of its region, are four of a larger cemetery (at least 15 tombs are known), which were excavated by the late E. Mastrokostas while ephor. These are represented entirely by the goods catalogued in the Patras Museum; no excavation notebooks or other reports of useful data concerning the stratigraphy or use of the tombs could be found. The goods, including some from an ‘unprovenanced tomb’ and some uninventoryed sherds, consist of 93 items of pottery, many of them complete vases, and 35 small finds, mostly the conical steatite buttons/whorls (plus three of clay) commonly found in Late Helladic (hereafter LH) III tombs, with a gold wire ring, three small bronze items, three glass beads, and one clay model of the known ‘throne’ shape. It is noteworthy that the total of items is more impressive than the 73 found in the 11 tombs dug by Papadopoulos himself, published elsewhere.

The range of the pottery spreads from LH II (at least 1 likely item) to IIIC, with the bulk datable to LH IIIB and IIIC. As often in Achaea, LH IIIC is particularly well represented, examples being found in all graves, especially Ts. C and D; there were at least 33 vases from all sub-phases, but only six are classified as Late (five being from T. C). Almost all pieces are illustrated by plates, mostly in colour, and line drawings with profiles; this makes appraising them particularly easy, though some of the photographs of small pieces are rather blurred and indistinct. But it has to be said, the need to keep looking between entries, plates and figures is a bit tiresome, and there are quite a number of errors in plate references in the catalogue (I have spotted 8, affecting references to pls. 24–26).

In general the assemblage fits Achaean patterns, most notably in the predominance of the stirrup jar, in various forms, in the later phases, with other not too large container shapes such as the amphoriskos and straight-sided alabastron or pyxis, and the typically Achaean, and surely intentionally showy, big two- or four-handled jars. Also typically Achaean is the total absence of the standard Mycenaean figurines, making the recovery of a single ‘throne’ figurine all the more intriguing. There is nothing very remarkable about most of the pottery, though some vases show unusual variations in shape (particularly stirrup jars), which may well reflect local production (p. 53). A small fragment of what appears to be a pictorial vase (111–?, much clearer in the drawing) is a rarity in Achaea; also rare among the few small finds is a bronze violin-bow fibula, a type that is generally rare in the Aegean. There were sizeable variations in the number of finds from the tombs, T. D producing far more than the others; this may well reflect continual use over a
longer period, since the LH IIIA2, IIIB, and IIIC Early and Middle phases are all well represented in the pottery. It remains to note that the map of Achaea, Plate 1, has been reproduced on far too small a scale to be useful (the placenames are illegible without a magnifying glass).

The publication of chamber tombs from the Ayios Vasileios cemetery near Chalandritsa is a more substantial piece of work, in a larger format. Chalandritsa is an inland town south-east of Patras, in a region that forms the natural routeway from east to west Achaea, skirting Mt. Panachaikon, and was later part of the territory of the city of Pharai in Classical times. Many prehistoric sites have been identified along the route, especially in the neighbourhood of Chalandritsa, and the volume contains several useful studies of the topography and site distribution of the region and comparison with other parts of Achaea.

The tombs belong to an extensive cemetery, covering an area of 1.3 hectares; over 50 have been identified. It has been associated with the Mycenaean settlement of Stavros, where there has been recent excavation (unlike Aigion, this site and cemetery are not in Hope Simpson and Dickinson 1979). Some information is given about this site, but not enough to make it clear whether it was big or important enough to require such a sizeable cemetery; maybe this served other settlements as well. The site and tombs both seem to have lasted until the late phase of LH IIIC (p. 285). The cemetery was first investigated by the local ephor Kyparissis in 1928–30, when four tombs were dug. Some detail is given on these, with a few views and illustrations of finds, and an appendix lists the items inventoried from this excavation in the Patras Museum, but the material published in this work comes principally from much more recent excavations, undertaken as urgent rescue work following incidents of plundering. Mastrokostas investigated at least three robbed tombs in 1961; only after that was a numbering system of all identified tombs developed, and not all of these can now be located. Most of the material comes from tombs investigated at various times between 1989 and 2001, especially in 1989 and 1993. Fig. 9 on p. 17 shows in a slightly stylised way the approximate sites of most of the numbered tombs investigated, including all those on which some detail is given in this work.

The need for haste in clearing the tombs, if anything was to be saved from the modern plunderers, and shortage of time and resources meant that some things had to be left undone. Thus, tomb dromoi were not always cleared, and chambers that were often found to have collapsed and/or been looted some time in the past or in modern times, and were generally full of accumulated soil etc., were rarely investigated extensively. The majority of the 16 described in some detail had also suffered partial or complete robbery. Ts. 17 and 24 showed much evidence of Early Geometric phase intrusion; in the former, a burial was made in the dromos and there was also evidence of Archaic period activity in the chamber. At least two of those excavated by Kyparissis were found more or less intact, and his useful sketch plans are illustrated (p. 207, fig. 277), but this was only true of Ts. 43-4 among the more recently excavated. Since the spread of olive groves has made much of the area unexcavatable, and more has been destroyed by a modern livestock farm, this publication is likely to provide the best impression of the information that the cemetery could give us, and it is a credit to the Achaean ephorate’s diligent efforts that so much could be retrieved.

More is offered than could be provided for the Aigion tombs, including sections, isometric reconstructions, interior plans and detailed accounts of the distribution of finds in some well-preserved tombs. The studies of material include not merely the standard accounts of the pottery and small finds, but a basic study (so covering only sex and age) of the human skeletal material recovered from ten tombs; this is particularly notable because such information is rare for Mycenaean Greece as a whole, and to the reviewer’s knowledge this is the first such evidence reported from Achaea. There is also a study of stone items found, which include not merely the products of chert working, cores, flakes and rough blades, but one definitely early (LN or EB) arrowhead, three pieces of obsidian, three fragments of ground stone implements and a small stone ball. The material is thought to be generally Bronze Age, and together with reports of handmade pottery (some quite possibly Mycenaean) and perhaps some of the decorated sherd material found in tomb dromoi, could point to the existence of a prehistoric settlement site in the neighbourhood, but this must remain speculative. The author of this volume deserves praise for her efforts in getting all this together.

The tombs were in general quite small, with dimensions rarely exceeding 3 m; the majority seem to have been four-sided, sometimes rectangular or square, but some were circular. Roofs were no higher than 1.8 m, and seem to have been curved or vaulted rather than flat. Entrances were low, but dromoi could be as long as 7 m. Several chambers contain one or more pits, but there were no benches or any other sign of elaboration. The tombs were cut evenly
but roughly, and could be placed too close to each other, endangering the stability of the earlier tomb, which may indicate that there were no markers to indicate their position more clearly. Only in three of the ten tombs where skeletal evidence was available for study was there evidence for quite a number of burials, ten or more (the tombs dug by Kyparissis also produced indications of relatively many burials, with pits holding apparently secondary remains, p. 12). More commonly, only four or five burials were identified. Almost all of the skeletal material belonged to adults, apparently male and female in roughly equal numbers; only one or two ‘sub-adult’ burials were identified, and no remains of infants and very small children were recognised. As in other Achaean cemeteries, burials were often found in a primary position on the floor (more rarely in pits), and there was evidence for secondary treatment of burials by moving them to one side of the tomb or placing the more substantial remains in pits.

The author makes many sensible comments on the tombs, but some features deserve further consideration. For instance, a point that is rarely faced in Mycenaean studies, what was the deciding factor in choosing to bury a particular person in a chamber tomb? They have often been called ‘family’ tombs, yet a moment’s calculation will indicate that the average number of burials is far lower than might be expected, if one couple and their descendants were placed in the same tomb over more than two generations – and the datable pottery recovered frequently covers a far wider span. In many tombs it ranges from LH IIIA (most often A2) to at least one, if not two or all three phases of LH III; but, surprisingly, clear LH IIIB types are rare, compared with Aigion. Quite often much if not all of the earliest pottery was found in the dromos, including not merely kylikes, often decorated, but other decorated vessels, open and closed. The author interprets these as representing the remains of ceremonies held in the dromos in honour of the dead, but while this has been suggested for finds of kylikes in dromoi at other cemeteries, and might be argued for mugs and kraters (of which fragments never seem to be found in chambers at Chalandritsa), it seems less likely for some of the other shapes, like amphorae. However, it has to be admitted that some significant remains of pottery found in dromoi may belong to the same late phases as material from the chamber.

It is still worth considering the possibility that some, maybe many tombs were not used continuously. Rather, there was a first phase of use for a few burials, after which tombs were abandoned for some reason, to be opened and reused, presumably by new groups, early in the LH IIIC phase, when there seems to have been a general increase in chamber tomb use all over Achaean. These new groups could have moved the more bulky grave offerings that accompanied earlier burials out into the dromos, while moving the skeletal remains aside or into a pit. Such a pattern of use has parallels in other Mycenaean cemeteries, suggesting that chamber tombs may not originally have been conceived of as ‘family’ tombs, intended for successive generations.

This leads on to another question, what sort of people were buried in the tombs? This is a question that may have different answers in different regions at various times, but the reviewer believes that they often represent an upper stratum in the population, although the grave offerings placed with them only rarely have any obvious ‘elite’ associations. Thus, in this cemetery, as at Aigion but not some other well-known Achaean cemeteries, hardly any of the grave offerings might be considered ‘valuable’. By far the commonest form of grave offering was pottery (over 180 items from the numbered graves, including quite a number of separately catalogued fragments); also found were some bronze implements (including three spearheads and two knives, one preserving bone handle-plates; more bronzes were found in Kyparissis’s tombs) and small items, especially beads of stone and glass, and the usual ‘whorls’ or buttons of stone and clay. Yet it may be significant that in the final phases of use at both Chalandritsa and Aigion the majority of the pottery consisted of containers, especially stirrup jars; at Chalandritsa they made up at least 50% of all vases of the LH IIIC phases found. This is pertinent to questions of an ‘elite’, for stirrup jars are generally thought to have been containers for fine quality, often perfumed olive oil, a probably valued commodity. The other container vases that made up the bulk of offerings in LH IIIC could also have contained special foodstuffs or liquids. Providing them in quantity, then, may have been a way of emphasising the status of the dead person when other valuable goods and materials were too expensive or simply unavailable.

The Chalandritsa pottery (well illustrated with colour photos and drawings, which helpfully are placed with the vase entries in the tomb catalogues) has a similar range to that of Aigion, beginning before the end of LH II with two probable examples, having a reasonable quantity of LH IIIA1 and IIIA2, surprisingly little LH IIIB, and a lot of LH IIIC, including much assignable to the Late phase. There are few unusual shapes, but two ring vases, a composite vase and three ‘duck vases’ may be noted. Like the great majority of the vases, these seem to be local products; items thought to be likely
imports (not always from far away, e.g. Voudeni to the north) are mostly LH IIIC stirrup jars, a potential affirmation of their significance as status symbols, though some kylix pieces and a deep bowl fragment assigned to LH IIIA are also thought imports. A minor criticism is that the entries for vases in the tomb catalogue can include an unnecessary amount of parallel hunting, when, before LH IIIC, vases are likely to be either versions of or clearly influenced by standard types, as defined in authoritative studies like French’s classic BSA articles or Mountjoy’s books, and need no further references. Once stylistic homogeneity has broken down, in LH IIIC, parallel hunting is more useful, providing significant evidence for interconnections between the different regions and also for assigning vases without context to phases.

Not only in pottery but in other respects the patterns suggested by the material preserved from the Aigion and Chalandritsa tombs fit Achaean norms, as analysed by Papadopoulos (where chamber tombs are called ‘family vaults’ in the standard way, although the number of recorded burials was generally only three to five, though ranging from one to nine1) and Cavanagh and Mee.2 The presence of spearheads, quite common in Achaean,3 might hint at an original ‘warrior burial’ in the heavily robbed T. 19, but hardly in T. 44, where two seem to be associated with the burial of a middle-aged woman, in a tomb where the only primary burials were of women. Interestingly, one of these spearheads is of the same type as that represented by a stone mould found at Stavros (p. 254). In one significant area Papadopoulos’s analysis does require updating; contrary to what he suggested,4 chamber tombs had clearly come into use at Chalandritsa by LH IIIA1 and were relatively common in LH IIIA2.

Overall, these two publications make a very useful addition to the documented Mycenaean material from Achaean, especially for the fascinating and still poorly understood postpalatial era, and provide much food for thought.

Oliver Dickinson
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Diachronic surveys of Mycenaean civilization, our term for the material culture that flourished above all on the central and southern Greek mainland during the six or seven centuries (ca. 1700/1600-1000 BC) we assign to the Late Bronze Age, typically and understandably focus on the regional cores of that culture in the northeast (Argolid and Corinthia) and southwest (Messenia) Peloponnese where it arose and has been most extensively documented. The overview of this culture provided by Margaretha Kramer-Hajos (hereafter MK-H) is refreshingly different in its spatial focus on the Euboean Gulf region of east-central Greece (figs. 1.1-1.2) as well as in its conceptual emphasis on certain aspects of network theory and human agency. Despite her study’s seemingly all-inclusive title, MK-H makes very clear right from the start of her excellently organized text precisely what will distinguish her consideration of the Mycenaean era during three successive periods of roughly commensurate length (two centuries apiece) that she terms prepalatial, palatial, and postpalatial: a non-traditional regional focus (1-18) and a particular theoretical orientation (19-31). She will employ network analysis to describe how social, political, and economic structures changed through time, while her examination of agency through iconographic analysis will provide her with clues as to why these structures changed (31-32).

MK-H devotes a pair of chapters to each of her prepalatial (Chs 2-3: 33-69), palatial (Chs 5-6: 107-148), and postpalatial (Chs 7-8: 149-179) periods, with a single chapter (Ch. 4: 70-106) set aside for the transitional Late Helladic (LH) IIIB-IIIA1 ceramic phases (ca. 1430-1370/1360) that constitute the

---

1 Papadopoulos 1979: 35.
2 Papadopoulos 1979; Cavanagh and Mee 1998.
3 Papadopoulos 1979: 163.