 46*(2): 192-205.

Boyd, M. J. (2002). *Middle Helladic and Early Mycenaean Mortuary Practices in the Southern and Western Peloponnese.* (BAR International Series, vol. 1009). Oxford: Archaeopress.

Branigan, K. (Ed.). (1998). *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 1). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Brown, J. A. (1981). The Search for Rank in Prehistoric Burials. In R. Chapman, I. Kinnes and K. Randsborg (eds), *The Archaeology of Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 25-37).

Brück, J. (2004). Material Metaphors: The Relational Construction of Identity in Early Bronze Age Burials in Ireland and Britain. *Journal of Social Archaeology, 4*: 307-333.

Busby, C. (1997). Permeable and Partible Persons: A Comparative Analysis of Gender and Body in South India and Melanesia. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 3*: 261-278.

Caskey, J. L. (1960). The Early Helladic Period in the Argolid. *Hesperia, 29*: 285-303.

Caskey, J. L. (1957). Excavations at Lerna, 1956. *Hesperia, 26:* 142-162.

Cavanagh, W. G. (1998). Innovation, Conservativism and Variation in Mycenaean Funerary Ritual. In K. Branigan (ed), *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age.* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 1, pp. 103-114). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Cavanagh, W. G. (1977). *Attic Burial Customs ca. 2000-700 BC* (unpublished PhD dissertation). London: University of London.

Cavanagh, W. G. and Mee, C. (1998). *A Private Place: Death in Prehistoric Greece*. Jonsered: P. Åström.

Chapman, J. (2000). *Fragmentation in Archaeology: People, Places and Broken Objects on the Prehistory of South-Eastern Europe.* London: Routledge.

Chapman, J. and Gaydarska, B. (2011). Can We Reconcile Individualism with Relational Personhood? A Study from the Early Neolithic. *Documenta Praehistorica, 38*: 21-43.

Combes, J. (2013). *Gilbert Simondon and the Philosophy of the Transindividual.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Crellin, R. J. (2017). Changing Assemblages: Vibrant Matter in Burial Assemblages. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 27*(1): 111-125.

Davaras, B. and Betancourt, Ph. P. (2004). *The Hagia Photia Cemetery I: The Tomb Groups and Architecture.* (Prehistory Monographs 14). Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.

Davis, J. and Stocker, S. (2016). The Lord of the Gold Rings: The Griffin Warrior of Pylos. *Hesperia, 85*(4): 627-655.

Davis, J. L. (1988). If There's Room at the Top, What's at the Bottom? *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, 35*: 164-165.

DeLanda, M. (2016). *Assemblage Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

DeLanda, M. (2006). *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity.* London and New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London and New York: Continuum.

Dickinson, O. (2016). Continuities and Discontinuities in Helladic Burial Customs During the Bronze Age. In A. Dakouri-Hild and M. J. Boyd (eds), *Staging Death: Funerary Performance, Architecture and Landscape in the Aegean.* Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter (pp. 317-334).

Dickinson, O. T. P. K. (1983). Cist Graves and Chamber Tombs. *BSA, 78*: 55-67.

Dickinson, O. T. P. K. (1989). The 'Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation' Revisited. In R. Laffineur (ed), *Transition. Le monde égéen du Bronze moyen au Bronze récent (Aegaeum 3)*. Liège: Université de Liège (pp. 131-136).

Dickinson, O. T. P. K. (1977). *The Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation* (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, 49). Göteborg: P. Åström.

Dietz, S. (1980). *Asine II: Results of the Excavation East of the Acropolis 1970-74: The Middle Helladic Cemetery, the Middle Helladic and Early Mycenaean Deposit*. (Acta Atheniensia, vol 4). P. Åström.

Dobres, M.-A. (2000). *Technology and Social Agency: Outlining a Practice Framework for Archaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dobres, M.-A. and Robb, J. E. (2000). *Agency in Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Dobres, M.-A. and Robb, J. E. (2005). 'Doing' Agency: Introductory Remarks on Methodology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 12*: 159-166.

Fischler, C. (1988). Food, Self and Identity. *Social Science Information, 27*(2): 275-292.

Foster, R. J. 1(990). Nurture and Force-Feeding: Mortuary Feasting and the Construction of Collective Individuals in a New Ireland Society. *American Ethnologist, 17*: 431-448.

Fowler, C. (2017). Relational Typologies, Assemblage Theory and Early Bronze Age Burials. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 27*(1): 95-109.

Fowler, C. (2016). Relational Personhood Revisited. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 26*(3): 397-412.

Fowler, C. (2004). *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach*. London and New York: Routledge.

Georgousopoulou, T. (2004). Simplicity vs Complexity: Social Relationships and the MHI Community of Asine. In J. C. Barrett and P. Halstead (eds), *The Emergence of Civilisation Revisited*. (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 6, pp. 207-213). Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Graziadio, G. (1988). The Chronology of the Graves of Circle B at Mycenae: A New Hypothesis. *American Journal of Archaeology, 92*(3): 343-372.

Hamilakis, Y. (1998). Eating the Dead: Mortuary Feasting and the Politics of Memory in the Aegean Bronze Age Societies. In K. Branigan (ed.), *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*. (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 1, 115-132). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Hamilakis, Y. (2017). Sensorial Assemblages: Affect, Memory and Temporality in Assemblage Thinking. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal,* 27(1): 169-182.

Hammond, N. G. L. (1974). The Tumulus-Burials of Leucas and Their Connections in the Balkans and Northern Greece. *BSA, 69*: 129-144.

Harrell, K. (2012). The Fallen and Their Swords: A New Explanation for the Rise of the Shaft Graves. *American Journal of Archaeology, 118*(1): 3-17.

Harrell, K. M. (2009). *Mycenaean Ways of War: The Past, Politics and Personhood* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Sheffield: University of Sheffield.

Harris, O. J. T. (2014). (Re)assembling Communities. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 21*(1): 76-97.

Hodder, I. (2006). Çatalhöyük in the Context of the Middle Eastern Neolithic. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 36*: 105-120.

Hodder, I. (1982). *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ingold, T. (2015). *The Life of Lines*. London: Routledge.

Jones, A. M. (2017). Art of Assemblage: Styling Neolithic Art. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 27*(1): 85-94.

Kilian-Dirlmeier, I. (1997). *Das Mittelbronzezeitliche Schachtgrab von Ägina.* Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Kilian-Dirlmeier, I. (1986). Beobachtungen zu den Schactgräbern ovon Mykenai und zu den Schmuckbeigaben mykenischer Männergräber. *Jahrbuch des Römisch-germanischen Zenralmuseums, 33*: 159-198.

Knappett, C. (2011). *An Archaeology of Interaction: Network Perspectives on Material Culture and Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Knappett, C. (2005). *Thinking Through Material Culture: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Knappett, C. and Malafouris, L., eds. (2008). *Material Agency: Towards a Non-Anthropocentric Approach*. New York: Springer.

Korres, G. (1984). State Formation: Useful Concept of Idée fixe? In T. C. Patterson and Gailey, C. W. (eds), *Power Relations and State Formation*. Washington: American Anthropological Association (pp. 27-34).

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (1994). On Technical Mediation: Philosophy, Sociology, Genealogy. *Common Knowledge, 3*: 29-64.

Lolos, Y. (1989). The Tholos Tomb at Koryphasion: Evidence for the Transition from Middle to Late Helladic in Messenia. In R. Laffineur (ed), *Transition. Le monde égéen du Bronze moyen au Bronze récent (Aegaeum 3)*. Liège: Université de Liège (pp. 171-176).

Lucas, G. (2017). Variations on a Theme: Assemblage Archaeology. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 27*(1): 187-190.

Lucas, G. (2012). *Understanding the Archaeological Record*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malafouris, L. (2008). At the Potter's Wheel. In C. Knappett and L. Malafouris (eds), *Material Agency*. New York: Springer (pp. 19-36).

Mee, C. B. (2012). Death and Burial. In E. H. Cline (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mee, C. B. (1998). Gender Bias in Mycenaean Mortuary Practices. In K. Branigan (ed.), *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*. (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 1, pp. 165-170). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Morou, E. (1981). Άργος. *ΑΔ, 36:* 107-114.

Mylonas, G. E. (1975). *Το Δυτικόν Νεκροταφείον τη; Ελευσίνος*. (Volumes A, B, Γ). Athens: Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας

Mylonas, G. E. (1983). *Mycenae Rich in Gold.* Athens: Ekdotike Athenon S.A.

Nordquist, G. C. (1979). *Dead Society: A Study in the Intramural Cemetery at Lerna.* (Unpublished M.A. dissertation). Southampton: University of Southampton.

Nordquist, G. C. (1987). *A Middle Helladic Village: Asine in the Argolid.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Uppsala: University of Uppsala.

Nordquist, G. C. (1988). The Middle Helladic Pottery from the Southern Argolid. *Hydra, 5: 17-31*.

Nordquist, G. C. (1990). Middle Helladic Burial Rites: Some Speculations. In R. Hägg and G. C. Nordquist (eds), *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid*. (Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11-13 June, 1988). Stockholm: P. Åström (pp: 35-41).

Normark, J. (2010). Involutions of Materiality: Operationalizing a Neo-Materialist Perspective Through the Causeways at Ichmul and Yo'okop. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 17*(2): 132-173.

O'Shea, J. M. (1984). *Mortuary Variability: An Archaeological Investigation*. New York: New York Academy Press.

Papadimitriou, N. (2001). *Built Chamber Tombs of Middle and Late Bronze Age Date in Mainland Greece and the Islands*. (BAR International Series, vol. 925). Oxford: John and Erica Hedges Ltd.

Papakonstantinou, M. (2011). Bronze Age Tumuli and Grave Circles in Central Greece: The Current State of Research. In E. Borgna and S. Müller-Celka (eds), *Ancestral Landsapes: Burial Mounds in the Copper and Bronze Ages*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée (pp. 391-400).

Pullen, D. J. (1994). Modeling Mortuary Behaviour on a Regional Scale: A Case Study from Mainland Greece in the Early Bronze Age. In P. N. Kardulias (ed), *Beyond the Site: Regional Studies in the Aegean Area*. United States: University Press of America (pp. 113-136).

Renfrew, C. (1972) *The Emergence of Civilisation: The Cyclades and the Aegean in the 3rd Millennium BC. London*: Methusen.

Robb, J. E. (2010). Beyond Agency. *World Archaeology, 42*(4): 493-520.

Robb, J. E. (2004). The Extended Artifact and the Monumental Economy: A Methodology for Material Agency. In E. Demarrais, G. Gosden and C. Renfrew (eds), *Rethinking Materiality: The Engagement of Mind with the Material World*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research (pp. 131-139).

Saxe, A. A. (1970). *Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). United States: University of Michigan.

Schoep, I. and Tomkins, P. (2016). 'Death is Not the End': Tracing the Manipulation of Bodies and Other Materials. In A. Dakouri-Hild and M. J. Boyd (eds), *Staging Death: Funerary Performance, Architecture and Landscape in the Aegean.* Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter (pp. 227-252).

Strathern, M. (1988). *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia Studies in Melanesian Anthropology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Tsountas, C. (1898). Κυκλαδικα. *Arch Eph*: pp. 137-212.

Vavouranakis, G. (2016). A Posthumanocentric Approach to Funerary Ritual and its Sociohistorical Significance: The Early and Middle Bronze Age Tholos Tombs at Apesokari, Crete. In A. Dakouri-Hild and M. J. Boyd (eds), *Staging Death: Funerary Performance, Architecture and Landscape in the Aegean.* Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter (pp. 253-274).

Voutsaki, S. (1998). Mortuary Evidence, Symbolic Meanings and Social Change: A Comparison between Messenia and the Argolid in the Mycenaean Period. In K. Branigan (ed.), *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*. (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 1, pp. 41-58). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Voutsaki, S. (1993). *Society and Culture in the Mycenaean World: An Analysis of Mortuary Practices in the Argolid, Thessaly and the Dodecanese*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

Wace, A. J. B., Boethius, W. A., Heurtley, W. A., Holland, W. A. And Lamb, W. (1921). Excavations at Mycenae. *BSA, 25*: 1-434.

Weiberg, E. (2007). The Invisible Dead: The Case of the Argolid and Corinthia During the Early Bronze Age. In H. Cavanagh, W. Cavanagh and J. Roy (eds), *Honouring the Dead in the Peloponnese: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Sparta 23-25 April 2009*. CSPS Online Publication 2: Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1861110/The_invisible_dead_The_case_of_the_Argolid_and_Corinthia_during_the_Early_Bronze_Age?auto=download.

Weiner, A. (1992). *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Whitley, J. (2012). Homer's Entangled Objects: Narrative, Agency and Personhood in and out of Iron Age Texts. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 23*(3): 395-416.

Whitmore, C. L. (2008). Symmetrical Archaeology: Experts of a Manifesto. *World Archaeology, 39*: 546-562.

Wilkinson, D. (2013). The Emperor's New Body: Personhood, Ontology and the Inka Sovereign. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 23*(3): 417-432.

Wolpert, A. (2004). Getting Past Consumption and Competition: Legitimacy and Consensus in the Shaft Graves. In J. C. Barrett and P. Halstead (eds), *The Emergence of Civilisation Revisited* (Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology, vol. 6, pp. 127-144). Oxford: Oxbow Books.