

LEFKANDI AND HOMER*

Carla M. Antonaccio

The cemeteries of Lefkandi on the west coast of Euboia are among the most important archaeological discoveries made to date for our understanding of Homeric poetry and its relationship to the Bronze and Iron Ages. Lefkandi's cemeteries have provided a new picture of the Dark Age; indeed the use of the very term 'Dark Age' began to decline with the finds at Lefkandi, which have proven to be surprisingly rich and far-flung in their origins.

Though the excavated settlement of Xeropolis is in itself important, Lefkandi and Homer are mentioned in the same breath because of the discovery of an apparently heroic burial at Toumba: a warrior's cremated remains gathered in an elaborate cloth and placed in a metal urn, accompanied by sacrificed horses and a woman, also perhaps sacrificed.¹ These were discovered beneath the floor of a huge building with fair claim to be a heroön to honor the couple. The structure was subsequently buried under a tumulus, and a cemetery grew up around the mound. The date is said to be around 950 B.C.E. As P. Blome and others have pointed out, the warrior burial parallels the funerals of Patroklos, Achilles, and Hector more closely, and at an earlier date, than any other example discovered so far. The excavators themselves state in the final report on the building: "The horse burials are only one of the features which recall the burial rites given to the heroes in the Homeric epics: we may add the cremation of the warrior, the placing of the ashes in an amphora (naturally of gold in Homer), the burial of the receptacle and the sacrifice of the horses as well as possibly that of pet dogs. The similarities can hardly be accidental".² At the same time, the period is incorrect for Homer's heroes: we are in the Iron Age, not the Bronze Age, the age of heroes. Homer does not mention a house or heroön being built for his dead heroes, only a mound and stele. Indeed, the absence of hero cult from the poems is notorious. Homer does not describe a cemetery around a hero's tomb at home or abroad, such as surrounds the burial building at Lefkandi; only several mounds lying in the same plain. While Achilles intended his bones to be mingled with Patroklos' in the urn and covered by the

same mound, the Lefkandi double burial included not a second cremated warrior, but an inhumed female. Lefkandi also illustrates neatly another problem of Homeric archaeology: Homer's heroes always cremated their dead, in the historical Iron Age fashion; the late Bronze Age Greeks inhumed theirs, almost without exception. Finally, the customs of heroic burials later in the Iron Age are often attributed to the impact of Homeric poetry, but the early date of the Lefkandi burials does not support this.

Such issues touch on the precise relationship of Bronze Age and Iron Age material culture to epic, one of the chief problems in Homeric studies. Until recently, every object or custom revealed by archaeology illustrated the influence of Homer on a Dark Age, or the veracity of Homer in recording the lost glories of Mycenaean history. Lefkandi is one of the places which is changing this relationship of poetry to history, text to context. The point of view taken here is that Homeric poetry stands at the end of an oral tradition reaching back to the Bronze Age. This tradition was not static or merely custodial, but underwent episodes of active generation, incorporating features of each period while at the same time retaining elements from the Bronze Age. Though the poems as we have them may be the product of a particular poet in a particular time, they owe their material to the entire period in which they were under formation. Certain phases, however, were more important than others, and one point of this paper is to add to recent emphasis on the tenth century's importance for the oral tradition.

The importance of Lefkandi has been recognized from the start of excavations there, but disagreement reigns in interpreting the Toumba burial ground. Final reports are now available, and certainty is possible about several contested features. With recent attention by M.L. West and Barry Powell to Euboia's role in the formation of epic, Lefkandi becomes even more significant to Homeric studies.³ Although there is further publication to come, a renewed discussion of this important and still astonishing find is therefore appropriate. While it is the central, heroic burials which have given rise to so much discussion, the total context, including the other burials nearby, as well as evidence for the use of the building, is crucial for understanding the so-called heroön. Part of the context provided by the Lefkandi cemeteries also involves another Homeric custom: gift exchange, or gift giving, as seen in the grave goods deposited with the burials.

The Site and Finds

The settlement at Lefkandi, called Xeropolis, was an important site in the Bronze Age, with a sequence beginning in Early Helladic, and

prosperous in the Late Helladic III phase. A brief period of abandonment may have occurred in the Submycenaean period. Lefkandi may be "Old Eretria", and its people at the end of the 8th century may have founded Eretria; in any event Lefkandi was abandoned and all burials cease around 700.⁴ The cemeteries, about 500 m. west of Xeropolis, fall into six groups: the East Cemetery, Kaliotis, Skoubris, Palia Perivolia, Toumba, and the South Cemetery. In the tenth and ninth centuries these burial grounds were exceptionally rich and outward-looking, with imports from Egypt, Cyprus, and the Levant, as well as Thessaly and Attica.⁵

The final publication of the settlement and cemeteries had already appeared when a permit application in 1980 to build at Toumba led to trial trenches being dug by the authorities. These located substantial remains of mudbrick walls on a stone socle, associated with Protogeometric pottery. The delay of permission to begin construction induced the landowner to bring a bulldozer to the site on a holiday while it was unsupervised and begin levelling the area. Up to three meters of rock were cleared in this way, resulting in the destruction of approximately one-third of the total building eventually uncovered. When excavated the structure was found to have been extensively damaged by recent stone robbing as well. Salvage excavations revealed a building of perhaps fifty meters in length and about nine in width, apsidal in form as most houses of the Iron Age, but larger than any known house of that period. Indeed, it was first reported as an early temple.

The entrance to the building was on the east through a wide porch divided by a central post and possibly without doors.⁶ The apsidal west end had been disturbed by the construction of an apartment building and traffic on an adjacent road. The structure was surrounded by a continuous series of wooden posts of elliptical section, forming a proto-peristyle supporting the eaves. This created what the excavators call a veranda, rather than a colonnade, and added five meters to the width of the building, for a total of fourteen meters. The main walls were strengthened by supports against their internal face, coordinated with the veranda posts. The roof was of thatch, supported by a row of eleven internal posts down the middle of the building. Internal walls created three main rooms of unequal size, the central one being the largest. The east room was probably blocked by a light screen wall, discouraging access to the doorway beyond, leading into the main room.⁷ Within the screened-off portion of the east room, a rectangular box of mudbrick was built into the northwest corner. In addition, two low platforms were found in this room: one was roughly oval with a mud-plastered surface, located in the southwest corner. The other, circular with pebble filling, was placed just inside the porch

in the southeast corner before the screen; this will prove important to interpreting the building.

In the central room, severely damaged by stone-robbing and bulldozing and beneath which the 'heroic' burial was found, supports for a stair up to a loft (presumably for storage) at least over the east room, extended from the north wall in the northeast corner.⁸ There was a second entrance to the building in the middle of the long south wall of this room, and another clay chest was constructed in the southeast corner of this room. Finally, a narrow passage with two square rooms on either side led to the apsidal west end. Like the east room, this also may have been divided by a light partition.⁹ At least eleven pits found in the south sector, where the floor was not always traceable, are suitable for storage pithoi, but none were found *in situ* (see below). Other pits in the north sector initially presented an enigma: a floor of green clay could be traced here; the pits were found in an area where it could not, below a reported packing of stone. Thus it seemed these pits were filled in and perhaps floored over. The final publication, however, states that virtually all were open at the time of the building's destruction, as proven by joins between sherds in different pits and in the fill above. The fill in some pits was entirely similar to that of the building as a whole, but others held a more concentrated amount of sherd and animal bone.¹⁰

Little other evidence for the functions of the various spaces was recoverable, partly because of the recent destruction, partly because of the ancient fate of the building. Out of *ca.* 65,000 sherds from the excavation, only a dozen vases may belong to the building's use, rather than its fill. These are for the most part Middle Protoegeometric to Late Protoegeometric in date: on the Lefkandi chronology, 1000-900 B.C.E.¹¹ Two groups of three small cuttings arranged in a triangular pattern are located in the floor in the east part of the central compartment, and it seems possible that cooking activity or votive tripods belong here; part of a cooking pot came from Pit 20 and is possibly to be associated with its use. There are several tripod braziers from the fill, and a clay tripod cauldron (all a little small to fit in either group of holes). Though none of this material can be definitively associated with the building, it is nonetheless suggestive.¹² A monumental tripod cauldron has been suggested for cuttings just outside the east porch as well (see below).

At the middle of the building, below the central room, two shafts had been cut into the bedrock, one to the north of the other, of 2.23 and 2.63 m. preserved depth. In the northern, the skeletons of four horses, apparently thrown into the pit, were uncovered. Two of the animals had iron bits in their mouths. While this shaft was unlined and the floor was rough, the south shaft had been faced with plastered mudbrick to a height of about a meter. The brick perhaps served to

support a wooden cover. The shaft was also partly lined with wood, and held two burials: a male cremation, contained in a bronze amphora, and a female inhumation laid out beside it.¹³

The bronze vessel, closed with a bronze bowl or phiale, had been crushed by the weight of the shaft fill, but its contents were very well preserved. Inside were the cremated remains of a male of early middle age. They were wrapped in a shroud, fringed on the upper half. Bands of cloth 1.65 cm. in width and 1.90 m. long and decorated with Geometric motifs picked out in colored threads, might have secured it to the body before the cremation.¹⁴ Traces of woven thongs, used either to hold in place the bronze bowl that served as a lid or to lower the vessel into the shaft, were visible during the excavation. A wooden cover or container may have enclosed it as well. Next to the amphora were an iron sword with traces of its wooden scabbard, a knife or razor, a spear and a whetstone.

The piriform bronze amphora was made from a single sheet with a cast rim decorated with a figured scene of archers hunting animals; the figures continue onto the handles which terminate in round finials with a curvilinear pattern. This type of object and decoration are almost certainly not products of the Protogeometric period in Greece. The closest comparisons are from Cyprus, and 12th century in date; it is likely that this is an heirloom from the Mycenaean period. The figures on the rim are blurred, and either the mould was worn when the rim was cast, or the vessel worn from use. It is either a long-kept gift, booty, or luxury trade object, or was cast on the site from an old mould.¹⁵

The inhumed female was stretched out against the north wall of the shaft. Her feet were crossed at the ankles, and her hands at the groin; it is also possible she had been placed in a wooden coffin. She had been laid out richly ornamented with hair spirals of gold, and a necklace of gold, faience and crystal beads with pendant decorated in granulation; two gold discs were placed over each breast, and a gold lunate pectoral between. Like the amphora, some of the jewelry has also been called antique. One gold ring and another of electrum were near her hands, and nine pins of gilt iron, bone, and bronze above her left thigh; an iron pin rested on the other. Near her head lay an iron knife with ivory handle.¹⁶

There was no pottery with the burials. Near the center of the building above the graves, however, an enormous krater, 0.88 m. in diameter, and *ca.* 0.80 m. high, was found badly shattered into fragments. It was a casualty of the bulldozer, but enough fragments were recovered to give a clear idea of its shape and decoration. The krater has double handles with "tree of life" motifs beneath and pedestal foot decorated with accumbent semicircles; a triple zigzag runs under the rim. Linked and fringed circles separated by vertically

stacked triangles appear in panels on the body. The decoration was produced by a person, according to Richard Catling and Irene Lemos, "intent on accumulating as many of the motifs current in the [Protogeometric] repertoire as possible, and in the most elaborate combinations".¹⁷ It functioned as "a *sema* or marker for the graves" within the building.¹⁸ This vase, however, appears stylistically more advanced than the Middle Protogeometric period, and may indicate a slightly later date for the final use of the building, in the Late Protogeometric, down to around 900, or even later.¹⁹

Interpreting the Burial Building

How the burials relate to the building has been a contentious issue. Though the form of this building is that of an enormous house, there is no evidence for habitation in this area. Nor, contrary to the first impression dictated by the sheer size of the building and its proto-peristyle, did the Toumba mound conceal an early temple. Though early Greek temples also used the apsidal plan, so early a building, in a funerary context, could not be a temple. Mazarakis argues that the building was the residence of the ruler of Lefkandi and his wife. After death, they were buried in their "anaktoron," which was then "demolished" and "the deceased were honored as heroes". J. Whitley argues along similar lines, while Kalligas goes further, and postulates an entire settlement centered on the building at Toumba, one of a system of hilltop *oikoi* and cemeteries in this period.²⁰ Stratigraphical evidence makes it at least certain that the burials were made before the roof fell in, after the bedrock had been levelled and within the same phase as the building's use. Most regrettably, the bulldozer destroyed valuable evidence in this area, and it is impossible to prove definitively whether the shafts were cut through the floor, which would make the building earlier than the burials.²¹ Evidence for a funeral pyre in the form of scorched rock and ash-filled postholes beneath the building floor, especially east of the burial shafts, indicates that the funeral pyre was lit on the levelled rock, before the building was constructed.²² After the construction of the building, the debris of the cremation was swept up and placed in the clay container attached to the south crosswall dividing the east and central compartments. The hypothesis of cremation on the spot preceding the construction presents some difficulties: the postholes in the southeast and northeast area of the main room together with the two groups of triangular holes in the east room do not obviously correspond to a pattern of supports for a pyre, nor does the area of intense burning extend over the entire area covered by the postholes.²³ Yet the activities these features represent took place before the plaster floor was put down, and thus at a stage prior to the house's construction.

At any event, wherever the cremation took place, the debris was collected and deposited in the building.

Even if the evidence for cremation is discounted, there is another argument against the existence of the building before the burials. The roof was in place, and placing the shafts within the central space of an existing, standing structure would necessitate the removal of the ridge-pole supporting it.²⁴ In fact, the building appears to have been unfinished, further undermining the idea that it had been a dwelling before burials were inserted beneath its floor. Incompleteness is suggested by several features. The plastering was unfinished and the floor fugitive. In the south corridor room, small piles of clay lay near the walls, possibly intended for further plastering. Where it could be observed, the floor was of clay over the levelled rock or a layer of pebbles, but it had not been subjected to traffic, and nothing was embedded in it, nor could successive floors be made out; nor, finally, had the circular platform inside the porch ever been used (see below).

There is, then, no good evidence for the sequence of inhabited house, burials, and tumulus. In fact, both Toumba and several adjacent fields were all used as burial grounds, and the known graves at Toumba, which so far cluster east and southeast of the building, date either to approximately the same period as the building or later.²⁵ The graves nearby at Palia Perivolia begin earlier, so that it seems the area was always used for burials.²⁶ The sequence suggested here, then, is cremation on the site, burials, construction of the building, and the tumulus in any case last, and the building both used and intended for funerary purposes, not everyday life. Though the building remains unparalleled in any context because of its sheer size and complexity of layout, comparisons can be made with the tenth-century 'Chieftain's House' (Unit IV-1) at Nichoria, similar in plan but not in size, and the seventh-century Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria, whose uses and context were however entirely different from the Toumba building.²⁷

Despite its brief existence, it is clear that the building was deliberately put out of use and buried, not accidentally destroyed or merely abandoned. Piles of water-worn pebbles were found inside the building, indicating an initial attempt to fill it in from the inside. Then, a ramp of mudbrick was constructed up to the walls on the north and south sides, and a fill of earth, pebbles, mudbrick and pottery dumped into the building. A rough retaining wall of stones was erected at the east end of the building to hold the fill.²⁸ Nearly all the pottery in this dumped fill is said to date from the same period as that of the building's construction: Middle to Late Middle Protogeometric or early in Late Protogeometric (i.e. early to mid tenth century). The dating of some of the pottery may be adjusted slightly, though, later in the Late Protogeometric period than stated, and, as mentioned, the

great fragmentary krater might belong in the Late or even Sub-Protogeometric period. Both the building's date (as indicated by the krater) and that of some of its fill might be brought down to ca. 900. Of course, the fill does not provide more than a *terminus post quem* for the building's destruction. Though it is very difficult to determine the dates of the burials, since no pottery was found in the graves, if we accept the original intent of the builders was to construct a funerary monument, the gap between the two cannot have been long.²⁹

A number of Mycenaean figurines found in this area initially led to the hypothesis that a Mycenaean chamber tomb beneath the foundations had collapsed and caused the damage. The excavators suggested that "Religious fear could well have driven the inhabitants both to abandon the shrine and to cover their desecration with a vast tumulus".³⁰ There is no previously published evidence for a Mycenaean cemetery in the area, however, and the final publication of the pottery from the building accounts for the figurines as part of the fill carted in, like other Bronze Age sherds, from somewhere nearby.³¹ The building may have been damaged by the subsidence of the ground on the southwest, where the walls and floor of the south small room and corridor appeared to have buckled. It is not impossible that the damage to the structure was caused by its burial, and some instability might also have been inherent in the size and design of the building.³² At any rate, other burials were made in physically and chronologically overlapping groups following the curve of the tumulus opposite its eastern edge. This supports the view that the tumulus existed when those graves were placed, and providing a *terminus ante quem* for the building. Of those published, Tomb 12 B is the earliest next to the building, Early to Middle Protogeometric in date; the first actually cut into the tumulus are Sub Protogeometric (Tombs 13, 36, 38), which accords well with a somewhat downdated building (see below).³³

To review before proceeding further: in the reconstruction suggested here, after the site was chosen and the area levelled, the male was cremated. The pyre debris was collected, to be deposited in the clay container on the crosswall of the building after its erection. The shafts were dug and burials made, then the building put up on the spot. Its size implies a communal undertaking. The Lefkandiot community built the biggest possible domestic type of structure to honor their dead. The female companion to the cremated warrior, whatever her status, may have been buried at the same time; but at any rate this would have been done before the building went up (or at least before the roof was in place), and thus not long after the cremation. While the burials themselves await detailed publication, evidence published so far suggests that either her burial was made at

the same time, or that the burial shaft was completely dug out and her body laid in at a later date. A section drawing perhaps indicates such an event, since it shows that the shaft fill settled differently over her position.³⁴ Nowhere is it suggested that the woman may have predeceased the warrior, something which would rule out her presence as a human sacrifice.

The Burial Building as Monument

If it is accepted that the Toumba building was an integral part of the cemetery, it remains to consider precisely how the building was used, or intended to be used, and how to understand its fate. This necessarily involves discussing the status of both the central burials and the cemetery. In the near-absence of finds, the plan of the house by itself tells us relatively little. The pits in the apse (if intended for pithoi) were either stripped of their storage vessels or the vessels were never placed, and they cannot therefore have held provisions intended for the dead. Another feature, however, connects the building with food and feasting: the low, round platform of pebbles and earth, built inside the porch. At the so-called Chieftain's House at Nichoria and in Iron Age cemeteries in the Argolid and on Naxos, such platforms were used in conjunction with sacrifice and feasting. Rather than hearths or dining tables, they were a kind of offering table for setting aside a fraction of the sacrificial remains, often including sherds, ash, and bone. The wide distribution of these stone platforms in space and time indicates a widespread mutual awareness of elite groups in different parts of Greece. The feasting created both solidarity and obligation among participants. At Lefkandi, negative reciprocity in the form of obligation is visible after the destruction of the building in the Toumba cemetery (below). The position of the platform in the Toumba building, accessible just inside the porch, rather than in the center of the building (as at Nichoria) or directly adjacent to the graves themselves (as at Asine), may indicate that it was meant to be used by those for whom access to the building itself was denied or restricted. It may also have been intended to be within reach of those visiting the later graves; the porch faces the cemetery and would be easily accessible – if the building was intended for long term use, and the cemetery planned from the beginning. On the other hand, the pits in the apse were intended for food storage (or perhaps to represent food storage), and the platform could have been designed to be used in conjunction with feasting inside the building. As with other features, however, the circular platform seems to have never been used.³⁵

The platform gives a clue to the use of the building: it may have been intended to serve as a place for ritual funerary meals, even if

only for the occasion of the funeral's immediate aftermath, or a limited time thereafter. The building may never have been intended to be permanent, but whatever motivated the decision to abandon and cover the complex, its features point to a monumental facility for ritual meals in honor of the dead, built on a scale possibly involving the effort of the entire community.³⁶ Barry Powell has suggested its use as a hall for the performance of epic.³⁷ While this cannot be proven, it is true that the Lefkandi building is the most suitable of all known Iron Age structures for such a purpose, and we know that singers might perform at Iron Age funerals (Hesiod WD 654-659). The ephemerality of the Toumba building might even indicate its one-time use for a performance and feast, and then destruction as part of the burial rite. We cannot be certain that it was built with the intention of continuing its use for the subsequent cemetery, but the cemetery's Middle Protogeometric graves suggest the possibility that the building still stood when the use of the area for further burials commenced. Finally, three small square cuttings were observed prior to the discovery of the Protogeometric building, arranged in a triangular pattern just to the east of the structure, by the side of the ancient path. If a monumental tripod stood in these cuttings, it perhaps assumed the significance of the krater after the tumulus covered the building. At any rate, the krater and house, or tripod and mound, would fulfill the Homeric expectation for a monument and marker.³⁸

This extraordinary building, at first glance taken for a Proto-geometric temple, was subsequently termed a heroön to honor the central burials. While it was certainly neither a temple nor an ordinary house, the presence of the two burials does not entirely justify calling the building a heroön.³⁹ A heroön requires a continuing cult, and there is no evidence for votive offerings or sacrifices associated with the building or with its tumulus. All later activity was restricted to the burial of the dead. The only evidence for ongoing ritual at the tumulus is the possible monumental tripod immediately to the east of the tumulus. It is possible that the road around the tumulus was used in funerary games including a chariot- or foot-race, but it also may simply be the path for the *ekphorai*.⁴⁰ The richness of the two burials within the building suggests that the incumbents were at the top of the hierarchy in this community. But equally important to our understanding, the area was used down to ca. 825 B.C.E. as a burial ground: that is to say, the building and its graves served as a focal point for the richest of the Lefkandi cemeteries.⁴¹ It is assumed these graves belonged to the family, clan, or *genos* of the warrior, the founder of a lineage.⁴² Since Toumba came into use after other burial fields (Skoubris, Khaliotis) we must examine what internal evidence for such a view is available. Furthermore, the relationship of these

closely associated graves in turn throws some light on the building shaft burials.

Gift Giving and the Toumba Cemetery

The Toumba cemetery contains cremations and inhumations of male and female adults, as well as children.⁴³ Like the building burials, the Toumba cemetery graves also hold rich offerings, some of which resemble the grave goods with the building burials. Warrior identity is obviously important at Lefkandi. Several graves contained weapons, as did of course the warrior burial. Tomb 14 held an iron sword and spear, and dates to LPG; Tomb 26 had a sword and arrows, and is of the same date. Pyre 1, with an iron spear, belongs in LPG, Pyre 8, a spear and sword, is SPG I. Pyre 13 produced a bronze dagger and iron spits, a shield boss, whetstone and grater.⁴⁴ Tomb 63 among other objects produced gold jewelry with similarities to the gold on the woman in the building, especially gold discs with a spiral design, and an elaborate necklace including a pendant whose design echoes that on the central burial pendant. There is another burial of horses in Tomb 68, and another double burial, two inhumations, in Tomb 49, one of the earliest in the cemetery (late Middle Protogeometric to early Late Protogeometric). This is a deep shaft lined with mudbrick and wood, and provided with a ceramic marker; offerings of jewelry also closely parallel the building burial.⁴⁵ Deep shafts are not unusual at Lefkandi, nor is reuse or crosscutting of graves, though Tomb 49 is exceptionally deep. Tomb 49 is also not the only double burial: a combined cremation and inhumation in Tomb 55, together with Tomb 49, show that the double burial in the building is not entirely unique, nor requires human sacrifice as an explanation for the woman's burial.⁴⁶ As Peter Blome also points out, iron knives in female burials are not unknown in Iron Age graves elsewhere in Iron Age Greece.⁴⁷ Furthermore, several graves held imports from the Near East and elsewhere, and at least one an heirloom bronze. These will be discussed below.

Given the similarities between the primary burials and the later cemetery the status of the two individuals who were celebrated at the building now becomes critical. If the term *hero* is misleading, then are king (and queen) or royal any better? Since Finley at least, the Homeric *basileis*, leaders previously referred to as Kings, are now often called chieftains. The shift in terminology represents an attempt to move away from concepts of monarchy or tyranny, to a model of leadership based both on the texts themselves and examples from other cultures provided by ethnography. The status or rank of *basileus* conforms more closely to a chieftain, or a so-called 'big man', in a ranked society. Homeric leaders and ethnographic Big Men alike do

not simply inherit their power; rather, men of a certain status compete among themselves for preeminence by amassing goods, attracting and feasting followers, and prowess in war. Their position can be undercut or lost, and though their sons have some limited ability to inherit status, as well as goods, inheritance alone will not guarantee a position at the top of the hierarchy. Gift giving is a part of their competition.⁴⁸

The value of gifts lies in their excellence, their quantity, their origin, and sometimes their age. For example, in the *Odyssey* (4.615-619) Menelaos of Sparta gives Telemachos a mixing bowl, which he in turn received from Phaidimos of Sidon. Similarly, Achilles gives a Phoenician silver bowl, which Patroklos had received as ransom for a son of Hektor, as a prize in Patroklos' own funeral games (*Il.* 23.740-749). Odysseus' bow, his prized possession which only he could use and which played a key role in his return home after the Trojan war, was a gift exchanged for other arms from Iphitos, who got the bow from his father Eurytos (*Od.* 21.15-20). The amassing of giveable wealth, and the maintenance of a household economy to support it, receives extensive notice in epic. A gift resides with an individual in his store of objects, but also circulates through these exchanges, and accumulates a pedigree with time. An individual's social position depends on his ability to participate in these exchanges, and a store of objects of value is imperative.⁴⁹

Several models incorporating the practices, well-documented in the ethnographic literature, of gift exchange or gift giving have been suggested for what is known from archaeology for the historical Iron Age. J. N. Coldstream, for example, proposed that Athenian ceramic objects, in particular kraters which are found in Cypriot and Cretan tombs of the ninth century, would be top-ranked gifts from members of the Athenian elite to their counterparts overseas.⁵⁰ Susan Langdon suggested that in later Iron Age sanctuaries gift exchange is a model for votive dedications to divinities. Dedications in sanctuaries represented the accrual of goods which were under the control of aristocrats in charge of the sanctuaries, and legitimated elite claims to power and land.⁵¹ Ian Morris, on the other hand, has criticized some aspects of these gift exchange models. He makes the important observation that deliberate disposal of wealth functions to preserve the exclusivity of top rank gifts by making them scarce, and by defending elite access to them against appropriation by individuals of lesser status.⁵²

Exchange or deposition is important, but the model of gift exchange applied so far to Greek archaeological contexts (as opposed to literary texts) have perhaps never been a particularly good fit. Archaeologists have mostly assumed a simple, direct exchange, a substitute for commercial trade mechanisms, between individual actors located at

either end of the transaction. They have wondered too little about intermediate stages of exchange and the basis for reciprocity, mostly because there is so much that is unknown about Iron Age exchange.⁵³ The contexts in which high-status objects that might be gifts enter into the archaeological record only partly correspond to those of epic poetry, nor could archaeological contexts possibly preserve all such gifts and exchanges: anything perishable or intangible would obviously not usually survive, including cloth, most food (though some of its containers do) leather, wood, and persons. Objects that circulate through exchange will also not reveal their circuit among givers and receivers. All we see is the endpoint of any circuit or exchange, when an object is lost or deliberately taken out of circulation. Depositing objects ends their circulation and renders them inaccessible to both giver and recipient, and from the system of exchange, just as when they are dedicated. If buried, as in the Toumba graves, they are also removed from view.

A case for Iron Age gift giving can be made which instead of long-distance relations stresses the use of gifts *internally* for the purposes of social control, in a prestige goods economy: "The basis of the prestige gifts model is that power is not based directly upon the regulation and exploitation of the production of food and other basic necessities, but rather rests on the controlled movement of socially important items, the most prized of which are often obtained in external trade with another group organised on different social and economic principles".⁵⁴ The most valuable gifts are passed on to subordinates to maintain their allegiance, and secure tribute in return. The cultural context supplied by epic provides a scale of values and delineates spheres of exchange.

At Lefkandi, the bronze amphora which held the cremation at the center of the tumulus has its best parallels in Cypriot work of the 12th century B.C.E., two hundred years earlier. The figured rim in particular is exceptional in such an early context. It is all but certain that the amphora was an heirloom which was finally deposited in the burial after being retained in circulation for generations. The material, origin, and age or pedigree of this object make it a top ranked item. Figural representations in general are also high status: the restricted number of representations on pottery in the early Iron Age is often remarked. A rare terracotta centaur came from Lefkandi and similar figures exist in Attika.⁵⁵ As mentioned, some of the gold jewelry from the woman's burial may also have been antique by the time of burial, and again, material, workmanship, and age all contribute to its value.

It is not insignificant that with one exception, a set of bronze wheels in Tomb 39 (another warrior burial with weapons, though the only human remains were a child's incisor), only the central burials in the

Toumba mound have heirlooms. Such pedigreed objects were the highest ranking objects available, allowing their givers or possessors powerful claims of legitimacy.⁵⁶ Considering Archaic Greece, Leslie Kurke notes: "Just as gift exchange creates community by forging a bond between exchange partners, precious objects form a chain through time as well [...]. The links with gods and ancestors affirm that the society's system of value is not contingent but natural".⁵⁷ The pedigree is a powerful way of constructing a relationship with a past that had been disrupted at the end of the Bronze Age. Elite social exchange and competition in Homer uses descent to bolster claims to equal or greater status, and heroes routinely identify themselves and others as sons of named fathers, and trace their descent back several generations. Yet inheritance was not the only factor in achieving or retaining high status in early Greek society. Historical genealogies are clearly fictitious, creating links with mythical ancestors to support elite power. The deliberate retention of pedigreed objects, like the Lefkandi amphora, and their exchange, or deposition, would confer enormous prestige on high-status individuals in this society, where power could shift based on the ability to give gifts, feast followers, and wield force. Kurke notes, "It is the unmatched expenditure or even destruction of top-ranked goods which establishes the preeminence of a family within the nobility."⁵⁸ Removing a pedigreed object from circulation by burying or dedicating it is tantamount to destroying it, and also accrues social capital within the society.

As noted above, the other graves at Toumba contained local ceramics, weapons, and a wide range of objects imported from near and far. There are ceramics from Athens and from Thessaly in the north of Greece, indicating links between Lefkandi and those areas. Most importantly, there is much material from the east: the tombs contain faience and bronzes from Egypt, or Egyptianizing in style, ring flasks from Cyprus and figured bronze bowls from North Syria.⁵⁹ We may then recall the importance in Homer of the origin and workmanship, as well as age, of some of the gifts mentioned. These other objects at Lefkandi, while still rare and prestigious, are of a second order. In order to understand them, a useful comparison from early Hallstatt Europe, the Iron Age of the first half of the first millennium B.C.E., can be suggested. Some individuals (chiefs) were buried at the center of large tumuli, and followers were buried within the mound. The chieftain burials included wheeled carts, Mediterranean and other imports as well as locally produced metalwork, cloth, pottery, jewelry, and weapons. The secondary burials are individuals dependant on the chief, with access to imported top-ranked objects, given as gifts and a sign of status, but restricted by the leader. This leader controlled local production and the routes by which objects from the Baltic or the Mediterranean arrived in central Europe.⁶⁰

Something similar may be going on at Lefkandi (without suggesting any direct dependence between Halstatt and Euboia). The *basileus* in the building, marked by his spectacular bronze heirloom, horses, and other indicators of rank and control of resources, would have controlled the distribution of such objects. Their recipients are then indebted to him for their position, symbolized in these objects, similar but not as valuable⁶¹ A further mechanism by which any leader attracts and retains followers is feasting, intended at least by the Toumba leader and his successors for communal celebration in the building. Furthermore, someone must have arranged the funeral for the warrior and organized the construction of the building; these events may have been part of the consolidation of power by a later claimant to power, and the feast part of his strategy. Whether or not the central burials are those of dynastic founders and the Toumba cemetery of their descendants, they are closely linked spatially, stylistically, and ritually in a carefully constructed symbolic relationship.

Lefkandi is unique in the Greek record so far, but other sites show some aspects of these patterns. Twenty-five years ago, J.L. Benson noted the incidences of prehistoric objects which are found in later historical Greek contexts, and this might not be mere antiquarianism, but deliberate creation of a hierarchy of objects.⁶² Some objects are both true heirlooms and have unusual origins: Cypriot bronze stands in southern Greece dating to the late Bronze Age are known in Athenian graves of the Iron Age, hundreds of years later; they also turn up in sanctuaries, and so do bronze figurines of a striding, smiting god of Bronze Age Eastern type. There are also several cases of ceramic offerings in earlier disturbed graves which are added to later burials.⁶³

It must be said that some of these objects may not be true heirlooms. The Lefkandi pectoral design is an extremely long-lived motif; Hartmut Matthäus has recently suggested that some of the ring stands of Bronze Age type may have been produced in the early Iron Age.⁶⁴ Stylistic conservatism, however, may amount to the same thing: an attempt to tap into the power of the past by emulating it. Furthermore, Morris' suggestion that emulation of elite practice by those lower in status can challenge the hierarchy may account for the imitation of bronze forms in clay, and also helps to account for the changing contexts in which metal objects are found as time goes on. Top-ranked items, particularly in metal, disappear from the cemeteries and enter the sanctuaries in the course of the eighth century, signalling a change in the meaning of these items and the contexts in which they were used. A new need had arisen among the elite for a wider arena for competition than the communal burial ceremony, and dedication in a sanctuary had the added effect of keeping objects on view, continuing to enact the symbolic destruction

entailed in deposition, while retaining its prestige.⁶⁵ The use of writing beginning again in the eighth century allowed objects to speak to viewers, specifying their dedicator and sometimes the occasion of dedication. This was not the end of *xenia*, of guest-friendship, since personal relationships among aristocrats continued to be vital to social and political relations in the historical period.⁶⁶ But the new forms and audiences represent a profound transformation of Iron Age society, and Homeric ideology.

Conclusion

Toumba's so-called heroic burials, so much earlier than the eighth century, undercut old claims that such burials indicate an awareness of Homer; indeed as Popham says, "it is much more likely that Homer is describing, and no doubt elaborating, the kind of funeral that a warrior leader or king of this period might be given".⁶⁷ Though the building has been termed a heroön and its male burial a hero, this is misleading. As an outstandingly rich, 'heroic' burial it clearly demonstrates by virtue of its unquestionably early date that such practices predate any possible circulation of Homeric poetry.⁶⁸ On the other hand, it strengthens the view that Homeric poetry, in its long period of evolution, picked up, preserved and transformed fragments of culture and history from the Bronze Age to the Dark. The Homeric poems can be read like the stratigraphy in an excavation, a process that recovers layers which represent periods of dynamic, active shaping of the epics. In addition to the Early Mycenaean period and the late 8th century, Lefkandi points especially to the earlier Iron Age, and Euboea, as critical for Homeric poetry as it has come down to us.⁶⁹

* This paper originated in my doctoral dissertation, *The Archaeology of Early Greek 'Hero Cult'*, Princeton 1987. Some of its ideas were presented before audiences at the College Art Association annual meeting in 1990 and 1993, at the Center for the Humanities of Wesleyan University in 1993, and the Aegean Seminar at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University in 1994. My thanks to the audiences on those occasions for their comments and suggestions. In addition, I would like to single out Ø. Andersen, M. Dickie, E. French, P. Kalligas, G. Kopcke, H. Sackett, and P. Themelis for their comments; they cannot be said to agree with my interpretations. Thanks also to my student, S. Mazer, and to F. Cooper, J. Camp, and S. Morris for on-site discussion.

1 M. Popham et al., "The Hero of Lefkandi," *Antiquity* 56 (1982) 169-174.

2 M. Popham et al., *Lefkandi II.ii, The Burial Building at Toumba* (London 1993 [BSA Suppl. 22]) 22; cf. P. Blome, "Lefkandi und Homer," *Würzburger Jahrbücher* N.F. 10 (1984) 9-21. Reports: H.W. Catling, *AR* 1981-82, 15-17; 1982-83, 12-15; G. Touchais, *BCH* 106 (1982) 588-592; M. Popham et al., (above, n.1); A. Mazarakis, "Contribution à l'étude de l'architecture religieuse grecque des âges obscurs," *AntCl* 54 (1985) 5-84, esp. 6-9; M. Popham "The Greek Dark Age," in B. Cunliffe, ed., *Origins*.

The Roots of European Civilisation (London 1987) 67-80; P. Kalligas, "Ἀνασκαφές στο Λεύκαντι Εὐβοίας 1981-84," *Ἀρχαίου Εὐβοικῶν Μελετῶν* 26 (1984-85) 253-269, mostly repeated in English in P. Calligas, "Hero-cult in Early Iron Age Greece," in R. Hägg et al., eds., *Early Greek Cult Practice* (Stockholm 1988) 229-234. Other information about Toumba and included here comes from two public lectures: M. Popham, "The Early Dark Ages and the Euboean Contribution" at the British School at Athens Centenary Celebration, June 24, 1986; H. Sackett, "The Burial Building at Lefkandi: Evidence for Euboean Leadership and Overseas Enterprise during the 'Dark Age'," abstract in *AJA* 72 (1987) 269. See also R. Catling and I. Lemos, *Lefkandi II. The Protogeometric Building at Toumba. i The Pottery* (London 1990 [BSA Suppl. 22]).

3 E.g. Blome (above, n.2); *idem*, "Die dunklen Jahrhunderte – aufgehehlt," in J. Latacz, ed., *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick* (Stuttgart 1991 [Colloquium Rauricum 2]) 45-60; see M.L. West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic," *JHS* 108 (1988) 151-172; *idem*, "The Descent of the Greek Epic: a Reply," *JHS* 112 (1992) 173-175; B. Powell, *Homer and the Invention of the Greek Alphabet* (Cambridge 1991); *idem*, "Did Homer Sing at Lefkandi?" *Electronic Antiquity* 1.2 (1993) and the response by J. Lenz, "Was Homer Euboean? A Reply" in issue 1.3 (1993); cf. W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992) p. 159 n.10, and E. S. Sherratt, "Reading the texts: archaeology and the Homeric question," *Antiquity* 64 (1990) 807-824.

4 M. Popham et al., *Lefkandi I. The Iron Age*. 2 vols. (London 1979-80 [BSA Suppl. 11]) 8; 368-369; 423-427 (on the name of the site, with references); see also S.C. Bakhuizen, *Chalcis-in-Euboea, Iron and Chalcidians Abroad* (Leiden 1976 [Chalcidian Studies III]) 7-13, 78-82 against identifying Old Eretria with Lefkandi, and see further on connecting Lefkandi and Eretria, n.27 below. There may be another area of settlement between Xeropolis and Toumba: E. French and P. Themelis, personal communication, December 1993.

5 Popham et al., (above, n.4) 7.

6 Coulton in Popham et al., (above, n.2) 35, 44.

7 *Ibid.* 44, 51.

8 For a reconstruction, see Popham (above, n.2) fig. 6.6 on p. 73. Interpreted as the foundation for a stair to an upper storey by Mazarakis (above, n.2) 8 ("une étage dans le comble"). See also Kalligas (above, n.2) 258; Popham et al., (above, n.2) 50-51 + pls. 6, 11 a-b, 28.

9 Popham et al., (above, n.2) 44, 50.

10 One yielded a pedestalled cup with pendant semicircle decoration. See *AR* 1982-83, 14-15 + fig. 17 (photograph of apse; cf. Catling and Lemos [above n.2] pl. 3), fig. 19 (cup; Catling and Lemos, 199 no. 293, pl. 52), fig. 20 (hydria; Catling and Lemos, 199 no. 469 pl. 7d). Fragments of a "drum head" resembling later clay well heads were found in the west end, but no pithos fragments; *AR* 1982-83, 15. The 'drum head' may now be called "furnace fragments", though these are said to have come from the east and south ramp (Catling and Lemos [above, n.2] 5; Popham et al., [above, n.2] 74-76, no cat. no.; pls. 35-36). See now Popham et al., (above, n.2) 25-26, 50, 65-67 (Table 4) + pls. 23-26 for this material and its associations.

11 Material was illustrated in *AR* 1981-82, fig. 34, but not all is part of the deposit; see Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) 3-4; *AR* 1982-83, figs. 18-19 p. 14; Popham et al., (above, n.1) fig. 4 on p. 172; again, not all from the floor. Two one-handled cups, broken but nearly complete, were recovered from the fill near the floor; they are also reported to come from the fill above the south room before the west apse. *AR* 1982-83, 14 fig. 18; cf. Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) no. 1 pl. 5c; no. 57 pl. 5a (possibly from floor): not a "floor deposit" as *AR* 1981-82, 117 + n.16. The material is called Middle

Protogeometric or early Late Protogeometric by Popham (AR 1981-82, 17); chronology, Popham et al., (above, n.4) under "Abbreviations" (no page numbers). See also the comments of Popham et al., "Further Excavation of the Toumba Cemetery at Lefkandi, 1981," *BSA* 77 (1982) 213-250, esp. 246-247. Catling and Lemos opt for a uniform Middle Protogeometric date for fill and floor deposit both, but see below.

12 See further below; Popham et al., (above, n.4) 214; Popham et al., (above, n.2) 52; 98, 99 pl. 7 pits 9, 11, 12 + 13, 14, 15. Cooking pot in pit 20: *ibid.* 17; Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) P 828, 132 + pl. 41, 76; tripod braziers: P 812-823, tripod cauldron P 860, cf. 66, pl. 42, 75 (evidence of use over fire); cf. also two pyraunoi, P 847, 848, 60-61, pls. 40, 78; 61, speculating on the possible prestige value of this Macedonian shape and its use in the funerary ritual.

13 For illustrations cf. Popham et al., (above, n.2) 22 (horses), 12-13 (shafts), 14 (brick lining). Other horse burials in the northeast part of the cemetery from the 1986 season: M. Popham et al., "Further Excavation of the Toumba Cemetery at Lefkandi, 1984 and 1986, a Preliminary Report," *AR* (1988-89) 117-129, 118 (T. 68); cf. J.H. Crowell, *Chariots and other Wheeled Vehicles in Iron Age Greece* (Amsterdam 1992) 23-24 (possible parallels at Eretria), 48 (on the bits), 54 (parallels with bits in Attic Early Geometric burials without horses).

14 Popham et al., (above, n.2) 20 with pl. 17a-d; E. Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles: the Development of Cloth in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages* (Princeton 1991) 197.

15 There is evidence at Lefkandi for bronze tripod production, but not for this type of object: Popham et al., (above, n.4) 93-97, 279. Cf. the very similar bronze rims in the Cesnola Collection of the Metropolitan Museum in New York and the Cyprus Museum, Nicosia: H. Catling, *Cypriot Bronzework in the Mycenaean World* (Oxford 1964) 146-161, pls. 23-4 from Kaloriziki and ?Kition. Catling had concluded that these were not Cypriot but Aegean "on grounds of technique, form, and ornament" and dated them to the 12th c., but in "Workshop and Heirloom: Prehistoric Bronze Stands in the East Mediterranean," *Report of the Department of Antiquities Cyprus* (1984) 69-91, he concluded that no examples from the Aegean area are identifiable. See also J.N. Coldstream, "Early Greek Visitors to Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean," in V. Tatton-Brown, ed., *Cyprus and the East Mediterranean in the Iron Age* (London 1989) 90-96, 91, discussing other evidence for contemporary contacts with Cyprus. Photographs: Popham et al., (above, n.1) pl. 24 (amphora rim); see now Popham et al., (above, n.2) 81-96, + pls. 16, 19-21; not Syro-Palestinian, as suggested by Kalligas (above, n.2) 260. See further below.

16 AR 1981-82, fig. 31 on p. 16 (female burial); Popham et al., (above, n.1) fig. 5a, b, fig. 6 on p. 173, + pl. 23 b (jewelry). Possible heirloom pendant: Coldstream (above, n.15) 91, suggesting a Babylonian parallel a thousand years older, though it is unlikely that the Lefkandi pendant is this old. Cf. Popham et al., (above, n.2) 20-21 + pls. 13, 15. The pectorals are paralleled most closely by discs in the Goulandris collection, from Skyros, and more were found at Lefkandi in excavations of 1986: Popham et al., (above, n.13) 120 figs. 23-5 (T. 63). For comparisons, see L. Marangou, *Ancient Greek Art. The N.P. Goulandris Collection* (Athens 1985), cat. nos. 220-223, five gold disks with spiral pattern said to have been found in burials with Protogeometric material. Marangou notes connections with Bronze Age traditions (144-145).

17 Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) 25; cf. pls. 54-56, 17-18 (P 327) + p. 110, 25-26.

18 AR 1982-83, 15 + fig. 21. Popham compares it to the Protogeometric kraters from Marmariani in Thessaly. Cf. W.A. Heurtley and T.C. Skeat, "The Tholos Tombs of Marmariane," *BSA* 31 (1930-31) 1-55, 30-33, "Class 20," pls. 10-11.

19 The krater may be compared, for instance, to an example in Popham et al., (above, n.4) pl. 16 no. 156 + pl. 21 no. 1, pl. 33, dated to Subprotogeometric. Though Catling and Lemos cite Late Protogeometric parallels for use of kraters as markers, they still

seem to date this example in Middle Protogeometric ([above, n.2] 26, 27, 29). They allow for "particular features [which] could belong to earlier or more advanced stages but still within the same phase" but never consider Late Protogeometric, much less Subprotogeometric dates for the fill or floor deposit (cf. 92). I thank G. Kopcke for sharing his thoughts on chronology with me.

20 A. Mazarakis, "Early Greek Temples: Their Origin and function," in R. Hägg et al., eds., *Early Greek Cult Practice* (Stockholm 1988) 105-119, 116; Kalligas (above, n.2), and Calligas (above, n.2); and J. Whitley *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece: The Changing Face of a Pre-Literate Society 1100-700 B.C.* (Cambridge 1991) 185-186 and *idem*, "Social Diversity in Dark Age Greece," *BSA* 86 (1991) 341-365.

21 The bulldozer narrowly missed the inhumation, and destroyed the center of the building; see discussion Popham et al., (above, n.2) 97-101; cf. 49. On the other hand, the cutting produced a clear stratigraphic section through the center of the structure.

22 Popham et al., (above, n.1) 173; Touchais (above, n.2); *AR* 1981-82, 17; cf. Popham (above, n.2) 75, Popham et al., (above, n.2) 12, 15-16, 50, 99-100 + pl. 8b, 106, plan 7; the clay box with ash also contained small fragments of bone. Mazarakis (above, n.2) 6-9 stated that there were four of these postholes near the south cross wall; *pace* Kalligas (above, n.2) 264.

23 Popham et al., (above, n.2) for several illustrations of this area.

24 If Coulton's reconstruction of this area of the building is accepted: Popham et al., (above, n.2) 42, 48, 97-98.

25 A test to discover possible habitation evidence brought to light the first of the graves, discovered before the building: Popham et al., (above, n.1) 170, map, Popham et al., (above, n.4) pl. 73; Popham et al., (above, n.2) 1. As mentioned, the structure is dated Middle Protogeometric or slightly later, while the earliest of the Toumba graves, Tomb 12 B, is Middle Protogeometric: Popham et al., (above, n.4) 174, 321; pls. 159, 202 d-f, 173; finds pl. 258 a (trefoil jug), 250, 10 (pin), 235 b (lentoid seals). See further on dating below. Tombs discovered in 1984 dated to Middle Protogeometric to early Subprotogeometric III, i.e. 950-825 B.C.E.: M. Popham et al., (above, n.13) 117-129, esp. 120; more in 1992 and 1993, below n.43.

26 Palia Perivolia, 200 m. to the east, has Middle Protogeometric tombs. Skoubris, the area with the earliest burials and somewhat further in distance to the north, has Submycenaean tombs and continues in use to the Late Protogeometric. It is unknown if all the cemeteries belong to the same settlement; there is no evidence for Submycenaean, Early Protogeometric or Middle Protogeometric habitation (Xeropolis produced nothing of this period in the excavated area): Popham et al., (above, n.4) 7; 355-356; see Popham et al., (above, n.2) 100-101.

27 For the Nichoria house, see Mazarakis (above, n.20) and "Nichoria in the South-western Peloponnese: Units IV-1 and IV-5 Reconsidered," *OpAth* 19 (1992) 75-84. On the early Temple of Apollo, cf. e.g. Mazarakis (above, n.2) 18-20 with plan fig. 7, D and references; "Geometric Eretria," *AntK* 30 (1987) 3-24: 10-14, 20-21. This building measures ca. 34.5 x 7-8 m. Mazarakis see this as the first monumental temple constructed after Building A (the assumed original cult building, or "Bay Hut" of the Swiss), which he interprets as a chieftain's house, went out of use. On p. 23, he goes further, making Building B "the residence of the deceased 'Prince' by the West Gate" and argues that his house was reserved as "a kind of 'heroon'" (n.80). See also Mazarakis (above, n.20) 110-112.

28 Popham et al., (above, n.1) 171, 174; Mazarakis (above, n.2) 8 (retaining walls at both ends?). See *AR* 1981-82, 17 fig. 33 and Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) pls. 3 + 4 and Popham et al., (above, n.2) pl. 6a, 37 for section through ramp and 29-31, 52-56 for detailed discussion.

29 Sackett, personal communication in 1985 on the fill, stated that no pendant semicircle decoration had been found, contradicting Popham in *AR* 1983-84. All previous descriptions of the fill, however, are superseded by Catling and Lemos (above, n.2). Coulton estimates the time needed to demolish the building (Popham et al., [above, n.2] 55-56) but not to construct it.

30 Popham et al., (above, n.1) 174; cf. Mazarakis (above, n.2) 6: "Dans la région de l'abside plusieurs fragments de figurines mycéniennes furent découverts, associés aux trouvailles protogéométriques, mais il n'ont reçu aucune explication satisfaisante jusqu'à présent". See Mazarakis (above, n.2) 8.

31 Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) 5, 91.

32 The fill was so tightly packed that the imprint of the mudbrick walls could be seen in it during the trial examination in 1980; plaster adhered to the fill even where the socle had been robbed out: Popham et al., (above, n.2) 10, 13, 14, 24, 42-43; see also 24, 35, 98.

33 See Popham et al., (above, n.4) 188-193, pls. 228 c-d, 229 for Tomb 35, dated to Sub Protogeometric II-III; Popham et al., (above, n.11) 214-217 with pls. 15-17 for Tomb 38, Late Protogeometric II and Popham et al., (above, n.13) 120. These tombs were not built of brick, as first thought, but cut into the tumulus fill, which includes mudbrick.

34 Popham et al., (above, n.2) 20-21; cf. section pl. 12, with discussion of the shaft fill on 17-18.

35 Popham et al., (above, n.2) 11 + pl. 8c, 51-52; cf. R. Hägg, "Funerary Meals in the Geometric Necropolis at Asine?" in R. Hägg, ed., *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm 1983) 189-194; K. Fagerström, "Finds, Function and Plan: a Contribution to the Interpretation of Iron Age Nichoria in Messenia," *OpAth* 17 (1988) 33-50, and Blome (above, n.3) 54-55; see also C. Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors* (Lanham, Maryland 1994) 199-244.

36 Catling and Lemos (above, n.2) hint at a period of use by referring to the building's "final phase", and Mazarakis (above, n.20) suggests the building saw about a generation of use.

37 Powell (above, n.4). Note that in the fill was found a bone pipe with fretted fingering, appropriate for a bagpipe (not a flute): Popham et al., (above, n.2) 72, 77 no. 10 (pl. 32 no. 11, pl. 34, no. 10). Sackett suggests: "Since this object derives from the fill of the East Room it can be dated to the Middle Protogeometric Period, and is contemporary with the central burial. If its identification as the chanter of a bagpipe is accepted, it becomes tempting to associate it with the burial ritual at which the dirge music provided by such an instrument would be appropriate."

38 Doubts about this monumental tripod have been raised by Coulton in Popham et al., (above, n.2).

39 P. Themelis, "Die Nekropolen von Lefkandi-nord auf Euboea," in *Griechenland, die Ägäis und die Levante während der 'Dark Ages' vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr.* (Vienna 1983) 145-160: 150-151; Popham et al., (above, n.11) 247 + n.47; cf. Popham et al., (above, n.2) 100-101.

40 Kalligas (above, n.2) 265. Kalligas believes the pathway went all the way around the tumulus, and presumably he thinks the graves did as well, but he gives no evidence for his opinion.

41 Not all the tombs in this area have been fully published; in particular the 25 tombs and 10 pyres of 1984-86 are not all individually dated, and those excavated still later are only briefly noted in *AR*. The richness and foreign connections of this group include the Cypriot or Cypriot-style amphora from the building cremation, to Egyptian jewelry and faience vases, Phoenician bronzes, and Attic imports in Late Protogeometric. See Popham et al., (above, n.1) 171 with fig. 3 (faience ring); *AR* 1981-

82, 15-17, figs. 25 (ring flask and bottle in the form of a grape cluster), 28 (bronze wheels, possibly Cypriot) and 30 (mug with strut handle shaped like a human leg, of northern origin?). Cf. also Popham et al., (above, n.11) graves T 39, 42 in particular. On Cypriot connections, cf. Coldstream (above, n.15), esp. 91. On metalwork, see also G. Falsone, "Phoenicia as a bronzeworking centre in the Iron Age," in J. Curtis, ed., *Bronzeworking Centres of Western Asia c. 1000-539 B.C.* (London 1988) 227-250, esp. 239-240; I. Winter, "North Syria as a bronzeworking centre in the early first millennium BC: luxury commodities at home and abroad," *ibid.* 193-225.

42 E.g. Blome (above, n.2) 247; *idem* (above, n.3) 47, 49.

43 Popham et al., (above, n.13) 118; more graves in 1992 and 1993: AR 1992, 38; 1993, 40-41, to the east and southeast, including a great pyre under boulders, a woman's burial with hair spirals and pins, in a cist with huge cover slabs. A crushed bronze bowl is another Near Eastern import. A retaining wall found running in an east-west direction may possibly belong to the tumulus.

44 Popham et al., (above, n.11) 227-229, fig. 235 + pl. 25c-d, 26; cf. 240. Outside Toumba, an iron knife was recovered from Skoubris Tomb 46 (PG). At Palia Perivolia, Tomb 47 yielded a sword and spear (SPG I-II); pyres 1 and 16 were furnished with a spear, and a spear, blade and whetstone (?) but cannot be dated. Tombs 31, 13, and 47 also held weapons; they dated LPG, SPG I and SPG I-II, respectively. Cf. Popham et al., (above, n.4) Tables 3-4, pls. 420-21.

45 T. 50 and P. 14: warrior burials; jewelry in T. 63, 59, 55, 38, etc.; Popham et al., (above, n.13) 118, 20; T. 49, 118-119 with fig. 3. Popham et al., (above, n.11) 236, on the similarity of gold bands in T. 39 (no. 23,28) to the decorated cloth bands in the building cremation is noted. T. 39: all LPG Attic imports; T. 44; ditto; T. 40, 41, LPG/SPG I; T. 42, SPG I (Popham et al., [above, n.11] 245).

46 T. 55 is dated to Attic EG I, or Lefkandi LPG/EG (see previous note).

47 Blome (above, n.2); cf. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (New York 1991) 46-47, who sees the woman as an example of suttee; cf. Kopcke (below, n.53) 93, pointing to Cypriot parallels of concubines buried with their dead masters.

48 See M. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (2nd ed. London 1978) who also recognized the importance of gifts to Homeric society; Whitley (above, n.20) and next note. On 'big men', cf. B. Qviller, "The Dynamics of the Homeric Society," *SymbOslo* 67 (1981) 109-155, *contra* H. van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam 1992) 281-294. See also L. Binford, *In Pursuit of the Past* (London 1983) 214-232 and C. Ulf, *Die homerische Gesellschaft: Materialien zur analytischen Beschreibung und historischen Lokalisierung* (Munich 1990 [Vestigia 43]) Ch. 5 *passim*, and further discussion below.

49 The bibliography on this is vast, but begins with M. Mauss, *Essai sur le don* (Paris 1925 [*The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, New York 1954]). Recent reviews of Homeric gift giving and economy: van Wees (previous note), esp. 228-237, 299-310; W. Donlan, "Duelling with Gifts in the *Iliad* as the Audience Saw It," *Colby Quarterly* 29 (1993) 159-173. See also M. Aubet, *The Phoenicians and the West. Politics, Colonies and Trade* (Cambridge 1993) 106-118 on Greek and Phoenician exchanges of gifts, esp. 108-109.

50 J. N. Coldstream, "Gift exchange in the eighth century B.C.," in Hägg, ed., (above, n.35) 201-206; cf. *idem*, "Mixed Marriages at the Frontiers of the Early Greek World," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12 (1993) 89-105; see also Kopcke (below, n.53) 95-96 with additional references.

51 S. Langdon, "Gift Exchange in the Geometric Sanctuaries," in T. Linders, ed., *Gifts to the Gods* (Uppsala 1987 [Boreas 15]) 107-113, esp. 109, 112-113.

52 I. Morris, "Gift and Commodity in Archaic Greece," *Man* 21 (1986) 1-17, esp. 9; *idem*, "Circulation, Deposition, and the Formation of the Greek Iron Age," *Man* 24, (1989) 502-519; see also next note.

53 See G. Kopcke, *Handel* (Göttingen 1990 [Archaeologia Homerica, Kapitel M]) 90-96; S. and E. Sherratt, "The growth of the Mediterranean economy in the early first millennium BC," *World Archaeology* 24 (1993) 361-378, and J. Hooker, "Gifts in Homer," *BICS* 36 (1989) 79-90 criticizing Finley's analysis of gift exchange and reciprocity in Homer. See also A. Appadurai, "Commodities and the Politics of Value," in A. Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things* (Cambridge 1986) 3-63.

54 C. Gosden, "Gifts and Kin in Early Iron Age Europe," *Man* 20 (1985) 475-493, esp. 476.

55 E.g. J. Hurwit, *Art and Culture in Early Greece* (Ithaca 1985); S. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton 1992). On cultural appropriation, see N. Thomas, *Entangled Objects* (Cambridge, Mass. 1991).

56 T. 39: Popham et al., (above, n.11) 217-220; fig. 2 p. 216, pl. 27a-b, finds pls. 17-20 + pl. 34 (wheels, on which see Crouwel [above, n. 13] 34 n.104). Morris (*Man* 21 [1986]) on spheres of exchange, rather than orders; heirlooms would thus constitute an incomparable order, not divisible for example into a corresponding number of weapons, though the Homeric heroes evaluated the worth of prizes in terms of oxen. See I. Kopytoff, "The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process," in Appadurai, ed., (above, n.53) 64-91, esp. 71-72. Aubet (above, n.49) 106, 109 points to the genealogies of some gifts in Homer, that is the stories that they accumulate, but does not make any connection with the archaeological record.

57 L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise* (Ithaca 1991) 25; cf. Kopytoff (previous note) 80-83, 88-90.

58 Kurke (previous note) *loc. cit.*

59 Tomb 42: a bronze situla, no. 17, Popham et al., (above, n.11) 224 pl. 33a, h.

60 P. Wells, "Mediterranean trade and culture change in Early Iron Age central Europe," in T. Champion, J. Megaw, eds., *Settlement and Society, Aspects of West European Prehistory in the First Millennium B.C.* (Leicester 1985) 69-89, esp. 83, 85. I now find that Aubet (above, n.49) 113 also refers to Hallstatt, for a parallel to Phoenician involvement with Etruria and Latium in the later Iron Age.

61 Wells (previous note) 74-75, for sixth century B.C.E. Europe; cf. also 83-86, and J. Collis, *The European Iron Age* (London 1984) 15-20 on Lefkandi, 39-61 on Iron Age Greece; also Sherratt and Sherratt (above, n.53), who suggest that Lefkandi prospered because of its location near the route from the eastern Mediterranean to the North Aegean. Kopcke (above, n.53) also emphasizes Lefkandi's position, but goes on to suggest that "Der 'Heros' von Leukandi mag ein Mann aus Zypern gewesen sein, der an den Ort seiner Vorfahren heimkehrte" and that this identification also provides the explanation for both the eastern objects and the monumental building (93). Popham et al., (above, n.11) suggested that the Toumba cemetery was used by a family including wealthy traders (237, 247 + n.50). In the early first millenium, the Phoenicians were beginning to emerge from the upheavals at the end of Bronze Age, and it is possible they had some hand in the arrival of luxury goods at Lefkandi; later in the Iron Age, as Aubet points out, they were responsible for the introduction of such items into Etruria, the Iberian peninsula, and Cyprus, targeting local princes in order to open up organized trade (above, n.49, 109, 111-112). She says, however, that Phoenician trade is casual in Homer; it "frequently appears associated with management by her monarchs and with the practice of gifts and hospitality. Hence, it all reflects an atmosphere very close to the start of Tyrian expansion westwards, that is, a situation more appropriate to the ninth century than to the eighth to seventh centuries BC" (103). See also Burkert (above, n.3) 9-21.

62 J.L. Benson, *Horse, Bird, and Man* (Amherst 1970).

63 See Antonaccio (above, n.35) 199-244 for examples from Thebes, Eleusis, and Paros; cf. Blome (above, n.3) 53.

64 H. Matthäus, "Heirloom or Tradition? Bronze Stands of the Second and First Millennium B.C. in Cyprus, Greece and Italy," in *Problems in Greek Prehistory*, E.B. French, K.A. Wardle, eds., (Bristol 1988) 285-300.

65 Morris in *Man* 21 (1986).

66 See M. Hansen, *Ritualized Friendship and the Ancient Greek City* (Cambridge 1987); W. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece* (Lawrence, Kans. 1980); cf. the remarks of Appadurai (above, n.53) esp. 13-16 on not dividing gifts from a market economy; also Thomas (above, n.55).

67 Popham et al., (above, n.2) 22. Similar observations have been made about the so-called Royal tombs at Salamis on Cyprus; see D. Rupp, "The 'Royal' Tombs at Salamis (Cyprus): Ideological Messages of Power and Authority," *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 1 (1988) 111-139 and Antonaccio (above, n.35) 199-244.

68 Blome (above, n.2) observed that Lefkandi provides a Protogeometric exemplar for the Homeric descriptions of heroes' funerals: "Der Fürst von Lefkandi starb gute 200 Jahre vor der Geburt Homers; wenn er sich dennoch wie ein neuer Patroklos bestatten läßt [!], zeigt dies zum Schluß, daß er und Homer in einer gemeinsamen Tradition stehen, daß also der vom Fürsten praktizierte und der von Homer besungenen Ritus einen terminus ante quem rund um 1000 v. Chr. besitzt" (p. 17). See also p. 20 for the "wechselseitig" influence of poetry and reality. In speaking of "ein neuer Patroklos" Blome, however, fails to follow his conclusion all the way through. His evaluation of late 8th c. aristocratic society is therefore inconsistent also: "So liegt es nahe, die 'homerischen' Begräbnisse unmittelbar mit der Verbreitung der Großepen in Verbindung zu bringen". This is "Teil eines allgemeinen Interesses an der heroischen Vorzeit", based on hero cult at newly discovered Mycenaean tombs, and expressed also in figural representations. In making the statement at the beginning of this note, he gave the answer to his question, "auf welcher kulturgeschichtlichen Stufe sind die homerischen Bestattungsriten ausgebildet worden?"

69 Sherratt (above, n.3).