

Bryn Mawr College

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

4-1-1986

Review of *Excavations and Surveys in Southern Rhodes: The Mycenaean Period (Lindos IV.1)*, by Søren Dietz; *Cyprus at the Close of the Late Bronze Age*, edited by V. Karageorghis and J.D. Muhly

James C. Wright
Bryn Mawr College, jwright@brynmawr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs



Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Citation

Wright, James C. 1986. Review of *Excavations and Surveys in Southern Rhodes: The Mycenaean Period (Lindos IV.1)*, by Søren Dietz; *Cyprus at the Close of the Late Bronze Age*, edited by V. Karageorghis and J.D. Muhly. *American Journal of Archaeology* 90:231-233.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.
https://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/31

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

THORIKOS VIII. 1972/1976. RAPPORT PRÉLIMINAIRE SUR LES 9^E, 10^E, 11^E, ET 12^E CAMPAGNES DE FOUILLES, by H.F. Mussche, J. Bingen, J. Servais, and P. Spitaels. Pp. 187, figs. 116. Comité des Fouilles Belges en Grèce, Gent 1984.

The preliminary report of the 9th to 12th seasons at Thorikos is published as a cloth-bound volume with six sections: an obituary for Jean Servais (H.F. Mussche); a preface (H.F. Mussche and P. Spitaels); a report on Tombs IV and V (J. and B. Servais-Soyez); the West Geometric Cemetery 4 (J. Bingen); the Early Helladic period in Mine No. 3 (P. Spitaels); and Inscriptions III (J. Bingen). Although these chapters vary in length and completeness, the general tone is excellent, with a good presentation of the information available in advance of final publication. One only wishes that the information were equally available for all subjects treated here.

The two tholos tombs provide evidence for the Mycenaean burial architecture at Thorikos. Tomb IV, a tholos with an oblong chamber, was partly excavated in 1890 and 1893 by V. Staïs. The date is LH I/II. A few gold objects and pottery pieces were found, but there were few finds. The description of the architecture is excellent and is accompanied by state plans, elevations, and photographs. Less is presented for Tomb V, a tholos tomb under a tumulus whose earliest material is MH. Its latest period is LH I/II, contemporary with Tomb IV. Together, the two tombs show the continuity of burial practices at Thorikos, beginning with a Middle Bronze Age tumulus tradition and continuing into the tholos tomb practices of LH.

The West Geometric Cemetery adds over 30 tombs to the Late Geometric burials known from Thorikos. Both cremation and inhumation were practiced with burial in small tombs that were usually lined with slabs. Each tomb is briefly described, and the most important pottery, including a number of Attic and Corinthian imports, is presented as catalog entries with both profile drawings and photographs.

Of particular interest to those dealing with the Early Bronze Age is the chapter on the EH Period in Mine no. 3. The mine was found in 1975, near the theater. No ore was discovered, but finds spanned the time from EH to Roman. The EH remains were mostly only 7 m. into the mine and just outside the entrance, near evidence for an outcrop that would have attracted early attention. Two small undisturbed EH deposits, along with sauceboats, were within the mine. The early pottery includes ouzo-cups, a depas, and possibly a tankard. This assemblage relates the mine's use to the Kastri Group, a culture that occurs at the interface between EC II and EC III and is known from Ayia Irini Period III, Kastri on Syros, and Lefkandi I. The exact dating and the cultural identity of this group is still disputed, and the presentation of additional material is welcome indeed. Good profile drawings aid in the presentation.

A brief chapter with discussion of eight new inscriptions from Thorikos completes the volume.

In general, the excavators at Thorikos are to be congratulated for their presentation of a preliminary report in such a professional way. The drawings and photographs are of

good quality, the format is attractive, and the writing style is clean and concise. A final publication with additional details is eagerly awaited, but a preliminary presentation of this quality should serve as a model for many excavators to follow; it is superior to the "final publications" of many Greek sites.

PHILIP P. BETANCOURT

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19122

EXCAVATIONS AND SURVEYS IN SOUTHERN RHODES: THE MYCENAEAN PERIOD. LINDOS IV.1, by Søren Dietz. (Publications of the National Museum, Archaeological Historical Series XXII.1.) Pp. 120, figs. 122, frontispieces 2. National Museum, Copenhagen 1984.

CYPRUS AT THE CLOSE OF THE LATE BRONZE AGE, edited by V. Karageorghis and J.D. Muhly. Pp. viii + 56, pls. 10. Nicosia 1984.

Despite the foundations laid by A. Furumark (*OpArch* 6 [1950]) for research into the role of Rhodes in Late Bronze Age trade and settlement networks, the island has received no systematic exploration directed toward these issues. Prehistoric settlement on the island remains almost entirely known from finds from cemeteries. The work under review brings the corpus of publication of mortuary remains to near completion by publishing the record of K.F. Kinch's work in the early decades of this century and supplementary researches verifying the context of Kinch's excavations. As is now standard for such work (see C. Mee, *Rhodes in the Bronze Age: An Archaeological Survey* [London 1982]), Dietz has devoted his efforts to copious and precise documentation of the stylistic and morphological details of the finds, especially ceramic, and their potential position in the typological scheme defined for the Argolid and, to an extent through stratified deposits on Cyprus, for the Eastern Mediterranean.

The volume is an elegant presentation of the important cemeteries at Vati, Apollonia and Kattavia, and of miscellanea in the National Museum of Denmark. Most of the material dates to the end of Late Helladic IIIB and the beginning of IIIC; some is of LH IIIA2 date. Kinch's drawings and notes are faithfully reproduced and supplemented by sketches and photographs of remains still identifiable. The photographs of the objects are of high quality. Profiles are produced only for recently found sherd material. There is no map locating the sites and one has to refer to Mee's publication for one. Some of the objects are already known from Blinkenberg and Johansen's *CVA* fascicles for Denmark and special studies by various scholars, notably Mee. A few special pieces are presented such as a pictorial painted jug from Passia grave 4 and two stirrup jars without provenance which are not easily categorized by standard conventions (the one, no. 12502, is a Late Bronze Age hybrid of the decorative repertoire transitional to Protogeometric on Cy-

prus and the mainland of Greece; the other is attributed on decoration (not shape) to a dubious sub-Mycenaean). Detailed presentation of beads, glass, knives, spearheads, and a razor and a fishhook complete the inventory.

The discussion and summary has, as the author admits, an Argolid bias, which is one of the fundamental problems of assessing Rhodian ceramics (see R. E. Jones and C. Mee, *JFA* 5 [1978] 461–70) and one wonders if the involved attempts to classify precisely much of the pottery will not be all overturned by the excavation of one good stratified deposit on the island.

With the publication of this material one senses that it is time to move on to analysis of the Rhodian cemetery material. Studies of burial practices on the island and consideration of changes in practice through the Late Bronze Age might move Rhodian studies onto a more explanatory level. But more important is the assessment of the role Rhodes played in Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean relations. This question has just been intelligently broached in a study by Portugali and Knapp ("Cyprus and the Aegean: A Spatial Analysis of Interaction in the Seventeenth to Fourteenth Centuries B.C.," in *Prehistoric Production and Exchange* [Los Angeles 1985] 44–78) where Rhodes is described as a "junction" on the trade route between the Aegean and the East, especially Cyprus. Fleshing out this description would require intensive, systematic, problem-oriented survey and excavation on the island and ought to be the goal of future research.

It should by now be evident that the Aegean during the Late Bronze Age cannot be understood without reference to the changing economic and political scene in the Eastern Mediterranean. Thus the flurry of activity instigated under V. Karageorghis' vicarage of the antiquities of Cyprus has produced in the last decade voluminous researches and reports that are transforming Bronze Age studies far in proportion to the importance of Cyprus in the context of Mediterranean archaeology.

The little volume, *Cyprus at the Close of the Late Bronze Age*, the product of a session on the archaeology of Cyprus at the ASOR meeting in Dallas in 1983, serves to illustrate the multitude of approaches presently being pursued in Cypriot archaeology and the pace of publication. The volume was out of date as it went to press insofar as the excavation reports on Maroni, Kalavassos-Ayios Dimitrios, and Pyla-Kokkinokremos had already been superseded by later reports or, in the case of Pyla, by a final report. Nonetheless the volume admirably addresses its theme and the analytical articles by Herscher, Kling and Muhly are paradigmatic of the directions being taken in LBA Cypriot studies.

There is a certain dialectical tension in the presentations and in his brief report on Pyla-Kokkinokremos and Maa-Palaeokastro Karageorghis lays down the gauntlet by stating that scholars should not be wary of using written sources along with the archaeological data to write history. His focus of interest is the change in material culture which he recognizes at numerous Cypriot sites of the LBA and his interpretation of this archaeological horizon is founded in synchronisms with archaeological and historical material in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean that he thinks sup-

port the idea that at this time peoples of the Aegean and Anatolia founded refugee centers on Cyprus. There are many problems with this conclusion. As E. Vermeule has pointed out (*AJA* 89 [1985] 359–60), there is little to justify the inference that Pyla-Kokkinokremos is a fortified site: nothing about the exterior settlement wall is characteristic of true casemate fortifications in neighboring Anatolia and there are no parallels in the Aegean for this kind of construction being a fortification. Further problems are identified by A. South in her contribution which reports on the site of Kalavassos-Ayios Dimitrios. She doubts that the archaeological assemblage at the sites of Pyla and Maa is substantially different from that at other contemporary sites such as Ayios Dimitrios. Of course the pottery is crucial to such determinations and B. Kling urges in her article that the Mycenaean IIIC1b style characteristic of the period be studied in the context of the tradition of Cypriot pottery in imitation of Late Helladic pottery and for variation in its decoration and preference for shape at different sites on the island. Further research needs also to be conducted to establish more concretely the chronological position of this ware in respect to Late Helladic IIIC production and the stratigraphy of sites along the Eastern Mediterranean littoral.

How then are reasonable interpretations to be derived from the welter of archaeological and historical data generated in researches in the Eastern Mediterranean? Clearly there are two, complementary directions, as Muhly indicates in his up-to-date review of the question of the Sea Peoples. On the one hand he acknowledges the need for specialist studies while castigating their frequent myopic scope, yet on the other hand he bemoans the shoddy treatment that historical-epigraphical material is accorded at the hands of naive and unsystematic researchers (cf. A. B. Knapp, *JFA* 12 [1985] 231–50 for a thorough elaboration of these points). What is clearly required are complementary researches by historians and archaeologists willing to reinspect the trammled scholarly terrain with critical eyes and sound methodologies. Thus Muhly's contribution here is to show how from a historian's perspective archaeological researches are changing the way we interpret the Sea Peoples (he argues that they are not Mycenaeans, who are not the Philistines, who did not overwhelm Cyprus) and to urge caution when establishing historical events on ceramic and stratigraphic synchronisms.

This caution is also the substance of Kling's researches into Cypriot Mycenaean IIIC1b pottery, yet it is to be hoped that such work will soon prove to be a powerful tool for close historical analysis of interaction in the Eastern Mediterranean at this time. Certainly it might help with assessing contemporary ceramic developments at such places as Rhodes. As indicated, the evaluation of Mycenaean IIIC1b in terms of regional developments within Cyprus is another important issue, one that has been long championed by Herscher. Her study of the Maroni pottery and her identification of change during the LBA towards a homogeneity of ceramic styles in the Vasilikos Valley area provide substantive documentation of some of the effects of the development of state-like political entities in Cyprus.

These developments are excellently demonstrated by the work being conducted along the southeastern coast by South

and Cadogan. Their sites of Maroni and Ayios Dimitrios are well paired. Cadogan's excavation is certifying the importance of the site, which has been known for a long time. Its position as a partner in the rise of state-like centers in Cyprus during the LBA seems certified by the discovery of a large ashlar building roughly comparable to the ashlar building X at Ayios Dimitrios, but possibly earlier (LC IIC1). Work at Ayios Dimitrios is further along and South presents in her report some evidence for differentiated residential areas within the site and for metallurgical practice. The role of the site in Cypriot metallurgy is a major question since it lies within a short distance of mines and perhaps had a controlling role in the processing of bronze (see T. Stech, "Urban Metallurgy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus," in *Early Metallurgy in Cyprus, 4,000-500 B.C.* [Nicosia 1982] 105-15). Continuing investigation of these sites and their finds will make clear the importance of this area in Late Cypriot political and economic affairs.

Muhly in an earlier article (in *Early Metallurgy*) has emphasized the need for more research defining the growth, structure and interrelations of cultural groups and subgroups in Cyprus. Such work is well represented by the excavations and the specialist studies reported here. Informed histories can only be based in structural examination of intra-site and regional phenomena. Clearly Cypriot studies are heading in this direction as the work in this volume and in more recent studies is demonstrating.

JAMES C. WRIGHT

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

DIE SPÄTBRONZEZEIT NORDÖSTUNGARN, by *Tibor Kemenczei*. Pp. 430, ills. 30, pls. 210. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest 1984.

This book is a valuable reference for comparative studies of the northeastern part of Hungary during the late Bronze Age. The author briefly introduces the Piliny, Berkesz, Kyjatice and Gáva cultures. From the ceramic and metallic finds of these cultures Kemenczei presents 220 tables, which contain over 5000 items. A lack of scale on the tables forces the reader to look for the actual dimensions in the text.

The literature about the late Bronze Age in Hungary is quite extensive. A great number of books and articles have been published not only by Hungarian but by foreign experts as well. One of the most often quoted sources is V.G. Childe's book on *The Danube in Prehistory* (Oxford 1929). Among Rumanian experts, Alexandrescu, a weapon specialist, published in the periodical *Dacia* in 1966 a useful article about the weapons of the Bronze Age. The Czechoslovak scholar Bouzek published in 1966 a comparative study between the Aegean Region and Central Europe and their culture relationships between 1600 and 1300 B.C. The German researcher Hansel published in Bonn (1968) a study about the mid-Bronze Age in the Carpathian Basin. The Bulgarian-American M. Gimbutas published her monumental work on *Bronze Age Cultures in Central and*

Eastern Europe, which appeared in The Hague in 1965. The contribution made to this subject by the Hungarian-American S. Foltiny has also been extremely valuable. In addition to an evaluation of the material culture of the Bronze Age in Hungary, Foltiny has helped greatly to clarify matters of chronology as well. Several Yugoslav, Polish, Bulgarian, and Russian archaeologists have also published articles pertinent to the late Bronze Age culture in Hungary. In making good use of Hungarian and international professional literature of the Bronze Age in Hungary, Kemenczei has rendered scholars in the field a useful service.

The book is divided into three parts: 1) a description of the main Late Bronze Age cultures in Hungary with a chronological comparison; 2) a catalogue of the most important findings stemming from Late Bronze Age cultures in Hungary; and 3) tables.

Two sketched maps also add to the value of the book. One indicates the sites of the Piliny and Berkesz cultures; the other shows the location of the sites of the Kyjatice and Gáva cultures. With the aid of these maps one can clearly recognize that the locations of the Piliny, Berkesz and Kyjatice cultures are situated in the northern part of present-day Hungary. Only the Gáva culture is located in the Eastern part of Hungary between the Tisza River and the Rumanian border on the east and Yugoslav border on the south.

In his chronological overview of the Bronze Age in Hungary, Kemenczei compares the dates proposed by Reinecke and the revised dates of Kalisz-Bona-Kemenczei. According to his chronological chart, during the 13th c. B.C. the inhabitants of the Piliny I culture buried their dead in tumuli, a custom characteristic of the urn-field group. During the 11th c. B.C. Kyjatice I and Gáva I cultures shared in the urn-field burial customs. During the 10th and 9th cs. B.C. the Kyjatice II and Gáva II cultures flourished. Finally, during the 8th and 7th cs. B.C., the Kyjatice III culture came to an end, marking the beginning of the Hallstatt Culture.

Among the urn-field cultures archaeologists already during the early 19th c. found unique features in the Piliny culture, then newly discovered near the village of Piliny, from which its name is derived. The first excavation report about this Late Bronze Age culture was published in 1828 by M. Jankovich. It was, however, only in 1838 that F. Kubinyi disseminated a descriptive analysis of Jankovich's findings. The result of the typological investigation of the ceramics was not presented in print until 1911 by L. Márton.

The chronology of both the Piliny and Berkesz cultures is still the subject of a scholarly controversy. The Berkesz culture and the Piliny culture on the right bank of the northern course of the Tisza River overlapped each other. The bulk of the findings of the Berkesz culture was discovered around the upper bend of the Tisza River.

The Kyjatice culture received its name from the village of Kyjatice, which is located in the southeastern part of Slovakia. This culture was formerly identified by M. Gedl as a subgroup of the Lausits culture of Czechoslovakia. In present-day Hungary it was discovered in the same area as the Piliny culture. I. Bóna and others clearly differentiated it from the Lausits culture.

The fourth culture presented by Kemenczei in this book