UNDERSTANDING HELLENISTIC *THANATOS*: DEATH, RITUAL AND IDENTITY IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN IN THE LATE 4TH – 1ST C. BC

Vasiliki Brouma BA, MA

VOLUME 1:

TEXT

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Στον πατέρα μου

Κωνσταντίνο Γ. Μπρούμα (1951-2005)

που έφυγε νωρίς

με αγάπη και ευγνωμοσύνη

για όλες τις αναμνήσεις

To my father

Konstantinos G. Broumas (1951-2005)

who left this world prematurely

with love and gratitude

for all the memories

Η ζωή μας τ΄είναι; Να:
Λίγες ώρες που διαβαίνουν.
Μόνο η πρώτη μας γεννά
κι όλες οι άλλες μας πεθαίνουν.

~ Η ζωή μας (Γ. Αθάνας)

What is our life? Here:
A few hours that pass by.
Only the first one signals our birth
and all the others lead to our demise.

~ Our life (G. Athanas)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to examine ritual action and identity formation in the funerary record of the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period (late 4th – 1st centuries BC).

Chapter 1 presents the aim, scope, originality, research context and methodology of the thesis. Chapter 2 provides the geographical background of the thesis along with the topographical features of the tombs and the cemeteries followed by a discussion on the deathscapes of the South-Eastern Aegean in Hellenistic times. Chapter 3 is a concise typological analysis of the tomb types in the islands and the mainland cities of the Rhodian *peraea* and Chapter 4 offers a contextual look into funerary and post-funerary ritual drawing from various types of evidence such as modes of disposal of the human body, monumental tomb architecture (tombs with funerary beds) and funerary monuments (cylindrical altars with decorations in relief) among others. In Chapter 5, I discuss several manifestations of individual and collective identity as inferred by the archaeological record, as far as this is possible, followed by a brief assessment of insularity and identity in the Hellenistic communities of the South-Eastern Aegean. Finally, chapter 6 offers a synopsised outline of the main themes explored in the thesis along with general and specific conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation and extend my obligations to a number of colleagues and friends for their constant support and encouragement throughout this creative journey. The responsibility for all the views and mistakes of fact or judgement expressed in this thesis are entirely mine.

I would like to thank my Ph.D. advisors, Dr Chrysanthi Gallou, and Dr William Bowden for their constant academic and mental support, cooperation, constructive feedback as well as all the opportunities they offered me. A special token of gratitude should be extended to my primary supervisor, Dr Chrysanthi Gallou, whose critical insight, joyful character, thorough guidance and mentoring have been irreplaceable. She is one of the most brilliant archaeologists I have ever met, and it has been a privilege to work under her guidance. Her welcoming office has been a warm and friendly recourse in various stages of this Ph.D.

Similarly, appreciation goes to my former Master's supervisor at the University of Oxford, Dr Maria Stamatopoulou. Her seminars introduced me to the alluring world of Hellenistic funerary archaeology. I am most obliged to the committee of the Centre of Spartan and Peloponnesian Studies (CSPS) at the University of Nottingham, especially, Professor William Cavanagh and Professor Steven Hodkinson for all the fruitful conversations and their interest towards my research. Professor Hodkinson, in particular, has given me more than once the opportunity to participate in various actions of the Centre and has entrusted me with the co-organisation of the 2nd Postgraduate and Early Career Conference organised by the CSPS (Nottingham, 22-23 March 2013). I would also like to thank Mr Sarantos Minopetros (CSPS researcher) for all his helpful advice and encouragement.

I am equally indebted to the University of Nottingham and the academic staff of the Department of Archaeology for giving me the chance to present part of my research in the departmental Research Seminars, where I had the opportunity to receive constructive feedback. Dr Jon Henderson and Professor Andrew Poulter for reviewing the chapters I submitted for my MPhil/P.hD. upgrade and the accommodating staff of the School's Research Office (especially Ms Amanda Samuels and Ms Katie Gill) who have

helped me immensely with administrative queries on more than one occasions. Overall, the Department of Archaeology at the University of Nottingham and its staff have offered the best environment possible for the completion of my research. Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Anthi Dipla and Dr Marina Panagiotaki whose friendship and concern over my progress have been a constant source of encouragement all these years from the beginning of my studies at the University of the Aegean.

Special thanks to Professor Anagnostis Angelarakis (Adelphi University) for providing me information on his anthropological research from Rhodes and my dear friend and fellow archaeologist Mr Ilias Diakantonis (University of the Aegean) for accompanying me on my research trips in the South-Eastern Aegean at various occasions.

This research would not have been completed without the generous grants offered by the Greek Archaeological Committee UK (GAC UK) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council UK. I am particularly indebted to the board members of GAC UK, Mrs Matti Egon, Dr Zetta Theorodopoulou-Polychroniadis and Professor Panagiotis Arvanitakis. Their constant help, support and interest in my studies are deeply appreciated.

At this point, I would like to thank my friends and colleagues at the University of Nottingham especially Camilla Bertini, Annie Zourgou and Neil Hall for being always there for me. This is a journey I could not have gone through without my best friends: Marianna Karakoulaki and Maria Bouga, who remind me constantly how lucky I am to have them in my life. Finally, a heartfelt debt of gratitude goes to my family; my mother and biggest fan, Aspasia Brouma-Nikolara, my constantly encouraging brother Thanos Broumas and the best uncle one could ever ask for, Ilias Nikolaras. This thesis is dedicated to the loving memory of my late father, Konstantinos G. Broumas (1951 – 2005).

CONTENTS

VOLUME I: TEXT

	ABSTRACT	*I*
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	*ii-iii*
	CONTENTS OF VOLUMES I AND II	*iv-viii*
	CHAPTER 1:	
	INTRODUCTION	**1-39**
1.1	Aim, Scope and Originality of the Thesis	1-4
1.2	The chronological setting	5-8
1.3	Natural and political geography of the South-Eastern Aegean	8-17
1.4	Social mobility and population increase in the Hellenistic period: the evidence from the South-Eastern Aegean	17-20
1.5	History of Research	20-33
1.6	Methodological Considerations	33-38
1.7	Limitations of Research	38-39
	CHAPTER 2:	
	THE ANCESTORS NEARBY	
	THE DEATHSCAPES OF THE SOUTH-EASTERN	

AEGEAN IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD **40-60**

2.1 Introduction 40-41

2.2 Some notes on the topography of cemeteries and graves in the South-Eastern Aegean 42

2.2.1 a) Rhodes 42-47

2.2.2 b)Rhodian funerary landscape architecture 47-49

2.2.3 c) The rest of the islands and the peraea 49-52

2.3 The topographic context 52-59

2.4 Conclusions 60

CHAPTER 3:

FUNERARY TYPOLOGY IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN DURING THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD (LATE 4TH – 1ST C. BC) **61-107**

3.1 Introduction 61-63

3.2 Non-monumental graves 64

3.2.1 a) Jar burials - Echyntrismoi 64-68

3.2.2 b) Pit Graves 68-71

3.2.3 c) Simple loculi (*thekai*) and drawer-shaped (*syrtarotoi*) GRAVES 65-68

3.2.4 d) Cist graves 74-76

3.2.5 e) Shaft graves 76-77

3.2.6 f) Periboloi (Walled enclosures) 77-81

3.2.7 g) Rock-cut burial chambers with flat or vaulted roofs 81-83

3.3 Monumental Graves 84

3.3.1 a) Rock-Cut Burial Chambers with funerary klinai 84-89

3.3.2 b) Heroa / Mausolea 90-94

3.3.3 c) Monumental tombs with elaborate façades 94-97

3.3.4 d) Monumental tombs with peristyle courts 98-99

3.2 Beyond typology 99-107

CHAPTER 4:

FUNERARY RITUAL IN AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

THE EVIDENCE FROM THE SOUTH-EASTERN AEGEAN 108-179

4.1 Introduction 108-112

4.2 Some notes on legislation and funerary ritual 113-116

4.3 The burial sequence: from the *prothesis* to the grave 116-123

4.4 Modes of disposal of the human body 124-126

4.4.1 Inhumations 126-31

4.4.2 Cremations 131-135

4.5 Funerary architecture and ritual 135-136

4.5.1 Rites of passage and their archaeological legacy 136-139

4.5.2. Architecture and liminality: the Tomb of the Caryatids 139-143

4.5.3 'Cult'-rooms and funerary ritual 143-147

4.5.4 Rhodian *klinai*: typology, occupancy, spatial arrangement and ritual function 147-155

4.6 Post-funerary ritual 155-157

4.7 Cylindrical altars 158-160

4.7.1 Basic typological characteristics 160-163

4.7.2 Altars and burial assemblages: the archaeological evidence 163-168

4.7.3 Of heroes and mortals: post-funerary ritual in context 168-178

4.8 Conclusions 178-179

CHAPTER 5:

STATUS AND IDENTITY **180-227**

5.1 Introduction 180-185

5.2 Individual Identity 185-186

5.2.1 Aspects of individual social status and identity 187-194

5.3 The status of women and children 194-196

5.3.1 Do women matter? Reconstructing female identities in the South-Eastern Aegean 197-207

5.3.2 Children and identity: a complicated narrative 207-211

5.4 Collective identity 211

5.4.1 Collective burials 212-216

5.4.2 Some observations on the Rhodian associations (koina) of foreigners 216-222

5.5 Insularity and Identity: the bigger picture 222-226

5.6 Conclusions 226-227

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSIONS **228-236**

6.1 Aspects of death in the South-Eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period 228-234

6.2 Death and the Islanders 235-236

BIBLIOGRAPHY 237-287

ABBREVIATIONS 237

VOLUME II: LIST OF MAPS AND FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES, MAPS AND FIGURES 287-291

TABLES, MAPS AND FIGURES 292-351

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Aim, Scope and Originality of the Thesis

Throughout the history of archaeological thought, graves have been used to discuss many aspects of human existence, ranging from economy, ethnic identity, social status and gender roles, to funerary ritual and cosmology. At the same time, diverse approaches to funerary archaeology are advocated by different archaeological traditions and it is possible to observe various interpretative schools which have influenced the history and discourse of funerary archaeology diachronically.

The amount of funerary material available for study in the Hellenistic South-Eastern Aegean has increased steadily over the past few decades as a result of controlled excavations, yet archaeological research is diachronically dominated by the study of pottery and funerary architecture to a lesser extent. The focal point towards this direction has been the Hellenistic *polis* of Rhodes and its extensive necropoleis, where excavations have been exceptionally fruitful over the past decades despite an inconsistency in publication, which often discourages further scholarly interest. At the same time, apart from a steady increase of subject and region-specific scholarly publications, Hellenistic funerary archaeology is a *terra incognita* to a considerable extent. It is no coincidence that with few exceptions (Chapter 3, section 3.1) there is a considerable lack of synthetic

works on the subject, while at the same time thorough exploitation of the available material must be accompanied by recognition of its limitations and specificities.

The aim of this thesis is to study various processes of ritual performance and identity formation in the funerary record of the Hellenistic South-Eastern Aegean. Examined side by side, these particular aspects of archaeological interpretation can complement each other and offer new insights into the understanding of the material remains. Under this context, one of the major contributions of this thesis, is the examination of the funerary and post-funerary ritual in the South-Eastern Aegean through the interpretative tools offered by ritual theory. Generally, burial ritual in Classical archaeology is understudied and is often perceived as a static set of actions with predefined outcomes (Chapter 4, section 4.1). This study aims to overturn this assumption and illustrate how the study of funerary ritual can contribute to our deeper understanding of issues regarding the interaction between the communities of the living and the realm of the dead. Some of these issues, which can be highlighted through the reconstruction of the burial sequence, include (but are not only limited to) the eschatological and religious beliefs of the living communities and ancestral veneration through the maintenance of tomb cult.

At the same, time the question of who people were and how they defined themselves in the cultural and political landscapes of the Hellenistic world has been a central theme of classical studies already from the 19th century. J. G. Droysen (1836-43) was the first to refer to the period as Hellenistic, essentially a mix of a Greco-oriental *Mischkultur*, a cultural fusion formed by mixing and merging (Droysen 1836-43, 438). Droysen perceived the Hellenistic period as mid-stage between Classical Greece and the rise of Christianity and more specifically he introduced the ideas of Hellenicity and Hellenization (Droysen 1836-43, 7) discussing the adoption of Greek culture by non-

Greek populations (for the concept of Hellenicity and Hellenization in history see also Sebastiani 2015). As well as the historical reasons for a focus on identity in Hellenistic studies, the nature of the surviving archaeological and epigraphic material has inevitably tended to put questions of identity – especially cultural identity – under the spotlight. The emergence of new theoretical models for the interpretation of funerary activity, the diversity, and versatility of the evidence as well as the increase in the study of the archaeological material within a contextual framework, indicate that we should discard altogether studies based on simplified associations. All in all, it does not suffice to 'prove' that identity is a worthy topic of investigation, but that theoretical constructs of identity and its operation offer constructive and productive ways of approaching the archaeological data.

Overall, the combination of these methodological approaches in the study of the funerary material will enlighten our appreciation of the social and cultural processes behind the formation of identities as well as the attitudes of the living communities towards death. Through a detailed assessment of the available archaeological material (i.e. grave architecture etc.), iconographical evidence deriving from funerary monuments, funerary inscriptions as well as the creation of deathscapes within the landscape, this thesis aims to place the funerary archaeology of the South-Eastern Aegean within its regional and interregional context.

To what extent are the islanders typical or unique in terms of their burial traditions both within a regional as well as an interregional perspective? Are there differences in the expression and articulation of the funerary identities of the locals and the foreigners and if so how are they manifested? How is material culture appropriated in the practice of funerary ritual and how did this process shape the social and cultural dynamics of these communities? Essentially, how can funerary archaeology shed light on

these issues both within a macro and micro level in the South-Eastern Aegean? These are, but a few questions one can expect to get answers from the archaeological evidence.

Furthermore, one of the challenges of this study is to contest the historical narrative of the political and social events that occurred on the islands and Asia Minor as attested primarily in written and epigraphical sources. There has been a long interdependent relationship between Hellenistic history and archaeology; this is particularly evident in the archaeology of the South-Eastern Aegean which has largely been studied through the interpretative lens of written and other historical sources with two major shortcomings. On the one hand, the area of the South-Eastern Aegean is usually studied as part of wider Asia Minor in modern historical studies, while at the same time historians and archaeologists (to a certain extent) favour 'Rhodocentric' approaches to the evidence heavily biased by the historical and cultural significance of the island in the wider geographical area throughout the Hellenistic period. As such, the study of funerary remains should not only aim to bridge history and archaeology in the historical long *duree*; it is my intention to challenge preconceived historical narratives and assess the importance of funerary ritual in the formation of individual and collective identities.

Overall, for the first time, aspects of the funerary archaeology of the South-Eastern Aegean with its limitations, specificities and exceptionalities will be examined under a comparative and critical perspective, expecting that this research could offer an alternative theoretical platform for the interpretation of Hellenistic funerary remains in the future.

1.2. The chronological setting

The Hellenistic period is demarcated by two historical events; it is generally accepted that it begins shortly after the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC and ends in 31 BC with the battle of Actium, the Ptolemies being the last dynasty to fall to Rome (see for example Bugh 2006 and Errington 2012 for general chronological discussions). However, the diversity of the period cannot be restricted to a uniform chronology. The adoption of the above chronological framework corresponds to a wide variety of geographical areas (including the one under study), but we must bear in mind that dates function as conventional boundaries. Continuity and change are dynamic processes, which can be better understood through the careful examination of the historical and archaeological material available together.

The chronology of the Hellenistic period has occupied the scholarly world from the 19th century onwards since the lack of relevant sources caused many uncertainties. Starting with the conventional beginning of the Hellenistic period up to a hundred years after the death of Alexander the Great, no accounts of contemporary historians have survived except fragmentarily in accounts of later authors. Nevertheless, the events of the period down to the Battle of Ipsus are known to us from Diodorus of Sicily (*Library of History,* Books 18 to 20). The Greek historian, who lived at the time of Caesar and Augustus, described the events that followed Alexander's death (Books 7 to 17) until 302 BC (Books 17 to 20), based on the lost accounts of the contemporary historiographer Hieronymus of Cardia (FGrH 154).

However, the loss of primary sources is not the only problem one encounters when studying the 3rd c. BC. The expansionist wars of the Successors between the years 323 and 217 BC led to the enlargement of the Greek world. As a result, the Greek

inhabitants of mainland Greece, the islands, Macedonia and Asia Minor came in close contact with the populations of Egypt, Phoenicia, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Iran and central Asia. Greeks settled everywhere and developed various types of relationships with the local populations. On the other hand, foreigners travelled all over the Mediterranean and settled in different parts of the Greek mainland and the islands (Bugh 2006; Errington 2012).

The problem in modern scholarship of the Hellenistic period, which is dominated by historians and philologists, is a recurring reliance on written sources. This tendency was initiated by Beloch (1904, 187-201; 1918: 235-49) who constructed an appendix of the chronology of the period of the Successors, summarizing the information provided only in the literary sources. His historical reconstruction (especially of the events of the Early Hellenistic period) had a long-lasting effect on scholarship. Eventually, contemporary sources such as Greek inscriptions, coins with date marks, Egyptian papyri, but more importantly the products of scientific archaeological excavation have considerably expanded our knowledge and enriched our understanding of the Hellenistic period in recent years (Bugh 2006).

Each region of the Hellenistic world is subject to its own chronological framework affected by internal and external political mechanisms, social and cultural practices as well as different choices and influences. Beginnings and ends in historical, chronological sequences are often fluid constructions, which never occur from one day to the other (Bugh 2006). For instance, Cary (1951) convincingly argued that the end of the Hellenistic period in mainland Greece was the result of the creation of the Roman province of Macedonia and the destruction of Corinth in 146 BC. However, Chaniotis (2005) argues that in some parts of the Mediterranean the early Imperial is but the 'extension' of the Hellenistic period. Nevertheless, we must always bear in mind that we are dealing with

terms which are modern constructions (i.e. Hellenistic, Hellenization) and have been continuously challenged and redefined. The most realistic approach is to use the term Hellenistic in a chronological rather than strictly cultural sense.

From a regional perspective, the transition to the Hellenistic period in the island-*poleis* of the South-Eastern Aegean occurred by the end of the 4th c. BC, after the *demes synoecisms* on Rhodes and Kos in 412 and 366/365 BC respectively. Though the islands are treated to a certain extent within the general, historical sources of the period we have already discussed, archaeology has led to an exponential increase in the number of inscriptions and it is safe to say that the political history of the islands, and more importantly the *peraea*, could not have been written if it were not for inscriptions coming from various collections and controlled excavations. Apart from the first corpora of Greek inscriptions deriving from the islands, *Inscriptiones Graecae* XII 1 and 4, and the new inscriptions which can be found in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* from 1923 onwards, there have been a number of significant publications and epigraphic collections which are geographically specific to the south-eastern Aegean (Paton and Hicks 1891; Maiuri 1925; Blinkenberg 1941; Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli 1949-51; Fraser and Bean 1954; Debord and Varinlioğlu 2001 to name the most important).

Inscriptions yield important information on various aspects of the political, economic, social and religious lives of the islanders on the one hand, as well as the diplomatic relationships between states and on political history generally. On the other hand, excavations have also produced a vast quantity of pottery allowing scholars to refine and establish more secure chronological boundaries. In that respect, the Hellenistic pottery coming from closed excavation units such as funerary assemblages and undisturbed deposits is very important for the establishment of a *terminus post quem*.

Furthermore, the architecture and style of graves can offer valued chronological insights through the careful assessment of a regional and interregional typology.

The process of dating tombs and burial assemblages often has its own problems, some of which are presented in chapter 3 (see section 3.1). For this study, the beginning of the Hellenistic period is the late 4th c. (350 – 300 BC) as evidenced by grave architecture. More specifically, the earliest Hellenistic tombs on the islands, namely the Charmyleion at Kos and the Lycian tombs at Kastellorizo, date to the late 4th c. BC. Late 4th c. tombs have also been discovered in Nisyros and Rhodes and though they are not as many, they provide interesting insights in the funerary customs of the early Hellenistic period. The majority of the tombs on the islands and the *peraea*, however, date between the 3rd and the 1st c. BC.

Reuse of the tombs and funerary monuments in the Hellenistic and Roman periods as well as the lack of specific dating in a considerable number of funerary assemblages, may hinder the establishment of precise chronological boundaries. In the absence of secure archaeological dating, the end of the period under review will be considered as the sack of the islands by Cassius in 43 BC (Plutarch, *Life of Brutus*, 44.2), or the late 1st c. BC in general. As such, undated assemblages will not be examined.

1.3. Natural and political geography of the South-Eastern Aegean

The geographical extent of the South-Eastern Aegean (**Map 1**) as demarcated in this study includes the islands of the Dodecanese (older form: *Δωδεκάνησος* or modern *Δωδεκάνησα*, meaning twelve islands) and certain territories in coastal Asia Minor (modern Turkey): from Theangela opposite Kos to the wider area of Caunus in the Carian

coast. These territories were incorporated in the Rhodian state at various stages before or during the Hellenistic period. This geographical area is important not only because it was affected by various social, political and cultural processes in the Hellenistic period, but also because it is understudied in terms of its funerary archaeology. With the exception of a few studies concentrating on specific islands or cemeteries within these islands (see Chapter 3, section 3.1), there has been no systematic synthesis of the funerary evidence so far from across the region, including the sites of the *peraea*. As we will see, this is mainly due to the lack of systematic excavations as well as extensive looting throughout the centuries (see section 1.7 below). Moreover, the area under study has long been treated as a geographical continuation of Asia Minor in the Aegean with an emphasis on the island of Rhodes and its rich and diverse history in the Hellenistic period. For all these reasons, an integrated approach is required, to ensure that the evidence is analysed most effectively across various geographical and thematic variables. We also need to shift from traditional typological or strictly regional archaeological approaches and emphasise on the islanders, as evidenced into the funerary remains.

Rhodes has been the dominant island in the Dodecanese since prehistory and the modern administrative capital of the region, while Agathonisi, Astypalaia, Kalymnos, Karpathos, Kasos, Kastellorizo (ancient Megiste), Kos, Leros, Nisyros, Patmos, Rhodes, Symi, Telos, and Chalki are the main islands of the group. The cluster of islands (**Map 2**) is confined to the north by the islands of Samos and Ikaria, to the south by the sea of Karpathos and south-east by Kastellorizo, to the west by the Cretan Sea and the north-west by the Cyclades. The region can be divided further into two subsections: the north including Agathonisi, Patmos, Leros, Kalymnos and Kos among others and the south comprising mainly of Rhodes, Telos, Chalki, Karpathos and Kasos; the Datça peninsula (Knidian peninsula) acts as a natural separator between the north and the south.

Kastellorizo, on the other hand, is the most easterly island of the Dodecanese (and the easternmost territorial border of Greece) and almost a separate unit; it is quite isolated from the rest of the islands (**Map 3**) and located only 5.5 kilometres (Ashton 1995, 3) from the coastal city of Kaş (ancient Antiphellos).

The *peraea*[1] (*περαία*), literally translated as the territory 'lying opposite', is broadly defined as 'the mainland possession of an island state' (Welwei 2000, cf. Gabrielsen 2000, 49 who argues that the term *peraea* can also be used to designate the controlled territories of a mainland state; on these territories see also Funke 1999, 57; Constantakopoulou 2007, 233-4). As such, the Rhodian *peraea* itself is not the natural geographical continuation of the islands,[2] but rather a constructed, neighbouring territory produced by various political actions (**Map 4**). At this point, it is essential to define the political boundaries of the Rhodian state and its *peraea* in historical terms. *Damos Rhodion*, the city of the Rhodians, was created around 407-8 BC according to Diodorus, when the citizens of the three main cities of the island – Ialyssos, Kameiros and Lindos – merged into one polis ('μετῳκίσθησαν είς μίαν πόλιν'), an event known as the Rhodian *synoecism* (Diod. 8.75). The polis of Rhodes was established on the northern edge of the island, eventually turning into one of the most important political and cultural centres in the area throughout the Hellenistic period. In the same period, some of the Aegean islands were under the direct control of the Rhodian state, others formed part of the Rhodian League of the Islanders founded in the 2nd c. BC and retained their independence, while few of them were gifted and eventually subjected to Rhodes in 1st c. BC (see below).

[1] I have maintained the original spelling of the term *peraea* (instead of *peraia* as it appears in recent publications) after Fraser and Bean (1954).
[2] Note, however, that geologically the Dodecanese and the Carian coast originate from the subduction of the African plate in the Aegean (Higgins and Higgins 1996, 151; Georgiadis 2003, 4).

Upon Alexander's death, western Asia Minor came under the influence of Antigonus (Diodorus 19.80-5, 93-4; Will 1979-1982, 61-5), who was ultimately defeated and killed by the other generals in the Battle of Ipsus in 301 BC (Plutarch *Demetrius* 28-30). Thus, the west coast passed into the hands of Lysimachus for a brief period of time, until 281 BC when he was killed and his territory was incorporated into the Seleucid kingdom. Around the same time, Philetairos usurped Lysimachus' treasury and established the Attalid dynasty at Pergamon, which grew rapidly in power and established itself as an equal opposite the three dominating kingdoms. Consequently, within the next century, the Hellenistic monarchs struggled to exercise control over Asia Minor and to extend their dominion over it. Ptolemy took over Caria and Lycia, yet Ephesus and Miletus remained neutral and under the auspice of Rhodes despite the control exercised by the Antigonid kings (Sherwin-White 1978, 83). By the time Ptolemy assumed control of the League of the Islanders, Samos and Kos came under Ptolemaic control in 246 and 309 BC respectively: Samos became a member of the League of the Islanders along with Astypalaia (for Samos see IG XII.7 506 and for Astypalaia see IG XI.3 204), and a Ptolemaic military base was set on the island as in Thera, whilst Cos despite being under Ptolemaic control developed close relationships with Rhodes to the end of the Hellenistic period.

Yet, Ptolemaic supremacy in the Aegean was not without problems. In 229 BC, the ambitions of Macedon over the Aegean and western Asia Minor heated when Antigonus III Doson came to the Macedonian throne. Thus, in 227 he launched an expedition to Caria, and eventually captured Priene, which was more than eager to escape from the influence of Pergamon (Will 1979-1982, 366-71). By the end of the 3rd c. BC, instability prevailed. After the recovery of Seleucid lands previously held by the Attalids, Achaios, the general of Antiochus III, proclaimed himself the ruler of Asia Minor. The cities of the

western Aegean were divided among the prevailing powers: Miletus was probably Seleucid (Polybius 5.35), whilst Samos and Ephesus were under Ptolemaic control (Shipley 1987, 191). The Ptolemies managed to retain their possessions in the South-Eastern Aegean such as Kos and Kalymnos, until the end of the 3rd c. BC. From 221 to 188 BC, Rhodes became the new equilibrium of power in the Aegean.

Rhodes presents a special case in the history of the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period mainly because it managed to retain its independence and flourish in terms of trade, economy, shipping and culture more than any other island in the Aegean. A diachronic characteristic of Rhodian history is the maintenance of good relations with all the Hellenistic monarchs, especially during the early period (Diodorus 81.4).

The strategic location of Rhodes at the crossroads of the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean region, attracted the interest of Antigonos in the early Hellenistic period, who invited the Rhodians to side with him against Ptolemy, and when the latter refused to submit under his influence, his son Demetrius turned against Rhodes and attempted to besiege the city by land and sea in 305-304 BC without result (Diodorus 20.82.4-5). Thus, Rhodes managed to secure its independence and neutrality, and, at the same time, to protect its financial interests in the Aegean region.

From 200 BC, the growing interference of Rome in Greece forced the Hellenistic monarchs to claim their territorial rights. As a result, Philip V campaigned against the Ptolemaic possessions in the Aegean without success and was forced to remove his garrisons from Asia Minor (Polybius 18.44). The decision of the Romans to leave Rhodes in charge of the area was against the interest of the Ptolemies. In 196 BC the Rhodians organized a treaty between Miletus and Magnesia on the Meander, and both cities were

granted their liberty (Will 1979-1982, 184). At the same time, Rome gifted the Lycian and Carian coastline to the island, therefore expanding its *peraea*.

Within the first decades of the 2nd c. BC, Rhodes reached the peak of its prosperity and the Rhodian protectorate supported by Rome expanded to the South-Eastern Aegean, especially after the war of Antiochus III against Rome (192 – 189 BC), which ended abruptly for the king after the treaty of Apamea in 188 BC (Will 1979-1982, 294). The war was a considerable blow to the Seleucid powers and their former territories were shared between the Attalids and the Rhodians (the Attalids gained the areas north to the Meander, whilst the Rhodians gained Lycia and parts of Caria south of the river Meander (Gabrielsen 1997, 47). Nevertheless, this period of prosperity and wealth did not last long for Rhodes; in 167 BC Rome removed Caria and Lycia from the Rhodes's sovereignty due to the denial of the Rhodians to ally with Rome against Perseus. Subsequently, the declaration of Delos as a free port in 166 BC gave a serious blow to the Rhodian economy, and the island was forced into a treaty with Rome in 164 BC, effectively ending Rhodian independence. The islands under Rhodian influence, were gradually incorporated into the Roman Empire, though most of them managed to retain their autonomy. Despite its subjection to Rome, Rhodes remained an important centre and rapidly evolved into a major cultural and educational centre for Roman nobility. The end of the Hellenistic period in the island and the wider area of the South-Eastern Aegean was marked by the siege of Cassius on the islands in 42 BC (Will 1979-1982, 295).

Overall, the Hellenistic period in the Aegean islands and Asia Minor, though usually treated as a period of gradual decline, was an era of intensive political and economic fermentations, migrations and installation of new populations coming either from Italy or the Eastern Mediterranean. As a result, the islands were transformed into cosmopolitan harbours with intensive political, cultural and religious activity. Therefore,

beyond the turbulent political and military history of the period in the wider Hellenic world, many of the Aegean islands may be seen as protagonists rather than pawns within the ever changing world of the Hellenistic *oikoumene*.

For this thesis, only some of the islands of the Dodecanese will be examined along with Rhodes, also known as the *incorporated islands* (Fraser and Bean 1954, 138), namely Kos, Chalki, Telos, Nisyros and Astypalaia, which belong to the modern island complex of the Dodecanese. Other islands that were part of the League of the Islanders and could have been under the influence of Rhodes in the early and middle Hellenistic periods, (Constantakopoulou 2012), belong geographically to the central Aegean in the area defined by the Cyclades and therefore are of no topographical relevance to this study. Furthermore, Kastellorizo (ancient Megiste) will be included in this study. It has been argued (Fraser and Bean 1954, 54) that Megiste was part of the incorporated Rhodian *peraea*, whereas the literary sources indicate that the island was Rhodian and potentially belonged to the Rhodian *demes*-system (Pseudo-Scylax, 99, GGM I, 73; Strabo XIV, 3, 7). On the other hand, Kos, the second largest island in the Dodecanese came into a *synecoismos* in 366 BC (Sherwin-White 1978, 65-8) and preserved close ties with the Ptolemies for the most of the Hellenistic period. The island of Kalymnos came initially under the influence of the Ptolemies after the death of Alexander, and eventually created a *homopoliteia* with Kos in the late 3rd c BC (Sherwin-White 1978, 65-8).

The second area of study is known in scholarship as the Rhodian *peraea*, denoting the geographical region under the control of the Rhodian state in coastal Asia Minor (**Map 5**). The Rhodian *peraea* was conventionally divided by Fraser and Bean (1954, 53) into two distinct categories; this distinction has endured in modern scholarship (Berthold 1984, 42, n. 16; Constantakopoulou 2007, 243): the Incorporated *peraea*, being the 'territory which formed an integral part of the Rhodian state and participated in the

demes-system, and whose inhabitants ranked politically equal to those of the island' (Fraser and Bean 1954, 53), and the Subject *peraea*, defined as the 'territory acquired, and lost, at various times by Rhodes, whose inhabitants stood to the island city in the relation of subject to suzerain' (Fraser and Bean 1954, 53). What is known as the incorporated territory was approximately the area from between Loryma in the south and Theangela in the north, while subject territory extended up to Caria, Lycia and possibly the Knidian peninsula. Sections of Caria (Reger 1999) and Lycia (Bresson 1999) were gifted to the Rhodian state in several occasions for a brief time in the aftermath of the war against Antiochus III in 189 BC (Gabrielsen 1997, 47-53).

In modern terms, what one can define as the Rhodian *peraea* in coastal Turkey is the wider area south of Bodrum opposite Kos to the Muğla Province on the south-west of the Turkish coast. Most of the sites of the incorporated *peraea* are located on the periphery of two major peninsulas which geographically enclose the island of Symi in the Gulf of Doris (Gulf of Symi): Datça peninsula on the north-west and Bozburun peninsula on the east of Symi respectively. Various sites of the incorporated *peraea* are also located in the Gulf of Marmaris on the north-east of the Bozburun peninsula. The short-lived subject *peraea* is a more abstract geographical designation corresponding to three areas in coastal Turkey that were allegedly gifted to Rhodes after the Peace of Apamea (Fraser and Bean 1954, 70-2, see below):

1/ The provinces of Antalya and Muğla on the southern coast of Turkey and the inland of the Burdur Province corresponding to ancient Lycia for which there is no material evidence (Fraser and Bean 1954, 70) and Dalyan (close to Lycian Caunus), a city in the Muğla Province located between the districts of Marmaris and Fethiye on the south-west coast.

2/ The area defined as northern Caria on the north and north-east of ancient Stratonikeia located at the present village of Eskihisar in the Muğla Province north-east of Bodrum. Again, the area has not produced any material evidence indicating Rhodian links besides the ancient sources (Fraser and Bean 1954, 70).

3/ The area between Sedir Adası (ancient Cedrae) and Eskihisar (ancient Stratonikeia) on the north of the Bozburun peninsula where quite a few inscriptions mentioning or honouring Rhodians have been unearthed (Fraser and Bean 1954, 71).

It should be made clear from the outset that this differentiation is a modern construction and the distinction between incorporated and subject *peraea* is often blurred (Papachristodoulou 1989b, 242; Gabrielsen 2000; Constantakopoulou 2007, 243; Carusi 2003, 220). Only a handful of sites have been identified archaeologically within the incorporated *peraea*, and even less have produced burial evidence for the given period. On the other hand, the territories of the subject *peraea* are poorly understood in literature and archaeology.

The majority of the islands are small in size with infertile and rocky terrain with small mountains and lowlands (Higgins and Higgins 1996, 151). Rivers do not flow on the islands, but there are abundant torrents and streams. On the other hand, the Turkish coast opposite the Dodecanese is quite asymmetrical made of many indented inlets and elongated peninsulas. Hills and low mountain ranges are the main characteristics of the area which is less dry due to the presence of water resources thus encouraging the cultivation of common Mediterranean species such as olive trees and vineyards (for the

cultivation of these species in the Mediterranean see Boardman et al. 1976; Johnson 1989, 35-46).

Yet, the most important connecting element between the islands and the Turkish coast is the sea itself. The centrality of the sea to communications dictates that short-distance voyages must have been an everyday routine activity for the islanders and those living in the coastal sites not only for the exchange of goods and services but also leisure. It is no coincidence that the prominent geographical position of Rhodes along with various social, economic, cultural and political factors that occurred in the Hellenistic period, facilitated the emergence of the island as an important maritime centre (Gabrielsen 1997). For instance, the maritime route from Rhodes to Alexandria was not very long with favourable winds (three and a half days approximately according to Diodorus 3.33). Nonetheless, the sea was not always a connecting but also a dividing agent in the insular landscape of the Dodecanese; this is particularly evident in the case of ancient Megiste where although there is evidence for interactions with the Rhodian state and the rest of the islands, it is possible that the island was not favoured for permanent habitation as a result of its isolated geographical position (Ashton 1995, 18). However, the above hypotheses cannot be confirmed until the island is properly excavated.

1.4. Social mobility and population increase in the Hellenistic period: the evidence from the South-Eastern Aegean

As part of a comparative and interdisciplinary project that encompasses all aspects of mobility in the Mediterranean over the *longue durée*, Moatti has identified

several types of mobility that flourished in the area from prehistory to modern times: individual, collective, pacific, violent, voluntary, controlled, negotiated, clandestine, permanent and pendular (Moatti 2004; see also Oliver 2011, 346). Some of these categories intersect, while others apply to very specific contexts. The Hellenistic period saw many changes in mobility patterns across the Mediterranean, the South-Eastern Aegean being no exception. Funerary evidence suggests that the nature of these movements was usually long-term or permanent. This is indicated by the plethora of funerary inscriptions on funerary monuments across the South-Eastern Aegean (Fabricius 1999, 212). In Rhodes and Kos especially, at least 200 different ethnic names are known, most of which belong to metics from the rest of the islands, Asia Minor, Egypt and Syria (Morelli 1955, 136; for ethnic names of the associations see Pugliese-Carratelli 1939-40, 195). The nature of this movement was mainly socio-economic, perhaps triggered by a desire to seek better opportunities elsewhere, even if this meant moving to a neighbouring island. In the South-Eastern Aegean mobility was internal as well. The funerary evidence suggests that the movement of Rhodian citizens in the islands and the *peraea* was flexible especially in the 2nd c. BC (Fraser 1977).

In this context, the conditions of cultural interaction are also important. Interactions can be roughly codified into 'symmetrical' and 'asymmetrical' states (Yao 2008, 10-4). Symmetrical states arise when two societies of comparable intensities of socio-political complexity and development come into contact with one another, which may or may not lead to the incorporation of one society within the other. The South-eastern Aegean fits into the category of symmetrical interaction. From the 4th c. onwards, the islands went through different states of influence and interaction. At the time of Alexander's conquest, the old *demes* of Rhodes unified under a common synoecism, which led to the creation of the polis of Rhodes on the northern end of the island. The newly

founded city, which was partly or wholly outside the hereditary *demes*-framework of the old cities (for an overview of the debate see Gabrielsen 1992, especially n. 12), gradually developed its own social and political structure.

The governance system on the island – somewhere between the prototypes of the democratic city-states of mainland Greece and the influence of a local aristocratic elite with strong interconnections comprised mostly by merchants and seafarers - affected neighbouring islands and it is assumed that they gradually came into the direct or indirect influence of Rhodes from the 4th c. BC onwards (Fraser and Bean 1954). This interaction between Rhodes and the islands was based on the *demes*-system of the former; according to the epigraphical sources the 'Rhodians' residing on the islands all belonged to a specific *deme* of the island of Rhodes.

In the 2nd century BC, the islands experienced an influx of foreign populations, either Greeks or non-Greeks, that can be divided in two broad categories: on the one hand short-term visitors who travelled around the Mediterranean world for economic, military and religious purposes and on the other hand the appearance of permanent populations that chose the islands as their stable residency (Errington 2012, 134). Epigraphic evidence suggests that foreigners had limited rights of participation in the political life of the islands, yet they formed and maintained a great number of private associations (Pugliese-Carratelli 1953). We know of 170 associations in total (Fabricius 1999, 212). The members of the *koina* came from major trade cities of the Eastern Mediterranean and while they were not politically important, they had considerable economic power (Pugliese-Carratelli 1939-40, 176; Konstantinopoulos 1967, 60. Members of the associations belonged to an economic elite and were organised along tribe lines and other activities that imitated sectors of civic life (i.e. athletic competitions with officials of the *poleis,* funerary symposia). However, there was no tension between the local elites of

citizens, who could also belong to associations (see for example the Rhodian associations, Morelli 1955, 127; Pugliese Carratelli 1939-40, 147) and the members of the associations of foreigners, because the latter could not become full members of the *polis* even in the late Hellenistic period (Fabricius 1999, 213). In the South-Eastern Aegean, the separation line in the society was not among the foreigners of various origins but between metics and Rhodian citizens. The concurrence of different populations of various origins, which were essentially a minority that had to contend with the local elite with longstanding traditions of its own, led to a *sui generis* multi-culturalism with various dynamics.

1.5. History of research

Research on the Hellenistic funerary archaeology of the Dodecanese and the *peraea* has been fuelled by the discovery and sporadic excavation of cemeteries and graves as well as the collection of stelai and funerary epigrams on the islands and the coastal sites of Asia Minor from the late 19th century onwards. Undoubtedly, focus has been placed on the island of Rhodes, since rescue excavations by the Greek Archaeological Service in the modern city of Rhodes have brought into light hundreds of simple and monumental tombs dated from the mid-fourth century to the late Roman period. Alfred Billiotti and Auguste Salzmann were the first to conduct excavations on Rhodes in the 1870s. Their interest focused on Ialyssos, the geometric, archaic and classical necropoleis at Kameiros (Salzmann 1875), Kymissala (one of the Kameirian *demes*), where they excavated tombs of the Iron Age and the archaic period (Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 420-1; 442; Smith 1883, 136; Smith 1885, 371), and Lindos where they described the visible Hellenistic monumental tombs in the north of the port and the Krana plateau respectively

(for the tomb at Agios Milianos, see Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 380-22, and for the Tomb of Archokrates see Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 378-80). Generally, their work can be described as amateurish, yet they managed to survey the Rhodian countryside extensively reporting sites, temples, parts of cemeteries and scattered pottery sherds, but failed to place them in context. The finds from their excavations, distributed in various foreign museums, were reported in 'L'isle de Rhodes' published in 1881 (Billiotti and Cottret 1881).

Besides focusing on the countryside they managed to describe a few monumental tombs in the area of the urban necropoleis outside the walls of the city of Rhodes. The first one was at Korakonero (Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 460-2) and it is only known to us from their descriptions, while the second one is visible at the valley of Rhodini (Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 483-485; Patsiada 2013). Furthermore, according to their observations, a number of rock-cut tomb façades close to the so-called Tomb of the Ptolemies at Rhodini were decorated with reliefs, which unfortunately do not survive nowadays (Billiotti and Cottret 1881, 494-5; Patsiada 2013). Between 1900 and 1914 the Carlsberg Institute of Denmark, directed by K. F. Kinch and C. Blinkenberg, conducted excavations on the acropolis of Lindos and surveyed the area in the environs as well as many sites in the eastern and southern parts of the island. Their observations on the Lindian necropoleis have been gathered, edited and enriched by E. Dyggve as part of the third volume in the Lindos excavations series (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 479-504). By surveying the area around the acropolis, they located numerous sites with tombs most of which dated up to the Classical period, and fewer Hellenistic ones, namely two destroyed rock-cut chambers containing Hellenistic pottery shards and a rectangular base for a cylindrical altar in the area of Achtarmas (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 482), as well as a small cemetery of Hellenistic tombs on the south of the modern city in the area of Vigli

(Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 483) which remains unexcavated. According to their observations, there was no trace of burial on the acropolis itself with the exception of certain funerary spolia, dating to the Hellenistic period, used as building material on the acropolis.

Furthermore, they published two important Hellenistic monumental tombs both of which were built on conspicuous locations: the rock-cut tomb with an elaborate, architectural, two-storey façade above the western section of the city on the Krana plateau also known as the Tomb of Archokrates, the family tomb of a priest of Athena Lindia as identified by inscriptions (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 491-504, pl. XIII, B, C; XIII, 12-22); and the Hellenistic round mausoleum (erroneously identified with the tomb of Kleoboulos in early bibliography), built on the highest part of a hill north of the port overlooking the islet of Phanos also known as Agios Milianos due to its conversion into a church during the Byzantine period. Both tombs, despite being looted and stripped of their funerary offerings, provide useful insights on the burial customs of the provincial, Rhodian elite.

Rock-cut monumental tombs of various sizes and types dispersed in the urban necropoleis of Rhodes were already described by 19th century travellers. In 1830, the French General Rottiers described the so-called Tomb of the Ptolemies at Rhodini as a temple dedicated to Demeter (Rottiers 1830, 199 ff, pl. 23, 75). In the late 1850s and early 1860s, Ludwig Ross described various monumental tombs in the city of Rhodes in the third volume of his monumental work entitled 'Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des agalschen Meers' (Ross 1845, 90-1 for the city of Rhodes, and 73-4 for the Tomb of Archokrates at Lindos). In 1850, he described the Tomb of the Ptolemies in more detail, along with a neighbouring monumental tomb of the Hellenistic period, known in the bibliography as the Corinthian tomb in the valley of Rhodini (Ross 1850, 210-4 for the

Tomb of the Ptolemies, and 212 for the Corinthian tomb). At the same time, he gathered and published various funerary inscriptions from the central necropolis (Ross 1845).

A few years later, in 1854, Victor Guerin, member of the French Archaeological School, surveyed the city and other areas around the island, and published his finds in 'L'isle de Rhodes et description de cette isle' two years later. As part of his extensive survey, which focused on the contemporary traditions of the Rhodian countryside, he described a small necropolis in the area of Korakonero (Guerin 1856, 157) in the city of Rhodes, as well as various funerary monuments at Rhodini, where he identified the cavernous constructions as quarries (Guerin 1856, 155-60). Finally, in his book 'Travels and Discoveries in the Levant I' C. T. Newton, described at least three tombs in the south-eastern side of the acropolis (Newton 1865, 178-81) and the so-called Tomb of the Shield, a rock-cut funerary monument with a shield relief on its façade (Newton 1865, 170), which was subsequently excavated by Ios Zervoudaki in the 1970s (Chapter 3, section 3.3.3c). Hiller von Gaertringen visited Rhodes in 1895 and gathered inscriptions, funerary ones included, which he published as part of the Inscriptiones Graecae corpus (XII,I).

In 1913, L. Pernier and G. G. Porro of the Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, surveyed the area of Kymissala and the western coast of the island (Pernier 1914, 236-42), whilst in 1915, A. Maiuri, excavated small parts of the necropolis (where he discovered some Hellenistic tombs) and mapped the antiquities of Kymissala with precision (Maiuri 1916, 285-98). In 1926 the 'Archaeological – Historical Institute FERT' was established at Rhodes and resumed excavations in various parts of the island and other islands of the Dodecanese, namely Nisyros and Chalki. The Italians excavated a number of cemeteries at Ialyssos and Kameiros, all of which dated from the prehistoric to the late archaic/early classical period. During their surveys around the island they reported but did not excavate numerous clusters of graves and cemeteries of all periods,

some of which were Hellenistic. Finally, they published funerary monuments and inscriptions of the Hellenistic period (Inglieri 1936, 23ff).

In 1947 the islands of the Dodecanese were united with modern Greece and the newly founded Ephorate of Antiquities initiated a systematic exploration of the vast necropoleis, situated outside the walls in the south of the city of Rhodes, began in the 1960s, when the need for expansion grew. To date, rescue excavations have revealed hundreds of cemeteries and fewer monumental graves recorded yearly in the Chronika series of the *Archaiologikon Deltion*. For reasons of practicality and convenience, the archaeologists have divided the vast necropolis into three topographical sectors: western, central and eastern.[3] All three of them consist of simple cemeteries of rock-cut graves and/or monumental assemblages of various types, spanning from the late 4th century BC to the late Roman period (1st – 2nd centuries AD). Though focus has been on the urban necropoleis, the Ephorate has excavated Hellenistic graves at Kymissala, Ialyssos and the outskirts of the city of Rhodes. In the words of P. M. Fraser 'necropoleis of a date later than the mid-fourth century have not been found in the areas of the 'old cities' (Fraser 1977, n. 1).

Despite the rich material, which remains mostly unpublished, modern scholarly focus on the necropoleis has been either on tombstones (stelai, altars, trapezai etc) or monumental architecture (Belli-Pasqua 2011, 43, n. 3-4), thus the important aspect of funerary ritual remains hugely understudied. At the same time, the lack of published reports remains crucial: only the monumental tombs at Lindos (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960,

[3] The Italians divided the necropolis in two sectors, western and eastern (the former containing the current central sector). The reports in the AD continued to employ the division of the Italians up to 1993, when entries started to appear under three distinct topographical sectors (western, central, eastern). For the purposes of this dissertation, I shall follow the current division (this includes converting the reports before 1993 to the current system of classification).

487-89; 491-504) and the monumental funerary complex at Kountouri plot (Patsiada 2013) in the central necropolis of Rhodes have been fully published.

In 1972, Lauter published an important article on Rhodini, suggesting that the area, which is full of cavernous constructions, running water and dense vegetation even today, was used as a recreational park; he was the first one to describe Rhodini an example of funerary landscape architecture (Lauter 1972, 49-58). In 1977, P. M. Fraser published his Rhodian funerary monuments (Fraser 1977), where he attempted a useful topographical division of the necropolis based on the data available at that time. He examined the published funerary monuments on the basis of their epigraphical attributes (inscriptions and to a much lesser extent iconography) and attempted to deduce information on various aspects of identity (personal, religious, communal, kinship) and social status among the deceased. Moreover, he discussed the cylindrical altars, which appear by many within the necropolis and are mostly dated to the Hellenistic period, in terms of funerary hero-cult, concluding that the evidence for heroisation is rather weak (Fraser 1977, 80-1).[4] His research, though innovative for the period, is largely outdated, since new funerary monuments have been added to the Rhodian corpus. Finally, he did not show any particular interest in placing the monuments within their place of origin (aka the necropoleis), though most of them were chance finds or products of looting, thus already stripped from their original contexts. Around the same period, Mobius and Pfuhl published their monumental opus '*Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs*', offering an exhaustive catalogue of the eastern Greek funerary monuments from the Classical to the late Roman period, thus providing a solid corpus of reference.

[4] In her study on Hellenistic, funerary, banquet reliefs (Totenmahl) from Rhodes, Samos, Kyzikos and Byzantium, Fabricius (1999, 165-79) argues that connotations of heroisation are adequately evident in the Rhodian funerary altars.

The discovery of more monumental tombs in the necropoleis during the 1980s triggered the interest of many scholars and led to the publication of articles focusing on Rhodian funerary architecture. In 1985, Lauter presented a paper on Rhodian grave typology in the conference on 'Archaeology in the Dodecanese' held in Denmark (Lauter 1988, 155-63). By re-examining the graves previously excavated by the Italians, he proposed a basic typology of four tomb types -namely tumuli graves, graves with false, rock-cut façades, rock-cut chamber tombs and hypogea. His division is now considered outdated. Moreover, he was one of the few scholars to have discussed the importance of Alexandrian influences on Rhodian grave architecture. Monumental tombs from Rhodes have also been treated in important handbooks of Greek architecture such as Lauter's 'Die Architektur des Hellenismus' (Lauter 1986, 131, 214, pl. 13a, 28a) and more recently, in Hellmann's 'L'architecture grecque: Architecture religieuse et funéraire' (Hellmann 2006, 303-4).

Vasiliki Patsiada presented a paper on Rhodian funerary architecture in the 'Rhodes, 2400 years' conference (Patsiada 1999) and has now published her PhD thesis on a late Hellenistic/early Roman funerary assemblage from the central Rhodian necropolis (Kountouris plot: Patsiada 2013). Though both works are quite useful for their plethora of information on various architectural types and a preliminary discussion of Hellenistic Rhodian funerary architecture based on the excavation data, they are largely typological. Maria Salta and Stella Palaiologou have equally published papers on Hellenistic urban cemeteries of Rhodes, though focus has been placed again on grave typology and pottery classification (Salta 1999, 47-54; Palaiologou 2002-2005, 149-52).

In 1996, Berges published the Hellenistic round altars from Kos and Rhodes along with an addendum by Patsiada offering information on architecture and burial goods from some monumental tombs in the urban necropoleis. In her book 'Die Hellenistischen

Totenmahlreliefs', Fabricius (1999) has examined, among other, the Rhodian funerary banquet reliefs in an attempt to place them within a topographical and social context. Her study, heavily influenced by Zanker's (1993) important article on identity and self-representation in the Hellenistic grave stelai from Smyrna, has produced interesting results in terms of gender representation and funerary ideology. Fabricius' research is exhaustive in its own right in a long line of publications treating Hellenistic funerary stelai in the wider area of Asia Minor.

Burial goods from the cemeteries of the island of Rhodes are rarely discussed in connection to funerary customs and ritual, and are subject to the nature of the evidence. Generally, burial goods are presented briefly in the AD. Furthermore, pottery and jewellery from the cemeteries has been published in a few articles, though discussion is once again limited to typology and classification (Giannikouri et al 1989, 56-94; Giannikouri et al 1990, 172-84; Giannikouri 1994, 233-45; Giannikouri and Patsiada 1994, 102-143; Patsiada 1996; Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 205-27). Nevertheless, these publications are important since they act as an addendum to the *Archaiologikon Deltion* entries and assist towards the contextualization of burial goods in specific assemblages.

Funerary cult has been briefly discussed by Bilde (1999), while Fabricius (1999) and to a lesser extent Berges (1996) have elaborated on the significance of funerary altars in ritual. The importance of the associations (*koina*) was treated by Pugliese-Carratelli in 1939-40, whereas the discovery of burial plots in the urban necropolis attesting to communal burials of associations has been highlighted by Gabrielsen and Fabricius. (Gabrielsen 1997, 123; Fabricius 1999).

In 2006, the Department of Mediterranean Studies of the University of the Aegean launched the collaborative research project 'Survey and Archaeological Excavation of the archaeological site of Kymissala in Attabyros' under the directorship of Assistant

Professor E. Stefanakis and the KB Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities. The primary objective of the on-going project is to map, determine and highlight the antiquities of Kymissala. The necropolis, used continuously from the submycenean to the late Roman period, lies in the valley created between the hills of Agios Phokas and Kymissala (Stefanakis and Patsiada 2009-2011, Stefanakis et al 2015). Excavations have revealed a late classical and early Hellenistic cemetery at Skali on the western foot of the Agios Phokas hill (Stefanakis 2010, 5-7) an area which according to the excavator served as the necropolis of the early Hellenistic *deme* (Stefanakis 2010, 7). Furthermore, survey on the western side of the hill leading to the coastal village of Glyphada, has revealed a cemetery of the Hellenistic period, which may be associated with a settlement of the same period located on the eastern side of the hill (Stefanakis 2009, 91-116).

As opposed to Rhodes, the Hellenistic cemeteries in the modern town of Kos are significantly unexplored. The necropoleis extended outside the city walls spanning from the archaic to the late Roman period.[5] Hellenistic funerary assemblages have been unearthed as part of the rescue excavations throughout the island. The Hellenistic necropoleis in the demos of Antimacheia (254 graves in total) are inadequately reported in the AD (Chronika entries from 1994 onwards). Smaller funerary assemblages of the Hellenistic period have also been excavated and recorded in the AD from 1980 onward in the areas of Kephalos (southern Kos), Kardamaina (where the sanctuary of Apollo is being excavated by the University of Athens), Mastichari and Pyli in central Kos, as well as the sites of Platanos and Zipari in northern Kos (Bosnakis 2006, 350-51). Grigoriadou and Skerlou have published Hellenistic pottery assemblages from the cemeteries of Kos and Antimacheia, yet their work, stripped completely from its original context, focuses

[5] Sometimes we observe a topographical division in the AD following the Rhodian example (AD 48, 1993 [Chronika], 620), but the reports on Koan graves and cemeteries are more summarized and less frequent as compared to Rhodes.

on typology and classification providing very little, if any, useful remarks on burial traditions (Grigoriadou and Skerlou 2004, 311-325).

At the Stavros chapel near Pyli in central Kos lie the remains of a Hellenistic monumental tomb excavated by the Italians in the 1930s. The discovery of an inscription in the vicinity may associate the monument to a local citizen, Charmylos and his family. The so-called heroon has been dated to the Hellenistic period by Hope-Simpson and Lanzeby on the basis of its façade (Hope-Simpson and Lanzeby 1970, 61), while inscription, variously dated between the 5th and 3*rd* c. BC, belongs to the early Hellenistic period (around 300 BC) according to Sherwin-White (1977, 207). The edifice which is highly influenced by the monumental tombs of neighbouring Asia Minor, was the product of provincial Ionian craftsmanship with certain Doric elements, and is the only example of a monumental tomb ever to be found on Kos.

The first systematic excavations on the island of Nisyros took place in 1932 under the Italian archaeologist G. Jacopi. Part of an extensive necropolis was unearthed on the Kostas property in the vicinity of Ai-Yiannis above Mandraki, the modern capital town of the island (Jacopi 1932-33). The results of the investigations were twenty two funerary pyres and two pithos burials from the archaic period, twelve pithos jars from the classical period and two Hellenistic built graves, all of which were described in detail. In 1969 Ios Zervoudaki excavated another twenty four graves dating to the fourth and third centuries BC in the area of Kampi south of Paleokastro acropolis; the results were briefly reported in the AD (Zervoudaki 1972). In the rescue excavation of the KB Ephorate on the occasion of the building of a new stadium in the area, thirty six funerary pyres were found dating from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC, a child pithos burial from the sixth century, forty one pithoi and eleven sarcophagi from the fifth and fourth centuries, and thirteen built cist graves and built-in containers from the Hellenistic period. The graves and their

furnishings have been published (Filimonos 1986). Most recently, on the occasion of the construction of the archaeological site guardhouse in 2007, a small section of the same necropolis was unearthed. Burials in pithos jars and amphorae were dated to the classical and late classical periods (Filimonos 2011).

The burials of Kastellorizo (ancient Megiste) were originally treated by Savignac in 1917, who placed the most emphasis on the so-called 'Lycian tomb'. In 1993-1994, N. G. Ashton surveyed the island and published the finds shortly after (Ashton 1995). During this archaeological survey he identified fifty-two burial sites dispersed all over the island, dating from 7th century BC to the Roman period. In the absence of burial goods and stratigraphic indicators – as the majority of the tombs were looted or destroyed – he divided the graves (and dated them accordingly) intoo twelve categories based on building and construction criteria. A relative density of graves is found in the area east and north of the Kastro and that around Aghios Georgios tou Vounou, where Kyparissis (1915) has reported the existence of at least twenty graves close to the city.

Yet, the most important funerary monument on Kastellorizo is the so-called Lycian Tomb, a monumental grave with carved platforms in its interior, located under the Kastro and dated most probably to the Early Hellenistic period (Ashton 1995, 95, nos 44, 97; Zervaki 2011). A second monument of the same type, though poorly preserved due to its transformation into a refugee dwelling during WWII, was identified by Ashton at Aghios Georgios tou Vounou (Ashton 1995, 96). Generally, the graves on Kastellorizo cannot be accurately dated due to the lack of context and similarities in construction patterns as most of the tombs are rectangular shaft graves hewn in the rock. Ashton has dated at least twenty assemblages including the Lycian tombs from the late Classical to the late Hellenistic periods.

The necropoleis of Telos are located in the eastern and southern slopes of the Aghios Stephanos hill very close to the ancient settlement. These cemeteries, though never excavated, belong to the Classical period on the basis of pottery sherds. On the west side of the settlement and along the coastline of Aghios Antonios, there is a cemetery of Hellenistic hypogea carved in the face of the rock. Large quantities of sandstone which have become loose during storms have revealed the entrance of these graves and pottery finds from within date from the 3rd c. BC onward (Kaninia 2011). In 1968, Ios Zervoudaki discovered a burial hypogeum at the site of Kena, associated with a looted set of gold jewels of Hellenistic date, which came into the possession of the Archaeological Service in 1948 after being impounded in Samos (Kaninia 2011). Unfortunately, due to limited financial means she was unable to excavate the underground chambers; in 2010 the site was revisited by the KB Ephorate revealing an extended underground burial gallery used for successive burials with a separate entrance cut for each inhumation (Kaninia 2011). The burial gallery consisted of five separate loculi each with its own entrance sealed by monolithic slabs. Due to the significant disturbance caused by illegal excavations, burial goods were found scattered and could not be associated with their original context with the exception of a few vessels which were found *in situ* in the fifth chamber (Kaninia 2011).

In 1931, the Italian Archaeological mission excavated nineteen chamber tombs in Chalki dating from the late 5th to the 3rd c. BC in the area from the foot of the hill of Chorio to Pontamos (Jacopi 1932; Palaiologou 2008; Bairami 2011, 175-6, catalogue nos 7-10, 17-24, 52-56). They also explored a looted Hellenistic tomb consisting of an antechamber and six cremations in niches at Misopea (Jacopi 1932). In the 1960s, K. Fatourou excavated a number of looted, late Hellenistic rock-cut chamber tombs along the road leading to Chorio. Many of the funerary offerings from Chalki were illegally transported

to museums abroad. The most notable item is a gold diadem now at the British Museum (Bairami 2011, 170).

The necropoleis of Astypalaia extended in front of the acropolis plateau on the eastern foot of Katsalos hill. Inhumations and cremations of children and adults dated from the Late Geometric to the Roman period. An astonishing number of infant pot burials (enchytrismoi) were revealed at the necropolis of Kylindra on the northwest of the Chora most of which dated to the archaic period, a unicum in Greek archaeology. More recently, another necropolis was discovered in the wider region of the Chora at Myloi consisting of at least twenty Hellenistic rock-cut tombs belonging to adults (Michalaki-Kollia 2010).

As far as the Rhodian *peraea* is concerned, sixty years after Fraser and Bean's survey more information has been added to the corpus of inscriptions (Bresson 1991; Blümel 1991) and the small fortified town of Loryma (or Larymna) was briefly excavated in the 1990s (Held 1999). Material evidence of cemeteries and graves in this area is very limited and the landscape has altered significantly due to human intervention (i.e. building works, urbanisation), thus contributing to the destruction of several of these sites. During my reconnaissances in the area in the summer of 2014, I managed to locate cemeteries and individual graves in the following sites: Turunç (ancient Amos), Sedir Adası (ancient Cedreae), Altinsivrisi/Karacasöğüt (ancient Euthena/Amnistos) and Bozuk Bükü (ancient Loryma). Not all the sites have been excavated.

The walled city of Amos and its cemetery were originally located and described by Maiuri in the 1920s (1921-1922, 415-9), while Cedreae was identified with the island of Sedir Adası as attested by inscriptions found in situ (Maiuri 1922, 378-84; Fraser and Bean 1954, 69). On the other hand, Euthena (or Amnistos) cannot be identified with certainty with the ancient ruins near Altinsivrisi/Karacasöğüt; the only evidence is the

epitaph of an Amnistian found a few kilometres away from the site, yet it is hardly conclusive (Fraser and Bean 1954, 69-70 conclude that the site is 'no longer discoverable'; for the epitaph see Bean and Cook 1957, 61). Finally, the walled citadel of Loryma, presumably a naval station and arsenal (Fraser and Bean 1954, 59; see also Gerding 2013, 372 for the Hellenistic shipsheds), was visited by explorers such as Leake and Ross in 1824 and 1840 respectively (Shear 1914, 451; Blümel 1991), while Benndorf and Maiuri visited and described the site in the late 1880s and early 1900s respectively (Maiuri 1921-1922, 413-4). Loryma was also surveyed by Held from 1995 to 1998 (Held 1999; 2003; 2006). These are not the only cities of the *peraea* that have identified epigraphically or archaeologically (for annotated bibliography see Debord and Varinlioglu 2001, 85), but are the only ones where tombs and cemeteries have been discovered to date. Attributing the tombs to the Hellenistic period was achieved through comparison to similar contemporary grave types from other regions.

1.6. Methodological considerations

After having highlighted the basic historical parameters and having discussed the state of research in the area of the South-Eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period, I will now proceed to some basic methodological considerations. It should be mentioned that much of the theoretical discussion will be integrated with the archaeological analysis in the following chapters. The approach to mortuary analysis which I adopt is multi-levelled and influenced by post-processual archaeology. Essentially although it has been contended that the treatment of the deceased in death reveals in multiple ways their standing in life (Saxe 1970; Binford 1972; O'Shea 1984), archaeologists have long

debated on the degree of this reflection in terms of the social status of the deceased. The presumption that the burial echoes the relationship between the deceased and the society he belonged in, has been debated by archaeologists in the study of various archaeological and anthropological contexts (Goodenough 1965; Saxe 1970; Binford 1972; Tainter 1978; Goldstein 1980). At the same time, burials can offer glimpses into the decisions made by the living for the dead; those decisions can be coloured by the personal choices of the living, their state of emotional consciousness and the circumstances of death among others (Hodder 1982; Parker Pearson 1999).

I propose that human expression in the mortuary setting is projected in three major areas: personal, social and cultural identities as they are understood by a given community (e.g. living – deceased). These three concepts and their sub-divisions are interconnected, often overlapping and cannot be treated separately when examining funerary remains. These actions sometimes may be reflected in the burial record as conscious choices; for instance, roughly from the 2nd c. BC, monumental tombs appeared on the island of Rhodes and their reuse within a wide chronological span (Patsiada 1999) by generations belonging to the same family or kin group, suggests a direct involvement in their overall planning as well as their architectural and decorative execution. At the same time, burial goods and funerary inscriptions may be the material realizations of personal identification attributes ascribed by the bereavers to the bereaved (Tarlow 1999). As such, a dead person is not necessarily remembered only for his status in life, but also as a beloved family member, or any other roles they held in their private lives and were subsequently transcribed or idealized in death (Hodder 1982, 146). Under this context, the concepts of collective identity and commemoration in relation to the funerary remains will be equally discussed within the framework of this thesis. Along these lines, the treatment of funerary ritual will add to our understanding all the ways

through which individuals and communities approached death in the South-Eastern Aegean. To this end the culmination of the funerary ritual as well the quest for the identification of personal, social and cultural identities will be analysed in respect to the following parameters which can be interchangeable:

1/ Material remains:

Material remains such as grave architecture, funerary monuments and grave goods are important for the study of funerary ritual and identity. However, not all of them can be analysed equally due to insufficient publication, lack of excavations as well as looting. Similarly, the lack of bioarchaeological studies prevents us from drawing conclusions that would enlighten biological aspects of the life and death of various individuals in the South-Eastern Aegean.

Luckily, the satisfactory preservation of the grave architecture, allows a careful examination of the available evidence as well as identification of its salient features. This must be a two-way process: presuppositions and generalizations about typology will restrict the range of patterns we can see, and so we should be prepared to enhance our appreciation with the aid of auxiliary material such as inscriptions or iconography.

Typological analyses often tend to concentrate on sameness rather than diversity; therefore we should be careful enough to balance between both. In addition to the elaboration and diversity of a given assemblage, there is also the issue of contrasting architectural forms (e.g. local vs foreign features) adding to the discussion of various forms of cultural interactions and interchange.

At the same time, burial goods are indicators of status and identity but can also be charged with symbolic perceptions of the afterlife. More importantly, they are indicative

of the private and social values of the deceased and contribute towards the reconstruction of the identities of distinct social groups such as women and children.

2/ Funerary ritual and symbolism:

Funerary ritual in this study is important, especially given the contrasting and parallel use of practices such as inhumation and cremation (often side-by-side within cemeteries) in the burial repertoire. Via a careful examination of the available archaeological evidence, including funerary cylindrical altars, we shall attempt to reconstruct the burial sequence from the moment of death to post-funerary ritual and commemoration and discuss concepts such as liminality and performance both in terms of archaeological and iconographic variables.

Iconography and funerary symbols as presented in funerary monuments as well as funerary goods correspond to a number of meanings. Cylindrical altars, in particular, are central to our study because of their characteristics and distribution. They are found in abundance in the South-Eastern Aegean and potentially played an important role in funerary and post-funerary ritual.

3/ Landscape:

Finally, the identification and exploitation of deathscapes in relation to the insular landscape of the South-eastern Aegean is important for the study of communication networks or isolation patterns between the islands and the *peraea*. As such the concept of insularity will be taken into consideration in the discussion of identity.

It is important to understand that there are no universal frameworks which can be applied to the interpretation of the materialisation of funerary ritual and identity, thus archaeological analysis must be as contextual as possible. Due to the chronological and geographical imbalance of the available evidence, I have opted for a thematic organisation of the chapters. Chapter 2 will offer a geographical and topographical introduction to the burial landscapes of the South-Eastern Aegean. By discussing in detail the geographical location and topographical characteristics of the tombs and the cemeteries, I aim to provide a better understanding of the sepulchral landscape of the South-Eastern Aegean. At the same time, I analyse the dialectic relationship between the tombs and the landscape and how this contributes to the creation of deathscapes. In Chapter 3 I provide a thorough typological presentation of the burial architecture of the South-Eastern Aegean in context. This chapter is a collection and synthesis of the available evidence and will be used as a basis for the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 3 is divided into two sections followed by a discussion; the first section looks at non-monumental grave types, while the second section is dedicated to monumental tombs. The graves are categorised in regard to their basic architectural characteristics; these characteristics are then discussed in terms of regional and interregional comparanda when possible. The final part of Chapter 3 is dedicated to an extensive discussion of the diverse architectural types and their meaning in their wider geographical and socio-political context. In chapter 4 I discuss funerary ritual in detail. My reconstruction of the funerary and post-funerary ritual is a comprehensive synthesis of Hellenistic funerary ritual in the region of the South-Eastern Aegean, the first of its kind. I contend that funerary ritual is a dynamic process influenced by various cultural and socio-political factors. By applying theoretical concepts such as liminality and performance, I bring forward the richness and diversity of funerary and post-funerary

ritual practices which are characterised by an ever-growing shift from the *polis* to the individual. In chapter 5 various aspects of status and identity are discussed in regard to the mortuary record. The chapter is divided into two wider thematic parts due to the limited nature of the evidence which hinders an analytical approach per archaeological category. As such, the first part is dedicated to individual status with an emphasis on modes of disposal, while at the same time the status of women and children is explored. The second part of chapter 5 discusses collective identity with emphasis on a special case study: the mortuary provisions for associations of foreigners in the necropoleis of Rhodes as reflected in the archaeological record. Finally, identity is explored through the lens of insularity. In the closing chapter 6 I offer a brief synopsis of the main themes explored in the thesis while also providing some thoughts for further research in the area of the South-Eastern Aegean and beyond. By looking into various aspects of the Hellenistic burial customs of the South-Eastern Aegean, I expect to bring forward a comprehensive picture of the funerary and post-funerary ritual in connection to the social and cultural identities of the people living and dying in the region at the time.

1.7. Limitations of research

Before proceeding to the discussion of the evidence, let us synopsise a few limitations imposed by this study. Major shortcomings include the lack of thorough publications, the nature of the rescue excavations and surveys and the considerable amount of illicit excavations and looting. Due to the availability of the excavated material, Rhodes will be discussed more extensively than any other island. Regrettably, though excavations in the *polis* of Kos have been fruitful during the past decades, published

reports are usually brief and lack significant contextualisation. Overall, the amount of the information provided is sufficient for a comprehensive study of the area within the proposed chronological framework, but a quantitative approach is not possible due to the uneven relationship between looted and intact assemblages.

CHAPTER 2

The ancestors nearby

The deathscapes of the South-Eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period

---

2.1. Introduction

The term 'deathscape' is a concept first used in geography in relation to informal memorials for roadside accidents (Hartig and Dunn 1998). It belongs to a wider category of a variety of 'scapes', as a means for understanding contemporary social processes (Maddrell and Sidaway 2010, 4). Deathscapes primarily refer to the physical spaces of death and commemoration (i.e. cemeteries, memorials, monuments) including their fluctuating, ephemeral or long-lived characteristics manipulated by the living over time. In archaeology, the term was first introduced by Rainville (1999) in her study of mortuary variability in New Hampshire from 1770 to 1920. Ever since it has been employed in various archaeological contexts in order to describe the places associated with death and the individuals involved – whether living or dead – and how these two can be linked to provide meaning and context at different levels (i.e. tombs as means for the legitimisation of power, funerary landscapes as arenas of social and political opposition) [Parker Pearson 1999; Rakita et al 2005; Dakouri-Hild and Boyd 2016]. Although deathscapes are heavily formed and influenced by various socio-political circumstances, they are important for our understanding of the role of the individual in relation to death and memorialisation. Under this context, they can offer an additional dimension to the

archaeology of mortuary landscapes, one that encompasses the material and cognitive dimensions of spatiality and death.

Deathscapes may overlap and interrelate with various topographies – whether physical or symbolic – the most obvious of which is the natural landscape (Maddrell and Sidaway 2010, 4-5). Essentially, deathscapes incorporate the landscapes, tombs as well as the identities of the living and deceased. The funerary landscape of the South-Eastern Aegean is characterised by numerous rock-cut tombs that can be divided into many categories by their typological characteristics (see Chapter 3). The diversity of the burials is demonstrative of the wide-ranging funerary architecture both on a regional as well as an interregional level (see Chapter 3). Though few typological analyses have been undertaken (for Rhodes see Fabricius 1999 and Patsiada 2013 and for Kastellorizo see Ashton 1995), there has been no comparative and contextual assessment of the evidence from the region as a whole. More importantly, the correlations among the funerary landscape, the architecture and the environment have been significantly overlooked.

The main objective of this chapter is to provide a topographical introduction to the funerary landscape of the South-Eastern Aegean followed by a discussion of certain interesting characteristics displayed in the relationship between the cemeteries, the tombs and the environment. Although topography has changed over the centuries – either the result of natural causes or human intervention – certain characteristics of the sites and the tombs which are still visible are interesting. In particular, it is interesting to see how we engage with monumental tombs and their social significance in a funerary context. This is because, monumental tombs offer a more fertile ground for this type of analysis since they have been preserved into the landscape as opposed to the majority of cemeteries of simple graves in the South-Eastern Aegean.

2.2. Some notes on the topography of cemeteries and graves in the South-Eastern Aegean

In this section, cemeteries and monumental graves are presented in connection with their topographical context. Most of the sites are identified bibliographically and were visited during my reconnaissances in the area in 2012 and the summer of 2014. However, a few difficulties were encountered. Firstly, several of the cemeteries were excavated because of modern construction works and as such, there were not preserved. This issue is more pronounced in the city of Kos where the vast majority of the ancient urban cemeteries are now buried beneath modern buildings and remain largely unpublished. In Rhodes, on the other hand, although the situation is not particularly different, we possess more information on the topographical characteristics of the cemeteries because they have been outlined by Fraser already in the 1970s (Fraser 1977, 1-8). Some of the cities and the cemeteries of the Rhodian *peraea* were surveyed by Italian archaeologists at the beginning of the 20th century and were subsequently visited by Fraser and Bean (1954). Intense urbanisation, development of tourism and building works in the area led rapidly to the deterioration of the natural environment, and the same applies for the rest of the islands to a lesser extent.

2.2.1. a) Rhodes

In Rhodes, cemeteries of non-monumental graves and monumental graves were predominantly located in the *polis*. As was the norm with ancient Greek cities, the necropoleis were located outside the fortifications along major roads leading to and from

the city (for an extensive discussion of the topography of the cemeteries of ancient Rhodes see also Fraser 1977, 2-5; and more importantly Patsiada 2013, 3ff). Excavations have revealed that the planning of the cemeteries outside the city walls had started already in the 5th – 4th c. BC, while special precautions were taken for the subsequent expansion of the population (Filimonos 1989; Patsiada 2013, 34, especially n. 63, notes that 5th and 4th c. clusters of graves were built at a considerable distance from the city walls). The western borders of the cemeteries were defined by the acropolis hill on the north-west up to the Rhodini valley on the south, whilst the eastern one extended as far as the Karakonero region. The presence of the Makry Steno and the Rhodini ravines divided the necropoleis geographically into three sections: western, central and eastern (**Map 6**). Italian excavators were the first to propose a basic division in a western and eastern sector (Maiuri 1925, 59; Patsiada 2001, 32, n. 60) and Fraser (1977, 2 – 5) introduced a central necropolis as a sub – division of the vast western necropolis. From 1993 onwards the *Chronika* series of the *Archaiologikon Deltion* present the standard topographical tripartite division.

The western necropolis (**Map 6**) occupied the area along an ancient road leading from the north-western end of the Acropolis towards the direction of Ialyssos (modern Trianta). The majority of the graves are located at the Dokuz Sokak area (modern Parthenopis street) in the area of Makry Steno ravine. A significant number of cemeteries of late 4th and early 3rd century burials are located near the Aghios Ioannis area. The tombs were tightly arranged in clusters, and they probably belonged to families. Elaborate burial structures do not appear in the Rhodian necropoleis during the early Hellenistic period, yet the western necropolis has yielded a small number of rock-cut subterranean chambers with vaulted roofs. The burials within these chambers were arranged in rock-cut graves and loculi which contained cinerary urns, whilst some of the

chambers included furniture in the form of rock-cut funerary beds (Chapter 3, section 3.1.3).

Although Classical and early Hellenistic graves are located nearer the city walls (see above), graves of the 2nd and 1st c. BC extended towards the northern and western edge of the Makry Steno ravine, thus merging with the central necropolis; the choice of this direction is not entirely coincidental given that the quality of the terrain in the western necropolis is not great, and quarrying has been practised in the area since antiquity (Patsiada 1999). The majority of the graves were concentrated on either side of Themistokli Sofouli and Michail Petridi streets, in the wider area of Dokuz Sokak on the top of a hillock (modern Parthenopis street) (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 475-6, fig. 12-13). Not very far from this area but closer to the central necropolis, in the junction of Olympou and Spetson streets, may one discern a delimited cemetery known as the Aghios Ioannis cemetery with *periboloi* graves with carved platforms for the erection of funerary monuments (Fabricius 1999, 200-1, see fig. 33 for a reconstruction of a *peribolos*). Unlike the central and eastern necropoleis which are characterised by a number of monuments dated to the 2nd and 1st c. BC, the western necropolis lacks monumental funerary complexes except for the so-called Tomb of the Shield (Zervoudaki 1977a, 637-40). The Aghios Ioannis *periboloi* and the Tomb of the Shield appear almost out of context in the densely populated western cemetery of simple rock-cut graves, and since they date much later than the rest of the tombs in the western sector, it is plausible to suggest that they were built in this part of the cemetery either because of a general lack of space or for other reasons, which evade us. Indeed, some of the hypogea in Aghios Ioannis were used by more than one family (Maiuri 1925, 124ff), while the complex is very close to the Karika-Papachristodoulou funerary complex, an area with graves and auxiliary buildings next to them which has been interpreted as the burial plot and the gathering space of an

association of foreigners (Papachristodoulou 1984, 368; see Chapter 5, especially section 5.4.2).

The vast central necropolis lies on the hill of Kizil-Tepe, known today as the regions of Analipsi and Aghia Triada (**Map 6**). Its northern end is defined by the Hellenistic fortification, the southern by the Rhodini valley and the eastern by modern Rhodos-Lindos Boulevard. An ancient road, whose direction concurs with modern Konstantinou Tsaldari Street, crossed the central necropolis from the Kizil-Tepe hill up to the Rhodini valley (Fraser 1977, 3). Graves of all periods are cut into the soft rock, predominantly pits, cists and loculi (Chapter 3, section 3.1.2). Large sectors of the 4th and early 3rd c. with rock-cut pit graves and loculi are located in the southern part of the necropolis above Rhodini valley. As in the western necropolis, monumental complexes did not appear in this early period, although two late 4th to early 3rd century elaborate subterranean burial chambers with rock-cut graves, loculi and burial beds are located in the central necropolis (Chapter 3, section 3.1.3 a). In the 2nd and 1st centuries, following a rapid increase of the population and the influx of foreigners from various parts of the islands and the *peraea,* the central necropolis was densely occupied with both cemeteries of simple rock-cut graves, cists and loculi, and larger grave complexes with built tombs enclosed by *peribolos* walls. As such, from the second half of the 3rd c., monumental tombs were added to the burial repertoire. One of the most noteworthy characteristics of the central necropolis is the valley of Rhodini; not only does it act as a natural divider (**Maps 6 and 7**) between the cemeteries, but is also a cemetery within a cemetery due to its private and secluded nature as evidenced by the graves and funerary monuments within it (see section 2.2.3 below).

Finally, the eastern necropolis lay on the eastern side of Rhodini, (**Map 6**) and occupied the area of Karakonero along the modern Rhodos-Kallithea Avenue which

follows the course of an ancient road (Patsiada 2013, 35-6). The eastern cemetery is not densely occupied because of the soft, clayish and brittle rock. Most of the graves are located in an almost delineated area with modern pathways leading from the one grave to the other in the Karakonero region which is not as private as Rhodini (**fig. 2.1**) As in the other cemeteries, simple rock-cut pit graves and loculi predominate here during the early Hellenistic period (Konstantinopoulos 1970). From the 2nd century until the early Roman period (late 1st c. BC - 1st c. AD), burial chambers and loculi were cut into the faces of natural terraces and were crowned by terraces or pedestals upon which altars stood (Patsiada 1996, Pl. 65-6, 67.2). These *periboloi* were aligned the one next to the other and delineated the space by acting as barriers for those entering and leaving the cemetery (Konstantinopoulos 1970, fig. 14, n. 8); their prominent position in the landscape suggests that they were either the sepulchres of important individuals or families. One of the most salient topographical characteristics of the eastern cemetery of Karakonero is a funerary structure (**fig. 2.2 a-b**) in the shape of a temple (Pi-shaped *peribolos*) (Fraser 1977, 4, n. 8-9, fig. 9-10; Lauter 1988, 158, n. 33; Bilde 1999, 226-46, Pl. 77-95) whose walls were carved with almost life-size scenes from the life of Hephaistus with a Dionysiac *thiasos* (Bilde 1999, 226–246, pl. 77–95). The courtyard has not been excavated yet – it is unclear whether it was a tomb or a place for worship among burial plots. Lauter interpreted it as the meeting point of a Dionysiac association, one of the many named in various inscriptions from Rhodes, though never in connection with an actual grave (Lauter 1988, n. 33). All in all, the centrality of the complex in the landscape amidst tombs suggests that it was an important point of reference in the area, whose exact function is unknown to us.

Finally, the necropolis of Kymissala (ancient *deme* of Kymissaleis which was part of Kameiros) exhibits some interesting topographical characteristics. Located about 70

km south-west of the city of Rhodes, below the mountain range of Atavyros, the vast necropolis is part of the wider city planning on the hill of Aghios Fokas including domestic and civic buildings (Stefanakis et al. 2015). The central cemetery occupies the valley between the hills of Aghios Fokas and Kymissala, extending to the northern slope of the latter outside the area where the civic, religious and domestic buildings have been unearthed. Excavations resumed a few years ago under the direction of the Department of Archaeology at the University of the Aegean and the KB Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities. The excavators have divided the cemetery into three topographical sectors – north, east and west for practical purposes; nonetheless, the current state of research cannot reveal whether there were any deliberate topographical divisions within the cemeteries (Stefanakis and Patsiada 2009–2011, 76–86).

2.2.2. b) Rhodian funerary landscape architecture

The discussion of the topography of the cemeteries of the city of Rhodes would be incomplete without a reference to the 'garden-necropolis' of Rhodini (Lauter 1972; 1988; Carstens 2010, 334; Patsiada 2013, 221-230). Rhodini is a separate topographical section of the central cemetery of the city of Rhodes lying in the southernmost part of the latter; in a way it is a cemetery within a cemetery (**Map 7**). The area hosts a few monuments and tombs as well as numerous cavernous constructions which are generally believed to be nymphaea (Lauter 1972; 1988; Patsiada 2013, 221). Unfortunately, they have not been properly excavated. Lauter (1972) was the first to realise the deliberate interplay between funerary architecture and the natural environment in the cemetery of Rhodini, which is directly comparable to other aspects of the Rhodian urban topography such as

the acropolis of the city and the sanctuaries of Athena at Lindos and Kameiros (Patsiada 2013, 222-4).

The relationship between the landscape and the architecture at Rhodini culminates at the so-called Tomb of the Ptolemies and its surrounding environment (Chapter 3, section 3.1.3b). The tomb, which is typologically identified as a provincial mausoleum, is the central focus of the necropolis (**fig. 2.3**) and one of the most important funerary monuments in the city of Rhodes presumably because it is believed to be the *heroon* of an important individual. Despite the fact that we know little about its actual occupancy or the decisions behind its construction, the central position of the monument with the sophisticated architectural details is of particular interest because of its proximity and possible association with two monumental tombs in the surrounding area; the Corinthian tomb (**fig. 2.4**) and a large *peribolos* with carved niches (**fig. 2.5**) almost opposite the tomb of the Ptolemies and 50 m north-west of the Corinthian tomb.

The Tomb of the Ptolemies occupies a prominent position in the middle of an elevated plateau at the edge of the Rhodini water creek and signals the start of a pathway leading to the nearby tombs. Generally, the Rhodini tombs are placed in a promenade arrangement in the modern landscape; one cannot follow the pathway starting from the Tomb of the Ptolemies without passing in front of the neighbouring tombs. Although the necropolis of Rhodini has never been excavated, remains of a pathway passing from the Tomb of the Ptolemies have been identified as an extension of ancient route P27 (Patsiada 2013, 39). Excavations have shown that this path, which was constructed in the late 4th or 3rd c. BC and gradually expanded until Roman times, was part of a larger road that crossed the central necropolis and continued through Rhodini in the south (Fraser 1977, 3 was the first to identity the pathway at Rhodini; for excavations establishing the relationship between the pathway and ancient route P27 see Patsiada 2013, 39-40,

especially note 79, who contends that remains of this road continue to the north of the tomb of the Ptolemies). Future excavations may reveal whether branches of this pathway connected the monumental tombs in the valley, already from antiquity.

Overall, the intense theatricality in the architectural layout of these tombs creates an inherent relationship between the monuments, the landscape and the funerary ritual, which in a way can be experienced and appreciated even by the modern visitor.

2.2.3. c) The rest of the islands and the *peraea*

The random dispersal of tombs at Kastellorizo (Ashton 1995, 92ff with an image on page 93) suggests that the island might not have had a central settlement in antiquity, but was rather exploited for seasonal habitation and pastoralism. A relative concentration of graves mainly in the form of carved rock-cut shafts is evident in two locations (Ashton 1995, 99-112; Zervaki 2011, 36) [**map 8**]: the first can be found on the peninsula separating the two ports of the islet on the east and the north side of the Kastro. The second location is at Aghios Georgios tou Vounou where a cluster of twenty tombs was explored by Kyparissis in the beginning of the 19th century (Kyparissis 1915; Zervaki 2011, 37). The rest of the graves are dispersed on the island either individually on in small clusters, usually next to fortified rural positions (Zervaki 2011, 37). The Lycian Tomb located on the slope under the Kastro , was elevated above sea level and is visible when entering the port of Kastellorizo (Ashton 1995, 94-5); a similar grave monument is also located at Aghios Georgios tou Vounou, though it is partially destroyed (Ashton 1995, 95).

On Chalki the ancient necropolis was located in between Chorio up to the bay of Pontamo where a cemetery of rock-cut tombs was excavated by the Italians in 1931

(Jacopi 1932; Palaiologou 2008; Bairami 2011, 175) [**map 9**]. When I visited Chalki in the summer of 2014, I realised that most of the tombs were destroyed due to the poor environmental conditions, negligible restoration and the proximity of the cemetery to the nearby beach at Pontamo. I could, however, trace the openings of two of them, both of which were located very close to each other and close to the seaside. Equally, traces of the rock-cut chamber with loculi above Pontamo in the road leading from the beach to Chorio are still visible today (Bairami 2011, 175) along with various rock-cut chamber tombs which were discovered accidentally during the opening of the road in the 1960s; some of them are still visible today (Fatourou 1967, 476; Bairami 2011, 175). The Chalkean graves can, therefore, be divided into two big groups. On the one hand, the cemetery at Pontamo is quite distinctive from the rest of the burials, and it ceased to be used in the early Hellenistic period. The tombs were concentrated in a specific area, and it seems that provisions for the expansion of the cemetery were taken, since the burial chambers were hewn the one next to the other, sometimes leading to burials sharing a common antechamber (Palaiologou 2008, 47, n. 14, 15). The second group of rock-cut tombs alongside the road leading to Chorio span from the early to the Late Hellenistic periods (Bairami 2011, 175).

The graves on Telos were mostly underground chambers carved into the soft rock and in many cases they were carved the one next to the other, thus creating underground tunnels and galleries (Kaninia 2011, 243, fig. 8). The cemeteries on the island appear to extend on the west side as far as the coastline of Aghios Antonios (**map 10**), where the port of the ancient city lay (Kaninia 2011, 242). One of the most common causes of the destruction of these tombs are storms during which large masses of soft sandstone become loose and fall down the cliff face resulting in the gradual deterioration of the tombs (Kaninia 2011, 242). On the other hand, the cemeteries of ancient Nisyros are

situated in the area of Ai Ghiannis on a plateau on the east of the acropolis of the city at Palaiokastro (**map 11**); the archaic, Classical and Hellenistic necropoleis were developed close to the city harbour on the north side of Ai Ghiannis where various types of tombs have been excavated dating from the geometric to the Hellenistic periods (Filimonos 1986, 60-61). The main topographical characteristic of the Nisyrian cemeteries is that they were developed outside the city walls as in most cities. In Astypalaia (**fig. 2.6**) the Katsalos cemetery with the infant enchyntrismoi is located on the neighbouring hill to the main town of Chora with archaeological finds dating its use from the Late Geometric to Roman times (Clement 2009, 17-21; Michalaki-Kollia 2010, 161-206; see also Chapter 5, section 5.3.2).

The cemeteries of the Rhodian *peraea* I have managed to locate during my fieldwork share two common topographical characteristics: proximity to the sea and to the settlement (**map 12**). The remnants of ancient Amos are centred on the elongated hill of Asarcık at Hisarburnu (meaning fortress point), just above the gulf of Marmaris (Maiuri 1921-1922, 415-9; McNicoll 1971, 355-8, pl. 161, 162, 165; Saner 1994). The necropolis (**fig. 2.7**) is located just outside city proper, north of the city walls at a lower level, in close proximity to the coastline. A funerary road leads to several rock-cut tombs which are visible in the terrain alongside inscriptions and fragments of monumental architecture (**fig. 2.8**).

The city of Euthena (possibly known as ancient Amnistos) is tentatively located by Fraser and Bean very close to Karacasogut village in the gulf of Marmaris (Fraser and Bean 1954, 69-70). The walls of the settlement on a hillock above sea level are preserved in great condition, but modern access to the site is unsafe due to the very steep terrain. Various rock-cut pit graves are visible alongside the road that leads towards the city walls. The walled city of Loryma, on the other hand, is located at the western extremity

of the peninsula known as the Rhodian Chersonesus, opposite to and less than 25 km from Rhodes. A small cemetery of rock-cut pit graves dated to the Hellenistic period on the basis of epigraphic evidence was revealed on the south-east outside the city walls (Held 1999). Finally, a small cemetery of rock-cut pits, cists and *periboloi* graves (severely eroded by the sea nowadays) was located on the south of the city walls at Sedir Adası in the Gulf of Gökova, off the coast of Ula near Muğla, in very close proximity to the *bouleuterion* and alongside a road leading to the main gate of the ancient city (**fig. 2.9**).

2.3. The topographic context[6]

The location of the cemeteries and the monumental graves seems to have been dictated by several factors the most important of which was the settlement itself. Cemeteries were clearly demarcated from the habitation areas but were established in close proximity probably for practical reasons. This separation was sometimes accentuated by the presence of funerary roads leading from the settlement to the cemetery. The cemeteries at Karakonero and Rhodini in the city of Rhodes are crossed by a major road with small paths connecting the graves from one side of the cemetery to the other. The funerary road at Rhodini is almost parallel to the stream: it follows the direction of the nymphaea from the north-east and continues to the south with small paths leading to various graves predominantly on the west. The most important of these graves (The Corinthian Tomb, a large *peribolos* and the Tomb of the Ptolemies) lie on the west side of the stream on an elevated plateau and are connected to each other with a

[6] Some of the observations included in this section were made during my visit at the sites between 2012 and 2014.

small circular pathway (see section 2.1.2b above). The main funerary road – whose remnants are visible to a certain extent nowadays – leads to the Tomb of the Ptolemies and then turns towards the south-west directing to outskirts of the city. As such, the Tomb of the Ptolemies was probably the focal point of reference at the cemetery of Rhodini, since the other tombs were connected by small paths with each other and the mausoleum, but were not crossed by the major funerary road.

On the other hand, the funerary road at Karakonero, archaeologically identified as an extension of ancient road P33a (Inglieri 1936, 19-20, n. 30; Berges 1986, 16; Patsiada 2013, 40, especially note 81), followed the direction of the modern road leading from Rhodes to Kallithea. The starting point of this road, which dates in the 3rd c. BC, can be traced south of the acropolis, parallel to the coastline in the road leading to Kallithea. Due to limited access, it is not possible to trace the various pathways within the cemetery. The relatively close distance of the tombs from one another, the flat surface as well as the presence the funerary temple in the middle of the cemetery (see section 2.2.2), suggest that paths may have not been necessary as in Rhodini. Future excavations in the area will establish their presence or absence.

Overall, it becomes evident that the cemetery at Rhodini was more exclusive and restrictive in nature. At Karakonero the funerary road crossed a vast, open area of rock-cut tombs of various dimensions and its nature was less exclusive. It should be mentioned, though, that the cemetery at Karakonero is more accessible compared to Rhodini and visible from the road.

At Amos we encounter an actual funerary road (Maiuri 1921-1922, 418) as evidenced by various inscriptions and fragments of funerary monuments which have been restored and are visible alongside the road leading from the city entrance to the acropolis (**fig. 2.8**). The 'funerary route' was flanked with funerary monuments and

inscriptions up to the level where the cemetery started and it had a dual function. On the one hand, it was the main gateway to the acropolis, whilst it also provided access to the extensive cemetery close to the city gates. However, given that the contemporary settlement has not been located yet and the acropolis has never been excavated, it is possible that alternative routes were used for the funerary procession leading to the cemetery.

Of particular topographical interest is the relationship between monumental tombs and the landscape. With few exceptions most of the monumental tombs occupied central positions within the landscape. More specifically, the Aghios Milianos rotunda in Lindos and the Lycian Tomb at Kastellorizo occupied very privileged positions; the former is built at the northern headland of the Lindian bay on a rocky promontory near the islet of Phanos opposite the acropolis (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 487), whereas the latter is situated east of the port on a sloping terrace under the castle, almost 30 m. above sea level (Asthon 1995, 95). Due to their elevated and somewhat central position, both tombs are visible from the sea: the Aghios Milianos rotunda is clearly visible on entering and leaving the Lindian bay as well as from the temple of Athena on the acropolis (**fig. 2.10**), whilst the tomb at Kastellorizo is visible on entering and leaving the harbour. Both tombs have their entrance built facing east, yet it is significantly more difficult to approach the Aghios Milianos rotunda due to the rocky, and at places dangerous, pathway that leads from the modern central square at Lindos to the wider area above Phanos. There has been an antithetic association between the rocky terrain and the settlement at Lindos already from antiquity, the point of reference being always the sea (Manousou-Della 2008). On the other hand, the area around the Lycian tomb has been developed and the monument is easily accessible on foot, though access may not have been as easy

around the time of its construction if we take into account the surrounding limestone landscape exhibiting signs of karstification.

In contrary, the Charmyleion, the Archokrateion and the Tomb of the Ptolemies hold equally visible positions in the landscape, though not as prominent as the aforementioned monuments. The remains of the Charmyleion (Chapter 3, section 3.1.3b) are located on the outskirts of the village of Pyli at 300 m. east of the modern town square. At present only the underground structure of the tomb survives, but an inscription found nearby has identified the monument as the sepulchre of Charmylos who was heroised after his death and this was reflected on his burial provisions; his tomb was built in the middle of a temenos with various buildings possibly of cultic character (see Chapter 4, section 4.5.3) Although we are not given any more information on the specific function of these buildings, we can easily imagine that the funerary assemblage and its surrounding temenos dominated the landscape.

Finally, the Archokrateion **(fig. 4.8 a-b, 4.9)** in Lindos is located in the locality of Kampana at Krana on a hill west of the Lindian acropolis (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 491-504). The tomb is built on the easternmost edge of an extended plateau and is enclosed by the hilly extensions of the Lindian acropolis; in contrast to the Aghios Milianos rotunda, it is not visible from the acropolis despite at lower height, but is in very close proximity to the modern city of Lindos. The difference between the first group of tombs we have discussed (Aghios Milianos rotunda and Lycian tomb) and the second (Charmyleion, Tomb of the Ptolemies, Tomb of Archokrates) is that the former tombs dominate (possibly intentionally) the wider landscape, whereas the latter occupies a central position within a specific landscape, which is relevant to the immediate surroundings of the tombs.

The monumental tombs of the urban necropoleis of Rhodes do not always stand out within the landscape of the necropolis due to their subterranean or semi-subterranean design (Theodosiou chamber, Tomb of the Caryatids, Sougganidis chamber and tomb at Petridis street). The Tomb of the Shield might be of special topographical significance, since it is the only monumental tomb to date in the western urban necropolis of the city of Rhodes, whereas the Tomb of the Caryatids and the Karageorgiou chamber are situated on a central road axis leading from the necropolis to the outskirts of the city where the monumental tomb at Asgourou is situated. As far as the Asgourou tomb is concerned, although we know of the existence of a cluster of simple cist graves in the wider area, the presence of the monumental tomb – whose exact location is unfortunately unknown – might again be of specific significance for the local landscape.

Monumental tombs are not equally distributed on the islands and most of them have not been excavated; therefore it is not possible to attempt a comprehensive spatial analysis. I contend that – with a few exceptions (see tombs with *klinai*; Chapter 3, section 3.1.3a) – the presence of an antechamber may contribute towards the creation (whether symbolic or practical) of enclosed or privatised spaces within the tombs with a direct impact on funerary ritual. The architectural structuring of ritualised action has been explored by Pearson and Richards who observe that 'walls, gateways and entrances serve to mark transitions between domains such as inside/outside, sacred/profane, male/female, public/private, enemy/friend, elite/commoner or initiate/uninitiated (Pearson and Richards 1994, 24). Portals and thresholds especially provide means of traversing classificatory boundaries and thus act as liminal spaces between different conceptual domains or even states of being (Pearson and Richards 1994, 25). However, their absence does not necessarily exclude other qualities that can transform places into hubs of ritual action. Sensations of transcendence in this context may be stimulated

through material forms and properties that surpass ordinary human frames of reference in space and time and the use of materials and/or symbols. More importantly, funerary architecture can also routinely co-relate places in the constructed landscape with natural features and phenomena (Tilley 1994).

This problem is evident in tombs without antechambers such as the Aghios Milianos rotunda and the Lycian Tomb. In the absence of a clear archaeological context, both tombs have been named conventionally. The Lindian Tomb was converted into a chapel in honour of Aghios Milianos and one can see traces of Christian frescoes in the chamber as well as a carved cross above the doorway (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 488, especially n. 46). It has also been erroneously linked with Kleovoulos, a poet, tyrant and native of Lindos as well as one of the seven Sages of Greece (Diogenes Laertius, I, 89; Strabo, xiv; Plutarch, de Ei ap. Delph. 3). The confusion between names and attributes is only indicative of the fact that we have very little information on the monument itself and subsequently we cannot link it with a name, a family or a clan. The presence of a single hollow *kline* that once probably contained a sarcophagus (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 488) is even more puzzling. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the entrance to the tomb was ever sealed by a door. It is perhaps unintelligible that someone would choose to build his individual tomb in such a remote and inaccessible location on the narrow summit of a rocky and steep hillock, where the performance of funerary ritual would be hindered or compromised.

In this context, a more plausible explanation of the tomb of Aghios Milianos would be that it might have been used as a cenotaph in honour of a person or a group of people whose death marked a significant loss in the Lindian community. The custom of erecting cenotaphs in the Greek world, defined as symbolic residences for the veneration of the souls of those perished away from their homeland, traces back to the Homeric tradition

(i.e. in Odyssey 9.62-6, Odysseus summons the souls of his companions that he lost in the sea into cenotaphs). The earliest cenotaph known from the classical period is that of Menecrates near the seashore of Kastrades, a harbour of ancient Kerkyra (Corfu). The tumulus dates tentatively to 625-600 BC and morphologically is very similar to the Aghios Milianos rotunda, albeit much earlier in date. An inscription found *in situ* informs us that Menecrates was a Corcyrean *proxenos* who lost his life at sea (Meiggs and Lewis 1969, 4-5, no 4). The structure is conveniently located about 100 m. from the shore on a site well below the ancient port cemetery, which is on a hill farther inland. Comparable cenotaphs are documented in Thassos and Rheneia (for Thassos see Vermeule 1979, 250, n. 10; for a catalogue of Rheneian cenotaphs of persons lost at sea see Couilloud 1974, 294-99, nos. 327-348). As expected, in the absence of any epigraphical data, these examples do not necessarily confirm the function of the Aghios Milianos rotunda as a cenotaph, but it is plausible to suggest that it was somehow linked with the sea, Lindos being a powerful maritime force from the 3rd c. BC onwards (Gabrielsen 1997).

The tomb at Aghios Milianos is a combination between an open and a closed space simultaneously: its openness is accentuated by its grandiose position and possible public or communal character, whereas -at the same time- difficulty of access prevents many from encountering, engaging with and perceiving the tomb at a close distance. At one level, of course, this -almost dramatic- ambiguity emphasises what is seen to be 'otherworldly' in contradistinction to what is perceived to be 'normal', the nature of both being socially constructed and culture-relative. The reason why we should see this monument as a place for the culmination of ritual is not related solely to its use as a tomb and/or a cenotaph, although if we agree that it was monument 'open' to visitors, then the absence of an antechamber might make sense. The theatrical use of the landscape, proximity to the sea, the use of rubble masonry that conveys a sense of timelessness (cf.

Parker Pearson and Ramilisonina 1998), the reference to unchanged natural features such as hill peaks (Tilley 1994), transcend the human life course and lapse under ritual time distinguished by Bloch (1986) 'between mundane conceptions of time which govern the conduct of everyday affairs […] and ritual time which involves the merging of the past in the present' (Bloch 1986, cf. Bradley 1991, 211). In other words, it is possible to perceive the Aghios Milianos tomb as a steady point of reference through time for the people of Lindos: it may have been built initially for the interment of an individual, a family or a clan, but in the course of time it went through a series of transformations similar to the rites of passage resulting to its possible subsequent use as a cenotaph and a place for remembrance and commemoration in the Lindian cultural landscape.

On the other hand, the so-called Lycian Tomb on Kastellorizo, which has not been excavated either, is almost certainly not a cenotaph. The 4th c. rock-cut monument has the form of a naiskos with a pedimental crown with acroteria and belongs to the Greek or Carian type of the rock-cut chamber tomb category, which is very common in Caria and Lycia but extremely rare in the Dodecanese (the only example of such a tomb can be found at Skala, Kameiros in Rhodes, Billiotti-Cottret 1881, 60-3). A second, heavily destroyed, rock-cut chamber tomb with carved platforms in the interior is located at Aghios Georgios tou Vounou on the same island (Ashton 1995, 95, nos. 44, 97), whilst the only example of such a tomb on Rhodes is the half-completed Lycian Tomb at Skala, Kameiros (Billiotti and Cotrett 1981, 60-3). The tomb (Ashton 1995, 95, nos. 44, 97) does not feature an antechamber and one enters directly through the doorway, which may have been sealed at some point in antiquity. The burial chamber could have contained up to six sarcophagi placed on six platforms arranged on two levels along the length of the three sides. The number of the platforms suggests that the tomb has been used continuously as the sepulchre of a family or a clan, opened and sealed accordingly on the occasion of death.

2.4. Conclusions

This analysis has aspired to highlight ways through which funerary architecture contributes to the creation of deathscapes in the South-Eastern Aegean. The early Hellenistic period saw the development of monumental tombs in Rhodes, Kos, and Kastellorizo, while cemeteries of non-monumental graves were built in Rhodes and Kos. The former were built most likely by local elites, whereas the latter served the practical needs of the ever-expanding cities. From the 2nd c. BC onwards smaller cemeteries of non-monumental graves were also built on the other islands and the cities of the *peraea*, along with a variety of monumental and non-monumental graves in Rhodes. It is important to notice that these deathscapes were not static, but were constantly renegotiated through human interventions in the landscape.

CHAPTER 3

Funerary typology in the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period (late 4th – 1st c. BC)

3.1. Introduction

In recent years there have been several publications on the subject of Hellenistic funerary architecture that can be divided into two broad categories. Firstly, there is the publication of type and site specific material in the form of excavation reports or monographs with a focus on particular, typological characteristics (i.e. the Macedonian tombs and the temple tombs of Asia Minor which have both been intensively researched). The second category consists of fewer publications focusing on a broader geographical area, aiming towards a contextualization of the archaeological and historical data available (Venit 2002 for Alexandria and Henry 2009 for Caria are amongst the most notable). Altogether, these publications have corresponded to the constant need for collecting the scattered reports of the excavated remains into comprehensive archaeological datasets and, at the same time, have livened discussions on architectural origins as well as interregional and extra-regional exchanges.

However, as Henry (2009, 25) has argued, it is difficult to apply a universal system of classification to the funerary architecture of the Hellenistic period, particularly in Asia Minor. Even within clearly defined architectural types, such as the Macedonian tombs, a certain degree of variation and regionalism is to be expected. In the first chapter of his

'Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age', Fedak (1990, 15-64) provides a comprehensive typology and terminology of monumental tombs with a particular preference for Lycia, where numerous tombs have been explored and documented over the years. It is one of the few attempts at a collective typological apprehension of Hellenistic monumental tombs to date. Recently limited re-assessments of Hellenistic funerary architecture have been published in other volumes (Winter 2006) or in the form of short entries in handbooks of Greek architecture (for an annotated bibliography see Hellmann 2006).

The body of literature concerned with the South-Eastern Aegean often fails to distinguish between the Dodecanese and mainland Asia Minor (see for instance Bean 1966). Typically the islands are usually incorporated into the archaeology of the latter without accounting for the geographic specifics and cultural aspects of the island communities (Ahrens 2015). Attempts towards the classification of Hellenistic funerary assemblages from the Dodecanese have been made for the urban Rhodian cemeteries only (Fabricius 1999; Patsiada 2013), where the density and dispersion of finds are recorded in greater detail than in any other area. While Fabricius (1999) has presented a spatial outline, Patsiada (2013) has proposed a comprehensive morphological typology based mostly on dated assemblages. By dividing tombs and complexes into monumental and non-monumental types, she has provided a complete typological guide, which is undoubtedly subject to various modifications. In such a disparate variety of types, it is likely that different scholars might propose different typological classifications, to the extent permitted by the archaeological material itself.

In this treatment of a collective Dodecanesian funerary typology, I gathered the most representative types of tombs from each island and the *peraea* and divided them into monumental and non-monumental types on the basis of their dimensions,

architectural layout and decorative elaboration. Patsiada's division (2013, 50) between monumental and non-monumental graves has been retained for the Rhodian tombs, though – for reasons discussed below – her criteria for monumentality are not always adopted.

The typological classification in this chapter is not by any means exhaustive and is subject to the disparity of evidence from island to island and the limited spectrum of rescue excavations (**Tables 3.1 – 3.2**). Funerary goods are often used by archaeologists to provide secure dating of burials. However, only a small percentage of burials in the South-Eaestern Aegean has been found intact, therefore, we cannot rely solely on the funerary goods for chronology. Moreover, even when burial goods are dated, archaeological reports and publications tend to provide date ranges rather than specific dates (i.e. early Hellenistic etc). Though the appearance of burials with Hellenistic furnishings in the South-Eastern Aegean does not start before the early 3rd c. BC, the late Classical period will be taken into consideration when the evidence permits it, so as to obtain a better understanding of the different tomb types and their use (**Tables 3.3 – 3.4**). Moreover, reuse of the tombs and funerary monuments in the Roman period may also hinder the establishment of precise chronological boundaries. While these circumstances are not ideal, for reasons of convenience and uniformity, chronology will be divided into three inclusive periods, each one represented by a century: the early Hellenistic period corresponds to the late 4th and 3rd c. BC, the middle Hellenistic period tallies to the 2nd c. BC, whilst the late Hellenistic period defines the 1st c. BC. Undated assemblages will not be examined in this typology. In regard to monumental tombs, whenever funerary goods are not present, secure dating is possible due to architectural parallels from similar, dated monumental tombs in the Mediterranean world (i.e. the Lycian tomb at Kastellorizo). Though much care has been taken to include updated

archaeological material, conclusions over this section may be enriched or altered by future discoveries and publications.

3.2. Non-monumental graves (Tables 3.1 and 3.3)

This section deals with simple grave types which are prevalent in the South-Eastern Aegean, especially in the islands of Rhodes, Kos and Nisyros. The discussion is focused on different types of sepulchres of single or multiple burials based on distinct architectural characteristics, while a differentiation is drawn between inhumation and cremation burials that may co-exist in the same cemeteries (for a discussion of the rite of cremation in terms of ritual and identity see Chapter 4, section 4.4.2 and Chapter 5, section 5.2.1). By employing the term simple, my aim is to describe tombs that do not display any elaborate characteristics in terms of architecture, plan or layout, though some types of tombs (such as the cist tombs at Nisyros or the Rhodian *periboloi*) can reflect various degrees of monumentality.

3.2.1. a) Jar burials – Echyntrismoi

Jar burials (mostly pithos jars and amphorae) were used for the interment of individuals in the cemeteries of Nisyros from the archaic to the late Classical – early Hellenistic periods (late 6th - late 4th c. BC). Adults were interred in large broad-mouthed storage pithoi measuring from 1.03 to 1.37 m in height, while children were placed either in smaller pithoi or unglazed pointed amphorae (Zervoudaki 1972, 518; Filimonos

1993b). The Classical and early Hellenistic echyntrismoi (4th – early 3rd c. BC) were dispersed in small clusters on the hill of Ai Ghiannis near the acropolis at Palaiokastro, in an area where the cemetery of the ancient city has been excavated with continuous use from the archaic to the Roman periods (Filimonos 1993b, 61, fig. 1; Filimonos 1986; Filimonos 2011, 310).

The pithoi were made of coarse red ware and had a globular body (with the exception of pithos 6 which was oval) with small, flattened bases. Some of the mouths were decorated with applied plastic rings. They did not feature handles. The simple decoration and coarse ware of these vessels suggest that they may have been originally domestic jars, though this hypothesis cannot be verified due to the lack of excavated domestic contexts on the island. However, various vessels which served as cinerary urns in the Rhodian urban necropoleis (mostly hydriai and kalpai) were re-purposed as burial receptacles as suggested by their wear from previous domestic use (see for example a funerary hydria at Chalkiopoulou plot with obvious signs of wear that was repurposed as an urn (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 473, pl. 474a).

Though it is not clearly stated, we should assume that the placement of the human remains inside the vessels was performed either through an opening cut into the side of smaller vessels or via the wide mouth of the large pithoi. Normally, a burial consisted of two pithoi: a bigger one for the actual deposition of the remains and another one to cover the mouth of the former (Bairami 2012, 269). At times, the opening of the ceramic vessels was sealed either with smaller vases or stone slabs. Funerary goods were placed within the vessels prior to sealing or outside the vessels, near their external walls. Subsequently, the pithoi were positioned in pits on their side supported by improvised stone props facing consistently towards the south-west. The pits were finally sealed by small mounds of earth (Jacopi 1932-1933; Zervoudaki 1972, 518; Filimonos 1993b). Isolated pithos

burial 6, which was discovered on the eastern side of the excavation area and at a considerable distance from the other pithos burials, was orientated towards the south (Filimonos 1993b, 64). The same direction is also reported for a burial within a pointed amphora (grave 12) on the southern edge of the area in the cemetery where the pithoi were laid (Filimonos 1992, 64, 71-73).

Most of the pithoi were looted and scattered into pieces, and the skeletal remains were found dispersed. Therefore, it is difficult to assess whether some of them were purposed for primary or secondary interments. The presence of the funerary goods around the external walls of jars 7 and 9 might be indicative of a secondary burial as for example in a few infant echyntrismoi at Olynthus (Robinson 1942, 179), where there is evidence that some earth mounds were reopened after the placement of the vases. Echyntrismoi are typically associated with the burial of infants and young children as in Astypalaia where a uniquely extensive cemetery of infant pot burials was in use from the late Geometric to Roman periods at the site of Kylindra (Michalaki-Kollia 2010). The excavations have brought to light at least 2,758 jar burials of infants, and since they are ongoing, the numbers are expected to rise. The jars used to bury infants and small children can be envisaged as metaphors for the womb (see Chapter 4, section 4.4.1).

On the other hand, the size of the Nisyrian pithoi strongly suggests that they were intended for the burial of adults, though the pointed amphora 12 was considerably smaller; its height did not exceed 0.65 m with an extant diameter of 0.44 m (see as well pithos burial 15 belonging to a young girl, Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 382-386 cat. nos. 71-78, Chapter 4, section 4.3). Among the frugal funerary goods in amphora 12, there was a clay figurine of a boy wearing a himation, suggesting that the vessel may have contained the remains of a child (Filimonos 1986, 71-2; Filimonos 1993b, 71, pl. 19b).

Adult echyntrismoi are uncommon in the Greek world. While the deposition of juvenile remains in clay vessels is well attested from the prehistoric to the archaic periods (Kurtz-Boardman 1971, 308), adult jar interments are infrequent after the 7th c. BC. Pithos interments dated to the 5th c. BC have been recorded in East Lokris (Diakoronia 1986, 57-8) and Kavala (Leventopoulou-Giouri 1967, 449, pl. 529) among other places. Moreover, excavations in various sites at Elis and Kyllini have revealed at least sixty-five burial pithoi with adult interments in continuous use from the Classical (5th – 4th c. BC) to the Hellenistic periods (Chatzi-Spiliopoulou 1991). The Elian pithoi, which frequently contained more than one interment per vessel, were placed similarly to the Nisyrian ones on their side within sand pits and were oriented to the west and the south [or a combined orientation when the pithoi contained more than one individual] (Chatzi-Spiliopoulou 1991, 356). The plain decoration of the Elian pithoi, their rough construction being an admixture of clay and pebbles, the absence of handles and their narrow, orbed bases, suggest that they were not utilitarian vessels, but were probably made for funerary use. A similar type of jar interment for adults has been also documented in two sites in the Coastal Plain of Hellenistic Palestine, at Kibbutz Lohamé Hagetá'ot (Peleg 1991, 132–34) and Yafoat Joppa (Avner-Levy 1998), but due to the summarised nature of the publications it is not clearly established whether they were primary or secondary burials. It is, therefore, difficult to assess the extent to which the jars from Nisyros form a distinct burial custom due to the fragmentary publication of the archaeological material and the absence of anthropological studies. Their prevalence during the Classical period might point towards the overall abandonment of the practice of cremation which was the norm in the Nisyrian cemetery up to the end of the archaic period (Jacopi 1932-1933). It is not clear why pithoi burials were favoured against other forms of interment such as deposition within pits, yet this custom was short-lived. Space limitation might be a

plausible explanation since the cemetery was in continuous use from the prehistoric to the Roman periods. Whether a matter of choice or practicality, the Nisyrian jar burials ceased to exist in the Hellenistic period with the exception of grave 12 which is marginally dated to the early Hellenistic period (Filimonos 1993b, 71-73).

3.2.2. b) Pit Graves

Pit burials were used for the primary deposition of individuals (inhumations and cremations) in the late Classical and early Hellenistic cemeteries of Rhodes (for a detailed description of pit graves in Rhodes see Patsiada 2013, 50-58 with notes), Kos (late 4th – 3rd c. BC) and the cemeteries of the *peraea* (presumably throughout the Hellenistic period). Typically, pit graves were side by side either with cist graves and/or loculi for the deposition of cremated remains.[7] The rock-cut pit graves of the late Classical and the early Hellenistic periods formed tightly packed cemeteries, often arranged irregularly in the space, with no standard orientation.

Cemeteries of pit graves dated to the 4th century were located in various sites of the Rhodian urban necropoleis (**fig. 3.1**) such as near the acropolis hillock (Fatourou 1925, 324-5, pl. 373 a-d, 374b) or the Anoikodomisi plot on the western necropolis (Patsiada 2013, 53). At the same time, a rock-cut pit grave of the late Classical – early Hellenistic period has been excavated within the city walls of Rhodes (Zervoudaki 1973, 503-4, fig. 1, pl. 434a-h). According to the excavator, the grave was probably part of a

[7] Cremations are associated mainly with rock-cut pit graves, loculi and graves within monumental complexes and they will be discussed as part of the funerary ritual (Chapter 4, section 4.4.2). Nevertheless, cremated remains were deposited either in vessels (plain hydriae, Hadra hydriae, kalpai and rarely pyxidai) or in stone ossuaries (osteothekai) and then placed in the graves or the loculi (Patsiada 1999).

larger cemetery extending to the neighbouring plots, in use for a limited time shortly after the synoecism. Eventually, as the city grew larger around the beginning of the 3rd c. BC, there was need for more space and cemeteries of simple pit graves were built beyond the city walls.

The overall structure of the cemeteries and the placement of graves within them suggest that there were provisions for the deposition of the deceased in the early stages of the city town planning. Following an increase in the population during the early Hellenistic period, cemeteries of rock-cut pits were arranged in dense, parallel and successive rows following the formation of terraces (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 476-80; Zervoudaki 1985, 402-3; Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 544-5; Katzia 1992, 613 among others). In terms of structure, rock-cut pit graves can be divided into three categories:

1/ Simple pits: they were formed by digging a pit into the soft bedrock and were covered with stone slabs sometimes incised with the name of the deceased.[8] Their dimensions vary with an average size of ca. 2 m long by 0.5-1 m wide and up to 1m deep. Larger pits may have contained more than one individual and most certainly their space was reused for subsequent burials, though the absence of stratigraphical information is frequent due to looting and destruction. On the other hand, smaller pits were probably used for child burials (Zervoudaki 1977b, 683). The simple rock-cut pit graves of Rhodes and Kos are morphologically comparable to the extensive cemeteries of rock-cut pit graves at Sciatbi and Hadra in Alexandria, Egypt dating to the late 4th and early 3rd c. BC (Adriani 1936, 109-11). Simple rock-cut pits were also common in the cemeteries of the Rhodian *peraea* especially Amos, Euthanna and Loryma.

[8]Rock-cut pit grave 44 at the Daskas-Pardalos plots in the central urban cemetery at Rhodes dated to the late 4th – early 3rd c. BC. Zervoudaki 1984b, 367-8.

2/ Large pits with vertical walls and ledges for the cover slabs: also known as type A in the cemetery of Antimacheia at Kos and the commonest type of pit burial (Zervoudaki 1977b, 683). The actual grave was hewn as a separate rectangular pit within a larger pit with dimensions varying from 2.77x1.75 to 1.90x1.20 and up to 1 m. deep.[9] The graves had dimensions from 2x0.77 to 1.40-0.50 m. and were 0.37 to 1 m. deep. Small cavities were frequently hewn on the bottom of the burial pit for the placement of funerary goods, while at Kos two of the pits were connected with an underground, arched opening on their shared long side (Graves 62 and 65, Zervoudaki 1977b, 683). This type of tomb was also present at Sedir Adası.

3/ Pits with a ledge for the cover slabs: also known as type B from the cemetery of Antimacheia, Kos (Zervoudaki 1977b, 683 ff). As with the above type the burial pit was opened within a larger pit measuring 1.90x0.65 m. to 2.37x1.10 and 0.60 to 0.90m, though the grave was not placed centrally but adjacent to one of the long sides of the large pit. The graves, 1.05x0.33 to 1.97x0.65, were 0.28 to 0.34m deep and were sealed by large vertical monolithic slabs or large tiles, thus creating the impression of a built-cist (Zervoudaki 1977b, 683-4). Types 2 and 3 are very similar in design but differ in size. A similar type with ledges for the support of the cover slabs is found at Antikythera (Tsavaropoulos et al. 2006).

Another form of burial closely related to the pit grave is a shallow, rock-cut trench usually up to 0.5m deep and from 5 to 30m long (Chapter 4, section 4.4.1). These narrow

[9]The burial pit of rock-cut grave 87 at the cemetery of Antimacheia, Kos was T-shaped (Zervoudaki 1977b, 683, n. 2).

channels – exclusive to the Rhodian cemeteries – are up to 0.55m wide and form part of larger cemeteries or grave groups delineating the space in square or rectangular units such as the trenches at the Kousournas plot (Papachristodoulou 1987, 444). Some of them were built outside the main burial area, usually towards the edge of the plot, suggesting that they were constructed at a later date or did not form part of the initial planning of the cemeteries. This is the case of the shallow trench at the Pagkas plot, which is situated alongside the modern road leading to Embona Street (Kostomitsopoulos 1993, 602-3). The trenches were either continuous or divided into smaller compartments by stone slabs; the latter resembled small loculi for the deposition of cinerary urns. As such, the trenches contained inhumations or incinerated remains within poros ossuaries or other vessels, but also served as interment loci accompanied by various funerary goods. The presence of skeletal remains along with funerary furnishings within the trenches suggests either an improvised primary group burial or a secondary deposition (see also Chapter 4, section 4.4.1).

3.2.3. c) Simple loculi (*thekai*) and drawer-shaped (*syrtarotoi*) graves

In Dodecanesian archaeology a loculus is equivalent to the Greek '*theke*', (literally meaning contained) which stands for a smaller niche destined for the deposition of human remains and/or cinerary urns. Circular and rectangular loculi are found side by side with rock-cut pit graves and their use is attested up to the Roman period. Their dimensions vary with an average size of ca. 2 m long by 0.5-1 m wide and up to 1m deep being very similar in size to the dimensions of the pit graves. Their orientation is not consistent, even within the same group.

Loculi are hewn on the faces of terraces containing mostly cremated remains in clay vessels or stone ossuaries. This arrangement is particularly favoured in the Makry Steno valley in the central Rhodian necropolis, where parallel and successive rows of loculi were carved in natural, vertical rock formations delimitating the space around the rock-cut pit graves. This is the case of the loculi at the Diakossava-Machairaki and Oikonomidis plots as well as the loculi within the cemeteries at the Daskas-Pardalos and Karamaritis plots (Patsiada 2013, 51, n. 114). The vertical development of the loculi and their arrangement in rows corresponded towards a need for more space within the pit grave cemeteries as it is observed with the loculi hewn on the faces of vertical rocks in the cemeteries of Sciatbi and Hadra in Alexandria (Adriani 1936, 109-11; Venit 2002, 109).

Another variable of loculi in the Rhodian necropoleis is the so-called *syrtarotoi* (drawer-shaped) graves owing their name to the apparent similarity in form with the arrangement of drawers put the one above the other. These graves were often shallow but particularly wide, containing mostly inhumations. They were hewn into the faces of terraces and their shape was dictated by the need to exploit the existing space to the greatest degree possible. For instance, graves 21, 33 and 53 were of the 'syrtarotos type' in Daskas and Pardalos plots in the central Rhodian cemetery (Zervoudaki 1984, 367-8). The loculi were hewn in the same vertical rock face which defined the plots on the south along with other narrow loculi and niches. The type is quite common in Christian catacombs, though a similar arrangement of narrower loculi can be found at the extensive 3rd century cemetery of Gabbari in Alexandria.[10]

[10] Personal observation during my 2008 visit to the site.

Furthermore, loculi were hewn on the sides of rectangular shaft vestibules. These usually consisted of one or two loculi, the one next to the other, with flat or gabled roofs as shown at Karageorgiou plot (Patsiada 1996, 134). Their entrances were firmly sealed with stone slabs. Most of them, dated to the early Hellenistic period, were marked with coarse undecorated poros stone monuments of a trapezoid or rectangular shape. As with simple rock-cut loculi, the vestibules are located in mixed typology cemeteries. For instance, the assemblages at Karageorgiou plot are surrounded by rock-cut tombs, cist tombs, simple loculi as well as a monumental complex with *klinai* (Patsiada 1996), while the vestibules at Kaka (Papachristodoulou 1989a, 394-5) and Stamatakis (Katzia 1992, 613) in the Rhodian necropoleis are found within larger cemeteries of rock-cut tombs and traces of *periboloi*. Their small shape, the presence of no more than two loculi and the signalling with various monuments suggests that these tombs were destined either as family groups or clans as evidenced by three inscriptions on ossuaries within shafts with loculi at the Stoupis plot in the western Rhodian necropolis (Konstantinopoulos 1969, 447).

This type of loculus is indigenous to Rhodes and the only comparable example outside the island is known from the cemetery of Pontamo at Chalki (Jacopi 1932; Palaiologou 47, n. 15), where two neighbouring loculi opposite a larger rectangular shaft (tomb 17) contained the skeletal remains of an adolescent and an adult respectively (tombs 16 and 18). The rock-cut vestibule is of simpler plan compared to its Rhodian parallels and dates to the early Hellenistic period.

Loculi are also hewn in the side walls of underground, rectangular trenches accessed by an opening on the surface. Among the best-preserved examples is the late Hellenistic rock-cut burial fosse at the Pagkas plot in the central Rhodian cemetery measuring 8.5 m in length, 0.54 m in width and 0.5 m deep (Kostomitsopoulos 1993, 602-

3). The side walls were lined with masonry of undetermined height, and hewn with loculi of various sizes and shapes, which contained mostly cremations. The opening extended towards the narrow west side of the trench, where one circular and two rectangular loculi were located. The central and the eastern parts of the space were occupied by the remains of three individuals, whilst more loculi were placed on the west side of the fosse. The use of rubble as a construction medium and relatively simple design of the sepulchre suggest that practicality and space availability was prioritised over architectural elaboration. This is even more evident in a similar assemblage which was unearthed during road works at Korinthos Street in the Rhodian urban necropolis (Patsiada 2013, 53, n. 116 for other examples as well). The loculi were tightly packed into two parallel rows consisting of four each with little space between them; the entrances of the westernmost loculi were abutted against each other (Patsiada 2013, fig. 19). Finally, pit graves destined for cremations could contain narrow loculi above them, which were used for the deposition of the cinerary urn, e.g. rock-cut grave 37 at Anamorfotirio works in the central Rhodian cemetery (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 480). Their entrances were covered with simple monolithic slabs or sculptural slabs as in the case of the Asvestis-Papaioannou complex (section 3.3.3c below).

3.2.4. d) Cist graves

Cemeteries and complexes of built cist graves were common in Rhodes, Kos and Nisyros. Especially in Rhodes (Patsiada 2013, 5, n.115), they are found within cemeteries of rock-cut pits and loculi. They were constructed of poros slabs which were lined along the walls of the pits and date from the early Hellenistic to the late Roman periods. Their

roof was either flat or gabled. It is difficult to trace their typological evolution due to an apparent uniformity in construction and the lack of distinct architectural characteristics from one period to the other (**fig. 3.2**).

Starting from the 3rd c. BC built cist graves (**fig. 3.3a**) were the norm at the cemeteries of Nisyros throughout the Hellenistic period. Their size can be up to 2.5 m. long, 2 m. wide and 2 m. deep with flat or vaulted roofs made of stone slabs. Some of them were plastered on the inside with a desire to imitate isodomic masonry (Grave 40: Jacopi 1932-1933; AD 25, 518; Grave 22: Filimonos 1993b), while three of the larger ones contained shallow niches in the side walls for the deposition of burial goods (Grave 40: Jacopi 1932-1933, 528-34; Zervoudaki, I. 1972, 518; Filimonos 1986; 73-86: graves 1, 13, 11, 2, 4; Filimonos 1993b: graves 22, 26).

The tombs at Nisyros are similar in shape and construction, albeit smaller in size, to the built cists at the cemeteries of northern Greece dated to the late 4th and early 3rd c. BC such as those at Aineia in Thessaloniki (Vokotopoulou 1990), Vergina at Veroia (Andronikos et al. 1973, 348 ff), Mieza at Naoussa (Missailidiou-Despotidou 1990) and Aiani (Karamitriou-Mentessidi 2008).

It is noteworthy that most of the Macedonian cists were painted with vegetal motifs and decorations related either with the female *kosmos* such as mirrors and chests or with male military paraphernalia such as swords and shields. The decoration of the Nisyrian cists is evidenced by the tombs whose walls were painted with patterns imitating isodomic blocks (Jacopi 1932-1933, 530, fig. 65 for a reconstruction of the tomb's interior, **fig. 3.3b)** possibly reproducing the effect of masonry on the walls of public or private buildings such as the isodomic walls of the ancient city of Nisyros located not very far from the cemetery at the region of Ai Ghiannis. Such a deliberate

imitation implies a potential experimentation (but not direct adoption) with various types of monumentality such as isodomic architecture and wall-painting.

3.2.5. e) Shaft graves

Rock-lined rectangular shaft graves were common in Kastellorizo during the Hellenistic period (Ashton 1995, 92ff), though again it is difficult to observe any substantial typological evolution from the archaic to the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods due to extensive looting (**fig. 3.4**). The graves were covered either with monolithic or pitched slabs and a few were lined with ceramic tiles (nos 8-10, 39: Ashton 1995, 105-6).

Similar graves hewn entirely out of the natural bedrock can be found all around the island and on the basis of sherd identification they are almost certainly Hellenistic (nos 6, 21: Ashton 1995, 106). The dimensions of the Kastellorizo shafts vary from 1.77 to 2.6 m long, 1 to 1.17 m wide, and 0.67 to 0.9 m deep. A rock-cut rectangular shaft on the northern edge of the field of Panayia near Palaiokastro (Ashton 1995, 106) is 0.6 m. wide and 0.64 m. deep but its length surpasses 4 m, possibly destined for two burials placed end to end within the grave. Finally, it appears that the deceased were deposited initially within stone sarcophagi, which were subsequently placed in the hewn recesses and while there is at least one example from the Hellenistic period (no 41, Ashton 1995, 106), this arrangement did not become popular until the Roman period.

Shaft graves are fairly common in the early Hellenistic period, and they are attested in the cemeteries of Phalasarna in Crete (Hadjidaki 1993, 566-7), and Echinos in Fthiotis (Bougia 2004, 149). Conversely to the above cemeteries which form part of

organised communities, there has been no identification of a permanent settlement of the island of Kastellorizo so far (Zervaki 2011, 164). Despite its port servicing important commercial routes between Rhodes and Lycia, (Ashton 1995), it is evident that the island served as a location for short-term habitation. As such it would be expected that the placement of graves would have taken full advantage of the naturally occurring outcrops across the island instead of opting for the establishment of a formal cemetery. Furthermore, the presence of seasonal agricultural buildings such as mills and presses for the production of wine scattered around the island enforces the above hypothesis (Ashton 1995, 45ff). Nevertheless, no excavations have been undertaken on Kastellorizo, thereby limiting the validity of further interpretation.

3.2.6. f) *Periboloi* (Walled enclosures)

Funerary *periboloi* are found only in the cemeteries of Hellenistic Rhodes among the islands, while traces of *periboloi* can be seen in the cemeteries of ancient Amos, Cedreae and Euthanna though their poor state of preservation hinders our understanding of their initial architectural layout. Minor differentiations in the architectural design of the Rhodian *periboloi* have led Patsiada to classify them into five types: simple *periboloi*, *periboloi* with pedestals on top, *periboloi* with Pi-shaped exedras on top, Pi-shaped *periboloi*, and underground *periboloi* with patios (for a detailed treatment of the Rhodian *periboloi* see Patsiada 2013, 59-72). It is my opinion that *periboloi* with pedestals on top and *periboloi* with Pi-shaped exedras on top may be conceived as variations of the same type. All the *periboloi* are either rock-cut or built of poros stones and are related with both above-ground and underground burial chambers.

Simple *periboloi* are complexes with rock-cut graves and loculi opening along the three walls of the *peribolos*, opposite the entrance. Their use spans from the early Hellenistic - as attested by small *periboloi* at plots in the Rhodian urban necropoleis such as those in Karageorgiou plot (Patsiada 1996, 187) - to the late Hellenistic period as those in the Peros and Pavlidis plots (Patsiada 1996, 189). Small assemblages of rock-cut graves are enclosed within *periboloi* on the north-west and the southeastern parts of the excavation at Karageorgiou plot.

The Karageorgiou *periboloi* are important due to their proximal distribution around the 2nd c. BC monumental tomb with *klinai* on the same plot, suggesting a certain degree of deliberate planning towards the placement of the latter. Patsiada has interpreted the small *periboloi* as family sepulchres, despite the lack of epigraphic evidence (Patsiada 2013, 59). This interpretation is credible given their dense concentration and clustering. The signalling of the Karageorgiou *periboloi* with *stelai* and *trapezai* (Patsiada 1996, pl. 80.1-2; Patsiada 2013, 59, fig. 26) denotes yet again an underlying preference towards various forms of monumental expression; in this case, it would be decorative architectural elements such as the funerary markers of the early Hellenistic period.

As such the presence of another, larger *peribolos* with multiple parallel loculi hewn on its northern wall in the same complex (Patsiada 1996, 59, sector E; Patsiada 2013, 59, fig. 26) dating to the 2nd c. BC implies a preference towards this practical type of burial (**fig. 3.5**). At the same time, this larger *peribolos* might have served the needs of an extended social group – potentially a *koinon* – and thereby its geographical and chronological proximity to the monumental tomb with *klinai* in the same plot might be important. Simple rock-cut *periboloi* can also be found concentrated just below the funerary road leading to and outside of the city in the cemetery of Amos in the Rhodian

peraea. Although they have never been excavated, and only their upper part is visible, they are quite large in size and were probably family graves (**fig. 3.6**).

Periboloi with pedestals are distinctly Rhodian in style and construction and are represented by the hypogea at Aghios Ioannis in the western (Maiuri 1925, 124-128, 130-131; Fraser 1977, 52ff; Patsiada 2013, 62, fig. 30) [**fig. 3.7a-b**] and the *peribolos* with pedestals central Rhodian necropoleis (Karamanoli-Pagia plots, Apostolou 1996). Although it is difficult to establish an absolute chronology for these monuments, they are usually dated to the 2nd and 1st c. BC (Patsiada 2013, 59). Chambers, loculi and built tombs were hewn or built into the lateral walls of these *periboloi*, mostly on the wall beside the entrance. As with all the other types of tombs already examined, there is not a standard pattern of orientation in these burials. The roofing of the underground tombs was attained either by straight slabs or semi-cylindrical arches with rock-cut or built loculi above them (Patsiada 2013, 59). The built or rock-cut monuments, either *stelai* or altars, were mounted on elongated pedestals above the graves and were frequently decorated with *cymatia* on the top and bottom sides.

A variation of *periboloi* with pedestals are those with overground Pi-shaped exedras, where the pedestals were replaced by *krepidomata* surrounded by narrow polygonal walls, creating the effect of Pi-shaped constructions upon which monuments were erected. This type of *peribolos* is adopted in two complexes at Korakonero in the eastern Rhodian urban cemetery (Fraser 1977, 4; Patsiada 1996, 97-8) and a complex at the central urban necropolis dated to the second half of the 2nd or the beginning of the 1st century BC (Protos plot, Patsiada 1995b, 483). Remains of similar structures have also been identified in Hypogeum III at Aghios Ioannis (Maiuri 1925, 128-9) and the Pavlidis plot in the western necropolis (Patsiada 1996, 96).

Pi-shaped *periboloi* contained rock-cut sepulchres hewn either in front of vertical rock faces or within stepped terraces. As already suggested, they were enclosed on three sides, while the façade remained open giving them a semi- private character. Two examples of this type come from Rhodini in the central Rhodian cemetery. Their upper structures were similarly mounted on pedestals for the erection of funerary monuments (Patsiada 2013, 66-70). In one of them, the space between the pedestals and the wall itself was hewn in the shape of deep, arched niches with plastered walls. Similar niches were hewn on rock faces in the Lindian cemeteries (Lauter 1972, 52), though their actual function is largely subject to speculation.

The dating of the *periboloi* to Hellenistic times is established on the overall dating of the sepulchral edifices in the Rhodini valley in the late Hellenistic period and their proximity to the so-called 'Corinthian tomb' in the same cemetery, a monumental Pi-shaped *peribolos* with a façade formed of three false doors flanked by four fluted columns, dated to the 2nd c. BC. The façade, which was 2.76 m. high and 5.25 m. wide is located on the northern wall of the *peribolos* above three chamber tombs. The upper visible structure of the *peribolos* is superposed by a three-stepped *krepidoma* which served for the display of the funerary monuments (Maiuri 1928, 53, fig. 36; Lauter 1972, pl. 16.3; Lauter 1986, 131, pl. 13a; Fedak 1990, 87, fig. 109; Patsiada 1996, 99, pl. 67,1; Patsiada 2013, 100-1; fig. 83; pl. I.39).

Finally, underground *periboloi* are exceptional to Rhodes. They are arranged in underground galleries accessed either via staircases or sloping pathways carved into the bedrock. Rock-cut graves and loculi were hewn into the lower part of their walls, while monuments were erected on horizontal levels or *krepidomata* on the upper side of the walls without any robust under-structure, but almost on the same level with the ground. They were not covered by mounds but opened upwards in a patio. Two *periboloi* in

Rhodini were of the same structure, though they still remain unexplored (Patsiada 2013, 67, n. 125).

Simple *periboloi* are typical in plan as in other cemeteries of the Hellenistic period from Macedonia to Athens and the Peloponnese and as far west as the Ionian Islands. It has been suggested that they might have served as distinct funerary monuments for families, kin groups or associations (Humphreys 1980) as the word *peribolos* (enclosure) itself suggests a degree of spatial liminality. This is certainly the case of the Rhodian *periboloi* as evidenced epigraphically in the tombs of Aghios Ioannis (see also Chapter 5; section 5.4) and by the extended clusters of *periboloi* tombs at the Karageorgiou plot; though no inscriptions survive, the large number of burials and the dating of the complex to the 2nd c. BC suggest a possible sepulchre for an association or associations. *Periboloi* with pedestals and exedras for the display of funerary monuments are known from Hellenistic Knidos (Love 1967, 137) though they are smaller in size and do not present the same typological diversity compared to the Rhodian ones (**fig. 4.13**). It is, therefore, plausible to suggest that the Rhodian *periboloi* with pedestals and exedras of various shapes form a local and distinct variation of *periboloi* graves combining practicality such as the arrangement of graves within a clearly defined space and the facilitation of funerary ritual, which is discussed further in Chapter 4.

3.2.7. g) Rock-cut burial chambers with flat or vaulted roofs

Rock-cut chambers with pit graves or loculi were widespread in Rhodes, Kos and Chalki and are characterised by the absence of decoration and elaborate architectural configuration. The Rhodian and Koan burial chambers were either above ground hewn

into the vertical fronts of terraces (burial chamber at the Kantimiris and Chatzimichali plot in the eastern Rhodian urban necropolis: Kostomitsopoulos 1988b, pl. 337b-c; AD 46, 473, fig. 16-17, pl. 171b-d) or underground (3rd c. underground chamber at Christou plot in the western urban cemetery of Rhodes: Patsiada 1992, 599-601; underground chamber at Pireos street in the western urban, cemetery of Rhodes: Triantafyllidis and Grigoriadou 1996, 467; see also an underground chamber near Archangelos in western Rhodes: Papachristodoulou 1989b, 137). They were either flat-roofed or vaulted with a hemi-cylindrical tholos and burials were deposited within rock-cut loculi or on rock-cut funerary beds (for early Hellenistic graves with funerary beds see section 3.3.1a below). Access to the underground chambers was often via narrow holes on the surface of the chambers (the best preserved examples come from the M. Petridi chambers in the western urban Rhodian necropolis: Michalaki-Kollia 1992, 597-8, fig. 5, Pl. 341a; see also **fig. 3.10**), which were ideal for descent, though we should presume that the construction plan of these sepulchres favoured a private or semi-private access.

Underground vaulted chambers with antechambers were common in Chalki from the mid-5th to the beginning of the 3rd c. BC (Jacopi 1932; Palaiologou 2008) and at late 4th – early 3rd c. Kymissala in Rhodes (Stefanakis and Patsiada 2013), where vaulted rock-cut chambers are equipped with shallow rock-cut benches (of unknown dimensions) – one per chamber (Grave 2/2006; Grave 4/2007). Access to the main funerary chamber(s) in the graves of Kymissala was granted via deep or shallow staircases (consisting of 3 to 10 stairs), while the chambers of Chalki often had more than one entrance (as in graves 1, 2, 7; Jacopi 1932, Palaiologou 2008). The entrance of the chambers was sealed with monolithic slabs. The merging of antechambers or burial chambers often led to the creation of vast interconnecting underground complexes. The dimensions of the chambers ranged from 1 to 3 m. in length and 1.5 to 2 m. in width. Three continuous

underground chambers with vaulted roofs have also been located in the area of Aghios Ioannis in the western urban cemetery of Rhodes, but in the absence of excavation data, it is impossible to provide any accurate dating (Livadiotti-Rocco 1996, 35).

Rock-cut chambers are quite common in the cemeteries of northern Greece where they appear in the early Hellenistic period and continue to be used until the end of the Roman period. Rhodian chambers can be compared in plan with the chambers at Veroia (Drougou and Touratsoglou 1980, 107-114) and Pella (Lilimpaki-Akamati 1983, 44 ff), while vaulted chambers were widespread in Hellenistic cemeteries of mainland Greece (for instance, for rock-cut chamber tombs of the same type at Lamia see Papakonstantinou-Katsouni 1992, 215 and Aegina: Kllipolitis 1966, 74-9) as well as in the necropolis of Salamis at Nicosia, Cyprus (Karageorghis 1973, 203).

A different variation of underground, rock-cut burial chambers with vaulted roofs are the underground galleries at Telos, which were carved into the soft bedrock with single or multiple burials. These chambers were often constructed the one next to the other leading to the construction of vast underground tunnels and the creation of burial galleries especially at the site of Kena (Kaninia 2011; Kaninia 2014), where an underground gallery (up to 10 m. long) with rock-cut chambers (**fig. 3.8**) was covered with monolithic slabs. Multiple burials and secondary burials accompanied by various funerary goods suggest that the galleries were being used continuously from the early to the late Hellenistic periods. An alternative yet distinctive type of over-ground funerary chamber is found in the cemetery of ancient Amos where – perhaps for reasons of practicality and availability – funerary chambers were hewn within large non-elaborate rock formations; in one case the main burial chamber was preceded by a narrow antechamber (**fig. 3.9**).

3.3. Monumental Graves (Tables 3.2 and 3.4)

As already stated in the introduction, I have differentiated between monumental and non-monumental graves on the different degrees of architectural elaboration. Monumental graves, which are found only on Rhodes, Kos and Kastellorizo, are independent architectural units with more than one burial of different types. The criteria for monumentality are not based strictly on the external appearance of the graves but take into consideration individual, decorative or practical elements incorporated into the architecture of the tombs as for example funerary *klinai* and altars.

3.3.1. a) Rock-Cut Burial Chambers with funerary *klinai*

Chamber tombs with funerary beds in the form of *klinai* are only present in the Rhodian urban necropoleis and they can be divided into two basic categories: three rock-cut chambers with rock-cut funerary beds of the early Hellenistic period (late 4th – 3rd c. BC) and two free-standing monumental chambers with funerary beds with architecturally complex façades, both of late Hellenistic date (2nd – 1st c. BC).[11] The early Hellenistic tombs with *klinai* are situated in the central Rhodian necropolis: the Theodosiou chamber (Filimonos 1988, 596-7, fig. 5-6, Pl. 364a-c; Patsiada 1999, 127-8, Pl. 37a-b) and the Sougganidis chamber (Filimonos 1992, 612; Patsiada 1996, 93-4, fig. 2). The third one forms part of the western cemetery at Petridi Street (Michalaki-Kollia 1992, 597-8, fig. 5, Pl. 341a); dating spans from the late 4th to the mid-3rd c. BC. On the

[11] The burial chamber with *klinai* at the Giakra, Chatzimichali and Ironia plot will not be included in this analysis (Patsiada 2013, 99) because of its poor state of preservation, limited contextual information and uncertain chronology.

other hand, the first monumental tomb with a conspicuous façade and *klinai* was excavated in the Karageorgiou plot (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 206-7; Papachristodoulou 1994, 770; Patsiada 1999, 131, Pl. 42a-b; Patsiada 2013, 54-5, Pl. 25-6), not far from the second one also known as the Tomb of the Caryatids, which owes its name to the presence of four female statues supporting the tholos (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 540-2, fig. 6, Pl. 340-1; Winter 1982, 555, fig. 22; Lauter 1986, 220-1, 251, fig. 73b; Konstantinopoulos 1986, 231-2, fig. 259-260; Papachristodoulou 1994, fig. 1007; Patsiada 2013, 95-8; pl. I.36; fig. 76-79).

In contrast to the two 2nd c. BC monumental tombs with complex façades and *klinai*, there is no evidence that the early Hellenistic tombs with *klinai* were decorated with architecturally complex façades. However, the presence of *klinai* as a distinct architectural characteristic of interior burial furnishing marks the beginning of monumentality, which is later manifested in the elaborate 2nd c. monumental tombs with funerary beds. The early funerary complexes contain burial chambers with rock-cut *klinai* cut into the soft rock. The chamber at Petridi Street is subterranean, whilst the chambers at Theodosiou and Sougganidis plots are above ground. It is difficult to determine the exact architectural plan of the chambers, since they were preserved almost at ground level with one exception: hypogeum A at Petridi Street, which was situated on the western end of a burial complex and consisted of three consecutive hypogea, all of which were covered by a semi-vaulted roof. Hypogea or chambers with *klinai* were placed either on an east-west or a south-north axis during the early Hellenistic period. The entrance to the chamber was either through a single opening (**fig. 3.10a-b**) on the roof (hypogeum A at Petridi street) or through wider entrances placed on the west (Sougganidis chamber) or the east edge (hypogeum A at Petridi Street – Theodosiou

chamber) of the complexes. As far as the tomb layout is concerned, all of the chambers were rectangular.

Their length varied from 3 to 8 m and their width is preserved up to 3 m. The chambers at the Sougganidis plot were smaller, although their actual dimensions cannot be determined due to their poor state of preservation. The hypogeum A at Petridi Street (**fig. 3.10a**) was flanked by five rock-cut loculi. A small group of rock-cut loculi was also present on the southern part of the excavation at the Sougganidis plot, but most of the *klinai* in Rhodian tombs were associated with rock-cut graves located either behind or below them, with the exception of that in the Theodosiou plot, where only the eastern *kline* was associated with two burials.

Moving to the 2nd c. BC chambers with *klinai*, a funerary monument with beds is located on the western part of the complex at the Karageorgiou plot (see bibliography above; Sector ΣΤ). The semi-underground rock-cut monument is situated on a north-south axis. The entrance to the antechamber, resembling an open courtyard in plan, is located on the west and is accessible through a wide four-stepped descending stairwell. The façade of the tomb was located on the south and was that of a standard stoa with five plastered Doric columns and two pilasters on either sides (**fig. 3.11**) Preserved parts of the frieze and an intact Doric capital may offer a valid restoration of the entablature. The large burial chamber located behind the stoa was accessible through a large opening whose threshold consisted of two huge plastered limestone slabs. It contained eight rock-cut beds in Pi-shaped arrangement and the lower part of a rock-cut throne on the right side of the entrance. The tomb was enclosed by a *peribolos* whose walls are nowadays visible on the eastern and northern edges of the excavation.

The closest Rhodian parallel to the Karageorgiou façade comes from a 2nd c. vaulted chamber tomb with loculi in the area of Asgourou, 3 km south of the city's

necropoleis: the simple façade of the tomb is made of four Doric semi-columns and two pilasters on the sides (Lauter 1986, 221, pl. 28a; Patsiada 1996, 100; Patsiada 2013, 95, fig. 76). Although a *unicum*, the 'free-standing' stoa at the Karageorgiou tomb finds parallels in mainland Greece, especially in funerary monument A at Arcadian Alipheira, a monumental rock-cut loculi tomb with a free stoa-like entrance made of five marble pillars and two pilasters on the sides, all supporting a solid, marble pediment (Orlandos 1967-8, 203-19, fig. 142-146; Hellmann 2006, 301, fig. 420). The closest comparanda of the Karageorgiou monument façade are found at early Hellenistic Cyrene where tombs with 'free-standing' false-façades were already in use from the late archaic period. The most direct parallel to the Karageorgiou façade is tomb N171 at Cyrene, the so-called Grave of the Mnesarchi, a rock-cut chamber loculus with a Doric façade built portico composed of six columns and two pilasters on the side in the northern necropolis dated to the second half of the third century (Cassels 1955, 19, 28; Stucchi 1975, 149-50, fig. 323; Thorn 2005, fig. 231). In both monuments the space behind the colonnade is defined by a court from which access to the burial chambers was granted. Open air courts behind the tomb's façade granting access to the central burial chamber are also present in Hellenistic monumental tombs in the Peloponnese, more specifically at Keryneia in Achaea and Alipheira in Arcadia (Keryneia: Dekoulakou 1994, fig. 3-4; Alipheira tombs A-C: Orlandos 1967-8).

The Tomb of the Caryatids (see bibliography above) is also a 2nd c. BC funerary complex in the central urban necropolis of Rhodes, which was unearthed in the course of construction works and consists of a square rock-cut chamber (4.62x4.62 m). The monument was enclosed within a *peribolos* wall whose traces survive in the form of two large walls occupying the space on the southern and eastern side of the plot. The entrance with the decorated façade of the tomb is located in the eastern part of the plot and was

heavily quarried in antiquity; the threshold is nowadays preserved along with the lower part of the decorative half-columns. The arrangement of the funerary chamber is very similar to the chamber in the Karageorgiou plot. The lower parts of two rock-cut thrones were found on the left and right side of the entrance respectively, whilst the space behind them was occupied by three Pi-shaped rock-cut plastered *klinai* with rock-cut footstools and cushions. The space behind each bed was occupied by two graves, the one placed next to the other (**fig. 3.12**). The most impressive characteristic of the tomb was the tholos ceiling supported by four freestanding female sculptures. The sculptures were placed in the four corners of the tomb as replacement of columns. Each one had one hand lifted supporting the Doric entablature with an architrave, a Doric frieze with triglyphs and *metopes* in relief and a cornice in relief composed of *mutuli* and *guttae* in red colour.

The Tomb of the Caryatids is a unicum in the Dodecanese. The presence of Caryatids in a sepulchral setting is not rare in the Hellenistic world. Caryatids are an inherent element in the Classical and Hellenistic funerary architecture of Asia Minor,[12] and most importantly Thrace, (Cicikova 1988, 50-6, pl. 13-4; Ridgway 1990, 178-9; Hellmann 2006, 295, fig. 410), where a late fourth-early 3rd century vaulted tomb at Svestari (Thrace) with ten caryatids carved in relief and symmetrically placed along the walls, is the closest parallel to the Rhodian tomb. The Svestari Caryatids, carved in high relief with elaborate attire developing in floral motifs, supported symbolically – rather than practically – the architrave as opposed to the Caryatids in the Rhodian tomb.

As far as the general arrangement of the beds is concerned, in all graves they were placed in rectangular shaped chambers mostly in a Pi-shaped arrangement; they were rarely attached to the walls of the chamber. Their dimensions ranged from 1.60 to 2.27

[12] The burial chamber of the heroon at Limyra (370 – 360 BC), dedicated to the Dynast Pericles, was placed on a high pedestal with Caryatids in each corner (Hellmann 2006, 284, fig. 391).

m in length and 0.30 to 0.45 m in width (the average measurements derive from the preserved parts). As a rule, the *klinai* are particularly narrow (the ones at the Theodosiou chamber did not exceed 0.30 m in width). They were all hewn out of the soft poros limestone, and some of them were plastered, mimicking the effect of a more expensive material like marble (Karageorgiou chamber). Their long sides faced either towards the entrance of the chamber or the antechamber, with the exception of the beds at Petridi Street, where both of them were placed in front of loculi on the eastern and western sides of the chamber respectively.

Early Hellenistic vaulted subterranean chambers with loculi, which were accessible via a *dromos* and rock-cut stairwell, have been excavated in Hellenistic Kydonia, Crete.[13] The loculi in these hypogea were strictly organised around a vertical axis, similarly to hypogeum C at Petridi Street, but unlike hypogeum A where loculi were not arranged symmetrically. The hypogea at Kydonia did not feature *klinai* but shallow benches in the loculi for the deposition of funerary offerings, whilst the deceased were laid on the floor of the loculi. Vaulted subterranean rock-cut chambers with rock-cut *klinai* have also been excavated at Veroia and Pella (Veroia: Drougou - Touratsoglou 1980, 19-24, fig. 2-3, 45-9, fig. 5-7, 84-5, 93-4, fig. 8-9. Pella: Lilimbaki - Akamati 1994, 27-43, 84-88). However, the tombs at Pella and Veroia were usually very small chambers without pit graves or loculi, and the deceased were laid on wooden beds and then placed directly upon the rock-cut benches.

Recent excavations in the eastern cemetery of Pella have revealed a monumental burial complex with seven loculi arranged on a central axis, accessible via an elongated, descending stairwell. As in the chamber tombs at Pella and Veroia, burials were deposited

[13] Rock-cut funerary monument with loculi at E. Mathioulaki plot (end 4th-mid 3rd) [Markoulaki and Niniou-Kindeli 1982, 8-119; Pl. 1-32].

on rock-cut benches upon wooden beds. In the northern loculus whose walls were painted with polychrome strips, two big blocks of stones were placed in front of the benches, possibly for the deposition of burial goods. The tomb, which has been dated by the excavator to the beginning of the 3rd century, is very similar in plan to the Petridi hypogea at Rhodes and the loculi complexes at Kydonia (Lilimbaki - Akamati 2005, 391-407, fig. 2). They all possibly belong to the same tradition and were clearly influenced by the monumental Chatby hypogea A and B at Alexandria, where this type of tomb originated in the first half of the 4th century (Breccia 1912, xxxii-xlix [Hypogeum A], xlix-li [Hypogeum B]; Venit 2002, 26-34, fig. 9-16), and was diffused not just in the Aegean (Rhodes-Kydonia), but also in northern Greece (Pella-Veroia) with local variations.

3.3.2. b) Heroa / Mausolea

With the term *heroon* (ηρῷον, plural ἠρῷα, heroa) and/or mausoleum, we refer to the series of monumental tombs built in the fashion of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus in Asia Minor and its predecessors. This type is rare in the Dodecanese and is attested only on Kos and Rhodes.

The family sepulchre of Charmylos at the site of Pyli on Kos dates to as early as the 4th c. BC (Schartzmann 1934; Roux 1987; Fedak 1990, 82; Rumscheid 1994). The tomb consisted of three levels; the lowest was underground (**fig. 3.13a**). The underground crypt was accessible only from above via descending steps forming a short staircase. The vaulted underground burial chamber, which was 5.58 m. long, was accessed by a shallow antechamber. The chamber featured six loculi along the west and east walls, each 2.45 m deep (**fig. 3.13b**). The loculi were sealed by large poros slabs depicting the short ends of

a funerary *kline* with a *tympanon* in relief on top. The narrow podium running along the main façade of the building above the basement, was interrupted by two symmetrically ascending staircases leading up to doorways. Behind the sculptured façade, there were two identical rooms with their storeys supported on six parallel rows of blocks made of poros stone. An inscription found in the area suggests that the initial layout of the tomb incorporated a temenos with other structures and gardens dedicated to the twelve gods and the hero Charmylos (Chapter 4, section 4.5.3). The Charmyleion is often described as a product of 'Ionian provincial architecture mixed with Doric elements' (Winter 2006, 84). But despite the architectural influences, Charmyleion has retained a distinct provincial character. After all, the presence of the cult room on the second storey is not foreign to the architecture of Dodecanesian monumental tombs, since it is repeated in the architectural programme of the Archokrateion at Lindos, possibly the earliest monumental tomb on Rhodes (see section 3.3.3c below).

The Rhodini mausoleum in Rhodes (**fig. 2.3**), also known as the Ptolemaion *or* the Tomb of the Ptolemies on the basis of the alleged discovery of a coin of Ptolemaic origin by an early traveller, acquired the form of a free-standing building (Lauter 1972, 49-59; Fraser 1977, 5; Fedak 1990, 85; Patsiada 2013, 86-88, pl. I.38, fig. 62-66). It was carved to form a cube of 4.5 m high and 27.8 m long part of which is preserved only on its north side. This side was decorated with a row of twenty-one engaged half Doric columns standing on a three-stepped *krepidoma* which rose on a high platform. Though no fragments of the entablature have been uncovered, various reconstructions of the roof have been proposed among which a pyramid or a mound.

Access to the burial chamber was granted from the north side where a doorway (2.7 m high and 1.1 m wide) stood between the fifth and sixth columns giving access to the interior which consisted of two rooms. The main 'cult' room was preceded by an

antechamber on the same axis with the central doorway measuring 6.75 m. long and 4.4 m. wide and flanked by two loculi in the long ends of the wall. The main funerary chamber had three loculi on the west side, two in the south and five in the east side of various sizes and depths. Both rooms have preserved traces of a coat of whitewash, and it is plausible to suggest that they were originally painted. The excavated space is so small (only ¼ of the complex has been unearthed) that various scholars have commented on the possible existence of more burial rooms (Fedak 1990, 85; Patsiada 2013, 87). Nevertheless, the tomb at Rhodini was an imposing free-standing monument that impressed more with its conspicuous location and mass, rather than its elaborate construction.

The tomb compares to the mausoleums of Asia Minor due to its monumental size, elevation and the presence of half-columns, all these elements being essential in the architecture of the dynastic tombs. Nevertheless, these characteristics are no more than a distant echoing of an established architectural type. The Rhodian stonemasons granted a provincial character to the monument in the same way the Charmyleion incorporated rather than duplicated various architectural elements from its contemporary counterparts.

At the northern headland of Lindos bay on a conspicuous promontory near the islet of Phanos lies a circular tumulus made of local limestone rubble masonry (Dyggve & Poulsen 1960, 487-9). The edifice is known in bibliography either as the tomb of Lindian Kleovoulos – an erroneous assumption based on its noticeable position and size – or the Aghios Milianos (**fig. 2.10, 3.14)** rotunda due to its transformation into a Christian church in the 19th century (Dyggve & Poulsen 1960, 487). The circular building, with a diameter of approximately 9 m, lies on a stone pedestal of irregular height due to the unevenness of the ground. The preserved height of the entrance from the threshold to the corniche is up to 1.6 m. The building was completed in several phases. While it is

not possible to determine when it was initially built, it was certainly re-used in the late Hellenistic period, when some of the original, horizontal joints were replaced. The simple façade of the tomb above the main entrance ends up to a cornice, the lower surface of which is oblique. The entrance is located on the east corner and is made of a solid doorway up to 1.7 m wide. Its poros lintel was decorated by three palmettes in relief. While in early bibliography the archaic style of the palmettes has led scholars to date them no later than the 7th c. BC, it is now accepted that the tomb dates to the Hellenistic period (probably mid-2nd c. – 1st c. BC) on the basis of the rubble masonry.

The edifice was never excavated properly, and the assumption that it was used as a tomb comes from the presence of a funerary bed in the form of a sarcophagus within the burial chamber. The interior walls of the rotunda are equally lined by poros rubble which was once plastered as evidenced by faint traces of stucco. The dimensions of the inner chamber are once more irregular, in average from 2.1 m wide to 4.16 m long near the entrance. The *kline*-sarcophagus was placed on the east wall of the chamber with its long side executed in rubble stone. The scattered remains of stones in the interior of the sarcophagus, suggest that the sepulchre was part of the initial planning of the building, though it was found completely empty along with the remaining of the tomb. The vaulted roof was achieved with protruding, bevelled stones in two rows intertwined in the middle. Finally, just below the centre of the vault, there is a horizontal circular moulding. Overall, the degree of architectural elaboration in the exterior and the interior of the tomb is remarkable. The plan of the architecturally intricate vault is unique in the islands and attests to a high level of craftsmanship. The tomb has been typologically associated with the tumulus at Pontikokastro at Noulia provisionally dated to the 4th c. BC on the island of Symi as well as other monuments in Caria and Lydia (Maiuri 1924, 455-9, fig. 62).

The presence of a single sepulchre suggests that it was probably intended for a single individual, though we cannot overrule re-use in later times. It is possible that the tomb was commissioned by a wealthy Lindian and gradually became a point of reference in the wider area of Lindos in the same way the family tomb of Archokrates was accessible for commemoration rites as evidenced by the in-built 'cult room'. Finally, it is possible that the tomb at Aghios Milianos was gradually transformed into the resting place of a local hero – whether real or mythical – thus serving as a cenotaph (Chapter 2, section 2.3).

3.3.3. c) Monumental tombs with elaborate façades

The Archokrateion (**fig. 4.9a-b, 4.9b**), the family sepulchre of Archokrates and his family as attributed by the funerary inscriptions incised on the cylindrical altars which formed the frontal upper storey decoration of the monument, is dated to the last quarter of the 3rd century BC (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 491-504, pl. XII, B, G, fig. XIII; Fedak 1990, 83-5, fig. 106; Hellmann 2006, 304, fig.424; Winter 2006, 84-5, fig. 212-213; Patsiada 2013, 88-91, fig. 67-9). It features an enormous funerary chamber with a rock-cut false façade and a Pi-shaped forecourt. Its two-storey façade, 22.5 m long and approximately 9.5 m high, was rock-cut, and faced eastwards. The lower level consisted of an engaged order of twelve Doric half columns whose shafts rested on a three-stepped platform. The simpler second storey was built at the rear side of a narrow platform (with a preserved width up to 1.64 m), which could have been reached from the sides with stairways similar to the ramps leading to the *proscenium* of a Hellenistic theatre (Patsiada 2013, 90-1). The centre of the space of the second storey featured four cylindrical marble

altars with inscriptions on their bases. Their measurements ranged from 0.81 m to 0.87 in height and up to 0.99 m in diameter (Berges 1996, catalogue nos 150-154).

The interior of the tomb was approached from the east: entrance was granted through three central doorways placed between the Doric colonnade giving access to a square 'cult' room, which was preceded by a wide and shallow antechamber. The 'cult' room contained an elevated podium on the west which was approached by steps along the sides of the chamber. The platform had a T-shaped burial space beneath, while rock-cut benches lined the walls of the chamber. Loculi were added on the lateral sides of the chamber at a later date, but even so, it is not easy to reconstruct their actual layout due to the high degree of destruction.

Architecturally, the Archokrateion is comparable to various public and religious buildings in Rhodes such as the lower stoa and the propylaia of the precinct of Athena on the Lindian acropolis, both of which featured imposing columnar façades (Fedak 1990, 83-5). Moreover, the tomb is morphologically related to other two-storey structures, especially the façades of theatres and tombs, where dramatic effects were stressed instead of following a more conventional design (Fedak 1990, 83-5; Patsiada 2013, 91). For example, there is a morphological relationship between the façade of the Archokrateion and the façade of hypogeum III in the necropolis of Mustafa Pasha in Alexandria; the latter was influenced from theatre architecture as well (McKenzie 2011, 64-65, pl. 182).

Other funerary complexes with conspicuous façades in the Rhodian urban necropoleis include the so-called Tomb of the Shield on the west cemetery and the complex in the Asvestis-Papaioannou plot in the central necropolis. Both structures share a common morphological characteristic: an elongated corridor along the burial chamber. The Tomb of the Shield (Zervoudaki 1977a, 637-40; Fraser 1977, 133, fig. 107a; Lauter

1986, 222; Lauter 1988, 156, fig. 1-2; Patsiada 1999, 132, pl. 44a; Patsiada 2013, 103-5, pl. I 5-6, fig. 84-6) features an open central hallway with rock-cut loculi on each side and an elaborate façade to the west with two false doors and a horizontal cornice decorated with a shield in relief. The presence of shallow benches on the outer sides of the false doors suggests that the tomb was probably open to visitors.

The funerary complex in the Asvestis-Papaioannou plot (Patsiada 1997, 621-3; Patsiada 2013, 105-8; pl. I. 19; fig. 89-70) follows the same structural principle as with the Tomb of the Shield. The tombs inside the monument were dug along the sides of an elongated corridor. The rock-cut tombs were vaulted and featured façades made of pseudo-doors and Ionic stanchions carved on the covering slabs of the rock-cut tombs. The pseudo-doors of the north cluster of tombs were surmounted by the lower parts of cylindrical, plastered altars made of poros stone. The decoration of the pseudo-doors was not uniform; some of them were framed by one column in relief per side, while others were decorated with a pair of contiguous, semi-columns in relief, one of which corresponds to one pseudo-door and the other to the neighboring door. This variation should be attributed to the continuous use of the complex for burials from the 1st century BC to the 1st century AD (Patsiada 1997, 623).

The façade of the Tomb of the Shield recalls the layout of a private house (Lauter 1988, 156), while the architectural layout of the Asvestis-Papaioannou monument is similar to funerary complexes in Hellenistic Italy, especially in Canosa (Fedak 1990, 113-15) and Taras (Fedak 1990, 114) where rock-cut or built vaulted graves with architecturally conspicuous façades are lined alongside open corridors. Shields are quite common in the painted decoration of Hellenistic tombs as evidenced by the painted shields in the funerary chamber of the Macedonian Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles at Lefkadia (Miller 1993, 87, fig. 23). Similarly, painted shields were also projected in the

entrance of the Macedonian tomb of Aghios Athanassios at Thessaloniki (Tsimpidou-Avloniti 2005, pl. 27-34).

More interestingly, two tombs with pseudo-façades in the form of temples of the so-called Lycian Type are located on the island of Kastellorizo. The state of preservation of the larger one (Savignac 1917; Asthon 1995, 94-6) is admirable. The tomb is entirely rock-cut and its façade takes the form of a temple with a pedimental crown with *akroteria*, an epistyle with dentils and an Ionic moulding above pilasters with Ionic bases and capitals. The entrance is ornated with a triple band and crowned with *akroteria* in relief. The interior of the tomb, which is inherent to the bedrock, possibly contained six sarcophagi placed on six pedestals arranged on two levels along the three sides of the tomb. The tomb has been dated either to the late Classical or early Hellenistic period (Ashton 1995, 94 dated the monument to the 4th c. BC but it is likely dated closer to the Hellenistic period, Zervaki 2011, 70) and belongs to a type which is extremely common in Lycian and Carian funerary architecture, albeit extremely rare in the Dodecanese (Zervaki 2011, 70. n 62). Influences and the interchange of 'architectural knowledge' should be sought with the neighbouring city of Antiphellos, a prominent Lycian city which flourished during the Hellenistic period. The presence of another tomb of the same type (which was likely contemporary to the Lycian tomb) is also attested in the area of Aghios Georgios tou Vounou (Ashton 1995, 48) on Kastellorizo, but due to its severe destruction during WWII, it is almost impossible to reconstruct its original plan, though it should not differ much from its better-preserved counterpart.

3.3.4. d) Monumental tombs with peristyle courts

Monumental tombs with peristyle courts are encountered only in the necropoleis of the city of Rhodes and date mostly to the late Hellenistic and Roman periods (Patsiada 2013, 109-116). Although they are visible in the landscape, these tombs remain largely unexcavated with the exception of a large late Hellenistic and Roman funerary complex at Kountouris plot which was published by Vasiliki Patsiada in 2013. The most interesting aspect of this architectural type is the presence of a court or court-shaped platform in the middle of the complex sometimes surrounded by a peristyle or a simpler wall. Individual burials were dug alongside the peristyle and sometimes they acquired monumental characteristics.

The simplest version of this type tomb with a central court made of an elevated platform is situated at Karakonero (Fraser 1977, 4, fig. 8; Berges 1986, 16, fig. 15-6; Patsiada 2013, 109-111, fig. 93-4). Despite the presence of the central court, the burials were quite simple and did not have monumental entrances. A similar funerary complex with more elaborate characteristics is located in the area of Rhodini. The architects of the tomb took into consideration the surrounding landscape and built the tomb against the natural faces of the rock. Several of the rock-cut graves that were dug alongside the faces of the natural rock acquired monumental façades in the shape of false-doors in the easternmost wall. The tomb is another example of the harmonious incorporation of funerary architectural features in the natural landscape of the Rhodini valley (Chapter 2, section 2.2.2b). These tombs remain unexcavated and cannot be dated with absolute criteria, however a date before the 2nd c. BC should be excluded on the basis of their similar architectural features to the dated complex at Kountouri plot (Patsiada 1999, 133).

The Kountouri plot, which is situated close to Rhodini (Patsiada 1999, 133-5, pl. 44b, Patsiada 2013, 123ff) consolidates in a much more effective way all the architectural characteristics of the peristyle court we have already discussed. The complex (**fig. 3.15**) was built in three building phases (2nd c. BC – 1st c. AD) and was surrounded by an impressive peristyle court alongside which various types of tombs were dug: the tombs to the east and the south of the court were overground chambers, while the ones to the southwest were underground vaulted chambers. The funerary complex was enclosed to the north by a wall with rock-cut loculi and a cavernous hall that the excavator has identified with the cult of Dionysus. Overall, tombs with peristyle courts trace their morphological parallels to private and public luxury residences and buildings of the late Hellenistic and Roman periods (Patsiada 1999, 135, n. 54-5; Patsiada 2013, 111, 113).

3.4. Beyond typology

A recurring issue in regard to the funerary architecture of the South-Eastern Aegean is how the physical setting and resources (Chapter 2) were closely related to carving and construction techniques of the tombs. By examining the forms and plans of various tombs and by taking into consideration the physical setting, which is predominantly rocky, it becomes evident that the stonemasons and the architects had a significant understanding of the geology of the sites and cleverly adapted funerary architecture to the surrounding landscape. As it has been already mentioned, the majority of the tombs were carved in the rock-faces and bedrocks of the terrain. There are many types of limestone on the islands and the coasts of Asia Minor. In Rhodes, the vast majority of the interior surface of the island is covered by poros, a soft limestone with

shelly inclusions (Higgins & Higgins 1996, 154), while a similar type of soft, ductile limestone (coined panchina by Higgins & Higgins 1996, 155) was used in the city of Rhodes. In Lindos, despite the presence of grey limestone and poros, soft limestone was again the predominant type of rock used in architectural projects; this material was employed due to its comparable softness in contrast to other indigenous rocks, thus making it easy to cut into various shapes and sizes (Higgins & Higgins 1996, 156). Various types of limestone and travertine were the main building materials on the island of Kos (Higgins & Higgins 1996, 161), while several types of sedimentary rocks such as limestones and peridotites were the main building materials in the Datça peninsula and its surroundings (Higgins and Higgins 1996, 165). Finally, volcanic rocks, soft limestone and lava were the main construction materials in Nisyros – a volcanic island – especially in the areas of Mandraki and Palaiokastro; the porous lavas were soft to cut and readily available (Higgins & Higgins 1996, 167).

The present typological analysis has aspired to demonstrate patterns of connection and/or differentiation as evidenced by some representative examples in the funerary architecture of the islands of the South-eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period. Unfortunately, the amount of information available for each island is not of equal weight. For instance, the cemeteries of Kos are largely unpublished and though we do possess general information on specific funerary architectural types, this is usually vague and out of context. As such, it is not entirely possible to reconstruct the typological diversity of funerary architecture on the island of Kos as it is for example for Rhodes in which case the documentation is substantially better (though not without problems). Having said that, it is still possible to draw some conclusions from the available data.

It has become clear that the various types of funerary architecture offer a picture of diversity rather than unity. From Rhodes to Nisyros and Chalki to Kastellorizo to the

cities of the Rhodian *peraea,* different architectural types developed and prevailed at different times. Nevertheless, tomb types such as the pit grave and the loculus, were favoured on more than one island and the sites of the *peraea*. For example, cemeteries of these types were very common in Rhodes and Kos with minor differentiations. The tight, parallel arrangement of pit graves in the Rhodian and Koan cemeteries was ideal under circumstances of spatial restriction as would have been the case in these multitudinous poleis. Rock-cut pits and loculi were fairly easy and inexpensive to build, thus corresponding to a constant need for funerary space. Equally, the narrow channels in a few of the cemeteries of the Rhodian urban necropoleis might have corresponded to the same need. Maiuri (1925,14) was one of the first archaeologists to calculate that as many as 60,000 to 80,000 people were living on the island of Rhodes from 200 BC onwards, half of which were slaves and immigrants or metics. And while it seems that early cemeteries of mixed grave types (4th c. BC) were not necessarily planned in advance, from the 3rd c. onwards some cemeteries were built down on slopes and terraces for the effective organisation of the space.

One can argue that the Nisyrian pithoi burials corresponded to an overall space restriction imposed by the fact that the cemetery at Palaiokastro was in continuous use from the sub-Mycenaean to the late Roman periods (see Chapter 4, section 4.2). Nevertheless, such an explanation might not be plausible, given that the Nisyrians were buried in large cist graves in Hellenistic times. Finally, it is almost certain that the large deposition of infant echyntrismoi at Kylindra in Astypalaia served practical reasons alongside accentuated symbolic connotations. Generally, with the exception of pit graves and loculi whose overall plan is not complicated and fairly common among the majority of contemporary cemeteries in mainland Greece, Asia Minor and Egypt, simple grave types were not identical from island to island. For instance, the cist graves at Kastellorizo

were usually hewn directly to the rock, whereas Rhodian cists were predominantly built with poros stones. The Chalkian vaulted chambers were built in the form of a dense underground necropolis, where most of the graves were interconnected to each other by narrow corridors, whereas the chambers at Kymissala were not directly connected to each other through internal passages. In the cities of the *peraea*, grave types were relatively simple and adapted to the physical environment. However, some grave types such as the rock-cut twin loculi within rectangular shaft vestibules, which originated and prevailed on Rhodes, were adopted at Chalki.

Another distinct type of a simple grave is the *peribolos* with its many variations, which became prevalent in Rhodes. One can imagine that the plan of the Rhodian *periboloi* was ideal for the interment of family and kin groups due to the neat and tight arrangement of the rock-cut loculi around the walls of the *periboloi*. Indeed, some inscriptions attest to the use of these tombs by family groups especially from the 2nd c. onwards (see Chapter 5, section 5.4.1.). All in all, from a typological viewpoint the Rhodian *periboloi* stand in between simple and monumental grave types since they are not overtly elaborate in terms of architecture but, at the same time, some types of *periboloi* were crowned with cylindrical altars over elevated pedestals. In essence, they were larger and more consolidated versions of the shaft vestibules arranged either in a Pi-shaped or rectangular plan. Consequently, various types of simple graves were used on the islands and the *peraea* throughout the Hellenistic period. Their plan and overall construction was possibly dictated by practical criteria such as the quality and the availability of the rock as well as the size and layout of the burial ground available.

The transition from the late Classical to the early Hellenistic period saw the construction of many cemeteries across the islands and the *peraea*. From Nisyros to Kastellorizo, this is period of funerary diversity. Larger cemeteries of pit and cist graves

such as those in Rhodes and Kos served the needs of the big *poleis*, while the tombs at Kastellorizo, Telos and Chalki were part of smaller cemeteries suggesting varying degrees of nucleation; for instance, the underground galleries at Telos and their reuse throughout the Hellenistic period, suggest that were probably family graves. Similarly, the cemetery at Pontamo in Chalki lasted for two or three generations of deceased families or kin groups, who chose to be buried on the island. At this point, we should not disregard the amount of travelling and mobility in the islands throughout the Hellenistic period. Inscriptions suggest that citizens of the subjected *peraea* travelled to Rhodes, where they settled permanently (Fabricius 1999). All the same, the tombs are Kastellorizo are even more puzzling in the absence of a central settlement.

On the other hand, monumental architectural display in a funerary context was developed in fewer places. The absence of monumental tombs in the islands and the *peraea* can be attributed to various factors such as the availability of space, the limited options offered by the landscape or a conscious preference for simpler burial types. Nonetheless, attempts towards monumentality can be seen in various facets of the funerary architecture such as the cist tombs at Nisyros, the underground burial chamber at Kena in Telos and the *peribolos* graves at Amos. At the same time, the lack of funerary monumental architecture in the *polis* of Kos (compared to Rhodes) is not problematic since it is possible that expressions of identity and display of status were not necessarily expressed in the funerary sphere; they were rather articulated through public and private architecture as evidenced by the plethora of public, residential and religious buildings that were built in the city throughout the Hellenistic period.

Overall, monumental graves with intricate architectural details were an elaborate arena for the display of status and affluence. It is noteworthy, that no single monumental grave on the islands is similar to another; even those sharing similar plans and

morphological characteristics. However, we can divide them conventionally into four basic categories: chambers with funerary beds, tombs with elaborate façades, heroa and tombs with peristyle courts. What differentiates monumental graves from simpler grave forms apart from size is the fact that they are usually individual, self-standing edifices with distinct architectural characteristics either as part of their exterior appearance or their interior planning and decoration. For instance, chambers with *klinai* in the Rhodian necropoleis were developed gradually from the 3rd c. BC to the 1st c. AD. The funerary beds of the 3rd century complexes were not as elaborate as their late counterparts, but the sympotic arrangement of the burial chamber with funerary beds was developed already in the 3rd c. BC (see Chapter 4, section 4.5.4). Later on, the *klinai* became part of the burial chambers with architecturally elaborate façades and were decorated to resemble actual funerary beds. At this period (2nd – 1st c. BC) they were also paired with thrones made of poros stone as in the Karageorgiou plot and the Tomb of the Caryatids (see Chapter 4, section 4.5.4). Though we possess limited information on the façade of the early Hellenistic tombs with *klinai*, it is possible that they had monumental characteristics such as elaborate entrances, columns and thresholds. As such, tombs with funerary beds present an interesting example of how tomb architecture was developed and consolidated through time.

At the same time, mausoleums/heroa are characterised as such due to their apparent resemblance with similar edifices in Asia Minor, where the specific architectural type originated as early as the 4th c. BC. Nonetheless, the term mausoleum (and even heroon) is used sparingly. Though the islands were briefly under the rule of the Carians in the 4th c. BC, it is highly unlikely that the island 'heroa' were constructed for rulers. As a matter of fact, the funerary use of the mausoleum at Rhodini has been doubted by a certain scholars (Papachristodoulou 1994), who contend that is was probably a

sanctuary or a building of unspecified use rather than a grave. The idea of a monumental tomb as a 'funerary sanctuary' has equally been put forward for the family tomb of Archokrates at Rhodini due to the presence of a spacious 'cult room' on the ground floor of the building (Belli-Pasqua 2009). The closest parallel to an actual mausoleum is Charmyleion at Pyli in Kos, which is probably the oldest monumental tomb on the islands dated to the 4th c. BC. Despite being influenced by various edifices of similar plan and structure in Asia Minor, epigraphical evidence found in situ delineates the tomb as a 'heroon', even providing information on a sacred garden (temenos) that used to be part of its grounds in antiquity (see Chapter 4, section 4.5.3). It has generally been argued that the monumental tombs of the Dodecanese are not influenced as much by the monumental tombs of Asia Minor in the sense that they do not resemble the distinct temple-tombs of Caria and Lycia (Patsiada 2013, 120), however the heroon at Pyli and the Lycian tombs at Kastellorizo dated to the late 4th c. BC were certainly influenced by the funerary architecture of coastal and inland Asia Minor. Due to looting and inadequate publication it is difficult to tell whether these tombs were actually constructed by the islanders, though it would be interesting to look into the various degrees of influence between Lycia and the island of Kastellorizo in the future.

In contrast to cemeteries of simple graves, monumental tombs of the early Hellenistic period were placed in conspicuous positions between crossroads and on the top of promontories. What is important about them is that they are constructed of poros limestone or other soft rocks readily available on the islands as we have already seen. Even the elaborately decorated Tomb of the Caryatids was made of poros stone. Poros stone is more easily worked compared to marble and it is no surprise that it was used almost exclusively on the islands for the construction of graves and funerary monuments. On the other hand, one cannot help but wonder why marble was not used extensively in

the construction of funerary buildings and monuments given that at least at Kos, where it was readily available, it was used for the construction of the Hellenistic city (Berges 1996, 45). Admittedly, when marble was not readily available like in Rhodes, poros limestone was an adequate replacement. However, poros stone is more susceptible to the effects of the environment and it has been argued that this is the reason why a lot of cemeteries and graves have been damaged over the course of time, especially in the eastern Rhodian necropolis (Patsiada 1999).

Finally, monumental tombs, as opposed to simple graves which were constructed by the hundreds, were more intricate to build and were more individualistic in nature and decoration compared to simpler graves. In Rhodes, it is plausible that they were intended for families of affluent citizens or member of associations of foreigners since their building started around the 2nd c. BC, when citizens of the incorporated *peraea* and foreigners moved to the island in large numbers. The state of current archaeological research does not allow us to connect these tombs with specific ethnic groups. Nonetheless, the dialectic relationship between the Rhodian monumental tombs and similar edifices predominantly in Alexandria and Cyrene to a certain extent (Patsiada 2013, 116) is suggestive of the varying degrees of interchange between the cities, especially Alexandria at various levels (i.e. cultural, political, and social). Future publications of these tombs will allow us to explore along this line of comparative research in more detail. The Rhodian monumental tombs are characterised by a subtle eclecticism subject to the creative minds of their owners and architects. Under this context, the Rhodian architects and stonemasons adopted interesting architectural traits into unique designs. The size and complexity of some of these tombs suggests that their plan and decoration were predetermined even before the sudden event of death. This brings us to the general question of the fluctuating degrees of interconnection and

interchange between the funerary monuments and the individuals associated with them, which I will attempt to explore through the study of funerary and post-funerary ritual in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

Funerary ritual in an archaeological context

The evidence from the South-Eastern Aegean

4.1. Introduction

It is often difficult to express what ritual is in archaeology because there are as many definitions as there are scholars who are trying to define it often leading to terminological 'abuse' (Goody 1962, 36; Renfrew 1985, 2-3). On the other hand, ritual is not a stand-alone term in bibliography since it is usually intertwined and discussed with notions such as 'cult,' 'ceremony,' 'sacred,' 'profane,' 'religion' and 'symbolism' to name a few. Under this context, there is a widespread archaeological consensus that ritual is a form of human action directly identifiable in material culture remains, whereas religion is a more abstract system of beliefs, myths, and indoctrination (Fogelin 2007, 56). Having said that, we observe two main tendencies in archaeological studies: some archaeologists see religion as primary with ritual as an underlying feature (structuralist approach), whereas others see ritual as primary, with ritual enacting underlying religious beliefs (functionalist approach) [Fogelin 2007]. The former are usually drawn to historical/mythological or ethnographic parallels, whereas the latter focus for the most part on the fragmentary material remains of ritual practice.

Renfrew defined ritual as the 'inception or repetition of conventional programmes of expressive actions' (Renfrew 2007) and his definition encapsulates two very important

aspects of ritual: repetition, what Bell described as invariance as one of her six identifying characteristics of ritual and ritual-related activities (Bell 1996) and expression, Warren's 'δυκνείμενα, λεγόμενα, and δρώμενα' (things shown, said and done) [Warren 1988, 12-3). Renfrew was inspired by the seminal thesis of Leach, who produced a model for ritual definition by introducing a schema for the mental location of ritual activities and the explanation of how they take place. He maintained that apart from the known world, being the one that humans can perceive with all their senses, there was an Other world, that of temporal experience and belief (Leach 1976, 33-6). These two worlds overlap in the area where human belief is expressed by actions – a liminal zone (in a Van Gennepian sense), which is connecting rather than separating. As such, the actions that take place in this area become ritual actions of varying intensity. If these actions affect the known world, then it is likely that they can be traced in the archaeological record. Renfrew also differentiated between religious/sacred and secular ritual (Renfrew 1985, 14) and this differentiation should be taken under consideration within classical archaeology for reasons we shall discuss below.

Following Leach's perspective, ritual is more of a process than an event (Bell 1992, Humphrey and Laidlaw 1994) and certain actions are ritualized assuming greater meaning and significance. It has been argued by many archaeologists that one of the clearest demonstrations of ritual action in past societies is the archaeological discovery of a human burial, the material remains category *à excellence* that results from actions that were initiated by a specific system of beliefs. Archaeological approaches to death vary from functional, where death is always examined from a socio-political stance to structural ones seeking to find the meaning behind death and burial with a focus on symbolism, ritual, and religion (Insoll 2004, 70). To quote Parker Pearson (1999, 3) the 'dead does not bury himself,' but when death occurs then the expressed action during a

funeral conforms to various ideological variables that pertain to a belief system associated with death and afterlife. As such, the dead are important for the society of the living as they are able to influence and maintain social stability or even evoke social change (Parker Pearson 1993).

Funerary ritual has only recently received attention in Classical archaeology either as an individual research interest (Morris 1992; Laneri 2007) or as part of general studies on various aspects of ritual mostly in connection with religion (Chaniotis 2011; Insoll 2011). The reasons for this are diverse. Firstly, Classical archaeology is not as preoccupied with the study of ritual as its prehistoric counterpart. Whereas prehistoric ritual has been the source of discord among many researchers (from its definition to its role, diffusion, and performance), in Classical archaeology ritual is hardly a controversial issue. However, a quick survey of seminal works on ancient Greek religion reveals that authors are in favour of the term cult (Parker 1996, Beard et al 1998, Price 1999; cf. Christensen 2009, 21) and cults and this is partly the result of a conscious distancing from the Christian concept of religion that involves belief (Zaidman and Schmitt-Pantel 1994; Christensen 2009, 21). Moreover, cult – as opposed to ritual – is a construction of the Classical world (although the word *cultus* derives from Latin and not Greek) and it is perceived as 'a complex of religious activities concentrated on one or more deities or heroes and including prayer, ritual, sacrifice and dedication' (Aleshire 1994, 12).

Indeed, Classical archaeologists rarely addressed cult directly in reference to the material evidence, and ritual, instead of being recognized as an important aspect of cult/religion, is usually referred to as a generalized set of actions involving performance, words and the participation of the senses; a Classical archaeologist would feel unsafe to address these classes of evidence in his material. In a way, some Classical archaeologists are bound by texts and ancient sources to such an extent that they refuse to address ritual

directly in connection with the archaeological material; this is either a defence mechanism in relation to traditional views of cult and religion in Classical scholarship, or perhaps more worryingly unwillingness to step out of the 'safe zone' and apply theoretical models of interpretation that 'after all, do not fit the material' (Christensen 2009, 23). Classical archaeology has been characterised by a very long and often interdependent relationship between text and material culture (Morris 1992, 11; Andrén 1998; Christensen 2009, 20). However, Classical archaeologists are now more open to examining their material from a theoretical viewpoint, especially when evidence is often scarce or inconsistent (see for instance the recent volume by Haggis and Antonaccio 2015 for theoretical approaches on Classical contexts).

Secondly, there is a certain amount of difficulty in observing and determining evidence from funerary or post-funerary practices. As such, funerary ritual from the Classical period onwards is predominantly explained with the Athenocentric tripartite scheme of the *prothesis* (laying out of the body), *ekphora* (funeral procession) and burial (Rohde 1925, 162-71; Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 143ff; Burkert 1985, 190-4; Garland 1985, 13ff; Vlachou 2012, 364-7). However, despite its usefulness regarding establishing a predictable sequence of ritual behaviour, we should always bear in mind that funerary ritual is not a static, but a dynamic set of expressive actions. For instance, it is highly unlikely that post-funerary commemoration of the deceased retained the same form and character diachronically throughout Greek antiquity. In this context, we should approach the tripartite explanation of Greek funerary ritual as an accompanying, but not necessarily a main, interpretative tool when examining the funerary ritual in post-Classical South-Eastern Aegean. For example, in the introductory chapter of the 'Death and Burial' entry in *ThesCRA* we read (my emphasis): 'the Greek funeral had a ritual structure**, which in most of its parts seems to have been maintained throughout**

Antiquity. In general, this structure relates to the schema of rites de passage defined by Van Gennep […]' (Vlachou 2012, 364). Greek funerary ritual is not static, and studies of the archaeological record have proven so (Morris 1992, Morris 1992-1993). The variability of Greek funerary behaviours was dependent upon numerous factors such as locality and different socio-political circumstances and by denying these particularities, we hinder our understanding of social and cultural identity in past societies.

For this chapter, I have attempted to synthesise all the manifestations of ritual activity that might be connected to funerary practices by taking into consideration some of the theoretical elements already discussed. The first class of evidence concerns the reconstruction of the events shortly before and immediately after the burial, whereas the second group of evidence will be focused on post-funeral practices and rites of commemoration occurring after the sealing of the tomb. The first category of evidence concerns mainly practices that have taken place initially outside the sepulchral space and have probably been subjected to various destructive factors, and therefore we can only safely reconstruct the archaeological evidence from the burial itself. In contrast, the second class of remains might have left traces of material evidence or even literary, epigraphic or iconographic traces.

Given the novelty of this endeavour, the introduction of the archaeological evidence could generate criticism. As such, a logical and chronological reconstructive pattern will be followed from the moment of death to the post-funerary commemoration. The presentation of the available evidence will be followed by discussion, where the performance of death rituals will be critically examined and placed within a contextual framework. More importantly, it is my intention to review how funerary ritual can be associated with the living communities of the South-Eastern Aegean and their contemporary sociocultural circumstances.

4.2. Some notes on legislation and funerary ritual

An alternative type of evidence that can shed light on various aspects of Classical and post-Classical Greek funerary ritual is funerary legislation. The Greek burial was codified with several local rules and regulations as dictated by quite a few corpora of funerary laws compiled in various periods of Greek antiquity. And while most of the legislative information derives from Attica, funerary laws were also present in other parts of the Greek world such as Delphi, Keos, Gortyn and Sparta among others (for the funerary epigraphic corpora and funerary legislation, in general, see Sokolowski 1969; Alexiou 1974, 25-20; Frisone 1994, 188–190; Sourvinou-Inwood 1996; Frisone 2000; 2011, 184). The literary sources point towards different moments in Greek history from the 7th c. BC to the Hellenistic period, when funerary legislation was changed or partially transformed: from Solon's funerary laws in the 6th c. BC (Herodotus, *Histories*, 6.58.1; Plutarch, *Solon*, 21.1-5) to the funeral of Aratos (Plutarch, *Aratos,* 53.2) in the Hellenistic period. Changes and variations in funerary legislation have frequently been associated with the emergence of the city-state and the various social and political implications which preceded and followed (see Frisone 1994, 184-8 for an annotated bibliography).

Frisone has convincingly argued that the corpus of epigraphic evidence spanning a little over three centuries (5th to the 3rd c. BC) can be regarded as a distinct class of evidence (Frisone 1994, 188-90; 2000, 10, 164; 2011); essentially a 'rulebook' on Greek burial ritual. Therefore, by recognising the Herculean task of attributing these documents to specific lawgivers, she regards inscriptions as a more objective group of evidence that encapsulates changes to funerary ritual either for short-term periods or diachronically (Frisone 2011, 184). Indeed, these regulations sometimes explain ritual explicitly or implicitly and prescribe the correct (or expected) form of procedure for a number of

actions such as the general structure of funerals, the paraphernalia of funerary rites, where and when is it allowed to deposit the deceased as well as a universal concern for *miasma*, the concept of pollution originating from the deceased with various physical and social implications for the bereaved (Frisone 2011, 184; on pollution and purification in Greek funerary ritual see Moulinier 1952, 76; Parker 1983; Garland 1985, 43-7).

The only reference in connection to the South-Eastern Aegean within this corpus comes from a short legislative document from Nisyros dated in the 3rd c. BC, namely a law prohibiting the erection of funerary monuments (IG XII, 3, 87; Frisone 2000, 155–162). It is not clear from the inscription, however, whether the regulation concerned the whole island or a specific place on it:

1 [. . .]· εί δέ τίς κα θά[πτηι ἢ ἐπί]-
σταμα ἐφιστᾶι, άποτεισ[άτω]
δραχμὰς μυρίας καὶ αίρέτω
τὸν νεκρὸν ἢ τὸ ἐπίσταμα· εί δ[έ]
5 κα μὴ ἄρηι, αίρόντω τοὶ προσπ[ά]-
ται· εί δέ κα μὴ ἄρωντι το[ὶ πρ]ο-
[στά]ται, άποτεισάντω ἕκαστο[ς]
[δραχμὰ]ς χιλίας ἐν εύθύναι[ς]·
[φαινέτω δὲ] ὸ χρήιζων ἐπὶ [τῶι]
10 [ἠμίσει(?) ἐπὶ

Translation by author (with the aid of Mrs Foteini Lymperi):

In the case that someone buries their deceased or erects a monument in their honour, they have to pay 1.000 drachmas and remove the deceased along with the monument. If

they fail to transport the body, then it is the duty of those in charge (of the *polis*) to do it. If those in charge fail to transport it, then a penalty of 1.000 drachmas should be imposed on each of them as a public debt. Those who cannot afford the debt, can pay half the amount.

The fragment suggests that burial and erection of a monument were prohibited at some point from the 3rd c. BC onwards. More specifically, if the offender would not remove the monument, then he would be obliged to pay a sum of 1,000 *drachmes* to the *epistatai,* ἐνεύθύναι[ς] (in expenses) [line 8]. Frisone contends that there is not any contextual evidence to link this fragment with general burial restrictions on the island (Frisone 2000, 160). It is highly unlikely that this was part of a civic decree issued by the *polis* such as the comprehensive funerary laws of Ioulis in Keos (5th c. BC with two additions of a later date documented on the stone of the inscription; IG XII 5, 593; SEG 49-1128; Sokolowski 1969, no. 97; Frisone 2000, 57ff). Instead, the prohibition can be understood as exclusion from an area reserved for the deceased of special status such as families or groups and associations with specific social affiliations, or even regulations to prevent burial and erection of funerary monuments in a public or sacred space such as a *temenos* (Frisone 2000, 160-2).

At the same time, it could be explained, in my opinion, as a regulation specifically tailored for non-Nisyrian citizens, who equally did not hold citizenship in any other *deme* of the *peraea*, depriving them of the right to bury on the island. This may be an attempt towards the creation of something similar to 'citizen cemeteries' (Morris 1987, 54, 210; 1991, 157-8) like those in Classical Athens. According to Morris, 'classical Athenians put great emphasis on formal, bounded cemeteries as symbols of membership of the citizen body as a whole' (Morris 1991, 157). However, there is no evidence to suggest that burial

was a citizen privilege in Nisyros (or any other part of the islands or the *peraea* for that matter). In Rhodes, members of the *koina* (who were non-citizens) were buried in separate sections of the necropoleis (see Chapter 5, section 5.4.2.), though this practice was not imposed by legislation.

The archaeological record indicates that from the Classical period onwards quite a few individuals were buried within pithoi and jars perhaps in an attempt to regulate and reduce burial space per cemetery on the island. This custom, however, declined considerably in 3rd c. BC and the pithoi burials were replaced by cist graves (Chapter 3, section 3.2.4); the latter were considerably fewer in numbers in comparison to the former, and that might be indicative of a population decline, migration to other islands or cities of the *peraea* or maybe even stricter burial regulations such as the above. In a sense, this could also explain the scarcity of funerary monuments in the archaeological record of Nisyros throughout the Hellenistic period.

4.3. The burial sequence: from the *prothesis* to the grave

In the absence of significant literary, epigraphic or other types of written evidence in the South-Eastern Aegean, how can we reconstruct the funerary sequence from the moment of death to the preparation of the corpse? In the following section, I will briefly present all the information we possess on ancient Greek funerals based almost exclusively on the model of the archaic and Classical Athenian burial in an attempt to introduce the reader to the burial codification that can be synopsized – as we have already seen – with the tripartite mechanism of the *prothesis*, the *ekphora,* and the *burial.* Where the evidence permits, I will cross-reference with examples deriving from our

geographical setting. The presentation of this information, which will be brief since a detailed analysis would depart considerably from the scope of this thesis, aims to highlight the basic stages of the Greek burial and validate its enduring legacy in modern times.

The funeral began with the *prothesis* during which the body was cleaned and then laid out on a table or *kline* (the choice of the medium was dependent on the status of the deceased) to be viewed by the mourners (Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 143–144; Garland 1985, 23–31; Johnston 1999, 39-43; Vlachou 2012, 364-6). This could be a prolonged event: in the *Odyssey* the funeral games in honour of Achilles lasted for an impressive seventeen days (*Odyssey*, 24.63–6), while in the *Iliad* nine days were dedicated to the funerals of Hector (*Iliad*, 24.664–665), and two for Patroclus (*Iliad*, 23.54–55). However, it is highly unlikely that the burials of ordinary people lasted as many days; the rapid decay of the human body would prevent it. According to Solon's laws, the *prothesis* could only last a day; the corpse had to be taken outside for the *ekphora* and the burial before the sunrise of the next day (Demosthenes*, Against Makartatos* 43.62). The funeral process was a female business, as shown by *prothesis* depictions on Geometric vases (Van Den Driessche 1985, 34-47; Oakley 2004, 76-87).

The body was then washed, anointed and dressed in new garments; the law from Ioulis specifies these garments as three white pieces of clothing: the *stroma*, the *endyma* and the *epiblema* (IG XII 5, 593, lines 1-4). The choice of funerary garments could be demonstrative of the elevated status of the deceased. For instance, the funerary garments that accompanied a cremation burial in the city of Rhodes were probably embroidered with 210 perforated, concave gold discs that were found alongside the rest of the burial goods (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 475, pl. 475a; Filimonos-Giannikouri 1999, 207, pl. 18). The sheer amount of discs suggests that this was the tomb of an affluent individual but

also attest to the transformation of the burial into an intense dramatic act for all those involved, culminating in the adoption of a different role by the deceased; possibly one that could not be fulfilled in her lifetime such as that of the bride (for the identification of the deceased as an unmarried female see Filimonos-Giannikouri 1999, 207). A similar effect could have been created with the presence of jewellery in some male but primarily female burials in Rhodes and Telos (for Rhodes see Filimonos-Giannikouri 1999; for Telos see Kaninia 2011, cat. nos 66-72); although some of the jewellery was discovered in connection with cremations, one can imagine that the adornment of the cadaver with jewellery would have had a dramatic and lasting effect on the participants.

We should presume that the role of women was pivotal at the *prothesis* and this can be cross-referenced with an ethnographical parallel. In the present-day villages of Karpathos, the washing of the corpse with water and wine for the *prothesis,* and the 'waking' (*xenychtisma*) of the cadaver, meaning staying by the side of the deceased the night before the burial and mourning for the whole night is usually a task overseen by the women of the family or elder, experienced members of the community, mostly – though not exclusively – women (Tsouloucha & Vlachaki 2010, 90). In these communities, preparing and wearing the funerary shroud (the so-called *anaoli*) constitute a form of folklore art that survives from generation to generation with specific religious connotations: if the process is not followed according to tradition, then the soul (*psyche*) of the dead will remain tormented (Tsouloucha & Vlachaki 2010, 90).

In her anthropological study of death-cult in rural modern Greek society, Håland (2011, 189 ff) compared and contrasted the role of women in the ancient and modern Greek funeral arrangements respectively to conclude that the participation of women in the performance of death-rituals is part of a wider understanding that she identified as 'poetics of womanhood': in simple words 'how to be good at being a woman' (Håland

2011, 189). She convincingly argued that although ancient and modern narratives rejected the idea of 'public' female performance, in reality, women had an active stance in public events such as funerals (Håland 2007; Håland 2011, 189) and ritual lament might be the most representative example towards this direction as we shall see below.

Before proceeding to the *ekphora*, I would like to discuss a special burial from the cemetery of Nisyros where we see another aspect of Håland's 'poetics of womanhood' process culminated through the choice of burial goods which were selected most certainly by women to accompany a young girl in her grave. The pithos burial was unearthed in the Classical and Hellenistic cemetery of the *polis* of Nisyros at Mandraki. The burial goods accompanying the body, which is identified as a young girl, have been published in catalogue form (pithos burial 15: Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 382-386 cat. nos. 71-78;) but we do not possess any other taphonomic information on the burial itself. The burial is dated to the early Hellenistic period though some of the items are dated in the late Classical period (bronze ring and glass beads from a necklace: Triantafyllidis 2011, 387, cat. nos. 79-80). The young girl was accompanied by an impressive number of clay figurines: two busts possibly representing deities of chthnonic nature (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, cat. nos. 71-72; for the identification and use of busts in domestic and other contexts see Daffa-Nikonanou 1973, 110-6; Chryssanthaki-Nagle 2006; Froning et al. 2010, 15-25; cf. Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 382-3), three figurines representing mortal women; more specifically, a standing woman, a *kourotrophos* (child nurse) and a seated woman respectively (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, cat. nos. 73-5; for the function of *kourotrophoi* figurines see Hadjisteliou-Price 1978; Simon 1987, 157-69; Tsakalou-Tzanavari 2002, 220; cf. Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 383-5), two figurines of a dove possibly associated with the cult of Aphrodite (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, cat. no. 76; for the connection of the doves with Aphrodite see Kostoglou-Despini 1979, 14; figurines

representing doves have also been found in the classical necropolis of Kameiros (Jacopi 1931, 117; cf. Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 385), a figurine of a turtle (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, cat. no. 77) associated again with chthonic deities (see Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 386 for an extensive bibliography of clay turtle figurines in Classical graves) and finally a clay replica of a fig (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 387, cat. no. 78 with bibliography on the presence of figs in graves in the archaic and Classical periods).

The funerary goods were completed with the presence of two items of personal adornment, both of which were dated in the 4th c. BC: a bronze ring (Triantafyllidis 2011, cat. no. 79) and part of a necklace consisting of glass beads (Triantafyllidis 2011, cat. no. 80). The presence of these items in the grave of the young girl are indicative of the special status of the deceased as a loving daughter as well as her potential elevated status in society since she was buried with items of personal adornment which are usually present in adult burials (see discussion in Chapter 5, section 5.2.2). More importantly, the clay figurines, besides their chthonic character, are associated with the female sphere; some of the iconographic elements such as the busts and the dove can be paralleled with the wall-paintings in the cist tombs of northern Greece of the same period (see in particular the wall-paintings in the tomb of a young woman who was cremated with her newborn in Aiani, Chapter 5, section 5.2.1). As such, the figurines were not only childhood toys or protective 'charms'; they symbolised the idealised role of womanhood that the girl did not survive to fulfil.

The second part of the funeral consisted of the *ekphora*, which had to be performed before sunrise according to the Solonian law (Demosthenes, *Against Makartatos* 43.62). The men led the procession of the body through the streets of the *polis* causing significant disruption. The bier was either transported on a cart pulled by horse or carried by male pallbearers as evidenced in vase iconography (Garland 1985). Female

mourners followed behind the procession singing laments and dirges along with manifestations of personal grief such as tearing their cheeks, baring their breasts and pulling/cutting their hair to express grief (Horst-Warhaft 1992; Sourvinou-Inwood 1996, 33; Alexiou 2002, 133 ff). Funerary laments also occurred during the *prothesis,* but in the *ekphora,* they were transformed into a powerful, public manifestation of female grief.

It has been argued that lamentation was the central event (what we can also define as a *dromenon,* a staged audio-visual act with various social implications) of the funeral (Stevanović 2009, 38). The earliest material evidence of lament in the Greek world dates back to the late Mycenaean period (1250 – 1150 BC) manifested in the Tanagra sarcophagi with representations of mourners either in procession or individually, their hands raised above their heads directly towards the body of the deceased or around the grave (Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 27). It is interesting to notice that their posture is similar to the imagery of Geometric vases, archaic clay plaques and vases and white ground lekythoi of the Classical period (Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 27-8). The prevalence and the continuity of the figure of the mourner in Greek funerary art for a prolonged period of time are indicative of the everlasting importance of lament in funerary ritual.

Comparative research in the literary sources of ritual lament from the Classical to the modern era has proven its exceptional features: it is characterized by emotional intensity, its content focuses on the negative aspects of the separation between the dead and the family/kin group and finally it has an antiphonic performative structure (Stevanović 2009, 42). Moreover, apart from being occasionally connected with uncontrolled behaviour and self-imposed mutilation, lament functions on two different levels: psychological and performative/communicational (Holst-Warhaft 1992, 1-2; Murnaghan 1999, 204). On the one hand, lamentation acts an intermediate liminal stage (spatially and temporarily divided from everyday life) between the sorrow of death and

normality in a sense that it is the means for those in direct confrontation with pain and loss to relieve and recover after a great distress (Danforth 1982). On the other hand, despite the fact that traditionally lament is not fixed but created spontaneously on the occasion of death, at the same time it can be a creative performance that goes beyond the personal grief of the relatives or the kin group often with the participation of other members of the community or with the employment of professional mourners (Holst-Warhaft 1995).

The performative aspect of lamentation is of particular importance in relation to the archaeological context. The laments either during the *prothesis* or the *ekphora* are doubly performative with increasing degrees of dramatization leading to the funeral itself. In modern Greece, the laments constitute a ritual equal to a social duty in most villages sung by the women of the house or the neighbouring women and sometimes even by professional lamenters (Håland 2011, 190). Echoes of these laments can be traced on grave inscriptions: an inscription associated with a Hellenistic cist tomb in Nisyros (grave 40: Jacopi 1932-1933, 529; Chapter 5, section 5.2.1) described the virtuous life of the owner of the tomb; a pious woman who was 'rushed' to the company of Demeter and Persephone. The inscription, which is indicative of the elevated social status of the deceased, can be alternatively read as a pious invocation to the goddesses of the underworld for the protection of the soul of the deceased.

Once at the cemetery, or burial place, the final part of the funeral involved the inhumation or cremation of the body (for an extensive discussion on the modes of disposal see section 4.4 below), with grave goods placed inside or near the grave. Unfortunately, archaeological reports often omit to describe the position and orientation of the body in the graves of the South-Eastern Aegean. Furthermore, quite a lot of funerary contexts are disturbed, therefore it is not possible to draw specific patterns on

the basis of body positioning and orientation. Whenever this information is present, the most commonly referenced positions are the supine and extended-supine for Rhodes and the necropolis at Pontamos in Chalki; in the Chalkian graves specifically the head of the deceased was almost always oriented towards the east (with a few exceptions, Jacopi 1932, 120ff; Palaiologou 2008, 48). In Nisyros, though very few burials were undisturbed, the deceased were placed in the supine-extended position in the Hellenistic cist graves (Jacopi 1932-1933) with the head oriented towards the east (or north-east as in grave 40 dated to the 2nd c. BC). Quite often the tombs were re-opened to accommodate subsequent burials; this phenomenon is very common in the urban cemeteries of Rhodes, and it is possibly associated with the lack of space in the cemeteries of the densely populated city. The above explanation does not, however, apply to the cemetery of Kymissala in southern Rhodes where at least 53 individuals were discovered in the large funerary chamber of tomb 10 in Sector I (Stefanakis et al. 2015, 273); it is likely that the tomb was reused and eventually became the ossuary of a family or a kin group for generations. Generally, the reuse of tombs with the addition of burials is a common occurrence in the graves of Kymissala though it is not always clear whether this was a conscious choice (i.e. the result of subsequent burials or the reuse of the tombs as ossuaries in the long term) or the result of prolonged looting.[14] Overall, though we cannot draw a comprehensive picture, the placement and the orientation of the deceased in the grave seem to have been influenced either by practical considerations or symbolic connotations in connection to the landscape, other monuments or even astronomical or cosmological deliberations (Parker Pearson 1999, 6).

[14] Looting was practised in the cemeteries of Kymissala already from antiquity. One of the most common acts performed by the tomb robbers was the disposal of human remains in neighbouring tombs, thus leading to the larger concentration of anthropological material in specific tombs. This is, however, not the case with tomb 10 in Sector I (Stefanakis et al. 2015, 273).

4.4. Modes of disposal of the human body

It is often suggested in scholarship that from the post-Classical period onwards inhumation was the customary rite for the disposal of the deceased in the Greek world as opposed to cremation which was practised intermittently (see, for example, Audin 1960, 526 and Morris 1992, 52ff). This hypothesis is erroneously founded on the comments of Roman authors such as Tacitus (*Ann.* 16.6) and Petronius (*Satyricon* 111.2) suggesting that cremation was the 'mos romanus', while inhumation was the 'mos graecus' (Morris 1992, 31, 52; Ahrens 2015, 186-7). Indeed, archaeological surveys and excavations of various cemeteries in mainland Greece suggest a general pattern where inhumation is prevalent over cremation. For instance, in Classical and Hellenistic Athens inhumation appears to be the preferred method of burial (Vlachou 2012, 375). The same pattern is predominant in northern Greece, where out of the 600 graves excavated at the cemetery of Olynthos only 53 contained cremations (Robinson 1942, 144) and out of the 229 burials in the cemetery of Akanthos only 16 contained cremations (Parlama 1978, 7). Finally, the same picture emerges in Northern Peloponnese where inhumation was the regular mode of the disposal of the deceased (Dimakis 2011, 95). These sites are among the very few well published regional contexts, and although they indicate a general tendency, lack of publications on hundreds of cemeteries all over mainland Greece hinder a detailed understanding of these practices diachronically.

The picture in the South-Eastern Aegean is somewhat different. On present evidence, it is apparent that inhumation and cremation were equally popular modes of burial on the islands and the *peraea* with regional variations; however, it is not possible to pursue a quantitative approach. A recent, contextual study on cremation in post-Classical Asia Minor has archaeologically confirmed that cremation was practised to a

certain extent in Asia Minor from the Hellenistic period onwards. In his article on the practice of cremation in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, Ahrens observes that 'the eastern Mediterranean has been considered, in terms of general studies on cremation, an area where inhumation rites were practiced nearly exclusively since the Hellenistic period' (Ahrens 2015, 185). He suggests that this assumption is heavily biased because it is founded on survey finds and a superficial comprehension of the distribution of the archaeological material (Ahrens 2015, 187); surprisingly enough scholars researching cinerary urns and funerary inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor have been conscious for a long time that cremations were practised in the area to an unidentified extent (Ahrens 2015, 187; Spanu 2000, 174). He then proceeds to present literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence (Ahrens 2015, 187-191) spanning from the post-Classical period to the 3rd c. AD (Ahrens 2015, 193ff) suggesting that cremation was not an uncommon occurrence in the cemeteries of Asia Minor as previously believed (Ahrens 2015, 208). His study – although preliminary and with various limitations as highlighted by the author himself (Ahrens 2015, 187) – is important because the evidence collected and analysed is studied in a chronological sequence, thus revealing various patterns of diffusion of cremations from the early Hellenistic to the late Roman period. More importantly, Rhodes and some parts of the *peraea* are included in the dataset but not without limitations.

Returning to the 'big picture', Ahren's study demonstrated that cremations were practised side-by-side with inhumations in Asia Minor in the areas of Ionia, Pisidia, Rhodes[15] and the wider area of Caria (Ahrens 2015, 208), thus concluding that it was an

[15] Though I do not consider Rhodes as an extension of Asia Minor, Ahrens has adopted a more traditional approach in bibliography where Rhodes is considered geographically (and to a certain extent culturally) a part of Asia Minor. This is erroneous in my opinion but at this instance I am only assessing his data presentation.

inherently 'Greek' or indigenous tradition adopted by these regions; overall though 'on a super-regional level' inhumations were more common especially from the Imperial period onwards (Ahrens 2015, 208). The findings of his study essentially confirmed what has been a 'common secret' among archaeologists in the past (Devreker et al. 2003, 342). Cremations were not a rare occurrence in the area, nor there is an even ratio between inhumations and cremations; we can observe a shift in burial practices both within a micro as well as a macro-geographical and chronological framework.

4.4.1. Inhumations

In the western world, the choice between inhumation and cremation is often the result of various considerations. It is often dictated by enduring personal, religious or philosophical beliefs coded into societies in what can be described as the 'moral of tradition' meaning the duration, continuation, and validation of past practices (Rebay-Salisbury 2012, 15). As in modern societies, inhumation and cremation were undoubtedly the most common methods of disposal in the ancient Mediterranean and at times they were practised interchangeably as we have already seen. In Classical archaeology inhumation refers to the disposal of human remains (single or multiple bodies) in various grave types from simple pit graves to monumental tombs as well as within vessels (most commonly pithoi).

The vast majority of inhumations in the South-Eastern Aegean were single burials contained in simple graves (predominantly pits but also cists) from the late 4th c. to the Roman period. Nonetheless, local variations emerge. Rhodes is the only island where inhumations and cremations were practised relatively at the same scale throughout the

Hellenistic period; quite often inhumations and cremations occurred within the same tombs (Fraser 1977, 12) but we cannot draw safe statistical conclusions due to the fragmented nature of the evidence. Normally, each grave was destined for one body with a few exceptions: larger tombs could contain two or more burials, but it is impossible to determine whether these burials occurred at the same time due to limitations imposed by the stratigraphical information.

Interestingly enough, a unique type of inhumation and cremation occurred in the urban cemeteries of Rhodes; namely the deposition of skeletal remains or cremations within trenches (**fig. 4.1**) along with funerary gifts (Patsiada 2013, 53). At Kousournas plot in the central necropolis four shallow elongated trenches were unearthed two of which contained skeletal remains and burial goods: trench no 1 contained the remains of a child burial in a hydria (Papachristodoulou 1987, 444) while traces of burials and echyntrismoi were also evident in trench 4 some of which were contained in loculi (Papachristodoulou 1987, 444). Likewise, trench no 4 at Zaranis plot in the central urban necropolis contained skeletal remains accompanied by five perfume vases (Papachristodoulou 1989, 394, pl. 172a), while the skeleton of an adult individual accompanied with numerous pottery offerings and cinerary urns was unearthed in trench 5 (Papachristodoulou 1989, 394); another trench at the same plot was filled with cinerary hydriai (**fig**. **4.2**). Two similar trenches were excavated at the Pintzios plot located in the north of the Zaranis plot; trench 1 was divided by stone slabs to three sections/loculi two of which contained skeletal remains, while the third one contained a stone ossuary (Patsiada 1989, 324). These trenches share a common characteristic: all of them were part of cemeteries of simple rock-cut graves, but it is not clear whether they were built at the same time that the tombs were constructed or at a later date. It would be plausible to suggest that they were created at a later date either as the direct result of

lack of space or as spaces for secondary burials, though there is no clear evidence to suggest the latter theory; we do not possess enough information on the nature and concentration of the skeletal parts discovered in the trenches. One could be tempted to draw a comparison between the Rhodian trenches and the 'Opferrinnen' ceremony in late Geometric and Proto-attic burials in Athens, (Young 1939, 55-67; Houby-Nielsen 1996, 46, no. 17; Vlachou 2012, 374-5) which revived again in the late archaic and late Classical cemeteries of Athens (Houby-Nielsen 1996a, 46–51; Vlachou 2012, 375); this practice involved the display of clay offerings (i.e. vases, figurines, etc.) on table-shaped structures (Opferrinnen) in front of the graves while they were still unsealed. Subsequently, the offerings were consumed by the pyres of the cremations and they were ceremonially buried within the trenches in front of the graves. This theory, although tempting, cannot be fully substantiated; the Rhodian trenches contained burials alongside pottery as well. Therefore, it is possible that they served as loci for primary cremation; this is certainly the case with some of the trenches at Zaranis plot (Papachristodoulou 1989a, 394, pl. 172a). A future publication of these burials will allow us to understand their function and connection to the graves.

A different picture emerges from the cemeteries of Kymissala in southern Rhodes where inhumation was the only mode of disposal of the body (Stefanakis and Patsiada 2009-2011, 76-86; Stefanakis et al. 2015, 266 ff). The rock-cut chamber tombs housed multiple inhumations, but skeletal remains have been severely damaged due to uncontrolled looting in the past (Stefanakis et al. 2015, 267) therefore we cannot establish an average of inhumations per tomb. Very few Hellenistic tombs have been excavated most of which belong to the late 4th c. BC. The most important of them is large chamber tomb 10 in Sector I, dated to the early Hellenistic period (early 3rd c. BC), which was probably reused as a family tomb or an ossuary for a significant length of time given

the impressive amount of skeletons retrieved; bioarchaeological analysis suggests that the anthropological material corresponds to at least 53 individuals including adults and infants (Bourbou 2015, 273).

Outside Rhodes it appears that inhumation was the favoured mode of burial, although cremation was practised sporadically. At Nisyros cremation was popular in the archaic period as suggested by twenty-two funeral pyres discovered in the cemetery outside the city walls (Jacopi 1932-1933; Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 310). It was continued to a limited extent in the 5th and 4th c. BC in the cemetery of Kastri south of the city walls where three funerary pyres were discovered in 2007 along with echyntrismoi burials (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 316, n. 44, excavation was directed by K. Bairami to be published in the *Chronika Series* of the Archaiologikon Deltion). However, cremations cease to exist in the Hellenistic period, and inhumation appears to be the only mode of interment in the Nisyrian cemeteries from the late 3rd c. onwards. These inhumations were either echyntrismoi interments in pithoi for adults and smaller pithoi or pointed amphorae for children as well as burials in sarcophagi (though limited) up to the late 4th – early 3rd c. BC (Filimonos 1986, 64ff). From the early 3rd c. BC the deceased were interred predominantly inside built cist graves (Jacopi 1932-1933; Filimonos 1986, 71-3).

Though the pithoi echyntrismoi for adults are a distinctive Nisyrian burial custom, a vast and remarkable necropolis of child echyntrismoi has been discovered on Astypalaia at the cemetery of Kylindra (Clement et al. 2009; Hillson 2009; Michalaki-Kollia 2010; Vlachou 2012, 384). The excavator maintains that the cemetery is linked with the cults of Artemis Lochia and Eileithyia; this association is based on inscriptions which report a sanctuary dedicated to Artemis Lochia in Astypalaia (Michalaki-Kollia 2000, 175-9). The contracted position of the bodies within the jars is indicative of the

foetal position, and the main globular body of the jar could be perceived as the womb, while the neck could be associated with the birth canal. It is important to notice that the bodies of the infants were inserted inside the vases through a small opening on the side, which was subsequently covered along with the neck of the amphora after the deposition (Clement et al. 2009, 19, fig. 8). As such, this scheme could mean the symbolic substitution of the human cervix by the jar. The human cervix opens during childbirth and subsequently closes after the delivery; one can imagine that the patching of the holes on the sides of the vases and the closing of the jars with a stone or a piece of ceramic might allude to this arrangement (for ethnographic parallels of pot burials compared to wombs in Africa see Evers & Huffman 1988, 739). According to the excavators, this analogy is tempting on the basis of the small percentage of double or triple echyntrismoi; they seem to believe that the low rate of these burials is comparable to the modern rate of twin births in modern European societies (Clement et al. 2009, 20).

In the rest of the islands, it appears that inhumation was the favoured mode of burial though the evidence is very small and hardly representative due to the vast extent of looting. Skeletal remains have been found in Kastellorizo suggesting that the deceased were either interred in stone sarcophagi or built cist or carved cist graves and recesses; a built tomb with 'twin' chambers in the form of loculi covered by large stone slabs was discovered above the plateau of Avlonia and, according to the surveyor (Ashton 1995, 98), it was probably destined for the interments of a husband and his wife. It is likely that some of the larger built cists and shaft graves at Kastellorizo were destined for more than one interment. For instance, two large built cist tombs above ground might have been built for more than one interment on the basis of their size: one at Limenari is 1.67 m long, 0.61 m wide and 0.35 m wide (Ashton 1995, 107-8, picture and drawing on page 104) and is dated probably to the late Hellenistic period, while a rock-lined rectangular

shaft at Megalo Khorafi is 1.88 m long, 0.5 m wide and 0.35 m deep (Ashton 1995, 108, drawings on page 106) again dated to the Hellenistic period.

Inhumations were the main burial rite (with one exception) at the cemetery above Pontamos bay at Chalki, though cremation was also practised on the island as we shall see below. The late 4th c. funerary chambers at Pontamos contained the skeleton of one adult with the exception of tomb 11 which contained the skeleton of 1 adult and a cinerary hydria (Jacopi 1932, 145), tomb 12 which contained 2 adult interments (Jacopi 1932, 145-7), tomb 17 which may have contained the remains of an infant (Jacopi 1932, 154-5) and tombs 15 and 16 which contained one adolescent per burial chamber (Jacopi 1932, 150-2 for tomb 15 and pp. 152-4 for tomb 16). Inhumation was also practised on the island of Telos during the Hellenistic period; again evidence is very limited. The underground burial gallery at Kena was used for consecutive inhumations as the 2010 excavation demonstrated: every new inhumation was accompanied by the carving of a separate entrance in the soft rock (Kaninia 2011, 243, fig. 8) sealed with large monolithic slabs. The excavations revealed five sealed loculi each of which corresponded to five inhumations though the archaeologists believe that there were many more that eventually collapsed through time (Kaninia 2011, 243). Finally, we cannot evaluate in a quantitative manner the inhumations occurring in the cemeteries of the Peraea though Ahrens' study has proven that cremation was practised alongside inhumation to a certain extent in the coastal sites and Caria (Ahrens 2015, 203) in the Hellenistic period; inhumation was probably the main rite. The same applies for the cemeteries of Kos where we have limited information on inhumations from various reports of the city cemeteries. However these numbers are small and barely demonstrative of the broad picture.

4.4.2. Cremations

From an archaeological viewpoint cremation is a complex procedure requiring varying degrees of labour and expenditure. Described as the 'practise of burning the dead, variously on a specially constructed above-ground pyre in a crematorium pit or trench […]' (Darvill 2008), the rite of cremation is characterised by a variety of features some of which are completely invisible in the archaeological process. As such, there is a distinction between the primary rite of cremation denoting the 'remains of the pyre site' (McKinley 2013, 149) and the secondary rite of cremation referring to 'a contained or uncontained burial within a grave, accompanied or not by a primary and/or secondary deposit of pyre debris' (McKinley 2013, 150).

In early Greek tradition cremation is identified with 'heroic' death: from the archetypal death of Hercules consumed by flames (Burkert 1993, 434 with bibliography) to the funerary pyres of heroes in the *Iliad* (see *Il*. 23, 161 for Patroclus and *Il.* 24, 778 for Hector) and the *Odyssey* (see *Od.* 12, 11–15 for Elpenor and *Od.* 24, 65 for Achilles). 'Heroic' cremations are also attested in the archaeological record in various places; the most notable are the so-called 'warrior' burials where the remains of the pyre were gathered along with weapons inside metal urns (D'Agostino 2005, 190). At the same time, the rite of cremation was favoured over inhumation in some places from the Early Iron Age onwards: cremation replaced inhumation for adults in Athens up to the 8th c. BC (Whitley 1988, 110-11) and an exceptional cemetery of tumuli with funerary pyres covered by stone mounds were unearthed at Halos in Thessaly spanning from the Protogeometric to the Archaic period (Georganas 2002, 289-298; Georganas 2006, 195-205). In the archaic period, cremations are attested in a few sites such as a part of the cemetery of Aghios Ioannis on Nisyros where twenty-two funerary pyres were

investigated (Jacopi 1932-1933) and Aigai where cremation was practised alongside inhumation from the archaic period onwards (Kottaridi 2001, 359-71). In the Classical and post-Classical periods cremations did not cease to exist but are considerably fewer in mainland Greece, although they are sporadically attested; i.e. in the royal necropolis of Aigai (Andronikos 1984) which will be discussed shortly.

In the South-Eastern Aegean there is little evidence (see Patsiada 2013, 232, n. 672 for a small list of primary funerary pyres) of primary cremations in the form of funerary pyres with charred bones and ashes; this practice is generally very rare in Asia Minor (for some examples see Spanu 2000, 174; cf. Ahrens 2015, 187 and table in p. 209) nor there is any evidence of sites where funerary pyres would have taken place. Cremated remains in the form of ashes and charred bones were collected and stored in funerary urns and were subsequently placed in the tombs. In the urban cemeteries of Rhodes, cremation burials are present in a variety of grave types: simple pits were they were placed on their own or along with inhumation burials but predominantly in loculi and/or pits inside chamber tombs, built tombs and monumental graves. The receptacles came in various shapes and materials: clay hydriai and pyxidai, Hadra hydriai and stone ossuaries were the most common.

The Hadra hydriai could be polychrome, black-painted (clay-ground) or white ground. Black-painted cinerary hydriai of this type were not very common in Rhodes; only six have been identified from various funerary complexes in the urban cemeteries of the city all of which were imported from Crete (Giannikouri et al 1989). On the other hand, white ground Hadra hydriai are found in abundance in the urban necropoleis either as single cinerary urns or along with other hydriai, ossuaries, and interments (Giannikouri 1997, 12ff). These vases are of special importance because they were often imported either from Crete or Egypt (Giannikouri 1996-1997, 256; Englezou 2005, 303ff;

Enklaar 1992, 5). Finally, stone ossuaries are found in abundance in the cemeteries of Rhodes already from the early Hellenistic period where they were produced locally (Ahrens 2015, 190); they could contain charred bones, but they are frequently found out of context. Numerous stone ossuaries are also present in the cemeteries of the city of Kos. Therefore we may assume that cremation was practised; the extent of this practice, however, evades us.

Yet cremation was not adopted widely in the rest of the islands with a few exceptions. A clay hydria, now in the archaeological museum of Mytilene, was the only find that can be related to a cremation from Kastellorizo; the vase containing traces of human bones dates to the Hellenistic period as suggested by a date ascribed to it and was discovered in an unspecified tomb in 1913 (Kyparissis 1916, 62-4; Ashton 1995, 118 with figure on the same page). Kastellorizo is a rocky island without arboreal vegetation. Therefore it is difficult to imagine that cremation was the preferred mode of burial. Burning a body would require a significant amount of wood – at least a ton according to experiments (Parker Pearson 1999, 49) – that was simply not present on the island. As such inhumation was a cost-effective and practical solution and cremation may have been practised to a very limited extent.

Secondary cremation burials have also been discovered on Chalki just above the bay of Pontamos at Misopea (Jacopi 1932, 158-162; Bairami 2011, 175). The underground tomb had an antechamber leading to the main funerary chamber with loculi/niches where three funerary hydrias were discovered all dating to the 3rd c. BC. The most important of them was of the Hadra type incised with the name of the owner/deceased and accompanied by a gilded bronze wreath (Jacopi 1932, 160, fig. 43-4; Palaiologou, 220, cat. no. 52). Rescue excavations in the 1960s on the road leading from

Emporio to Chorio have revealed looted Hellenistic chamber tombs one of which contained a black-glazed cinerary urn holding bones (Fatourou 1967b, 475).

Finally, although Ahrens's study (2015) has demonstrated that cremation was also practised in the Rhodian *peraea,* a careful look at his catalogue reveals that very few sites of the *peraea* are mentioned and thus claiming that 'cremation was practised throughout the Hellenistic period on Rhodes and the **Peraea**' (my emphasis) [Ahrens 2015, 197) is an overstatement. Besides Kasara (Asardibi), a Rhodian *deme* which included Loryma where there is evidence for an osteotheke dated to the early 3rd c. BC (Bresson 1991, 155, no 163), only ancient Physkos and Selimiye (probably ancient Hydas) both in the wider area of Turunç have produced three inscribed ossuaries – one at Physkos and two at Selimiye – dating to the Hellenistic period (for Physkos see Bresson 1991, 56, no. 21 and for Selimiye see Bresson 1991, 96, no. 71). Nonetheless, many ossuaries of unknown provenance and dating (whether inscribed or uninscribed) originate from the area filling up the storage rooms of local museums. Under this context, though we can acknowledge that cremation was practised in the Rhodian *peraea*, it is not possible to maintain that it was practised to the same extent as on the island of Rhodes due to limited contextual evidence; future excavations might point towards either direction.

4.5. Funerary architecture and ritual

In this section, I will attempt to examine various manifestations of ritual practice in the South-Eastern Aegean as evidenced by architectural remains. Undoubtedly, a material-cultural approach of this sort to ritual is inherently cognitive to a sense that space can be used no less than texts and myths in relation to the 'other' (Elsner 2012, 15).

Though it cannot provide us with the whole picture – whatever that would be – it can delineate the parameters of the space that ritual, architecture, and art within ritual filled. More specifically, I will discuss various aspects of liminality and performance.

4.5.1. Rites of passage and their archaeological legacy

Of all the contributions to the study of funerary ritual in past societies, one of the most intriguing and extraordinarily enduring is that of 'the rites of passage' and more specifically the idea of liminality loosely defined as the quality of ambiguity that occurs in the middle stage of ritual performances, when the agents no longer hold their pre-ritual stage, but have not yet begun the transition to the status they aspire to achieve when the ritual is complete (Thomassen 2009).

Our modern conceptualisation of liminality in connection to ritual is often blurred. As expected, the term is not defined in many dictionaries such as the seminal Oxford English Dictionary where we only find a brief entry for the word liminal defined as: 'of or pertaining to the threshold or initial stage of a process.' The word derives from the Latin *limen*, literally meaning threshold, and though it appears as early as 1884 in the field of psychology, it was popularized by Belgian anthropologist Van Gennep (1960), whose book *Les Rites de Passage* [The Rites of Passage] published in French in 1911 and belatedly in English in 1960, remains influential as the point of departure for discussions of transitional rituals. Van Gennep defined rites of passage as 'a change in condition or a passage from one magico-religious or secular group to another' (Van Gennep 1960, 11). Essentially, he maintained that all important rites in a person's life – including death – are

marked by a threefold succession of progressive ritual stages (Turner 1967, 94; Turner 1968, 576-7; cf. Van Gennep 1960):

a. *Margin* or the *liminal stage*: to indicate a person departing from a stable social structure or a previous point of reference in the social structure or from a predefined set of social conditions.
b. *Separation* or the *pre-liminal stage*: to indicate when the state of the ritual subject is ambiguous: the old state has been abandoned, but the new one has not been reached yet.
c. *Aggregation* or the *post-liminal* stage: to indicate when the ritual object enters into a new stable state with its own rights and obligations.

Rites of passage are often interconnected with funerary ritual, and they are understood as a process through which the transfer of the living to the dead is ritually significant and exploratory of the ways in which the notion of an ideal society can come to terms with the actual living society (Bloch 1971, 138). Essentially, this means that some aspects of the funerary ritual present an idealised version of the society in which the deceased belonged. The idea of a liminal zone and the role of communities ('communitas') as well as the introduction of the performance in the understanding of the rites of passage, were initiated and further developed by Victor Turner (1967, 1969, 1974). Turner extended Van Gennep's threshold model in order to encompass many kinds of what he defined as 'social dramas' (legal, political, or religious) requiring similarly structured processes in order to reinstate order and introduce new social and moral codes within a group of people or a society (Turner 1986, 293).

Although van Gennep's tripartite structure has been questioned and challenged (Gluckman 1962; Werbner 1989), his model remains fundamental to the anthropological perception of ritual, repeatedly drawn upon for the identification of various ritual activities and applied in various cultural contexts from antiquity to modern times. In archaeology, studies pertaining to liminality – with few exceptions – are generic and often fail to discuss the different structure and characteristics of the rites of passage throughout the ritual process. For instance, it is generally accepted that the ancient Greek funeral was a 'three-act drama' (Garland 1985, 21), or in other words, a ritual divided into three liminal stages that remained unchanged throughout antiquity.

An especially interesting theme emerging in this context relates to the idea of *potentiality* in rites of passages especially when it comes to funerary events (Garwood 2011). Instead of seeking a totality in passing through the ritual process, rites of passage often 'create' fragmentary identities, which are directly relevant to the personal and social circumstances of the individuals. As such, death rites provide us with a means of exploring an imagined classificatory order and idealized transformations of personhood after death. Although the mechanisms and technologies for the constructions of 'persons' that never were may be based on a similar tripartite structure, it is highly unlikely that they retained the same social and religious significance for every single burial.

Another important approach to the archaeology of rites of passage and liminality focuses on materiality and performance as evidenced by architectural remains or material deposits. Pearson and Richards suggested that ritualized action in the form of 'walls, gateways and entrances serve to mark transitions between domains such as inside/outside, sacred/profane, male/female, public/private, enemy/friend, elite/commoner or initiate/uninitiated' (Parker Pearson and Richards 1994, 24; cf. Garwood 2011, 273, especially section 7.3). More recently, the way space, place,

architecture and ritual interact was revisited in an edited volume by Westcoat and Ousterhout (2012) with various examples of buildings as spiritually transformative spaces in the historical cultures of the Eastern Mediterranean. As we shall see, architectural forms may reify conceptual divisions, define bounded contexts for the spatial articulation of cultural meanings and ultimately guide the enactment of specific performative practices through intended directionality of actions. This is particularly important with monumental architecture and more specifically monumental tombs and ritual performance.

All in all, rites of passage in archaeology should not be understood in a selective and partial manner, focusing on specific features of ritualized passages such as thresholds, or on specific instances of the ritual process such as liminality. On the contrary, by restoring rites of passage in the archaeology of ritual, it may be possible to understand – from a material perspective – the specific purposes of ritual acts and at the same time reassess their transformative qualities in past social practices.

4.5.2. Architecture and liminality: the Tomb of the Caryatids

An interesting example where the interplay between architecture and liminality can be assessed within a sepulchral context is presented by the monumental Tomb of the Caryatids (Chapter 3, 3.3.3c) [**fig. 3.12**]. The most impressive characteristic of the tomb was its tholos ceiling, supported by a Doric entablature with architrave, a frieze with triglyphs and *metopes*, whilst the cornice was made of *promocthoi* and *guttae* in red colour. The tholos was painted in blue pigment, an imitation of the open sky with possible sepulchral connotations. Interestingly enough, instead of columns supporting the tholos, four almost life-size, rock-cut female statues, were placed in the corners of the *klinai*

supporting each side of the roof with alternating raised palms and the *poloi* on their head (**fig. 4.3**). The statues were plastered so as to imitate the effect of marble and were free-standing though carved entirely out of the rock. Each Caryatid was wearing a long chiton with folds and a himation in a different style (**fig. 4.4**).

The Rhodian Caryatids are unique because they are free-standing and three-dimensional; their presence serves a practical and potentially a symbolic function. On the one hand, they replaced columns or other supportive architectural elements and as such they guaranteed the mechanical support of the tholos. On the other hand, in the absence of contextual evidence it is difficult to ascribe a specific role to these Caryatids, but we cannot deny the overtones of mourning or lament associated with them. However, the Rhodian Caryatids do not exhibit any signs of *pathos* compared to the Caryatids from the Bulgarian tomb at Svesthari (Chapter 3, 3.3.3c); on the contrary their expression – though schematic – is far more natural and peaceful and there is a vague ambiguity as to where they could represent real, every day women.

There is no doubt that the style and attire of the Aghia Triada Caryatids is Rhodian; indeed they are wearing the same clothes and have the same hairstyles as their Rhodian sculptural equivalents representing women from the upper echelons of society (see for example Merker 1973, pl. 9, fig. 19-21; pl. 12, fig 26-28). Under this context, I would like to propose an alternative explanation as to their function by comparing and contrasting them with a group of contemporary figurines usually deposited as burial goods in graves, the so-called Tanagra figurines. Having said that, we have to stress from the outset that this is a comparison in terms of function but not form (i.e. large scale versus small scale funerary sculpture).

The Tanagra figurines are a specific style of Hellenistic moulded terracotta figurines named after the cemetery of Tanagra in Boeotia where they were initially

discovered in 1911 (Burr-Thompson 1966, 51). Since then, a plethora of these figurines of the same style have been excavated at other sites inspiring the question of their origin. They probably originated from Athens (Burr-Thompson 1966, 51) and therefore when we talk about Tanagra figurines nowadays, emphasis is given on the style and not the location. The diffusion of Tanagras was wide (Connelly 1990; Bell 1993) and the trade routes set by Athens served as a catalyst for the diffusion of the figurines (Jeammet 2010, 68) along with other traded wares. In the Hellenistic period, especially between 330 and 200 BC, Tanagra style was a dominant phenomenon in small-scale sculpture (*coroplastike*) with various figures; mostly standing draped women and girls with relaxed body postures and soft expressions (Higgins 1967, 97). These figurines can be found in houses and sanctuaries but more importantly graves. As to their interpretation as funerary gifts, many theories have been developed over the years. They could represent actual people or gods but they might also be toys (Ammerman 1990, 44) or assemblages destined for the fulfilment of various roles; for instance, the presence of figurine groups of women playing *astragaloi* or dancing in funerary assemblages might refer to the life of the deceased and their unfulfilled desires such as marriage or motherhood – a life that *could have* been – caused by a premature death (Jeammet 2010).

Could the same function be served by the Caryatids in the Rhodian tombs? Although the skeletal remains from the tombs in the funerary chamber have not been identified, the idea of the representation of dead women, perhaps some of the tomb's occupants is rather tempting; however only tomb 16 can be securely linked with a female burial because of the presence of a gold band decorated with a rosette (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 540-2). Moreover, they are larger than average size figurines and not portable; they were made as part of the decoration of the tomb itself. On the other hand, the idealised beauty of these statues might refer to an ideal state of womanhood for

the deceased, either fulfilled or not. Finally, the Caryatids could have served as funerary statues for the deposition of post-funeral offerings though entrance to the funerary chamber was quite restricted and there are no signs of cavities on the statues similar to those on a female statue that was found in front of a base in the west necropolis; the inscription read 'Menodora daughter of Demetrios from Ialysos, of the *deme* of Neopolitai, set by her son Menseros, son of Dionysios' and small cavities for liquid or other offerings were sculpted on the front of the base (the statue which was discovered at Kirchatzi plot dates to the late Hellenistic period, and remains unpublished; see reference in Fabricius 1999, 218, n. 259).

The architectural programme of the tomb highlights the fundamental link between the Caryatids, the *klinai* and the tholos itself. All elements are architecturally conjoined, and this might be of particular ritual significance. The concept of the funerary tholos or the 'celestial dome' as an allegory of the creation of the sky is first described in Plato (*Phdr* 247 b-c). Tholoi and cupolas are frequent in Macedonian tombs, though not in the South-Eastern Aegean where besides the tomb of the Caryatids only the tomb of Agios Milianos had a tholos in contrast to arches which were common in Rhodian funerary architecture. The decoration of the tholos in Hellenistic funerary chambers is geometric and schematic (see for instance the tholos in a Hellenistic tomb in Paphos with a decoration of half-stars on a red background (Michaelides 2004, 90-1, fig. 2) or monochromatic (i.e. usually blue especially in Alexandrian tombs, see Mckenzie 2011, 137). This type of decoration is probably inspired by funerary canopies originating from ancient Egypt (Guimier-Sorbets 2003; cf. Huguenot 2008, 128). In ancient texts, the terms καμάρα and θόλος are sometimes related to the canopy: for instance, we read of the golden tholos decorated with precious stones in the funerary chariot of Alexander (*Diodorus* 18.4.5) or the 'golden sky' (χρυσούν ούρανίσκον) of the throne of Darius when

Alexander sits for the first time (Plut. *Alex.* 38. 4). On the other hand, the term οὐρανίσκος appeared in the Hellenistic period and was often used to describe parts of the canopy on thrones and other official tents during banquets or carriers used for the *prothesis* (Brigger and Giovannini 2004, 243-6).

In conclusion, we may assume that the decorated tholoi probably represent the sky in various phases. As such, underground chambers with tholoi can be seen as an intermediary place between the chthonic world and the sky. This concept is also described in Platonic philosophy where the soul is compared to a butterfly trapped in the middle trying to fly towards the sky and the celestial tholos (Hautecoeur 1954, 64). Under this context, the tripartite arrangement of the *klinai*, the statues and the tholos is not only functional from a technical perspective; we can understand the funerary chamber as an intermediate place – an abode of transition rather than a final place of rest. Despite the fact that the particular details of this celestial symbolism escape us, we should bear in mind that painted *tholoi* were rare in Hellenistic tombs and as such they should have had a special eschatological significance.

4.5.3. 'Cult-rooms' and funerary ritual

The preservation of funerary cult in monumental tombs through the presence of dedicated 'cult-rooms' and other paraphernalia is observed both in the monumental tombs of Asia Minor (Carstens 2004) as well as the 'private' tombs of Ptolemaic and Roman Alexandria (Venit 2002, 13). With the exception of the Charmyleion on the island of Kos, all the other tombs and funerary temples are of Rhodian origin. Charmyleion is the only monumental tomb that has been positively identified as a *heroon*, thus

suggesting post-mortem heroisation, on the basis of epigraphic identification. Although the record of the tomb's foundation has not survived, we retain the dedicatory stele reading:

1 ἱερὰ ἀ γᾶ καὶ ἀ οἰκία
ἀ ἐπὶ τᾶι γᾶι καὶ τοὶ κᾶ-
ποι καὶ ταὶ οἰκίαι ταὶ
ἐπὶ τῶν κάπων Θεῶν
5 Δυώδεκα καὶ Χαρμύλου
ἥρω vac. τῶν Χαρμυλέων.
(Kos, Pyli, 3rd c. BC; copied from ZPE 24, 1976, 207, 3).

Translation (author's own):

Holy may be the land and the home (that they have) on this earth and this garden and the homes (they will have?) in the gardens of the twelve gods, her (o/es) of the Charmylioi.

Two 'cult-rooms' surmounted by a façade were installed on a platform over the subterranean chamber of loculi (Schazmann 1934, 110-127; Roux 1987, fig. 136; Rumscheid 1994, 76-82, cat. no 316). Besides the fact that both rooms are described as identical, we have no other information on their interior arrangement and furnishings. The only information available, besides the fact that they were protected by the tomb's façade, is that they were supported by six parallel rows of poros blocks set above the vaulted basement. This arrangement possibly facilitated the raising of the floor to a

required height. The rooms were connected with the underground vault with a small staircase.[16]

In contrast, the almost square 'cult-room' in the Tomb of Archokrates at Lindos (Rhodes) is located after the main entrance and the narrow antechamber (Dyggve & Poulsen 1960, 491-504, pl. XIII B). The room contained an elevated podium on the west approached by steps along the sides. The platform had a T-shaped burial space beneath, while rock-cut benches lined the walls of the rest of the sides of the room. Loculi were added on the lateral sides of the chamber at a later stage, but even so it is not easy to reconstruct the initial shape of the room due to the high degree of destruction.

Another area that could possibly be identified as a 'cult-room' (though it is not identified as such in the literature) is the antechamber in the monumental tomb at the Karageorgiou plot. The antechamber, in the form of an open court, is located to the west of the entrance and is accessible through a four-stepped, wide stairwell. Traces of quarrying suggest the presence of benches on either side of the entrance (Patsiada 2013, fig. 77); their presence is quite important since it is suggested that the stoa at least was probably open to visitors at some point during the use of the tomb. Patsiada compared these benches to the benches found within the 'cult-room' in Archokrateion and suggested that the stoa itself might have been the locus of funerary ritual in the Karageorgiou Tomb (Patsiada 2013, 95), which presents a rather plausible explanation. At a later period, the intercolumnar spaces of the colonnade were filled with mortar, and thus the façade became a semi-column one; it is likely that through this intervention access was restricted to fewer people.

[16] Today, only remains of the underground funerary chamber are visible on the site.

These ‘cult-rooms’ (if the Karageorgiou stoa can be broadly identified as one) do not share similar architectural characteristics, but all three form substantial parts of the funerary complexes to which they belong. The identification of the Charmyleion as a *heroon* is verified by the inscription already presented; nonetheless, detailed knowledge is lacking on how the hero-cult was organised and who participated as well as the nature of the rituals performed. What we know is that land, buildings, and gardens were consecrated to the Twelve Gods and Charmylus, a hero of the kin of Charmyleioi. As such, we are able to visualise the funerary *temenos* (for a reconstruction of a generic Hellenistic funerary *temenos* see Novakova 2011, fig. 1), where a funerary altar would be the focal architectural element for the deposition and sacrifice of offerings to the deceased and the gods (Berges 1986, 12-26). Yet, unlike traditional *heroa*, which were situated within or in close proximity to the urban centre (Novakova 2011, 2013), funerary *temenoi* were separated from the urban landscape, thus accentuating their sacred character. In conclusion, the ‘cult-rooms’ in the monumental tomb of Charmylos and his family accentuate the dual character of this funerary cult: on the one hand, access to the tomb and the ‘cult-rooms’ was restricted to the family and the kin group, yet the presence of the temenos including gardens and auxiliary buildings would have definitely attracted the local community – the Koan *deme* of Halieis – and it is possible to suggest that the cult of the hero Charmylos combined with the worship of the Twelve Gods gradually accrued a unique local appeal. According to Sherwin-White (1978, 367), the background to the pubic heroisation of certain individuals at Kos was an amalgamation of various characteristics deriving from family cults and the cults of Hellenistic rulers. To some extent, the sacredness of the site was retained as witnessed to date by the Christian chapel of Aghios Stavros (Holy Cross) built directly above the vaulted chamber.

Heroisation or lack thereof is a more complex affair when discussing the almost contemporary Archokrateion at Lindos. Besides the monumental architecture, there is no unambiguous epigraphic evidence suggesting that Archokrates and his family were the recipients of an enduring hero-cult comparable to that of Charmylos. Nonetheless, the layout of the 'cult-room' in the tomb advocates funerary ritual through the means of performance. By employing the term performance we do not necessarily mean a large-scale public spectacle; scale can be modest and relevant to the space as well as the groups of people involved. This 'manipulation' of architecture through human intervention, the 'production of context' according to Thomas (1996, 171; cf. Boyd 2015), is what essentially renders certain actions more meaningful than others. As such, the presence of benches and an elevated platform in the 'cult-room' hint the materialisation of a funerary ritual whose specifics, unfortunately, evade us. At the same time, the difference of level between the benches and the platforms suggests fluctuating degrees of hierarchy in the performance of this *δρώμενον* by different agents.

4.5.4. Rhodian *klinai*: typology, occupancy, spatial arrangement and ritual function

Tombs with *klinai* from the Rhodian urban necropoleis present an interesting case study of ritual action within an architectural context. In the Greek world, a *kline* (bed *or* couch), was a distinct type of furniture used predominantly for sleeping, banqueting but also for the presentation of the corpse (*prothesis*) and transport (*ekphora*) of the deceased (Baughan 2013, 15ff). The earliest rock-cut funerary beds with decoration rendered with stucco in relief come from the Theodosiou plot (Filimonos 1993a, 595)

[**fig. 4.5, 4.6a**). Five rock-cut Pi-shaped beds (**fig. 4.6a**) conserve their lower part with rectangular footstools in relief decorated either with rosettes alternating with phialai (eastern *kline*) [**fig. 4.6b**), a motif already known from three *klinai–sarcophagi* of a 3rd c. tomb at Antiphellos (Fedak 1990, 78-9, fig. 93a-b; Patsiada 1999, 128, n.7), or palmettes (northern and southern *kline*) carved in low relief. It is possible that the Theodosiou *klinai* were equipped with stone cushions, since one was found in tomb 1 beside the eastern *kline*. Much to our dismay, the beds at Sougganidis plot were heavily damaged upon discovery (Filimonos 1992, 612), whilst those at Michail Petridi plot are not sufficiently published (Michalaki-Kollia 1992, 597, fig. 5, pl. 341a).

Second century Pi-shaped *klinai* at Karageorgiou plot (**fig. 4.7**) and the Tomb of the Caryatids (**fig. 4.8a**) also preserved their lower part with rectangular feet in relief. The surviving legs at latter are embellished with double volutes and palmettes in low relief (**fig. 4.8b**). The *klinai* at the Tomb of the Caryatids were also equipped with cushions (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 540). Finally, the panels of the beds at the Tomb of the Caryatids were decorated with friezes in low relief with human, animal and mythical figures, which unfortunately remain unpublished (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 540-2, fig. 6, pl. 340-1).

Rhodian funerary beds were placed in rectangular shaped chambers mostly in a Pi-shaped arrangement such as the chambers in the Theodosiou and Sougganidis chambers as well as the Karageorgiou chamber and the Tomb of the Caryatids and rarely adjacent to the walls of the chamber as in hypogeum A at the Petridis complex. Their extant dimensions span from 1.6 to 2.27 m in length and 0.3 to 0.45 m in width; the Theodosiou *klinai* were particularly long and narrow. All the funerary beds were rock-cut in the soft poros limestone and the beds in the Sougganidis chamber as well as the two 2nd c. BC tombs were plastered, thus mimicking the effect of more expensive material

like marble; actual marble *klinai* were quite rare in Greek tombs and only some beds in Macedonian tombs were made of white marble (Sismanidis 1997, 189-90, n. 603). It is not possible to determine how many beds were associated with actual burials due to limited publication or destruction. In the Theodosiou plot, only the eastern *kline* was related to at least two burials. In contrast, in the Tomb of the Caryatids, all three *klinai* were each placed in front of two parallel (the one placed in front of the other), rock-cut pit graves, with which they were clearly associated.

Though we do not have a clear picture of the actual burials, rock-cut chambers with *klinai* were destined mostly for inhumation (Hypogeum A at Petridis street and the Sougganidis plot) though cremation was also attested (Tomb of the Caryatids). In the Tomb of the Caryatids, where cremation was predominantly practised, tomb 16 contained a cinerary urn and tomb 14 an osteotheke made of poros stone. In the Sougganidis plot it is not clear whether burials were actually contained within the *klinai* chambers, while in the Karageorgiou plot the tombs have not been excavated due to static problems during the rescue excavation. Nevertheless, two *klinai* on the narrow side of the Karageorgiou chamber served as cist graves with a gabled roof containing the remains of the deceased in their recesses (Patsiada 2013, fig. 77, 79). Tombs with two or more beds were clearly intended for multiple burials and may have been family tombs. But when skeletal remains are lacking, as they usually are, it is impossible to know how many burials were housed in each burial chamber. However, it is evident that the Karageorgiou chamber contained (or at least had the capacity since the number of burials has not been established) many more burials compared to the other tombs, while re-occupation of the tombs probably occurred over the years especially in the Karageorgiou chamber where an additional bed was added at a later stage, or in the tomb of the Caryatids (burial 14). Although human remains were not deposited directly on the *kline*, scattered human

skeletal remains along with 3rd c. pottery sherds vessels were found on the north-eastern corner of the funerary chamber at Theodosiou plot, and it is possible that they were associated with the adjacent *kline*.

The 'interment' of the deceased upon stone *klinai* has been well documented in early tombs in Asia Minor, where the deceased were laid out upon stone benches and rock-cut formations imitating beds and is further evidenced by the presence of anthropoid burial hollows on some Anatolian funerary beds (Baughan 2013, 169-170). Floor burials are also attested in a later couch tomb at Sardis (Baughan 2013, 169, cat. no. 4) and in a tumulus in Mysia (Baughan 2013, 169, cat. no. 60); more surprisingly in the Dardanos tumulus in the Troad, the remains of at least forty-two individuals were found on and beneath three stone beds, stacked with intervening offerings that attest to continuous reuse through the centuries (Baughan 2013, 169, cat. no. 62). In Macedonia and northern Greece, inhumation and cremation were practised side by side in funerary chambers with beds. Given that many of these tombs were already looted upon discovery, it is somewhat difficult to restore burials and funerary goods contained in them. However, it is almost certain that inhumation in Macedonian tombs occurred exclusively in *klinai-sarcophagi,* which could contain more than one burials: one inside the recess of the *sarcophagus,* one on the actual surface of the *kline-sarcophagus* while sometimes a cinerary urn could also be placed directly on the bed. Skeletal remains in Macedonian tombs were found directly on the beds of the tombs of Potidaia, Dion II and Pydna III (Sismanidis 1997, 30-31, 193-4, 230), while in tomb I at Dion the remains of two individuals were deposited on the same stone *kline-sarcophagus* (Sismanidis 1997, 91-5; 119-123). Other Macedonian tombs contained wooden beds associated with cinerary urns; these beds did not hold the body but the armour of the deceased (tomb II & III, the so-called tomb of the Prince and the tomb of Philip at Vergina respectively [Sismanidis

1997, 139]). In tombs where cremation was practised, the funerary bed made of wood, which was used during the *prothesis* and the *ekphora,* was consumed in the funerary pyre; the bed was usually replaced by a new one, either in stone or precious wood as in tomb II at Vergina (Guimier-Sorbets 2001).

On the other hand, in Italy inhumation was practised in the necropoleis of Tarentum where in some cases the dead were placed on funerary beds within individual or family tombs (Bertocchi 1964, 83, fig. 64, 87, fig. 67, 92, fig. 72, 94, fig. 74, 106, fig. 86); this was a one-way process since the funerary chambers were later sealed by stone slabs which were painted or had decoration in relief similar to the slabs on Alexandrian loculi. As such, Tarentine chambers with *klinai* signalled a definite closure and the chambers were not be reopened or disturbed. In contrast, the tombs in via dei Cristallini (Baldassare 1998) and inside the hypogeum of Santa Maria la Nuova (Gabrici 1912, 148-61) in Naples were probably family tombs which were used over and over again and as such the deceased were interred inside the *klinai-sarcophagi,* which were subsequently covered with terracotta slabs. Finally, in Alexandria no skeletal remains have been found on a *kline* (Guimier-Sorbets and Nenna 2003, 561). The funerary chambers in Alexandrian tombs were open spaces in the hypogea and the only distinction between a *kline* and a *kline-sarcophagus* is whether it contains the deceased; *klinai-sarcophagi* acted as burial receptacles, while plain *klinai* were associated with loculi burials usually above the bed. According to Venit (2002, 19), both types offered a place for the body to be laid out and in her opinion it is most likely that all the dead – both those consigned to *kline-sarcophagi* and those deposed in loculi - were provided with a rite of a second *prothesis*. Similarly, Andriani argues for perpetual *prothesis* on the *kline* (Adriani 1966, 106) and he also believes that both types of beds were used for the exposition of the deceased during the funerary ceremony in connection with simple rock-cut benches occasionally found in

the funerary chamber in tombs preceding the *klinai* chambers. On the other hand, Guimier-Sorbet and Nenna (2003, 561) reject the above hypothesis and ascribe a symbolic function to the Alexandrian funerary beds. In their opinion, the central and elevated placement of a single bed in the funerary chamber is reminiscent of the Macedonian tombs and the *prothesis* of the deceased is raised to heroic status. Moreover, it might also be an indication of the elevated status of the deceased.

Returning to the Rhodian *klinai* chambers, it has become evident that Rhodian beds are quite unique in the Mediterranean world. With the exception of two of the *klinai* in the Karageorgiou chamber and the Sougganidis *klinai* where we have no information, all the other beds were associated with pit graves beside the *klinai* containing either inhumations or cremations. Typically, the *klinai-sarcophagi* of the Karageorgiou chamber served the same purpose as the *klinai-sarcophagi* in tombs in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Italy, and Alexandria. However, the relationship between the graves and the plain Rhodian *klinai* themselves can only be compared to the Alexandrian plain *klinai* with significant differences. In Alexandrian tombs, plain *klinai* were associated with a single loculus hewn above the bed (Guimier-Sorbets and Nenna 2003), while in Rhodes simple *klinai* were usually associated with more than one pit graves as we have already seen. More importantly, while Alexandrian chambers with beds contained only one *kline* (with the exception of two beds in a gamma-shaped arrangement with the *kline* placed in adjacent walls within the burial chamber of Chatby Hypogeum A; Guimier-Sorbets and Nenna 2003, 574), their Rhodian counterparts always contained more than one *kline* in a Pi-shaped (i.e. Theodosiou chamber, Sougganidis chamber, Karageorgiou chamber, Tomb of the Caryatids) or a gamma-shaped arrangement (i.e. hypogeum A at Petridi street). Furthermore, as with the opinion of Guimier-Sorbets and Nenna on Alexandrian beds and the laying of the deceased (Guimier-Sorbets and Nenna 2003, 561), it is equally difficult

to ascribe a rite of secondary *prothesis* to the Rhodian beds which were particularly narrow.

Undoubtedly, the Rhodian funerary chambers have the interlocking arrangement of *klinai* in a Greek *andron* in which each wall – even the rear one – accommodated at least one couch placed lengthwise as well as the short end of another couch. Furthermore, the presence of thrones in the Karageorgiou chamber and the Tomb of Caryatids might reinforce this hypothesis. However, these arrangements are not necessarily meant to evoke banquet halls in the absence of direct or circumstantial evidence such as banquet vessels; yet it is a hypothesis that cannot be overlooked. Alternatively, multi-bed tombs can also be explained by the access patterns of the overall tomb architecture. With the exception of the Sougganidis chamber and hypogeum A at Petridis street, all other multi-bed chambers in Rhodes had an antechamber either in the form of a stoa (Karageorgiou tomb), a vestibule (Tomb of the Caryatids) or a narrow hallway leading to the funerary chamber (Theodosiou tomb). The presence of an antechamber does not necessarily imply a stricter control access to the chamber – as we have already seen access to hypogeum A at Petridis Street was granted only by the roof. On the other hand, it is almost certain that the chambers at the Sougganidis and Theodosiou plots were accessible to specific visitors and the same can be said for the Karageorgiou chamber and the Tomb of the Caryatids; in contrast to the Tarantine tombs, the burial chambers were not sealed yet accessibility should have been restricted to member of the family or the kin group, potentially for the maintenance of post-funerary ritual.

In accepting that Rhodian chambers with *klinai* may be associated with certain sympotic characteristics, we must remain open to alternative or additional meanings. And even if we can conclude that primary the symbolic meaning of these funerary beds, is related to banqueting, the implications of this meaning is not certain. What we can say

with some degree of certainty though, is that Rhodian tombs with *klinai* conform to a general emphasis on theatricality and performance and the best example is the Tomb of the Caryatids with its almost dramatic iconographical programme. This theatricality, a prominent feature of the late 3rd – early 2nd c. BC Hellenistic art (Pollitt 1986, 230-49), may here be linked with various performative aspects of ritual – whether symbolic or real. We can imagine tombs with *klinai* as stages where the culmination of the funerary ritual would occur with the participation of different actors and agents. These agents might not have been belonged to the same group of people that participated in the *prothesis* and the *ekphora* of the body; it is likely that the last act of the burial within the tomb would only be open to a smaller audience consisting of the family and the kin group of the deceased. The narrowness of the beds prevents us from thinking that they were actually destined for the laying-out of the bodies; however, they could symbolise a secondary *prothesis* echoing all the actions that materialised funerary ritual: from the first stages of the funeral to the last act of the deposition within the grave. In this context, if we see the beds deprived of any practical connotations, one can imagine Rhodian funerary chambers with *klinai* as backdrops against which the funerary drama was unfolded.

This sense of theatricality, which derives from the Alexandrian tombs where it had immediacy and a relevance which lacked in other Hellenistic examples of 'theatrical' art, is already known in Rhodes from the Archokrateion in Lindos, a monumental tomb that combined a theatrical façade and a ritual chamber where post-funerary *dromena* could have taken place at regular intervals. The pronounced theatricality of the tomb – both on the outside and the inside – suggest various levels of accessibility to the local community: if we follow the dominating scholarly approach (Patsiada 2013, 90, n. 206) and perceive the tomb as a theatrical stage with various props, then the façade acts as a private barrier

facilitating access to the actors/agents and the co-efficiants – whether the family or the kin group. Finally, the mere fact that Archokrates himself was a priest of Athena Lindia may suggest that certain of the post-funerary *δρώμενα* taking place within the tomb were performed by priests themselves.

To sum up, although it may be impossible to reach certainty about the actual or symbolic significance of the Rhodian *klinai,* it is important to note that this may owe as much to the multivalence of the *kline* form itself in a funerary context; they could serve at once as beds for eternal rest, as burial receptacles or as a means of identifying their occupants as elite banqueters recalling feasts enjoyed during their lifetimes or imagining their participation in a funerary feast or an afterlife banquet. More significantly, Rhodian chambers with *klinai* are characterised by a sense of theatricality which may have encouraged the intensification of dramatic performances during funerary ritual.

4.6. Post-funerary ritual

In her seminal study of 'Death and Burial in the Roman World', J.M.C. Toynbee (1971) introduced the phrase 'post-funeral practices' as a general umbrella term encompassing a larger group of actions and activities taking place after the burial. Though some archaeologists have adopted this term on the grounds of the 'neutrality' or vagueness often provided by the archaeological evidence (for instance see Ota 2009, 108), it tends to have the same meaning as the term 'burial customs' which has been used extensively (and perhaps excessively) in Greek archaeology in order to denote almost every aspect of the burial sequence. As such, both terms are problematic not only because

they tend to be overused and fairly generalised, but also because they fail to capture the quintessential characteristics of post-funerary ritual: memory and commemoration.

On the other hand, broadly speaking, post-funerary ritual in Classical archaeology is again an imprecise term signifying all those actions taking place outside the sepulchral pit after the burial. It is therefore essential to differentiate between the actions taking place in the days immediately following the burial and those occurring at regular intervals for a prolonged period of time following the burial (months or even years). Whereas the former are often difficult to pinpoint as one-time actions due to their exposure to destructive environmental factors, the latter tend to be described rather vaguely as the '[private] cult of the dead' varying widely in origin and nature suggesting repetitive veneration at the level of the family or the community in the form of commemorative acts such as the crowning and anointing of the stelai, feasts by the tombs and placing of offerings in the form of food, drinks and flowers (Garland 1985, 104ff; cf. Vlachou 2012, 371-2 though with examples limited to Geometric Greece). On the other hand, the Hellenistic period (especially from the 3rd c. BC onwards) witnessed the prominence of hero-cults dedicated to affluent individuals in various parts of the Greek world. The presence of hero-cults in the Greek world dates back to the late 6th c. BC (Antonaccio 1993; Antonaccio 1995, 268) as a distinct component of the prevalent cult of the dead, however from the 3rd c. onwards they developed into a private affair (Fabricius 1999, 71) and evidently the fine line between a private funerary cult and a hero-cult became more blurred as we shall see below.

Perishable or mobile material evidence is scarce and rarely evident on or around the graves by the end of the funeral, yet architectural remains may help us towards reconstructing the whole image even if the detail of individual actions escapes us. In this section, I will discuss post-funerary ritual in the South-Eastern Aegean by focusing on

funerary markers, particularly cylindrical funerary altars with decorations in relief, which in my opinion may enlighten our understanding of post-funerary rites and actions with an emphasis on commemoration through the deposition of food and other offerings, and heroisation (or absence thereof). Unlike other manifestations of funerary and post-funerary ritual which are perishable and do not survive in the archaeological record (i.e. libations, meals etc), cylindrical funerary altars are found in their hundreds on the islands and the cities of the *peraea*, suggesting their special importance in funerary and post-funerary ritual. More important, the association between the altars and the funerary architecture – as seen in Rhodes and Knidos – can enlighten our understanding of various facets of funerary and post-funerary ritual including heroisation.

By consciously employing the term ritual, I wish to emphasise the repetitive element of the actions taking place for months or years after the funeral in terms of ancestral veneration and commemoration. As expected, I am using this specific material corpus because of the variety of the archaeological information it can provide as well as sufficient publication or good state of preservation. However, in several cases the data emanate from different sources and are scattered throughout the reports. While every consideration has been taken to ensure that the data spans various geographical regions, the Rhodian material dominates much of the discussion due to the abundance of the archaeological evidence on the island itself as well as the sufficient state of publication. This enterprise attempts not only to approach the material from a different perspective, but also provide a significant shift of focus from the artistic and/or typological value of the objects to their context and prominence in post-funerary ritual in an attempt to provide interesting perceptions into the contemporary social history of the South-Eastern Aegean.

4.7. Cylindrical altars

Cylindrical altars of funerary provenance with decorative motifs in relief are quite common in the Hellenistic periphery spreading from Delos to Rhodes and the other islands of the South-Eastern Aegean (especially Kos) on to several regions of Asia Minor (for Delos see Couilloud 1974, 1975, for Rhodes and the islands see Berges 1996, and for Asia Minor see Berges 1986). Generally, they were decorated with garlands and ox skulls – sometimes with the addition of standing figures or snakes. Cylindrical altars on Rheneia, the necropolis of Delos, had rectangular cuttings on their surface, suggesting that they were probably used as funerary *stelai* (Couilloud 1974). In contrast to mainland Greece where cylindrical funerary altars are very rare and always out of context, so that we cannot be certain about their function (see Ricketti 1982 for limited examples), funerary cylindrical altars are the funerary monument *par excellence* on Rhodes, Kos and coastal Asia Minor (especially Knidos) up to the 1st c. AD. Other funerary monuments include free-standing sculptures, trapezai, stelai and *osteothekai* (ossuaries), though the latter are not funerary monuments *per se* in the sense that they do not demarcate a grave – the motives for choosing these monuments and what this choice tells us for the identities of the deceased will be discussed separately in the following chapter.

The funerary cylindrical altars from the Dodecanese and the coastal Asia Minor have been gathered and studied mainly from a typological and chronological perspective by Berges in two exemplary publications (Berges 1986; 1996); yet no study so far has approached them stripped from their art historical or typological connotations or has efficiently challenged their apparent use as funerary markers. In the appendix to his 'Rhodian Funerary Monuments', Fraser (1977, 76-81) put forward a hypothesis that influenced substantially (but not necessarily effectively) the study of these artefacts in

later scholarship. In short, he interrogated himself whether 'are we to consider such monuments [cylindrical altars] by reason of their altar-like form indicative of a 'Hero-cult', or not?' (Fraser 1977, 76) and he proceeded to reject altogether the idea of heroisation 'in the absence of any link between the monuments themselves or the epitaphs on the one hand, and the established cult of heroes on the other' (Fraser 1977, 81). His proposition (but convincing as it is based on a series of valid archaeological and epigraphical arguments) has never been really challenged, updated or revisited by future scholarship possibly because of the absence of definitive evidence in favour of either interpretation. Moreover, it appears that discussion has shifted and become confined to the presence or absence of heroic status rather than a comprehensive understanding of cylindrical altars and their use. Nonetheless, the link between cylindrical altars and heroisation is only a part of the discussion focusing on post-funerary ritual.

In this section, it is my intention to discuss cylindrical altars in post-funerary ritual by providing an alternative explanation for their ostensible function as funerary markers. In order to achieve this aim, it is essential to examine the altars in close connection to their original context rather than isolated as examples within a generalised typology. A fundamental starting point is the realisation that altars were essential structural components of the grave complexes to which they belonged as well as their surrounding environment. Even when they are stripped from their original context (i.e. chance finds), iconography is a significant factor in understanding their use and dissemination in post-funerary ritual. However, this enterprise comes with certain limitations. Firstly, as already briefly mentioned, the most important drawback is the lack of published excavations and the vast number of altars designated as 'chance finds' or architectural materials in secondary use without any clear context; indeed the museums of Rhodes and Kos store and display a plethora of unidentified altars. As a result in the majority of cases

the only indicator of the funerary use of these altars is the presence of inscriptions. Moreover, due to the lack of associated archaeological contexts of the Koan altars and the scarcity of the evidence from the rest of the Dodecanese, discussion will inevitably focus on the Rhodian material. It is only in the Rhodian necropoleis that we find concrete evidence on the installation of the cylindrical altars at the actual monuments (Brouma 2015, 155). Nevertheless, the cylindrical altars of Kos (Berges 1996) and a small group of altars from Nisyros and Telos published recently by Triantafyllidis (2012) with distinct iconographical features might be associated with ruler cults or religious cults respectively. After offering a small introduction to cylindrical altars and their basic typological features (this discussion will not be exhaustive nor extensive as this would defeat the purpose of the present analysis), a thorough discussion will be provided on the actual installation of the altars at the monuments themselves as indicated by the archaeological evidence.[17]

4.7.1. Basic typological characteristics

As previously stated, the Dodecanesian cylindrical altars have been grouped, categorised and described in a scholarly manner by Berges in his *Rundaltare aus Kos und Rhodos* (1996). As such, the information in this section will derive mostly from this publication. The largest markets for the production and consumption of cylindrical altars in the South-Eastern Aegean were Rhodes and Kos – the majority of the sculptures

[17] It should be noted that this section is a revised and extended version of my recent article entitled 'Cylindrical altars and post-funerary ritual in the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period: 3rd to 1st centuries BC' in Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, Z. & Evely, D. (eds) 2015, *Aegis - Essays in Mediterranean Archaeology presented to Matti Egon by the scholars of the Greek Archaeological Committee UK*, 155-64.

produced on the islands were local commissions a small number of which was exported to the cities of the extended Rhodian *peraea* (Berges 1986, cat. nos. 1-2, 4-43, 54; Berges 1996, 43, n. 130-131). Variations in style and decoration point towards different artistic workshops, yet we possess no material or textual evidence for these workshops. As a result, Berges classified the cylindrical altars in two major groups: Koan and Rhodian (for the Koan type see Berges 1996, 56-65 and for the Rhodian type see Berges 1996, 46-55). It is essential to highlight that these terms correspond to specific types of altars with distinct iconographical variables and they do not necessarily represent the island of origin.

Rhodian cylindrical altars were hewn from *lartion* stone (*lithos lartios*), hard grey-blue finely grained limestone originating in the area of Lardos near Lindos on the South-East coast of Rhodes (Papageorgakis 1966, 259-160; Marinos 1970, 110-2) or the so-called *amygdalitis* rock (*migdalopetra*) also known as travertine, a soft limestone with blue undertones readily available on the island (Papageorgakis 1966, 260); the former is even cited in inventory inscriptions such as IG XII, 1, 677, line 7 from Ialyssos (3rd c. BC) where the mining of *lartion* for the construction of stelai is briefly mentioned. In contrast, the Koan altars were made of the local white, crystalline marble, which although superior to *lartion* stone was poorer in terms of quality and colouring to other renowned marbles known in antiquity such as those originating from Paros, Naxos and Chios (Berges 1996, 24-5). Though the quality of the decoration and craftsmanship was not necessarily dependent on the choice of material, those executed in white marble were probably destined for an elite clientele. This is particularly evident in Rhodes where they are considerably fewer in number: out of approximately 180 cylindrical altars of Rhodian provenance reported in Berges' catalogue only 31 were made of imported marble (Berges, cat. nos. 110 to the end).

Both Koan and Rhodian types (**fig. 4.14**) were decorated with upper and lower mouldings and the space between them was reserved for the main decorative frieze. The decoration (if present) consisted of alternating *boucephalia* (ox heads), rarely *bucrania* (ox skulls) or deer heads, fruit garlands with various vegetal and cereal motifs, laurel garlands, *taeniae* (strips) and *guttae* (drops in relief). Rhodian altars could display up to three *boucephalia* in relief joined with garlands, their rear side left undecorated, roughly decorated or half-decorated, suggesting that at the time of installation the rear side would not be visible. On the other hand, Koan altars were decorated with up to four *boucephalia* in relief connected with garlands of exquisite detailing, a quality not apparent in the Rhodian altars. The Koan altars may also include an additional motif, a *dikeras* (bicornuate); an iconographical element which is never present in the Rhodian ones. The decorative combination of the oxen and the garlands in the cylindrical altars of the first two groups are reminiscent of the actual offerings in sanctuaries, which, according to Berges, were subsequently incorporated as standard imagery on the altars, thus losing their original meaning (Berges 1996, 14).

Finally, a distinct but rare decorative motif on some Rhodian altars is that of a snake wrapped around the main body of the cylindrical sculpture. The presence of the snake as an iconographical motif on a limited number of altars (Berges 1996, pl. 52, 53) is a chthonic symbol, intimately connected with the earth. Snake iconography is often charged with heroic attributes, but when encountered on funerary art snakes are often perceived as the guardians of the tomb or benevolent spirits (*agathoi daimones*) with pronounced autochthonous attributes (Salapata 1997, 251). In our examples, almost exclusively from Rhodes, the snakes were depicted with their bodies wrapped around the circular altar, orientated towards the direction of the surface, as if they were the actual recipients of the offerings (Berges 1996, pl. 52.2–3, pl. 53.1–2).

Rhodian cylindrical altars stood on a rectangular base, which does not survive on the Koan counterparts. Size-wise they varied greatly. Their height ranged from 0.3 up to 0.8 m, while the diameter from 0.25 to 0.65/0.75 m (these are average measurements based on Berges' 1996 catalogue). The cylindrical altars from the monumental tomb of Archokrates at Lindos were larger than the estimated average (see below, section 4.7.2). Some of the altars were decorated with incised inscriptions, either on their base, or on the main body underneath the main decoration, while others were not inscribed at all. The inscriptions identified various public groups: slaves, metics, half-citizens and full citizens were the most common (Berges 1996).

4.7.2. Altars and burial assemblages: the archaeological evidence

Dodecanesian altars are predominantly chance finds removed from their original context and as such their study has been limited to typological features. However, even those altars that originate from controlled excavations are almost never preserved *in situ*. In some cases archaeologists have hypothetically restored them on the grave monuments. In this section, I will discuss the limited number of cylindrical altars that have been found *in situ* – all of them originate from Rhodes – whose function may be reconstructed with some relative accuracy in relation to the graves. By combining the archaeological information provided by excavation reports with plans and images in various publications, we shall attempt to understand the relationship between the cylindrical altars and the graves within various contexts. As expected, cylindrical altars were versatile sculptures with more than one purpose, whose use and functionality were dictated by the architecture of the grave complexes and the surrounding environment.

Cylindrical altars found *in situ* are not representative of a specific type of sepulchral architecture in Rhodes, although they may be closely associated with *peribolos* tombs. The earliest monument featuring cylindrical altars on Rhodes is the 3rd c. family tomb of Archokrates in the area of Kampana at Lindos (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 491-504). Four cylindrical altars were displayed on a narrow platform on the second storey of the tomb measuring from 0.81 to 0.87 m in height and up to a notable 0.99 m in diameter (Berges 1996, cat. nos. 151-154). At present, one can see only replicas at the site since the original altars have been moved to the archaeological museum of Rhodes. The poor state of the tomb's preservation is the direct result of centuries of harsh environmental conditions and human intervention (**fig. 4.9b**); indeed the wind and the hot and humid climate of Lindos as well as quarrying activities from antiquity to modern times in the area have led to the gradual fading of the monumental tomb which is exclusively hewn on the face of the rock. Additionally, the tomb was allegedly used as a Christian chapel during the occupation of the Knights Hospitaliers on the island as witnessed by the name Fragkoklisia, literally meaning the church of the Francs (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, 491). Nonetheless, Dyggve and Poulsen (1960, pl. XIIIC) have provided the only plan of the tomb to date based on the actual state of its discovery, while we also possess drawings and descriptions from early travellers (Konstantinopoulos 1986). Dyggve's plan suggests that the upper storey, where the altars were displayed, could be reached externally from the sides via narrow staircases hewn on the rock (**fig.4.10**).

The Tomb of Archokrates demonstrates originality and variability in terms of its architectural plan. The altars were individual decorative elements incorporated into the upper storey, as the result of a premeditated architectural design (Dyggve and Poulsen 1960, pl. XIIIC). Visibility was a primary concern; the tomb is visible from the Lindian acropolis on a bright day. On the site, the altars are indeed well discernible even from a

distance; in a visit to the tomb in April 2012, I was able to observe the façade clearly and from different angles from a distance of up to 500 metres. The main entrance of the tomb led to the large funerary chamber with its loculi and a central elevated platform. Entry to the second storey was seemingly gained through the aforementioned side staircases: these were essential for the support of the upper part of the tomb and the façade, but is not clear whether they continued to serve the same function after the completion of the tomb. However, given that the monument is exceptionally high, it is plausible to suggest that they formed an essential part of its planning from the beginning, for instance as auxiliary stairs to the builders.

This brings us to the question whether the altars themselves were easy to reach, or had a merely decorative purpose. Scholarship has generally rejected altogether the theory that the altars might have been accessible for practical purposes and it is generally accepted that the cylindrical altars of the tomb of Archokrates were decorative and installed in a frontal position to enhance the theatricality of the façade. Berges has argued that there is very little space between the altars, their bases and the platform they are sitting on, making it almost impossible for someone to walk around them comfortably (Berges 1996, 18). Fabricius, on the other hand, has commented eloquently on the imbalance between their height and diameter, suggesting that they were not crafted with proportions in mind – they were too tall, and narrow – and as such they were constructed to fit specifically into the space of the walkway of the upper storey of the monument (Fabricius 1999, 78). Indeed, it appears that the cylindrical altars at the tomb of Archokrates were mere tombstones and had a primarily decorative function; however we cannot disregard altogether the presence of the stairs and an alternative explanation must be sought for their purpose. Having completely disappeared today, we are unable to comment on their actual functionality and the plan does not give out as many

information as desired. As a result, it is plausible to suggest that they were built either as auxiliary platforms or decorative elements for the enhancement of the theatrical façade. In any case, the façade of the Tomb of Archokrates has been compared to the theatrical scene of a Hellenistic theatre: Patsiada argues that the presence of the pathway where the altars stood – what she calls a 'free-corridor' (Patsiada 2013, 9) – is reminiscent of the Hellenistic *λογείον,* a raised platform or stage behind the orchestra and in front of the *skene* (Winter 1983, 38-9).

Generally, little information exists about the position of the altars on other grave monuments. From the first systematic excavations by Italian archaeologists at the city of Rhodes in the early 20th century, several altars were restored *in situ*, but the accuracy of these restorations is questionable – there is no recording that they were based on actual archaeological finds. For instance, a number of cylindrical altars were placed in the central courtyard of a rock-cut hypogeum in the area of Aghios Ioannis, though there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that the altars were found inside the grave complex. More likely, they were arranged around the space as if displayed in a museum (Livadiotti and Rocco 1996, 35, figs. 81-6).

On the other hand, the restoration of the altars on an elevated pedestal in two grave *periboloi* in the area of Karakonero in the eastern urban necropolis of Rhodes may be closer to their original installation. Though neither of these graves has ever been excavated, the Italian archaeologists gathered the cylindrical altars found in the vicinity and placed them on top of the *periboloi* (Patsiada 1996, 98; 1999, 129, pl. 40a; 2013, 64-6, figs. 31-2). In architectural terms, the altars were perhaps associated with the rock-cut *periboloi*, as evidenced by the presence of elevated platforms — sometimes stepped — on their upper parts. These platforms, still visible on the grave complexes at Aghios Ioannis and Karakonero were relatively narrow; in this case, too scholars have

questioned their accessibility (Berges 1996, 14-22). Despite the fact that space between the platform and the altars is restricted, the *periboloi* at Karakonero are considerably shorter than those at the tomb of Archokrates: one of them is 3.1 m long and 3.6 m deep (extant dimensions), measuring from the podium (Patsiada 1996, 98). Evidently, they could be easily reached by lateral platforms and even if the space between the altars does not permit someone to move comfortably alongside the podium, it is very likely that the altars could be reached from the rear side of the *periboloi* - this would have allowed enough space for the deposition of offerings on the surface of the altars (**fig. 4.11**).

Nonetheless, a burial assemblage in the Rhodian necropolis provides solid evidence on the installation of cylindrical altars in relation to the graves themselves. Two cylindrical altars and the base for a third one were also found in situ at excavation area A in Peros plot (**fig. 4.12**) in the vicinity of Aghia Triada at the central urban Rhodian necropolis (Patsiada 1996, 92). They were all inscribed with names of Rhodians whose provenance were various *demes* of the *peraea*, while two of them were husband and wife (Kontorini 1983, 79-84). All three had collapsed in front of an elevated platform, which was enclosed by a *peribolos* containing three built chamber tombs. It is thus evident that the altars were initially standing on the platform (Patsiada 1996, 92).

The installation of cylindrical altars on top of platforms either as part of *periboloi* or simple rock-cut tombs is already hinted in the early Hellenistic period, where orthogonal altars, stelai and trapezai made of poros stone were erected on pedestals above rock-cut tombs. This practice is evident at the Karageorgiou (excavation area D, Patsiada 1984, 315-6, pl. 160a-b) Sougganidis (excavation area B, Filimonos 1992, 612; Patsiada 1996, 93, fig. 2) and Dalia plots (Vassilogambrou 1992, 599), the former two situated in the central Rhodian necropolis while the latter is located in the western Rhodian necropolis. All three burial assemblages are dated from the early Hellenistic

period onwards (3rd to 2nd c. BC) and have yielded rock-cut graves with elevated pedestals for the installation of built orthogonal altars, stelai and/or trapezai. More significantly, it is highly likely that the cylindrical altars were erected in the same way as their Knidian counterparts (**fig. 4.13**) as evidenced by the drawing of a Knidian *peribolos* by C. Texier (1837, 176, fig. 164) where the cylindrical altar was placed in the centre of the rectangular *peribolos* on top of an elevated pedestal, thus becoming the focal point of the tomb.

4.7.3. *Of heroes and mortals*: post-funerary ritual in context

We shall now return to the installation of the cylindrical altars on the grave monuments and attempt to assess their role and function in post-funerary ritual with the aid of iconographical and epigraphical evidence. For the island of Rhodes, the evidence we have already presented suggests that the altars were functional and formed part of the initial architectural design of the graves; however the theatrical façade of the Tomb of Archokrates was probably the exception. Equally, if we accept that the cylindrical altars stood on top of the *periboloi* in the Karakonero and Peros plots in the same way they were erected on the Knidian tombs, it may have been that they were mounted there for a reason: to server as funerary markers or *stelai*. But what if they played a more subtle but equally important role? In order to answer this question, we need to take a closer look at the iconography of the altars.

The iconography of the bulls and the altar in connection to the funerary arrangements of a person in Hellenistic times is equally described in the fragment of a *stela* from Labraunda (Isager and Karlsson 2008, 39-52; SEG 58.1220). The inscription is

part of an honorary decree for Olympichos, son of Olympichos, who lived in western Caria in the second half of the 3rd century BC. Olympichos, a governor or *strategos* of the district of Mylasa, is mentioned as a benefactor, who obtained a status similar to that of the city founders – *πόλεως κτίστης* after his death (Novakova 2011, 219-220). The decree was probably issued by the people and the council of Mylasa, and the original text is dated to 240 BC, whilst the copy dates to the end of the 2nd c. BC, suggesting that the rituals for Olympichos were still performed on a yearly basis even after decades. The text is significant because not only does it highlight the usual honours that one should expect for a deceased acquiring the status of city founder (essentially a case of heroisation), but also because it attests to the sacrifice of two bulls and a rich banquet in honour of the deceased: 'And in front of the statue shall be founded an altar for him in white stone similar to the one for Mausolus in the sanctuary of Zeus Labraundos' […] 'The offering for him shall consist of two bulls, and on this day participants in the feast will be the priests, the victors in the stephanic games, and all the magistrates. The priests shall take care of the offering and the banquet and the treasurers provide the expense from the common revenues' (translated by Isager and Karlsson 2008, 44; SEG 58.1220). Despite the fact that this episode does not represent an ordinary funeral, one should note the presence of the altar and the bulls as part of the post-funerary commemorative scheme. However, in Rhodes we should probably reject the idea of sacrificial offerings on the absence of textual references as well as animal bones or ashes and other by-products associated with them, though one could argue that this absence may be approached epistemologically as the absence of excavated evidence, since most of the altars are devoid of their archaeological context.

Food offerings to the graves were a standard practice (Garland 1985, 104), though the lack of stratigraphic information hinders considerably our appreciation of the

different types of offerings during and after the funeral. Food offerings were either presented at the grave site, usually accompanied by libations or were part of larger funerary meals, the so-called *nekrodeipna*, held at grave precincts in honour of the deceased after the funeral (Garland 2001, 110). As such, the presence of fruit and cereal garlands as well as actual grain strains on altars (Triantafyllidis 2012) might refer to that practice. It is likely that foodstuffs were brought to the graves at regular intervals following the burial; in the epitaph of the Rhodian philosopher Arideikes (Hiller von Gaertringen 1912; Fraser 1977, 34-6, 103, n. 101; Fabricius 1999, 223-4) it is stated that *μείλια* and *πελανοί* would be presented at his grave in burnt offerings. The word *μείλια* probably refers to sweet cakes, also known as *πόπανα* (Fraser 1977, 23). Fraser pointed out that 'scholiastic and lexicographic' sources indicate that these cakes were placed on funerary or religious altars -the latter related to chthonic cults (Fraser 1977, 23, n. 99 for a list of the sources). On the other hand, *πελανοί* probably refer to liquid offerings destined for libations (Fraser 1977, 23).

A combination consisting of *πελανοί*, *πόπανα* and the so-called *πυραμίδες* (pyramidal constructions made of fruit or cakes) are also present on contemporary Totenmahl reliefs (Fabricius 1999, 92). The latter also known as funerary banquet reliefs have been recognised and classified since the 19th century, and hundreds of examples are known from the 6th c. BC to the Hellenistic period (Fabricius 1999). In these scenes, the deceased are usually depicted as reclining on funerary beds (*klinai*) and are frequently accompanied by family members, servants, and/or pets; a table with food and drink is depicted at their side. Early critics like Furtwangler and Gardner debated much about their purpose and function: were they sepulchral reliefs like grave stelai intended to commemorate the ordinary dead or were they meant to honour heroes and gods? (Furtwangler 1883-1887; Gardner 1896). Contemporary critics agree that at least

through the 4th c. BC, there was a firm distinction between those reliefs for use in heroic cult and those intended for the cult of the dead (Thonges-Stringaris 1965). The shape of the reliefs is significant: sepulchral reliefs are usually stelai – tall and relatively narrow – while votive Totenmahl reliefs for gods and heroes are oblong and wide, intended to fit into the wall of a shrine (Larson 1995, 43ff). Fabricius (1999) traces the shift from the votive to the funerary meaning of the east Greek banquet by ascribing various meanings to the stelai whether symbolic or realistic, based on context and individual elements depicted on the stelai (Larson 1995, 43).

As such, the presence of *πυραμίδες* on the depicted table of a Rhodian Totenmahl panel altar (Fraser 1977, fig. 86 c; cf. Fabricius 1999, PM 1547) is important in connecting the altars to food offerings. Similarly, a Totenmahl relief from Ainos dated to the 4th c. BC, now in the archaeological museum of Istanbul (Fraser 1977, fig. 52a), carries beneath (or in front) of the table with cakes and fruit, a representation of a rectangular altar with volutes, forming a hollow upper surface as on the Rhodian rectangular altars, with four or five cakes and fruit of various shapes placed in the recess. A similar altar of rectangular shape decorated with ox heads and garlands is also depicted on another Totenmahl relief (Fraser 1977, fig. 50b) from Rhodes: the altar is shown in the left corner of the relief, behind the seated figures, and seems to be decorated with one ox head and one stag head. Funerary rectangular altars with hollow upper surfaces form a considerable group of Rhodian funerary monuments, but Fraser has debated their use as food receptacles; he argued that the bosses of the rectangular altars were destined for the deposition of wreaths (Fraser 1977, 23). But, no matter how we choose to interpret the Totenmahl reliefs, it is evident that food was a vital part of the post-funerary ritual. Communal feasting may also have been performed on the actual graves. This would explain the presence of Megarian bowls in the corridors of the family grave Enclosure C at Rheneia

on Delos (Couilloud 1976, 822ff) and the deposition of numerous Megarian bowl sherds in a large pottery dump in the southern area of the necropolis of Knidos (Love 1967, 139). The association of the altars with food offerings and/or feasting does not necessitate their use only for this purpose. In this context, it is essential to revisit Fraser's question with regard to the heroic attributes or lack thereof of the altars (Fraser 1977, 76-81). But before moving to the specifics of his thesis, it is useful to provide some information on the concept of the heroisation of the deceased in the Hellenistic period. Possible and debated evidence of heroisation in the strict sense of the term – i.e. the maintenance a hero-cult – consists of a wide array of testimonies dated to Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods. Nonetheless, the idea of heroisation after death derives already from the Bronze Age from older cults of heroes and ancestor cults (Carstens 1999, 48-53). The oldest heroes, who obtained divine attributes and were honoured post-mortem, were usually mythic entities: city founders, law-givers, or gentilicial ancestors (Antonaccio 1987, 27-35). From the Classical period onwards, this practice changed, and prominent citizens obtained heroic honours after their death. It is not accidental that private heroic cult is accentuated in the Hellenistic period; it is often assumed that the consequences of various political and legislative changes within the polis afforded the opportunity for the flourising of private hero-cults as a way of reinforcing the social role of the individual within the polis (Alcock 1991, 447-8). It is generally accepted that the only means of determining whether a dead person should be regarded as a hero in the Hellenistic period, is either (Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 299-302; Fraser 1977, 76-7):

a/ When provisions are recorded in a decree or other document for expressly described ceremonies to be held at his tomb of 'heroic' nature.

b/ With a sepulchral inscription designating him as a 'hero' (*ήρως*).

c/ Some scholars believe that the simplest and most common way to express hero-cult of the deceased in the Hellenistic period was the construction of funerary altars on the grounds that already from the 4th c. BC the word *ηρώον* (heroon) was used in reference to tombs (Guarducci 1967-1978 [III], 152-3).

The first category (a) is somewhat complicated by the fact that heroisation can be divided into two categories: official and private (Wypustek 2013, 69; Herrmann 1995; Habicht 1970, 105). The term official would indicate that the deceased received a public *αφηρωισμός* (heroisation) in the name of an entire community usually with a decree issued by the *polis* (Fraser 1977, 76). In practical terms, the difference was that in public heroisation the entire community was expected to make funerary offerings, not only the family and the kin group of the deceased. As such, there are numerous of inscriptions honouring individuals after their death, where the *deme* paid tribute to the deceased with wreaths and by granting them the title of hero in a public act of heroisation: the text usually began with the words *δήμος αφηρώιζε* (Graf 1985, 121-137; Burket 1985, 206; Wypustek 2013, 69). Examples (Wypustek 2013, 69) include a 1st c. AD inscription certifying the heroisation of the priest of Apollo by the *deme* (Peek 1960, no. 1010), a 1st c. AD inscription from Thyatira (Lydia), recording the raising by the *deme* of a certain Xenoneon as a hero for Gaios Xenos [TAM 5.2, no. 1098] (though here there is no mention of offerings) and of course the Labraunda decree for Olympichos (see above); yet another example of an individual publicly receiving the status of a hero – in this case as a city benefactor.

All of these bring us to the alleged association between cylindrical altars and heroisation of the deceased. Boardman and Kurtz (1971, 301) state emphatically that 'the clearest indication of a claim to Hero-cult was an altar either at the tomb or as a tomb monument […] In the late Hellenistic period there are a number from Rhodes and the islands, usually cylindrical with relief swags and bucrania'. This somewhat unsupported statement was the beginning point for Fraser to discuss the association or lack thereof between cylindrical altars and heroising attributes; he emphatically concluded that there are no grounds to accept the altars as convincing archaeological evidence of the heroisation of the recently deceased (Fraser 1977, 77-8). Fraser's brief discussion and conclusions are based on eight points: half of them are the presentation of all those elements that constitute a hero-cult that we have already discussed. Furthermore, he notices that the use of the word *ήρως* itself in the South-Eastern Aegean is rare (Fraser 1977, 78-80); by presenting the few examples where the title appears on cylindrical altars or elsewhere (i.e. stelai), he concludes that 'we cannot claim a different, 'heroic', status for those commemorated on the cylindrical monuments from those on the rectangular monuments or the *stelai*' (Fraser 1977, 80). His interpretation is convincing since not one of these examples can be connected to an actual decree or inscription describing a specific hero's cult.

But can we reject heroisation altogether on the absence of evidence? The answer to this question is not that simple. Fraser's interpretation opted for an *ad hoc* understanding of the cylindrical altars and he rejected 'conjectural interpretation' (Fraser 1977, 76), thereby failing to take into consideration context. In my opinion, cylindrical altars do not offer definitive proof of heroisation and it would be wrong to use their existence unequivocally for the support of such a claim. Nevertheless, various

elements in the cylindrical altars under question might actually provide the answer as to how post-mortem heroisation was perceived in the area.

From the text on the honorary stele of Dionysodoros from Alexandria (*IG* XII, 1.155; Gabrielsen 1994), another prominent member of an association of foreigners (*koinon*) in Rhodes, we learn that amongst the honours bestowed upon the members of the *koinon* after death, was the crowning of the funerary marker with a wreath in perpetuity (line 85: είς στέφανον είς τὸν άεὶ χρόνον) and the pouring of libations ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων (line 121), which should be understood as επί των ταφίων meaning 'on the graves' (Fraser 1977, 62). The decree of Dionysodoros is directly related to another monument, namely a 2nd century BC rectangular altar, now at the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes. The altar has been identified by many scholars as the sepulchral monument of the same Dionysodoros and his family, on the basis of the information provided on the inscription (Gabrielsen 1994, 139, n. 5).

Though it is not clear whether the cylindrical altars were directly indicative of honours bestowed upon the deceased, the presence of 'laurel' (*Lorbeergirlande*) garlands on a few of them, may point towards this direction: sometimes the depiction of ox heads and skulls were combined with 'laurel' garlands instead of the typical fruit garlands. For instance, the cylindrical altars of the tomb of Archokrates were decorated with 'laurel' garlands and three of them had an additional wreath in relief above the garland on the visible side of the altar (Berges 1996, pl. 41, especially 41.3). In this context, we can differentiate between two distinct iconographical subtypes: altars with ox heads/skulls and laurel garlands, which were rather scarce, and altars with fruit garlands and ox heads/skulls. Though the difference might appear to be simply a matter of style at first glance, wreaths and laurels were usually associated with public honours and the lifetime achievements of the deceased (Lauter-Bufe 1983, 161-3): in Rhodes, they were bestowed

after death, as we are informed by both the decrees of the Sabaziastai and Dionysodoros (for the decree of Sabaziastai see Kontorini 1983, 71ff and Chapter 5, section 5.3.2).

Conclusively, though we cannot talk of direct heroisation, we observe the appropriation of 'heroising' elements in private tomb cults maintained either by the family or the associations and this might suggest that the border between heroes and men was much more floating and permeable in both directions, yet the designation *heros* in this case should not be confused with the status of a semi-god, but rather as a moral exemplum of the elite towards the polis itself. In this context, we observe a significant shift from the heroic-cults of the early *polis* (Antonaccio 1995, 17-23) to the private funerary cults of individuals in the Hellenistic period. But whether in such cases we are dealing with real heroes it is very difficult to tell. Therefore, from the Hellenistic period onwards there were various crossing points between explicit hero-cults, and luxurious commemorative rites held by the graves, which had various facets, among them the heroising. Whether these commemorative meals, which were celebrated by members of a *koinon* for a deceased member (such as the *koinon* of Sabaziastai in Rhodes), can be seen within the frame of heroic honours is difficult to decide. What is important though is that meals by the grave were originally taken from the hero-cult and were gradually incorporated into the grave ritual (Fabricius 1999, 78). It is believed that the old custom of the *perideipnon* took place in the house, but contrary to the Roman period where *perideipna* were definitely limited in the house (Fabricius 1999, 79), in the Hellenistic period banquets could take place in the necropolis as exceptions.

All in all, if we agree that the presentation of food and other offerings was a common occurrence at the graves, we should then return to our initial question: how should we interpret the cylindrical altars? Patsiada (1996) has regarded them as continuing the role of the *poros trapezai* and the built rectangular altars of the early

Hellenistic period: she maintained that the presentation of food offerings to the graves did not cease throughout Hellenistic times in Rhodes, but that attention gradually shifted to other funerary goods. Indeed, from the 2nd c. BC onwards grave goods became considerably lavish: burial assemblages of the period included increasing amounts of gold jewellery and abundant unguentaria (Patsiada 1996, 105).

The building of monumental tombs with increasing complexity and multiple foci resulted in cylindrical altars ceasing to be individual monuments in their own right and gradually being incorporated into the developing grave architecture. While being included within the elaborate architecture relating to an entire complex, inscriptions show that cylindrical altars continued to be used in order to commemorate individual burials. At the same time, extensive manufacture led to a wider availability and reduced cost of their production. The majority of Rhodian altars were executed in the local poros stone, readily available on the island, thus making them more accessible to many people. If we take into consideration all the elements discussed so far; it becomes apparent that for cylindrical altars, when present as part of the architectural decoration of funerary complexes, visibility was a more important objective than accessibility.

An alternative explanation may be plausible: from the 2nd c. BC onwards, the cylindrical altar became the funerary marker *par excellence* in the Dodecanese. My view is that altars served a dual function: one the one hand, they were used as grave markers and this is further enhanced by their reuse as inscriptions sometimes suggest, while gradually they were incorporated in funerary and post-funerary ritual. These processes could have been either simultaneous or parallel to one another. Thereby, actual offerings deposited on the plain grave stelai and trapezai of the early Hellenistic periods were replaced by offerings permanently portrayed in relief. This may not necessarily imply that offerings were not brought to the graves; instead, the portrayals may have acted as

a representation and perhaps a reminder of the nature of the offerings. Rendered in stone, these symbolic offerings became a channel of communication between the living and the dead in perpetuity.

This practice may be compared with the deposition of clay food offerings, mostly in the form of pomegranate plaques or pomegranate-shaped vases, in graves and sanctuaries from the Geometric period onwards (Muthmann 1982, 78-82), Rhodes being no exception (Kourou 1988, 106). Initially deposited as tomb offerings in the archaic cemeteries of the pre-synoicised cities of Rhodes, the pomegranate vases were regarded as a gift to mortals in their journey to the Underworld. As with the pomegranate plaques, food offerings worked onto the cylindrical altars were not a literal replacement of food products *per se*, but they sought to reiterate the importance of the occasion that they were destined for: offering and commemoration in a funerary context on a regular basis. Their presence ensured the harmonious relationship between the deceased and the bereaved for generations to come.

4.8. Conclusions

A closer look into the various facets of funerary and post-funerary ritual in the South-Eastern Aegean has revealed interesting information on perceptions of death, mortality and their interchangeability within society. People were able to accept death as part of their everyday lives and burial ritual was not uniform at either regional or interregional level. The basic tripartite structure of the Greek burial seems to be followed with local variations; manifestations of funerary and post-funerary ritual were diverse and resourceful.

For instance, the mode of burial differed from island to island or even on the same island. Whereas cremation and inhumation were practised side by side in the urban cemeteries of Rhodes, the deceased at Kymissala were inhumed. Geographical factors were sometimes important in this choice (for instance, see Kastellorizo where cremation was probably not practised extensively), however, it appears that this diversity was likely the result of individual choices rather than general cultural adoptions or regulations imposed by the *polis.*

Other examples of diversity in terms of funerary and post-funerary ritual include tombs with klinai in the Rhodian cemeteries and funerary monuments, especially cylindrical altars, in Rhodes and Kos. The former exemplified notable aspects of funerary ritual such as liminality and performance, where the latter were incorporated into funerary architecture and promoted commemoration through the interaction of the living community with the deceased. More importantly, the Hellenistic period in the South-Eastern Aegean is characterised by a change in mortuary patterns towards an emphasis to the individual and the values of the family; this is evident through funerary architecture as well as heroisation, which became a private affair compared to earlier periods. The creation and maintenance of private funerary cults, some of which shared many characteristics with the eponymous hero-cults of the same period, witnessed the rise of the individual and the family or groups of individuals tied by financial and other bonds in the centre of the political, economic and civic life of the city. More importantly, the interaction between the living and the dead via post-funerary ritual and commemoration was established and maintained within the limits of the *polis*.

CHAPTER 5

Status and identity

5.1. Introduction

In its broadest sense, identity is defined as the 'individual characteristics by which a person or thing is recognised' or 'the state of having unique identifying characteristics held by no other person or thing' (both definitions derive from Collins English Dictionary). From an archaeological viewpoint, it is the 'identification with broader groups on the basis of differences socially sanctioned as significant' (Diaz-Andreu & Lucy 2005, 1). The cultural fusion of the Hellenistic period offers a fertile field for the research of various identities, especially when it comes to the interaction between Greeks and the non-Greeks in various parts of the Hellenistic world. As such, the quest for identity in the Hellenistic period is often a quest for ethnicity, dominated by the idea of distinct 'archaeological cultures' (Shennan 1978). Naturally, the rise of the concept of the 'archaeological culture' – which now has been largely abandoned – was echoed in Droysen's (1877) analysis of the Hellenistic period, a mix of Greek and oriental culture.

The typical model of cultural interaction commonly discussed in relation to the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period is that between Rhodians and those under the direct or indirect influence of Rhodes, being usually citizens of the islands or the *peraea* belonging to various Rhodian *deme* and non-Rhodians or foreigners, who according to epigraphic testimonies came from various parts of the Hellenistic world. The appellations 'Rhodian' and 'foreigner' denote various ranks of citizenship in the island states, which were neither necessarily important nor interconnected. The societal model

of differentiation between Rhodians and non-Rhodian assumes that Greek and foreign ethnic identities were the driving force in the formation of the island-states and beyond.

The apparent strength and proliferation of textual evidence can overshadow the information from other sources, and in the case of the South-eastern Aegean the political domination of Rhodes throughout the Hellenistic period as well as the uneven distribution of evidence from island to island, have been projected onto our understanding of material culture, creating perhaps falsely the expectations for non-existent divisions and potential cultural and ethnic separations. Rather, ethnicity is only one category of identity more broadly conceived among populations, and should not necessarily be understood as the most important element in the interpretation of material culture. From my viewpoint, the separation of different categories of identity in the reading and interpretation of material culture, offers a valid and relatively unbiased understanding of the archaeological material.

Ethnicity has been a central aspect of archaeological interpretation since the beginning of the discipline. In the 19th century, archaeologists were pre-occupied with the 'races of humanity' in an attempt to observe human differences through archaeological remains (Jones 2008, 321). As such, concepts such as ethnicity and ethnic groups were associated with race. Races were studied as separate entities with specific biological and cultural capabilities (Stepan 1982) and archaeological research was dominated by racial typology, created on the basis of empirical criteria (Jones 2008, 321). At that time, the prevalent theory was that culture was directly related to race and this led many archaeologists to assign racial identifications to their evidence in the absence of anthropological remains (Jones 2008, 322). Likewise, similarities and differences in terms of art, architecture and technology led many archaeologists to distinguish between

higher races and lower races (Lubbock 1865; Pitt-Rivers 1906) in an evolutionary scale extending from savagery, to barbarism and then civilization (Jones 2008, 322).

In the 20th century, the quest for the biological and social evolution of races was abandoned in favour of particular aspects of racial groups and their diffusion within specific geographical areas. As such, similarities between artefacts and other aspects of material culture were regarded as positive evidence for interactions between different groups and pinpointed a common racial heritage (Kossinna 1911). This led to the definition of 'archaeological cultures', which replaced 'ethnic groups' without really questioning the link between material culture and different groups of people (Curta 2002). For instance, the Deetz-Longacre hypothesis (Longacre 1964; Deetz 1965) makes a strong yet simplistic equation between style and unilineal kinship organisation. In simple words, the closer two ethnic groups are to each other, the more likely they share the same culture and gradually incorporate into one ethnic group. The relationship between ethnicity and material culture was rejected by Hodder, whose ethnoarchaeological fieldwork in the Baringo district in Kenya (Hodder 1982) revealed that material culture and style should not be confused with ethnicity nor can they related to ethnic boundaries. His study fuelled the so-called 'style debate' of the 1980s, where many archaeologists argued over the role of material culture (for an overview see Wiessner 1983). In this context, material culture is perceived as primarily social and not ethnic.

Returning to the ancient Mediterranean, ethnic identity is an important parameter in the study of mortuary remains. Ethnic identity was defined by Jones (1998, 13-4) as 'that aspect of a person's self-conceptualization which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or common descent'. Although ethnic and cultural identities can be closely linked,

they are not the same and should not be confused. Whereas ethnicity is generally understood as a large-scale social group identity, whose members share common ancestry (Hall 1997, 19-33), culture refers to a specific set of beliefs, morals, values that are reflective of a group's way of life (Hall 1997), usually reflected in the material culture of this particular group. Ethnicity, on the other hand, is not about genetics but rather a collective sense of identity and shared history within a group (Emberling 1997). Unlike cultural identity, ethnic identity is not always visible in the archaeological record.

Jones' definition of ethnic identity has introduced parallel discussions in the history and archaeology of the Hellenistic period and is often linked with terms such as 'Hellenization', a process which is described as the 'spread of Greek culture and its adoption by non-Greek peoples' (Mairs 2011) in the period following the death of Alexander the Great (for a collected bibliographical overview see Mairs 2011). Although it was used extensively in scholarship as a model for the understanding of cultural change, it can be extremely misleading and one-sided. For example, though we hardly know anything about the dynamics of the relationship between the Rhodian state and its possessions in coastal Asia Minor from an archaeological perspective, it is often assumed that they went through a process of Hellenization (and to be more precise 'Rhodianisation') in the Hellenistic period, while the same approach has been put forward for the majority of the islands which appear to have been dependent on the island of Rhodes in the period (Fraser and Bean 1954). While the infiltration of Rhodians in various layers of these societies is uncontested, the dynamics of the reciprocal interaction between Rhodians and non-Rhodians is hardly examined; indeed they are usually presented as separate but co-existing passive entities with limited overlapping. Therefore, it is essential not only to assess the interactions between Rhodians and foreigners, but also revisit the appellation 'Rhodian' among the islanders. As such,

cultural interaction in the islands should not be regarded as a one-way cultural influence, but an active, reciprocal, redefining and creative process.

At the same time, separating into different categories of identity in the reading and interpretation of material culture, offers a valid and relatively unbiased understanding of the archaeological material. Especially, in funerary archaeology, identity has been a field of contention among researchers belonging either to the processual or the post-processual school of thought. In the 1970s the fundamental works of Arthur Saxe (1970) and Lewis Binford (1971) determined that the study of funerary remains should be perceived as a study of social structure. Saxe argued that a social persona should be mirrored in the burial evidence (Saxe 1970), while Binford (1971, 17) defined the social persona as 'a composite of the social identities maintained in life and recognized as appropriate for consideration at death'. Though influential, they were heavily criticized (Hodder 1982; Parker Pearson 1982), but left their distinct mark in archaeological research for generations to come. Processualists were generally accused of a paucity of testing of their ethnographic based hypotheses in the archaeological record (Chapman 2003) among other things.

In the 1980s criticism of the Saxe-Binford approach led to the creation of the post-processual theoretical movement in archaeology developed within a symbolic, structuralist and highly interpretative framework (Parker Pearson 1982; Tilley 1994; Hodder 1982). Post-processual approaches are not dependent on a specific axiom; they rather recognize the fact that ideas and beliefs are an important factor in mortuary practices. In the words of Hodder (1982, 150) it is the 'rules and concepts behind these practices that give meaning to the social system'. Along the 1990s attention shifted to particular archaeological case studies (Morris 1992; Parker and Pearson 1995; Silverman and Small 2002), where funerary remains were treated as active manifestations of social,

political, ethnic and material structures. In parallel, scholars like Ian Morris (1992) attempted to bridge the gap between procesualism and post-procesualism by interpreting the funeral as ritual action following the rules and norms of each society with room for individual expressionism. However, like some of his predecessors, he did not focus on the complexity of funerary ritual in ontological terms (i.e. the interaction between the living and the dead through the establishment of post-funerary ritual and commemoration). Indeed, studies focusing on the importance of ancestry and the dead in shaping the identities of the living have created a renowned interest in examining mortuary activity through the lens of various and often complex ritual interactions (Parker Pearson 1999; Gallou 2005).

Taking into consideration all of the above, this chapter will be divided into three parts. The first part will explore various aspects of individual identity (Section 5.2) as inferred by the archaeological record, while communal identity will be discussed in the second part (Section 5.3). Finally, the last part of this chapter will be dedicated to a brief discussion on identity and insularity in the South-Eastern Aegean (Section 5.4).

5.2. Individual Identity

In the first section of this chapter, we shall examine various ways through which individual identity and status may have been manifested after the burial. In regard to the disposal of the human body, inhumation and cremation were practised concurrently in the South-Eastern Aegean throughout the Hellenistic period though interesting patterns emerge at a regional level. At the same time, patterns in grave goods and even grave markers are often interpreted by archaeologists as indicators of social status. The

adoption of such an approach is inherently problematic in this study, since the distribution of burial goods is uneven from island to island and this is due to the nature of rescue excavations. Moreover, with the exception of a few burial assemblages, funerary goods are rarely reported in detail in the archaeological reports or may even be out of context in the case of looted assemblages. Therefore, any quantitative or qualitative approach would lead to a serious interpretative problem. Nonetheless, when the evidence permits, we discuss funerary goods within their regional contexts.

On the other hand, funerary *stelai* do not form a main part of the identity discussion, because they have been treated exhaustively already in the bibliography in regard to this aspect of archaeological interpretation (for the Totenmahl *stelai* of Rhodes see Fabricius 1999 and for the *stelai* of Kos see Bosnakis 2008 and especially Tsouli's 2013 unpublished doctoral dissertation on the funerary monuments of Hellenistic and Roman Kos). However, whenever I find it relevant, I include general remarks and characteristics in relation to my identity discussion as evidenced by the *stelai* and the burial goods.

Finally, the status of women and children will be discussed in this section as well though the evidence is limited. Isolated or combined, the above groups of evidence can provide helpful insights for the individuals and the communities they were part of. It is important to emphasize from the outset that due to the nature of the fragmented and often insufficiently published data, it is not possible to provide the general picture within a consecutive timeframe; nonetheless, through the use of case studies and well-excavated dated assemblages it is possible to identify several concurring or conflicting displays of identity and social status (or the lack thereof).

5.2.1. Aspects of individual social status and identity

Overall, inhumation and cremation were practised simultaneously in three areas of the South-Eastern Aegean: Rhodes, Kos and the *peraea*. However, in Rhodes, we observe interesting inter-regional differentiations; while in the necropoleis of the city inhumations and cremations in the form of cinerary urns and osteothekai were equally popular, in the cemetery of Kymissala the only mode of burial was inhumation despite the rich arboreal vegetation in the area. Inhumation was also the principal mode of disposal in the cemeteries of Nisyros, Chalki and Kastellorizo. Especially in Nisyros, there is a clear shift from cremation to inhumation from the archaic period onwards leading up to the Hellenistic period where inhumation was the only mode of burial on the island. At the same time, an interesting variation of inhumation, namely burials in pots, was practised on the islands of Nisyros and Astypalaia.

Cremation and inhumation require varying levels of complexity, and it has been argued that cremation was not a 'cheap' method of disposal compared to inhumation (De Schutter 1989, 56; Humphreys 1980, 10). Robinson offers some interesting remarks on cremation in his discussion of the burials from Olynthos (Robinson 1942, 142) suggesting that in some parts of Greece inhumation might have been favoured over cremation subject to availability of fuel; however, this was not the case with Olynthos where wood was presumably abundant. There has been much debate on which of either practice was the more affordable one, yet several studies have demonstrated that the mode of disposal is not always an indicator of elevated status. An interesting antithesis is observed in the necropolis of Aigai in Macedonia where from 359 to 356 BC, 8% of the excavated material corresponds to trench cremations of common Macedonian citizens as evidenced by the simplicity of the grave goods accompanying them (Kottaridi 2001, 362). At the same time,

cremations practised in the cemeteries and the royal necropolis of Aigai from the late 4th c. onwards are indicative of elite funerals accompanied by lavish funerary goods and impressive funerary pyres (Kottaridi 1998, 113-6). On the other hand, inhumation can arguably provide varying degrees of complexity both in terms of expenditure and social stratification.

In the South-Eastern Aegean, there is no reason to suggest that there is ground for social conflict originating in the choice between inhumation and cremation. On the basis of current evidence mode of burial is not an indicator of social status. Cremation burials in Rhodes are for the most part very simple, and they appear in various contexts: for instance, cinerary urns (kalpai) and an ossuary were found inside the tombs of the monumental Tomb of the Caryatids (Papachristodoulou 1988b, 540) suggesting that cremation was the preferred mode of burial in this specific context. Nonetheless, the quality of the vases and the osteotheke was not different to all the other funerary urns and osteothekai found everywhere in the Rhodian urban cemeteries.

At this point, it is pertinent to discuss a common feature shared by some inhumation and cremation burials, namely the presence of gold wreaths (or parts of them) with elaborate decorations imitating flowers and fruit. Out of the thirty wreaths from the Rhodian necropoleis sixteen were associated with inhumations (Kaninia 1998, cat. nos 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 30) and at least eight with cremations (Kaninia 1998, cat. nos 1, 4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 22 and 29); the remaining could not be associated with either burial practice because they were discovered out of context (Kaninia 1998, cat. nos 2, 7, 13, 14, 20, 31). At the same time, the gold wreaths originating from the outskirts of the city of Rhodes and the other islands were all associated with inhumations (Kaninia 1998, cat. nos 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38). Though it is established that these wreaths accompanied adult individuals, it is impossible to determine whether they

were paired with male or female burials on the absence of further bioarchaeological analyses. Kaninia (1998, 24) suggests that some of them could be associated with male burials due to the presence of strigils, but strigils are not always a safe indicator of male burials as we shall see below. The taphonomic connection between the wreaths and the bodies is not always clear as long as inhumations are concerned, yet it seems that they were not worn directly on the head of the deceased (only a few of them could have actually been worn in real life); they were rather placed by the side of the skull (Kaninia 1998, 25) or around the body and as such they can be interpreted as funerary goods. Wreaths associated with cremations, on the other hand, were either placed around the neck of cinerary urns, on the top of osteothekai or pits containing cremations or directly above the incinerated bones in osteothekai.

Variety in terms of deposition and display of the wreaths in a funerary context suggests that they were quite versatile. In life, wreaths were awarded mainly to the champions of athletic, poetic or other competitions (for wreath crowning and its various connotations in the Greek world see Blech 1982, 81-108; Tsigarida 1988). They were also awarded to individuals bearing civic titles such as *archontes, bouleutai,* and *rhetores* as a recognition for their services to the city; a type of euergetism (Larferd 1914; for euergetism see also section 5.2.1 below). In Rhodes specifically, funerary inscriptions associated with *koina* of foreigners and their burial provisions mention the deposition of gold wreaths as part of posthumous honours on the graves or the funerary monuments of the members and the benefactors (*euergetai*) of these associations (Fraser 1977, 62ff; Lauter-Bufe 1983, 160-3; Berges 1986, 52-3; see also section 5.3.2 below). Additionally, quite a few Rhodian funerary monuments (i.e. stelai and cylindrical altars) are decorated with wreaths in bas-relief (Fraser 1977, 68; Kaninia 1998, 126, especially n. 123); the most interesting of all is a sepulchral stele decorated with three skeletal bucrania

encircled in wreaths (for an analytical discussion see section 5.3.2 below). However, the connection between manifestations of euergetism as practised by the *koina* or other types of honours associated with wreaths cannot be validated in the archaeological record. Kaninia notes that no gold funerary wreath has even been found in connection with a monument such as a stele or an altar *in situ* within the graves; therefore it is possible that they were funerary goods that were earned and worn by the deceased in everyday life (Kaninia 1998, 126-7; Despini 1990, 26-7). In any case, gold wreaths symbolised and in a way immortalised the elevated status of the few individuals they accompanied. Common association with inhumations and cremations is another indicator that modes of disposal *per se* cannot be a clear indicator of social contention in the funerary sphere.

An alternative motivation for practising cremation might have involved transporting individuals who died abroad back to their place of origin. The mobility of goods and people was quite increased in the Hellenistic period throughout the Greek world; for instance, mercenaries were stationed at various cities away from their homeland and often married, lived and died in their new locations (for mercenaries in the Hellenistic world see Trundle 2004, Chaniotis 2004). A well-documented case is that of Milesians and their families stationed on the islands of Patmos, Leros, and Leipsoi in the Hellenistic period (Pimouguet 1995, 89-109; Chaniotis 2004, 486). Similarly, islanders were dispersed in the South-Eastern Aegean and other places of the Mediterranean world throughout the Hellenistic period. It is plausible to suggest that whenever their death involved cremation, their remains would eventually return back to their homeland. This could be the case with a clay hydria, now in the archaeological museum of Mytilene, the only find that can be related to a cremation from Kastellorizo, provided that the island was inhabited and there was a permanent settlement. The vase

contained traces of human bones and dates to the Hellenistic period as suggested by a date ascribed to it. It was discovered in an unspecified tomb in 1913 (Kyparissis 1915, 62-4; Ashton 1995, 118 with a figure on the same page). Kastellorizo is a rocky island without arboreal vegetation. Therefore it is hard to imagine that cremation was the preferred mode of burial. Burning a body would require a significant amount of wood – at least a tonne according to modern experiments (Parker Pearson 1999, 49) – that was simply not present on the island. As such inhumation was a cost-effective and practical solution and cremation may have been practised to a very limited extent.

On the other hand, it is doubtful whether the choice of large pithoi for adult interments on the island of Nisyros was dictated only by considerations of status. Pithoi were the largest among Greek storage vases (Amyx 1958, 168) and served for the storage of produce such as cereal, wine, oil, fish or other foodstuffs. Overall, pithoi were quite expensive costing at least 187-322 obols each by the 4th c. (Amyx and Pritchett 1958, 277), therefore it is quite unlikely that they were purchased or manufactured for funerary use exclusively. Their plain and uniform design and moderate furnishings suggest that they were not the burial choice of prominent individuals; it is likely that they served as burial receptacles after being cracked or broken or simply losing their utility instead of thrown away.

A similar picture is painted in connection to grave goods. In Rhodes, where we have a more comprehensive outline of burial goods as opposed to the other islands and the *peraea*, the most common grave goods during the early Hellenistic period (3rd c. BC) were groups of small pointed amphorae accompanied by vases for eating and drinking (Giannikouri et al 1989, pl. 35a, 37a, 39a-b, 40a, 43a-b, 45b, 55b, 56a, 57a), while in the late Hellenistic period graves were furnished predominantly with unguentaria (Giannikouri et al 1989, 79, pl. 52,3; Giannikouri 1997). Other objects such as strigils,

mirrors, and jewellery could be indicative of the sex (though see section 5.2 below) or the activities of the deceased. Sometimes, burial goods could denote the professional capacity of their owners; for instance, a small group of judicial panels found within Rhodian tombs suggest that the professional status of the deceased as judges was an important aspect of their individual identity (Fraser 1972, 119-24). Overall, with the exception of some notable burials which contained gold jewellery and potentially belonged to individuals of high status (for an overview Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999; see also section 5.2.1 below), burial goods were standardised and relatively homogenous across the urban necropoleis.

At the same time, the grave monuments of the South-Eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period display an interesting repertoire of typological and iconographical features and they have been the subject of dedicated scholarly publications (Fraser 1977; Pfuhl and Möbius 1977-1979; Berges 1986; Berges 1996; Fabricius 1999 are among the most important). It is not, therefore, my intention to provide an analytical presentation of the typological characteristics of the monuments since it would defeat the purpose of this discussion. I will instead discuss specific artefacts that can be indicative of the identity and the social status of the deceased.

Grave markers in the form of plain stelai, trapezai, cylindrical and rectangular altars or even osteothekai (if we agree that the latter they could also be used for demarcating the tomb) were mass-produced, and most of them were relatively cheap because they were made of locally available materials; it is likely that monuments made of more expensive materials such as marble were imported therefore were a limited choice for the ordinary citizens. Considering that the population on the islands and the *peraea* was quite mixed – a combination of islanders and foreigners – one would expect to see varied styles on the funerary monuments, but a recurring motif is easily identified:

monuments that were readily available namely rectangular and circular altars dominate the archaeological record and show hardly any signs of personal adaptations or preferences.

Some exceptions apply; a handful of cylindrical altars depart from the standard decoration (for the decoration and typology of cylindrical altars see Chapter 4, section 4.7.1 and 4.7.2) and may indicate various personal identities. The first example is Rhodian; it is an altar of unknown provenance in the shape of a rose bell crater (**fig. 5.1**) encircled by a snake dated between the 2nd and the 1st c. BC (Maiuri 1932, 73, cat. no. 33, fig. 39; Lauter-Bufe 1983, pl. 39-40). The unique iconographical motif is completed with a bas-relief between the top of the calyx and the head of the snake portraying two laurel wreaths. The presence of the snake is indicative of the funerary character of the monument (Chapter 4, section 4.7.3). The monument is not accompanied by a funerary inscription and as a result, we cannot tell whether it belonged to a Rhodian or a foreigner. Lauter-Bufe contends that it was the funerary marker of a non-Rhodian *koinon* of foreigners (Lauter-Bufe 1983, 156-7). Her interpretation is based on the connection between the iconography of wreaths on sepulchral monuments and the funerary inscriptions by some of these associations referring to the crowning of the tomb or the funerary monument with a wreath (i.e. for the Dionysodoros decree see Chapter 4, Section 4.7.4; see also section 5.3.2 below). The author makes an association with the funerary stele of Aristoboulos of Termessos and his wife, Isigone of Ephesus (see section 5.3.2 below) in an attempt to support the idea that wreaths (especially laurel wreaths) were always associated with foreigners and members of associations on funerary monuments (Lauter-Bufe 1983, 156). Undeniably, there is a compelling amount of epigraphical evidence to suggest that the associations in Rhodes honoured only foreigners (Fraser 1977, 64), but there is hardly any contextual evidence to suggest that

depictions of wreaths on funerary monuments should only be associated with foreigners. All in all, the funerary monument could belong either to a Rhodian or a foreigner wishing to display a close connection to the island since the calyx of the rose was the identifying (*λαλούν*) symbol of Rhodes on coinage and amphorae stamps already from the early Hellenistic period (Lauter-Bufe 1983, 156-7; for variants of the rose as an iconographic element on the reverse of Rhodian coinage see Stefanaki 2010, 413-446).

A second cylindrical altar with unique decoration comes from the cemetery of ancient Amos; it is dated in the 1st c. BC but is, unfortunately, unpublished (currently on display at the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes). The altar, which is relatively small in size (almost half-size compared to typical cylindrical altars), is exceptional because it does not follow the standard funerary iconography of the remainder of the cylindrical altars; instead, it is decorated with sieves indicating that it was the funerary marker of a musician or an actor. Finally, a 2nd c. grave monument from Nisyros depicting a warship prow (Bairami 2011, cat. no 26) was likely the funerary marker of a seafarer. Overall, there is no tendency to use a specific type of monument for certain groups; we do not encounter funerary markers exclusively for children, women or older men. The most important factors of differentiation among the funerary monuments were probably the monument type, the material, and the quality of decoration.

5.3. The status of women and children

The quest for gender determination in burials has been an important issue in funerary archaeology and has lately received attention due to major developments in bioarchaeology and skeletal studies. However, there is a significant lack of such studies

in the Classical and Hellenistic cemeteries of Greece: many cemeteries were excavated a long time ago, skeletal remains were not always in an optimal condition, and the importance of the skeletal remains could not be fully appreciated at that time leading to unsuitable storage conditions of the anthropological material (Shepherd 2013, 547). A similar picture emerges from the South-Eastern Aegean. With the exception of two recent analyses of skeletal remains – one from the archaic necropolis of Kymissala (ongoing research, though the skeletal material from Kymissala is poorly preserved due to many factors such as the quality of the soil; Bourbou 2015, 301-2) and the other from the late Hellenistic/Roman grave complex at the Kountouri plot in Rhodes (Sardi 2013) – there is a significant lack of bioarchaeological analyses in the area that prevents a quantitative approach based on gender and sex identification per cemetery.[18]

The absence of biological indicators has driven many archaeologists to alternative methods for gender identification the most important of which is the determination of gender via specific burial goods corresponding either to males or females. A common misconception is the assignment of male status to strigils accompanying the deceased and the appropriation of mirrors as indicators of female burials: the mirror being employed as a parallel to female beauty and the strigil as part of the kit of the male athlete (Lee 2015). This identification has stirred much controversy (Milledge-Nelson 1997, 20-2; Strömberg 1998, 11-28) among archaeologists and various regional studies have proven that it is not always valid (see for instance Shepherd 2013, 548 focusing on Olynthos). Burial contexts are representative of the values of the social group, and they

[18] There is also an on-going study on Hadra Hydriai cremations from the city of Rhodes undertaken by Prof. Angelarakis (Adelphi University) in collaboration with the KB Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and the Archaeological Institute of Rhodes. The research of Prof. Angelarakis has already produced two reports (Angelarakis 2004-5, Angelarakis 2005), which are not yet accessible to the public due to restrictions imposed by the Ephorate (information derived from personal communication with Prof. Angelarakis in 2013).

signify what Houby-Nielsen explains as 'the cultural gender' (Houby-Nielsen 1995, 138). While it is true that certain burial goods such as jewellery can be gendered to a certain extent, gender distinction might be overall unimportant due to the homogeneity of burial furnishings; the general picture suggests that there is no apparent discrimination in burial goods in terms of expenditure. A quantitative identification of male or female burials based on funerary kit cannot be achieved due to the inconsistent nature of the evidence. As such, I will discuss specific case studies that in my opinion can enlighten our understanding of the status of women in the South-Eastern Aegean.

A population group that cannot benefit as much in the discussion of social identity is that of children. Admittedly, child burials are generally overlooked by archaeologists and this tendency often lies on the notion that the anthropological remains of children are not preserved as well as those of adults due to their fragile nature (see Baker et al. 2005, 3ff for a general discussion). This discrepancy is also encountered in Greek archaeology where recent studies have highlighted several variations in the funerary treatment of children (Shepherd 2013, 544; Lagia 2007; Guimier-Sorbets and Morizot 2010). A recognisable and recurring tendency in the Greek archaeological record is the reservation of separate cemeteries or special sections within adult cemeteries for child burials (Shepherd 2013, 544). The evidence from the South-Eastern Aegean is scarce and inconsistent. At the present stage of research, it is not possible to extrapolate all this information in order to create a comprehensive framework. Nonetheless, some interesting social correlations arise.

5.3.1. Do women matter? Reconstructing female identities in the South-Eastern Aegean

The urban necropoleis of Rhodes offer a glimpse of the status that some women might have enjoyed in life as reflected in their burial arrangements from the 3rd c. BC onwards. Overall jewellery, mostly made of gold, signifies a small but representative amount of burial goods in the cemeteries of the city. The most common types are earrings; at least 44 pairs and at least 31 single ones have been discovered (Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 215) and perhaps even more given that not all finds are explicitly recorded in the archaeological reports. Other types of jewellery include finger rings and necklaces as well as bracelets and items of personal adornment such as fibulae, hair rings and beads (Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 215).

Some of these burials unravel interesting individual stories. Tomb 5 at the Chalkiopoulou plot (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 475, pl. 475b; Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 207) in the central necropolis contained the cremated remains of an individual (possibly a young woman) accompanied by various grave goods among which fragments of a mirror, jewellery and fragments of a distaff and a comb. Archaeologists have identified the occupant of the tomb as a young unmarried woman on the basis of the presence of the comb (Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 207 especially n. 15). Yet the most impressive find was the discovery of 210 perforated, concave gold discs (Konstantinopoulos 1970, 475, pl. 475a; Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 207, pl. 18) that were probably sewn on pieces of garment that were deposited within the tomb. This unique discovery underlines the elevated social status of the deceased woman; the rich decoration of what could be interpreted as a funerary attire might have symbolised an idealised image of the unmarried maiden.

Another rich burial at the Katsara-Tambaki plot is of particular interest. A small treasure consisting of a necklace, earrings, and rings was found below three cinerary caskets probably belonging to an earlier inhumation (Marangou and Papachristodoulou 1995, 495; Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 213, pl. 60, 61, 62a-b, 63a-b) dated to the late 3rd – early 2nd c. BC. Though it is not clear whether the jewellery was associated with the cremation burials or the previous inhumation, it is likely that the treasure belonged to a wealthy woman wishing to retain her elite status in life after death. The same picture emerges from a single lavish burial of the late Hellenistic period at the Papatheodorou plot where a woman was buried with two rings, a pair of earrings, a bracelet and a gold crown accompanied by an impressive amount of pottery consisting mainly of ceramic *unguentaria* (Papachristodoulou 1988, 543-4, pl. 343b; Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 214-5). In general, the majority of the jewellery recovered from the Rhodian cemeteries was worn in life and was not made solely for funerary use (Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999, 216); therefore it is evident that besides items of elevated status they were also treasured personal belongings and potentially family heirlooms.

At the same time, a unique early Hellenistic burial of a young woman interred into a loculus in the western urban necropolis of Rhodes was of particular interest not only because it was found undisturbed but also because of the lavish funerary goods that accompanied the deceased (Patsiada 1995; Patsiada 2014) consisting of abundant gold jewellery and silver miniature vases among which a gold diadem decorated with a Herakles knot just like the diadem discovered in a rich grave in Telos (see below). The burial is of particular importance because the burial goods were found intact in connection with the body of the deceased. As such, she was wearing the jewellery on her body: rings on her fingers, a diadem on her head and simple hoop earrings all made of gold; other pieces of jewellery were recovered during the excavation scattered around

the loculus. Furthermore, the miniature silver vases, which are quite rare on the island, were carefully placed on her chest, and the rest of the funerary goods were deposited at her feet. Overall, the material culture gathered with the corpse suggests various levels of human agency (Boyd 2015). These objects could have been used at various stages during the funeral acquiring various meanings: from simple objects of personal adornment and utility objects to artefacts charged with various social and symbolic connotations. Essentially, we should presume because of her age that the burial of the young girl was staged and directed by her close family group whose choice of burial goods suggest various degrees of agency in a funerary context.

Another female identity can be reconstructed through an impressive treasure of gold jewellery unearthed from a grave at Telos. The assemblage was initially removed during illegal excavations on the farm of Antonios Oikonomou at Kena, where an impressive underground burial gallery has been unearthed, but was eventually returned to the Archaeological Service of the Dodecanese in 1948 (Kaninia 2011, 242, 288). Archaeologists have recently associated the jewellery treasure with the burial in the northernmost chamber of the gallery, which was larger compared to the other chambers and was preceded by an ante-chamber (Kaninia 2011, 243). It is noteworthy that each one of these chambers was carefully hewn for individual burials at different times, thus demonstrating that the underground gallery was used for the burial provisions of a family, kin or small community group of people. The excavators note that 'special attention was paid to the exterior configuration of the entrances to accentuate the individuality and distinctiveness of each deposit in the single elongated space of the burial gallery's interior' (Kaninia 2011, 244).

The jewellery consisted of a gold diadem with a Heracles knot and Erotes (late 3rd – early 2nd c. BC; Kaninia 2011, cat. no 66), a pair of gold pendants (2nd c. BC; Kaninia, cat.

no 67), a gold chain necklace (second half of the 3rd c. BC; Kaninia 2011, cat. no 68), six gold oviform buttons that have been identified as pin components, (late 3rd – early 2nd c. BC; Kaninia 2011, cat. nos. 69-70), a spiral snake-shaped gold ring (late 3rd – 1st half of 2nd c. BC; Kaninia 2011, cat. no 71) and a seal stone depicting a female figure wearing a diadem and a peplos (2nd c. BC; Kaninia 2011, cat. no 72). A first reading suggests that the rich and technically sophisticated personal ornamentations are indicative of the elevated social status of the deceased, an affluent woman who had access to wealth during her lifetime. At the same time, iconography can be quite revealing. Three out of the six gold oval buttons were decorated with a winged thunderbolt, an iconographical motif associated with Zeus (described in Aristophanes, Birds, 1714, as the 'fire-bearing weapon of Zeus'; cf. Hesperia 35, 1966, 449), a symbol of divine power (*LIMC* Suppl. 2009, s.v. *Brontai*, 136-8; Kaninia 2011, 293) with apotropaic characteristics in art (see for example the depiction of a winged thunderbolt on the painted shield of the tomb at Agios Athanasios in Thessaloniki, Tsimpidou-Avloniti 2005, 146-7, pl. 37, 41; Kaninia 2011, 293). The excavator contends convincingly that the symbolism of the winged thunderbolt on the buttons from Telos is an indication of the high-status ancestry of the individual (Kaninia 2011, 293), but at the same time one can also argue that it could be the heraldic emblem of a family or association with increased influence on the island or even an indirect reference to a chthonic cult (though there is no evidence for an organised cult of Zeus at Telos; for the chthonic cults of Zeus in Greek religion see Fairbanks 1900, 244-7).

On the other hand, the iconography of the carnelian seal stone is equally interesting. A female figure wearing a crown and a belted peplos holds a cornucopia on her left hand and a phiale on her right. She is depicted in front of an unidentified setting, and she has been interpreted as a Tyche due to the presence of the horn of plenty (Kaninia et al. 2011, 294; Plantzos 1999, 77-8) and a small incision she is standing on that could

represent the prow of a ship. I am not entirely convinced that the female figure should be seen as a general illustration of the goddess Tyche on its own; a specific context is plausible. The iconography of the cornucopia, a symbol of wealth and prosperity, is a recurring motif on a group of cylindrical funerary altars of Koan provenance (Berges 1996, 38-9) that have been associated with the cult of Arsinoe II as seen on contemporary coins (Berges 1996, 38; Svoronos 1908, 86-94; see also Athenaeus 11.497b-c for the introduction of the cornucopia in the cult of Arsinoe). Under this context, the iconography of Tyche combined with the cornucopia (more specifically Agathe Tyche) are related to the concept of euergetism, a major aspect of the cult of Arsinoe (Burr Thompson 1973, 51-52).

Euergetism (*évergétisme*), meaning the endowment of wealth in the community by an affluent individual (essentially patronage), is a term introduced by Boulanger in 1923 in his study of Aelius Aristides (Boulanger 1923, 25; later adopted by Marrou 1948). The term 'ευεργέτης' appears in numerous Hellenistic honorary decrees (Veyne 1990, 10); the function and nature of these endowments differ from one geographical area to the other, yet it is believed that it originated in Asia Minor (Zuiderhoeck 2009, 12-3). A distinct aspect of euergetism in the South-Eastern Aegean is associated with the funerary inscriptions of the Rhodian *koina* of foreigners as we shall see below (section 5.3.2).

Altogether, it is plausible to suggest that the woman of the Telian grave was a very important individual whose status in life was reflected in her burial arrangements. It is unclear whether the deceased was a member of the local aristocracy or a foreigner who moved to Telos when the island was incorporated to the Rhodian peraea. Most of the vases that were found in association with the jewellery (although it is not clear from the reports whether they belonged to this specific burial or others) were either imported

from Rhodes or were manufactured locally imitating the Rhodian style (Kaninia et al. 2011, cat nos. 58-65).

One of the most interesting burials at the cemetery near Palaiokastro in Nisyros is that of a woman who lived and died possibly in the early 3rd c. BC (Jacopi 1932-33, 529-34); the body of the deceased (identified as a woman by the inscription on her epitaph) was deposited at the bottom of a built cist surrounded by abundant pottery, glass vessels, a bronze cup and two iron strigils (fig. 3.3). The clay pottery, consisting mainly of lekythoi, unguentaria, plates and amphorae, was plentiful but not of outstanding quality; the vases were produced locally and did not differ significantly from the vases found in other cist tombs in the area (Filimonos-Tsopotou 2011, 316), yet the presence of glass vessels and a bronze ciborium (cup), which were probably imported (Jacopi 1932-33, 534, cat. nos. 12, 13, 14, fig. 69-70 for two glass bowls and a glass lekythos and cat. no. 16 for the ciborium), attest to the elevated status of the deceased. Of particular significance was a small plate deposited at the southernmost wall of the tomb close to the feet of the deceased (Jacopi 1932-33, 530, cat. no. 2, fig. 65, 67). The plate was inscribed centrally with a bas-relief reading ΔΩ/PON, meaning gift; it was probably a personal belonging of emotional significance which was chosen to accompany her to the grave.

Burial furnishing aside, the tomb is of particular importance due to its remarkable decoration; the internal walls were painted with patterns imitating isodomic blocks (Jacopi 1932-1933, 530, fig. 65) possibly replicating the effect of masonry. Not all the burial goods were deposited next to the deceased, though; some of them were contained in two rectangular niches on the north and the upper west wall of the tomb respectively.

The northern niche, which was the smallest, contained a clay oil lamp straight above the head of the deceased, which was oriented on the north-east, while the bigger niche on the west wall contained the metal ciborium, a small glass amphora and various

bronze and iron fragments (the latter were parts of a strigil). The western niche housed part of the lavish grave goods, while the presence of the oil lamp in the niche above the cadaver might be significant (another three lamps were recovered from the tomb, but they were placed around the body). While lamps are not encountered frequently in the Hellenistic tombs of the South-Eastern Aegean, one cannot overlook their practical use as illumination devices facilitating funerary ritual (Raptou et al. 2002, 217; Şöföroğlu and Summerer 2016, 263); it is possible that they were left inside the tomb after the funeral as a result of the *miasma* (for possible interpretations of lamps in graves see Şöföroğlu and Summerer 2016, 263-5). An alternative explanation can be sought; the presence of lamps in female tombs might be connected with the female sphere. Hermanns argued that the presence of lamps in Sicilian graves combined with other elements attributed to female activities is a strong display of the social role of women in life and is indicative of everyday domestic tasks such as weaving that would require a significant amount of light (Hermanns 2004, 125-6; Şöföroğlu and Summerer 2016, 263).

Such an interpretation is not unlikely; iconographical elements and burial goods associated with female activities have also been found in Macedonian cist tombs of the same period, and they are generally regarded as underlining the social status of women in life and their association with the *gynaikeion* (γυναικωνίτης), the female sector of the Greek house. For instance, an early Hellenistic cist tomb from Aineia near Thessaloniki in Northern Greece contained the cremated remains of a woman and her newborn in a wooden larnax accompanied by offerings such as alabastra and a gilded bronze wreath. Moreover, the walls of the tomb were decorated with elements associated with female activities, which were painted as 'hanging' from the walls: a mirror, a headband, a chest, various ribbons, a bust of Aphrodite and wreaths (Vokotopoulou 1990, 35-49, fig. 14-20, pl. 1-6, 21-25). Contemporary cist tombs at Pella (Karamanoli – Siganidou 1984, 261, pl.

201b; Akamati 1996, 85-6, pl. 19b), and Agios Athanasios (Tsimbidou – Avlonitou 2000) in northern Greece display a similar iconographical programme related to the female sphere. In conclusion, all these tombs, the Nisyrian cist tomb included, denote to a certain extent the expected social position of women in life but are certainly more revealing of the contemporary norms and expectations for the burial of women by their husbands or other members of their social group.

Finally, our knowledge of the status and the identity of the Nisyrian woman is enriched by her funerary epitaph found nearby her tomb (Jacopi 1932-1933, 529, fig. 66):

. . . . . νε. τ . . . . . ἄριστον αιε. . . . . .υδος

. . . . . ακαιετ. . . . . νε . . . . . ἰκ]ανὸν ἔπος

φ]ήμη κηρυσσ. . . . . εὐσεβὲς ἦθος ἐν ἀστοῖς

καὶ κατὰ γῆς φήμης ἄρνυται ἀθανάτου

᾽Αρχ[εν]έω δὲ θυγατρὰ τίς ού κηίνηι σὲ θανοῦσαν

τὰν ὀσίην ὅσιον τέρμ᾽ ἐπεὶ εἶλε βίου.

Εἴτε σὺ γ᾽εύσεβέων χώρους Δαματρίου εύν[ή

ναίεις, εἴτε θεᾶς Φερσεφόνης πάρεδρος,

ἵλαος οἰκοίηις καὶ ὑπόχθονος υἰεῖ ῞Αδρωνι

ὅς σοι ὕπερθε τάφου θήκατο σῆμα τόδε.

Translation (author's own):

…excellent…

… adequate words/speech

saying words…. … pious character among citizens.

And on land nobody denies the saying that the pious daughter of immortal Archenaus will have a pious end of life when she dies. Either you live in the room (bedroom) of Demeter among the areas of the pious, or you are sitting beside goddess Persephone, in a propitious home under the earth (it is thanks to) the son of Adronis, who set this sign above your grave for you.

We, therefore, learn that the woman (θανοῦσαν), whose name evades us, was the daughter of a certain Archenaos (᾽Αρχ[εν]έω δὲ θυγατρὰ) and had a good and virtuous life resulting to her premature death (τὰν ὀσίην ὅσιον τέρμ᾽ ἐπεὶ εἶλε βίου). More importantly, the social presence of the deceased as a pious and virtuous woman is underlined by an allusion to the underworld; she will soon be in the company of the chthonic goddesses Demeter and Persephone (Εἴτε σὺ γ᾽εὐσεβέων χώρους Δαματρίου εὐν[ή/ναίεις, εἴτε θεᾶς Φερσεφόνης πάρεδρος), and this is thanks to Adronius (presumably her husband) who built the tomb for her. In this context, it is clear that the status of the unknown woman was dependent upon her father and husband since her portrayal as a daughter and a wife is more important than her individual standing. It is likely that she died being a young bride as an allusion to the bedchamber of Demeter (ευσεβέων χώρους) might point towards this direction.

Last but not least, funerary iconography may offer a glimpse of female status and women's social standing. One of the most frequent motifs of women's representation on Hellenistic stelai is the so-called *pudicitia* type denoting a veiled woman with clothing held tightly against the body in a modest way, yet this is a rare motif on tombstones in the South-Eastern Aegean. Women are usually depicted as secondary and subsided figures in Totenmahl reliefs. Totenmahl (funerary banquet) is the most popular motif on the Hellenistic stelai in the area but still, it is not as widespread as altars in Rhodes, Kos

and the other islands (Fabricius 1999, 78). In its simplest form, the Totenmahl shows one figure on a *kline* with or without a servant present. Most often, however, we see a man and a woman on a *kline* together, the man lying down and the woman sitting by his legs. The scene may include a table with food, and although it is not always possible to identify the setting from the background, these scenes are considered to take place in the *oikos* or the private sphere (for an extensive treatment of Hellenistic Totenmahl reliefs see Fabricius 1999, especially for Rhodes 165-224; in connection to funerary ritual see Chapter 4, section 4.7.3).

An interesting variation are those reliefs involving two women hugging each other possibly representing the departure of the deceased and a family member (Dontas 1958, 211ff); one from Karakonero in Rhodes dated to 150 BC depicts two women involved into a tight and emotional embrace during or at the aftermath of mourning (Pful and Möbius 1977-1979, 725, fig. 5.6), while another one from Telos (Pful and Möbius 1977-1979, 724, pl. 108) dated to the 1st c. BC depicts another pair of women embracing; the deceased is identified as Menestrati, daughter of Menestratos of Knidos, wife of Dionysios. These scenes stand out because they offer a rare glimpse into the private lives of women and depart from the standardised female representations on the rest of the stelai.

Overall, in the Hellenistic period, an increasing number of women of elite or royal status enjoyed financial independence and elevated social status compared to the Classical period (for elite women in the Hellenistic period see Pomeroy 1984; Carney 2000). Pomeroy (1984, 3-40) recognises that the most important factor for this a differentiation came with the conquests of Alexander the Great followed by a significant introduction of new ideologies and views especially in the kingdoms established in Egypt and Asia Minor. As a result, elite royal women began to compete in a traditionally male arena and challenged men in equal terms. In contrast, ordinary women were seen as

dependent on men but perhaps less so compared to the Classical period. Although boundaries were set in their interactions with men in the public sphere (Burton 1998, 41), they enjoyed social recognition and their political status was not necessarily dependent upon that of their husbands. In the South-Eastern Aegean, this is particularly evident in the funerary inscriptions where women are designated along with men as benefactors of *koina* (i.e. IG XII,1, 384, 385). Nonetheless, though it seems that women in the South-Eastern Aegean during this period were conformed to social standards set by men, quite a few of them could achieve wealth and prosperity in their lifetime, and this is apparent in the post-mortem display of their status.

5.3.2. Children and identity: a complicated narrative

The cemeteries of Astypalaia present a unique insight on how children's identities were perceived and re-negotiated after burial. The Classical cemetery at Katsalos contained burials of individuals of all ages, while the cemetery at Kylindra contained only burials of new-born babies and some young children; the cemetery at Kylindra was in use from the Geometric period to Roman times (Clement et al. 2009; Hillson 2009; Michalaki-Kollia 2010; Vlachou 2012, 384). The infants and the young children at Kylindra were inhumed in trade amphorae (**fig. 5.2 a-b**), but sometimes other pots were used such as hydriai (Clement et al. 2009, 19, fig. 7). The babies were inserted inside the vessels through an opening on the side of the amphorae; after the interment, the hole was closed with the broken piece of pottery, while the neck of the pot was obstructed with a plastered stone (Clement et al. 2009, 19, fig. 8). Osteological analysis has revealed that the vast majority of the babies died at the time of childbirth; a small group of babies were

stillborn while some larger skeletons indicate that these babies died a few weeks or months after birth (Clement et al. 2009, 19-20; Hillson 2009, 133-50). Whenever the position of the babies inside the pots could be determined, it recalled the position of an embryo within the womb: infants laid on their side with bent knees while their head was oriented towards the opening of the pot and the lower back was oriented towards the bottom. A small percentage of infants (described as 10% by the excavators) had the opposite position to the one described above. The vast majority of the amphorae housed the remains of one infant. However, 1.9% of the burials contained two or three skeletons though some of them may be contaminated with neighbouring burials since they originate from disturbed parts of the cemetery. There are no signs of pathological symptoms that would lead to a different interpretation of the cause of death. Offerings were almost non-existent, and the sporadic presence of sherds suggests that the latter were used as plugs for the sealing of the pots (Clement et al. 2009, 20). Unfortunately, we do not know the exact percentage of Hellenistic echyntrismoi; an analysis of the ceramic wares in the future would be useful towards this direction though the uniformity of the finds might hinder the creation of a reliable chronological sequence.

How are we to interpret such a unique find? The excavator has associated the cemetery, which is the largest of its kind in the world, with the cults of Artemis Lochia and Eileithyia (see also Chapter 4, section 4.4.1). This association is based on inscriptions found nearby reporting the presence of a sanctuary dedicated to Artemis Lochia in Astypalaia (Michalaki-Kollia 2009). However, this connection does not necessarily explain on its own the extensive deposition of infants at Kylindra. Though the uniformity and the standardisation of the burials do not leave much room for the promotion of individual attributes, it is unlikely that infants were stripped of their initial social status as anticipated members of their family group. In contrast to the 450 neonates in the

Hellenistic well G5:3 close to the Athenian agora, whose remains were mixed along with the remains of an adult, a child and at least 150 dogs (Rotroff 1999, Papadopoulos 2000, 110-1) and did not receive proper burial, the echyntrismoi at Kylindra were delivered with care. Ancient Greeks believed that childbirth and death were connected events and this association was paralleled with an analogy between the care for the new-born and the care for the corpse by women (Houby-Nielsen 1996, 241). Clearly, the role of the women as caretakers of small children and babies was extended to the burial following the death of their loved ones; it is evident that they were directly involved in the burial procedure described above both from a practical but also an emotional perspective. Under this context, it is important to notice that the infants at Kylindra received a 'proper' death ritual suggesting their status as established or anticipated family members.

Infant echyntrismos was also practised in the Rhodian necropoleis. At the late Hellenistic/early Roman complex at the Kountouri plot (Chapter 3, section 3.3.4) four infants up to six months old were deposited in kalpai within four separate loculi which were built especially for this purpose in the northern part of the funerary complex (Patsiada 2013, 232-3, fig. 109, 122, 123; for the anthropological study see Sardi 2013, 388-9). According to the excavator, this is the only recorded case of infants or children buried separately from the rest of the group in the Rhodian necropoleis (Patsiada 2013, 233). A similar depositional pattern of infant echyntrismoi can be observed in Messene, where the infant burials were gathered in the outdoor area of a 2nd – 1st c. BC peribolos (K3); the adults were deposited in the cist tombs of the funerary chamber in the centre of the peribolos. It is noteworthy that the infant echyntrismoi were in close proximity to a group of small dog burials (Themelis 2000, 124-36, fig 111-122; Bourbou and Themelis 2010, 111-28; Patsiada 2013, 233).

Generally, the distinction between adult and infant/children cemeteries was pronounced in earlier periods as evidenced by the burials of infants and children in separate cemeteries or isolated sections of the same cemetery in Corinth (Blegen et al. 1964, 68), Phaleron (7th c.; Young 1942), Marathon (8th c.; Sotiriadis 1934, this is not, however, an 'ordinary' cemetery because the large concentration of infant and child burials has been attributed to an epidemic) and Eleusis (Young 1939, 15). The most representative example of this distinction is the cemetery at Kylindra in Astypalaia we have already discussed. The separation between adult and children burials has been explained in various terms: the fear and *miasma* of untimely death, as well as epidemic diseases, are the most common (Dasen 2010, 19-44). However, there might be underlying social conventions behind this choice. There have been cases in the archaeological record where children burials were particularly rich in terms of burial goods (Shepherd 2013, 545): for instance, in Italy, a geometric infant burial at Pithekoussai was accompanied by twenty-two fibulae (Buchner and Ridgway 1993; Shepherd 2013, 545), while three children burials in an archaic tomb at Megara Hyblaea 'were literally covered in silver' as the excavator notes emphatically (Orsi 1913, 195; Shepherd 2013, 545). At the same time, grave 597 in Olynthos belonged to a child and contained gilded metal fragments (Robinson 1942; Shepherd 2013, 545).

In Nisyros, the pithos echyntrismos (grave 15; Filimonos-Tsopoutou 2011, cat. nos. 71-80) of a young child (girl) dated to the early Hellenistic period was richly furnished. The burial goods consisted of two female clay busts representing either deities or *kourotrophoi*, three clay female figurines of a standing woman, a seated woman and a *kourotrophos*, a clay figurine in the shape of a dove, a miniature figurine of a turtle, a replica of a fig, a bronze ring and glass beads belonging to a necklace. Though most of the items were of chtonic nature (for an analytical discussion see Chapter 4, section 4.3), their

presence in connection to a girl's burial is important not only in terms of her overall social standing in life, but also as indicators of an idealised social status (potentially as a future bride) that could be achieved if it was not for her untimely death.

Undeniably, the choice between disposing an infant formally or not had many social inferences. The evidence of the echyntrismoi burials from the South-Eastern Aegean suggests that although the infants and small children (with a few exceptions) did not receive the same funerary treatment as the adults, the emphasis was placed on a respectful burial ritual by highlighting their transitional status as anticipated but not fully integrated members of the communities.

5.4. Collective identity

In this section, we shall attempt to explore whether bonds that existed during one's lifetime could be retained after death. These bonds could be biological (based on age and gender) or social (based on family, kin or other associations); unfortunately it is impossible to assess the first category for reasons we have already explained above. Therefore, we shall look into the evidence for collective burials with a particular reference to the Rhodian associations of foreigners and the archaeological evidence for their burial provisions.

5.4.1. Collective burials

Apart from their importance in regard to the landscape and the articulation of the funerary and post-funerary ritual, tombs with more than one burials were also the sepulchres of social groups whose placement in death may have reflected the social bonds that the deceased shared in life. At the same time, these social bonds could also be shared by the living actors that identified with them. However, the relationship between this form of collective commemoration and the construction of a group identity is not always clear.

There are two categories of social groups that can be associated with collective burials in the South-Eastern Aegean: families (or kin groups) and associations (*koina*) of foreigners. In Rhodes and Kos, funerary inscriptions frequently record the names of families; a recurring epigraphic formula is that of a man and his wife. Nonetheless, most of these inscriptions are out of context, and very few can be associated with archaeological remains, all of them from Rhodes. Fraser (1977, 52-58) has discussed the evidence for family graves in the Aghios Ioannis district in the western urban necropolis of Rhodes with an emphasis on the inscriptions and their formulaic characteristics. The results are quite interesting: inscriptions on the funerary caskets, urns and other burial receptacles from two of these hypogea can be associated with families of Rhodians and non-Rhodians some of which were intermixed. For instance, one of these hypogea with five burial chambers and nine loculi (Maiuri 1925, 124ff, inscription nos. 362-83; Fraser 1977, 53-4) contained a large number of inhumations and cremations.

Fraser divided the burial evidence from this hypogeum (2nd c. BC) into two groups on the basis of the relationships revealed by the inscriptions: a family of Amians whose remains were housed in a sarcophagus, caskets and funerary urns in the main burial

chambers (*cellae*) of the complex and a second, probably unrelated, family or kin group of citizens belonging to the various *deme* of Kameiros, including an individual from Tlos in Asia Minor, a city of the incorporated *peraea* (Fraser and Bean 1954, 58, n.1) all of them buried in the loculi above the underground chambers (Maiuri 1925, 128-9; Fraser 1977, 54). It is generally accepted that citizens of the incorporated *peraea* were designated with their demotic on inscriptions in contrast to citizens of the subject *peraea* where the ethnic Rhodios accompanied the name of the individual on inscriptions (Fraser and Bean 1954, 53; Papachristodoulou 1989b, 43; idem 1999, 38; Constantakopoulou 2007, 244). The first group was that of an extended family (without the mother) of a father, his sons, and members of his extensive male kin group as well as individuals of low rank that Fraser identified with servants or slaves (Fraser 1977, 54). On the other hand, the second group that was buried in the loculi was of diverse origins with a common point of reference – cities and *deme* that had direct ties to Kameiros such as Tlos, Nisyros and Lelos (a city in the south of Rhodes incorporated to Kameiros as evidenced by a reference regarding one of its officials in the *Tituli Camirensis* 84; Fraser 1977, 54) probably the result of mixed marriages.

Fraser also identified a family of Rhodians from a different tomb consisting of three burial chambers and loculi in the Aghios Ioannis complex (Maiuri 1925, 124ff, inscription nos. 385-395; Fraser 1977, 55) again in reference to the inscriptions on their funerary receptacles representing two or three generations of Rhodians from various Lindian and Kameirian *deme.* It is noteworthy that the first two family groups of foreigners were buried with some of their servants whom they probably regarded as an integral part of their household and this link was maintained even in death. The identification of these individuals with servants has been achieved through the interpretation of their names in the inscriptions: the lack of any ethnic or demotic

adjectives or other attributes following their name suggests that they were individuals of a modest background, possibly servants or slaves (Fraser 1977, 54).

Funerary inscriptions from a handful of other plots in the city necropoleis also link some of the funerary complexes with families of Rhodian descent for which we do not possess much information (Patsiada 1999, 128, n. 11; Patsiada 2013, 716, n. 716, 717). However, these complexes share two common characteristics. Firstly, they all belonged to families originating from Rhodes and the incorporated *peraea*. At the Peros plot (Fatourou 1967a, Kontorini 1983, 79-84, nos. 9-26; Patsiada 1996, 95), two families had been buried within chamber A as evidenced by two cylindrical altars, the base of a third one (all inscribed) and five osteothekai (some of which were inscribed) dated to the 3rd c. BC. The inscriptions indicate that one family was Rhodian (from the *deme* of Istanion in Ialyssos), and the other one consisted of a husband and his wife: the husband, Ermokrates was from Kasara, a *deme* of the Rhodian peraea with allegiance to Kameiros, while his wife Antiarista was also an Istanian. As such, there is a possibility that the two families were somehow related given that the *deme* of Istanion was a common denominator. Equally, excavations at the Kritotsakis plot revealed five inscribed osteothekai, two of which were associated with two loculi on a pedestal adjacent to one another and the rest with a cist grave dated to the 1st c. BC (Zervoudaki 1984, 371-2); this was a family of Rhodians, though one of the inscriptions belonged to an Ephesian. At the Kampouris plot (Kostomitsopoulos 1989, 322-3, pl. 161a-b) several inscribed osteothekai in loculi housed the remains of an extensive family of Amnistians descending more than one generations; the excavator notes the resemblance of the funerary complex with hypogeum III at Aghios Ioannis which equally contained the remains of a family of Amnistians as we have already seen (Kostomitsopoulos 1989, 322-3; cf. Maiuri 1925, 128-9; Fraser 1977, 54). Inscribed bases and altars were also found on the outskirts of

the city of Rhodes (site Vodi) as part of a larger funerary complex consisting of a cluster of chamber tombs with a monumental façade (Kaninia 1990; Kaninia 1993, 610-11, fig. 11); the tombs were associated with a large family of Rhodians from the Lindian *deme* of Netidan in southern Rhodes (Papachristodoulou 1989, 76). Another important connecting characteristic of these tombs, all of which date to the late Hellenistic period, is their architectural layout: the tombs and the loculi at the Peros, Kritsotakis and Kampouris plots were organised within periboloi, while the tombs at Vodi were clustered together. It is, therefore, apparent of the basis of the current evidence that periboloi tombs were preferred by families from the 2nd c. BC onwards.

In general, if it was not for the inscriptions it would probably be impossible to tell whether all these funerary assemblages belonged to a family (or families) or not. There is no direct evidence that families that were entombed in a common space favoured specific types of burials, funerary goods or grave architecture with a possible exception: periboloi graves. Though there is no definitive evidence to suggest that all the Rhodian periboloi graves were built for families, we may extend our line of thought and argue that periboloi graves could have been a favoured mode of burial for families in the same way their earlier counterparts in the cemetery of Kerameikos functioned as loci for the establishment and the promotion of the family ideology in classical Athens (Closterman 2007, 633-52). However, this analogy cannot be entirely substantiated; Closterman's argument is interconnected with the iconography on the tombstones associated with the Athenian periboloi, which is relevant to the traits of the average Athenian family, 'longevity, virtue, and intergenerational harmony' (Closterman 2007, 651). On the other hand, the Rhodian periboloi are associated (to a certain extent) with cylindrical altars, whose iconographical attributes are not indicative of family bonds or family life. An interesting example comes from a number of 3rd c. burial periboloi at the Karageorgiou

plot which predate the monumental tomb with burial beds on the same plot (Patsiada 1996). The arrangement of the periboloi in the space, their consecutive building phases and the absence of a larger cemetery suggest that these would have belonged to families not extending over a generation or two; the construction of the 2nd c. funerary complex coincided with the final building phase of the periboloi. Similarly, one can assume that the rock-cut periboloi graves at the cemetery of Amos were also family burials. Although they lacked sophistication in terms of layout and execution, they were tightly arranged alongside the funerary road that coincided with the road leading towards and out of the city proper and it would be tempting to link their prominent position and function as family tombs to that of the Athenian periboloi in Kerameikos (Humphreys 1980).

5.4.2. Some observations on the Rhodian associations (*koina*) of foreigners

As we have already mentioned, numerous inscriptions (dated to the 2nd and 1st c. BC) allow us to associate certain tomb complexes with families or social groups in the urban necropoleis of Rhodes in a way that has not been observed for any other Hellenistic necropolis elsewhere. In total, we know of 170 *koina* whose members were from major trade cities of the eastern Mediterranean (Fabricius 1999, 212). The associations should not be seen only as exclusive clubs whose members benefited with various provisions. In contrast, they exercised significant influence: for example, certain associations were structured along tribe lines and organised games for their members with officials of the Rhodian state, thus imitating various sectors of public life in the polis (Papachristodoulou 1989b, 204).

In Rhodes and Kos, requirements for the burial of individuals in graves owned and maintained by associations are documented in inscriptions; the Rhodian corpus spans from the 2nd and 1st c. BC, whereas the Koan inscriptions appear as early as the 3rd c. BC up to the 3rd c. AD. The inscriptions of the *koina* have been studied thoroughly and have produced interesting results in terms of prosopography, financial matters and social hierarchy among the members of these associations (Pugliese-Carratelli 1939-1940; Kontorini 1983; 1989). It is not my intention to review these inscriptions because that would depart considerably from the scope of this thesis; I will, however, provide some general information and then discuss several interesting aspects of some of these inscriptions in connection with the archaeological evidence.

The Rhodian corpus of funerary inscriptions of the *koina* can be divided into two sub-groups. The first one consists of at least 33 epitaphs documenting 38 names in total among which 37 belonged to foreigners (IG XII 1, 156-162, 385, 394, 917-918, 937, 939-940, 955; Hiller 1896 n. 12; Maiuri, 1916, n. 4; Maiuri 1925, nos. 39-41, 43, 46, 192-193; Maiuri 1925-1926, n. 6; Pugliese-Carratelli 1939-1940, nos. 8, 11; Pugliese-Carratelli, 1952-1954, n. 17; Pugliese-Carratelli 1986-1987, n. 12; Blinkenberg et al. 1941, 656, 683). These inscriptions do not reveal any information on the *koina* themselves; they simply recall the act of bestowing honours on the benefactors (euergetai) of various associations. Interestingly, some of these benefactors were women; the most notable example is an epitaph (now at the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes) for Aristoboulos from Termessos and his wife Isigoni from Ephesus commemorating their status as members and more importantly benefactors of a *koinon* (Αριστοβούλου / Τερμεσσέως / εὐεργέτα /χο- ραγήσαντος τρίς //και τας γυναικός / Ισιγόνης / Εφεσίας /**εὐεργετίδος**; IG XII 1, 385; Fraser 1977, 36; Kaninia 1998, 126, especially n. 123). The *stele* is decorated

with three skeletal bucrania encircled by three wreaths each, thus connecting the concept of euergetism with the deposition of wreaths.

The second group of evidence from Rhodes consists of a number of inscriptions reporting funerary provisions of the associations for their members and benefactors. One can see in detail various operational sides of the associations in reference to diverse aspects of the funerary ritual from the financial contributions of the members to the maintenance of the common burial grounds (known in the inscriptions as κοινοί τόποι and/or κοινοί τάφοι and the monuments (known in the inscriptions as μναμεία) on them (Konstantinopoulos 1966; Fraser 1977, 62).

I will now focus on two of these documents from Rhodes, because unlike anywhere else in the Greek world, they have been found *in situ* within actual grave plots[19]. At the Peros plot, excavations revealed a funerary complex consisting of two chambers and loculi where a funerary decree was discovered in situ (Fraser 1977, 58ff; Kontorini 1983, 71ff). The decree refers to the *koinon* of Sabaziastai dated to the late 2nd or early 1st c. BC and describes the honours set for an individual from Syrakous, Ariston. These honours include the deposit of a wreath on a yearly basis during the symposion at the *andron*, the banquet room, of the koinon. It was discovered in chamber A along with five osteothekai, two round altars and an altar base whose date is earlier of that of the decree inscribed with names that belong to Rhodians; it was probably transferred there a later date. It is, therefore, evident that chamber B was of later date, it was built next to chamber A and could have been used as the gathering room for the members of the koinon of Sabaziastai as suggested by Kontorini (1983, n. 18). However, Patsiada has altogether rejected this

[19] For a list of the three burial complexes in Rhodes that can be connected with associations on the basis of the presence of honorary decrees by *koina* in their premises see Fabricius 1999, 207-210; Patsiada 2013, 240, n. 715. A third inscription, which is not discussed here, was found within a grave plot outside Rhodes in the Ialyssian *deme* of Pontoreis (Papachristodoulou 1989, 198-200, no. 10). The name of the association does not survive on the inscription and we possess very little information on the tomb itself.

interpretation (Patsiada 1996, 95-6; 2013, 59) on the basis of chronological and functional discrepancies between the funerary monuments of chamber A (which predated the decree itself by at least a century) and the decree dated to the late Hellenistic period. Moreover, the inscriptions in chamber A recorded citizens from Rhodes and the incorporated *peraea*, a social group that could not be a member of these associations (Fabricius 1999, 207-210), therefore the decree was clearly not related with the altars and the osteothekai. It is also my opinion that the decree is not associated with the funerary complex where it was discovered. It was probably moved to this area from somewhere else (perhaps an *andron* belonging to an association in the same or a different part of the necropolis), since there is no contextual evidence to suggest that it was included in the initial planning of chamber B.

A second decree was found in situ at a burial complex in the eastern urban necropolis of Rhodes, thus suggesting that the complex was also used as a common grave (SEG 39, 1989, no. 737; Kontorini 1989, 74-75).[20] The decree refers to a group of associations, an *eranos*, of Samothrakiastai, Aristobouliastai, Hermaistai, and Panathanaistai founded by a certain Ktesiphon of Chersonesos. The layout of the burial complex was that of a peribolos with an elevated pedestal for the erection of funerary monuments and loculi all of which contained inhumations. In this context, *periboloi* graves, were not strictly family graves, but could also have been used by members of the *koina*. Further discoveries will help us determine whether this specific grave type is intrinsically connected with a particular group or groups of citizens as well as the reasons behind this choice.

[20] The burial assemblage is unpublished, therefore, we do not know anything about the plan of the tomb or the location of the decree within the complex.

The honours for Ktesiphon as described on the decree included the deposit of a gold wreath and an extensive list of benefactors; the complete sum of money collected for the purchase and the maintenance of the burial *topos* (meaning probably the plot) was 930 drachmas, which is a considerable amount of money. The founder of the association was also one of the major benefactors with a contribution of 250 drachmas (Κτησιφῶν Χερσονασίτας σν'). However, no evidence for a gathering room has been discovered in the plot, while associated finds like altars are of a later date although they document names of non-Rhodians.

Overall, although the evidence is very limited it appears that there was no special preference towards a specific architectural layout for the common burial complexes of these associations. As such the purchase of burial grounds was probably dictated by criteria such as availability of land and sustainability as well as the financial status of the benefactors. Interestingly, two themes are worth noticing in connection with the burial plots maintained by the *koina:* participation and gathering and the concept of euergetism in a private, non-civic context. Both of these themes were crucial for the development and the maintenance of the social memory of the group. By participation and gathering, I denote all these aspects of the funerary ritual that precipitated the gathering of the members of the associations in order to honour the deceased both from a material perspective as well as a collective, social presence. This collectiveness is described in the Sabaziastai decree as a banquet held at the andron of the association once a year; it was probably a separate building belonging to the *koinon* either in proximity to the burial complex or at a separate part of the necropoleis.

In 1979, excavations in the southwestern urban necropolis of Rhodes brought to light a rectangular building (**fig. 5.3**) with *kline*-shaped benches surrounded by numerous grave plots (Papachristodoulou 1984, 368; Papachristodoulou 1987a, 435-7,

fig. 6, pl. 232 β-δ, 233α; Kontorini 1983, 76; Papachristodoulou 1988, 204, fig. 4-5). More interestingly, two round altars with inscriptions, possibly linked with an association, were placed in the middle of these benches; unfortunately they remain unpublished. Patsiada has linked the area with the *andron* of the *koinon* of the Sabaziastai (Patsiada 1996, 104), but the evidence for such a connection is purely speculative at this stage. What is really interesting about the complex is that it is perhaps the first time that altars have been found in an area that suggests active participation and performance (Fabricius 1999, 207). The crowning of the altar is mentioned in the provisions of posthumous honours in relation to the decree of the Sabaziastai (though there is no specification regarding the actual altar type) and that could indicate an area where *dromena* such as the crowning of the monument or gathering of members of the *koinon* for a symposion could have taken place. The idea of banqueting in a symbolic funerary context has been already discussed in relation to a group of monumental tombs with *klinai* from the Rhodian necropoleis. (Chapter 4, section 4.5.4).

At the same time, and perhaps more importantly, the funerary associations were founded on the notion of euergetism as we have already seen. Under this context, the honours assigned by the associations to their members can be paralleled to the honours bestowed by the polis to the citizens during their lifetime or their death as a recognition of their benefactions; in a way the associations substituted the role of the state in the funerary process as also happened in Hellenistic Athens (Jones 1999, 266). As such, we observe a growing individualism, which culmiated in the monumental tombs of the middle and late Hellenistic periods; however, this individualism does not necessitate the alteration of those characteristics that constitute civic identity. After all, associations were not only tied by financial or social bonds; in my opinion they were one of the most

powerful mechanisms for the cultivation and preservation of collective memory in a funerary context.

5.5. Insularity and Identity: the bigger picture

One of the greatest challenges encountered by those studying the history and archaeology of the South-Eastern Aegean diachronically is overcoming the concept of the geographical area as a cultural entity since it is usually studied as an integral part or a geographical continuation of Asia Minor at least from the post-classical period onwards. In general, the perception of the wider Mediterranean region as a solid cultural and social entity with a distinct social identity is problematic and has been challenged (Knapp 2007, 37). At the same time, predefined concepts of ethnicity and Hellenization have dominated modern historical accounts and this is also reflected in the study of the archaeological material. For instance, it is highly doubtful that the citizens of 2nd c. Knidos would identify themselves with their contemporary Rhodians and this is not only because of the geographical distance between the two regions but also due to the different social, cultural and political events that occurred in these cities throughout the Hellenistic period. Therefore, geographical proximity and commercial ties cannot be the only criteria in determining a common social and cultural identity.

More importantly, insularity, concepts of connectivity and isolation as well as the connection of the islands with the mainland are issues that are hardly taken into consideration in archaeological studies of the classical and post-classical South-Eastern Aegean (for the prehistoric period see Georgiadis 2003). Indeed such an endeavour would require an extensive and comparative treatment of the material evidence;

unfortunately, the limitations imposed in the archaeological record available hinder such an attempt, but it would be possible to discuss insular identities on the islands and the *peraea* through specific examples. Before proceeding to this discussion, I would like to briefly mention two important points which are integral to insularity and the formation and negotiation of insular identities: connectivity and isolation. The concept of connectivity is inherent in the Mediterranean predominantly because of the distribution of the islands on the landscape and the various sea networks already connecting them from antiquity (Horden and Purcell 2000, 123; Broodbank 2000; 2013). However, the sea can be a connecting and an isolating element at the same time. We may presume that navigation would not have been easy with the presence of strong currents and winds, especially in the winter (Constantakopoulou 2007, 23). At the same time, the concept of isolation is not only geographical. Islands can be understood as 'laboratories', essentially closed systems with limited interaction where various cultural and historical processes can be observed and quantified (Evans 1973, 1977). However, this approach cannot be applied to the Aegean as many have already observed because of its geographical particularities (Kolodny 1974, 435; Broodbank 2000, 26-7; Constantakopoulou 2007, 23). This is not to say, however, that isolation could not have occurred even in the Aegean in different islands at different times subject to various conditions. For instance, the island of Karpathos has been employed by Febvre (1932, 220; cf. Brun 1996, 50 and Constantakopoulou 2007, 4) as an example of isolation. It is likely that the island experienced periods of isolation throughout its history and resisted various cultural processes such as the Mycenaean influence even in the late Mycenaean period, perhaps because of its isolated geographical position (Constantakopoulou 2007, 4). However, a different picture is painted in the Classical and post-Classical periods when the island became a member of the League of the Islanders (Constantakopoulou 2007, 4). A similar

condition of controlled isolation could have occurred at Kastellorizo, though different processes must have taken place.

How did insularity or connectivity (or lack thereof) impact on the ways that the islanders of the South-Eastern Aegean viewed themselves or separated themselves from the other islands and the mainland and how is this portrayed in the archaeological record? The information we may infer from the funerary evidence is multidimensional. On the one hand, funerary architecture and tomb typology show enough variation to demarcate regional differences if not distinct burial choices and identities from island to island. This is particularly evident on the island of Rhodes and the variety of monumental tombs that were built in the city necropoleis from the 2nd c. onwards. These tombs are not only indicative of the elevated social status of their owners; despite the typological influences from other parts of the Mediterranean, their diverse architecture and layout attest to a unique Rhodian style of tomb architecture tailored to the desires and requirements of the inhabitants of the island. The same applies for other islands such as Nisyros where built cist tombs were preferred in the Hellenistic period; a local burial choice that can be comprehended as a statement of identity along with the pithoi burials of the late classical and early Hellenistic period on the island. On other islands such as Telos for instance, burial architecture conformed to the requirements imposed by the geomorphology of the terrain; as such underground galleries and caves near the sea were easier to construct. However, a relative homogeneity can been seen in regard to the architecture of non-monumental tombs across the islands and the *peraea*: simple pit graves and cists were favoured across the islands from Kos to Rhodes to the cities of the *peraea*. At the same time though cultural homogeneity can be seen in regard to other aspects of the funerary ritual such as the concurrent practise of inhumation and

cremation and the choice and iconography of funerary markers especially cylindrical altars.

On the other hand, Kastellorizo presents an interesting case study. Although there is evidence to suggest that the island was somehow connected to Rhodes from the 4th c. onwards and as such was part of the incorporated *peraea*, burial evidence does not reflect this situation. The geographical distance of the island from the rest of the islands of the Dodecanese and the sites of the Rhodian *peraea*, and the presence of material evidence connected to oil pressing and grain processing suggest that the island could have been inhabited periodically for agricultural activities. Nonetheless, on the absence of archaeological excavations, we cannot rule out the presence of a central settlement or smaller settlements. Although the architecture and the layout of the tombs seems to be predetermined by the terrain and the space available on the island, interestingly enough the unique presence of two monumental tombs of the Lycian type suggest that connections with neighbouring Lycia were definitely established at some point on the island from the late 4th c. onwards.

Finally, in regard to the *peraea* itself, the amount of the epigraphic evidence attesting to the movement of people and goods on the islands and the mainland in the Hellenistic period is revealing. Funerary inscriptions record islanders (mostly Rhodians) that were buried in the cemeteries of the *peraea* and vice versa. However, it is noteworthy that -at least from an epigraphical perspective- there was a distinction between Rhodians (and subsequently the other islanders of the incorporated *peraea*) and non-Rhodians or foreigners. This distinction is clearly recorded both in the epigraphic formulas as well as the burial provisions of the associations of foreigners. Under this context, it is also important that individuals of the incorporated *peraea* tend to identify themselves with their place of origin (demotic) in their funerary inscriptions, therefore we cannot really

talk about a Rhodian identity. The funerary evidence reveals that individuals perceived themselves firstly as part of their local communities and subsequently members of a general geographical and civic entity such as the *polis* or the Rhodian League.

5.6. Conclusions

Our discussion of identity has posed some interesting patterns that could be further explored in the future with the discovery of more burial assemblages on the islands and in the *peraea.* The burial activity on the late 4th and 3rd c. on the islands and the *peraea* was translated into funerary diversity with different forms of non-monumental tombs. The 3rd c. in particular, was a period of intense building activity for Rhodes which lasted at least two hundred years and witnessed the growth of the city and the necropoleis. Essentially, the island of Rhodes became a central destination for many citizens of the islands and the *peraea* as well as foreigners from various parts of the Mediterranean, as evidenced by various funerary inscriptions. The city of Rhodes gradually became a hub of civic life and the relatively homogenous burials, in terms of burial goods and modes of disposal, exemplified the ideals of the city and renegotiated the role of the citizens and non-citizens within it. In the same period, the cemeteries of the cities of the *peraea* were also built and were really simple and homogenous in plan.

On the other hand, certain burials were more prominent than others both in Rhodes and the other islands, revealing various levels of social complexity. These burials were mostly associated with the monumental tombs in Rhodes and Kos as well as certain rich, individual burials in Rhodes (i.e. burials with gold jewellery)and Nisyros (i.e. large cist tombs with rich furnishings). In these instances, monumental architecture and the

presence of funerary goods, can be regarded as displays of wealth and social status. However, this concerned only a small part of the population, who had access to various resources of wealth.

Burial ritual, on the other hand, did not only reflect social diversity, but was also indicative of the identities of the deceased. Personal relationships and lifelong ties were really important as evidenced by child burials at Astypalaia as well as the family tombs and the burials of the associations in Rhodes. The *koina* owned plots in the Rhodian necropoleis with specific burial provisions and developed their unique commemorative rituals with an emphasis on communal activities such as commemorative meals and the practice of euergetism.

Finally, there is a disparity between the funerary inscriptions found out of context on the islands and the *peraea* and the burial assemblages themselves. It is impossible to see a difference between Rhodian and non-Rhodian citizens on the basis of architectue and other types of material culture with the exception of the archaeologically identified tombs of the Rhodian associations. However, the burial provisions of the associations are not dictated by ethnicity – they are rather the result of common social and cultural values shared in life.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

Each culture defines and understands death, dying, bereavement and commemoration in unique ways. Studying death and burial customs in Classical archaeology often comes with the baggage of academic preconceptions and preferences for certain areas of archaeological research and analysis with little or no focus on context. Burial customs comprise a composite set of dynamic beliefs and practices, which express and negotiate various social, cultural, religious and cultic features between the world of the living and the realm of the dead. This study has sought to bring forward a significant aspect of the archaeology of the South-Eastern Aegean and ultimately add another piece to the complex puzzle of Hellenistic funerary archaeology in the wider Mediterranean region.

6.1. Aspects of death in the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period

Before proceeding to the discussion of distinct, individual themes and patterns that have been deliberated in this thesis, it will be useful to summarize the diverse tomb types and burial customs which emerged in the South-Eastern Aegean in the Hellenistic period. Cultural interactions and exchanges among the islands of the South-Eastern Aegean and the nearby territories of Asia Minor existed since prehistory (Georgiadis

2003), and this reality is diachronically evident in the burial record. There is, however, a moment in history that defined the political and cultural geography of the area, and that is the Rhodian synoecism of the three hitherto independent cities on the island which led to the establishment of a new *polis* on the northernmost part of the island in 408 BC: the city of Rhodes. From that point, the Rhodian state and its *demes* politically incorporated various parts of the *peraea* in Asia Minor as well as the majority of the Dodecanese (Chapter 1, section 1.3).

The evidence for these integrations, which have been described with the terms incorporated and subject *peraea* (Chapter 1, section 1.3), varies from place to place. It is agreed in scholarship that some places experienced different degrees of dependency and influence from the Rhodian state in the economic, social and the political sphere as attested by the epigraphic evidence. Rhodes reached the peak of its power and influence in the wider area of the Aegean in the first half of the 2nd c. BC by becoming the power centre of the League of the Islanders, which was subsequently rebranded as the Rhodian League. Interestingly enough, the island of Kos retained its status as independent from Rhodes, acting as a political counterweight in the area. The Koans, however, developed close ties with the Ptolemies, and this is particularly evident in the civic and religious life of the city. It is also manifested in the archaeological record. For instance, the presence of Ptolemaic iconographic symbols and insignia such as the *dikeras* on many Koan cylindrical funerary altars suggests that the cults of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II were practised widely on the island and acquired significance in the funerary sphere possibly through the civic institution of euergetism, whose manifestations can be echoed in funerary assemblages from Rhodes and Nisyros respectively.

In the late Classical and the early Hellenistic period, we observe two trends regarding funerary architecture and burial customs. On the one hand, the emergence of

monumental tombs in Rhodes, Kos, and Kastellorizo (Chapter 3, section 3.3) and on the other, the establishment of larger clusters of simple pit and cist graves outside the city walls of Rhodes and Kos (Chapter 3, section 3.2). The former echoed comparable edifices in Asia Minor and other parts of the Hellenistic world and were probably built by local, provincial elites, while the latter served the practical needs of the citizens of the flourishing cities. However, there is a significant difference between the monumental tombs of the early period and those that were built from the 2nd c. onwards.

This discrepancy is not only evident in terms of architectural planning and layout. Indeed, the monumental tombs of the early Hellenistic period were considerably influenced by the funerary architecture of Asia Minor. For instance, the Charmyleion at Kos had the basic structural components of a *heroon* or mausoleum as did the Tomb of the Ptolemies in the necropolis of Rhodini in Rhodes and the rotunda of Agios Milianos at Lindos. Similarly, the Lycian tombs in Kastellorizo were influenced by the funerary architecture of temple tombs in 4th c. neighbouring Lycia. In contrast to the 2nd and 1st c. BC monumental tombs from the urban necropoleis of Rhodes, whose character was more private and which served as the family sepulchres of families or other social groups, the use, and character of early Hellenistic monumental tombs extended beyond the family or other ties. There is no doubt that elite citizens built these tombs for their significant dead; the Charmyleion was the resting place of the local hero Charmylos and his family as attested by inscriptions and the Tomb of Archokrates was the family tomb of the Lindian priest Archokrates also verified by inscriptions. Features such as architectural elaboration, prominence in the landscape and the presence of auxiliary rooms for the culmination of the funerary and post-funerary cult, suggest a close and conspicuous association between the deceased and their families and the local communities. It is likely that this association was based on mutually beneficial ties: either social, cultural, political

or religious. If we take this consideration a step further, it may be that some of these tombs, such as the Tomb of the Ptolemies or the Agios Milianos rotunda, were erected to honour glorious dead from the past like heroes, *euergetai* or city-founders and could be cenotaphs (Chapter 2, section 2.3).

At the same time, the transition from the late 4th c. to the early Hellenistic period saw an exponential growth in the number of cemeteries across the islands and the *peraea*. It is a period of funerary diversity translated into various forms of non-monumental tombs and a range of burial customs (Chapter 3, section 3.2). At Nisyros, 3rd c. built cist tombs replaced the *pithoi* and pot burials of the earlier periods, (Chapter 3, section 3.2.3d) while rock-cut tombs of various types and sizes were constructed on Kastellorizo (Chapter 3, section 3.2.3d). It seems though that the tombs at Kastelloziro, Telos and Chalki were clustered in small groupings suggesting some level of nucleation; for example, it is likely that the Telian underground galleries (Chapter 3, 3.2.3f) were family sepulchres re-used for generations. On the other hand, the small cemetery at Pontamo in Chalki spans in a very narrow time frame, thus signifying two or three generations of deceased (perhaps local citizens) that could be associated with each other and chose to be buried on the island. The presence of tombs at Kastellorizo is even more problematic given that they cannot be linked with a central settlement in the absence of any archaeological excavations on the islet. While these burials suggest a close connection of the deceased with the place, the nature of this connection is not sufficiently clear. The dispersal of tombs on the island spanning from the late Classical to the Roman period suggests some degree of organisation centered around maritime and agricultural activities and it is likely that the island was inhabited at least periodically. In this context, people could have been buried on the island following their own will or perhaps their

remains were difficult to move elsewhere. Future excavations may enlighten the reasons behind this choice.

The 3rd century is also rich in terms of burial activity in the cemeteries of Rhodes and Kos. In this period, rock-cut tombs of various types containing both inhumations and cremations were built outside the city walls with no specific plan in mind (Chapter 3, section 3.2.2b). The intense building activity is evidenced by large cemeteries of tombs often surrounded by periboloi in different parts of the Rhodian urban necropoleis which housed hundreds of burials and were built in such a way as to allow internal expansion and development; it is the beginning of a period which lasted approximately two hundred years and saw the rapid evolution of the city and its necropoleis. In a way, Rhodes became the 'ultimate' destination for a plethora of citizens with various ethnic backgrounds. Funerary inscriptions suggest that these citizens did not originate only from the islands or the cities of the *peraea*; they came from various parts of the Mediterranean world. At the same time, the abandonment of the cemeteries in the old cities is evident in a significant influx of Rhodian citizens from various *demes* of the island to the capital of the *polis* in pursuit of various socio-political interests. As such, the city became the epicenter of civic life and burials exemplified the ideals of the *polis* and at the same time re-negotiated the role of the citizens within it. This image emerges from a relative uniformity in burial goods, the modes of disposal as well as representations of the self as an ideal citizen on funerary stelai and monuments.

However, this is not a uniform picture as some burials stand out and reveal varying levels of social stratification and complexity. 3rd c. Rhodes witnessed the emergence and development of monumental tombs or to be more precise tombs with monumental characteristics built for families, kin groups or associations. These tombs had a more private character compared to the monumental tombs of the earlier period

and exemplified the social status and affluence of a part of the population. In the 2nd and the 1st c. BC more monumental tombs were built on the island of Rhodes, all of which share some common characteristics: a. semi-private nature; they were part of the complex web of the urban necropoleis but access to the tombs for the culmination of funerary and post-funerary ritual was restricted to specific audiences, b. monumental architecture as display of wealth and social status; diverse funerary architecture and various degrees of complexity in terms of structure and layout underlines attempts at differentiation and it is evident that monumental tombs became an arena for social display, c. diversity of funerary and post-funerary ritual; tomb architecture exemplified the nature of ritual action in terms of liminality as well as theatricality and performance.

At the same time, aspects of funerary ritual such as liminality and performance can be reconstructed in the tombs with *klinai* in the Rhodian cemeteries (Chapter 4, section 4.5.4). Funerary monuments, especially cylindrical altars, were incorporated into funerary architecture and facilitated the practise of post-funerary ritual and commemoration through the interaction of the living and the deceased. In this period, there is a shift in mortuary patterns towards the individual and the values of the family (i.e. the cemetery at Kylindra in Astypalaia) or the group to which they belonged; this is demonstrated both via funerary architecture but also through attempts at posthumous heroisation (Chapter 4, section 4.7.3). In any case there is diversity and differentiation in the display of identities in the funerary arena between Rhodians, citizens of the incorporated *peraea* and non-Rhodians and this is illustrated in the provisions for the burial arrangements of the members of associations of foreigners in the city of Rhodes in the 2nd and the 1st centuries BC (Chapter 5, section 5.4.2).

In this context, the concentration of a large part of the population in the city of Rhodes (in a sense the 'urbanisation' of the *polis*) from the 2nd c. onwards resulted in a

wider social stratification equally manifested in the burial record. Nonetheless, this social divergence was limited to a small elite with a correlation between authority and wealth. The same relationship between social stratification and access to wealth resources is also observed in individual burials in other islands, thus suggesting that social differentiation was practised to a certain extent even in smaller communities (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1). Burial ritual, however, was not only a reflection of social diversity and stratification but also representative of the identities of the deceased and the groups to which they belonged, such as women and children (Chapter 5, sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2). Despite the limited evidence, it seems that personal relationships really mattered: a solid example is the infant cemetery of pot burials in Astypalaia where we observe a close connection between the living and the dead through the adoption of a distinct burial ritual. The same connection is also seen to a certain extent in family tombs and burials of associations. The latter not only owned private burial plots in the Rhodian necropoleis, but also adopted their own funerary commemorative rituals which were centered around communal activities such as gathering, feasting and the *symposion*. At the same time, the concept of *euergetism* was adopted in the private sphere and was consolidated through the establishment of posthumous honours. It is, therefore. evident that funerary diversity in the South-Eastern Aegean was manifested by various markers the most important of which were tomb typology, funerary ritual and, to a certain extent, the location of the graves in the natural environment.

6.2. Death and the islanders

Arguably one of the most important contributions of this thesis is the synthetic assessment of the funerary customs spread among the islands and the mainland *peraea.* The burial evidence itself has demonstrated that although Rhodes played a very central and important role in the area by attracting many citizens from the neighbouring islands and the *peraea*, we cannot talk about a uniform or 'Rhodian' way of burial. Further excavations and publications of funerary contexts from the island of Kos might shed more light on this matter, since Kos was the second most important island in the area throughout the Hellenistic period and it is therefore expected that it developed a rich and diverse burial culture.

At the same time, although there is a direct interdependence between Rhodes and the cities of the *peraea* as expressed in various written sources, this relationship can only be assessed in the funerary sphere via the excavation of these cemeteries and this would be a useful step towards future research. It seems though that the cities of the *peraea* developed a very similar urban planning: walled citadels with cemeteries in close proximity to the city. With the exception of ancient Amos where funerary diversity can to a certain extent be observed in terms of tomb typology, the cemeteries of the cities of the *peraea* are quite simple and uniform suggesting a lack of social stratification. As such, there is a relative imbalance between the funerary inscriptions which are found out of context on the islands and the *peraea* and the monuments themselves: we cannot detect a differentiation between Rhodian or non-Rhodian citizens on the basis of the funerary architecture or ritual with the exception of the archaeologically identified tombs of the Rhodian associations; even in this case burial choices are not determined solely by ethnicity, but are based on mutual social and cultural bonds shared in life.

Overall, the funerary archaeological evidence advocates that despite the political, financial and perhaps cultural dependence of the islands and the cities of the *peraea*, diversity in the funerary record suggests that the *poleis* developed and flourished within their own insular microcosms with external influences and interventions. As such, connectivity of material goods and ideas was really important for the well being and flourishing of the communities. The better understanding of the local funerary traditions has allowed us to suggest that the South-Eastern Aegean comprised of a vibrant collection of communities with distinct local characteristics. Some of these islands and cities were more open to external interactions that others and this led to the development of a *sui generis* cosmopolitanism evidenced in the funerary record.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

For abbreviations of Greek and Roman authors see: *A Greek English Lexicon* edited by Liddell, Scott and Jones*, The Oxford Latin Dictionary* edited by Peter Glare, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd edition) edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. The abbreviations of modern periodicals and series derive from the *American Journal of Archaeology* list of abbreviations. Please note the following abbreviations in addition to the bibliography:

Islands off the beaten track	Stampolidis, N., Tassoulas, G. and Tsopotou-Filimonos, M. 2011*. Islands off the Beaten Track. An archaelogical journey to the Greek Islands of Katellorizo, Symi, Halki, Tilos and Nisyros.* Athens: Museum of Cycladic Art.
Hellenistic Rhodes	Gabrielsen, V., Bilde, P., Engberg-Pedersen, T., Hannestad, L. and Zahle, J. (eds.). 1999. *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press

Adriani, A. 1966. *Repertorio d'arte dell' Egitto Greco-Romano*, series C. Rome.

Ahrens, S. 2015. '"Whether by decay or fire consumed...": Cremation in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor', in Rasmus Brandt, J., M. Prusac, and H. Roland (eds.), *Death and Changing Rituals: Function and meaning in Ancient Funerary Practices. Studies in Funerary Archaeology 7.* Oxford: Oxbow, 185-222.

Alcock, S. E. 1991. 'Tomb cult and post-classical Polis', *AJA* 95 (3), 447-8.

Aleshire, S.B. 1994. 'Towards a Definition of 'State Cult' for Ancient Athens,' in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence, Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Athens, 1991, 9-16. SkrAth 8°, 13*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen, distribution Paul Åströms Förlag, 9-16.

Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ammerman, R.M., 1990. 'The religious context of Hellenistic Terracotta figurines,' in J.P. Uhlenbock (ed.), *The Coroplast's Art*. New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 37-46.

Amyx, D. A. 1958. 'The Attic Stelai: Part III. Vases and other containers', *Hesperia* 27, 163-254.

Amyx, D. A. and Pritchett, W. K. 1958. 'The Attic Stelai: Part III. Vases and other containers', *Hesperia* 27, 255-310.

Andrén, A. 1998. *Between Artifacts and Texts: Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. Translated by A. Crozier. New York: Plenum Press.

Andronikos, M. 1984. *Βεργίνα: οι βασιλικοί τάφοι και οι άλλες αρχαιότητες*. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών.

Andronikos, M., Drougou, S., Saatsoglou – Paliadeli, Ch. and Faklaris, P. 1989. 'Χρονικά – Ανασκαφή στη Βεργίνα', *Egnatia* 1, 483-93.

Angelarakis, A. 2004-2005. 'Rhodes Hellenistic Archaeo-Anthropology Research Project: Handra Hydriae Cremations'. Archival Report. Historic and Archaeologic Institute of Rhodes.

Angelarakis, A. 2005. 'Demographic Dynamics and Funerary Rituals as Reflected from Rhodian Handra Urns'. Archival Report, Archaeological and Historical Institute of Rhodes.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1987. *The Archaeology of Early Greek Hero Cult*. Princeton.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1993. 'The Archaeology of Ancestors', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: cult, performance, politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46-70.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors, Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece.* Lahman: Rowman and Littlefield.

Apostolou, E. 1996. 'Οικόπεδα Γ. Καραμανώλη - Γ. Πογιά', *ArchDelt* 46, 477-9.

Ashton, N. 1995*. Ancient Megiste: the forgotten Kastellorizo.* Nedlands, W.A.: University of Western Australia Press.

Audin, A. 1960. 'Inhumation et incinération', *Latomus. Revue d'études latines* 19, 518-32.

Avner-Levy, R., 1998. 'Yafo, Yefet Street', *ESI* 18, 55–56.

Bairami, K. 2011. 'Chalki', in *Islands off the Beaten Track*, 169-180.

Bairami. K. 2012. 'Ο δε δαίμων έφθασε τους χούς: εγχυτρισμός νεαρού ατόμου από το Παλαιόκαστρο Νισύρου', in *Δινήεσσα. Τιμητικός τόμος για την Κατερίνα Ρωμιοπούλου,* Thessaloniki, 269-76.

Baldassare, I. 1998. 'Documenti di pittura ellenistica da Napoli' in L'Italie méridionale et les premières expériences de la peinture hellénistique, Table Ronde, Rome 1994. Rome, 95-159.

Barr-Sharrar, B.. 2008. *The Derveni Krater: Masterpiece of Classical Greek Metalwork*, Princeton.

Baughan, E. 2013. *Couched in death: 'Klinai' and identity in Anatolia and beyond.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Bean, J. E. and Cook, J. M. 1957. 'The Carian Coast III', *BSA* 52, 58-146.

Beard, M., J. North and S. R. F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, C. 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, C. 1996. 'Constructing Ritual,' in R. L. Grimes (ed.), *Readings in Ritual Studies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 21–33.

Bell, M. 1993. 'Tanagras and the Idea of Type', *Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin* 1.3, 39-53.

Belli-Pasqua, R. 2011. 'L' architettura funeraria a Rodi in eta ellenistica: documentazione locale e forme di contatto', *Bollettino di Archeologia On Line*, Volume Speciale C/C7/4, 43-58.

Beloch, K. J. 1904 – 1918 [1927]. *Griechische Geschichte.* 2nd edition. Strassburg, Berlin and Leipzig.

Berges, D. 1986. *Hellenistische Rundaltäre Kleinasiens*. Freiburg: Kommissionsvertrieb Wasmuth.

Berges, D. 1996. *Rundaltare aus Kos und Rhodos*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.

Berthold, R. M. 1984. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Bertocchi, T. F. 1964. *La pittura funeraria apula*. Naples.

Bilde, P. 1999. 'Dionysos Among Tombs. Aspects of Rhodian Tomb Culture in the Hellenistic Period', in *Hellenistic Rhodes.*

Bilde, P. 1999. 'Dionysos Among Tombs. Aspects of Rhodian Tomb Culture in the Hellenistic Period', in *Hellenistic Rhodes,* 226-6.

Billiotti, E. & Cottret, A. 1881. *L'isle de Rhodes*. Rhodes.

Billiotti, E. & Cottret, A. 1881. *L'isle de Rhodes*. Rhodes.

Binford L. 1972, Mortuary Practices: Their Study and Their Potential, in Binford L. *An Archaeological Perspective*. New York: 208-251.

Blech, M. 1982. *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

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

Blinkenberg, C. 1941. *Lindos II, Inscriptions*. Berlin and Copenhagen.

Bloch, M. 1986. *From Blessing to Violence: History and Ideology in the Circumcision Ritual of the Merina of Madagascar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloch, M. 1971. *Placing the Dead. Tombs, Ancestral Villages and Kinship Organisation in Magadascar.* London and New York: Seminar Press.

Blümel, W. 1991. 'Epigraphische in Knidos und in der rhodischen peraia', *Araş* 9, 131-6.

Boardman, J., Kenyon, K. M., Moynahan, E. J. and Evans, J. D. 1976. 'The Olive in the Mediterranean: Its Culture and Use [and Discussion]', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, vol. 275, no. 936, 187-196.

Bosnakis, D. 2008. *Ανέκδοτες επιγραφές της Κω. Επιτύμβια μνημεία και όροι.* Athens.

Bougia, P. 2004. 'Κεραμικά σύνολα από το ελληνιστικό νεκροταφείο του Αχινού', in *Πρακτικά ΣΤ΄ Επιστημονικής Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική*. Athens, 149-160.

Boulanger, A. 1923. *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II siècle de notre ère.* Paris: E. de Boccard.

Bourbou, C. 2015. 'Appendix 1: The Analysis of the Human Skeletal Remains from Kymissala', in Haggis and C. M. Antonaccio (eds.), *Classical Archaeology in Context. Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 299-302.

Bourbou, C. and Themelis, P. 2010. 'Child Burials at Ancient Messene', in A. M. Guimier-Sorbets and Y. Morizot (eds.), *L'enfant et la mort dans l'Antiquité - Volume 1, Nouvelles recherches dans les nécropoles grecques, le signalement des tombes d'enfants,* Paris, 111-128.

Boyd, M. J. 2015.' The materiality of performance in Mycenaean funerary practices', *World Archaeology* 46 (2), 192-205.

Bradley, R. 1991. *The Significance of Monuments.* London: Routledge.

Breccia, E. 1912. *La Necropoli di Sciatbi.* Cairo.

Bresson, A. 1991. *Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée Rhodienne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Bresson, A. 1999. 'Rhodes and Lycia in Hellenistic Times', in *Hellenistic Rhodes,* 98-131.

Brigger, E. and Giovannini, A. 2004. 'Prothésis. Étude sur les rites funéraires chez les Grecs et chez les Etrusques' *MEFRA* 116/1, 179-248.

Broodbank C. 2013. *The Making of the Middle Sea: A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broodbank, C. 2000. *An Island Archaeology of the Early Cyclades*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brouma, V. 2015. 'Cylindrical altars and post-funerary ritual in the South-Eastern Aegean during the Hellenistic period: 3rd to 1st centuries BC', in Z. Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis and D. Evely (eds.), *Aegis - Essays in Mediterranean Archaeology presented to Matti Egon by the scholars of the Greek Archaeological Committee UK*, Oxford: Archaeopress, 155-64.

Buchner, G., and Ridgway, D. 1993. *Pithekoussai*. Rome: G. Bretschneider.

Bugh, R. 2006. *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Cambridge.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek religion, Archaic and Classical*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Burkert, W. 1993. *Ελληνική μυθολογία και τελετουργία: δομή και ιστορία.* Athens: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Εθνικής Τραπέζης.

Burr-Thompson, D. 1966. 'The origin of Tanagras', *AJA* vol. 70, 1, 51-63.

Burr-Thompson, D. 1973. *Ptolemaic oinochoai and portraits in faience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton. J. 1998. 'Women's Commensality in the Ancient Greek World', *Greece & Rome* 45 (2), 143-165.

Carney, E. D. 2000. *Women and monarchy in Macedonia.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Carstens, A. M. 1999. *Death Matters. Funerary Architecture on the Halikarnassos Peninsula*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Carstens, A. M. 2004. 'Rock-cut tombs in the Halikarnassos Peninsula', *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 4, 49-67.

Carstens, A. M. 2010. 'The sepulchral landscape of the Halikarnassos peninsula in Hellenistic times', in R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia - Oxford, 29 June - 2 July 2006*. Bordeaux, 331-352.

Carusi, C. 2003. *Isole e peree in Asia Minore: contributi allo studio dei rapporti tra poleis insulari e territori continentali dipendenti*. Pisa: Scuola normale superiore.

Cary, M. 1951. *A history of the Greek world from 323 to 146 B.C*. London: Methuen & Co.

Cassels, J. 1955. 'The Cemeteries of Cyrene', *BSR* 23, 1-43.

Chaniotis, A. (ed.). 2011. *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean: Agency, Emotion, Gender, Representation.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Chaniotis, A. 2004. 'Mobility of Persons during the Hellenistic Wars: State Control and Personal Relations', in C. Moatti (ed.), *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée, de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne. II. La mobilité négociée. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*. Rome, 481-500.

Chaniotis, A. 2005. 'Ritual dynamics in the Eastern Mediterranean: case studies in ancient Greece and Asia Minor', in W. V. Harris (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean*. Oxford, 141-166.

Chapman, R. 2003. 'Death, society and archaeology: the social dimensions of mortuary practices', *Mortality* 8 (3), 308-315.

Chatzidaki, E. 1993. 'Νομός Χανίων: Ανασκαφικές Εργασίες', *ArchDelt* 42, 566-7.

Chatzi-Spiliopoulou, G. 1991. 'Ταφικοί πίθοι στην Ηλεία κατά τον 4ο αιώνα π.Χ. και τους Ελληνιστικούς χρόνους', in A. Rizakis (ed.), *Achaia und Elis in der Antike: Akten des 1. Internationalen Symposiums, Athen 19-21 Mai, 1989.* Athens: KERA, 351-63.

Christensen, L. 2009. '"Cult" in the Study of Religion and Archaeology', in J. T. Jensen, G. Hinge, P. Schultz and B. Wickkiser (eds.), *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult. Context, Ritual and Iconography. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity (ASMA) VIII.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 13-27.

Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. 2006. 'Les protomés et les protomés-bustes féminines de Macédoine et de Thrace revisitées : l'exemple des protomés-bustes de la maison A de Tragilos', *RA*, 3-31.

Cicikova, M. 1988. 'Tombeau Royale Thrace de Svestari (Nord-Est de Bulgarie)', in *Πρακτικά του XII Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας*, 1988, 50-6.

Clement, A, Hillson, S. and Michalaki-Kollia, M. 2010. 'The Ancient Cemeteries of Astypalaia, Greece', *Archaeology International* 12, 17-21.

Closterman, W.E. 2007. 'Family ideology and family history: the function of funerary markers in Classical Attic peribolos tombs'. *AJA* 111*(*4),633-652.

Connelly, J.B., 1990. 'Hellenistic terracottas of Cyprus and Kuwait' in J.P. Uhlenbock (ed.), *The Coroplast's Art*. New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 94-101.

Constantakopoulou, C. 2007. *The dance of the islands: insularity, networks, the Athenian empire, and the Aegean world.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Constantakopoulou, C. 2012. 'Identity and resistance: The Islanders' League, the Aegean islands and the Hellenistic kings', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 27, 1, 49–70.

Couilloud, M. T. 1975. 'Autels et stèles des Cyclades (compléments)', *BCH* 99, 313–329.

Couilloud, M. T. 1976. 'Rhénée', *BCH* 100, 822–828.

Couilloud, M.T. 1974. *Les Monuments funéraires de Rhénée* (*Exploration archéologique de Délos* 30), Paris.

Craik, E. M.1980. *The Dorian Aegean. States and cities of ancient Greece*., London.

Curta, F. 2002. 'From Kossinna to Bromley: ethnogenesis in Slavic archaeology', in A. Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian identity. Critical approaches to ethnicity in the early Middle Ages*: Turnhout: Brepols, 201-218.

D'Agostino, B. 2005. 'Funerary Ritual and Social Representation: Models and Perspectives', in Ancient Greece at the Turn of the Millennium. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, 2001. Athens: Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens, 187–197.

Dafa-Nikonanou, A. 1973. *Θεσσαλικά Ιερά Δήμητρος και κοροπλαστικα αναθήματα*. Volos: Εταιρεία Θεσσαλικών Ερευνών.

Dakouri-Hild, A. and Boyd, M. J. (eds.). 2016. *Staging Death: Funerary Performance, Architecture and Landscape in the Aegean*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Danforth, L. 1982. *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Darvill, T. 2008. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Archaeology*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dasen, V. 2010*. Archéologie funéraire et histoire de l'enfance dans l'Antiquité: nouveaux enjeux, nouvelles perspectives*. Paris: de Boccard.

Debord, P. & Varinlioğlu, E. (eds.). 2001. *Les Hautes Terres De Carie.* Bordeaux.

Deetz, J. 1965. *The Dynamics of Stylistic Change in Arikara Ceramics. Illinois Studies in Anthropology 4*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Dekoulakou, I. 1994. *Ταφικό μνημείο στην Κερύνεια Αχαϊας.* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Despini, A. 1990. *Αρχαία Χρυσά Κοσμήματα* (*Ελληνική Τέχνη*). Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών.

Devreker, J., Thoen, H. and Vermeulen, F. 2003. *Excavations in Pessinus. The so-called Acropolis: from Hellenistic and Roman cemetery to Byzantine castle.* Ghent: Academia Press.

Diakoronia, F. 1986. 'Λοκρικά Ι', *ArchDelt* 34 (Μελέτες), 56-61.

Díaz-Andreu, M. & Lucy, S. 2005. 'Introduction', in M. Díaz-Andreu (ed.), *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion* (New York).

Dimakis, N. 2011. *Social Identity and Status in the Classical and Hellenistic Northern Peloponnese: the evidence from Burials*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

Dontas, G. 1958. 'Παρατηρήσεις επί ροδιακών τινών επιτυμβίων αναγλύφων', *AE* 97, 208-16.

Driessche, B. Van Den. 1985. 'Prothésis et cortège de porteurs de lébès sur des fragments de loutrophores attiques à figures rouges du Musée de Louvain-la-Neuve', *Revue des archéologues et historiens d'art de Louvain*, 18, 34-47.

Drougou, S. and Touratsoglou, I. 1980. *Ελληνιστικοί λαξευτοί τάφοι Βέροιας.* Athens: αμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.

Droysen, J. G. 1877. *Geschichte des Hellenismus.* 3 volumes. [First published as separate volumes 1836-43.] Berlin: Gebr. Ungar.

Dyggve, E. and Poulsen, V. 1960. *Lindos. Fouilles de l' Acropole 1902-1914 et 1952, III.I, III, II. Le sanctuaire d' Athena Lindia et l' architecture lindienne*. Copenhagen & Berlin.

Elsner, J. 2012. 'Material Culture and Ritual: The State of the Question', in B. D. Westcoat and R. G. Ousterhout, *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-26.

Emberling, G. 1997. 'Ethnicity in Complex Societies: Archaeological Perspectives, *Journal of Archaeological Research* 5 (4), 295-344.

Englezou, M. 2005. *Ελληνιστική κεραμική Κρήτης: κεντρική Κρήτη*. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτροιώσεων.

Enklaar, A. H. 1992. *The Hadra Vases* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Errington, M. 2012. *A History of the Hellenistic World: 323 - 30 BC*. London.

Evans, J. D. 1973. 'Islands as laboratories of culture change', in C. Renfrew (ed.), *The Explanation of Culture Change: Models in Prehistory*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg. 517–520.

Evans, J. D. 1977. 'Island archaeology in the Mediterranean: problems and opportunities', *World Archaeology* 9, 12–26.

Evers, T. and Huffman, T. 1988. 'On why pots are decorated the way they are', *Current Anthropology* 29, 739-41.

Fabricius, J. 1999. *Die Hellenistischen Totenmahlreliefs: Grabrepräsentation und Wertvorstellungen in ostgriechischen Städten.* [Studien Zur Antiken Stadt 3]. Munich: F. Pfeil.

Fairbanks, A. 1900. 'The Chthonic Gods of Greek Religion', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 21 (3), 241-59.

Fatourou, K. 1965. 'Νοτιοδυτική Νεκρόπολις Ρόδου', *ArchDelt* 18, 324-5.

Fatourou, K. 1967a. 'Νοτία Νεκρόπολις: Οικόπεδον Ελευθερίου Πέρου εις τον οικοδομούμενον συνοικισμόν παρά την θέσιν Κιζίλ-Τεπέ', *ArchDelt* 19, 473.

Fatourou, K. 1967b. 'Περιοδείαι', *ArchDelt* 19, 475.

Febvre, L. 1932*. A geographical introduction to history*. London.

Fedak, J. 1990. *Monumental tombs of the Hellenistic Age: a study of selected tombs from the Pre-Classical to the Early Imperial Era.* Toronto.

Filimonos, M. 1986. 'Νισυριακά Ι'. *ArchDelt* 35 (Μελέτες), 60-88.

Filimonos, M. 1989. 'Ένα νέο γυμνάσιο στη Ρόδο και η μαρτυρία του Διοδώρου XX, 100, 3-4', *AntCl* 58, 153-4.

Filimonos, M. 1992. 'Γωνία Οδών Άννης Μαρίας και Μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου: οικόπεδο Δημήτρη Σουγγανίδη', *ArchDelt* 42, 612-13.

Filimonos, M. 1993a. 'Οικόπεδο Μαργαρίτας Θεοδοσίου', *ArchDelt* 43, 595-7.

Filimonos, M. 1993b. 'Ανασκαφικές Έρευνες στη Νίσυρο', *Νισυριακά* 12, 139-46.

Filimonos, M. and A. Giannikouri. 1999. 'Grave Offerings from Rhodes: Pottery and Jewellery', in *Hellenistic Rhodes,* 205-26.

Filimonos-Tsopotou, M. 2011. 'Nisyros', in *Islands off the Beaten Track,* 308-87.

Fogelin, L. 2007. 'The Archaeology of Religious Ritual', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36, 55–71.

Fraser, P. M. 1977. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraser, P. M. and Bean. G. E. 1954. *The Rhodian Peraea and islands.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frisone, F. 1994. 'Tra linguaggio rituale e vita materiale: le leggi sul rituale funerario nel mondogreco', in S. Alessandrì (ed.), *Ἱστορίη. Studi offerti dagli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno*, Galatina, 183–210.

Frisone, F. 2000. *Leggi e regolamenti funerari nel mondo greco. I. Le fonti epigrafiche*. Galatina.

Frisone, F. 2011. 'Construction of Consensus: Norms and Change in Greek Funerary Rituals', in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean: Agency, Emotion, Gender, Reception*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 179-201.

Froning, H. and N. Zimmermann-Elseify. 2010. *Die Terrakotten Der Antiken Stadt Elis* (*Phillipika* 32). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Funke, P. 1999. 'PERAIA: Einige Überlegungen zum Festlandbesitz griechischer Inselstaaten', in *Hellenistic Rhodes*, 55-75.

Furtwangler, A. 1883-1887. *La Collection Sabouroff I*. Berlin.

Gabrici, E. 1912. 'Tomba hellenistica di S. Maria la Nuova a Napoli', *MDAIR* 27, 148-61.

Gabrielsen, V. 1992. 'The Status of *Rhodioi* in Hellenistic Rhodes', *ClMed* 43, 43-69.

Gabrielsen, V. 1994. 'The associations honouring Dionysodoros from Alexandria', *Classica & Mediaevalia* 45, 137-160.

Gabrielsen, V. 1997. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Gabrielsen, V. 2000. 'The Rhodian Peraia in the Third and Second Centuries BC', *Classica e Mediaevalia* 51, 129-83.

Gallou, C. 2005. *The Mycenaean cult of the dead*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Gardner, P. 1896. *Sculptured tombs of Hellas*. London.

Garland, R. 1985. *The Greek Way of Death*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Garwood, P. 2011.'Rites of Passage', in T. Insoll (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 261-284.

Georganas, I. 2002. 'Constructing identities in early iron age Thessaly. The case of the Halos tumuli', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 21, 289-98.

Georganas, I. 2006. 'Dying in Early Iron Age Thessaly', *Αρχαιολογικό Έργο Θεσσαλίας και Στερεάς Ελλάδας* 2, 1, 195-205.

Georgiadis, M. 2003. *The South-eastern Aegean in the Mycenaean Period: Islands, landscape, death and ancestors*. Archaeopress: Oxford.

Gerding, H. 2013. 'Loryma', in D. Blackman and B. Rankov (eds.), *Shipsheds of the Ancient Mediterranean.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 372-6

Giannikouri, A. 1994. 'Υδρίες Hadra με λευκό βάθος από τη Ρόδο. Μια πρώτη προσέγγιση', in *Πρακτικά της Γ΄ Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης για την ελληνιστική κεραμεική, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991,* Athens, 302-310.

Giannikouri, A. 1997. *Υδρίες Hadra από την Ελληνιστική νεκρόπολη της Ρόδου. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της γραπτής Ελληνιστικής Κεραμεικής.* Rhodes.

Giannikouri, A. and Patsiada, V. 1994. 'Σύνολα κεραμεικής από τη νεκρόπολη της Ρόδου. Συμβολή στην ελληνιστική κεραμεική', in *Ελληνιστική Κεραμεική από το Αιγαίο, Μυτιλήνη 1994,* Athens, 102-125.

Giannikouri, A. and Zervaki, F. 2006. 'Παρουσίαση της Αρχαιολογικής Συλλογής της Κάσου'. *ΑΑΑ* 39, 252-266.

Giannikouri, A., Patsiada, V. and Filimonos, M. 1989. 'Ταφικά σύνολα από τις νεκροπόλεις της Ρόδου', *Πρακτικά της Α' Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμεική, Ιωάννινα 1986.* Ioannina, 56-94.

Giannikouri, A., Patsiada, V. and Filimonos, M. 1990. 'Χρονολογικά προβλήματα γραπτής κεραμεικής από τη Ρόδο', in *Πρακτικά της Β' Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης για την ελληνιστική κεραμεική, Ρόδος 1989,* Athens, 172-185.

Giannikouri, A., Patsiada, V. and Filimonos, M. 2000[2]. 'Ταφικά σύνολα από τις νεκροπόλεις της Αρχαίας Ρόδου', in *Πρακτικά της Α' Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης για την ελληνιστική κεραμεική, Ιωάννινα 1986,* Rhodes, 63-119.

Gluckman, M. 1962. 'Les Rites de Passage,' in M. Gluckman (ed.), *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1-52.

Goldstein, L. G. 1980. *Mississippian mortuary practises: a case study of two cemeteries in the Lower Illinois Valley.* Evanston: Northwestern University Archaeological Program.

Goodenough, W. H. 1965. 'Rethinking 'status 'and 'role': toward a general model of the cultural organization of social relationships ». *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology. M.* Banton, éd. Tavistock, London.

Goody, J. 1962. *Death, Property and the Ancestors: A Study*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Graf, H. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*. (*Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana* 21). Rome: Schweizerisches Institut in Rom.

Grigoriadou, D. & Skerlou, E. 2004. 'Ελληνιστική κεραμική από τα ταφικά σύνολα των νεκροπόλεων της Κω', in *Πρακτικά της ΣΤ΄ Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης για την ελληνιστική κεραμεική, Volos 2000,* Athens, 311-326.

Guarducci, M. 1967-1978. *Epigraphia Greca*. Volume I-IV. Rome.

Guerin, V. 1856. *Voyage dans l'ile de Rhodes et description de cette ile.* Paris.

Guimier-Sorbets, A. M and Morizot, Y. (eds.). 2010. *L'enfant et la mort dans l'antiquité. I. Nouvelles recherches dans les nécropoles grecques: le signalement des tombes d'enfants.* Paris: de Boccard.

Guimier-Sorbets, A. M. 2001. 'Mobilier et décor de tombes macédoniennes', in R. Frei-Stolba and K. Gex (eds), *Recherches Récentes sur le Monde hellénistique. Actes du Colloque international Organisé à l'Occasion du 60e Anniversaire de Pierre Ducrey (Lausanne, 20-21 novembre 1998)*. Bern, 217-229.

Guimier-Sorbets, A. M. 2003, 'Les décors de plafond dans les tombes d'Alexandrie', in J. Y. Empereur and M. D. Nenna (eds.), *Nécropolis* 2 (Études Alexandrines 7). Alexandria, 589–629.

Guimier-Sorbets, A. M. and Nenna, D. 'Le lit funéraire dans les nécropoles alexandrines', in Empereur, J. Y. and Nenna, M. D. (eds.), *Nécropolis 2. Volume 2*, Alexandria, 533-575.

Habicht, Ch. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte [2]. (Zetemata* 14). Munich: C. H. Beck.

Hadjidaki, E. 1993. 'Εφορεία Εναλίων Αρχαιοτήτων. Φαλάσαρνα', *ArchDelt* 48, 588-591.

Hadjisteliou-Price, T. 1978. *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities.* Leiden: Brill.

Haggis, D. C. and C. Antonaccio (eds.). 2015. *Classical Archaeology in Context: Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Håland, E. J. 2007. *Greek Festivals, Modern and Ancient: A Comparison of Female and Male Values* (in Norwegian). Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press.

Håland, E. J. 2011. 'Emotion and identity in connection with Greek death-cult, modern and ancient', *Ethnological Researches* (Etnološka istraživanja) 16, 183-236.

Hall, J. M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartig, K. and Dunn, K. M. 'Roadside Memorials: Interpreting New Deathscapes in Newcastle, New South Wales', *Geographical Research* 36, 1, 5-20.

Hautecoeur, L. 1954. *Mystique et architecture: symbolisme du cercle et de la coupole.* Paris: A. et J. Picard.

Held, W. 1999. 'Loryma in Karien. Vorbericht über die Kampagnen 1995 und 1998' *Istanbuler Miteilungen* 49, 159-196.

Held, W. 2003. 'Neue und revidierte Inschriften aus Loryma und der karischen Chersones' *Epigraphica Anatolica* 36, 55-85.

Held, W. 2006. 'Platz, Heiligtum und politische Institutionen in Loryma und der Karischen Chersones', in W. Hoepfner and L. Lehmann (eds), *Die griechische Agora*, *Symposion Berlin 2003*. Berlin, 41–52

Hellmann, M.-C. 2006. *L'architecture grecque – Architecture religieuse et funeraire.* Volume 2. Paris: Picard.

Henry, O. 2009. *Tombes de Carie.* Rennes: Presses Universitaires.

Hermanns, M. H. 2004. *Licht und Lampen im westgriechischen Alltag. Beleuchtungsgerät des 6.-3. Jhs. v. Chr. In Selinunt*. Rahden.

Herrmann, P. 1995. 'Τέρας θανόντων– Totenruhm und Totenehrung im städ-tischen Leben der hellenistischen Zeit', in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993.* Munich, 189-197.

Higgins, M.D. and Higgins, R. 1996. *A Geological companion to Greece and the Aegean*. Ithaca, NY / London: Cornell University Press / Duckworth Publishers.

Higgins, R.A., 1967. *Greek Terracottas*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Hiller von Gaertringe, F. 1896. 'Inschriften aus Rhodos', *MDAI(A)* 21, 39-66.

Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1912. 'Arideikos und Hieronymos von Rhodos', *BCH* 36, 230-9.

Hillson, S. 2009. 'The World's Largest Infant Cemetery and its Potential for Studying Growth and Development: the Notia Kylindra Site on the Island of Astypalaia in the Dodecanese', in Schepartz, L., Bourbou, C. and Fox, S. (eds.), *New Directions in the Skeletal Biology of Greece*. *Occasional Wiener Laboratory Series*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 137-154.

Hodder, I. 1982. *Symbols in Action: Ethnoarchaeological Studies of Material Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoghammar, K., (2004) 'The inscribed, cylindrical funerary altars: questions of date and stylistic development', in K. Hoghammar (ed.), *The Hellenistic polis of Kos – State, Economy and Culture*, Upsala, 69–82.

Hope-Simpson, R. and Lazenby, J. F. 'Notes from the Dodecanes II'. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 65, 44-77.

Horst-Warhaft, G. 1992. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*. London: Routledge.

Houby-Nielsen, S. H. 1995. 'Burial language in archaic and classical Kerameikos', *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 1, 129-92.

Houby-Nielsen, S. H. 1996a. 'The Archaeology of Ideology in the Kerameikos: New Interpretations of the 'Opferrinnen'', in R. Hägg (ed.), *The role of religion in the early Greek polis. Proceedings of the third International seminar on ancient Greek cult organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-18 October 1992.* Stockholm*: Svenska Institutet i Athen,* 41-54.

Houby-Nielsen, S. H. 1996b. 'Women and the formation of the Athenian city-state. The evidence of burial customs', *Metis* 11, 233-60.

Huguenot, C. 2008. *La tombe aux érotes et la tombe d'Amarynthos: architecture funéraire et présence mecédonienne en Grèce centrale (Eretria: Fouilles et recherches* 19*).* Gollion: Infolio éd.

Humphrey, C. and Laidlaw, J. 1994. *The archetypal actions of ritual: a theory of ritual illustrated by the Jain rite of worship.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Humphreys, S. C. 1980. 'Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens. Tradition or traditionalism', *JHS* 92-126.

Inglieri, R. U. 1936. *Carta Archeologica dell' Isola di Rodi*. Florence.

Insoll, T. (ed.). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Insoll, T. 2004. *Archaeology, Ritual, Religion.* London and New York: Routledge.

Isager, S. and Karlsson, L. 2008. 'A new inscription fromLabraunda. Honorary decree for Olympichos', *EA* 41, 39–52.

Jacopi, G. 1931. *Esplorazione archeologica di Camiro* I. *Scavi nelle necropolis camirese 1929-1930, ClRh* IV.

Jacopi, G. 1932. 'La Necropoli di Pontamo (Calchi)', *ClRh* II, 117-164.

Jacopi, G. 1932-1933. 'Scavi e ricerche di Nisiro', *ClRh* VI-VII, 443-67.

Jeammet, V. (ed.). 2010. *Tanagra. Figurines for life and eternity*. Paris: Bancaja.

Johnson, H. 1989. *Vintage: The Story of Wine*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Johnston, S. I. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. California: University of California Press.

Jones, N.F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, S. 1998. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present.* Routledge: New York.

Jones, S. 2008. 'Ethnicity: Theoretical Approaches, Methodological Implications', in H. D.G. Maschner, C. Chippindale, R. A. Bentley (eds.), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories.* Lanham: Altamira, 321-333.

Kallipolitis, V. 1966. 'Αίγινα', *ArchDelt* 19, 74-9.

Kaninia, E. 1990. 'Ο αρχαιολογικός έλεγχος των εκσκαφών για τον κεντρικό αποχετευτικό αγωγό Ρόδου: εκπλήξεις και προβλήματα', *Αρχαιολογία καιΤέχνες* 37, 60-7.

Kaninia, E. 1993. 'Περίχωρα πόλης Ρόδου: Έργα ΔΕΥΑΡ', *ArchDelt* 43, 610-11.

Kaninia, E. 1998. 'Χρυσά στεφάνια από τις νεκροπόλεις της Αρχαίας Ρόδου', *ArchDelt* 49-50(Μελέτες), 97-132.

Kaninia, E. 2011. 'Telos', in *Islands Off the Beaten Track,* 234-245.

Kaninia, E. 2014. 'Αρχαία χρυσά κοσμήματα από την Τήλο', in A. Giannikouri (ed.), *Κοροπλαστική και μικροτεχνία στον αιγαιακό χώρο από τους γεωμετρικούς χρόνους έως και τη ρωμαϊκή περίοδο, Διεθνές Συνέδριο στη μνήμη της Ηούς Ζερβουδάκη, Ρόδος, 26-29 Νοεμβρίου 2009*, Τομός ΙΙ. Athens: 219-36

Karageorghis, V. 1973. *Κύπρος.* Athens: Τύπος.

Karamanoli – Siganidou, M. 1984. 'Πέλλα: Ανατολικό Νεκροταφείο', *ArchDelt* 31, 261.

Karamitrou-Mentesidi, G. 1998. *Αιανή*. Athens: *Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού. Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Αιανής.*

Katzia, E. 1992. Οικόπεδο Σταματάκη (Φανερωμένη), *ArchDelt* 42, 613.

Knapp, A. B. 2007. *Insularity and island identity in the prehistoric Mediterranean*, in S. Antoniadou and A. Pace (eds.), *Mediterranean Crossroad*s/ Athens: Pierides Foundation, 37–62.

Kolodny, E. 1976. *La population des îles de la Grèce: essai de géographie insulaire en Méditerranée orientale*. Aix-en-Provence: Edisud.

Konstantinopoulos, G. 1967. 'Ροδιακά Ι', *ArchDelt* 21, 51-6.

Konstantinopoulos, G. 1969. 'Οικόπεδον Στουπή', *ArchDelt* 23, 447.

Konstantinopoulos, G. 1970. 'Αρχαιότητες και μνημεία Δωδεκανήσου', *ArchDelt* 24, 451-485.

Konstantinopoulos, G. 1986. *Αρχαία Ρόδος. Επισκόπηση της Ιστορίας και της Τέχνης.* Athens.

Kontorini, V. 1983. *Rhodiaka* I. *Inscriptions inedites relatives à l'histoire et aux cultes de Rhodes au IIe et au Ier S. av. J-C.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art.

Kontorini, V. 1989. *Ανέκδοτες Επιγραφές Ρόδου* 2. Athens: Kardamitsa.

Kossinna, G. 1911. *Die Herkunft der Germanen*. Leipzig: Kabitzsch.

Kostoglou-Despini, A. 1979. *Προβλήματα της παριανής πλαστικής του 5ου αιώνα.* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Kostomitsopoulos, F. 1988a. 'Οικόπεδο Β. Καντιμοίρη (Κτημ. μερ. 595, Ο.Τ. 295)', *ArchDelt* 35, 536.

Kostomitsopoulos, F. 1988b. 'Οικόπεδο Π. Ζαράνη (Κ.Μ. 582Β, Ο.Τ. 315)', *ArchDelt* 35, 544-5.

Kostomitsopoulos, F. 1989. 'Νοτιοδυτική Νεκρόπολη: Πάροδος Κωνστ. Τσαλδάρη (οικόπεδο Σκεύου Καμπούρη)', *ArchDelt* 39, 322-3.

Kostomitsopoulos, F. 1993. 'Οδός Έμπωνας: οικόπεδο Μιχ. Παγκά (Ο.Τ. 345, Κ.Μ. 593)', *ArchDelt* 43, 602-3.

Kottaridi, A. 1998. 'Macedonian Burial Customs and the Funeral of Alexander the Great', in *Πρακτικά του Συνεδρίου Αλέξανδρος ο Μέγας, Από τη Μακεδονία στην Οικουμένη*. Veroia, 113-120.

Kottaridi, A. 2001. 'Το έθιμο της καύσης και οι Μακεδόνες. Σκέψεις με αφορμή τα ευρήματα της νεκρόπολης των Αιγών', in N. Stampolidis (ed.), *Πρακτικά Συμποσίου: Καύσεις στην εποχή του Χαλκού και την πρώιμη εποχή του Σιδήρου, ΚΒ΄ Εφορεία Προϊστορικών και Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης.* Athens, 359-71.

Kourou, N. 1987. 'Ρόα γλυκεία. Γύρω από τα πήλινα ομοιώματα ροδιού του 8ου και του 7ου π.Χ. αι.', in *Ειλαπίνη. Τόμος τιμητικός για τον καθηγητή Νικόλαο Πλάτωνα*, 101–116, Iraklion.

Kurtz, D. C. and J. Boardman. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*. London.

Kyparissis, N. 1915. 'Περί ανασκαφής γενομενης εν Καστελόριζο', *ArhDelt* 1, (Annex), 62-64.

Lagia, A. 2007. 'Notions of Childhood in the Classical Polis: Evidence from the Bioarchaelogical Record', in A. Cohen and J. B. Rutter (eds.), *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy*. *Hesperia* Suppl. 41, 293–306.

Laneri, N. (ed.). 2007. *Performing Death: Social Analysis of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean.* Oriental Institute Seminars 3. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Larfeld, W. 1914. *Griechische Epigraphik*. Munich: Beck.

Larson, J. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults.* Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Lauter, H. 1972. 'Kunst und Landschaft- Ein Beitrag zum rhodischen Hellenismus', *AntK* 15, 49-59.

Lauter, H. 1986. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt.

Lauter, H. 1988. 'Hellenistische Sepulkralarchitektur auf Rhodos', in S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, Copenhagen, 155–163.

Lauter-Bufe, H.. 1983. 'Zu einem hellenistischen Grabzeichen aus Rhodos', *AM* 98, 155–172.

Leach, E. 1976. *Culture and Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, M. 2015. *Body, dress, and identity in ancient Greece*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leventopoulou-Giouri, E. 1967. 'Καβάλα', *ArchDeltp* 20, 447-51.

Lilimbaki-Akamati, M. 1994. *Λαξευτοί θαλαμωτοί τάφοι της Πέλλας.* Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.

Lilimbaki-Akamati, M. 2005. 'Ανασκαφική Έρευνα στην Πέλλα το 2005', *AEMTh* 19 (Thessaloniki 2007), 391-407.

Livadiotti, M. and Rocco, G. (eds.). 1996. *La presenza italiana del Dodecaneso tra il 1912 e il 1948*, Catania: Edizioni Del Prisma.

Longacre, W. 1964. 'Archaeology as Anthropology: A Case Study', *Science* 144, 1, 454-1, 455.

Love, I. C.1967. 'Knidos – Excavations in 1967', *Turk Arkeoloji Dergisi* 16, 133–159.

Lubbock, J. 1865. *Pre-historic times.* Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate.

Maddrell, A. and Sidaway, J. D. 2010. *Deathscapes: Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance.* Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Maillot, 2013): "Les associations à Cos" in: Frölich P., Hamon P. ed, *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques* (IIIe s. av. J.-C.-IIe s. apr. J.-C.), Genève, 199-226

Mairs, R. 2011. 'Hellenization', in R. S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C. B. Champion, A. Erskine and S. R. Huebner (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (Oxford).

Mairs, R. 2014. The Hellenistic Far East: Archaeology, Language, and Identity in Greek Central Asia. Berkeley: University of California Press

Maiuri, A. 1916. 'Nuove inscrizioni greche dalle Sporadi meridionali: Iscrizioni del Museo Archeologico di Rodi', *ASAA* 2, 133-179.

Maiuri, A. 1921-1922. 'Viaggio di esplorazione in Caria', *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 4-5, 415-9.

Maiuri, A. 1925. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Firenze.

Maiuri, A. 1932. *Monumenti di scultura del Museo archeologico di Rodi* I, *ClRh* II.

Maiuri. A. 1925-1926. 'Nuovi supplementi al « Corpus » delle iscrizioni di Rodi', *ASAA* 8-9, 313-322.

Manousou-Della, K. 2008. 'Lindos: The Cultural landscape of an ancient city-state. Proposals for the protection and contemporary emergence', *The Dodecanese annals,* Volume V, Reprint, Periodical Scientific Journal (Rhodes), 537-551. pp. 537, 551.

Marangou, L. and Papachristodoulou, I. 1995. 'Δυτική και Κεντρική Νεκρόπολη: Οδός Έμπωνας (Ο.Τ. 346, οικόπεδο Κατσαρά - Ταμπάκη (Παυλίδη)', *ArchDelt* 44, 495.

Marinos, G.P. 1970. *Annales geologiques des pays helleniques, ser.* 1, vol. 22, Paris.

Markoulaki, S. and Niniou-Kindeli, B. N. 1982. 'Ελληνιστικός λαξευτός τάφος Χανίων. Ανασκαφή οικοπέδου Μαθιουδάκη', ArchDelt 37 (Μελέτες), 7-118.

Marrou, H. I. 1948. *Histoire de l'Education dans l'Antiquite*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

McKenzie, J. 2011. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt: 300 BC–AD 700.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

McKinley, JI. 2013. 'Cremation: excavation, analysis and interpretation of material from cremation related contexts', in L. Nilsson-Stutz and S. Tarlow (eds.), *Handbook on the Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 147-171.

McNicoll, A. W. 1997. *Hellenistic fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D. M. 1969. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merker, G. 1973. *The Hellenistic Sculpture of Rhodes. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Volume XL.* Goteborg.

Michaelides, D. 2004. 'Cypriot painted Tombs and their Ceilings', in L. Borhy (ed.), *Plafonds et voutes a l' epoque antique, Actes du Vile Colloque International de L' Association Internationale pour la Peinture Murale Antique, 15-19 Mai 2001*. Budapest, 89-96.

Michalaki-Kollia, 1992. 'Δυτική Νεκρόπολη: Οδός Μιχ. Πετρίδη (έργα ΔΕΥΑΡ, σκάμμα Α)', *ArchDelt* 42, 597.

Michalaki-Kollia, M. 2010. 'Un ensemble exceptionnel d'enchytrismes de nouveau-nés, de foetus et de nourrissons découvert dans l'île d'Astypalée, en Grèce : cimetière de bébés ou sanctuaire ? (Première approche)', in A. M., Guimier-Sorbets and Y. Morizot (eds.), *L'enfant et la mort dans l'antiquité. I. Nouvelles recherches dans les nécropoles grecques: le signalement des tombes d'enfants.* Paris: de Boccard, 161-205.

Milledge – Nelson, S. 1997. *Gender in archaeology: analyzing power and prestige.* California: AltaMira Press.

Miller, S. G. 1993. *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles. A Painted Macedonian Tomb*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

Misailidou – Despotidou, V. 1990. 'Από το νεκροταφείο της Αρχαίας Μίεζας', *AEMTh* 4, 127 – 34.

Moatti, C. (ed.). 2004. *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne: procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification.* Rome: École française de Rome.

Morelli, D. 1955. 'Gli Stranieri in Rodi', *Studi classici e orientali* 5, 126—90.

Morris, I. 1987. *Burial and Ancient Society. The rise of the Greek city-state.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, I. 1991. 'The archaeology of ancestors: the Saxe-Goldstein Hypothesis Revisited', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 1, 147-69.

Morris, I. 1992. *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, I. 1992-1993. 'Law, culture, and funerary art in Athens, 600-300 B.C.', *Hephaistos* 11/12, 35-50.

Moulinier, L. 1952. *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère à Aristote.* Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Murnaghan, S. 1999. 'The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic', in M. Beissinger, J. Tylus, and S. Wofford (eds.), *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 203-20.

Muthmann, F. 1982. *Der Granatapfel. Symbol des Lebens in der alten Welt*. Bern: Office du Livre.

Newton, C.T. 1865. *Travels and Discoveries in the Levant*. London.

Novakova, L. 2009. 'Selected Funeral Inscriptions on the Round Altars From Stratoniceia in the Hellenistic Period', *Anodos* 9*. Studies of the Ancient World,* 111-118.

Novakova, L. 2011. 'Funeral Rites and Cultural Diversity in Hellenistic Caria Based on Epigraphic and Archaeological Evidence', *Anodos (Studies of the Ancient World)* 10/2010, 213-221.

Oakley J. H, 2004. *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the. White Lekythoi* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, G. 2004. 'Mobility, society, and economy in the Hellenistic period', in Z. Archibald, J. K. Davies and V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 345-67.

Orlandos, A. K. 1967-8. *Η Αρκαδική Αλίφειρα και τα Μνημεία της.* Athens.

Orsi, P. 1913. *Contributi alla storia della fibula greca. Opuscula Archaeologica Oscari Montelio Septuagenario dicata.* Holms: I. Haeggstroem.

O'Shea, J. N., 1984. *Mortuary variability*. London: Academic Press.

Ota, L. 2009. 'Post-Funeral-Practices in Moesia Inferior. Archaeological Information'. *Dacia* 53, 2009, 131–161.

Ozgan, R, M. Ozgan, M. Sahin, and Ch. Berns, (1999) 'Knidos Kazilari', *Kazi Sonuclari Toplantisi* 21/2, 115-33.

Palaiologou, S. 2002-2005. 'Τάφοι της ελληνιστικής περιόδου στη δυτική ροδιακή νεκρόπολη', *AAA* 2002-2005, 149-62.

Palaiologou, S. 2008. 'Πόνταμος τσης Χάλκης – Τάφοι και ταφικά έθιμα από την αρχαία νεκρόπολη', *Δωδεκανησιακά Χρονικά* ΚΒ, 45-70.

Palaiologou, S. 2011. 'Chalki', in *Islands off the Beaten Track,* 220-2.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1984. 'Κιζίλ Τεπέ: Οικόπεδο Παπαχριστοδούλου – Καρίκα', *ArchDelt* 32, 368.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1987α. 'Νοτιοδυτικές Νεκροπόλεις: Οικόπεδα Ευαγγ. Παπαχριστοδούλου και Χρ. Καρίκα', *ArchDelt* 34, 435-7.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1987β. 'Περιοχή Αγίας Τριάδας και Ανάληψης (Κιζίλ-τεπέ): Οικόπεδο Γ. Κουσουρνά (Ο.Τ. 311)', *ArchDelt* 34, 444.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1988a. 'Οικόπεδο Π. Παπαθεοδώρου (Ο.Τ. 259)', *ArchDelt* 35, 543-4.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1988b. 'Αρχαίες Νεκροπόλεις; Γωνία οδών Στ. Κωτιάδη και Δημ. Αναστασιάδη: Ο.Τ. 274, οικόπεδα Αν. Κεραμέα - Π. Φουντουραδάκη και Γ. Τσίκκη', *ArchDelt* 35, 540-2.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1989a. 'Νοτιοδυτική νεκρόπολη: Οικόπεδο Ζαράνη, Οικόπεδο Κακά', *ArchDelt* 38, 3945.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1989b. *Οι αρχαίοι Ροδιακοί Δήμοι. Ιστορική Επισκόπηση. Η Αρχαία Ιαλυσία.* Athens: Η Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική εταιρεία.

Papachristodoulou, I. 1994. *EAA Secondo Suppl.* 1971-1994, IV, 'Rodi', 769-70.

Papadopoulos, J. K. 2000. 'Skeletons in Wells: Towards an Archaeology of Social Exclusion in the Ancient Greek World', in J. Hubert (ed.), *Madness, Disability and Social Exclusion: The Archaeology and Anthropology of 'Difference'*. London: Routledge 96–118.

Papageorgakis, I. 1966. *Τα εις την μαρμαρικήν τέχνην χρήσιμα πετρώματα της Ελλάδος,* Athens.

Papakonstantinou-Katsouni, M. 1992. 'Οδός Μαλιέων: Οικόπεδο Παν. Σαδράλη', *ArchDelt* 42, 215-6.

Parker Pearson, M. P. 1982. 'Mortuary practices, society and ideology: an Ethnoarchaeological study', in I. Hodder (ed.), *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology* (Cambridge), 99-114.

Parker Pearson, M. P. 1993. 'The Powerful Dead: Archaeological Relationships between the Living and the Dead', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 3 (2), 203-229.

Parker Pearson, M. P. 1995. *Return of the living dead: Mortuary analysis and the New Archaeology revisited. Antiquity* 69 (266), 1046-1048.

Parker Pearson, M. P. 1999. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Texas: Texas A. and M. University Press.

Parker Pearson, M. P. and Ramilisonina. 1998. 'Stonehenge for the ancestors: the stones pass on the message'. *Antiquity* 72: 308-26.

Parker Pearson, M. P. and Richards, C. (eds.). 1994. *Architecture and order: approaches to social space*. London: Routledge.

Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: pollution and purification in early Greek religion.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Parker, R. 2011. *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Parlama, L. 1978. 'Καύσεις στο Κλασικό νεκροταφείο της Ακάνθου', *AAA* 11, 5-28.

Patsiada, V. 1989. 'Νοτιοδυτική νεκρόπολη: Οδός Κωνστ. Υδραίου (οικόπεδο Σ. Πίντζιου)', *ArchDelt* 39, 324.

Patsiada, V. 1992. 'Οδός Μιχ. Πετρίδη (οικόπεδο Μ. Χρήστου)', *ArchDelt 42*, 599-601.

Patsiada, V. 1995a. 'Δυτική Νεκρόπολη: Οικόπεδο Δ. Ασβέστη - Ε. Βαζούκου', *ArchDelt* 45, 471-2.

Patsiada, V. 1995b. 'Οικόπεδο Δ. Πρώτου', *ArchDelt* 45, 483.

Patsiada, V. 1997. 'Δυτική νεκρόπολη (Ανάληψη – Αγία Τριάδα). Οικόπεδο Δ. Ασβέστη-Παπαϊωάννου', *ArchDelt* 47, 621-3.

Patsiada, V. 1999. 'Ροδιακή Ταφική Αρχιτεκτονική', in *Ρόδος 2.400 χρόνια. Η πόλη της Ρόδου από την ίδρυσή της μέχρι την κατάληψη από τους Τούρκους (1523), Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συνέδριο, Ρόδος 1993.* Athens, 127-36.

Patsiada, V. 2013. *Μνημειώδες ταφικό συγκρότημα στη νεκρόπολη της Ρόδου: συμβολή στη μελέτη της ελληνιστικής ταφικής αρχιτεκτονικής.* Rhodes, Athens: Υπουργείο Παιδείας και Θρησκευμάτων, Πολιτισμού και Αθλητισμού.

Patsiada, V. 2014. 'Σύνολο χρυσών κοσμημάτων και αργυρών αγγείων στη νεκρόπολη της Ρόδου', in A. Giannikouri (ed.), *Κοροπλαστική και μικροτεχνία στον αιγαιακό χώρο από τους γεωμετρικούς χρόνους έως και τη ρωμαϊκή περίοδο, Διεθνές Συνέδριο στη μνήμη της Ηούς Ζερβουδάκη, Ρόδος, 26-29 Νοεμβρίου 2009*, Τομός II. Athens: 219-36.

Patton, W. R. and Hicks, E. L. 1891. *Inscriptions of Kos*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Peek, W. 1960. *Griechische Grabgedichte*. Berlin.

Peleg, M. 1991. 'Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Burials at Lohamei haGeta'ot', *Atiqot* 20, 131–52.

Pernier, I. 1914. 'Ricognizioni archeologiche nelle Sporadi'. *Bolletino d'Arte* 8, 236-42.

Pfuhl, E. and Möbius, H. 1977. *Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs*, 1 (Text) & 2 (Plates), Mainz: von Zabern.

Pimouguet, I. 1995. 'Défense et territoire. L'exemple milésien', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 21(1), 89-109.

Pitt-Rivers, A. H. 1906. *The evolution of culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Plantzos, 1999. *Hellenistic Engraved Gems.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pollitt, J. J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomeroy, S. B. 1984. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: from Alexander to Cleopatra*. New York: Schocken Books

Price, S.R.F. 1999. *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*. *Key Themes in Ancient History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pugliese-Carratelli, G. 1939-1940. 'Per la storia delle associazioni in Rodi antica', *ASAA* 17-18, 145-200.

Pugliese-Carratelli, G. 1953. 'Sui damoi e le phylai di Rodi', *Studi classici e orientali* 2, 69-78.

Purcell, N. and Peregrine, H. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Rainville, R. 1999. 'Hanover Deathscapes: Mortuary Variability in New Hampshire, 1770-1920', *Ethnohistory* 46, 3, 541-97.

Rakita, G. F. M., Buikstra J. E., Beck, L. and Williams, S. R. (eds.). 2005. *Interacting with the Dead: Perspectives on Mortuary Archaeology for the New Millennium*. Florida: Florida University Press.

Rebay-Salisbury, K. 2012. 'Inhumation and cremation: how burial practices are linked to beliefs', in M. L. S. Sørensen and K. Rebay-Salisbury (eds.), *Embodied knowledge: perspectives on belief and technology.* Oxford; Oakville: Oxbow, 15-26.

Reger, G. 1999. 'The relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC', in *Hellenistic Rhodes*, 76-97.

Renfrew, C. 1985. *The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi*. London: British School at Athens and Thames and Hudson.

Renfrew, C. 2007. 'The Archaeology of Ritual, of Cult, and of Religion', in E. Kyriakidis (ed.), *The archaeology of ritual. Cotsen Advanced Seminars, 3.* Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, 3-12.

Ricketti, P. 1982. 'Altari cilindrici a bucrani e festoni in Grecia. Studio preliminare', *Xenia* 3, 49–70.

Ridgeway, B. S. 1990. *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331-200 BC*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Robinson, D. M. 1942. *Excavations at Olynthus XI. Necrolynthia: A study in Greek Burial Customs and anthropology.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.

Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Ross, L. 1845. *Reisen auf den griechisen Inseln. Band III.* Stugart – Tubingen.

Rotroff, S. I. 1999. 'The Artifacts from Well G5:3 and Some Conclusions Concerning the Deposit'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 103. 284–5.

Rottiers (Colonel). 1830. *Description des Monuments de Rhodes*. Brussels.

Roux, G. 1987. 'La terrasse d' Attale I', *FdD* II, 111-114.

Rumscheid, F. 1994. *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus.* Mayence: von Zabern.

Salapata, G., (1997) 'Hero Warriors from Corinth and Lakonia', *Hesperia* 66, 245–260.

Salta, M. 1999. 'Αρχαία Ρόδος. Μια κλασική νεκρόπολη', in *Ρόδος 2.400 χρόνια. Η πόλη της Ρόδου από την ίδρυσή της μέχρι την κατάληψη από τους Τούρκους (1523), Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συνέδριο, Ρόδος 1993.* Athens, 143-50.

Salzmann, A. 1875. *Nécropole de Camiros.* Paris.

Saner, T. 1994. 'Observations on the different types of masonry used in the city walls of Amos', *RÉA* 96, 273-284.

Sardi, A. 2013. 'Οικόπεδο Κουντούρη – Ανθρωπολογική και Δημογραφική Ανάλυση', in Patsiada, V. 2013, 373-401.

Savignac, R. P. 1917. 'Monuments funeraires et religieux de Castellorizo'. *Revue Biblique* XIV, 520-36.

Saxe, A. A. 1970. *Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practises.* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Schazmann, P. 1934, 'Das Charmyleion', *JDAI* 49, 110-127.

Schutter, X. de. 1989. 'Rituel funéraire et coût des obsèques en Grèce à l'époque classique', *Kernos* 2, 53-66.

Sebastiani, B. B. 2015. 'Droysen's concept of Hellenism between philology and history', *Aitia* [online journal], 5, 2015. Posted online 19/8/2015, viewed 20/06/2017.

Segre, M. & Pugliese-Carratelli, G. 1949-1951 [1952]. 'Tituli Camirenses', *ASAA* 27-9, 141-318.

Shear, T. L. 1914. 'A Sculptured Basis from Loryma', *AJA* 18, 3, 285-96.

Shennan, S.J. 1978. 'Archaeological 'cultures': an empirical investigation', in I. Hodder (ed.), *The spatial organisation of culture*. London: Duckworth, 113-39.

Shepherd, G. 2013. 'Ancient Identities: Age, Gender, and Ethnicity in Ancient Greek Burials', in S. Tarlow and L. Nilsson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 543-557.

Sherwin-White, S. M. 1978. *Ancient Cos. A historical study from the Dorian settlement to the Imperial Period* (Hypomnemata 51). Gottingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht.

Shipley, G. 1987. A History of Samos, 800-188 B.C. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silverman, H. & Small, D. (eds.). 2002. *The Space and Place of Death*. Archaeological *Papers of the American Anthropological Association,* 11. Washington, D.C.

Simon. E. 1987. 'Griechische Muttergottheiten', in Matronen und verwandte Gottheiten, (Bjb Beih. 44), 157-169.

Sismanidis, K. 1997. *Κλίνες και κλινοειδείς κατασκευές των Μακεδονικών Τάφων.* Αθήνα: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.

Smith, C. 1883. 'Inscriptions from Rhodes', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 4, 136-141.

Smith, C. 1885. 'Vases from Rhodes with incised inscriptions'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 6, 371-377.

Şöföroğlu, M. and Summerer, L. 2016. 'Light for the Dead. Some Thoughts on Funerary Lamps in Light of the Hellenistic/Roman Tomb in Kormakiti/Koruçam' in, Summerer, L. and Kaba, H. (eds.), *The Northern Face of Cyprus. New Studies in Cypriot Archaeology and Art History*. Instabul: Vavinlari.

Sokolowski, F. 1969. *Lois sacrées des cités grecques.* Paris: E. de Boccard.

Sotiridiadis, G. 1934. *Ανασκαφή Μαραθώνος*, *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 29-38.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1996. *'Reading' Greek Death. To the End of Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Spanu, M. 2000. 'Burial in Asia Minor during the Imperial Period with a Particular Reference to Cilicia and Cappadocia', in J. Pearce, M. Millett and M. Struck (eds.), *Burial, society and context in the Roman world: symposium held at the Research Centre for Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Durham between 18th and 20th April 1997*. Oxford: Oxbow, 169-177.

Stefanaki, V. 2010. 'Το νόμισμα στα νησιά του Αιγαίου', *Οβολός 9*, 413-446.

Stefanakis, M. and V. Patsiada. 2009-2011. 'Η αρχαιολογική έρευνα στον αρχαίο δήμο των Κυμισαλέων (Ρόδος) κατά τα έτη 2006-2010: Μια πρώτη παρουσίαση', *Ευλιμένη* 2009-2011, 63-99.

Stefanakis. M. 2009. 'Ο Αρχαίος Δήμος των Κυμισαλέων: πέντε χρόνια έρευνας του Πανεπιστημίου Αιγαίου και της ΚΒ΄ ΕΠΚΑ', *Δωδεκάνησος* 2, 93-116. (Retrieved from: http://www.eulimene.eu/read/Stefanakis_2009.pdf).

Stefanakis, M. 2010. 'Η αρχαία Κυμισάλα στο Δήμο Αταβύρου: Παρελθόν, παρόν και μέλλον', Πρακτικά 1ου Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου, Τοπικές Κοινωνίες και Τριτοβάθμια Εκπαιδευτικά Ιδρύματα: Συνύπαρξη για Αειφορική Ανάπτυξη, Δήμος Ροδίων-Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου-Διεθνές Κέντρων Συγγραφέων και Μεταφραστών Ρόδου. (Retrieved from: http://www.eulimene.eu/read/Ancient-Kymissala.pdf)

Stefanakis, M., Kalogeropoulos, K., Georgopoulos, A. and Bourbou, C. 2015. 'The Kymissala (Rhodes) Archaeological Research Project (KARP): Multi–disciplinary experimental research and theoretical issues', in C. Haggis and C.M. Antonaccio (eds.), *Classical Archaeology in Context. Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 259-314.

Stepan, N. 1982. *The idea of race in science: Great Britain, 1800–1960*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Stevanović, L. 2009. *Laughing at the Funeral: Gender and Anthropology in the Greek Funeral Rites*. Belgrade: Institute of Ethnography SASA.

Strömberg, A. 1998. 'Sex-indicating grave gifts in the Athenian Iron Age', in L. Larsson Loven and A. Strömberg (eds.), *Aspects of Women in Antiquity. Proceedings of the first Nordic symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity.* Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag, 11-28.

Stucchi, S. 1975. *Architettura Cirenaica.* Rome.

Svoronos, I. 1908. Die Münzen der Ptolemaeer. Athens: P.D. Sakellarios.

Tainter, J. 1978. 'Social inferences and mortuary practice. An experiment in numerical classification', *World Archaeology*, 7 (1), 1-15.

Texier, C. 1837. *Description de l'Asie Mineure faite par l'ordre du Gouvernement Français de 1833 a 1837*, Vol. III, Paris.

Themelis, P. 2000. *Ήρωες και ηρώα στη Μεσσήνη*. Athens: Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία.

Themelis, P. and Touratsoglou, P., (1997) *Οι Τάφοι του Δερβενίου*, Athens.

Thomas, J. 1996. *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretative Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Thomassen, B. 2009. 'The Uses and Meanings of Liminality', *International Political Anthropology* 2 (1), 5-27.

Thonges-Stringaris, R. N. 1965. 'Das Griechische Totenmahl,' *AthMitt* 80, 1 -99.

Thorn, J. 2005. *The necropolis of Cyrene: two hundred years of exploration.* Rome.

Tilley, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments.* Oxford: Berg.

Touchais, G. 1982. 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1981', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 106 (2), 529-635.

Toynbee, J. 1971. *Death and Burial in the Roman World.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Triantafyllidis P. and Grigoriadou, A. 1996. 'Οδός Πειραιώς', *ArchDelt* 46, 467.

Triantafyllidis, P. 2011. 'Nisyros. Grave Groups. From the Geometric period to Late Antiquity', in *Islands off the Beaten Track*, 388.

Triantafyllidis, P. 2012. 'Κυλινδρικοί επιτύμβιοι βωμοί με διακόσμηση σταχύων και μηκώνων από τα Δωδεκάνησα', *ArchDelt* 57 (Μελέτες), 213-36.

Trundle, M. 2004. *Greek Mercenaries from the Late Archaic Period to Alexander*. London & New York: Routledge.

Tsakalou-Tzanavari, K. 2002. *Πήλινα ειδώλεια από τη Βέροια.* Athens: Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού. Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.

Tsavaropoulos, A., Martis, T. and Zoitopoulos, M. 2006.'Antikythera. The Early Hellenistic Cemetery of a Pirate's Town', in S. A. Luca and V. Sîrbu (eds.), *The Society of the Living - the Community of the Dead (from Neolithic to the Christian Era), Proceedings of the 7th International Colloquium on Funerary Archaeology*, Sibiu: Bibliotheca Septemcastrensis, 125-134.

Tsigarida, B. 1988. *Metal Wreaths in the Greek World*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Oxford: University of Oxford.

Tsimbidou-Avloniti, M. 2005**.** *Μακεδονικοί τάφοι στον Φοίνικα και στον Άγιο Αθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της εικονογραφίας των ταφικών μνημείων της Μακεδονίας.* Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.

Tsimbidou-Avloniti, M. 2000. '«...λάρνακ' ες αργυρέην...» (Ιλ. Σ, 413)', in *ΜΥΡΤΟΣ, Μελέτες στη μνήμη της Ιουλίας Βοκοτοπούλου*. Thessaloniki, 543-575.

Tsouloucha, D. and E. Vlachaki (eds.). 2010. *Έθιμα και παραδόσεις στην Κάρπαθο.* Karpathos: Municipality of Karpathos.

Turner, V. 1967. *The forest of symbols: Aspects of Ndembu ritual*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Turner, V. 1968. *The drums of affliction: a study of religious processes among the Ndembu of Zambia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Turner, V. 1969. *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine.

Turner, V. 1974. *Dramas, fields and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Turner, V. 1986. *On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

Van Gennep, A. 1960. *The Rites of Passage* (M. B. Vizedom and G. L. Caffee, transl.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Vasilogamvrou, A. 1992. 'Δυτική Νεκρόπολη: Οδός Μιχ. Πετρίδη (οικόπεδο Ν. Ντάλια)', *ArchDelt* 42, 599.

Venit, M. S. 2002. *Monumental Tombs of Ancient Alexandria. The Theater of the Dead.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in early Greek Art and Poetry*. *London: University of California Press*.

Veyne, P. 1990. [1976]. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Vlachou, V. 2012. v. 'Death and Burial in the Greek World. Greek Funerary Rituals in Their Archaeological Context', in *ThesCRA* VIII Add. VI 1. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 363-84.

Vokotopoulou, I. 1990. *Οι ταφικοί τύμβοι της Αίνειας.* Athens. Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτροιώσεων.

Warren. P. 1988. *Minoan religion as ritual action.* Gothenburg: Åströms Förlag.

Welwei, K. W. 2000. 'Peraia', *Neue Pauly*, vol. 9, 533-5.

Werbner, R. 1989. *Ritual Passage, Sacred Journey. The process and organisation of religious movement.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Westcoat, B. D. and Ousterhout, R. G. 2012. *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitley, J. 1988. 'Early states and hero cults. A re-appraisal', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108, 173-82.

Wiessner, P. 1983. 'Style and social information in Kalahari San projectile points', American Antiquity 48, 2, 253-76.

Will, E. 1979-1982. *Histoire politique du monde hellenistique. 323–30 av. J.-C* (2 vols). Nancy.

Winter, F. E. 2006. *Studies in Hellenistic Architecture* (Phoenix *Suppl*. 42). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wypustek, A. 2013*. Images of Eternal Beauty in Funerary Verse Inscriptions of the. Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Periods*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Yao, A. 2008. *Culture Contact and Social Change along China's Ancient Southwestern frontier.* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Michigan: University of Michigan.

Young, R. S., 1939. 'Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora, *Hesperia,* Suppl. 2, 55–67.

Young, R.S., 1942. 'Graves from the Phaleron Cemetery'. *AJA* 46, 23–57.

Zaidman, L. B. and Schmitt Pantel, P.. 1994. *Die Religion der Griechen: Kult und Mythos*. Munich: Beck.

Zanker P. 1993. 'The Hellenistic Grave Stelai from Smyrna: Identity and Self-Image in the Polis', A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World. Conference held at Berkeley, April 7-9, 1988*, Berkeley, 212-230

Zervaki, F. 2011. 'Kastellorizo,' in *Islands off the Beaten Track*, 24-70.

Zervoudaki, I. 1972. 'Νίσυρος: Παλαιόκαστρον', *ArchDelt* 25, 518.

Zervoudaki, I. 1973. 'Οικόπεδα Χαστά - Μουσταφά Βογιατζή - Μιχ. Παπαγεωργίου', *ArchDelt* 25, 503-504.

Zervoudaki, I. 1977a. 'Μνημείον της Ασπίδος', *ArchDelt* 28, 637-640.

Zervoudaki, I. 1977b. 'Κως, Αντιμάχεια. Νεκρόπολις', *ArchDelt* 27, 683-5.

Zervoudaki, I. 1984a. 'Κεντρική Νεκρόπολη: Οικόπεδο Βασίλη Κριτσωτάκη', *ArchDelt* 32, 371-2.

Zervoudaki, I. 1984b. ‘Οικόπεδο Κωνστ. Ντάσκα - Μιχάλη Παρδαλού’, *ArchDelt* 32, 367-8.

Zervoudaki, I. 1985. ‘Οικόπεδο Πολίτου, Χατζηστρατή και Κουτσομανώλη (Ο.Τ. 352)’, *ArchDelt* 33, 402-3.

Zuiderhoek, A. 2009. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire*. New York: Cambridge University.