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Abstract

This project investigates the relationship between material culture and ethnic groups in Iron Age Thrace (northern Greece and southern Bulgaria). Within the past two decades, studies involving the investigation of ethnic identity have witnessed a persistent but low interest from archaeologists, with the last major pieces of work on the topic published in the late 1990s. It was, therefore, the purpose of this project to update these investigations concerning ethnicity and archaeology through an investigation of a ‘people’ who are often heavily couched in ethnic terms – the Thracians. From the perspective of the Greek authors and other contemporary ancient evidence, the Thracians have been inconsistently depicted both as a single ethnic group with shared customs and as a series of distinct groups with their own traditions and material culture. Therefore, it was the purpose of this project to assess the material basis of such ethnic claims made by the ancient historical authors using the corresponding archaeological evidence. Thus, building on past discursive and materially-focused approaches to ethnicity as began by Siân Jones (1997), a more archaeologically applicable method was created in order to deduce its existence in the past. Thus, through a renewed theoretical conceptualisation of ethnicity in the past, a new understanding of the ethnic makeup of Thrace and the Thracians could be offered and used to support the depictions ascertained from the ancient literary evidence. Overall, the project discovered that despite the ancient Greek authors inconsistently discussing the ethnicity of the groups in this area, it was found through the analysis of particularly funerary data that a much broader range of regional identities were in fact being expressed throughout the Early and Late Iron Ages (1200-300 B.C.).
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Who were the Thracians?
Chapter 1

Introduction

The mediating role that archaeology plays, bringing us closer to people in the ancient past, naturally encourages us to ask questions about those people: How did they live? How did they operate within their daily lives? And perhaps most pertinent of all, how did they see themselves?

It is clear from the perspective of Herodotus – arguably the first anthropologist – and indeed the broader Greek literary tradition of the 6th and 5th centuries B.C., that identities did matter and what customs people had, where they came from, and what they looked like defined almost everything about them.

Within contemporary scholarship, questions relating to the definition of social identities through the material record represent some of the most important and still disputed topics within archaeological theory today. However, archaeology and concepts of identity have in fact been long and established bedfellows, long before archaeology was even formalised into its own discipline. Together, material culture and theories of identity have been used to substantiate myths of origin and the rise of nation-states within the context of 19th and 20th century Europe (Kossina 1911; Jones 1997; Bailey 1998, 87-110; Trigger 1989).

The study of specifically ethnic identity, however, is a topic which has received both acceptance and wide-spread criticism from dozens of voices within various spheres of archaeological practice (Siapkas 2014; Hall 2002, 7-23; Broodbank 2004; Brather 2004). After much denouncing, theoretical developments concerning ethnicity and archaeology have come to a halt, with the last major publications on the topic now over two decades old. This thesis, therefore, aims at revitalising these old debates, using the archaeology of an area which has often been uncritically couched in ethnic terms – Thrace.
During the 5th century B.C. – a period of time where most of the literary evidence concerning the Thracians comes from – Thrace had many associations. In one sense, it was a place which was shrouded in mystery, being both on the edge of the Greek world and on the intersection between Europe and the Persian Empire. For some Athenians, Thrace also acted as place where one could escape the legal jurisdiction of the state (Thu. 5.26.5; Dem. 23.57-58), and the people who ruled this territory were caricatured and mocked in dramas like Euripides’ *Hecuba*, and were believed to be morally backwards, self-interested, and deceitful.¹

Despite this, Thrace maintained important political links with the Greek speaking world (Thu. 5.26.5; Hdt. 6.34). Athens itself granted citizenship to the Odrysian prince Sadocus, son of Sitalces in exchange for aiding in the expulsion of Perdiccas from the Thracian Chalcidice (Thuc. 2.29, 2.67). Indeed, it is clear that from at least the 5th century B.C., Thrace was in such popular demand that those who went often, gained the label the ‘Thrace-haunters’ or the θρᾳκοφοίται (Θρᾳκοφοίτης) which is introduced during the late 5th century, in Aristophanes’ lost comedy the *Gerytades* (Ath. 12.75; E. Hall, pers. comm.).² Whilst the term was used in a moment of jest, it is critical to acknowledge as it serves to underline that for many in the Greek-speaking world, Thrace played an active role within the popular imagination and this, as I shall argue, played a significant role in shaping their depictions – in both ancient texts and on pottery – which were so enthusiastically consumed.

Yet in many respects the Thracians still inhabit a peripheral position within the academic agendas of both Classics and Archaeology. Akin to the ‘Greeks’, the Thracians lie on the intersection between textual history and archaeology, which have critically dealt with notions of identity and ethnicity in fundamentally different ways (cf. J. Hall 1997, 111-142; 2002; S. Jones 1997). The construction of Thracian identity has, therefore, been dealt with from two different perspectives. Archaeologically, the Thracians are attributed to the Iron Age archaeology of Bulgaria which stops at the borders of Greece and Turkey. Within contemporary ancient literary evidence, however, the Thracians have been depicted using several tropes used to bind them as a group, which consisted

¹A good example of this can be seen in Euripides’ *Hecuba* where Agamemnon denounces the Thracian king Polymestor after he transgressed the Greek custom of harming his guest-friend, adding that ‘...to us Greeks this is an abominable deed’ (Eur. *Hec.* 1247-1248) (E. Hall 1989, 185-188).

²This has been translated into English as ‘Thrace-haunter’, ‘-traveller’, and ‘-frequenter’. The crux of the word is simply someone who often goes to Thrace. This point was first made by E. Hall in her talk, “Peisetairos, adventurer in Thrace: a New Reading of Aristophanes’ *Birds*” at the National Hellenic Research Foundation during 2016.
of shared customs or norms and mythical-progenitors. Therefore, a renewed analysis of these claims made by Greek authors and their reflection in the material record is an essential endeavour, particularly in order to ascertain the truth behind such claims.

1.1 Research Questions

Questions relating to the ethnic make-up of the Thracians and, more critically, to how ethnicity may be seen through the archaeological record are at the heart of this project. Several steps must be undertaken in order to achieve a convincing answer regarding these fundamental issues. Therefore, the first half of this thesis seeks to establish the ethnic claims made about them in both the ancient literary evidence and within recent archaeological discourse. More specifically, the first several chapters attempt to analyse the image of ‘the Thracian’, particularly in Chapter 2, where it is argued that – in reference to their ancient image – they were depicted through a series of ethnic tropes that emerged during the 5th century B.C. Thereafter, the thesis tackles the question of creating an archaeologically looser conceptualisation of ethnicity, which can be used in order to deduce whether or not there are archaeological definable ethnic groups in Thrace during the Iron Age, particularly against the backdrop of claims made by authors in the 5th century B.C. The merit of such an approach will be to understand whether or not there is truth behind ethnic claims made by ancient Greek historians that the Thracians were a consistent ethnic groups.

Building on the need for an updated review of ethnicity within archaeology and scholarship regarding the Thracians, this thesis consists of four core questions. My first research question is: ‘Were the Thracians an ‘ethnic group’, and what might this mean for how we think of them within both the archaeology and the ancient literary evidence?’.

This question is explicitly answered within Chapters 2, 3, and 8. In the first instance, in Chapter 2 I attempt to discern whether or not the extant surviving depictions of the Thracians adhere to a consistent Greek ethnic trope, and I question whether this has fundamentally influenced how we have perceived them through the surviving Greek texts. Building on this, I attempt to show that the Thracians have not only been depicted as ethnically inconsistent by ancient Greek authors, but in light of other contemporary evidence provided by Hansen and Nielsen’s (2004) The Inventory of Archaic and Greek Poleis and coins, their image loses further consistency and in fact hints at considerable ethnic diversity. Chapter 3 then takes a different, but no less relevant perspective
through the re-analysis of the concept of ethnicity within archaeology. Within this chapter, preparations are made for the discussion by defining how ethnic entities are to be understood through the material evidence. The chapter begins by discussing the historical precedence of such an approach, first by tracing its development in anthropology with the identification of ‘races’, and then its parallel development in archaeology beginning with the cultural historical paradigm. It is then within the discussion of Chapter 9 that these three perspectives – i.e., the literary image, the archaeological, and the theoretical – are brought together with the hopes of offering some answers in relation to the ethnic reality of the Thracians, and whether or not they can even be discussed in such ethnic terms.

My second research question is: ‘How can archaeology aid in the identification of ethnic groups?’ This question is explicitly answered in Chapter 3, where it is identified that ethnicity in the past is best defied through packages of overlapping material distributions and regional contextual variability. This approach builds on previous approaches as established by the likes of S. Jones (1997), and attempts to cleanse ethnicity of its attachment to descent as espoused by J. Hall (1997). The tools used as a consequence of this theoretical approach are then established within the methodology in Chapter 5, where it is stated why the funerary context is used as the main vehicle of analysis and why key variables have been chosen in order to discern the relationship between material culture and ethnic groups. It is then discussed in light of this, why the funerary context is parsed into different categories of analysis, each containing their own unique perspective of cultural variability. Other evidence is also considered in Chapter 5, where regional variabilities concerning religious spaces and pottery are analysed to preemptively signpost the extent of the diverse material cultural traditions around Thrace.

My third research question is: ‘How can a re-appraisal of the ancient literary evidence assist in this endeavour?’ This question specifically pertains to the material and literary symbiosis at the heart of this thesis which seeks to explore both the ancient literary and the archaeological record side-by-side as equals with different parts of the same story to tell. In Chapter 2, I reassess what we know about the Thracians through the ancient literary evidence and, as stated above, attempt to interrogate whether they conformed to a consistent Greek ethnic stereotype as expressed by Herodotus’ (8.144.2) famous passage. Beyond this, however, the second part of Chapter 2 assesses additional evidence contemporary with the ancient Greek authors as provided by the Copenhagen Polis
Project and coins in order to understand their image from alternative ancient perspective still outside of archaeology. Thereafter, in Chapter 9 I then compare both the results from the statistical and spatial analyses of funerary assemblages to the observations made in Chapter 3, in an attempt to assess the existence of ethnic groups in Thrace. This is perhaps the most critical endeavour of this thesis as it penetrates the heart of the existence of the ‘Thracians’ beyond their existence as a Greek literary ethnic trope, but more importantly it attempts to create a narrative of the Thracians based on both the archaeological and literary record without the exclusion of either tradition.

This brings me to my fourth and final research question: ‘Who were the Thracians?’ As the title of this thesis suggests, the existence of the Thracians has seldom been questioned, with the majority of discussions concerning them taking their existence at face value (cf. Archibald 1998; Owen 2000b). These conclusions will have additional and useful outcomes in terms of re-conceptualising the material basis for ethnic groups in the past, but will ultimately provide a more clearly articulated image of who these ancient peoples were within the developing historical narrative of the ancient world.

1.2 Scope of Research and Conceptual Problems

The chronological and geographical scopes of this thesis are of central importance in assessing the reality behind ethnic groups within Thrace. As shall be discussed later in this chapter, the often fragmentary nature of both Bulgarian and Greek archaeological narratives have left the area of Thrace historically incomplete. It was, therefore, the purpose of this study to try and bring together these separate historical entities, beginning with their archaeological narratives. The area of study here encompasses two modern-day countries – Greece and Bulgaria. Within the next section, I want to outline both the geographic scope that is under investigation here, but also the chronological sequence used. On this point of chronology in particular, I shall discuss some contemporary problems pertaining to Bulgarian Iron Age chronology and the difficulties in reconciling such chronologies with preexisting Greek ‘traditional’ chronologies.

1.3 Geographical Scope

Geographically speaking, the area that is called Thrace is divided up into three modern-day countries which hold claim to the term: Greece, Turkey, and Bulgaria (figure 1.1).
As shall be touched upon more within the next chapter, the modern-day limits of Thrace is a direct consequence of the turbulent political histories observed within the Balkans after the break-up of the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century.

Within antiquity, the geographic area is no less contested. Large parts of the Aegean coastal zone were inhabited by the Thracians as far west as the area south of modern-day North Macedonia and into parts of the Chalcidic Peninsula. Thus, where such ancient territories as Thrace ended and other historical territories as Macedonia began were in fact only delineated much later during the reign of Philip II of Macedon (Archibald 1998, 6). Confusing still is the fact that further north in Bulgaria, the beginning and end of the lands in which the Thracians inhabited is also less clear. Historically speaking, the ‘Thracians’ are thought to exist northwards to around the Danube, and into Romania with the Getae tribe (Hdt. 4.93) – who are largely ethnically ambiguous – to the Black Sea coast in the east, and west to around the Pirin and Rila mountain range in the

---

3Although this is in itself unclear. In documenting Thracian tribes who contributed to the Persian army during the battle of Thermopylae, Herodotus (7.185) documents the Chalcidic tribe. He refers to the tribe as a genos, presumably meaning a Thracian genos. Yet, confusingly, as C. Jones (1996, 318) notes, he also calls this tribe an ethnos elsewhere (Hdt. 8.127).
west. Yet, the area which is designated to contain ‘Thracian archaeology’ stretches beyond modern-day Bulgaria and extends northwards into modern-day Moldova and Ukraine (Melyoukova 1979). The presence of Thracians within the northern Black Sea region is a complicated matter as the material boundaries between northern ‘Thracian’ and ‘Scythian’ are blended, and idea in particular is explored in Melyoukova’s (1979) and Nikulitse’s (1987) pioneering studies on cultural symbiosis in the northern Black Sea region. The question of where the Thracians stop and the Scythians begin is also problematically compounded by the presence of a pottery sub-group known as the ‘Thracian group’ within Russian, Ukrainian, and Moldovan archaeology (Gavrilyuk 2010, 16-35; Kaizer et al. 2017). Put simply, not all those designated as ‘Thracians’ lived in Thrace, yet all of what was called ‘Thrace’ was indeed inhabited by people labelled as ‘Thracian’.

The area of study here, however, follows the curve of the Maritza river from Plovdiv and south into northern Greece where it becomes the Evros (figure 1.1). As I have stated above, Thrace was a geographically ‘grey-area’, the boundaries of which were blurred, therefore, this study includes large parts of the northern Aegean coastal zone that stretch beyond the boundaries of modern-day Greek Thrace and into areas of Greek Macedonia. This is done with the aim of reconciling the archaeological narratives of regions designated as ‘Thracian’ in both Greece and Bulgaria. Turkish Thrace was not included in this study because of time constraints needed to learn an additional third local language.

1.3.1 Chronological Range

Chronologically, Thrace provides an interesting historical contrast between other areas further south in terms of material continuity at the end of the second millennium B.C. Broadly speaking, the end of the Bronze Age around the Aegean is characterised by a series of wide-scale changes in material practices during LH IIIC (1350-1200 B.C.) (Coldstream 2001, 22; Demakopoulou 2003; Vitale 2006, 117-204). In Thrace, however, the all too familiar destruction horizons of the south are not present. Material practices that were established during the Late Bronze Age continue largely unchanged, with significant quantities of handmade ceramic types continuing well into the Late Iron Age (Whitley 2017, 36-47; Czyborra 2001; Gyuzelev 2005; 2008, 277-293; Shalaganova & Gotzev 1995). Yet, this phenomenon of continuity is problematised by the lack of

---

4Herodotus is unclear about whether the Getae are Thracian but speaks about them within his chapters on Thrace. In contrast, Menander (fr. 877) explicitly refers to the Getae as Thracian.
consistency concerning the many chronologies currently used to measure it.

This problem of continuity is compounded by additional Thracian ‘exceptionalisms’ regarding the lack of epigraphic and literary evidence which could provide useful crossover dates for the sequencing of Thrace. Therefore, its earliest chronologies were either cross-dated using Attic pottery (Filov 1934) or through the same cultural-historical methods as established by the likes of Montelius (Trigger 1989, 223-225) during the 19th century. Some of these earliest chronological frameworks for the Iron Age were attempted by Vulpe (1930) and Mikov (1938), on the basis of metal jewellery (cf. Archibald 1998, 26). Both Mikov and Vulpe independently attributed early discoveries of fibulae to the central European Hallstatt culture on the basis of similar finds from Romania (Vulpe 1930). Using this, Mikov managed to formatively date the Iron Age into two very broad periods, i.e., Early and Late, which endured as one of the main ways to compartmentalise the Thracian Iron Age for much of the 20th century (Mikov 1938; Archibald 1998).

It was not until the 1970s when a more stable chronological framework was eventually created using ceramic evidence discovered from the Early Iron Age horizons at the settlement of Pshenichevo during the early 1970s by M. Chichikova (1971). On stylistic grounds, Chichikova attributed the lowest ceramic layers of the settlement with urns of the Transylvanian Gava group, which placed it firmly within the Early Iron Age (Chichikova 1968, 18-19). These Pshenichevo styles consisted of biconical vases with narrow necks, horns, and horizontal incisions (which was visually similar to Schlieemann’s Buckelkeramik: cf. Wardle & Wardle 2007, 481-497; Bozhinova 2012; Archibald 1998, 29). On further analysis of slight changes in the later ceramic layers at the site, Chichikova further divided her chronology of the Iron Age into three phases, which she equated with the Hallstatt A-D periods, ranging in date from 1200-600 B.C (table 1.1) (cf. Hänsel 1976, 82ff; Archibald 1998, 27).

Today, however, it is generally understood that the beginning of the Early Iron Age between south and Aegean Thrace is characterised by what has been labelled as the Plovdiv-Zimmnici-Cherkovna (hereafter PZC) group, which was spread over the entirety

---

5Problematically, however, these early chronological attempts were firmly based on preexisting typologies, like those created by Blinkenberg (1926) for Greek fibulae. As I discuss later, critically Blinkenberg (1926) did not accommodate ‘Thracian-style’ fibulae into his classifications, which have only recently been revised by Buston (2019). Therefore, the parallels that Mikov (1938) was attempting to make were based on non-Thracian typologies. Although some very formative work had been conducted which drew parallels between central European and Bulgarian fibulae (see Dyakovich 1922).

6The pottery was identified as similar to examples found at Troy, which were named by Blegen (1958, 142ff) as ‘knobbed ware’, which came from the late prehistoric horizon (Troy VIIb2) dating to around 12th century B.C. (Archibald 1998, 29).
of Thrace during the transitional period between the end of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Early Iron Age (cf. Hänsel 1976, 204; Bozhinova 2012, 53). This PZC pottery was completely replaced during 1100 B.C. by what was called the Fluted Ware Horizon (Shalaganova & Gotzev 1995; Bozhinova 2012, 53). Within the past two decades, however, the Fluted Ware Horizon has been further partitioned into phases 1 and 2 after excavations of the transitional horizons at sites like Ada Tepe (Bozhinova 2012, 53), Kush Kaya (Popov 2009), and Smercheto (Bozhinova 2012, 53). Broadly speaking, by the 10th century B.C., it is now accepted that the Fluted Ware Horizon was replaced by the Pshenichevo group. Akin to these discoveries – which resulted in the partitioning of the Fluted Ware Horizon – excavations from sites such as Malkoto Kale (Domaradzki et al. 1991), Ada Tepe (Bozhinova 2012), and Chala (Bozhinova 2002) confirmed Chichikova’s (1971) original chronological divisions, by revealing distinct stylistic Pshenichevo sequences, which were subsequently labelled Pshenichevo 1-3 (Bozhinova 2012, 58).

Currently, there is a shared consensus that the Early Iron Age in Thrace is divided largely into two broad periods; the Early part which is characterised by the Fluted Ware Horizon and the Late part which is characterised by the development of the Pshenichevo group. Yet, despite this broad understanding of the development of the Iron Age, recent reappraisals of these chronologies have brought to light minor discrepancies between them. For example Bozhinova (2012), who recently reengaged with an assessment of the traditional Thrace-wide chronology, characterised the beginning of the Early Iron Age with two separate ‘Fluted horizons’. Yet, as pointed out by Nechrizov and Tzvetkova (2018, 18-19), these horizons do not occur during this time at sites like Ada Tepe and Gluhite Kameni in south eastern Thrace, where over 90 percent of the transitional Bronze/Early Iron Age pottery is characterised by a large amount of undecorated ceramics, with a very minor proportion Fluted material. In addition, Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1982, 135ff) also discovered evidence of ‘Fluted Ware’ within the transitional/Early Iron Age phases on Thasos, yet she critically rejected the idea that this represented a shared cultural horizon between Thrace and Thasos, and therefore discounted it as being part of the corresponding transitional phase.

Outside the Early Iron Age, the Late Iron Age has been identified by Bulgarian academics with the introduction of wheel-made grey monochrome pottery, which is thought to be introduced from the east, specifically through Anatolia (Nikov 1999; 2001; 2012).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Phanaridovo 3</th>
<th>EIA II 2</th>
<th>Period III</th>
<th>Ha D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period II</td>
<td>Phanaridovo 2</td>
<td>EIA II</td>
<td>Period II</td>
<td>Ha C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Phanaridovo 1</td>
<td>EIA I</td>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Ha B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Fluted Ware Horizon 2</td>
<td>EIA I</td>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Ha B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Fluted Ware Horizon 1</td>
<td>EIA I</td>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>Ha A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Table showing the multiple traditional chronologies still used in Iron Age Thrace, and their relative to one another (after Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018, 18)
Figure 1.2: Comparative example of the numerous chronological sequences created for the Thracian Iron Age (after Bozhinova 2012, 72)
Disappointingly, however, there has been no formal attempt to study this pottery phenomenon in its entirety which limits the extent to what we can use it to mark the development of the Late Iron Age. Nevertheless, aside from grey-ware pottery, the Late Iron Age represents a notable period within the historical transition of Thrace, as it is marked by the large-scale consumption and reproduction of Greek styles, like stamped amphora, Attic ceramics, and imported Greek fine-wares. Overall, the period of transition between the Early Iron Age and Late Iron Age is marked by an increase in contact between Thracian and Greek communities. As Bozhinova (2012, 61) adds, this period is marked by its rapid change in material traditions which now characterises the periods after the 6th century B.C.

1.3.2 Chronological Syncretism: Developments to the South

Since a large part of Thrace is situated in Greece, it is worth here briefly stressing the completely different chronological typologies applied to the archaeology of Greek Thrace. In contrast the archaeological chronologies used to measure temporal change in Bulgaria – a country which was arguably proto- or even neo-historic until the development of Glagolitsa (Bulgaria’s own alphabet system) during the 9th century A.D. – Greece’s historical development is very much tied, amongst other things, to its literary record.

Broadly speaking, the periods of time this thesis is concerned correspond to four chronological periods within Greece: the Early Iron Age (1000-700 B.C.), the Archaic period (700 – 480 B.C.), the Classical period (480 – 300 B.C.), and the Hellenistic period (300-onwards). Yet, there are further sub-divisions even within these four phases. The Early Iron Age is subdivided into the Protogeometric and Geometric (early, middle, and late), and the Archaic period is pushed later by the occurrence of localised phenomena like the ‘Orientalising period’ (particularly on Crete) and the Protocorinthian and Protoattic pottery traditions.

Essentially, however, Greek chronology relies on the dated methods of stylistic analysis and literary cross-dating in order to create its chronological narrative. Broadly speaking, the dates of the Greek chronological system are attributed to the relative changing stylistic sequence of Athenian, Euboean, Corinthian, and Cretan pottery since the 11th century B.C. building on the foundations of works which treated them – perhaps problematically – as works of art that warranted connoisseurship (cf. Cook 1935; Desborough 1952; Coldstream 1968). These chronologies created as a result of this con-
noisseurship were then used against the literary and epigraphic evidence in order to produce a date. For example, an Athenian Panathenaic amphora was discovered in a grave near Philopappus Hill in Athens which had the name of the archon Asteius inscribed on it, as a result Classical Archaeologists were able to obtain a *terminus post quem* for its context through the name of the archon, yet it also allowed for the style of the amphora to be recorded and chronologically placed within the wider typology of Classical Attic ceramics (Snodgrass 2006; Robinson 1910, 422). Beyond pottery, other chronological frameworks have been attempted using objects such as sculpture (Richter 1970, xiii, 118-119, 193; 1968). Yet to use this as a marker of temporal change, on the basis of style alone, presents serious issues concerning chronological resolution and reliability.

Local pottery traditions, therefore, which have been used to verify chronologies in Bulgaria, and the connoisseur influenced and text-based chronological sequences of Greece have produced a significant chronological gap between Greek and Bulgarian archaeologies, and this has had direct implications for the sequencing of Thrace as a whole. Indeed the problem which faces chronologies in Thrace now are is in how they can be combined and used together in order to successfully help date a region which has been historically split in terms of its archaeological background.

### 1.3.3 Chronology Used Within This Study

This thesis, therefore, attempts to side-step many problems found within ‘traditional’ chronologies by building on one that integrates radiocarbon samples from various sites around north and south Bulgaria (Ada Tepe, Gluhite Kamani, Stambolovo, Kazanlak, Svilengrad, and Dolno Cherkovishte), published in an innovate paper by Nechrizov and Tzvetkova (2018). The 47 samples (which were from a mixture of bones, seeds, and charcoal) were dated using AMS (Accelerator Mass Spectrometry) between 2011 and 2012. Based on C14 dates, therefore, this thesis shall attempt to align itself more with this chronology as an alternative to other traditional chronologies, which have proved to be regionally dependent and subjective. Table 2 shows the results of Nechrizov and Tzvetkova’s (2018) calibrated dates in connection with the relative dates from Early-Late Iron Age of Thrace that shall be used hereafter. The ‘site’ column represents the corresponding phases where dating samples were taken. Sites represented with an ‘N/A’ signify C14 dates that have not been obtained but instead traditional means of
chronology have been used in lieu of radiocarbon data. The date of the Late Iron Age is taken from using the Early Iron Age II as a terminus post quem, and the Hellenistic phase from Ada Tepe phase IV as terminus ante quem.

The chronology of this thesis has used data provided by Nechrizov and Tzvetkova’s (2018) study as a starting point to help divide the phases under investigation. As a result, the chronology here has been cut into three broad periods, the Early Iron Age I (1100-1000 B.C.), Early Iron Age II (800-700 B.C.), and the Late Iron Age (400-300 B.C.). This chronology is, however, far from complete and gaps persist between each of the periods due to an uneven amount of published evidence. I have attempted to overcome this by broadening out the chronological brackets of each of the three periods, but in doing so, I am aware that it presents additional risks in terms of misidentifying temporal change for regional material variations. Yet, the merits of this chronology should be understood in reference to its attempts to combine – at least provisionally – two long separated archaeological traditions, i.e. Bulgaria and Greece. Table 1.3 displays the chronology used within this thesis in comparison with the corresponding historical periods and pottery styles used within the chronological sequences in the south.

This chronology is not without risk, however. Radiocarbon dates should not be taken completely at face value as we cannot overlook problems concerning the so-called Hallstatt Plateau (cf. Hamilton et al. 2015; Cunliffe 2005, 652). Concerning the above chronology, the period which corresponds to the this plateau is problematically only supported by a single datable sample which comes from pit.204 from the Svilengrad Pit Sanctuary (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018, 35-36). In order to remedy this, I have correlated the date with Chichikova’s (1971) Period II, Toncheva’s (1980) Period II, and Bozhinova’s (2012) Pshenichevo 2, with a cut-off date of 700 B.C. thereby forming a period I designated as the ‘Early Iron Age II’. This period, therefore, relies more heavily on the presence of more traditional chronologies to aid in its definition, which under-mines problems caused by the plateau. The dating of the Late Iron Age is also hampered...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Site (Phase)</th>
<th>Years B.C.</th>
<th>Absolute 1 $\sigma$ cal B.C.</th>
<th>Absolute 2 $\sigma$ cal B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Stambolovo II</td>
<td>3129 ± 28</td>
<td>1436-1321</td>
<td>1493-1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ada Tepe I</td>
<td>2980 ± 30</td>
<td>1260-1130</td>
<td>1372-1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Ada Tepe II</td>
<td>2931 ± 12</td>
<td>1189-1115</td>
<td>1208-1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gluhite Kamani II</td>
<td>2946 ± 11</td>
<td>1158-1109</td>
<td>1184-1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>EIA I</td>
<td>Ada Tepe III</td>
<td>2880 ± 30</td>
<td>1111-1012</td>
<td>1192-939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolno Cherkovishte I</td>
<td>2885 ± 30</td>
<td>1111-1017</td>
<td>1193-946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stambolovo III</td>
<td>2871 ± 20</td>
<td>1058-999</td>
<td>1109-987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazanlak I</td>
<td>2850 ± 40</td>
<td>1071-932</td>
<td>1120-910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stambolovo IV</td>
<td>2798 ± 22</td>
<td>975-908</td>
<td>999-899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gluhite Kamani III</td>
<td>2730 ± 30</td>
<td>901-836</td>
<td>930-812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>EIA II</td>
<td>Gluhite Kamani IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ada Tepe IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Svilengrad I</td>
<td>2700 ± 40</td>
<td>895-812</td>
<td>921-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kralevo I</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>LIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Ada Tepe IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Table showing the calibrated c14 dates obtained from a number of LBA-EIA sites around Bulgaria (after Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018, 37)
by the absence of any radiocarbon dates which makes its chronological definition rather transient, especially as there has been no systematic effort to define it within academic literature (see earlier). Despite this, I have dated this period – through the presence of grey ware pottery and Greek ceramic imports – to around 400-300 B.C., which directly corresponds with Nechirzov and Tzvetkova’s (2018, 37) ‘Hellenistic’ period. The chronology within this thesis is far from perfect, and features a few substantial holes, however, if we do not engage with developments concerning radiocarbon dates, then we cannot hope to more accurately date the archaeology of the Thracian Iron Age.

Lastly, it ought to be mentioned here that there have been recent C14 dates published from the Protogeometric and Geometric layers from Sindos, a tell settlement on the north-western fringes of the Chalcidic Peninsula (Gimatzidis & Weninger 2020). Notably, the results showed that instead of beginning around 1050 B.C., the Late Protogeometric was pushed forward to around 950 B.C. and the Late Geometric period – which we presumed began after 870 B.C. – was also pushed forward by over a century to around 750 B.C. Critically, these results will inevitably have considerable ramifications for how we chronologically place monuments within Thrace. Concerning this study, the dates ascertained from Sindos helpfully correspond to my Early Iron Age II period – albeit roughly – from the Middle to Late Geometric (800-700 B.C) without the need for revision. Nevertheless, with an increasing amount of radiocarbon dates being taken from sites in northern Greece and southern Bulgaria, it can be hoped that soon both sides will come together in an attempt to create a Thrace-wide chronology using the growing number of C14 dating currently underway.

1.3.4 Conceptual Problems: Greek Colonisation

Finally, before any sort of analysis concerning potential ethnic groups in Thrace, the topic of colonisation needs to be briefly mentioned as it had significant influence on the resulting material traditions in the region after the 5th century B.C.10 Broadly speaking,

---

10As has been succinctly argued by Osborne (1998, 392), the term colony is certainly a disputed one. I will not here discuss the reasons why Greeks sent out settlers beyond their mother cities. This has, however, been the subject of a number of fruitful debates and publications (see. Malkin 2016a;
it is recognised that earliest colonial efforts within the context of Aegean Thrace began between the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., which consisted of the Parian invasion of Thasos (ca. 680-670 B.C.) and the Clazomenian invasion of the Thracian coast to establish the colony of Abdera (ca. 656-652 B.C) and Samothrace (ca. 660-640 B.C.). These early colonial efforts, as has been discussed at length by Osborne (1998, 373), seemed to have been the motivated by the efforts of the demos, but largely orchestrated with the backing of a grandee, and several of these early colonial enterprises in Thrace have been documented by contemporary and later authors, particularly in reference to the violent encounters between colonial and precolonial communities (Plut. Per.11.5,19.1; Kim.7.1–3; Thuc. 1.98.1; 4.102.2–4; Hdt.5.123-125).

Problematically, however, difficulties concerning the dating of these early colonial endeavours still remain. Concerning Thasos, most early assumptions were based, perhaps too eagerly on Archilochus’ account of the Parian invasion (see in particular Graham 1978). Yet, as has been pointed out by Owen (2003), the date of these fragmentary written testimonies are not secure themselves, and oddly they fashion an image of the Thracians that is more consistent with the period after the Persian invasions (see Chapter 3). Archaeologically, the earliest evidence for the foundation of Thasos was first published by Bernard (1964), which was followed by a more in-depth discussion of its significance by Graham (2001). The key discovery identified by Bernard concerned stratigraphic layers X and Y within Sondage 1, located between the Dionysion and Artemison within the later city. The stratigraphy showed that the earliest Greek-associated layers from the island were indicated after the destruction of an pre-colonial building which was found in Sondage 1. The terminus post quem for the occupation – as revised by Graham (1978, 64-65) – was 680 B.C. based both on the post-destruction horizon of Sondage 1, but also based on literary evidence which, problematically, was already chronologically unstable (Owen 2003). Despite Graham’s reliance on the literary record, which he used to support his revision of Bernard’s dates, we can assume at least a mid-7th century date for the foundation of Thasos based on the appearance of G 2-3 ware from within the same deposit.11 This would make the Greek settlement on Thasos as near contemporary with

---

2016b; Osborne 1998). Archaic Greek settlements seem to have been much more the result of trial and error, rather than operated as well-defined enterprises. As has been shown, early Greek apoikia featured irregular plans, independent trade sources, and variable levels of interaction with pre-existing communities.

11 This is supported by the discovery of two Protocorinthian aryballoi found in the excavations in the sanctuary of Athena, which can be dated between 650-630 B.C. if Neeft’s (1987) dating of the aryballoi is to be taken as accurate (Graham 2001, 374).
the early/mid-7th century B.C. colonisation of Samothrace, as assigned by Lehmann (1952, 35), based on the discovery of G 2-3 ware in a ‘sacrificial deposit’ situated in the north western end of the temenos in what later would become the Sanctuary of the Great Gods.\[12\] Greek colonisation of the area of the Thracian coast can be thought of as a 7th century phenomenon, and this important to remember, particularly in Chapter 9, where evidence to support the material basis for ancient ethnicity is discussed in light of diachronic social changes taking place in the region as a result of colonisation.

Yet it is also critical to note that Greek contact with Thrace did not begin with colonisation, and in fact has much older Bronze Age antecedents. More specifically, recent excavations within the context of the northern Aegean have provided strong evidence to support the opinion that communities during the Late Bronze Age were engaging in long-distance trade with the south; as evident with the discovery of Mycenaean pottery at the fortified settlements of Asar Tepe, Kastri, Maronia Cave, and Phaia Petra (Tiverios 2008, 66-68; Baralis 2008, 107-112). After the Bronze Age, these engagements seem to have endured, which is represented by the presence of the 8th-7th century G 2-3 ware phenomenon (discussed later), which has been discovered at the earliest colonial levels of Samothrace, Thasos, Neapolis, and Eion (Ilieva 2016; 2020).

As I shall demonstrate within Chapter 8, the arrival of Greek colonists into the north Aegean fundamentally changed the methods and grave-goods surrounding the funerary context. New traditions were started and old ones modified or forgotten, and we know that these pre-colonial communities living in Thrace were influenced outside of the funerary context as well. Epigraphic evidence found at both Samothrace, Mesembria, and Zonē demonstrate that the arrival of Greek-speaking communities brought with them not just new ceramic styles, but also literacy (Tsatsopoulou 1989; Brixhe 2006; Graham 2002). These new relationships – at least on Samothrace and Zonē – seem to have been formed on the basis of cooperation rather than enmity.\[13\] And I shall return to the theme of Greek colonisation periodically throughout this thesis as it had considerable enduring legacies on the archaeology of the region after their establishment, and also prompted secondary responses from neighbouring communities further north.

\[12\] The dates ascertained for the G 2-3 ware phenomenon originate from their discovery at Troy. The findings were discovered just before the horizon of Troy VIII, which was dated to the early half of the 7th century B.C. (Bernard 1964, 106; contra Cook 1973).

\[13\] Although I would not go as far to say that this relationship was peaceful as insinuated by J. Pouilloux (1982, 95-100) who uses Thracian names recorded on Late Classical Thassian inscriptions as evidence of marriage and, therefore, peaceful cohabitation between Greeks and Thracians, contrary to the disputed image provided by Archilochus’ account (Archil. fr. 5).
Chapter 2

The Thracians: An Ancient Literary Perspective

I begin, here, the investigation into Thracian ethnicity through an examination of their the ancient image and the tropes used to depict them. This is a critical endeavour particularly as the ancient texts are in many ways responsible for laying the proverbial groundwork for our current conceptions of these ancient communities. Yet, despite the large body of work which has sought to investigate the more general image of the ‘barbarian’ within Greek literature particularly through opposition, the specific image of the ‘Thracian’ has yet to be formally examined.¹ Within this chapter, therefore, I will demonstrate that despite being depicted through a series of ethnic tropes that Greek-speakers used to conceptualise distinct social groups, i.e., manufacturing common myths of descent and sharing of cultural behaviours (for full discussion on these factors see R. Thomas (2000, 102ff; 2001, 213-218)), the tropes used to bind the Thracians actually serve to underline their messy diversity rather than their unity as a whole ethnic group. I shall also show that this is further supported by other contemporary evidence as documented on coins and findings from Hansen and Nielsen’s (2004) An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis (hereafter IACP).

In sum then, the chapter has two purposes; firstly, it begins by exploring Greek conceptualisations of the Thracians as presented through the ancient literary evidence, and particularly through external ethnic tropes like mythic descent and culture. Secondly, the chapter turns to look at other non-archaeological sources of information, contem-

¹For more work on the image of the barbarian within Greek antiquity see: E. Hall (1989) and Said (1984, 27). Concerning the Scythians, see Hartog (1988).
porary with the ancient authors, in order to support the diversity behind the ancient literary evidence.

2.1 Terminology

Within this first section of the chapter, it is worth establishing what is meant around particular terms that have often been implicated within discussions surrounding ancient identities, specifically *ethnos* and *genos* and how these terms link to our concept of ethnicity. This is of critical importance to undertake here, as there seems to still be much confusion towards how each of these terms link to one another, and how they relate to ancient formulations of identity. This will not be an exhaustive discussion, however, as this topic has been touched on before but is worth briefly mentioning (on this topic see with reference J. Hall (2002, 192-195), Fraser (2009, 1-11), and McInerney (2001, 51ff).

2.1.1 Ethnos and Ethnicity: uncomfortable bedfellows

Within any publication that deals with identity in ancient Greece, the word *ethnos* is always lurking in the background (see Sollors 1996, 2-12, introduction for a lengthy discussion on this and its modern equivalents in anthropology). The word itself has been translated to have two basic meanings, and each of them have slightly different relationships within our concept of ethnicity. More specifically, *ethnos* has been used to characterise both generic groups of things (cf. Il. 2.87, 459, 469), and to distinguish between different types of socio-political organisations centred on a civic centre (Hansen 2004, 39-42 with references; Morgan 2003, 4-10; and for basic reading Fraser 2009, 1-11). There is, thus, no one meaning of the word *ethnos*, and this has historically caused problem when equating it with our concept of ethnicity. This difficulty in adequately translating the term *ethnos* into English without losing its socio-political complexity, offers further proof of its susceptibility to misinterpretation, and this relates to a central problem concerning the concept, that is *ethnos* has often been used in previous scholarship as *de facto* proof of ethnic groups in the past and this, of course, is not correct. Indeed, looking for ethnic groups in the past through *ethnos* is part of an ongoing intellectual fallacy which circles the same four self-serving points (figure 2.1).
At this point, we may ask ‘what is an ethnos’? The answer is not easily explainable and needs to be cut into two halves surrounding its dual meaning. On the one hand, the term has been used since Homer to group common beings of things like animals (Il. 2.87, 459, 469), band of young men (Il. 13.495), or even corpses (Od. 10.526); and on the other hand, ethnos has been used as a socio-political framework, through which people have been characterised living both as part of a polis (i.e., Thuc. 1.18) and scattered within non-nucleated settlements (i.e., the Thracians who are defined as living as an ethnos living kata komē, Xen. Anab. 7.1.13).²

On the other hand, despite its loose links with our modern term, groups that have been designated as being ‘ethne’ (the plural of ethnos) – rather confusingly – are also often labelled as part of a genos, which comes from the verb γίγνεσθαι (‘to be born’ or ‘become’) (Hall 1997, 34-35).³ In slight contrast from ethnos, the term genos has stronger semantic emphasis on shared descent.⁴ According to Fraser (2009, 5-6), whilst

²Although Plato (Laws 636c) uses komē as a Doric form of the Attic demes, in this respect it could be thought of as forming part of a polis. Snodgrass (1980, 40-41) interprets the ethnos to be the existence of an older ‘tribal’ system into historic periods. However, in agreement with both McInerney (2001, 56) and to an extent Morgan (2003, 9), despite Snodgrass’ original hypothesis regarding the ethnos, recent reappraisals of the term have highlighted its nuance which was prone to local exceptions (see especially McInerney 2001, 55-57).

³Interestingly, genos only occurs once in the Iliad (2.851-2) and it is in reference to a pack of mules, which would indicate that its use as a way to additionally define members of an ethnos group to be a later invention (Fraser 2009, 3-4). For more discussion on the development of genos in post-Homeric society see (Fraser 2009).

⁴Yet a final third word should be noted concerning the disambiguation of Greek ethnic terms – the phyle (φυλή). The term itself, akin to ethnos and genos, has a particularly broad range of meanings.
ethnos is a common classification of beings, genos operates in respect to inherited descent or inheritable civic membership. However, and rather unhelpfully, the use of the term during the 5th century defies any sort of consistency, and in a similar way to ethnos, genos has been used to describe inherited kingships (Arist. Pol. 1285a, 1313a10), a pack of mules (Hdt. 4.29), and or a clan-like group (Hdt. 1.125).

On this note, the Thracians themselves were not immune to changes and fluctuations concerning their ‘ethnic’ labels by Greek authors. Prior to the end of the 5th century B.C., the Thracians are consistently referred to as an ethnos, which as I mentioned earlier, classifies the Thracians as a common group, rather than one sharing descent. Herodotus himself even conceptualised the Thracians to form a single ethnos (Hdt. 5.3) due to their shared nomoi, which I shall discuss in the next section. However, by the end of the 5th century, Aristotle (Prob. 911a), Plato (Laws 637), and even Euripides (Erech. 1085-190) begin referring to the Thracians as a genos. This attempt to articulate an inherited relationality amongst the Thracians is a marked change from their prior designation as a simple ethnos yet, as I shall argue later, is unsurprising given the literary precedence in attributing mythic origins to groups of people. Thus, ethnos and genos are not simple and easily definable terms, and in many respects these terms have been victims to the changes and fluctuations of Greece’s ethno-political history which heavily and influenced these concepts, particularly in Athenian terms as a result of Cleisthenes’ legislative reforms.

Among its definitions are ‘clan’, a ‘race’, or ‘tribe’. More specifically, the term has been used by Herodotus to refer to the Dorian tribes (Hdt. 5.96), to the Ionic tribes (including Athenians) (Hdt. 5.69), and the Laconian tribes (Hdt. 4.145). Confusingly, the term has also been used to refer to the new and somewhat arbitrary groupings established by Cleisthenes at the end of the 6th century B.C. (Pol. 3.1275b; Ath. Pol. 21).

The conflation of the term genos to clan clarifies its meaning, especially when Herodotus (1.56-7) refers to the Attic nation as a ethnos, which is also an Ionic (Pelasgian) genos. Genos here acts within a similar respect to Scottish clanships; whereby membership and descent from a mythical progenitor is ascribed through birth, principally from the father (Smith 1986, 21; Adam 1952, 396-401).
Nevertheless, we are still left with the question: how does *ethnos* relate to ethnicity? And can we (as modern 21st century researchers) speak of an ancient ethnicity (figure 2.2)? The short answer is, yes. Without wanting to fall into the circular argument above, the very origin of our word ethnicity comes from the ancient Greek word *ethnos*. The two are, therefore, invariably connected. However – and this is the crucial point – it is the types of groups that each of these two historically separated words refer to that differ. Whilst *ethnos* is both a classifier of a group who possess common characteristics and of the same socio-political organisation, our modern term ethnicity has specific participatory cultural implications which the ancient word *ethnos* does not necessarily possess.\(^6\) For example, for the classical authors, *ethnos* was often used as a loose classification when describing both specific tribal groups (e.g., Thuc. 1.18) and more generally ‘peoples’ (like the Thracians Hdt. 5.3). The ascription of *ethnos*, therefore, was purely for, in the words of McInerney (2001, 56) “...a group that thinks of itself as a ‘people’.” This is not to suggest that the two do not overlap, of course they do. People who have aligned themselves into the same socio-political group often also participate in repro-

---

\(^6\)See for a more recent discussion on the specific performative and specifically cultural aspects of ethnic groups in Brubaker’s (2004) *Ethnic Groups Without Boundaries*. Brubaker’s conceptualisation of ethnicity, which I shall elaborate on in the next chapter, emphasises that ethnicity is found in the doing-ness of identity, and that contrary to former studies on the topic, is not a pre-existing quality of groups.
ducing the same ethnic symbols as part of expressing their membership and solidarity (Morgan 2009, 21; Smith 1986, 22-32). Thus, whilst an *ethnos* does relate to our concept of ethnicity, the two operate differently and they do not need to exist simultaneously to occur. Put simply, not all *ethne* are ethnic^7^ nor are all ethnic groups necessarily *ethne*.^8^ Thus, the overlap between *ethnos* and ethnic is often subtle, but not without historical precedence. Within this next section, I will briefly discuss some of the ways through which ancient authors have characterised the Thracians as an inconsistent ethnic group, against the backdrop of Herodotus’ often cited (8.144) passage, which focuses specifically on culture (*nomos*) and descent (*homaimon*) as the two critical criteria necessary for a common identity group. These themes are critical for how the Thracians have been remembered today and offer a useful starting point in separating the etic constructions of these communities through a deeper textual analysis.

### 2.2 The Thracians, identity, and Herodotus (8.144)

Since the 1980s, but more consistently within the last two decades, it has been argued that the 5th century marked a definitive shift concerning how Greek-speaking communities articulated aspects of their shared identity (cf. Long 1986, 132; Hall 2002, 175). As framed by J. Hall (2002) as the partial impetus for shifts in ethnic conceptualisation, the Persian invasions acted as a type of ‘cultural reset’ for Greeks, both concerning their own unified Hellenic identity, but also the identity of the ‘other’, or more specifically the unified archetype of the anti-Greek, i.e., the barbarian. As Thucydides (1.3.3) himself notes in reflection, the label ‘barbarian’ is conspicuously absent within the writings of Homer because – as he hypothesises – there was no such category as Greek (or Hellen) against which it might be contrasted. Yet, Skinner (2012, 14) frames this event in a slightly different way, and attributes these changes to a wider literary shift prompted by the burgeoning interest in ethnography by Greek authors as playing a significant role in inventing and simultaneously defining both Greek and other. Consensus between classicists today, however, largely agree of the significance the image of the ‘barbarian’ had for Greeks during the construction of their own burgeoning identity (E. Hall 1989; J. Hall 2002; Vidal-Naquet 1997).

---

^7^Socrates calls the rhapsodes an *ethnos* (McInerney 2001, 55), and see Homers’ use of the term earlier.

^8^In this instance I would refer to Herodotus’ classification of the Thracian elites who participate in claiming common descent from Hermes, but are not described as being a separate elite ethnos (see Hdt. 5.7).
From the perspective of J. Hall (2002, 175) it was more than a coincidence that representations of barbarians dramatically increased during the period immediately after the Persian invasions. Evidence relating to this is also observed concerning the surviving Attic tragedies of the 5th century, all of which feature the depiction of a ‘barbarian’ character (see also. E. Hall 1989, 70-73; J. Hall 2002, 175). Likewise, this is explicitly true for Euripidean tragedy, where, according to Said (1984, 27), the term ‘barbarian’ was so common that it was references in over 100 instances (see also J. Hall 2002, 177). Interestingly, it also seems that the Thracians were also no less immune to this post-Persian appetite for the anti-Greek, and exhibit a similar explosion in terms of literary references during and after the 5th century (table 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work (abbriv)</th>
<th>Century B.C.</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesiod</td>
<td>Res. Op.</td>
<td>8th-7th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Hom. Il; Od.</td>
<td>8th-7th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeric Hymns</td>
<td>Hom. Hymn.</td>
<td>8th-7th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td>Aesch. Cho; Pers; PV.</td>
<td>6th-5th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>Hdt.</td>
<td>5th century B.C.</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>Eur. Alc; Hec; Rhes.</td>
<td>5th century B.C.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>5th century B.C.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>Ar. Ach; Ran; Lys; Pox; Vesp.</td>
<td>5th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysias</td>
<td>Lys.</td>
<td>5th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates</td>
<td>Isoc.</td>
<td>5th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>Xen. Anab; Cyr; Hell; Vect.</td>
<td>5th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>Pl. Alc; Chrm; Hp. Mai; Ion; Resp; Thl.</td>
<td>5th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschines</td>
<td>Aeschin.</td>
<td>4th century B.C.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>Arist. Ath. Pol; Pol; Rh.</td>
<td>4th century B.C.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycurgus</td>
<td>Lycurg.</td>
<td>4th century B.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>4th century B.C.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Table showing the total number of uses of the word ‘Thracian’ and its cognates within ancient Greek literature from Hesiod to Demosthenes

Yet in part, a portion of this Thraco-mania may have in fact been due to their conspicuousness within the Athenian population itself. In agreement with J. Hall (2002, 186), we are told from several sources during the 5th century that Athens had a considerably large resident non-citizen community (for more on metics in Athens see Akrigg 2015; Whitehead 1977). The most referenced of these sources is a census taken by

---

9 Of course this may in part be due to the preservation bias. A large amount of Euripides’ work has survived which refer to barbarians, but it could also be indication of how entrenched the image of the ‘barbarian’ had become.

10 The data collected to create table 2.1 was taken from the Perseus under PiloLogic online web resource. The results included cognates of the word ‘Thrace’ or ‘Thracian’ since Homer. Variations counted include Θρᾷξ, Θρᾴκη, Θρῆιξ, Θράκιος, Θρᾷσσα and more archaic forms from Homer such as Θρῄκη, Θρήϊξιν, and Θρῃίκιος. Notably, among these archaic forms were two invented terms which are found once in both the Iliad and the Odyssey which highlighted intentional direction to and from Thrace – Θρῄκηνδε (to Thrace; Od. 8.361) and Θρῄκηθεν (from Thrace; Il. 9.32).
Demetrius of Phalerum during the end of the 4th century B.C. who records 10,000 metics (μέτοικος) and 40,000 slaves (οἰκέτης) residing in Athens (Ath. 272c). The true size of this community is still the subject of debate, but we can assume it was large, and indeed, was the source of considerable anxiety, reflected in the tightening of citizenship reforms from Cleisthenes and then during the 5th century with Pericles’ reforms (Whitehead 1977, 81).11 Yet, concerning the Thracians, this obviously did not seem to include the Athenian elite; Themistokles’ mother was a Thracian aristocrat Abrotonum (Plut. Them. 1.1-2), and Miltiades’ second wife was the Thracian princess Hegesipyle (Hdt. 6.39). Indeed, Thucydides himself had close ties with Thrace, and we know from his own account that he operated gold mines within the region (Thuc. 4.105.1), and allegedly his own father Olorus was of Thracian descent, being related to Kimon who was the son of Thracian royalty (Plut. Vit. Cimon. 4.1-2; Paus. 1.23.9; Kennedy 2014, 79, 88). Yet, during Thucydides’ own lifetime, this Thracian heritage never seems to be a point of contention. Additional evidence of Athens’ 5th century Thracian presence also comes from the significant rise in depictions of Thracians on Athenian pottery, which depicts them through their distinctive clothing and tattoos (Tsiafakis 2000; 2015) (figures 2.3 and 2.4).12 This is not to suggest, however, that depictions of the Thracians suddenly appeared during the 5th century, rather that they were popularised during the period (see. table 2.1). There are in fact several literary accounts of Thracians that extend back before the 5th century. Beginning with Homer (Il. 2, 844-850; 5, 461-462; 6, 7-8; 130-140; 10, 433-511; 11, 221-263; 20, 484-485; Od. 9, 39-66; 197-212) Thrace was depicted as a particularly prosperous land, ruled by a single warrior king, Rhesus. Outside of poetry we only have two specific fragments concerning the Thracians. We know from the perspective of the earliest colonial efforts in the region – i.e., the Parian colonisation of Thasos – that colonist faced additional struggles framed in Archilochus’ poetry when one member of the local Saian tribe (a Thracian tribe) stole his shield (Archil. frag 5).13 Another instance is from Xenophanes (frag. 16) who says that the Thracian gods look like the Thracians with red hair and blue eyes.

Contemporary with the rise in pictorial references to Thrace, the 5th century also

---

11 It has been argued by both Whitehead (1977) and later by Blok (2009) that these reforms were introduced mainly to prohibit the dilution of the Athenian citizen body, through mixed metic-Athenian marriages.

12 The subject of Thracian tattoos also featured as part of an exhibition in 2016 held at the Museum of Archaeology in Sofia, entitled: A Mirror of Time: Female Beauty over the Centuries. The exhibition used iconography from Greek pottery as substantive evidence towards female Thracian tattooing.

13 Although, as has been discussed by Owen (2003) the date of Archilochus’ fragments are contested in and of themselves.
witnessed a dramatic rise in the depictions of Thracians within drama, within which playwrights used a series of very subtle barbarian qualities to reemphasise the negative and foreign associations which underpinned the Thracian character. Within Attic Tragedy, the image of the Thracian is constructed to convey their transgressive nature, and this is no less clear than through the character of Polymestor in Euripides’ Hecuba, the warlike Eumolpos in Euripides’ Erechtheus, and the murderous Thracian king Tereus in Sophocles’ homonomous play (fr. 581–595b) (J. Hall 2002, 177-178; E. Hall 1989, 103ff). Similarly, within the realms of Comedy, language and speech have been used to carefully depict and underpin additional barbarian qualities of the Thracians as well. For example the Triballian (Thracian) god in Birds speaks mostly nonsense, which is in direct contrast to the depiction of the Scythian archer from the Thesmophoriazousai, whose attributed speech is more understandable but consisted of errors in the use of moods and gender (J. Hall 2002, 178; Colvin 1999, 285ff). E. Hall (1989) has dealt with this topic explicitly in her seminal publication which investigated the image of the barbarian within Classical Athens. Therein, E. Hall (1989, 76-77, 118) highlighted the use of language, behaviour (i.e., murderous, cunning, and deceptive), and even dress as being used to accentuate tropes commonly associated with Thracian barbarians at home.

Yet, outside of Athens, the sources seem to disagree about who the Thracians were, what they culturally practiced, and how they defined themselves. This inconsistency in socio-cultural terms hints, at the very least, at a deeper intellectual conflict concerning their reality from the perspective of Greek speakers, and this is important to note. In many ways what we see are the attempts made by historical authors (particularly Herodotus), to try and fit the Thracians, to varying degrees of success, within conceptualisations of a single consistent group, bound by a common series of qualities. Such qualities today we would usually equate with the underlying properties of an ‘ethnic’ group. However, as I shall stress in the next section, the result is often inconsistent, contradictory, and even illuminating concerning the Thracians variability. Within his eighth book, Herodotus showcases these defining and group-binding qualities in the mouths of the Athenians, during their response as to why they will not be going to join the Persians in an alliance, and instead fight for the ‘Greek’ cause:

14 For the Thracian ‘tongue’ see: (Eur. Rhes. 284). For the depiction of Thracians speaking nonsense see: (Ar. Aves 1606, 1646).
15 Interestingly, Aristophanes in Frogs (680-685) makes reference to the ‘bilingual lips’ of a ‘Thracian swallow’. The word used is ἀμφίλαλος, and has been translated as either being ‘bilingual’ or speaking broken Greek, yet the latter seems more likely, especially when compared to Aristophanes’ depiction of the Thracian god Triballus in Birds (1606, 1646) who speaks nonsense.
“Besides, even if we were willing to act that way, there are many serious considerations which would prevent us from doing so. First and foremost, of these is that the images and buildings of the gods have been burned and demolished, so that we are bound by necessity to exact the greatest revenge on the man who performed these deeds, rather than to make agreements with him. And second, it would not be fitting for the Athenians to prove traitors to the Greek people, with whom we are united in sharing the same kinship (ὅμαιμον) and language (ὁμόγλωσσον), with whom we have established shrines and conduct sacrifices to the gods together (θεῶν ἱδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι), and with whom we also share the same way of life (ἡθέα τε ὁμότροπα)” (Hdt. 8.144.2)\(^\text{16}\)

For Herodotus at least, blood, language, and culture formed the motivation behind Athens’ loyalty, and has been taken more broadly by contemporary scholarship to be the foundation of the ‘ethnic group’ in the Greek speaking world.\(^\text{17}\) Yet this quote comes with a hefty preface. J. Hall (1997, 44-45) pointed out that the passage marks an innovation concerning the cultural underpinnings of ethnicity which should be noted as a social turning point concerning conceptualisations of Greek ethnic unity, whilst R. Thomas (2001, 214-215) considers the gravity of the speech’s sentiment as undermined by it’s irony. Prior to this point in Book 5, Athens had been dangerously liaising with the Persians in order to ascertain assistance with the ongoing frustrations between Athens, the Lacedaemonians, and Cleomenes which later culminated in an alliance between the Athens and Persia (Hdt. 5.73). Yet by Book 8, instead of entering into another alliance, Athens rejects Xerxes’ offer for assistance on the basis of the passage above (Hdt. 8.140-144). Ironically, however, this ‘blood, culture, and language’ speech seems to have been completely forgotten by Book 9 where the Athenians, in response to delays in Lacedaemonian aid, go to Sparta to reemphasise the fact they could still potentially take up the Persian offer of alliance as it benefited them more than war (Hdt. 9.6-11). As remarked by Bowie (2007, 235-237), the whole episode of (8.144) is tinged with self-importance and is seemingly contradicted by Athens’ other actions both later and earlier. Rather than being the rallying cry for Greeks to unite, Bowie (2007, 237) sees the episode more as Herodotus’ way of projecting his conceptualisations of ‘Greek-ness’ back from the time he was writing onto the events of 480 B.C., particularly as such conceptualisations of

\(^{16}\)Translation provided by R. Strassler (2007) in *The Landmark Herodotus*.

\(^{17}\)E. Hall (1989, 165) even uses this defining criteria as the framework in her own publication in order to discuss the qualities of ‘Greek ethnicity’. See also Polinskaya’s (2010) analysis of the meaning of ‘common’, in reference to religion from Herodotus’ passage.
homogeneity are not found within the corresponding material evidence (see Cartledge 2002; J. Hall 1997; 2002, 190). Others have noted Herodotus’ remarks to be even contradictory when compared to accounts of confused identity by Xenophon. In this respect Harman (2013, 84-85) points out one particular instance in the *Anabasis* (6.3.26) where two groups of Greek-speakers (i.e., Acadians and Achaeans) even misidentify each other on the grounds of odd behaviour despite recognising them as Greek-speakers, insinuating that speech alone did not guarantee identification. Furthermore, R. Munson (2014, 343-347, 349-352) addressed these very problems with Herodotus’ passage and maintained that whilst language and blood (through mythic descent) were important for the author, they were always secondary to the importance of culture which was of critical in distinguishing people. Relating to this, Munson (2015, 351) pointed out that we should always maintain the awareness that Herodotus was operating through a cultural ‘grid’, i.e., his framework of values and assumptions of the time, which may account for moments of literary flourish, including his earlier ‘blood, language, and culture’ remark. Certainly as I shall show, the Thracians were prone to the same flourishes in Herodotus’ work, particularly involving customs. Pertinently, however, with an awareness of the Herdotoean ‘grid’ and his preference for culture and mythic descent, we can move forward mindful and aware during the interpretation of his work.

In sum, the point at the heart of this section is that the Thracians were not immune to these burgeoning tropes of the barbarians originally began in Athens during the 5th century B.C. and this was explored by E. Hall (1989). During this time, Greek historians, but in particular Herodotus, used several different techniques in order to articulate Greek and non-Greek identities and how they manifested, and this in many ways in highlighted par excellence with Herodotus’ (8.144) attributed speech. Within the next part of this chapter, therefore, I will use these criteria of descent and culture as a framework through which to discuss the Thracians and how they have been characterised, in order to assess their literary creation from their possible ethnic reality. However, by doing this I will demonstrate that behind these accounts is an image of the Thracians which confirms their variability and distinctness rather than their boundedness. Indeed, this image of

---

18 J. Hall (2002, 189, 191) also uses this passage as additional evidence for a burgeoning unified notion of Hellenic identity, although critically he considers Herodotus’ emphasis of ‘blood’ as a reference to Archaic conceptions of Hellenic identity involving mythic shared descent as offered by Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women*. Indeed, I agree with J. Hall (2002) that Hesiod’s work does in fact frame the beginning of Greece’s concerns with origins. Yet, as Herodotus is where most of our literature concerning the Thracians comes from, it is through his definition of a bounded Hellenic people that I consider had the most influence on how the Thracians were ethnically conceptualised.
variability and regionalism will become clearer in the later parts of this section where other perspectives from their ethnic-political status and coins will used to support the image of variability as ascertained from the ancient literary evidence.

2.3 Mythical Genealogies and Thracian Ethnicity

As demonstrated by Herodotus’ (8.144) comments which sought to qualify group-based identity, kinship ties and commonalities of blood and descent formed a central part of identities in the ancient Greek-speaking world. This is no surprise, particularly as this has already been the central topic of investigation by J. Hall (1997; 2002) and Thomas (2001, 339ff) who demonstrated that mythic genealogies formed the cornerstone of Greek-speaking ideas of group identity and self. Within this section, therefore, I shall demonstrate that the very same tropes as highlighted by Herodotus (8.144) have also been used by ancient authors and applied to the Thracians in order to help conceptualise them as a consistent group. However, as I shall also show, this was successful to varying degrees, and even at times contradictory, which subsequently complicates the reality behind such claims.

The first instance involving this attributed practice comes from Herodotus (5.7), where it was claimed that whilst the Thracians (as a whole) only worship Dionysus, Artemis, and Ares, their princes/kings (οἱ δὲ βασιλέες αὐτῶν) only worship Hermes and claim him as their ancestor (καὶ λέγουσι γεγονέναι ἀπὸ ῾Ερμέω ἑωυτούς) (Hdt.5.7). This ethno-historic separation between ruler and ruled is not a new trope within Greek literary circles. Another example can be seen in relation to the ruling houses of Macedonia who were ascribed, by Hellanikos of Mytilene, as descending from Hellen’s grandson Aiolos (Hel. 4) possibly – as J. Hall (2002, 165-166) originally suggested – as a way to ethnically separate them (the ruling class) from their subjects.

Yet additional support for Herodotus’ remark comes from Euripides’ Polymestor in Hecuba, where he refers to his fellow Thracian countrymen – presumably referring to the non-nobles beneath him – as “people devoted to Ares” (Ἄρει κάτοχον γένος) (Eur. Hec. 1090). Hermes is obviously not mentioned in this instance, but if Euripides was referring

---

19 The Hellenising of Thracian gods may not have been ignorance on Herodotus’ part. Ustinova (2009, 273-274) argues that Herodotus’ submission of links between the healer Zalmoxis with the Greek Pythagoras, was an attempt to assimilate the Thracian myth into pre-existing Greek mythical narratives involving healing (cf. Plut. Chrm 156-157; Dimova 2015, 142-143). How and Wells (1912, 3) attributed both the worship of Ares and Dionysus to Thrace, although whether Herodotus was aware of this it cannot be said.
to all those under the dominion of Polymestor, then it gives strength to Herodotus’ claim, although we cannot discount that Herodotus was Euripides’ source of information concerning this. Another instance which may give some weight to Herodotus’ claim comes from a much later 5th century A.D. Greek poet Nonnus, who refers to the daughter of the Thracian king Sithon as being begat by “your own Thracian Ares” (οὐράνιος δὲ πείθομαι ὡς σε λόχευσε τεὸς Θρηίκιος Ἄρης) (Non. Dion. 25-230). The attribution of Ares to a Thracian genos should not be underappreciated, particularly as it compliments Herodotus, but more broadly suggests that a similar practice of mythic descent may have been appropriated in Thrace. Simultaneously, however, it cannot be overlooked the attempt to incorporate a god of war into ideas concerning who the Thracians were descended from, especially since they are often portrayed as having a proclivity towards violence and bloodshed (see specifically Thuc. 7.29.4).

Outside of the literary evidence, numismatic evidence from the early classical period (roughly 470 B.C.) in Thrace as discussed by Youroukova (1976, 22-24, 54, 217) offers further support for Herodotus and Euripides, with coins having been discovered decorated with images of possibly both Ares/Hermes. The ambiguity of the deity stems from the figure’s costume, consisting of a Petasos (which Youroukova associated with Hermes) with a spear (which she associates with Ares) (see Youroukova 1976, 22). Although, different from Herodotus’ claim (involving all the Thracian elites), these particular coins are directly associated with Getas, ruler of the Edoni. On the one hand, it is possible that Herodotus was unaware of this being an Edonian practice, particularly as we do not know who his informants were. On the other hand, it may have be possible that the Edoni were simply the only tribe to objectively monopolise this image on their coins, with the other early socio-political groups involved in the practice but not in the minting of coins. Slight support could be given to the former interpretation when we consider that Herodotus was clearly aware of the specific groups which were involved in this practice elsewhere i.e., he named explicitly the ruling houses of Macedonia for example (for discussion on this see Hall 2002, 155, 165-166).

A second instance of this attributed practice comes from Xenophon’s Book 7 of his Anabasis, who documents an attempt made by Odrysian aristocracy to augment their mythic lineage for potential socio-political ends. During his account of the military aid he provided for the Odrysian king, Xenophon wrote that their king, Seuthes II, claimed πρόγονος or ancestor from the mythical figure Tereus (who married the Athenian princess
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Procne) (*Anab. 7.2.22*), and on the basis of which he trusted all Athenians, based on this commonality of historical descent (*συγγενής*) (*Xen. Anab 7.2.31*). The point of contention here, however, is not in relation to the significant links that Athens and the Odrysian tribe had, particularly as we know from Thucydides (2.29; 2.67.2) that Seuthes II’s relative, Sadocus (son of Sitalces) was granted Athenian citizenship. Rather, the problematic aspect here revolves around two closely named historical characters, Teres and Tereus (*Anab. 7.2.22*). Concerning the latter, Attic playwrights Philocles and Sophocles record a character by the name of Tereus – a mythical Thracian king – who after marrying the Athenian princess Procne, daughter of the Athenian king Pandion (Sophocles. fr. 581–595b), rapes his sister-in-law, Philomela, and cuts out her tongue to ensure that she would not report the crime.

What is most notable about this mythic claim made by Seuthes II is its dismissal by contemporary historians like Thucydides (2.29.3), who refutes this link, instead asserting that Teres and Tereus are not related at all.\(^{20}\) As Hornblower (1991, 284-288) notes, this digression seems almost polemical, insinuating as Stronk (1995, 52, 184, 190) also suggested, that it may have been met with some belief in Athens itself (as also agreed by both Kazarov, 1930, 555; Graninger 2015, 29). Interesting still, is the fact that the play Tereus by Sophocles may even have coincided with these developments including the citizenship granted to Sadocus around 430/420 B.C. culminating, at least partially, with the rise in Thracian depictions in later 5th century B.C. Athens (see earlier and Stronk (1995, 52-53)). It is understandably why an augmentation to the Athenian myth may have been met with some anxiety, particularly as licensing such pedigree between Athens and Seuthes II would have unintentionally included the Odrysian elite, at least partly, within the autochthonous myth of Athens.\(^{21}\) Alternative social reactions can

---

\(^{20}\)Both Graninger (2015, 29) and Stronk (1995, 52) hypothesise that the mythical king Tereus could have been the alleged progenitor of Teres, however, there is no evidential basis for this opinion, as the link was originally espoused on behalf of the English translators of the *Anabasis*, who cite Thucydides’ dismissal as possible evidence.

\(^{21}\)The first reference to Athenian autochthony is patchy at best. Hall (1997, 54) himself, attributes the *terminus post quem* of the Athens’ autochthonous claim as descended from the hero Erechtheus to around 450 B.C. with the performance of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*. This, Hall adds, stood in direct opposition to references made about Athens as the ‘Ionia’s oldest land’ which he attributes to the 6th century poet Solon (Hall 1997, 51; Aris. *Ath. Pol. 5*). However, in my opinion it is dubious to overstate an Archaic emphasis on autochthony, especially as evidence suggests that Athens had more relaxed citizenship requirements prior to the reforms of 450 B.C. (Blok 2009; Whitehead 1977; Akrigg 2015). Hall’s discussion on autochthony mirrored closely the opinion of Loraux (1993), who argued that the link made between Erechtheus and autochthony was substantiated in Homer’s *Iliad* (2.546-8). Certainly, Halls (1997) claims are strengthened by Euripides’ *Ion* (585–647) and *Erechtheus* (fr. 360), where the Athenian *ethnos* is attributed to having direct descent from the hero Erechtheus, and thereby an autochthonous *genos*.
be understood as best represented through Euripides’ _Erechtheus_ – written some time during the late 5th century – which depicted the Thracian king Eumolpus attempting to capture Athens and defeat the hero Erechtheus, the cornerstone of Athenian autochthony (Eur. _Erech._ test.ii; Apollo. _Lib._ 4; Plut. _Mor._ 310d; Iso. _Panath._ 911a). Although the dating of it is uncertain, we can say that the play falls between the periods of Sadocbus obtaining citizenship and Seuthes’ II attempt at legitimising his own descent through Tereus. In this light, the subject matter of both Euripides and indeed Sophocles’ plays seem more than a coincidence. Yet, what the plays suggests within this socio-political milieu, is certainly a similar polemic as expressed by Thucydides (2.29.3).

There is no denying, therefore, that the Thracians have been depicted as participating in that very typical Greek tradition of claiming mythic descent. Yet concerning its reality, the two claims as presented by the different authors differ to such an extent that they contradict one another. The former attempt made by Herodotus stands in conflict with Xenophon’s ( _Anab._ 7.2.22, 31) account, as the Odrysian elites would have been unable to claim full descent from Hermes (or Ares) if they were historically related to Athens via Procné (Hdt. 5.7). Further frustrations are also caused if we consider the numismatic depictions of Hermes/Ares which were directly attributed to the Edoni tribe. However beyond their possible truth, the subsequent and explicit dismissal around Seuthes II’s claim may offer partial support for the opinion that _some_ Thracian rulers were – during both Thucydides’ and Xenophon’s own lifetimes – participating in the strategy of descent manufacturing as a way of self-promotion for socio-political ends. However, this does not appear to have been participated in unilaterally particularly as the accounts by Xenophon, Thucydides, and Herodotus differ to such an extent. Therefore, whilst the remarks by Thucydides may hint at this practice extending to at least the Odrysians, Herodotus’ remarks may reflect an additional attempt from the outside to make sense of broader Thracian identity through a method which was beginning to be participated by _some_ of its elites, perhaps even suggesting divergent tribal elite practices.

### 2.4 The Thracians as bounded cultural entities

As originally noted by Herodotus (8.144.2), and reiterated by both E. Hall (1989, 185-86) and Humphreys (1987, 211-220), there was a persistent sense of sharing ‘the same way of life’ (ἡθέα τε ὁμότροπα) or sharing of distinctive culture practices (_nomos_) amongst those who identified as being Hellenes during 5th century B.C., and this is no different
when it comes to the way Herodotus (5.3) conceptualised the Thracians. In this respect, Herodotus characterised all Thracians as sharing a series of particular cultural practices or nomoi, which he articulated as binding the Thracian ethnos. Confusingly, however, Herodotus also attributes specific customs to the particular Thracian ‘tribes’, which contradicts his definition of the Thracians as a consistent whole ethnos. As a result, I want to use this part of the chapter to discuss each of these nomoi considering what they may mean for how we conceptualise the Thracians. Yet, I shall also attempt here to highlight what Herodotus alluded to, yet never explicitly articulated; rather than being a definable whole, the Thracians consisted of a series of nested and diverse communities with diverse cultural traditions, some of which have been used as methods to emphasise and exploited their barbarous image, akin to those depicted back at home in 5th century B.C. Athens.

Beginning with Book 5, Herodotus attributes two specific cultural traditions which are practised by communities across Thrace, that is the purchasing of wives, and tattooing. The practice of selling of young married Thracian women appears to have been a long established practice within Thracian society, and spans the work of Herodotus to Xenophon’s Anabasis, with Seuthes II (Xen. Anab. 7.2.38; Hdt.6.1). According to Herodotus, during the 5th century B.C., young Thracian women are attributed with a high degree of sexual freedom until they are ‘purchased’ (the verb used is ὠνέομαι), in a transaction between a prospective husband and the bride’s family. We can assume from Herodotus that the act of purchase in this instance acted as the method of marriage, as after a bride is ‘bought’ her social situation changes and she becomes closely monitored and protected from other men (Hdt. 5.6). Interestingly, this may not simply be a point of fictional inversion from Herodotus’ perspective, as Aristotle (Pol. 2.8.1268b) records such a tradition being common-place during the time of Solonian Athens and even gains mentions in Homers Odyssey (Hom. Od., xv. 367). 

Xenophon’s remark seems more plausible, as he attributes Seuthes II with saying that he would ‘happily buy Xenophon’s daughter if he had one because, after all, this was the ‘Thracian custom’ – ὠνήσομαι Θρᾳκίῳ νόμῳ (7.2.38). Herodotus’ and indeed Xenophon’s remark, therefore, may have some basis in reality, yet not to discount Aristotle’s later comment, the attribution of these practices to the Thracians could have been used to infer their perceived...
lack of social development in comparison with Greece. Yet as Stronk (1995, 196) notes in his commentary on the *Anabasis*, this type of marriage was not as barbaric as it may first seem, the ‘purchasing’ of wives may not insinuate that these women were treated like chattel, rather the process should be thought of as more of a strategy of financial transaction on behalf of the bridegroom to assure the economic advancement of the bride to her family.

![Attic cup from the Classical period depicting a Thracian woman slaying Orpheus](image)

Figure 2.3: Attic cup from the Classical period depicting a Thracian woman slaying Orpheus; her right shoulder is tattooed with a deer, on the inside of her left arm and below her chin are tattoos of vertical lines (see Graef et al. 1933, pl.36)

Herodotus also attributed ‘all Thracians’ with the practicing of tattooing, or branding (literally τὸ ἐστίχθαι). Unfortunately, unlike the practice of ‘purchasing wives’, Thracian tattooing does not receive additional and near contemporary verification by others. Beyond the textual sources, there is some evidence to suggest that 5th century Athenians were aware of the associations between Thracians and tattoos, as is depicted on a large number of contemporary 5th century Attic pots featuring Thracian maenads and wet-nurses covered in tattoos (Tsiafakis 2000; 2015) (figures 2.3 and 2.4).\(^{23}\) Other contemporary evidence of tattooing comes from further afield in Siberia, from an a series of Iron Age (5th century B.C.) mummies discovered housed below tumuli from the cemetery in the Altai Mountains (Stepanova & Pankova 2017, 94-97). In this instance tattoos were recovered from two bodies – one adult male and one adult female – from

\(^{23}\)A good example of this comes from a cup dated to around the early 5th century which depicts a Thracian woman slaying Orpheus (above) (Graef et al. 1933, 439; Zimmermann 1980, 177). There is additional evidence that Thracian men were tattooed as well. Jones (1987) noted that Lysias makes passing reference to “Theocritus... son of Elaphostictus”, which she translated as ‘deer-tattooed’ (Lys. 13. 19; Crusius 1903; Wolters 1903)
Figure 2.4: Depictions of Thracian women from Classical red-figure Attic pottery: A) Depiction of a Thracian slave on a hydria with arm and neck tattoos, Paris, Musée du Louvre; B) Thracian (slave?) with chin and neck tattoo from krater fragment, Staatliche Antikensammlung und Glyptothek München (No. NI 8717); C) Old Thracian woman with tattoos on her neck and forearm depicted on a skyphos, Staatliches Museum (No. KG 708); D) Thracian women on a column-krater with tattoos on her leg, arms, and neck, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek (No. NI 2378). Images taken from (Jones 1987; Tsiafakis 2015)
mounds 2 and 5. The designs of the tattoos feature mythical beings, hunt scenes, and flowers.\textsuperscript{24} Yet, an alternative perspective on Herodotus’ remarks could argue that akin to the purchasing of wives, it was an attempt to integrate the Athenian moral perception into the depiction of a bounded group. More specifically, the image of the tattooed Thracian slave. Convincing observations of this nature have been made by C. P. Jones (1987, 149-150), who argued that criminal tattooing was a possibility within Greek society, and that these criminals could have then been sold as slaves, thus reinforcing the visual association between social status and tattoos.

Outside of selling of wives and tattoos, Herodotus binds all the Thracians with the practice of selling children into slavery (Hdt. 5.6.1) and the moral virtue attributed to Thracians who manage to live solely off the spoils of war (Hdt. 5.6.2). Yet not too dissimilar from the depiction of ‘noble tattooing’, these parts of Thracian culture act almost explicitly as cultural inversions, and not too dissimilar from those discussed in by F. Hartog (1988, 212-229) concerning the Scythians. For Hartog (1988, 241-242) these inversions acted as a reflexive schema through which Greek-speakers could establish what was Greek by way of emphasising practices that were perceived as non-Greek.\textsuperscript{25} Of course, as mentioned earlier, Athens has a considerably large non-citizen body which we can assume a proportion of which was Thracian. We also know from Attic playwrights that Thracians did constitute a significant portion of the domestic task-force within Athenian society, which may explain the attribution of the selling of children into slavery, with being typically ‘Thracian’. Likewise, the consistent trope that the Thracians were supposedly barbaric and warlike offers additional contextual support for the attribution of Herodotus’ (5.6.2) spoils of war comment. In sum, it seems likely that these practices are not strictly factual, but that is not to suggest that they are not grounded in common conceptions surrounding the Thracians within 5th century Athens. Yet what is critical in these instances is that – despite being potentially fictional – the Thracians have been depicted as consisting of a common series of \textit{nomoi}, and this is complicated by other practices which Herodotus designates to specific tribes.

As mentioned at the beginning of this final section, there are cultural traditions which

\textsuperscript{24}Interestingly, although much later, Athenaeus attributes the origin of Thracian tattoos as coming from Scythia, specifically given by Scythian women to Thracian women (\textit{Ath.} 12.69). What is of note here is the gendering of tattoos within his account, which coincidentally corresponds to pictorial representations of Thracian women as being tattooed.

\textsuperscript{25}See Hartog (1988, 241-223) for an extensive discussion on inversion within Herodotus, and Lloyd (1966) for a discussion on the history of the rhetoric of polarity within Greek thought, which he argues originates in the Archaic period.
are not shared by all the Thracians, rather they are relegated to certain communities in Thrace, and this specifically concerns the tradition of human sacrifice. Interestingly, Herodotus only records this practice in reference to four specific communities, i.e., the Apsinthian Thracians, the Getae, the Crestonaeans, and a third unknown community who live on Mount Dysoron. Despite maintaining that this cultural tradition is shared between these four communities they, in fact, each practice this tradition in considerably different ways; one being in the context of religious sacrifice and the others in reference to the funerary ritual and the social status of Thracian women.\textsuperscript{26} Beginning with religious sacrifice, the Getae practise ritual self-immolation (ἀθανατίζοντες) (literally to make themselves immortal) (Hdt. 5.3) every four years in order to send messages to the mythic, once human figure, Zalmoxis (whom people also refer to as Gebeleizis). Within this ceremony, they throw a chosen member of the community onto a set of spears. If the victim dies then he has been accepted into the company of the daemon, and himself becomes immortal. If the messenger does not die, however, then the victim is accused of being rejected by the daemon and is, therefore, corrupt and consequently executed (Hdt. 4.94). The second instance concerns the Apsinthian Thracians, who captured and killed Oeobazus (a Persian general), whilst he was returning to Persia and sacrificed him to a local god (ἐπιχώριος θεος) named Pleistorus (Hdt. 9.119). The other two instances of human sacrifice that we are told about are different. In these instances, the sacrifice concerns the status of women in relation to their husbands. In these cases, Herodotus documents that an unnamed community living on the peaks of Mount Dysoron considered it a tradition after a man had died, they would choose and ritually execute his best wife and bury her with him (Hdt. 5.5). As noticed by Graninger (2015, 23-25), physical geography seems pertinent in Herodotus’ claim here as underlining the tribes’ cultural differences with additional topographic significance. Similarly, when a man died in the Crestonaean community, one of his many wives would prove that she was adored by her husband the most, thereby entering a sort of sacrificial competition with his other wives. After which, the best wife is slain at the tomb of her nearest of deceased kin, and then buried with her husband (Hdt. 5.5.1).

The specific details through which Herodotus records the instances of sacrifice certainly mark it in contrast to the other more generic cultural practices which all Thracians participated. Beyond these four instances, Thracian human sacrifice is never mentioned.

\textsuperscript{26}For possible archaeological comparisons in Bulgaria, see Tonkova (2010) in English.
again by any ancient author, thus peculiarly it forms a sort of hapax legomenon within writings about the Thracians. However, it cannot be overlooked the fact that the Herodotous does record the two instances of wife-sacrifice to a geographically specific area, that is around the area of modern-day Kerkini Lake National Park. From this perspective, Herodotus was clearly reticent towards the fact that these communities were different, and this was on accordance with their cultural practices. Yet there is a possibility of course that Herodotus’ remark on the topic was simply fanciful and constructed to reinforce the image of the Thracian as morally and culturally backwards. We know elsewhere that similar ‘barbaric’ depictions were constructed slightly later by the likes of Thucydides (7.29.4) as well, and in one particular instance he even calls the Thracians (as a people) φονικώτατον (coming from φονικός), i.e., being the most inclined to murder. These murderous tropes often attributed to the Thracians seem to have been emboldened within the likes of Attic drama, particularly through the depictions of Euripides’ Polymestor. In a similar vein, Herodotus (8.116) later retells the story about the chief of the Bisaltae tribe (ὁ τῶν Βισαλτέων βασιλεὺς) blinding all of his six sons after they disobeyed him and became involved with the Persian invasion, once again reinforcing the association between the Thracians and their propensity to kill or harm.

Asheri (1990, 139) even attributes the association of human sacrifice with the Aspinthian Thracians, as a product of the good relationship between Athens and the Dolonci, who were enemies of the Aspinthian Thracians (see Hdt. 6.34). The association of human sacrifice with the Thracians, therefore, corresponds too strongly with emergent tropes which existed during the 5th century, and this is also backed up by the archaeology which currently has not revealed any such corresponding evidence of such practices (see Tonkova 2010).

Overall, without direct testimonies from the Thracians, truthful accounts of Thracian cultural practices are patchy at best. Observations can be made from a brief analysis of the ancient literature that there were, it seems, a variety of cultural practices that could be distinguished as typically ‘Thracian’. However, there also existed tribal specific practices which contradict the assumption that the Thracians were a bounded cultural group. Indeed, there is a lack of consistency concerning the depictions which feature

---

27 Interestingly, this notion that the Thracians had a propensity to kill seems to have endured well into the 2nd century A.D. as told by Athenaeus’ (12.242-243) The Learned Banqueters who recounts an earlier story. In the account, he attributes a specific sympotic game that Thracian men do when they are drinking. The game consists of tying a noose around the neck of a guest and giving them a scythe. The participants then put the person on a stone with the aim of trying to kick it away from under their feet. If they succeed, the hanging person needs to cut themselves free with the scythe before they die, and if they die – according to Athenaeus – it is considered a big joke.
many regionally specific customs instead of the Thracians being a unified whole, despite Herodotus claiming that there were (Hdt. 5.3). Therefore, if Herodotus’ (8.144.2) definition states that a ‘shared ways of life’ and ‘shared descent’ were necessary prerequisites to define a consistent identity group, then from the perspective of the Greek authors, the Thracians were not one. Yet as I have shown during this section through the inconsistent depictions of the Thracians, the ancient historical authors perhaps contrary to their literary aims, captured a genuine diversity of cultural practices between Thracian communities. To such an extent that these traditions marked these communities out as distinct and worth describing by the likes of Herodotus. To this end, F. Hartog’s (1988) inversions and contrast falls short of full explanation, and in agreement with Asheri (1990) who discusses Herodotus’ Thracian account, Herodotus was eager to note where possible the participation of specific ‘people’ with a particular ‘culture’, thus his attribution of certain practices with specific Thracian groups is important to note.

2.5 Topography

Beginning from Herodotus’ (8.144) attributed speech, it has been submitted that the Thracians were inconsistently grouped together in these terms pertaining to culture and descent. In each case contemporary sources added to, or contradicted Herodotus’ claims, which complicates the assumption that the Thracians represented a distinct clear-cut ethnic unit. Rather, what has been shown is that behind such accounts of the Thracians as given to us by the likes of Herodotus, Xenophon, and Thucydides is an image of diversity and regional variability, whether it be in reference to the mythic descent claims made by the Odrysian’s or the cultural practices involving human sacrifice of the tribes around Mount Dysoron. Nevertheless, there is a third criteria which supports this view, and this is concerning the characterisation of the topography of Thrace, specifically by Herodotus. Although not featuring in his (8.144) speech, Herodotus enjoyed using territory as a method of underpinning additional differences between people. As Munson (2014, 344) adds, whilst this may not have been a sufficient enough category to distinguish Greeks from non-Greeks, it does stand to emphasise further differences between peoples already conceptualised as different, particularly the Thracians.

The significance of topography in particular has already been articulately examined by Asheri (1990, 140-143) who has written at length on the ethnographic significance of Herodotus’ work. More broadly, both Asheri (1990) and Graninger (2015, 23-25) noted
that for Herodotus, topography played a key role for the delineation of tribal communities and as a method for underpinning their different qualities in order to distinguish them. On further inspection of the context in which Herodotus is writing, it becomes unsurprising the reasons as to why he chooses aspects of territory to underline deeper differences involved with blood and behaviour of the Thracians. R. Thomas (2000, 102, 128-134) explores Herodotus interest in these themes which run through episodes in his work. Thomas accredits this to Herodotus himself as being part of a wider burgeoning intellectual climate which was interested in the relationship between culture (nomos) and nature (phusis), or more plainly, whether where you lived had an effect on your daily practices and your character (see also work on this by Heinimann 1945; Ostwald 1990; and its relationship with ethnicity Hall 2002). In this respect, Herodotus knew of and enjoyed theorising about these equivalences, particularly concerning the role the environment had on the ways people lived and looked; for example, he mentions that the Egyptians have thick skulls due to prolonged sun exposure (Hdt. 3.12.2) and attributed a quote to the Persian King Cyrus, that “Soft lands breed soft men; wondrous fruits of the earth and valiant warriors grow not from the same soil.” (Hdt. 9.112). Of course, however, as both Thomas (2000, 104) and Hall (2002, 198) have argued, these notions did not pervade all writing during this time, and to argue so would be over emphasising these debates. Nevertheless, what is critical to note about nomos and phusis is that it had a particular emphasis on Herodotus’ work, and in particular, his depiction of the Thracians. As also noted by Asheri (1990, 140) for Herodotus at least “topography overlaps sociology” and this concepts also penetrates Herodotus’ conceptualisation of Thracian variability.

Beginning with the influence of topography on political autonomy, Herodotus within his Book 7 offers the earliest instance of this equivalence in Thrace. In his path towards Greece during the 5th century B.C., Xerxes demanded the help of the Thracian communities (ἔθνεα δὲ Θρηίκων) he encountered on the coast except for the Satraians, who lived high within the mountains in the most heavily wooded areas and were particularly skilled warriors, which enabled them to live ‘free’ (Hdt. 7.110-111).  

---

28 When it came to the depiction of people in relation to the use of phusis, a number of authors have commented on the similarity between the Hippocratic treatise and the work of Herodotus (Thomas 2000, 25-101; Heinimann 1945). Despite this, it is unknown whether Herodotus was actually aware of the Hippocratic treatise, however, there is certainly no doubt that he was working within a similar academic climate which was beginning to question the link between phusis and nomos (Hall 2002, 196).

29 Despite occurring slightly earlier than the 5th century, mountain settlements were widely settled in both Bulgarian and Aegean Greek Thrace. The best evidence for the remains of such are published only partially in the AD (1972, 536-540).
Similarly, Herodotus offers additional accounts of these tropes in reference to a Thracian community who live in the middle of Lake Prasias, on the border of modern-day southeastern Macedonia (Hdt. 5.16.1-4; David 1990, 140-141). Not dissimilar from his account of the Satraians, Herodotus specifies in this particular instance that it was due to their location in the middle of the lake that ensured their escape from the Persian Megabazos. Yet, their habitation in the middle of the Lake does not only underpin their autonomy, but also served to underpin their ways of living. Herodotus describes that they only consumed fish and lived in houses built on stilts over the water. Topography, therefore, was used by Herodotus to highlight social differences between Thracians on account of their ways of life. In this respect and despite privileging culture or *nomos* for distinguishing non-Greeks more broadly, Herodotus was especially attentive in attributing significance to the environment in underpinning the reasons why the Thracians were different. Physical geography, therefore, is used as a marker of difference, not similarity. Therefore, at least for Herodotus, tribal location was ostensibly as important in defining an *ethnos* as claims of descent and culture, which in turn influenced not just the Thracians political autonomy (being either free or subject to Persian rule) but their ways of dwelling and fighting.

It is, therefore, undeniable that topography formed an important part in the characterising of Thracian difference. Ironically, despite minor attempts made by Herodotus to designate the Thracians and a bound and consistent whole who shared certain cultural practices, his account of topography only serves to undermine this view. We can say then that contrary to the F. Hartog (1988) and to an extent E. Hall (1989), that the representation of the Thracians from the historical authors, beyond the fictitious *nomoi* as outlined earlier, serves to underline Thracian distinctiveness and regional variability. To this end, literary depictions evidence of the Thracians as given to us by historical, rather than dramatic, authors paint a pictures of an incredibly diverse series of historical ethnic groups. Groups which may have been practicing their own way of mythic descent manufacturing, maintaining their own cultural and religious practices, and living in locations which reinforced differences in fighting and subsistence. With this in mind, additional perspective can also be gained elsewhere to support this opinion, specifically.

---

30 This may not have been fanciful for Herodotus. There are examples of these types of communities in Thrace during this time, one with particular example of a dwelling in the middle of a lake at Dispilio (Touloumis and Xatzitouloussis 2001, 601-607).

31 It is interesting to note here that the depiction of ‘houses on stilts’ in Herodotus is very close to the architecture used in Iron Age central and western Europe, and are called ‘pile-dwellings’ or ‘crannogs’ within the northern European archaeological tradition.
from coins and the results of the *IACP*, which hint at significant ethnic differences in Thrace as expressed by their numerous and changing political formations.

### 2.6 Other perspectives: poleis and coins

When we investigate ethnicity in the past, we must bear in mind that this is explicitly a modern phenomenon, despite the etymological link between *ethnos* and ethnicity. It is also important to note that despite *ethnos* and ethnicity being linked, we are in fact talking about several different phenomena which have been articulately discussed by Skinner (2012, 24-25), i.e., *ethnos* the ancient phenomenon, its translation into English, our concept ethnicity (which has a distant relationship to the word *ethnos*), and how our concept of ethnicity can be distinguished from other identities in the past. Particularly on this point, it is by no means a coincidence that almost all of publications dedicated to ethnicity in Greek antiquity also contain lengthy discussions on the role of the *polis* and its relationship with the word *ethnos* (Morgan 2001, 75ff; 2003; Fraser 2009, 16-59; Hall 1997, 5-19, 218; 2001, 159ff; McInerney 2001 51ff; Antonaccio 2001, 113ff). To reiterate a quote by Amselle (1996, 6) “For the Greeks, the notion of ethnos was a political category” (this has also been used and echoed by Skinner (2012, 46). And on this note, if a discussion about *ethnos* (linked to our concept of ethnicity) is political or at least linked closely to a group’s socio-political makeup, then it is also necessary here to briefly discuss the political implications of Thracian ‘ethne’ as additional evidence towards the ‘ethnic’ diversity of Thrace. Which offer different, but still contemporary perspective from the ancient literacy sources who, as I have already pointed out, discussed the Thracians in rather inconsistent ethnic terms. I will discuss this more theoretically in the next chapter, but it is worth here commenting on specifically some conceptual difficulties faced when tracing ancient Thracian ethnicity beyond the ancient literary evidence, particularly considering several publications which have dealt with its equivalent in Greece in relation to the foundation of the Greek polis (Malkin 2001 edited volume). After this, I shall also endeavour to discuss what implications recent discoveries concerning language and coins may also have for our ethnic conceptualisations of the Thracians.
2.7 Other ethnic perspectives: ethne and poleis

First, it ought to be made clear how socio-political structures relate to ethnicity. This has been a point already stressed on numerous occasions by Morgan (2001, 75-94; 2003, 9-16). I.e., if we conceptualise ethnicity as a participatory ‘us-hood’ which is activated when social communities (ethne) exhibit their most salient means of autonomy (i.e., through political institutions) then the ancient past and our modern definition can then be connected (cf. Morgan 2003, 11). Hence, a discussion involving the different Thracian communities and how they represented themselves through poleis ethnics and coin kktetcs therefore matters. This point was echoed by A. Smith (1986, 22-35), who stressed that since socio-political institutions have historically played a particularly dominant role in the formation of ethnic groups, they are necessary to analyse when available. Specifically their contribution to the formation of ethne (or ‘ethnic’ as Smith calls them), and this involves the manipulation of ethnic discourse (i.e., its symbolic material outcomes) by social elites (see Smith 1986, 31-33). Yet, whist Morgan (2003, 202-203) has discussed issues pertaining to ethnic conflict, there has been little in the way of a discussion involving ethnic manipulation by those in power at the top, dictating ethnic affiliation on the ground. I will explore this slightly below, and how this relates to the sense of ethnic solidarity maintained through Thracian coins. Within this section I want to draw out what we know about these Thracian ethne, and variations regrading their socio-political constitution as evidence towards their ethnic difference, particularly considering the results produced by the IACP.

What then do we currently know about Thrace and its numerous socio-political communities? In the broadest sense, Thucydides (2.29.4) describes Thrace as consisting of τὰ ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης χωρία, which has been translated as ‘towns’ or ‘districts’ (see commentary Merchant 1891). This does not, however, speak to the type of equivalent political structures that can be compared or contrasted with poleis. On this note, we hear from both Herodotus and Thucydides that Thrace consisted of a series of tribal king-ships, yet with two different kings designated as the ‘king of Thrace’. This relates directly to Thucydides (2.29) who attributes the title Θρᾳκῶν βασιλέα to Teres the first Odrysian ruler, and Herodotus (6.39) who gives this label to Olorus of the Dolonci (Θρηίκων βασιλέος). This may be in part due to differences in translation. It is not unusual for the genitive plural to be used adjectivally in this way. In Greek, ‘king of the Thracians’ can also mean ‘a king who rules over some Thracians’ rather than the sole king of all the Thracians. For example, ‘Θεσσαλῶν βασιλέως’ used by Thucydides (1.111) is used in this way. I, however, use the translation as ‘king of Thrace’ as it is currently translated in the Dutton’s (1910) translation of The Peloponnesian War and Godley’s (1920)
The confusion about the political autonomy, however, does not end here, and these titles are further frustrated by Thucydides’ (2.97.3) strange remark relating to Odrysian ‘paradynasts’ and Odrysian ‘noblemen’ (καὶ τοῖς παραδυναστεύουσί τε καὶ γενναίοις ᾿Οδρυσῶν) (this passage was not commented on in Hornblower’s (1991) commentary).33 Both remarks complicate and even contradict one another. On the one hand, if there were no de facto ‘king of Thrace’ then the Odrysian paradynasts and noblemen could be conceptualised as a Odrysian specific socio-political expression, that is, exclusive to their tribal political community akin to the priestly sub-class of the Satrae (i.e., the Bessoi, prophets of Dionysus (Hdt. 7.111)). On the other hand, if we are to believe that there was a ‘king of Thrace’ then it undermines the control and autonomy of Thrace’s other kings, of which there were many (see Hdt. 6.34; 8.116; Thuc. 5.6). The accounts, therefore, of Thracian society are as contradictory as they are revealing, and equally confusing is also Herodotus’ earlier remark that the Thracians were too ‘fickle and unorganised’ to come together as a unified whole nation, which opposes the idea of their being a royal house which somehow unified all of Thrace (Hdt. 5.3).34

Beyond the possibility of a single ‘king of Thrace’, even if we were to agree with Herodotus and Thucydides, the corresponding archaeology does not support this claim, at least not in the way we would expect. Particularly as no large, nucleated settlements from which we would expect to seat such a ruler have been discovered. Indeed, what we know archaeologically is that the landscape in Thrace during the 7th and 6th centuries remains modest and punctuated by small to medium-sized hamlets of wooden structures, much more reminiscent of Xenophon’s komai (Anab. 7.1.) (see also for comparison, Plato Laws 636c; see also Popov 2015, 109-114; Nankov 2015, 399-401).

This organisation of the urban landscape of Thrace, underneath the reign of kings, is also only hinted at by contemporary sources. In his description of the route the Persian general Megabazos takes through Thrace, Herodotus (5.2.2) adds that he subjugated ‘every city (polis) and people’ (πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος). Whilst it is more probable that Herodotus in this instance is referring to the Archaic Greek poleis in the region of Aegean Thrace (i.e., Abdera, Maronia, Mesemvria-Zonê, and potentially Thasos) it still stands to reason the potential for Herodotus here to be calling non-Greek settlements translation of The Histories.

33 LSJ translates the word ‘παραδυναστεύουσι’ as ‘reign beside or with another’ and ‘γενναίοις’ as ‘of persons, high-born, nobleman’ (see also. Archil. 107).
34 Moreover, the conspicuous absence of the Odrysian tribe in Herodotus’ account of Thrace is particularly noticeable considering the size of the tribe by Thucydides’ time and their relationship with Athens.
poleis and for these institutions to house different ethne. In contrast, Xenophon (Anab. 7.1.13; 7.3.10; 7.3.44; 7.3.48; 7.4.5) attributes Thrace as consisting of many different komai, which dwell both on the Aegean edges and interior of Thrace (i.e., beyond the Rhodope). During Xenophon’s expedition north, these komai were subject to frequent raids by passing bands of soldiers, which suggests that they were not fortified places but instead small hamlets relying on subsistence from the surrounding agricultural land. However, problems arise concerning the autonomy of such collectivities particularly given the earlier remarks concerning Thracian kings and cities. Were these komai in the urban sense, usually regarded as ‘villages’ (see Stronk 1995, 150, 201, 219, 221, 225) or were they komai in the political sense, i.e., acting as a subdivision of a polis akin to a deme (Hansen 2004, 41). In addition, if we take this point further, more questions arise concerning whether the Thracian system of governance is then perhaps subdivided into regional komē which are overseen by kings/paradynasts, who in turn are overseen by a supra-regional Thrace-wide king (figure 2.5).

---

See Loukopolou (2004b, 856) for more evidence of pre-Roman komai between the Strymon and Nestos. The names of the rural hamlets are neither Greek nor Roman and give a better but later indication of the levels of dispersed and small-scale urbanism in Aegean Thrace. For further discussions on this topic after the 5th century, just prior to the invasions of Alexander and Philip II see Tacheva (1997, 13ff) for the same evidence through tribal coins.
Figure 2.5: The possible formations of Thracian society as evidence from the ancient literary sources, and at which social level the ethnos is conceptualised, a) combines Herodotus’ (5.22) Thracian poleis remark and Xenophon’s (7.1.13) Thracian komē account, whilst b) represents Thucydides’ (2.97.3) strange remark relating to Odrysian paradynasts. Both diagrams take the ‘oikos’, i.e., the household, as the smallest unit of social existence as from (Aristot. *Econ.* 1.1343a)
Other perspectives, however, offered through Attic tragedy suggest a landscape which is inherently decentralised, perhaps not too dissimilar from Xenophon’s dispersed *komai*. For example, in Euripides’ drama *Hecuba*, whilst Troy was described as a πόλις (polis) (Eur. *Hec.* 251, 484, 518, 658, 767, 812, 933, 953, 1187), Polymestor was characterised as having political dominion from his δῶμα (dôma) (Eur. *Hec.* 1). In addition, Polymestor is apparently a king whose sphere of rule is simply ‘land’ χώρα instead of communities or towns, or even other δῶμα. Yet Euripides was not the first to characterise Thrace in such a way. The earliest attestation of Thracian dôma comes from Homer’s Iliad (*Il.* 11.210-225), where it is used to describe the house of the Thracian king Cisseus. Indeed, the nature of the word loosely suggests a form of archaic chiefly ‘house’ (as has been designated as such in the Iliad (*Il.* 21.44)) within which is situated the μέγαρον, θαλάμος, and αὐλή (*Od.* 22.494; 17.329). If we are, therefore, to take the literary depictions of the Thracian landscape as evidence for Thracian society, based on the presence of Homeric δῶμα within later Euripidean literature, then perhaps its use denotes a landscape populated by dispersed chiefly ‘big-men’ living in large hall-like dwellings (see with references Whitley 1991, 184-185).36

The literary evidence, therefore, provides another inconsistent picture, which is at best varied and at worst contradictory. What then, can the results from the *IACP* add to our ethnic understanding of Thrace? It is necessary to state first that the existence of Greek-speaking institutions in traditionally non-Greek-speaking areas, like Thrace, can be interpreted as the result of several key factors: a) Greek-style institutions like emporia and poleis which were established in Thrace as products of emulation at the hands of Thracian elites (e.g. Pistiros and Seuthopolis); b) Greek institutions which were established through means of colonisation, conquest, or other means of acquisition in areas already inhabited by indigenous populations (e.g. Zonê, Maroneia, and Mesemvria); c) the designation of poleis in Thrace exists only as a theoretical equivalence used in order to make sense of pre-existing Thracian socio-political institutions.37 Z. Archibald’s (2004, 886-890) significant contribution to the *IACP* regarding poleis in inland Thrace can aid in this respect. Specifically, Archibald offered new insights into Thrace’s burgeoning

36 If we look to archaeological evidence for this, contemporary with Homer (during the Early Iron Age), settlement evidence does partially confirm this. Recently excavated 5th century BC ‘chief dwellings’ of Kozî Gramadi and Tartar Masha suggest something close to δῶμα, or a centralised Hall-like chiefly dwelling (Hristov 2011; 2012).

37 These features were originally pointed out by Archibald (2004, 892), indeed most of the poleis as recorded in Thrace by Stephanus of Byzantium, applied the label more generously to many different non-Hellenic institutions. It was, therefore, understood that Thracian poleis may not necessarily be poleis, rather a misidentification by Stephanus.
civic identities as evident through the Pisteros and Seuthopolis inscriptions. Therefore, it is worth discussing these ethnic implications as submitting further evidence for the ethnic variability of Thrace, particularly through its political institutions.

To begin, it is worth outlining the parameters of what a *polis* is, before any discussion of its presence in Thrace can begin. I therefore use the definition offered by Hansen (2004, 17), which is that during 5th and 4th centuries B.C., the polis was a small but “*highly institutionalised and self-governing community*” within the confines of an urban centre. This community was made of citizens, i.e., adult men, who shared the urban space and its associated hinterland (chora/ge) with women, children, foreigners (xenoi), and slaves. As a political community, Hansen (2004, 49-50) adds, the polis acted as a person’s fatherland (*patris*), and this fatherland was more strongly linked to its citizens more than its physical territory. Hence, special emphasis was put on the city-ethnic, that is, an adjective originated (often) from the toponym where the urban centre is situated. This, in turn, was adopted to represent those living in the polis and was used as a kind-of surname whenever two or more citizens from different poleis were discussed (for the significance of this when attempting to place strangers see Hom. *Od*. 1.170; 8.555; 10.325; 15.260; 19.105; 24.295; Eur. *IT*. 492; Soph. *Phil*. 3.220-225). Political institutions like poleis were, therefore, intimately related to matters of group (*ethnos*) identity, which meant that conceptualisations (through Greek eyes) of Thracian identity was both political and ethnic. Political assumptions relating to Thracian society were then intimately linked with Thracian ethnicity and their subsequent variation serves to underpin significant ethnic differences.

What can be said about Thrace and its associated poleis? As mentioned earlier, the presence of poleis in Thrace can be reduced to three possible phenomena. From the perspective of the institutions found in inland Thrace, they can be broadly defined as products of emulation, and from this perspective I am specifically referring to classical (and pre-Macedonian) institutions like Pistiros\(^{38}\) and Seuthopolis\(^{39}\) (Archibald 2004, 885-891). In each of these instances, the urban sense of polis can be distinguished, that is it

\(^{38}\)It is worth mentioning that Pistiros, is now thought of as a Thracian institution which emulated a polis (see Archibald 2004, 885ff). Therefore, it would perhaps be more correct to designate this as a ‘polis-like emporion’, despite Steph. *Byz*. (524.11) calling it Πίστιρος, ἐμπόριον Θρᾴκης. We could, therefore, classify Pistiros as a result of factor c, from above.

\(^{39}\)Apros could be included here, but it lacks much associated evidence which prevents it from being used, despite it being listed by Archibald (2004, 893) as it was designated as πόλις Θράκης (107.5) by Stephanus of Byzantium. Alexandropolis, Philippopolis, and Kabyle were not included here as their polis-like status is more likely a result of Macedonian conquest and influence rather than organic Thracian emulation of Greek institutions. This was further explored by Tacheva (1997) who analysed the affect the Macedonian conquest had on Thrace’s urbanism and social organisation.
consists of an urban space featuring organised street-plans, residential and commercial units with a hinterland, and religious buildings. Yet it was not solely the organisation and built environment of these places which emphasised their polis status, rather the political procedures of the ‘hellenising’ elites which has been underlined within key inscriptions found nearby both sites, that is the Pisteros and Seuthopolis inscriptions. Archibald (2004, 887ff; 1997, 311) has already discussed each of the inscriptions in detail along with the additional evidence for poleis in Thrace, therefore, I will not do so here, but I shall briefly outline them.

Beginning with the inscription found at Seuthopolis (IGBulg 3.2 1731), the stele records an oath taken by the five Odrysian princes (Seuthes III, Hebryselmis, Teres, Satokos, and Sadalas) on behalf of Berenike. The inscription is decidedly earlier than the Pisteros inscription, dating to around the late 4th/3rd century B.C. (Graninger 2018, 181; Nankov 2008). The inscription is often used as strong evidence for the increasing hellenisation of Thracian elites, and in particular these arguments stress key symptoms as proof, those being the formulaic layout of the inscription, its conformation to the format of Greek decrees (see introduction by Rhodes and Osborne 2003, xiii-xxvii), the mentioning of Greek cults and deities, the use of Greek as a diplomatic language, and the name of the city as representing its people (the inhabitants of Seuthopolis, who we can only assume were Thracian (or more specifically Odrysian) (see with references Graninger 2018, 181; Archibald 1998, 310-311; 2004, 886-887). The Seuthopolis inscription (l. 33) orders that it should be set up in Seuthopolis in two locations, the Sanctuary of the Great Gods and in the agora of the Sanctuary of Dionysus (presumably also in the city). As Archibald (2004) pointed out, the public display of this stele and its association with open spaces like a central market ‘agora’, points toward strong attempts made by Odrysian elites to emulate Greek-style civic practices, and this is significant particularly concerning its use of Greek. Yet who would have been able to read such an inscription? If we imagine that the everyday Thracian inhabitants of Seuthopolis may have been at most able to speak Greek for commercial reasons, but not necessarily able to read it, then the inscription represents more pomp and ceremony from the perspective of the elites rather than being meaningful to people on the ground. We cannot be sure whether, as the decree reflects, the inhabitants of Seuthopolis (the Seuthopolitans) even understood the function of such a monument, and whether, the Seuthopolitans formed a collective sense of identity of themselves beyond simply being the inhabitants of Seuthopolis. Nevertheless, the
inscription does confirm the bureaucratic, urban, and city-ethnic qualities which have been deemed essential for Greek poleis being manipulated by Odrysian elites, and the potential implications of this conformity should not be overlooked.

Correspondingly, the Pistiros inscriptions also offers key evidence for the implication and manipulation of ethnic identities by Thracian elites at the expense of political autonomy. The inscription was found on a large granite block during early excavations of the site located at Adjiyska Vodenista, near Vetren (Archibald 2004, 889). This large block was found only partially preserved, and has since discovery been dated to around the mid-late 4th century B.C. (prior to Macedonian hegemony of Thrace in 340 B.C., but after the assassination of Kotys I) (for discussion of dating see Graninger 2012, 100) and an earlier discussion as part of the IACP by Archibald (2004, 887)). The inscription itself outlines the rules of merchants traveling to and from Pistiros, along with the native Thracians, and other ethne like the Thasians and Apollonains living in Pistiros. Again, as Archibald (2004, 889) pointed out, like the Seuthopolis inscription, the Pistiros example exhibits several features which highlight Pistiros’ emulation of Greek institutions, i.e., the use of city-ethnics as differentiation between citizens (Pistironoi (l. 16)) and non-citizens (i.e., the other ethne named in the inscription), the dedication of inscriptions, and the use of Greek as an administrative language along with a formalised chancery style of the decreeing royal dynasties (Rhodes DGS, 18). Crucially, however, ethnic problems are met concerning both cases that have still been overlooked by both Archibald (1998; 2004) and Hansen (1997; 2004) and specifically relating to the city-ethnics. If we were to assume that both respective urban centres were overseen by the descendants Kotys (in the case of Pistiros) and Seuthes II (in the case of Seuthopolis) then in each of the cases the Pisteronoi (l. 16, contra. BCH 16, Steph. Byz. 524.11) at Pistiros and Southopolitans at Seuthopolis would be members of the Odrysian tribe, as they are situated within the geographical confines of the Odrysian Kingdom (Thuc. 2.97.1-6). Why, then, are the tribal names not recorded in each of the cases, and even more problematically, why are the Thracians self-referentially using the Greek term τοῖς...
Θραιξίν (l. 8-9), when denoting the non-Greek emporitai at Pisteiros (see Hansen 1997, as this has been likened to an ethne i.e., those dwelling in the emporion are different from the (potentially) Thracian Pistironoi). These two facts further complicate what we know about Thrace and ethnicity. On the one hand, it could be that names like Pisteronoi were purely juridical and did not reflect how people expressed themselves on the ground. Yet, the existence of these names in lieu of ‘Odrysian’ contradicts the opinion that tribes within Thrace unilaterally formed the basis of ethnic affiliation comparatively like Greek city-ethnics. This point shall be discussed later, as evidence of this type comes from the very first coins minted in Thrace, which incidentally are all affiliated with specific tribes, rather than particular rulers. The subscription of a city-ethnic, therefore, amongst other important emulating factors, is critical to note. Not only would its use be a marked difference concerning the conceptualisation of ethnic identity within inland Thrace, particularly in areas where tribal ethnics may have continued to be the basis for ethnic affiliation (as shown by early coins), but its manipulation and change to a more Greek-style city-ethnic during the late 4th century should be seen as a notable regional change.

Beyond Archibald’s (2004) contribution involving Thracian inscriptions, what else can the IACP tell us about ethnicity in Thrace? Another large part of the project helped shed light on the effect early Greek poleis had on the Aegean front for preexisting local communities. These observations were offered by L. Loukopoulou (2004, 854ff), who documented and discussed some of the pre- and post-colonisation settlements on the Aegean coast, but this presented more questions relating to the ethnic composition of the region as a whole. That is, what happened to these local inhabitants and settlements after periods of colonisation? As Loukopoulou (2004) noted, what we find from the regions of Aegean and inland Thrace (below the Maritsa) are Greek political institutions which arise in and around pre-Greek settled areas. Yet little to no evidence exists of the status of the region’s pre-colonial inhabitants, which inevitably complicates our understanding of the regions’ ethnic dynamics. For example, the town of Datos between the Strymon and Nestos rivers, according to Herodotus was originally inhabited by the Edonians (Hdt. 9.75), yet around 360 B.C., the Thasians (Diod. 16.3.7) establish an apoikia of the same name, which was presumably nearby to the original Datos. After this, the Edonians

---

42 Interestingly, tribal names (as given to us by the Greek authors) are never recorded on contemporary inscriptions, but are only ever mentioned on early Thracian coins.

43 This is the area starting at the Axios river and stretching until the Evros river.
are not mentioned again, and what happened to these former Thracian inhabitants is never specified. Perhaps we can presume that they did not leave but may have gradually integrated themselves within the Thasian apoikia, but there is seldom evidence to say this.

Another puzzling example comes from further along the Thracian coast opposite Samothrace, and its dependent polis of Zonē (for classification of its polis status see Hdt. 7.59.2, Loukopoulos 2004a, 881). The site dates to the 6th century B.C. and features all the trappings of a new colonial city, i.e., a hippodamic layout, sewage systems, an acropolis, paved roads, and stone-built houses (Loukopolou 2004a, 882-883). By the 4th century B.C., the city begins using its city-ethnic Ζωναίος both on coins but also on tribute lists (Loukopoulos 2004a, 881). We know from contemporary literature that this area was inhabited historically by the Kikones (Hdt. 7.108), which corresponds with the large quantity of non-Greek inscriptions found at Zonē (as well as at Maroneia and opposite on Samothrace) that clearly demonstrate that the population consisted of both Greeks and non-Greek-speakers alike (cf. Il. 17.44; Hdt. 7.59, 110; Zonē: IThrAeg 427; Maronia: IThrAeg 376-378; Samothrace: Lehmann 1955, 93-100).44 What Zonē demonstrates is the potential for the absorption of local pre-colonial populations by new Greek colonial institutions. Most of the colonies on the Thracian coast do not contain much, if at all, archaeological evidence which would lead us to identify these non-Greek populations, except for rough handmade pottery (mostly cups) which occurs in graves in the Archaic cemetery of Abdera and the associated cemeteries at Mesamvria- Zonē and Maronia (Tsatsopoulou 1989; 1993; Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi 2001).45 Without this accompanying proof of the endurance of local populations elsewhere, it is impossible to gauge the full extent of local-Greek synoikism, although we can be sure from the inscriptions on both Samothrace and Zonē that this was, on some level, taking place. The question now should be if and how these new political institutions changed preexisting tribal ethnic identities. These Aegean Thracian ethne would not only have found themselves in new political contexts like poleis, with (we assume) new ideals and conventions surrounding membership, yet the question remains to what extent did these new Thracian citizens (if they were permitted to be so, and not some form of local metic-

44 Another enduring Thracian connection of the region is further emphasised by a later decree (IGBulg 12 307 [IGBulg 5 5086] dedicated to honouring Sadalas, a Thracian dynast, along with his supposed ancestor, Koty at Mesamvria (for further discussion of this and its meaning see Graninger 2012, 106-107; 2015, 189-191).

45 The strange tomb at Maronia with strange architecture (Tsastopoulou-Kalapoudi 2001).
like status), adopt new poleis-orientated identities in place of their older tribal affiliations like the Odrysians earlier, i.e., when did a Kikonian become a Zonaian? Beyond this example, it is well documented from the perspective of near contemporary literature beginning with Homer, that, from a Greek-speaking perspective at least, the city where you came from mattered in relation to who you were.46 This fact is pertinent, particularly if city-ethnics mattered. For example, the Arethusian’s, a community who lived on the Chalkidik peninsula were at once described as ‘Thracian’, but are then later referred to as ‘Macedonian’ after the region is consolidated by Philip II (evidence is offered in two Athenian proxeny decrees) (Fraser 2009, 136; FD 3(1), 396). This, therefore, begs the question – and something Morgan (2009, 20) and Antonaccio (2001, 115) have been at pains to stress – was ethnic-manufacturing, particularly concerning the discourse and manipulation of descent, purely an elite decision? The people on the ground obviously had no say in the matter after the area was conquered by the Macedonian ruling-class, and in this respect the IACP has been seminal in helping to highlight these current problems regarding ethnicity on the ground. Moreover, if we accept that some of the preexisting tribes in the region did conform to these new ethnic labels, then the ethnic makeup of Thrace inevitably becomes more complex, perhaps consisting of both older tribal ethnicities and new city-state orientated identities living side-by-side.

2.7.1 Other ethnic perspectives: Thracian coins

Another area of historical evidence which can be used to support ethnic variability as offered by the ancient authors comes from coins. Historically, the study of coins (or numismatics) has always sat comfortably on the intersection between archaeology and classics, on account of both their materiality as objects able to be excavated and used, but also due to their literary significance offered by their embossed writing. Unfortunately, Thracian numismatics have been overlooked in narratives concerning the identity of the Thracians prior the Macedonian invasion of Thrace (for brief summaries see Archibald 1998, 126-135; 2013, 49-52). Ironically, however, Thracian coins have been the source of a considerable amount of academic study and classification stemming as far back as the 18th century. In this respect, four studies stand out which have attempted to integrate the substantial amount of evidence from Thrace into a more concise historical narrative of the region this being specifically Ulrike (1997), Yourouchka (1976), Zlatkovskaya (1971),

46 See earlier for instances in Greek poetry and drama. In these cases, the question is asked ‘what city are you from’ in attempting to place an individual, along with further questions about ones father was.
and to a lesser extent Slovova (2009, 177ff). Although there are numerous other publications which indirectly deal with Thracian numismatics in a more typological sense, particularly pertaining to the Odrysian king-ships (see with references Paupov 2015).

Coins in Thrace not only offer a unique insight into the ways different tribes were able/wanted to invest and participate in the growing commercial and economic activity of Aegean Thrace and beyond, but more crucially, they offer an insight into how these tribes ethnically referred to themselves. Yet, as I mentioned earlier with respect to the once Thracian then Macedonian Arethusians, the choice of ethnic names that we know from coins was controlled from the top, i.e., the person able to mint the coins, therefore, we cannot say for certain whether identities operated differently from the bottom (Fraser 2009, 136). Bearing this in mind, the coins that are left to us from the around the end of the 6th to the mid-5th century B.C. offer unique perspectives of the changing ethnic landscapes of Thrace.

During the periods prior to Xerxes invasion of Greece, evidence exists of eight tribal communities who are producing their own coins (figure 2.6). These are the Derrones, Tintenoi, Oreski, Bisaltae, Zaïeli, Lauai, Ichnai, Edoni, and Letai (Slavova 2009, 177-178; Paunov 2015, 266-270). After Xerxes invasion, however, only the coins of the Bisaltae, Edoni, and Derrones exist, and different still, is that the Edoni and Bisaltae both change from using their tribal ethnics on their coins, to that of their respective kings, i.e., Getas of the Edoni and Mozes of the Bisaltae (Paunov 2015, 266-270). Further changes are observed after 465 B.C., when all tribal coins minted in Thrace belong solely to the Odrysian elite, the earliest being Spardokus around the mid-5th century (Paunov 2015,
Theories have been submitted as to why this may have been. Archibald (1997, 107ff) attributes the rise of the Odrysians as a result of the power-vacuum created after the Persians retreated from Thrace, and Paunov (2015, 267) links it with a response to Macedonian monopolies on Thracian resources during the later 5th century. Yet regardless of what the potential causes were, we are still left with a series of substantial questions which even contradicts with what we know from other contemporary evidence. Herodotus (7.110-12) tells us that the Satrae tribe were a fiercely independent Thracian tribe with substantial metal mines available in their tribal jurisdiction. So why then did they not have their own coins minted? Equally, why are most of the pre-465 B.C. tribes (with the exclusion of the Bisaltae and Edoni) not mentioned by any of our contemporary authors, particularly as the Derronian coinage endured for the same amount of time as those belonging to the Bisaltae and the Edoni, who are attested in the ancient literary evidence? These problems are not easily explained and suggest a landscape which was prone to change, re-configuration, and tight control particularly as all these changes seem to have occurred within a 40-year span.

Concerning ethnicity, the coins offer a special insight into the potential ethnic and political variabilities of Thrace during this time. If we are to accept Hansen’s (2004, 144-149) view that all coins were minted by established communities (both poleis and organised ethne) to such an extent that they created ‘regional ethnics’, then we would expect to see this reflected in the archaeological record. However, this is not the case, and what currently stands is a severe lack of settlement data to ascribe to any of these coin producing tribes in Greek Thrace. Hansen’s definition thus becomes difficult to sustain, yet it could suggest that not all coins were produced by such organised and tangible communities, nor were all those who used them attached to a polis-like political settlement.

As mentioned earlier, the literary evidence has been anything but consistent on the topic of political and urban formation of Thrace. We can agree at least that it was varied as a result of its multiple depictions, and in this respect the coins can only confirm this. This is further emphasised if we consider the non-coin producing communities in Thrace at this time, were they made of different socio-political formations from those with

---

47 It has been suggested by Paunov (2015, 267-268) that this was due to the fact each of the tribes lacked the resources necessary to mint coins in their respective districts, and such resources may have been tightly regulated once monopolised by dominant power groups.

48 No such large settlement evidence has been found in Greek Thrace to correspond to the coin producing areas, at least not beyond Koprivlen, which rises to prominence during the latter parts of the 5th century B.C. (see Delev & Bozhkova 2002)
coins? And did they have/use the same types of regional ethnics as was deployed on the coins? These are significant questions and although no answer can be brought about here, they offer an important negative image of Thrace’s political and ethnic variability. Clearly some tribes were beginning to participate in the ascription of coin ethnics, but even more interestingly, they were doing it through Greek. Similarly, another important question to consider from this section is what exactly did it mean the ethnic groups who produced coins when their coins changed from denoting tribal names, to instead recording the names of particular kings? Did this signify the loss of tribal ethnics as meaningful in Thrace, or was this just a reflection of the ongoing economic competition between particular Thracian elites.

Nevertheless, if we return to the opinion that conceptualisations of ethnicity were rooted, at least partially, in the formation of one’s home political institution, then the variation and change in coin ethnics around Thrace can only stand to underline the regions political and ethnic diversity.

2.8 Concluding Remarks

To repeat points from the beginning of this chapter; ancient terms like *ethnos* and *genos* have incredibly broad lexical meanings, and neither of which can be translated directly to refer to an ethnic group. As I opened this section attempting to clarify these complex and often convoluted terms, I have shown from the accounts of Thracian *ethne* given by non-Thracian authors, there is compelling evidence to assume that the ancient authors regarded the Thracians as an inconsistent ethnic group. Indeed, the enduring impressions left after an analysis of the ancient literary evidence supports the view that the Thracians were a nested series of ethnic groups with their own ways of living and diverse cultural traditions, particularly relating to the elites. In support of this, it was shown through evidence offered by coins and the *IACP* that Thrace was a heavily diverse region, filled at least potentially with different political groups with their own way of negotiating their identity through a variety of different media and political/urban formations. Ultimately, we are not left with the question of *who* the Thracians were in the literature, as it has been demonstrated here that their image, beyond Herodotus’ (8.144) comment was incredibly diverse, rather *how* do the conceptualisations of the Thracians pulled from this section compare with the image from the archaeological evidence?
Chapter 3

A Materialist Approach to Ethnicity

To begin, it is worth establishing that an *ethnic group* is simply a term used to designate a particular cluster of people on the basis of *shared traits*. The Oxford English Dictionary defines *ethnicity* – i.e., that which characterises the ethnic group – as “The fact or state of belonging to a social group that has a common national or cultural tradition”. It is, therefore, not disputed within literature on the topic what ethnicity is, rather debates surrounding ethnicity have instead focused on *how* it manifests, how its adherents or ‘members’ reproduce it, how it is negotiated, and how such an identity is passed on. This is critical to note, as past studies in both archaeology and anthropology have diagnosed ethnicity to consist of many different criteria, resulting in a large amount of ethnic literature with no agreed upon consensus. This chapter, therefore, attempts to map the development of ethnicity briefly within anthropology and then within archaeology, in order to articulate the current situation regarding its definition. I then argue that despite several impressive publications on the topic in archaeology, the study of ethnicity needs some discursive renewal. Hereafter, I attempt to remedy this by submitting a slightly looser conceptualisation of ethnicity, which lends itself to being applied to the archaeological record, after which it is hoped that such an exercise will aid the difficult relationship between material culture groups and theories of ethnicity in archaeology.

3.1 History of ethnicity: outside of archaeology

From the point of its conception, the earliest studies on what we would later call ‘ethnicity’, were originally identified under the term ‘race’.\(^1\) Although understood differently

---

\(^1\)OED defines ‘race’ as "A group of people, animals, or plants, connected by common descent or origin." The emphasis here is on descent rather than the sharing of common phenotypical or cultural
today, these early studies actively connected ideas of cultural homogeneity with additional phenotypical differences involving skin colour and social behaviour. Chesnutt’s (1900/1996) article *The Future American* was one such study, which clarified early conceptualisations of the word, adding “I [the author] use the word ‘race’ here in its popular sense— that of a people who look substantially alike and are moulded by the same culture and dominated by the same ideals” (Chesnutt 1996, 19). Ironically, however, Chesnutt (1996, 18-19) was also unsure of the concept of ethnicity himself, as was demonstrated with his identification of the ‘American race’, which he also calls the ‘American ethnic’. Yet Chesnutt was not alone in connecting ideas of ‘race’ with culture in early anthropological circles. Kallen’s (1915) *Democracy versus the Melting-Pot: A Study of American Nationality* was another early example of the conflation between consanguineous and cultural groups. In the article, Germans, Slavs, and Jews are spoken about in no uncertain terms to be underpinned by ‘blood’ which is expressed through their shared material traits, which were then mixed (the bloods) in the melting-pot of America. Early discussions of identity groups, therefore, were represented through blood related ‘race’ groups underpinned by ‘common cultural’ traits. Yet, beyond being superficially problematic and dangerous, these early studies were prone to inherently etic and white Anglo-Saxon based perspectives of non-white collectives, the likes of which would have been heavily influenced by existing social prejudices and economic status. Thus, the extent to which these different ‘races’ which Chesnutt and others referred, identified as groups themselves (based on observed objective differences of skin and culture) often held no bearing in reality (for examples see Eriksen 1993, 3-7; Hannerz 1976, 434). These problematic conflations of race were eventually stripped away from discussions of social groups with a common identity and replaced gradually with the term ‘ethnic’ or ‘ethnicity’, the first of such studies came from continental Europe, specifically Weber’s (1978) ‘Ethnic Groups’ article.

Despite participating in the belief of ‘races’, which he understood as biologically and anthropologically given, Weber’s understanding of identity groups shifted away from characteristics. Confusingly, however, the OED has also defined the term as an ‘ethnic group’ or ‘as forming a distinct ethnic set.’ Thus, the conflation of ethnic and race is not easily distinguishable to such an extent that definitions relating to ‘race’ are defined as ‘ethnic’. For a slightly later but still good example is Toomer’s (1929) *Race Problems and Modern Society*. Again, in the article ‘race’ is used to insinuate geo-specific blood relations, which are underpinned by common objective cultural traits. Interestingly, many of the ‘common cultural’ traits (particularly in reference to Black African Americans) were significantly proven later to be the result of low socio-economic status rather than autonomy as an identity group (see Eriksen 1993, 3-7; 1976, 434).
those which had gone before (for view on race see Weber 1978, 387). Yet, in contrast from previous investigations, Weber stated explicitly that such ‘racial’ differences “account for little, except in cases of extreme aesthetic antipathy.” (Weber 1978, 387), and for him, ‘ethnic identity’ offered a better theoretical explanation as the glue that bonded his concept of Gemeinschaft (community). This glue or verhesten (understanding) – of which I shall discuss more later – featured some of the hallmarks of ethnic criteria, that being a belief in common ancestry/origin, shared culture, and from a particular place (see similar criteria by Smith 1986).

Unfortunately, however, the term ethnicity or ethnic identity did not initially find popularity within anthropological anglophone literature until the post-war period. Prior to this, the study of what would later become known as ‘ethnicity’ was taking place implicitly in publications like Evans-Pritchard’s (1940) The Nuar and Leach’s (1954) Political Systems of Highland Burma which discussed the ways identity groups operated through culturally specific behaviours that helped foster a sense of extra-familial group cohesiveness and constituted group membership (cf. Smith 1986, 22-32). Notably, both of these early publications recognised and developed the idea that members of a social kinship group – which was viewed essentially as a social unit with linked language, culture, and beliefs – could manipulate and deliberately switch between other identity groups by behaving through certain ways and adapting to the customs of neighbouring groups. Much to the surprise of early anthropologists, tribal identities were critically not a fixed phenomenon, even if this was only relegated to the position of elites. Yet, despite ethnicity’s fluid significance being demonstrated, these studies also demonstrated that social groups still maintained important myths both as ways to distinguish each other and to legitimise intra-group relationships. A good example of this is in Evans-Pritchard’s (1940, 123-125) study of the relationship between the Nuar and Dinka tribes. Both tribes were described as very similar in terms of their culture and ways of life, and both adhered to the same founding myth, i.e., they believe that both tribes are descended from two brothers of the same God. Evans-Pritchard even documents that the two tribes use their fictive origin myth to substantiate modern tensions between them, just as their two mythic sibling ancestors did in the mythic past (ibid). Yet, despite their strengths, these early investigations overlooked much of the ways through which material culture was implemented in reference to the tribal identities. This oversight relating to the culture properties of ethnicity largely continued throughout much of the anthropological works.
from the first half of the 20th century, and even after this time, cultural products only received marginal inference in relation to ethnicity.

During the 1960s, studies involving ethnic identities became increasingly explicit with their theoretical aims and began to develop the theoretical understanding of this type of identity and how it operated within the context of an increasingly multi-cultural America. These new studies disputed past conceptualisations of group identity, as established by Leach (1954) and Evans-Pritchard (1940), in order to assess if these types of group identities operated in a similar manner within the context of multi-ethnic nations like the US. A pioneering study in this vein was published by Glazer and Moynihan (1963), who analysed five distinct immigrant ethnic groups within New York. The pioneering work traced the history of these immigrant communities from their arrival to the US until the 1960s, where it was argued that due to the new competitive economic and political contexts these communities found themselves in, their ‘old world’ ethnicities gradually eroded and became subsumed within the more general ‘American middle-class’. Despite this, the study also found that these communities did retain important ethnic differences between one another, but that these were the result of new world pressures like political ideology, economic aspirations, and religious conservatism. Thus, broadly speaking, ‘old-world’ first generation immigrant identities were fundamentally changed (not necessarily eroded) into more homogeneous cultural practices, often prompted by social competition.

It was not until the pioneering study conducted by Barth (1969), that anthropological investigations which explicitly sought to understand ethnicity underwent a monumental shift. I shall not discuss Barth’s contribution to ethnicity and its relationship to archaeology at length as this has already been undertaken most extensively by S. Jones (1997), however it is necessary to note that Barth’s studies were part of a wider conceptual shift which opted to discuss theoretical concerns within non-western contexts, in order to better understand how theoretical concerns like ethnicity operate within ‘traditional’ societies. Significantly, it was first through Barth’s work where the emphasis on materiality was placed in attempting to identify the expression of ethnicity, which had up until this point been mostly disregarded. Critically for Barth, material culture was acknowledged to be able to signal ethnic affiliation within the context of social interaction on the boundaries between groups. The critical point developed from his study came with the acknowledgement that the ‘cultural stuff’ that encloses a group, i.e., the boundary, should not come to characterise a group, but only those products
constructed on the boundary of any group should be considered as ethnically significant
and recognised as ethnic signalling against an ethnic ‘other’. This theoretical innovation
is key to understand and had considerable influence on the conceptualisation of ethnicity
within anthropology, particularly as it recognised that material culture did not (always)
correspond to subjective notions at the heart of social groups allegiance.

Since Barth, ethnicity witnessed an explosion in scholarly popularity, and after the
early 1970s it fast becoming a major avenue of academic enquiry (cf. Glazer & Moynihan
1975). One significant edited volume on ethnicity was published as a result of these
lively debates, that being Glazer and Moynihan’s (1975) *Ethnicity: Theory and Experi-
ence*. The collection of papers within the volume touched on a broad sweep of topics,
beginning with current conceptualisations on what ethnicity was, to drawing on a range
of case studies, the likes of which have found successful use within recent papers in ar-
chaeology as well (see Morgan (2003) for use of Patterson’s (1975) definition). Yet what
is critical to note about the rise in popularity concerning ethnicity during this time is that
for most of its theorists, its operation and identification was not the same. For example,
Horowitz (1975, 113) pointed towards ethnic groups consisting of a series of key criteria
for membership, which was essentially acquired at birth, to varying degrees, and could
not be entered on will. This separated it in Horowitz’ opinion from a voluntary group
affiliation. However for both Parsons (1975, 57) and Patterson (1975, 307-9), members
of an ethnic group could willingly enter an ethnic group without being born into it, as
the primary basis of these kinds of identity groups were simply a sense of extra-familial
belonging (and this could be fostered through many cultural media). In this respect
Glazer and Moynihan’s (1975) early collection of papers marks a diversity of conceptual-
isations surrounding the term which would later be typified into two dominant strains of
argument within ethnic theoretical discourse, that being primordialism (which identified
ethnicity as being based through blood and kinship groups) and instrumentalism (which
saw ethnicity as being constructed and manipulated).

By the late 1970s, most working on the subject had generally accepted that ethnic-
ity was essentially a dynamic yet contextually based phenomenon (see Eriksen 2013).
Scholarly consensus on the matter seemed to overall agree that ethnicity maintained a
dynamic and active relationship with material culture and that it communicated differ-

---

4 For the large number of scholarly papers on ethnicity published on ethnicity see *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader* by Sollors (1996).
ences between identity groups within specific social contexts. From this point, the new theoretical problem facing discussions was now orientated towards discovering where it originated and how it operated. These two debates later became known as either *primordialist* or *instrumentalist*.

Primordialism believed that ethnic identity was innate within a particular group of people, and the symbols and objects which came to represent them were fixed. One of the most famous discussions on the primordialist position came from Geertz (1973), who both argued that cultural symbols (i.e., religion, language, but particularly pheno- notypical qualities described as ‘race’) were inherent within specific groups, and that one could only enter such groups through birth. Geertz’ interpretation of ethnicity owes, at least in part, its inspiration from an earlier piece work by Shils (1957) who advocated much the same and placed great emphasis on inherited symbols of identity. These symbols used within the group were thus maintained by ‘primordial’ and ineffable feelings of connectedness to fellow group members based on their perceived exclusivity and consanguinity.

Correspondingly, instrumentalist theories of ethnicity held that ethnic groups could alter their identities and symbols which came to represent them as strategies for specific socio-political or economic gain. One of the best series of studies to demonstrate this position was Abner-Cohen (1969; 1981), particularly his study of Nigerian Hausa traders living in Yoruba. Within the study, Abner-Cohen (1969) demonstrated that during fiscal encounters, immigrant Hausa dealers could use and manipulate their ethnic status in order to secure the trust and trade of a Hausa broker, even if the dealer had only tangential links to being Hausa. To ensure this economic relationship, Abner-Cohen identified that the Hausa dealers would attempt to maintain visual identifiers of their Hausa heritage in order to highlight aspects of shared ethnic symbols, specifically for economic benefit. Another good example is A. Cohen’s (2013) *Symbolic Construction of Community* (building on his earlier 1982 publication) considered the symbolic capital of culture as the locus of ethnic identity, and for A. Cohen, this made it unique from other types of identification.

During the 1980s, however, another shift occurred which was heavily influenced by

---

*5* A good series of debates relating to material culture and ethnicity in anthropology was had between Naroll (1964: 1968) and Moerman (1965; 1968), with regards to the Lue communities in Thailand. S. Jones (1997) has already pointed this out and discussed this at length, however, it remains relevant to note it particularly in reference to the development of ethnicity and how it was understood during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

*6* For recent re-appraisals of primordialism beyond Geertz and Shils see Bayer (2009).
the growing socio-political unrest felt in Europe. During this time, it became increasingly necessary to assess how ethnicity operated within the concept of ‘nation’, and to more importantly link up this question to broader concerns about how ethnicities act during the rise of new nations. This resulted in a hive of academic interest between ethnicity and concepts of nation-states. The foremost voice in these discussions was that of Smith (1986), whose work is still the cornerstone for such discussions. Within his work, Smith identifies and discusses the symbols and categories through which nations ethnically legitimise themselves whilst attributing power or disenfranchising minority ethnic groups on account of the nation’s historical identity. Nations, from Smith’s (1986, 22-32) perspective, are made of **ethnie**, i.e., social groups bound by myth of common descent, a collective name, a shared history, a distinctive shared culture, a specific territory, and a (rather elusive) sense of ‘solidarity’. Equally important were other discussions which instead placed emphasis on ethnic violence and how ethnicity was crystallised within the context of group violence motivated on this basis. In this instance, Horowitz’s (1985) book *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* remains a fundamental addition to these debates and closely relates to theme which runs through Smith’s work, that is an attempt to identify the mechanics of ethnicity within the context of politically volatile and ethnically plural contexts.

Since the 1990s and until today, theories surrounding ethnicity are as manifold as the criteria used to define them, which is epitomised by the publication of three separate readers on the topic that draw chronologically on the different debates which characterise ethnicity in each of the decades after 1900s (see Sollors 1996; Hutchinson and Smith 1996; Guibernau and Rex 2010). Critically one of the largest contributions these readers make, albeit implicitly, is making clear that ethnicity is not participated in in any one way, rather it is expressed through multiple avenues, both physically and non-physically. In some instances, myths of descent and being tied to a specific territory do not matter, but in other cases, being born in a place and the acquisition of the local language is enough to ethnically assimilate. The power of various ethnic criteria is, therefore, relative and contextually validated. No one series of categories can be used to define ethnic identity in general. Sometimes emphasis is placed on language (Das Gupta 1975), other times cultural items (Cohen 1985), or descent (Geertz 1973), but none are necessary to be present in order to be ethnic. This realisation has, in fact, been observed by those working on ethnicity (see broadly Jenkins 2008), but unlike in archaeology, it’s difficult-
to-define nature has not stopped use of the theory. We can accept now, for example, that participating in Scottish ethnicity is not the same as participating in Jewish ethnicity, and more interestingly, an individual can of course participate in both ethnic identities at any one time.

Beyond this, additional debates within the last twenty years have focused on cognate issues relating to ethnicity. As discussed by Jenkins (2008, 111-112), these topics have primarily focused on re-conceptualising ethnic ‘groupness’, through the analysis of national identities like Hungarian-ness and Romanian-ness in plural contexts like Transylvania. In particular Brubaker (2002; 2004) investigated this interplay in Romania and used it to argue in favour of ethnic groups being re-conceptualised as a ‘process’ or ‘event’, wherein individuals chose from a range of symbols in different contexts to best represent their affiliation to a particular ethnicity, and the material symbols of which are contested in different everyday spaces resulting in constant re-negotiation.

It is important to note, however, that these recent anthropological arguments concerning ethnicity have largely neglected the role of culture that was last purported by Barth (1969), with the exception of Cohen (1985). Today, some of the most innovative research concerning ethnicity comes from investigations in reference to the ever-broadening set of identities inhabited by people as mediated through technology. These debates began around the early 1990s with studies by Fuglerud (1999), who investigated the idea of so-called ‘trans-nationalism’ (for summary on this see Eriksen 2013, 1-7). The fluid nature of modern-day ethnicities negotiated by technology, inevitably complicates pre-existing definitions. Moreover, the use of culture as implicated within the expression of ethnic identity and the formation of ethnic groups is another aspect of the theory which has since been largely overlooked since Barth (1969). Of course, the anthropological theoretical agenda is arguably less concerned with the materiality of identities than archaeology, but critically, discussions concerning the materiality of ethnicity have been largely under-debated within recent anthropological literature, meanwhile the use of technology to connect divided members of an ethnic group indubitably presents new questions towards culture and how ethnicity operates using it to express itself. Thus, many of the recent anthropological debates have, akin to archaeology, over-theorised ethnicity in reference to the modern-day world, which has complicated its usefulness and applicability in reference to archaeology, especially regarding its alienation of the material record.
3.2 Early Archaeological Approaches: ethnicity’s origins in culture-history

Within archaeology, however, the history of ethnicity could not be more different. The question of ethnicity and social groups was, in contrast with anthropology, born out of ‘cultural-historical’ approaches that assessed the association of preexisting historical peoples (ideally within the confines of the burgeoning European nation-states) with archaeological cultural groups. Paradoxically, archaeological discussions of past ‘people’ were the first to relate it to the concept of a ‘group’ which had associated material boundaries, long before Barth (1969). However, in contrast to the much later Barthian boundaries seen in anthropology, these early discourses which began in the 19th century, defined social groups as the sum-total of their material cultural products.

These ideas began during the 19th century, where burgeoning academic inquiry into the past which was fuelled by an ever-present need for modern-day European Empires to historically situate themselves. In Russia, archaeological excavations of kurgans (tumuli) and the display of antiquities that were the result of burgeoning interest in ideas of pan-slavism and myths of Scythian descent, during the 1800s eventually led to the establishment of a centralised Archeographical Commission in 1834 by Count Sergei Uvarov (Díaz-Andreu 2007, 256; Whittaker 1984). Likewise, in France during 1803 Napoleon Bonaparte created the Academy of Celtic Studies that aimed at archiving historical and archaeological data, which ultimately helped sustain a direct link between the French and ancient Gaul (Trigger 1989, 213). Germany, as well during this time was no exception, and in 1869 founded the influential Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, which aimed to understand the development of European peoples behind archaeological ‘cultures’ (Trigger 1989, 235). Members of this newly created society were espousing ideas which connected cultural evolutionary frameworks – originally espoused by the likes of G. Montelius – with ancient ‘peoples’ frequently on the sole basis of pottery styles (Trigger 1989, 234). This zeitgeist, which sought to identify the ancient antecedents of the European, but particularly the German Volk, paved the way for G. Kossina’s 1911 publication ‘Die Herkunft der Germanen’. Within his seminal work, Kossina directly equated archaeological cultural groups with the a ‘racial’ history of a nation.\footnote{There is a considerable corpus of work in German literature on the early ‘romantic’ notions of the past as espoused by Kossina and his contemporaries. Most of these articles focus on linking it within}
cultural provinces coincide at all times with certain peoples or tribes.”

On the basis of his methodology, Kossina claimed that he was able to identify past peoples, such as the Germans (or Aryans) during prehistory, solely based on their cultural products (cf. Trigger 1989; S. Jones 1997, 15-26).

It was only during the mid-1920s, that Kossina’s culture historical method finally transferred across into anglophone archaeology with the publication of V. G. Childe’s (1925) *The Dawn of European Civilization*. Yet differently from Kossina, Childe’s approach was more deeply rooted in positivist investigations of the archaeological record, which drew on a vast amount of data from around Europe, in order to identify the homeland of the ‘Indo-Europeans’. Yet despite developing Kossina’s ideas into a much more sophisticated methodology, it was also clear that for most of his career, Childe himself struggled with merging archaeology with ideas of race or ethnicity. As is particularly evident from his publications throughout his life, Childe’s definitions surrounding the ‘cultural group’ developed and changed, and in this respect, we can say that Childe himself was the first archaeologist to explicitly attribute an ‘ethnic’ association to the conceptualisation of the ‘cultural group’ (Trigger 1989, 245-246).

These struggles involving the people behind the archaeological record began early within Childe’s career, specifically during his 1926 publication, *The Aryans*. In contrast to Childes carefully constructed *Dawn of European Civilization*, his *Aryans* advanced into the same sort of problematic analyses which had been constructed by Kossina over a decade earlier. For Childe (1926, 212): “The physical qualities of that [Nordic] stock did enable them [the Aryans] by bare fact of superior strength to conquer even more advanced peoples and so to impose their language on areas from which their bodily type has almost completely vanished.” Within his publication, Childe inferred on the basis of the archaeology the different ‘races’ around Europe and attributed their ‘physical strength’ to their enduring cultural products (Childe 1926, 211-212). For example, Childe added that ‘ancient people’ the likes of the Greeks were only marginally superior as a ‘culture’ since they fundamentally lacked the superior racial qualities possessed by the Nordic.
peoples, being racially diluted themselves (Trigger 1989, 248). These new ideas adopted by Childe were a significant step back from his more positivist Montelius-style models published a year earlier. Likewise, a similar sentiment is repeated within his 1929 publication *The Danube in Prehistory*. Despite the book more broadly representing a positive advancement from his 1926 ‘cultural historical model’, he made additional problematic associations between material culture and race, adding that the nature of north African local rock-art was “…best understood in racial terms.” (Childe 1929, 32). It can, therefore, be attributed with some certainty that Childe’s highly influential framework of cultural history, at least during the mid-late 1920s, equated ‘race’ with material remains.

Yet, notwithstanding his early, and often overlooked racial links, by the 1930s his conceptualisation of culture seems to have undergone a significant shift away from ideas of race and towards more neutral ideas involving ethnicity: “If *ethnic* be the adjective for people, we may say that prehistoric archaeology has good hope of establishing an *ethnic* history of Europe, whilst a *racial* one seems hopelessly remote.” (Childe 1935, 198-199) It is worth noting here, that whilst Childe never again discusses archaeology in such ‘racially’ charged terms, he does maintain the position that cultural groups represent ‘people’, and he upheld this position until his final publication in the 1950s: “*Between these extremes the sociological counterpart of an archaeological culture can only be designated by the non-committal term ‘people.’*” (Childe 1956, 133). Unfortunately, Childe never specified what he meant using the term ‘ethnic’, which was relatively novel within the first several decades of the 20th century. Unfortunately, it is not known what led to this shift in perspective for Childe, that is away from race and more towards a material conceptualisation of ethnicity. Yet despite this we can appreciate that his later theories on the ethnic basis of cultural groups would come to form the conceptual groundwork for archaeological investigations for much of the 20th century until the 1970s (cf. Piggott 1965; Trigger 1989, 288-289; S. Jones 1997, 17-25).

From the advent of the early 20th century, therefore, pervading assumptions relating to archaeological enquiry viewed cultures as a direct reflection of past peoples, which began as a racial history and later became one defined by ethnicity. This notion of culture

---

10Despite this, modern historiography fiercely maintains that Childe was apparently ‘unaware’ of Kossina’s problematic theories despite essentially regurgitating the exact same sentiment within his earlier publication (Trigger 1989, 243).

11See also S. Jones (1997, 17-25) who also quotes this passage for a deeper analysis of Childe and his contribution.
was critically based on the idea that social groups would conform to a series of consistent material traditions. Yet, much to the chagrin of contemporary archaeological thought, this culture-historical approach was an extremely beneficial means of classification which helped delineate regional chronological and stylistic differences of material culture until the latter parts of the 1970s within the context of anglophone archaeology (cf. Renfrew 1972; 1979).

3.3 Processual and Post-Processual Frameworks

The end of the ‘culture history’ method as developed by archaeologists like Childe was heralded by the establishment of conceptual shift, later called ‘Processual Archaeology’. Henceforth, it was now argued that culture constituted a process or ‘system’ and that the archaeological material must be conceptualised as such, instead of being merely a reflection of descriptive patterns which could be used to infer the presence of past ‘ethnic peoples’ (for main arguments see Clarke 1968, 365-394; Binford 1962; 1965). In particular, a considerable amount of formative investigation into this topic focused on the utilisation of frameworks in determining levels of similarity and difference on account of a series of testable variables (cf. Clarke 1968, 365-369). These new approaches which prioritised quantitative data largely contributed to the demise of discussions concerning ethnic groups, and this is particularly observed in the conspicuous absence of any reference to ‘ethnicity’ within archaeological literature prior to the advent of ‘social archaeology’ (or post-processual) in the 1980s.

Yet this is not to suggest that broader debates of what ‘culture’ was, beyond the Childean framework were not being had, rather they were being tested through quantifiable means in order to identify how it worked. In this respect, one of the greatest contributions to this ongoing series of debates was from Clarke (1968), in his widely influential publication, *Analytical Archaeology*. As a concept, Clarke was extremely sceptical of the culture as a bounded entity, which he recognised needed to be radically reorganised away from the culture-ethnic ideas put forward by Childe, with a distinct emphasis on its non-uniform and chaotic nature:

“Prehistorians still seem to think that in order to define groups it is necessary that every member within the group must have all the qualifying attributes. In practice this ideal has never been demonstrated in archaeology; no group of cultural assemblages from
a single culture ever contains, nor ever did contain all of the cultural artefacts” (Clarke 1968, 36).\textsuperscript{12}

Clarke’s (1968, 37-38) answer was to define cultures as ‘polythetic’, which meant that it consisted of a group of entities which shared many attributes, yet whose attributes were not sufficient or necessary for group membership. The argument was later echoed by Shennan (1989, 11-13), who emphasised that this conceptual leap was necessary in order to move the discourse beyond the understanding that culture was an inherently bound to any one group. It was then hoped by viewing cultures as polythetic that archaeologists would acknowledge that fixed and continuous ‘cultures’ do not exist, and instead understand that ‘culture’ is the contingent interrelations of material distributions which were the product of different social conditions.

It was within Clarke’s (1968, 263-269) idea of ‘cultural distribution’ where his theory of polythetic cultural groups came into action. For Clarke, artefact-types were distributed between cultural groups in irregular lobes of overlapping material variations, with many artefact-types occurring in other cultural assemblages in neighbouring areas, and vice versa (figure 3.1). Yet critically these polythetic overlapping objects also feature a sort of ‘fall-off’ concerning shared cultural elements when the area of distance between cultural groups increased (figure 3.2) (see also Gifford 1960, 341-342). For the first time since Childe, a new idea of what culture was had been established which critically dismissed the idea that artefacts represented peoples. Now, the pervading ideas was that cultural groups were dynamic, and were formed of a unique series artefact types which it both shared and maintained in reference to its neighbouring cultural groups.

Yet, what exactly these overlapping polythetic cultural zones represented, was even for Clarke (1968, 385-394), still somewhat of a mystery. Despite finding some evidence for correlation between cultural and linguistic groups within North American tribal societies, he understood that within the context of the ancient world, making assumptions about ethno-linguistic groups on account of the distribution of cultures was in many ways too difficult, despite agreeing that the “... ‘peoples’ of the classical historians usually broadly equate with the intersect of language group, cultural group and subrace sets, whilst the smaller ‘tribal’ entities concern individual and specific language, culture and kinship

\textsuperscript{12}Clarke cites Childe (1956, 33) who voices a similar sentiment to Clarke, i.e., that not all artefact types need to occur in every assemblage to be part of that ‘culture’ but need to occur in at least two sites, with more than one example within each site. Yet one of the main differences between the two was that, for Childe, these cultural groups had strong ethnic associations.
Figure 3.1: Visual representation expressing the relationship between the distribution boundaries of four cultural groups (after Clarke 1968, 311)

Figure 3.2: Diagram showing ‘cultural assemblage’ variation within and without a cultural area. The curve plot represents the negative relationship between shared cultural elements and geographic distance of cultural groups (after Clarke 1968, 384)
sets.” (Clarke 1968, 404). Ethnic discourse within the realms of archaeological theory had, up until this point, only received marginal inference, with no explicit reference with any of the major works. Clarke (1968, 394-404) himself made only a passing comment about ethnicity during his discussion on cultural groups representing ‘past peoples’ as documented by ancient Greek historians, but largely the topic was still very much on the fringes of the processual archaeology. Consequently, the ideas born out of early anthropological studies during the 1960s and 1970s as discussed earlier had little to no effect on contemporary theoretical archaeological discourse, and it was only with the advent of the 1980s and the pioneering ethno-archaeological study of communities in the Baringo District of Kenya by Hodder (1982) and Wiessner’s (1983; 1985) research of the Kalahari San people, that links between material culture as directly involved with discourse of identity were being theorised.

These new debates sprang out of a new theoretical shift which took place at the beginning of the 1980s, which rejected the purely scientific and functionalist explanations offered by the quantitatively saturated discourse of processualism. These new archaeologists would eventually adopt the name ‘post-processualists’, and scholarly discourse during this time was focused on re-conceptualising the past and its products with a heavier emphasis on identities and social personae, and this was no less the case in reference to ethnicity, particularly evident in two pioneering ethno-archaeological studies concerning style and identity by Hodder (1982) and Wiessner (1983) (S. Jones 1997, 113-116).

For the first time since the publication of Barth’s (1969) study on ethnic groups and boundaries, it was demonstrated by Hodder (1982), that despite large-scale social interactions across two ethnic groups, well-defined material cultural distinctions were maintained, but only through specific artefact mediums. From this perspective, it was beginning to be realised that material culture between ethnic groups could lead to archaeologically identifiable material distributions, which could, by extension, be used to trace the expression of regional ethnicities. Yet, it was also suggested by Hodder (1982, 186-187) that whilst ethnic groups could be identified through objective differences of material distributions, ethnic groups could also opt for other tactics of self-expression which did not need to be observed on a ‘boundary’ of any particular group. On this basis, Hodder (1982, 56) identified the position of hearths between the Njemps, Pokot, and Tugen communities in Kenya corresponded to the extent of the tribal groups, yet critically, they were not on public display. Further frustrations were recognised when Hodder
(1982, 69) also identified that even when tribal specific styles were on visual display – like the unique styles painted on calabash milk containers within the Njemp community – they were instead used to signal information within the group and not outside, which would be beyond the remit of understanding if discovered by archaeologists.

On this basis and furthering Hodder’s idea, Wiessner (1983; 1985) suggested that public and private ethnic signalling ought to be expected within studies involving ethnic groups. Style was contextually conspicuous, and this is something that both Hodder and even Barth had initially overlooked. To overcome this, Wiessner suggested two types of styles within the context of an ethnic group, 1) emblematic style, which she defined as being formal and for the purpose of relaying a message to those outside of the social group; and 2) assertive style, which she defined as being on a smaller scale (and is personally based), communicates identities of the individual (see also S. Jones 1997, 113-116). Therefore, at least within ethnoarchaeology, it came to be realised that material culture had the potential to be implicated within the creation of identities within a group and the negotiation of ethnic identities beyond it. Yet, problematically, it was still unspecified how this could be identified within the archaeological record, particularly in prehistory, and further still, there was still a persistent gap in relation to which artefacts were best to distinguish it.

As a result of the ideas originally put forward by the likes of Wiessner and Hodder, it gradually came to be understood that whilst the expression of ethnicity was not an essential quality of artefact style or shape these attributes could be used for the process of ethnic signalling, with styles and forms encouraged to cross social boundaries whilst other may have been actively maintained (Barth 1969; Hodder 1982). The social identities and, therefore, ethnic identities, archaeologically speaking, were now understood to be able to manifest through artefacts within different social contexts (see Haaland 1969; Hodder 1982, 54-55). Yet, despite these theoretical innovations, it was still unclear what this would look like within the archaeological record of prehistory. It was known from this point that objects and identities – like ethnicity – were linked, yet it remained unclear how exactly this operated in reference to objects deposited in the ground within different contexts and this problem was the subject of discussion within the major advances in the study of ethnicity offered by S. Jones (1997).

More recently, however, Engevik (2008; 2010) – who was directly inspired by the methodology identifying styles in the communication of group identities, constructed by Wiessner – proved through his study of the distribution of ‘bucket-shaped pots’ and cruciform brooches in Norway that artefacts were distributed in such a way to suggest the deliberate demarcation of regional boundaries.
3.4 Current Archaeological Approaches: enter Hall and Jones

As the debate stands today, there is still a persistent gap between what we think ethnicity is and how it is linked/expressed within material culture. Despite the conclusions made by ethno-archaeological studies from the 1980s – who identified the mobilisation of identities through both artefacts and artefact styles – no concrete methodology of ethnicity had yet been formally introduced into academic archaeological narratives. At least since the early 1990s, there still existed a considerable gap between discourse involving ethnic identity and material culture, the latter often being treated as a passive aspect intended to communicate group identity (cf. Sackett 1990; Lucy 2005, 43ff).

Yet, studies concerning ethnicity within archaeology were fundamentally changed after the publication of S. Jones’ (1997) magnum opus, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*, which addressed the perennial problems involving the relationship between ethnic identity and material culture. Her investigation involved an analysis which combined the social relationships that objects were embedded with a sharper re-examination on how artefact types and contexts may hold the key to understanding group ethnic expression. Unfortunately, however, despite contributing the most exhaustive historiography of anthropological and archaeological debates surrounding ethnicity to-date, S. Jones (1997, 84-140) never formally defined an archaeologically applicable methodology of ethnicity beyond the past definitions that she so articulately critiqued. Instead, and using the anthropological work of Bentley (1987, 27), S. Jones argued that it was through Bourdieu’s (1977) theory of habitus that archaeologists could overcome the *emic* versus *etic* dilemma that had been argued within anthropological circles three decades prior between Naroll (1964; 1968) and Moerman (1965).14 For S. Jones, the enduring problem with ethnicity, at least in terms of material culture was epitomised with the debate relating to where to find it, i.e., in the self-definition of groups or within the criteria created by external others. S. Jones (1997, 84) identified that although ethnicity had been defined as a culturally ascribed, based on real/assumed shared culture and common descent; questions remained about how it operated through culture. What was needed from the perspective of S. Jones, was a guide on how to define ethnicity within the archaeological record, beyond falling back into the trap of creating a cultural-historical framework.

---

14It should be mentioned that S. Jones, in the creation of her theory, also drew on a series of debates between Bentley (1987, 1991) and Yelvington (1991), wherein the applicability of Bourdieu’s habitus concept in relation to ethnicity was first evaluated. Bentley arguing in favour of its use in accounting for the changing nature of one’s ethnic affiliation within different ‘fields of action’, whereas Yelvington argues against this.
Therefore, using Bourdieu’s (1977, 78-93) theory of habitus, S. Jones (1997, 123-129) defined that ethnic identity is “...grounded in the shared subliminal dispositions of the social group, which shape and are shaped reflexively by objective commonalities of practice, i.e., the habitus”. These practices then become symbols of ethnicity which are then given meaning from the group as they are appropriated and used to reflect common group affiliation and boundedness. Importantly for S. Jones (1997, 70-71), there was no de facto relationship between representations of the ethnic group and material culture, rather ethnic identity was expressed contextually, and was expected to cross-cut artefact boundaries and manifest as a series of overlapping material boundaries made up by various representations of cultural difference.

Despite the use of habitus, there remained some theoretical stumbling blocks, which were also voiced by Yelvington (1991) in response to Bentley’s (1987) use of the theory, which in turn S. Jones also faced. In using habitus, problems arose relating inevitably to the free-will of agents against the embodied structure from one’s field-of-action. We know from past anthropological works like Leech that people can and do change ethnic groups, and formally appropriate a new culture. Therefore, if ethnicity is linked to habitus as S. Jones theorises, then the question remains as to what extent ethnicity can be changed at will. Otherwise, it would demand that this manipulation-based behaviour be pre-existing within a habitus from an agent’s field-of-action.

The immediate academic reverberations created by S. Jones’ (1997) work were significant. A year after her publication, similar style investigations on ethnicity were beginning to germinate, which critically attempted, as S. Jones had done, to more sharply re-examine the contexts in which group identities were being created and reproduced. For example, this style of argument was explored by Diaz-Andreu (1998), within her discussion on the problematic ethnic associations attributed to prehistoric pottery found near modern-day town of Lliria, in Valencia. During the 1990s, Diaz-Andreu (1998, 207) pointed out that the territory of distribution of Llirian pottery had unhelpfully been used as evidence, but other scholars working in the region, of the Llirian people (see also Lucy 2005, 43ff). However, Diaz-Andreu (1998, 211-214), in a similar vein to S. Jones (1996), noted that the type of pottery itself was associated with specific contexts linked with wealth, status, and masculinity. Consequently, Diaz-Andreu argued that artefacts (in this case Lliria pottery) should be viewed as resources within specific contexts that are implicated in the recreation of specific identities rather than inherently ethnic signifiers.
Unfortunately, however, the enduring reception of S. Jones’ new theoretical framework, beyond the 1990s failed to ignite academic discussions and theoretical debates — beyond several near contemporary journal articles — and critically what was still needed was a study which could be used to test its applicability. Henceforth, since the work of S. Jones (1997), no direct relationship had yet been proved between ethnic identity and material culture. Enter Jonathan Hall.

From the perspective of classics, parallel debates were taking place which took an explicitly anti-materialist approach towards the identification of ethnicity, epitomised by J. Hall (1997, 267), who critically rejected Jones’ work:

“As Siân Jones has argued in a book that appeared while Ethnic Identity was in press (Jones 1997), there is simply no justification in regarding an ‘archaeological culture’ — itself a problematic category — as the material manifestation of an ethnic group. I do not dispute that ethnic groups may communicate their identity via material symbols consciously or unconsciously selected from a broader cultural repertoire and endowed with ‘emblemic’ significance. In the absence of textual commentaries, however, I see no rule-of-thumb by which the modern researcher may distinguish ethnic signalling from the communication of other forms of cultural identities.”

For J. Hall (2002; 1997), the discourse involved in the construction of ethnic identities evolved as a response to socio-political tensions and aspiration between Greek city-states from the 7th to the 5th centuries B.C. J. Hall (ibid) highlighted this by laying out attempts made by the Hellenes, to claim ancestry from figures in the ancient past. Notably, within his 2002 publication, Hall was primarily concerned with the recognition of Greek-ness. He proposed that there was a particular shift in the conceptualisation of Hellenic identity in terms of the definitions which were used to articulate it, particularly in response to the Persian invasions. Overall, J. Hall proposed that the term ‘Hellas’ (as a common identifier amongst Greeks) should be conceptualised as originating after the development of the Great Amphictyonic League at Delphi. Yet, the ethnonym ‘Hellenes’, can be traced as growing out of communal celebrations and festivities like the Pan-Hellenic games.

Despite the coherent arguments put forward by J. Hall (2002; 1997) which mapped the development of communal Greek identity to developments relating to religious cele-
brations and to the pursuit of power, the use of archaeological evidence within the overall study was almost non-existent. The main arguments used to hold up the publication were fundamentally based on the ancient literary evidence. The explanation for this from J. Hall’s perspective was because “... there can be no archaeology of ethnicity among societies who have left us no record.” (J. Hall 2002, 24).

Critics of this approach have articulately expressed that this heavy reliance on the text disregards those in the past who did not have the skills to access it (Morgan 2009, 19-20; Antonaccio 2001, 115-116). Yet, this did not deter J. Hall (2002, 9-10) from establishing his own ethnic criteria, consisting of five key components that he argued defined an ethnic group:

(i) Self-ascribing;

(ii) Containing biological, linguistic, and religious underpinnings;

(iii) Contain core elements which determine membership and distinguish the group from others (specifically, a subscription to a myth of common descent associated with a specific territory);

(iv) Consist of a broad spectrum of social identities which may be instrumentally manipulated in times of need;

(v) Ethnic identity emerges in the context of migration, conquest, and/or appropriation of resources between ethnic groups.

Critically, J. Hall’s definition is one which openly rejected the instrumentalist theory that had been created by the likes of S. Jones (1997). J. Hall contended that past archaeologically based definitions were too inconsistent and non-essential to be of any use in the ancient world. From this perspective, it became clear that while the social context of ethnic identity may vary, the definition of it would not. The definition created by J. Hall stressed the identification of (real or fictive) kinship groups based on the existence of several key features throughout Greece, i.e., language, Gods, and mythic history. However, to reject traceable variations in the material culture by grounding his theory in such rigidity, Hall constrained not only what archaeologists could identify but also relegated the potential ethnic expressions of past societies to a set list which – as Clarke (1968, 37) stressed – are more often not present within a single socio-historic context.
It is in reference to his definitions which so heavily emphasised subscription to myth and territory, that J. Hall’s definition of ethnicity struggles to account for much of the fluidity of ethnicity identities that had been established within past anthropological work discussed earlier. For example, taking Leach’s (1954) study of the Kachin and Shan communities, Leach demonstrated the inconsistent nature of many criteria which we often associate as fundamental with ethnic identities. The Kachin, for example, are made up of distinct lineages – whereby members who are Kachin are bound to strict caste systems of entrenched hierarchies – which are more broadly linked through clan-like ties (Leach 1954, 57, 214). Correspondingly, the Shan construct their identities on the basis of land ties where their ancestors have lived, and even if a Shan village splits and relocates, the dispersed members of that community will still claim descent from the new village (Leach 1954, 213-214). Yet, importantly for Leach, these differences in terms of descent did not prohibit ethnic mixing, and as he noted, if Shan and Kachin elites marry, they – in a way – become ethnically ‘dual’ and endowed with the cultural traditions from both communities (Leach 1954, 61, 217). J. Hall’s definition critically does not allow for this type of ethnic fluidity, and is therefore, beset with additional struggles concerning ethnicity and its potential nuance in the past. The discourse of ethnic identity is much more fluid and fluctuating than J. Hall allows.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to insinuate after a lengthy discussion on J. Hall and S. Jones that archaeological studies of ethnicity have solely been focused around these two seminal arguments. As mentioned above, ethno-archaeological studies by Hodder and Wiessner have acquired valuable results for our conceptual understanding of ethnicity and its meaningfulness in the past. Yet, what I want to do here is discuss briefly other studies in archaeology and classics which have dealt in some way with the topic of ethnicity. Specifically, I want to draw out the manifold ways through which ethnicity has been understood to have operated in the past.

3.4.1 Current Archaeological Approaches: beyond Hall and Jones

As mentioned earlier, studies which were conducted with the specific aim of understanding ethnicity through the archaeological record were a product of the theoretical and even social changes affecting archaeology after the late 1980s and into the 1990s, of which J. Hall and S. Jones are two of the most significant voices. In this respect, Emberling (1997) marked another early notable synthesis of early works in both anthropology and
Table 3.1: Selected Archaeological Studies Involving Ethnicity From Different Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Authors/References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cornell and Lomas 1997; Roymans 2004; Grummond 2014; Rupke 2014; Cornell and Lomas 1997; Rupke 2014; Roymans 2004; Grummond 2014; Rupke 2014;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>S. Jones 1997; James 1999; Lucy 2005;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Kazanski and Perin 2008; Muller 2014;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso-America</td>
<td>Clark 2004; Stone 2003; Varien and Potters eds. 2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>Emberling 1997; 2014; Tyson-Smith 2014;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Bergvik 2006; Engevik 2008; 2010;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

archaeology, and who himself attributed ethnic significance to distributions of specific pottery styles during the early third millennium B.C. in Mesopotamia (see Emberling 1997, 320-324). It was not until the early 2000s, however, when studies involving ethnicity outside anglophone academia also began to germinate (table 3.1). Within this next section, I shall some of the main points from studies involving ethnicity in and around Europe from the 1990s. As table (3.1) shows, there are of course a great diversity of approaches and studies involving ethnicity, each of them critically different in how they interpret it, how they look for it, and how people in the past expressed it. Although all, to an extent, agree its discursive and embodied nature. Indeed, an additional thesis is warranted to discuss each of these attempts in appropriate depth, therefore, I shall only sketch the main current developments which I feel are pertinent to note, but this is not exhaustive.

Within German-speaking academia, ethnicity through the archaeological record had taken two divergent paths. On the one hand, those such as Brather (2004) in his seminal *Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie* held that ethnicity, being a group self-ascribing identity, was to be defined in much the same way that S. Jones had previously defined it. That is, through patterns of artefact distribution and contextual variability. Although, despite pointing out the potential for archaeologists to define a self-ascribing group based on material culture, Brather (2000; 2004) instead

---

15See Knapp (2001, 29-41) for a more cautionary approach to ethnicity. Knapp himself called for caution on the topic, particularly after S. Jones’ publication. See Emberling (1997) for a list of ethnicity studies prior to 1997.
choose to warn archaeologists about its ephemeral nature of ethnicity and potential for it to mask other identities which may have even mattered more, like political affiliation or gender identity. On the other hand, authors like Daim (1996, 479-497) understood ethnicity to be very much archaeologically verifiable despite the associated risks, and that it was to be most clearly expressed within the funerary context. Within his analysis Daim prioritised grave inventories and their variability as most obvious markers of group ethnic difference. Although this was not a universal opinion, other voices within German academia like Sommer (2003, 205-221) understood ethnicity and its signalling to others to be much the same as Wiessner and Hodder’s conceptualisation of style, particularly ceramic styles on *Linearbandkeramik* pottery.

Outside of German-speaking academia, concomitant developments concerning ethnicity were taking place in the realms of central European medieval archaeology, which directly deployed instrumentalist definitions of ethnic identity onto funerary dress (Hakenbeck 2004; 2007; 2011). Hakenbeck (2007, 21) attempted this through the study of brooches which she stated were still considered as directly reflecting the ethnic identity of the people wearing them, specifically young pre-married women. Hakenbeck expressed that the brooches were assumed to have been given to women in their pre-married lives and were retained and subsequently taken with them after marriage to their new homes (and into potentially new brooch stylistic areas) thereby signalling their ethnic identities (cf. Koch 1998). In support of the argument that this artefact medium was used to display ethnicities, Hakenbeck (2007, 24-25) found through her analysis of two early medieval cemeteries between the towns of Altenerding and Aubing in Bavaria, that despite there being no substantial differences in terms stylistic variability of brooches, the two cemeteries exhibited considerable variation in terms of the placement of the brooches on the bodies, which she suggested indicated a form of regional ethnic signalling.

More generally, however, the active symbolising of ethnic identity associated with the funerary dress of women has been noted by several recent studies beyond Hakenbeck (2007). Concomitant discussions have also taken place concerning the presence of ethnic boundaries represented by funerary assemblages between areas identified as Frankish and Alamannic. Siegmund (1998, 558ff; 2000) identified – in his publication which argued in favour of the existence of a material ethnic boundary between ethnic groups in Medieval Germany – that despite there being a high concentration of swords which were contained within graves from regions designated as ‘Alamannic’, axes and spearheads
were found in their highest concentration within graves labelled as ‘Frankish’ (cf. Curta
2011a). Siegmund also identified that burials within areas which he had designated
as ‘Frankish’ contained wheel-made and glass vessels, whilst vessels found within areas
which he labelled as ‘Alamanni’ were handmade. Using these material variabilities as
substantive proof, Siegmund concluded that an ethnic boundary was likely to have existed
between the two regions and this was no less expressed through the burials. Yet critics
of this approach have appropriately deconstructed this narrative by questioning whether
someone buried with these items in these zones would have identified themselves as being
either ‘Alamannic’ or ‘Frankish’ (see Härke 1990; 2014). Alternatively, as has been voiced
by both Curta (2011a, 537-548) and Härke (2014, 47ff), assemblage data and personal
items directly associated with the body should not be regarded as de facto markers of an
individual’s identity or status.\textsuperscript{16} And related to this, similar discussions have also taken
place within the realms of Francophone archaeology, particularly the work of Kazanski
and Périn (2008, 181-216) who attempted to identify the ethnic group signalling through
Medieval funerary dress and artefact style using a similar method as Hakenbek (2007)
had originally proposed.

Outside of the medieval world, other archaeological schools, particularly those in
France who study the Mediterranean Iron Age, opted for a more holistic approach,
specifically the work of J-M. Luce (2007b; 2007a; 2014) and his student A-Z. Chemssed-
doha at the University of Toulouse (2014; 2017; 2020). In reference to work here, the
engagement with theories of ethnicity was undertaken through similar methods as had
been attempted by S. Jones (1996), that is to suggest it focused on regional material
variability as a proxy for ethnic consciousness. And in much the same way, other aca-
demics within French academia on the topic of ethnicity have followed suit, particularly
in agreeing that archaeology can provide an ethnic basis onto the past, but its extent
has historically been prone to abuse and misinterpretation (for critique see Luraghi 2014,
213ff).

More recently, other theoretically and methodologically articulate work published
in German by Fernández-Götz (2009) involved Iron Age research on ethnicity. In a
compelling article, Fernández-Götz (2009, 15-19) argued that ethnicity should be anal-

\textsuperscript{16}This argument was originally expressed in Härke’s (1990) publication which argued that items
such as grave-goods should not be taken as direct reflections of a person’s status or social position. Rather, Härke (1990) found – through his analysis of weapons deposited within graves during the 5th-8th centuries A.D. in England – that the deposition of weapons within graves highlighted instead more about the status of the family and where they came from.
ysed holistically and on the macro-scale, instead of focusing on arbitrary minutiae which may or may not carry ethnic significance at any one historical context. Instead, he advanced, ethnicity should be analysed through many historical media, like ancient texts (although this is not essential, contrary to J. Hall), archaeology, coins, and epigraphy (figure 3.3). He argued that ethnic sentiment also lies within the lives of those living together instead of being simply a product of material style and ‘ethnic indicators’ (Fernández-Götz 2009, 18). From this perspective, political organisation, as evidence through settlement structure, epigraphy, and numismatics could hold ethnic significance between groups, in addition to differences in group representations of gender, age, and/or religion. For Fernández-Götz at least, ethnicity was not the only meaning an object was likely to be conveying, therefore, the evidence base used to identify it in the past needed to be widened and encompassing of many different social factors. Lastly, Fernández-Götz (2009, 19) also contended that ethnicity was not a constant but expressed more strongly during events and times where it matters, particularly during periods of conflict. This echoes Horowitz’s (1985, 145-47) and Brubaker’s (2004) work on the topic, which contended that conflict was the proverbial touchpaper for ethnic material signification.

Figure 3.3: Visual representation of the process of ethnic identity between peoples in archaeological terms (Fernández-Götz 2009, 19)

Outside of archaeology, classics too have witnessed a divergent series of discussions involving ethnicity both including and excluding material evidence as the basis for their understandings. In anglophone archaeology, C. Morgan (2001; 2009) has, for the last two decades, consistently published on the topic of ethnicity and its operation within the Greek Iron Age. Importantly, Morgan has aimed at understanding how Iron Age
communities articulated themselves into groups through the material record, particularly considering recent developments like the *IACP*, and how identities were shaped by emergent political ideologies at the end of the Archaic period. Indeed, the *IACP* more generally, as explored in an earlier chapter, needs to be given additional credit for highlighting the ethnic significance attached to political institutions in the ancient world, and how this needs to be considered in the wider understanding of ethnicity within archaeology as a whole.

More generally, however, interest in ethnicity has been profound in classics just as it had been in archaeology, and this can be seen in relation to several collection of papers which have been published on the topic during the last two decades. Those being Malkin’s (2001) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, and McInerney’s (2014) *Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, both of which offered a series of stimulating and still relevant discussions on ethnicity and its operation in the past. Notably, however, each of these books dealt with the concept of ethnicity in very different ways from how it had been conceptualised and understood within the archaeological record. For contributors to Malkin’s (2001) edited volume, ethnicity was still maintained as a discursive practice, just as S. Jones (1997) had previously defined it. Although critically within the collection, the emphasis of ethnicity’s expression shifted between mythic descent links/accounts provided by Herodotus (Thomas 2001, 215ff; Hall 2001, 159ff; Said 2001, 275ff), and material culture (Antonaccio 2001, 113ff; Morgan 2001, 75ff; Malkin 2001, 187ff). Archaeological material was not always implicated in the formulation of group identities, and this point characterises much of how classics has understood and viewed ethnicity more generally. Correspondingly, McInerney’s (2014) edited volume marks the most recent and cumulative discussion involving ethnicity in classics. One of the best contributions was offered by Siapkas (2014, 66ff) who discussed, more generally, the current state of affairs regarding the theory and an up-to-date overview of literature surrounding it. His account offered a thorough review of the study of ethnicity and sketched the direction the study has taken since its popularity in the 1990s until 2014. From Siapkas’ perspective, more recent investigations into ethnicity in classics had not developed the theory in any meaningful way beyond the growing consensus that it should be archaeologically dismissed (Siapkas 2014, 74; MacSweeney 2009, 101-106; Hall 2002, 19ff). According to Siapkas, this wariness with the material record originated in a deeper intellectual struggle in classics between the perceived problematic *etic* nature of material
investigations into ethnicity without the use of the literary record. Yet, Siapkas rejected this position, adding that the aim of any ethnic investigation is not to verify the ethnic experience of those in the ancient past, as this is beyond the remit of classics. Rather, it is to account for the complex processes, fluidity, and multifocality involved in the relationship between objects and people. And to disregard such would be to disregard the principle of archaeology more generally. In this respect, successful studies into ethnicity have not actually been studies about ethnicity. Rather they have been studies which have successfully identified ethnic expression within the context of interactions with the ‘Other’, during periods of colonisation. Specifically, studies by Malkin (2001; 2011) and Woolfe (2011) have used these post-colonial discourses to discuss ethnicity, particularly as a result of co-habitation and interaction, resulting in phenomenon like creolisation and hybridisation of local identities. Finally, although different from the previous edited volumes, Fraser’s (2009) *Greek Ethnic Terminology* should also be included here for its significant contribution to the understanding of *ethnos* and ethnicity in the ancient world from a purely textual perspective.

The kind of theoretical observations presented within the last two decades concerning the study of ethnicity within archaeology offers much scope for its potential reappraisal and rejuvenation. Two divergent traditions can most obviously be seen concerning its debate. On the one hand, ethnic identity has been defined as an identity which rests on the genealogical claims that can only be distinguished with the help of the ancient literary evidence. On the other hand, archaeological approaches towards the debate have defined it as multi-focal in nature and as partially expressed through variation in types of artefacts and social organisation, with specific focus on context of discovery, which owes much of its present form to previous debates surrounding the purpose of culture as a unit of analysis. As I have mapped within this section, theories surrounding ethnic identity have seen huge popularity in archaeology since the 1980s, however, the frequency to which topic has been critiqued and lambasted far outweighs the frequency it has been modified and constructively debated (cf. Broodbank 2004, 50-54). Therefore, the next part of this chapter shall be spent arguing for a more up-to-date definition of ethnic identity which incorporates past definitions, yet also includes a sharper conceptualisation on its applicability and its use in terms of funerary archaeology.
3.5 Theoretical tools

Up until this point it has been argued that ethnic identity is a dynamic process that can take diverse forms in different contexts of social interaction. Whilst it has been established that there is not a *de facto* relationship between ethnicity and material culture, S. Jones’ (1997) convincing study proposes its manifestation to be represented as overlapping patterns of material variability, akin to how Clarke (1968) defined his polythetic culture. Therefore, this section shall be spent arguing in favour of a more practical methodology of ethnic identity that is specially developed to work with the material record. The definition of ethnicity use within this work comes from Abner-Cohen (1974, ix-x):

“... an ethnic group can be operationally defined as a collectivity of people who (a) share some patterns of normative behaviour [i.e., kinship formations, customs, beliefs, and ritual] and (b) form a part of a larger population, interacting with people from other collectivities within the framework of a social system. The term ethnicity refers to the degree of conformity by members of the collectivity to these shared norms in the course of social interaction.” (clarification my own)\(^\text{17}\)

I should admit, at the risk of hypocrisy, that adding another definition about what ethnicity is risks muddying the academic waters with even more definitional casuistry. The result does not aid in the endeavour of understanding how ethnicity operates through the archaeology beyond shifting the focus to yet more non-essential criteria against which our definition of ethnicity would operate. A similar example would be J. Hall’s (1997, 16) own definition, which he described as “the operation of socially dynamic relationships which are constructed on the basis of a putative shared ancestral heritage” which is only fit for purpose within the analytical framework of his own creation, i.e., with textually verifiable accounts of communities who adhere to membership based on a shared notion of common ancestry. Therefore, I adhere to the above definition loosely, but particularly its instrumentalist nature.

Beyond this definition, we are still left with the logistical problem regarding which

\(^{17}\) The idea of collectivity or community as the unit of primary analysis here needs emphasizing. Particularly as it aligns with A. Smith’s (1986) primordial formation of the nation-state, and in many ways, it echoes what Patterson’s (1975) and Morgan’s (2003) definition. Yet, unlike Morgan’s definition, the assumption relating to a groups ‘most meaningful basis of primary identity’ is avoided, so as to not misinterpret non-meaningful ways of ethnic participation.
specific contexts such an identity is created and how such a groups come together to participate in the discourse of ethnicity? This problem is something that has been absent in archaeological discussions concerning ethnicity.\textsuperscript{18} What I suggest here is that what has formally been conceptualised within archaeology as an ‘ethnic group’ should in fact be thought of as two related phenomena, i.e., the formation of groups and the process of ethnicity. In order to accommodate this, I take inspiration from the conceptualisation of ethnicity as submitted by Brubaker (2004) in his publication *Ethnicity without Groups*, particularly his distinction between ‘the group’ (which he defined as an ‘event’ which is prone to contextual flux) and ‘ethnification’ (a term I borrow here from Brubaker (2002), and Kuran (1998, 624))\textsuperscript{19}, which should be thought of as a process of coming together through practice and symbols which are underpinned by many cultural, political, and psychological factors. In this way, we can begin to understand the process of ethnicity (and its markers) as dis-aggregated into many material and immaterial arenas of a community (see Horowitz 1985). Based on this, therefore, I contend that the ethnic group be understood in terms of the process of *ethnification* involving the community, however, for the purposes of familiarity I still adhere to calling this process the ‘ethnic group’.

But how is this type of group archaeologically created? To answer this, I draw on the discussion of discursive and non-discursive methods of identity construction as outlined by Budden and Sofaer (2009, 1-2). These methods of identity construction are more generally likened to the distinction between ‘saying’ or ‘doing’, and in this sense I characterise the process of the ‘ethnic group’ as being both discursive, i.e., articulated in archaeologically objectifiable terms through material culture, and non-discursive, i.e., the performative and embodied in particular ways of doing which are reproduced without conscious thought (see for larger discussion on materiality Knappett 2005; and on symbols Hodder 1982). To this end, we can liken this process with S. Jones’ (1997, 84) use of Bourdieu’s habitus which I still feel is pertinent. From this perspective, material culture begins life as discursive and is then embodied, given meaning to the forming ethnic group (however it may have formed) and becomes the ‘non-discursive’ structuring of internal structures that reproduces it from one’s field-of-action (for ‘field of action’

\textsuperscript{18} In anthropology see good accounts as given by Brubaker (2002; 2004). In this regard I hold the ‘ethnic group’ in a very similar way to (but not the same as) the Bourdieu-like process of habitus, see vis-à-vis Bentley (1986) and then S. Jones (1997, 84ff) in archaeology.

\textsuperscript{19} Kuran (1998, 624) writes that “In principle, ethnification does not require a reallocation of physical resources. The members of a society may become ethnified simply by redefining their prevailing behaviours as ethnically meaningful and by becoming more alert to the ethnic symbolism of goods, actions, and events.”
see Bourdieu 1977, 72ff). These embodied and non-discursive ways of doing are then able to facilitate the group’s discursive material symbols which (implicitly or explicitly) come to represent it and are agreed upon by its ‘members’. These discursive material symbols, to use Abner-Cohen’s words (1974, x) “attain an objective existence when they are accepted by others during social interaction within a collectivity.” Once the material ethnic symbols of a group have been formalised, they would become what the ethnomethodologist Garfinkel (1967, 118) would call “seen but unnoticed” in that they are often taken-for-granted in conforming with the community’s ideology of itself relating to its own existence. Similarly, as Giddens (1991, 42-63) has also identified in terms of social ideology, community members who embody the processes of a single group identity in a society simultaneously police ‘correct’ gestures, ways-of-being, and ways that things are done. To this extent, acceptable or passable ways-of-doing are reinforced by the possibility of charges of guilt or shame, and thus the normalised discursive ‘ethnified’ behaviours now serve to bind the group.\footnote{For more on the policing of ‘correct’ ways of reproducing the community’s identity, manifest in its traditions and non-discursive ‘norms’ see Bourdieu (1977, 47-49), Garfinkle (1967, 118-119), and Giddens (1991, 67-69).} Maintenance of material culture is, therefore, important and the changing of such should be seen as something that is either enforced or agreed by significant members of the community or as a whole.

Returning to an earlier point, against many of the papers dedicated to ethnicity of late, this conceptualisation does not hold putative descent to be necessary. This is, however, not to discount its recorded use as a method through which groups in the past at one point formally dictated membership. But as Brubaker (2002, 169) stated, those who understand such as a prerequisite of the ‘ethnic group’ often cite Max Weber’s definition of ethnicity as their primary source material, yet, according to Brubaker, this is a case of misunderstanding on behalf of Weber’s work (contra Hall 2002, 10):

“...\textit{ethnic commonality, based on belief in common descent, is ‘in itself mere (putative) commonality \textit{[Gemeinsamkeit]}, not community \textit{[Gemeinschaft]} [...]} but only a factor facilitating communal action \textit{[Vergemeinschaftung]}’ Weber 1964, 307” (Brubaker 2002, 169; see also Weber 1978).

A belief in common ancestry is also not necessarily always present in every ethnified group. For example, people who identify as being ‘ethnically Scottish’ would most likely
not consider themselves as directly descended from nomadic Scythians as specified in the 14th century Declaration of Arbroath. Nevertheless, descent did matter as a factor of ethnification which communities used during the process of group-making, particularly in Archaic Greece as J. Hall (1997) and Morgan (2003) have shown. However, the very fact these myths were manipulated only serves to support Brubaker’s (2002) observation that it merely facilitated group action in achieving the goal of being ethnic rather than being an essential quality of it. Therefore, it should be understood as one possible factor or method of ethnification, rather than inherently designating ethnic and non-ethnic groups.

We are still left with the question facing how does this theory of ethnicity operate, and how is it different from what has been before? From this point my theory departs in similarity from S. Jones (1997), and instead I here draw inspiration from the German sociology of Weber to aid my conceptualisation of ethnicity in archaeology. Weber (1917/1978) theorised that ethnicity was the product of community (Gemeinschaft) as originally formulated by an earlier sociologist called Ferdinand Tönnes. For both Weber (1922/2019) and Tönnes (1887/2001), the concept of community (Gemeinschaft) referred to a group of people who lived and worked together, share goals and/or objectives in relation to their way of life, and possibly shared a language. This has been verified recently by other studies within both anthropology and cognitive sociology which found that social actors gravitate towards those with ‘perceived’ similarities in traditions, politics, and values.21

These communities interact on a face-to-face basis with particular emphasis on their interpersonal ties and hold similar shared beliefs or values which help foster a wider sense of cohesion and togetherness (Tönnes 2001, 34-36; 191-192; see also and Weber 2019, 120-121, 482-485). For Weber (2019, 120-121), the concept of ethnicity was linked closely to this idea of community, specifically the process of ‘communilisation’ (Vergemeinschaftung), which he defined as the processes of engendering feelings of belonging to the community, and in turn, is given objective significance through the discursive creation of the community’s material culture or Kulturgemeinschaft. This careful interplay between culture (Kultur) and community identity (Gemeinsamkeit) was, as Weber (1978,

21In reference to this, work of this nature has been conducted already in sociology, called ‘homophily’. The basic premise of the study is that networks occur between people who are more similar in culture, ideology, or religion. Thus, these networks then in turn effect the socialisation of people, similar but not the same as habitus, and influence the kinds of people they interact with. For more on this, see: (McPherson et al. 2001; Kossinets & Watts 2009).
385-386) saw it, critical for fostering a sense of commonality which would be embodied by members of the community, during both discursively expressed and non-discursively enacted ways-of-doing those things.

This is where ethnicity and the expression of the ethnic groups is to be found, i.e., through the commonality of the symbols, behaviours, and cultural products of the Kulturgemeinschaft. Yet, it is critical to reinforce that no one cultural product is owned by a single ethnic group. To return to Clarke (1968), we are aware that no ‘culture group’ exists in a vacuum, with material products spread over large areas and covering many communities. Thus, any one cultural product may represent several Kulturgemeinschaft who hold it pertinent to represent their wider group identity. Therefore, a holistic approach which encapsulates many avenues of material culture is needed. Thus, following Clarke (1968), one way to do this is to assess a region’s unique polythetic ‘cultural package’, particularly if we are to avoid picking any one arbitrary material product which no member of a particular community may have held pertinent to their group identity. In this respect, using Weber and Tönnies concept of community is perhaps a little misleading. Archaeologically, there can be no hope of identifying the exact limits or boundaries of an ethnic community, rather it seems more applicable to identify ethnically divergent ‘regions’ on account of their material non-conformity, at least during periods where the resolution of data is weakest or lacks additional historical evidence. This issue I must, at least partially, concede to J. Hall (1997). Ancient textual evidence is invaluable in offering another vantage point for understanding how the nuance of group identity worked in the past. As I discussed in the previous chapter, there was clearly a careful interplay between ethnic and political institutions in the past, and in a sense the archaeology alone could not have told us this. However, I do not think it is impossible to start a discussion involving ‘ethnic groups’ at least not on a broad regional level, encompassing many avenues of material culture over large geographic areas.

This thesis is, therefore, explicitly instrumentalist in its perception of ethnicity. Beginning with Abner-Cohen’s definition, the conceptualisation of the theory used here contends that ethnicity is a process of the community or a series of communities with particular emphasis on the process and degrees of conformity expressed by these communities concerning their discursive cultural products (i.e., funerary practices, building techniques, or ceramic style). Culture is central in this respect essential for expressing the formations of a community’s discursive sense of self (Kulturgemeinschaft), and by
using these material discourses, the process of group identity can be crystallised and expressed as a part of social life. Of course, these group-making processes can change and become manipulated and fused within the context of larger political powers and multi-ethnic contexts (cf. Smith 1986). This was also discussed in the previous chapter considering the Aegean Thracian communities within new Greek political contexts. What is also central to the understanding of ethnicity here is the possibility of subversion, eradication, or synthesis of many Kulturgemeinschaft within the multi-ethnic contexts.

The aim of my theory, therefore, is to broaden our understanding of the ethnic group to include the active discursive strategies that groups employed within any given region to express their difference or conformity, rather than based on a rarely objectively identifiable criteria as submitted by J. Hall (1997; 2002). Thus, by having an instrumentalist and loose conceptualisation of ethnic groups, particularly one which does not discount ethnic change, it leaves open the possibility for actors to alter and subvert their material surroundings in order to suit their changing identities, at least on agreement of the wider community. This in particular has already been a point of discussion concerning Late Iron Age Thrace, where it was found that members within mixed Greco-Thracian communities would modify their funerary assemblages in favour of the dominant community in order to achieve specific ethnic ideals (see Dimova 2015).22

To reiterate, in no way does this theory translate to simply looking for ‘cultural groups’ within the archaeological record as proof of ancient ethnicity. As it has been discussed through the work of Clarke and indeed Childe, a ‘cultural group’ does not exist in its totality at any one time or place. Instead, the process of ethnicity is to be found through the nuanced interplay between object and context on several different scales to conceive of broader archaeological patterning which can help identify regions with degrees of conformity which may offer clues to the formation of ethnic group in prehistory. For these reasons, I end this chapter with a series of very loosely criteria which I intend are ‘symptomatic’ of the process of ethnification:

(i) Clues to recognising the process of ethnification and ethnicity are to be found within the articulation of specific clusters (packages) of material variability in social processes (i.e., variability in settlements, cemeteries and ways of dying, and

---

22Within her PhD thesis, Dimova (2015, 144-151) identified a strong correlation between new burgeoning ‘post-colonised’ identities and Greek imports at Apollonia Pontica on the Black Sea coast. Dimova (ibid) found that in comparison to contemporary graves from inland Thrace, 5th-4th-century Apollonians were depositing large quantities of Greek imports like lekythoi and other ceramic materials within their tombs to align themselves more explicitly with the newly arrived Greek communities.
religious spaces) which are underpinned by regional preferences in terms of style and contextual use of artefacts;

(ii) Material culture represents the discursive and socially agreed upon objective community practice, through which ethnicity can be highlighted through its members conforming to these discursive practices;

(iii) Changes in material styles, forms, and practices stand to represent dynamic shifts and re-formation of the ethnic group, which may be a result of one or more significant socio-political changes experienced by the community and how it materially expresses itself.

To summarise, within the last decade, research focusing on ethnic identity within archaeology has fiercely questioned many of the traditional views relating to bounded cultural groups and the relationship between ethnicity and culture. However, one of the major critiques from past literature is that by concentrating on what ethnicity is not, archaeological discussions on what it is and how to find it within the material record have been overlooked. Considering recent debates, and subsequent major publications, I have submitted a slightly looser conceptualisation of it here. This conceptualisation aims at overcoming some of the inherent problems within past definitions like its emphasis on mythic kinship. Overall, this new definition – although in many ways like what S. Jones (1997) attempted – can more helpfully lend itself to be archaeologically applicable and help with the identification of ethnic identity through the archaeological record.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has briefly outlined the development of ethnicity within archaeology until today, and as a result, has demonstrated the critical need to reopen a discussion around its meaning and expression due to the problematic ways in which it has been previously mishandled and unfairly dismissed. A materialist approach to ethnicity has much to offer not just for archaeology, but for the broader discussion surrounding ethnicity in the social sciences. The methods through which people in the past used to implicate objects – through a complex series of socially charged actions – within their social identities has far-reaching implications.

Past definitions of ethnicity within both archaeology and classics have mostly been skirting the very same theoretical problems – i.e., defining ethnicity beyond the sim-
ple recognition of cultures and the expression of it at different social levels – without recognising the need for a standard process of identification which accounts for both the lack of the written record and the inclusion of it. In addition to this, definitions have also overlooked the complex economic and social realities of prehistoric communities, especially those living on the periphery of the Greek-speaking world.

Drawing on an updated series of identifications as stated above, the aim within the proceeding discussion will be to identify ethnicity through the data used within this study. The conclusions brought from the use of this criteria will neither define regions of material and cultural similarity as de facto representations of ethnic groups, nor will it define such regions with the labels of the local tribes, as provided to us by the ancient Greek authors. Instead, using the practical criteria laid out here, I propose that the identification of regions which exhibit strong material social conformity to insinuate the harbouring of ethnic allegiances, which in turn offers hints about broader group identities and affiliations within a particular socio-historic setting.
Chapter 4

Methodology

It was established in Chapter 2 that the Thracians were more often inconsistently depicted and through their inconsistency were hints of their variability and distinctiveness. It was then expressed in Chapter 3 how ethnicity has been conceptualised within archaeology, and how it ought to be found within the archaeological record. It is, therefore, the purpose of this chapter to elaborate on the analytical tools that I shall be using in order to assess the presence of ethnicity within the archaeological record. Beyond this, I shall be explicitly focusing on the funerary assemblage – consisting of tomb architecture, grave-goods, and the body itself – as the main context of analysis (figure 4.1).

It should come as no surprise that the burial context is a multifaceted area of archaeological investigation. Since the inception of ‘Processual Archaeology’, the context of death and its associated finds, have been used almost as blueprints for the calculation of the complexity and composition of the societies that they were situated within (cf. Saxe 1970; Binford 1971; Tainter 1975). Moreover, it was also stressed earlier in regards to other studies involving ethnicity that funerary archaeology is often the first type of evidence used concerning identity, as it is considered to be the most ideologically charged context, particularly concerning the wider group identity. This this is not why they are used here, as I consider other avenues of archaeology to be just a pertinent in expressing group ethnicity. Rather within Greek and Bulgarian archaeology, the funerary contexts represent most well-published avenue of archaeological data. Therefore, in order to significantly quantify any results in order to discern an ethnic presence in Thrace, the funerary data must be the main mode of analysis. Within the rest of this chapter, therefore, what needs to be discussed are the quantitative measures through which each of these categories of funerary data were processed and analysed, and additionally, what
Figure 4.1: Diagram showing the three main variables of any burial context
each of these categories mean for the analysis of ethnic identity.

4.1 Variables Under Analysis

Archaeological data is by its core nature inescapably numerical. Within the context of an archaeological site, all things need to be counted, quantified, and set within its respective classification in order for its significance to be studied (cf. Van Pool & Leonard 2011, 5). Since the 1990s, archaeology as a discipline has experienced a sharp rise in approaches which have promised accurate means of data analysis. Yet, as I shall lay out below, due to the varying levels of data quality and amount, several analytical procedures had to be used in order to ascertain the most meaning from the data used within this study. As Shennan (1988, 21) expresses, the golden rule of any data analysis and visual representation is to keep it simple so as not to obscure the data being analysed.

4.2 Typology and Spatial Distribution

The first component of formal analysis within this thesis focuses on the spatial distribution of architectural tomb types. These types have been differentiated on the basis of selected nominal values, specifically methods of construction and physical form. These values were then plotted as points on a map in an attempt to make an argument based on the patterns presented through the spatial distribution of architectural types. The earliest use of such an attempt within archaeology was Whallon (1973), who published an examination of spatial patterning between objects distributed within caves in Mexico. The plotting of tomb types, however, was undertaken alongside a typological discussion involving the architectural form of tombs. This was conducted by using what Adams and Adams (1991, 198) have termed as ‘gestalt acquisition’, which specifically refers to the attribution of form as the primary basis of differentiation of an object. That is to suggest, types were distinguished on the basis of building technique and overall form. Despite long debates over the arbitrariness of some qualitative typologies in general (see Hill & Evans 1972, 231; Daniels 1972), the typology created within this thesis distinguishes six different forms of architecture between inland and Aegean Thrace based on the different methods of construction and overall form. Within the last two decades alone, methodologies behind the creation of typologies have become increasingly sophisticated with the use of complex statistical analyses (see Whittaker et al. 1998). Despite this, simple
methods used to distinguish material types should not be discredited, and the methods used within this thesis shall be such, due to fragmentary and often inconsistent nature of the excavations records.

Quantum Geographic Information System (QGIS) was used as the principle program for spatial analysis. The method used to plot a QGIS map was done first by plotting the coordinates using Google Earth and then exporting the file through a .ksl format to QGIS. Unfortunately, the vast majority of map plots within the thesis are only in the vicinity of the sites discussed within the text. This is because both Bulgarian and Greek site reports only contain a vague reference to the areas where sites were located as most publications on both sides of the border do not provide maps with exact site location. Within Bulgarian academia, there does exist the Archaeological Map of Bulgaria (Arheologicheska karta na Bulgariya - Археологическа карта на България) yet this is only open to academics connected to the Bulgarian Academy Sciences.

Most of the sites that are plotted within Greek Thrace are the result of simple and often confusing small-scale and hand-drawn maps that can be found within the regional archaeological reports like AEMTh, AAA, AD, and PAE. These maps very often only show a basic outline of the surrounding areas of each site. As a result, scans were taken of these hand-drawn maps and overlaid on Google Earth in order to plot their approximate location. Therefore, the plots should not be taken as exact but still useful for large-scale distribution of sites. This was also the same for the maps presented within the Thasos excavation reports, which offered no exact geospatial data, but instead only simple hand-drawn maps.

Overall, the significance of typologically based spatial analyses offers broad-scale understandings of material cultural similarity and difference between regions, thereby highlighting regions of significant material alterity. Herein lies its impact for the definition of regional ethnicities as shall be discussed in Chapter 8: regional material variability is the most evident signifier of differences in ethnic identity (cf. Clarke 1968, 364; Jones 1997, 129-135). More specifically, regional differences in the articulation of, for example, large megalithic tombs in comparison to medium cairn inhumations serve to suggest alternative articulations of communities (through the mobilisation of collective action), ritual, and cosmology surrounding the processes of death, which would not be evident through other key variables.
4.2.1 Types of Maps Created

Three types of maps that were produced on account of using QGIS, these were kernel density maps (or ‘heat maps’ are they are more commonly known as), simple distribution maps using geospatial data points, and more complex intervisibility maps (QGIS Development Team, 2019-2020. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project. http://qgis.osgeo.org).

Kernel density maps are created when the two-dimensional probability function is spread across plotted data points (Conolly and Lake 2006, 175). The points were plotted on a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) obtained from NASA Earth Data. The visual representation of this two-dimensional probability function is what we recognise as the ‘heat map’. The variance of this two-dimensional probability (or radius) is a factor which can be manipulated and results in either a narrow or broad distribution of corresponding data points. During the creation of kernel density maps, the radius was more often not augmented in order to avoid misrepresenting the spatial data points and their relationship to one another. The purposes of such maps were to highlight the concentration and spatial distribution of points over a landscape. This visual representation of data can then be used as an exploratory technique in order to discern the possibility of localised concentrations of points.

Simple distribution maps using geospatial data points were created using many of the same tools as the kernel density maps. For the maps which display the elevation, a DEM was obtained using NASA Earth Data along with geospatial points were imported from Google Earth, and plotted onto the DEM, with the help of R for projecting purposes (using the code: proj4string(DEM) <- CRS("+init=epsg:3840")). These simple maps helped conceptualise the basic spatial relationships between points within a landscape.

Finally, intervisibility maps were created in order to understand the possible visual relationships between points in a landscape as contributing to a monument’s significance. These maps were created using a ‘Intervisibility Network’ program on QGIS, created by Zoran Ćučković. Using separately plotted ‘target’ and ‘observer’ geospatial points on a DEM, the program worked by assessing the possible visual relationships these points had to one another, with a basic observer and target height of 1.60 metres (for further discussion about intervisibility maps see Conolly and Lake 2006, 246-248). The program would then calculate the possibility of objects of a certain height being able to see one another based on surrounding topography. However, it also should be added that the
algorithm behind the program does not account for visibility to be affected by weather types and ground flora, which are two significant factors.

4.3 Partitioning of Regional Analytical Units

A key aspect of the analysis within the project is to identify the extent of phenomenon like regional variation and what that can potentially tell us about the presence of ethnic groups in antiquity. Yet, in order to achieve this, it was necessary to first separate Thrace into units of analysis in order to test whether or not material regionalism could be seen at all. During this stage of the analysis, I attempted to separate Thrace through a clustering algorithm in order to ascertain whether the grave-good from my database lent themselves to be separated into regions with different cultural preferences. However, this data was largely skewed due to the variability in quality and quantity. Therefore, the partitioning of regional units had to be undertaken by eye and using a knowledge of local topography, i.e., sites which were separated by mountains, rivers, or large distances were not grouped, in line with Clarke’s (1968, 364) hypothesis. As a result, a total of seven units were created for analysis within this thesis. I shall explain here some of the more contentious decisions concerning the partitioning of certain sites (figure 4.2).

Beginning from the south, Greek Thrace could not be further divided akin to the other more northern units as it consisted of both fewer sites with a smaller sample sizes and sites which were already situated near one another. As a result, Filiouri, Kossynthos, and Samothrace had to be combined, whereas Thasos was kept as its own analytical unit as it distorted the results from the other Aegean Thrace sites, due in part, to the large amount of published data associated with its cemeteries.

The Industrial Plain near Drama and the Kastas Tumulus near Amphipolis, although consisting of a very small sample size, also had to be analysed within its own unit as geographically it was too far from other sites and on the other side of the Nestos river. This was also the case with sites such as Katrishte in the South Western region and Stambolovo, Bulgarska Polyan, and Malka Deterlina in the Eastern region. The next contentious separation was between Gela and Stoikite. The two are only marginally separated at 7 miles – as the most direct route – yet both lie within a heavily forested and mountainous terrain, therefore, I made the decision to separate the two. Overall, the partitioning of sites into analytical units was undertaken with the hope that significant broad-scale material variations would transcend arbitrary unit groupings.
4.4 Analytical Procedures Involving Univariate Analyses

Procedures involving univariate analyses are those which measure a single variable. Within this project, data extrapolated from a contingency table was used to plot two different diagrams involving the analysis of single variables: bar charts and box-and-whisker plots. The key variables under analysis between these diagrams were the regional differences in artefact preference (the bar charts) and size of fibulae (in the box-and-whisker plot).

Bar plots were created using grave-good data that has been grouped into designated regions. The application of univariate procedures of analysis was the best method to approach the grave-good data due to both its inconsistently published nature but also due to the considerable variability in artefact preservation between graves in different regions. Therefore, regional artefact frequencies were represented through calculated percentages in relation to the total number of artefacts found within each of the respective regions of analysis. Additional measures were introduced in an attempt to overcome this variability of data quality between each region. By introducing a minimum degree of occurrence at 10 percent of the total regional artefact count, less frequent and potentially anomalous artefacts were excluded from the diagrams. This in turn meant that only artefacts which occurred above 10 percent within each of the regions were compared, and this was undertaken with the aim that it would more clearly represent regional artefact variation. The significance of this approach is to ascertain the extent of regional artefact similarity and dissimilarity, which in light of the theoretical discussion of Chapter 3, may archaeologically indicate regional ethnic signalling when coupled with other analytical procedures involving bivariate and multivariate approaches.

Other methods of univariate analysis involve box-and-whisker plots which were used to observe deeper levels of variability between specific characteristics of artefacts. In this instance, regional fibulae sizes were the key variables under analysis, and this was used in order to ascertain whether or not different regions had larger or smaller fibulae in comparison to neighbouring regional units.

4.5 Analytical Procedures Involving Bivariate Analyses

Procedures involving bivariate analyses are defined as consisting of two variables. This method measured the relationship between two key variables: the relative number of
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4.6 Analytical Procedures Involving Multivariate Analyses

Procedures involving multivariate analyses are those methods which deal with more than one variable. By definition bivariate analyses could loosely be included within this definition, however, for the purposes of this methodology, multivariate defines those methods which deal with specifically three key variables. The procedures here involved the creation of a correspondence analysis and the turnery plot.

The correspondence analysis is one method used within this thesis to graphically represent three different variables. The graph itself visually represented the relationships between popularity of style, location found, and their relationship between one another, within each of the regions in and around Thrace. On the graph itself, the distance between each of the plotted data points signifies the similarity/differences (cf. Greenacre 2007, 32). Put simply, fibulae that are closer to one another are styles which are more commonly found together in specific areas. However, the further the fibulae are away from one another, the more different they are, and the more unlikely they are to be found together. The significance of such an approach to questions relating to the identification of ethnic identity should not be under appreciated. In the case of fibulae, the aim through a correspondence analysis was to identify whether or not clear artefact distinctions can be seen in different regions, which by extension may infer differences in the articulation of material discourse involving jewellery and other wearable items which could be classified as visual identity markers.

A second procedure which involved the analysis of three key variables concerns the turnery plots, which is used to visually represent the relationship between the three main
methods of bodily processing analysed within this thesis. The diagrams were constructed using calculated percentages of each method of bodily processing relative to the sample size of each region, i.e., 15 instances of cremation out of 25 graves = 60 percent of the total regional sample. This graphic is used to show the calculations from each region, in each of the three periods under investigation. The significance of this approach rests more in its ability – akin to the correspondence analysis – to highlight the relationship between key variables from different periods and how they change. In terms of ethnicity, varying levels of bodily processing methods may underpin significant differences in terms of cosmology and ritual, which offers clues to differences in expressed material ethnicities as outlined in Chapter 3.

4.7 Fibulae Classification

An important part of this thesis is to analyse the relationship between type and size of fibulae, and for this exercise, a typology of fibulae had to be used. Yet, it is not the purpose of this project to create a new typology of Thracian Iron Age fibulae, akin to recent impressive typologies created by both Buston (2019) and Vasileva (2012). Rather it is the purpose of this project do document find-spots of pre-classified styles in an attempt to identify specific stylistic concentrations and whether or not they correspond to other variations of artefacts and architecture. For this reason, fibulae types were collected and assigned a corresponding code using the preexisting fibulae classifications published in the *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* catalogues. Today, Bulgarian archaeologists use Gergova’s (1987) typology for classifying excavated fibulae. Therefore, to re-attribute classifications within Thrace would necessitate the creation of a new Thrace and Aegean-wide typology which is beyond the remit of this study. Yet, in agreement with Curta (2011b, 51-81), there currently exists ‘too many typologies’ within the Aegean concerning fibulae, which categorise and prioritise different key variables in the creation of new classifications. Indeed, recent attempts to create an inclusive typology of Aegean fibulae – extending that originally compiled by Blinkenberg (1926) – completely exclude fibulae types originating in Bulgarian Thrace (cf. Buston 2019, 39), which does not help the current and well-established gap that exists between Thrace and other parts of the wider Aegean area. Of course, future work must be undertaken which extends the methodology used by Buston (2019) to classify the fibulae in Thrace and connect these fibulae with what we know from other parts of the Aegean.
4.8 A Statistical Approach to Funerary Archaeology in the Balkans

The most published and complete data available from the Iron Age in Thrace is funerary in nature, and publications on cemeteries and finds from graves outnumber publications dedicated to other avenues of archaeological evidence. This project may be the first to apply these quantitative methods to Thracian archaeology, yet it is not the first analysis to do so within the context of Greece. In reality, the methods deployed on the funerary data here are part of a larger collection of works ostensibly begun by the students of the Snodgrass archaeological school.\(^1\) Nevertheless, the approaches taken within this thesis are decidedly more simple in comparison which is due to the general state of published data and the lack of any statistical analyses that have been undertaken before in Thrace.

From the outset, and certainly from the perspective of other areas of prehistoric archaeology, Classical Archaeology has only recently been asking appropriate questions in relation to the social lives of people in antiquity beyond the traditional concerns of connoisseurship (cf. Childe 1956, 69). Historically, Classical Archaeology had managed to avoid such issues prior to the 1970s, and so it has only been until recently that new ideas relating to the behavioural aspect of past social actors and new quantitative methodologies have been employed. The result being a boom in analyses concerning social demography (Morris 1987), quantitative investigations into the possible relationship between ceramic style and political identities (Morgan & Whitelaw 1991), and whether differences in funerary assemblages correlated with different articulations of fundamental social identities (Whitley 1991). Despite this, sophisticated computational approaches have been primarily living on the boundaries of Classical Archaeology in the world of the Aegean Bronze Age. For the past decade, members surrounding the UCL school of archaeology have been using complex exploratory analyses in order to ask more sophisticated questions relating to spatial modelling in artefact-rich landscapes (Bevan & Conolly 2009), methods of spatial analysis which investigate broad-scale artefact assemblages (Bevan 2012), and large-scale processes of cultural affiliation and differentiation (Ichim 2020).

Yet, despite what many have witnessed in recent years in relation to a progression of

\(^1\)For students who pioneered quantitative methods in Greece see: Morris (2000) for bivariate and univariate approaches to artefact distributions and funerary archaeology and Whitley (1991) for more complex computational approaches involving the use of clustering algorithms on Attic Iron Age funerary data.
quantitative methods, Thrace has not been privy to any such analyses. Instead, and in many respects akin to its position in classical antiquity, Thrace has been marginalised in reference to many of these approaches and only now, with the pioneering work conducted by Dimova (2015), has been subject to any sort of statistical analyses. This thesis, therefore, sits on an intersection between traditional subjects and contemporary methodological approaches. It is, therefore, hoped that by extending simple computational approaches into Thrace that current trends to utilise it will continue more widely within other areas of Classical Archaeology in order for us to better understand and observe patterns within the material record.

4.9 Notes on Translation: from Greek and Bulgarian to English

Akin to the previous section, there is also strength in making my own modern translation choices as transparent as possible in order to make clear my results and processes of data acquisition. As has been stated earlier, the data used for this thesis comes from Bulgaria and northern Greece, and its existence, therefore, currently rests in both of these local languages. Consequently, the task of translation became a significant part of this thesis, and one which came with its own series of conceptual problems. The translation of data from these local languages was as much a methodological exercise as was choosing which ways to analyse the data. As a result, it became necessary to make a series of conclusions and interpretations about the data when translating it into English depending on each of the different publications which discussed the data in different ways. Within this next section I shall document some of the different ways I chose to interpret key data, and what ramifications this had for how the data was recorded, analysed, and presented (see appendix C for all graphs).

4.9.1 Greek Publications

Some of the most significant obstacles regarding the translation of Greek-language publications were in reference to ceramics. In contrast to Early Iron Age northern Thrace, or modern-day Bulgaria, the extant ceramic record in Aegean Thrace was a mix of handmade and wheelmade vessels. This made my blanket designation of ‘handmade kitchenware’ for Greece unusable, and a more nuanced and specific category of nouns
had to be created for the different types of vessels which were being found within the archaeological reports. These translations had to also capture both the type of object, i.e., handmade or wheelmade, but also the shape and style of the vessel if possible as well. Where possible, and when an alternative simple form-fitting name could not be given, the names of items were transliterated from Greek into English in an attempt to try and avoid misidentification, therefore, alabaster (i.e. αλαβάστρο), amphotiskos (αμφοτήσκος), stamniskos (σταμνήσκος), skyphos (σκύφος) were kept as direct translations. However, oinochoe (οινοχόης) was translated as jug. Equally, ‘fragments of one handled vessel’ (Θραύσμα μόνωτου χειροποίητου αγγείου) found in significant quantity on Thasos and on the mainland was translated as ‘cup’, although I am aware again that this translation to ‘cup’ may infer too strong a teleological meaning during the use-life of the object which it may not in fact have possessed.2

Beyond pottery, there were also a series of miscellaneous items which had to be translated in some meaningful way in order to record. One example of this was the large amount of bronze items found within graves. This could be long pieces of bronze wire, a small bronze plate or button like object, or a polymorphous small bronze object which did not have any clear function. These items were labelled as ‘bronze application’, as I made the decision that these items were most likely associated with something larger that did not survive, i.e., clothing or other organic object. Coils of bronze spiral wire, however, were recorded as such, and are found in both Aegean and inland Thrace. Therefore, as I wanted to highlight this similarity in grave good I recorded the spiral wire as separate from the other ‘bronze applications’, yet it could have also been designated as an ‘application’.

4.9.2 Bulgarian Publications

Concerning the extrication of data from Bulgarian language site reports, the decisions that were made relating to the translation of certain objects also warrants explaining.

---

2 Due to the ‘fragmentary’ nature of Thassian pottery, amounts of pottery should be taken as approximate rather than absolute. This is the same for most of the burial record on the island, as the extant grave-goods do not necessarily represent the true nature of the funerary package, rather only that which survives the test of time. Moreover, it was unclear from the three volumes presented by Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1992), whether fragments found were from different or the same object. With this in mind, it is worth emphasising the fact that the majority of the pottery fragments recorded may have in fact been the same vessel, but were recorded as different vessels. A handle and body of a cup or bowl in a tomb may have in fact belonged together, rather than to two different vessels as shown in the pictorial volume of the Thassos reports. Therefore, the results recorded here are to be read with the understanding that different results could be had if different rules surrounding data collection were to be introduced.
The majority of the Bulgarian language words used in the thesis were direct translations from Bulgarian. So for example, words like fibula (фибула), knife (ножче), torc (торк), and bracelet (греяна) were retained. However, since the publications were generally inconsistent in documenting the material the items were made from, only objects themselves could be recorded without their corresponding material types. For example, despite there being some instances when an iron knife (железен ножче) was found, most of the time this information was not available, thus knife was kept instead of specifying possible material types. Similarly, fibulae could also have been bronze or iron but due to recording inconsistencies, these items were recorded simply by their name. Perhaps in the future when more data is published this can be overcome, however, at the moment, due to consistency, the material was omitted.

When pottery was recorded within the funerary context, the word vessel (съд) or vessels (съдове) was used. These vessels were almost always handmade domestic wares which ranged in shape from vases, plates, bowls, and amphora-like vessels. Yet, unlike the Greek reports which documented such vessels, often within the Bulgarian language reports they were far less detailed and for the sake of consistency the name ‘handmade kitchenware’ was given as a blanket term to refer to these vessels. I am aware that such designation as ’kitchenware’ implies strong teleological functions to the objects, however, the term attempts to translate more the forms that were found as not inconsistent with everyday domestic use. An exception to this are cups (чашка) which were almost always specified if found, so they were retained as separate from the handmade kitchenware, despite being part of the handmade ceramic repertoire deposited in graves.

4.10 Concluding Remarks

There is no denying that the available data quality in Iron Age Thrace – Bulgarian and Greek – is fragmentary in nature. This data, therefore, limits what can be undertaken. It would have been extremely interesting to embark upon the sort of statistical analyses as has been undertaken in the other European schools of prehistory (cf. Popa 2018). Yet, quantitative approaches to Thracian prehistory need to begin somewhere, and using the data available with caution through simple methods should be seen as an important starting point.

A key aspect of this section has not solely been to state the rationale behind different approaches of data analysis; this is an important aspect to outline nonetheless. Rather,
an additional aim of this section has been to make clear the benefits of these different methods of data analysis with the above outlined key variables, as by doing so each method draws out different perspectives of the data being analysed. For example, the use of bar charts to compare the general level of object variability between regions offers different insights in comparison to fibulae styles and sizes which have been analysed in reference to exploratory methods of data analysis. Each of these approaches use different modes of analysis due to the different types of data; one being categorical and the other being continuous. Likewise, the use of primarily categorical data meant that more sophisticated analyses could not be undertaken here without running the risk of misrepresenting the data, therefore, simple methods have been used to draw out answers to help identify the presence of ethnicity within Iron Age Thrace.
Chapter 5

Regional Trends

As in Chapter 3, the key clues for recognising the process of ethnicity are to be found within the articulation of specific packages of material variability (i.e., variability in settlements, cemeteries and ways of dying, and religious spaces) which are underpinned by regional preferences of artefact style and context. Therefore, in order to fully conceptualise the extent to which regional identities may have been expressed, it is worth first discussing the wider discourse of material trends within Iron Age Thrace in order to begin highlighting aspects outside of the funerary context which offer complementary evidence for the ethnic diversity of Thrace.

It should be noted here parenthetically that the study of material regional variabilities within the context of Iron Age and Archaic Greece has been noted by a number of academics since the late 1990s (Whitley 2001, 231-265; Morris 1998, 14-75). The discoveries made from these perspectives have undoubtedly revealed significant results for how we should conceptualise the period prior to the Late Iron Age in the area south of Thrace. Regionally distinct pottery traditions have been identified during the Late Geometric period, and in particular during the 8th century, where local pottery styles have been observed to correlate directly with regional differences in burial traditions (Coldstream 1968; Snodgrass 1971, 147-176). Likewise, within his study, I. Morris (1998, 22) defined a further four distinct regions during the Greek Archaic period on account of the regionally diverse expression of burials, settlements, and sanctuaries. Yet, Morris (1998, 50-51) points out that Aegean Thrace during this time is substantially different, based on the little archaeology we have from the region beyond funerary evidence. The conspicuous absence of burials with weapons observed in surrounding areas like Vergina (see Andronikos 1969; Snodgrass 1971, 160-163; Morris 1998, 43-45), the absence of any
sort of formal sanctuary buildings (Morris 1998, 50-51), and the lack of any domestic archaeology makes assumptions about this area notoriously difficult. Yet, Morris himself grouped the entirety of the area of Thessaly, Greek Macedonia, and Aegean Thrace as his ‘north’ region which, as I shall show, encompasses a range of diverse regions that exhibit substantial archaeological differences. Therefore, I will begin by outlining current conceptual problems concerning the phenomena of Iron Age material regionalisms in reference to pottery styles (following Czyborra 2001), and then move more broadly to discuss three distinct regional material trends concerning pit sanctuaries, peak sanctuaries, and rock-cut niches as additional supportive evidence.

5.1 Stylistic Regionalisms: Early Iron Age I Pottery

As I have emphasised earlier in Chapter 1, ceramic stylistic variations around Early Iron Age I Thrace have caused considerable conceptual difficulties for those attempting to establish a chronological framework of Iron Age Thrace (cf. Hänsel 1976; Gergova & Kulov 1976). Yet beyond chronology, the study of stylistic and material regionalisms have been largely neglected within the broader study of Early Iron Age Thrace, with the exception of work by Czyborra (2001) and Nikov (2011). Ironically, for an avenue of academic inquiry which has relied so heavily on pottery as a proxy for social and temporal change, its regional variety and clustering has been severely neglected. Czyborra’s (2001) synthesis of the distribution of particular pottery decorations from Early Iron Age southern Bulgaria, Turkish Thrace, and northern Greece represents the last formal and systematic investigation of its type. Yet, what Czyborra (2001) did not analyse was the regional concentration of particular pottery decorations – which can now be better represented through contemporary GIS mapping technology – and the occurrence of stylistic clusters.

The topic of pottery regionalism within Early Iron Age Thrace was also briefly commented on by Nikov (Nikov 2000a; 2000b; 2011; Czyborra 2001, 7-10) – although not offering a comprehensive investigation of regional pottery decorations – he argued Thrace consisted of stylistically distinct regions on the basis of the distribution of specific styles, like the nested concentric circles, the S-band, and rectangular/trapezoidal/triangular panels during the Early Iron Age I (figures 5.1 and 5.2). Based on these stylistic distributions, Nikov (2011, 219-224) argued that regional stylistic variation of pottery represented the formal distribution of tribal groups throughout south eastern Thrace during
the first millennium B.C. (figure 5.2). Yet, whilst not discounting Nikov’s (2011) hypothesis, Czyborra’s (2001) data highlights a significantly different pattern altogether during the same period. The maps above (figures 5.3) have been produced using data obtained from Czyborra’s (2001) thesis and the decorations have thus been labelled according to her original analysis for the sake of cross referencing. The dates of these decorations have been assigned by Czyborra (2001) to her Alada / Frühe Phase (roughly 1000-900 B.C.) which corresponds to the Early Iron Age I period within this thesis.

To begin, it is clear from the spatial distribution of ceramic styles in Thrace during the Early Iron Age I period that there were strong concentrations of stylistic groups in particular areas. This can clearly be observed in reference to eight of the styles in particular, which congregate within the south eastern part of Thrace. Yet the data also suggests that other decorations do not appear to be static, or at least locally maintained, and indeed the maps indicate that certain styles and stylistic groups travelled beyond natural boundaries – like the Rhodope mountains – and into areas extending towards the Aegean coast. Whether this is the result of trade, gift exchange, or itinerant potters is unknown, but it does indicate a significantly high level of communication and connection during this time. Of course, Clarke (1968, 365) would have conceivably argued that there we should assume there to be a negative relationship between shared cultural elements (such as style) and distance between a hypothetical ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ regions, yet the data obtained from Czyborra’s (2001) seems to contradict this particular theory. Moreover, the simultaneous nature of both the spread and conservation of stylistic motifs is significant here, and stands to reflect that styles were being deliberately enabled to spread whilst others were maintained. This question of transmission has been explored widely within anthropological literature, and most notably by Sackett (1985; 1986; 1990) who argued that transmission and acquisition of style was essentially passive and without conscious awareness, and certainly this point in particular has been reemphasised in several recent ethnographic studies which identified the subconscious transmission of style during the acquisition of pot making from the immediate members of the affinal and agnatic kin group (cf. Fowler 2015, 85-90; Jolles 2005; Huffman 2007).

Perhaps it was the type of pottery that was significant to the spread of style around these areas. What we currently know about Early Iron Age I pottery during this time suggests that domestic pottery manufacture was the main mode of ceramic production and consumption (Nikov 2000a, 9). Notably the practice of domestic pottery production
Figure 5.1: Map of distinguished regions with strong concentration of concentric circles connected with tangents and S-shaped spirals (Nikov 2011, 218)

Figure 5.2: Map showing the distribution of tribes across Thrace on account of regional pottery style clustering during the Early Iron Age I-II period (Nikov 2011, 222)
Figure 5.3: Kernel density maps which show the regional clustering of ceramic styles during the Early Iron Age. Map created using NASA’s Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project.
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Figure 5.4: Forms of Early Iron Age I-II pottery: 1, 8, Kutela (after Tsonchev 1963); 2, Tron (after Mikov 1958); 3, 4, 5, 7, Amphipolis (after Papadopoulos 2001); 6, Kossynthos (after Triandafilos & Kallidzi 1998); 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, Katrishte (after Georgieva et al. 1998); 15, Borino (after Kisyov 1985); 16, 19, Tsruncha (after Domaradski 1986); 17, Kazichene (after Stancheva 1974); 20, 24, Babyak (after Domaradski 1999); 22, 23, Dorkovo/Tsepina (after Hänsel 1976); 28, 21, 13, 12, Gluhite Kameni (after Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018); 26, 27, 14, Ada Tepe (after Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018)
may be in some way linked to other studies concerning Early Iron Age I habitation behaviours, with current consensus pointing towards seasonal transhumance pastoralism being widespread throughout much of the area below the Maritza (cf. Sobotkova 2016; Popov 2015; Bozhinova 2010; Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2010b; Porozhanov 1998). If we agree with the theory pertaining to seasonal transhumance, along with domestic pottery production, then it seems feasible to hypothesise the potentially large distances that any group of styles may travel, resulting in their wide-scale distribution as stemming from seasonal transhumance rather than a system of passive adoption (contra. Sackett 1985; 1986; 1990). Concerning forms, Early Iron Age I pottery is characterized by a growing standardisation that extends throughout much of Thrace (both Aegean and inland), and in respect to this the distribution of ceramic styles in Thrace could also be related to the gradual process of standardisation of ceramic forms (Bozkova 2015).

Yet, what is critical to reemphasise from Czyborra’s (2001) data is that there are observable regional stylistic clusters present during the Early Iron Age I. Some of these styles travelled vast distances which is not contrary to what we currently hypothesise concerning how people were living during this time. Despite this, regional clusters were maintained in specific areas, which poses additional questions as to its significance, and runs contrary to many of the anthropological studies involving the spreading of ceramic styles. These clusters, therefore, represent something meaningful which is specifically highlighted through their geographically specific location. Past analyses like Nikov (2011) have indeed noted some preliminary observations regarding the regional nature of pottery styles, yet he chose to define them as ‘tribes’. From the point of view of this project, these clusters of style are highly significant and they – whilst disproving one of Clarkes hypotheses – highlight the polythetic and overlapping nature of cultural assemblage data.

In continuation of this point, by the Late Iron Age, additional areas of stylistic developments had also been taking place within the western Rhodope. However, as I shall discuss, this Late Iron Age phenomenon is slightly different from the corresponding Early Iron Age I, and in this instance, the pottery manufactured is not only stylistically different but also contextually specific.

---

1Prior analysis into historic animal economies within the Balkans have often characterised particular practices of animal husbandry as underpinning particular ethnic identities (Koster 1977; Schein 1975).
5.2 Stylistic Regionalisms: Late Iron Age Tsepina Pottery

Figure 5.5: Map showing the distribution of Tsepina pottery around Late to Late Iron Age Thrace (after Georgieva 2003, 195). Map created using NASA’s Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project

From the inception of the Late Iron Age (around the 6th century B.C.), numerous ceramic technological and stylistic changes were taking place within Thrace. Wheelmade monochrome pottery begins to spread throughout Thrace and the Greek colonies on the Aegean coast; early examples of which have been identified at Histria (Alexandrescu 1977) and Apollonia Pontica (Nikov 2012). Simultaneously, G 2-3 Ware – which is a thin-walled fine tableware made of pure and well-baked clay – was beginning to spread throughout Aegean Thrace and Islands like Samothrace and Thasos alongside traditional handmade wares beginning from the end of the Early Iron Age II period (cf. Iliev 2009, 109-121; 2013, 123-129; Lehman 1952, 36-37). Critically during this time, the elites in central Thrace began to consume significant quantities of Greek imported pottery – mostly Attic with shapes typically connected to the symposium – as part of their lavish funerary assemblages, as was the case for the tumuli excavated at Duvanlij and Dalboki (cf. Lazarov 2003; Filov 1919; 1937). In comparison to the Early Iron Age, the Late
Iron Age is marked by a greater degree of pottery regionality, and in the Rhodope this is expressed through the highly localised phenomenon of the Tsepina pottery group.

The site of Tsepina – where the pottery acquires its name – is located in the northwestern Rhodopes. The site itself is naturally protected by a rocky outcrop that surrounds it, which prompted initial theories regarding the use of the site as some kind of Thracian hillfort settlement (Tonkova 2007, 213-214). During these initial excavations two main periods of activity were identified which were correlated roughly to the 7th-6th centuries B.C. (Gizdova 1974; 1990, 76; Archibald 1998, 36). Upon excavation, the site revealed hearths and pits lined with clay which were next to features through to be the remnants of various small-scale wooden constructions. The finds from the site varied considerably, with objects such as axes and knives being found alongside fibulae of ‘Thracian type’, metal equestrian equipment, and small, roughly formed clay idols (Archibald 1998, 36). Yet it was the pottery from the site which was particularly noteworthy. The ceramics discovered were mainly handmade, although there were some fragments which suggested the use of a wheel (Archibald 1998, 36). On this basis, the pottery was divided into two categories: course-ware and fine-ware. The coarse wares included thick-walled pots which were burnished and decorated in relief with rolling waves and intricate geometric and stamped patterns. Correspondingly, the fine-wares were made from well-fired clay and covered in a glossy slip, which consisted mainly of bowls with curved rims and one-handed jugs (Gizdova 1974; Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b, 210ff). A few examples of the fine-wares were also found decorated with some anthropomorphic figures and crude depictions of animals, which was a marked difference from the purely geometric patterning exhibited on the earlier ‘Pshenichevo’ pottery. Indeed, more widely the ornamental repertoire on the Tsepina pottery was a considerable shift from the pottery types and styles which were known to have existed during this time and before (Hänsel 1976; Georgieva 2003).

Morphologically, the Tsepina shapes are also a marked change from other contemporary ceramic traditions with its preference for bowls, large bucket-like urns, and jugs with rounded rims and protruding feet (Georgieva 2003). With additional excavations at surrounding hilltop sites like Babyak, it became increasingly clear that the Tsepina phenomenon was highly localised, concentrating in and around the Strymon valley (Stoyanova-Serafimova 1970; Georgieva 2003, 173-176). Hänsel (1976, 222ff) had initially dated the Tsepina phenomenon to the Early Iron Age II period on the basis of the
formative results produced from the Tsepina excavations (cf. Georgieva & Domaradski 1999, 22-27). Yet, beyond the Tsepina site, the pottery was noted by its first excavators to be conspicuously absent from most of the Early Iron Age I-II excavated cemeteries outside the western Rhodope (Georgieva 2003). More concise dating was produced only relatively recently, through the excavation at the sanctuary of Babyak, where it was confidently stratigraphically dated to the 6th century B.C. (Tonkova 2007; Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b). The evidence was provided from a trench on the so-called ‘Top Sector’ of the site (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b, 65-73). It was during excavation of these contexts where excavators discovered large quantities handmade pottery with patterns deployed in deep reliefs, which was the same as the decorations discovered earlier at the Tsepina site (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b, 40-43, 68, 72). As the upper level consisted mainly of wheel-made later ceramics which could be chronologically placed to sometime around the 4th-3rd centuries B.C., it provided a comfortable terminus ante quem for the layers where the Tsepina pottery had been discovered, and this in turn could be assigned to roughly around the Late Iron Age (i.e. sometime after the 6th century B.C.). Today, the Tsepina style is regarded as a strictly Late Iron Age phenomenon on the basis of more examples having been discovered at sites dated to the 6th-4th centuries B.C., like at Stoikite, Zornitsa, and Kovil (Georgieva 2003, 174; Kisyov 1989b; 1994; Georgieva 1991a).

As there have been more instances of Tsepina excavated since its original discovery, we can now confidently recognise that the pottery is characterised by its incised and geometric patterns which are drawn in relief, i.e. straight lines, swastikas, geometric shapes, anthropomorphic figures, and continuous waves (Domaradski 1994; Shopova 1990) (figure 5.6). In addition to its distinctive style, the interior surface of the majority of the vessels of the Tsepina group are not smoothed – which as hypothesised by Archibald (1998, 38) – marked the pottery type as distinct from other contemporary ceramics.2 The context of use associated with the pottery also points towards its significance with the majority of discoveries occurring in so-called peak sanctuaries (cf. Shopova 1990, 80-86; Kisyov 1989b, 15), and other voices have noted that this richly decorated pottery is also conspicuously absent from the domestic sphere (cf. Georgieva 2003; Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b). Today it is generally thought that the Tsepina pottery is specifically a

---

2 According to Archibald (1998, 38) 30 percent of the decorated sherds from Babyak were highly polished on the outside and left rough on the inside, which she argued was an indicator for their ritual, rather than domestic function.
Figure 5.6: Tsepina decoration from the western Rhodope: 1, Ispervovo (Delev & Bozhkova 2002); 2, 6, Mt Ostrets (Domadadski 1995); 5, Stoikite (Kisyov 1989b); 7, Pokrivenik (Stoyanova-Serafimova 1970); 4, 3, 8, Babyak (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b); 2, 6, Babyak (after Domaradski 1999); 11, 12, 14, 15, Tsepina (Hansel 1976); 13, 17, Koprivlen (Delev & Bozhkova 2002); 16, 18, Yunatsite (Titov 1995). Drawings taken from Georgieva (2003) and Tonkova (2008b)
cult type of pottery, which is to suggest its only found within the context of north western Rhodope peak sanctuaries (Domaradski 1990a; Domaradski 1990b, 30ff; Tonkova 2007, 75, 120). This has, however, not prohibited some scholars studying it to advance further theories as to what it’s localised phenomenon may mean. In arguably a similar vein to Nikov (2011) earlier, Domaradski (1990b, 30-40) – who has discussed at length the role Tsepina pottery had within the Late Iron Age – held the opinion that the regional nature of the Tsepina phenomenon represented the outline of the Bessoi tribe, who we know loosely correspond to the area of the upper Strumon through the writings of Herodotus (7.111) (cf. Georgieva 2003, 175).

The Tsepina pottery group has only even been found in any considerable quantity within peak sanctuaries of the western Rhodope, with a few single examples having been found near Pazardzhik and Koprivlen (Georgieva 2003, 174-175). Beyond this, the Tsepina group represents a Late Iron Age locally maintained pottery type. Authorities on Late Iron Age Thracian ceramics have overlooked the fact that the Tsepina style seems to loosely coincide with attempts made to establish a colonial settlement around Amphipolis (Ennea Hodoi) in the south during the period of increasing Greek settlement of the Aegean (see Thuc. 1.100; 4.102). Critically this cannot be completely dismissed, especially if this led to the conscious maintenance of a localised pottery style between immediate kinship groups. Nevertheless, in connection with the spatial distribution of styles undertaken earlier, the conscious maintenance of style to a specific location cannot be viewed as arbitrary. Likewise, akin to the regionalisms observed in the Early Iron Age I, I suggest that the Tsepina phenomenon highlights a distinctive aspect of material regionalism occurring within Thrace, which by extension, offers additional support for the regional variability of Thrace during this time.
5.3 Material Regionalisms: Pit Sanctuaries

From the early to mid 2000s, major investments in the national infrastructure of Bulgaria – coinciding with their membership into the EU in 2007 – saw the creation of several large-scale projects aimed at improving infrastructure within the Thracian plain (Dimova 2015, 105). As a result, dozens of Early Iron Age sites were unearthed within the process of construction consisting mainly of fields filled with pits (figure 5.7). After more than two decades of systematic analysis, it was recognised that a majority of these pit sites originate during the Early Iron Age which has since puzzled archaeologists working within this period as to their function (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2008; Nechrizov 2006). To date, archaeologists still adhere to the work of Georgieva (1991b, 1) who coined the term ‘pit sanctuary’. A key aspect of these sanctuaries was persistent evidence of structured deposition which ruled out their use as a middens. Within the last two decades, excavations have revealed structures in association with pits found at the sites of Chirakman (Tonkova 2003, 479) and Gledachevo (Tonkova & Georgieva 2006, 164), which further complicates their meaning and use. The size of the sites also vary, the
largest known example comes from near Malko Tranovo which was composite of over 500 pits dated throughout the Early to Late Iron Ages, and spread over an area of almost 7.4 acres (Dimova 2015, 105; Hawthorne 2009, 53).

Beyond pit sanctuaries, structure deposition within pits has been documented within the context of peak sanctuaries. Yet, within these contexts a few pits have revealed deliberate deposition of items including clay hearths, animal bones, fragments from ceramic vessels, and large amounts of charcoal (Tonkova 2010; Hawthorne 2009). Moreover, an important point of contrast concerning pits in peak sanctuaries – particularly in the north western Rhodope – is the conspicuous lack of Greek imported ceramics, which only seems to accompany pits found within pit sanctuaries (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008). Pits have also been found situated at the base of burial mounds and filled with items such as like hearths, clay platforms, and altars (Georgieva 1991b, 2-5; Filov 1934). The most significant discovery relating to this type was below the Kralevo tumulus in north-east Bulgaria, here over 100 pits were discovered containing what has been described as ‘cult equipment’ like braziers and clay altars (Ginev 2001, 8ff; Hawthorne 2009, 235-236).

The largest concentration of pits do, however, come from so-called pit sanctuaries. These sites are scattered over an extensive territory, but concentrate within the east side of the central Thracian Plain (figure 5.7). Whilst there is clear evidence that this site formed part of a regionally specific tradition, scholars like Georgieva (2015, 147-151) have dismissed this, and attributed it to excavation bias. In total, over 100 sites of this type have been discovered which have been dated between the Early and Late Iron Ages, with several lasting later into the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and have been discovered as far north as modern-day Romania (Hawthorne 2009, 50; Bozhkova & Nikov 2010). The depths of the pits found within sanctuaries vary as well, some have been found to be extremely shallow, at not even half a metre deep, whilst others have been recorded at sites like Malko Trunovo and Dvora, which have measured in depth at more than 3 metres (Hawthorne 2009, 61).

Not all the pits are the same, however. Examples have been found partially and completely lined with clay (Bonev & Alexandrov 1993; Vulcheva 2002, 104–110), or lined with a mixture of clay and daub (Filov 1934, 16) (figure 5.8). Pits can also be completely empty and back-filled with plain soil. However, examples have also been found filled with a thick and dark soil, which has later been identified by excavators to be indicative of the presence of natural fats in the pit (Georgieva 2015, 150). More
common are pits found containing charcoal, clay objects, and ceramic vessels (often
decorated). Animal bones are very common within pits, but whole sacrificed animals
have also been found within a number of Early and Late Iron Age pit sanctuaries. For
example in *pit.32* at the Svilengrad the remains of twelve articulated perinatal canines
were found (Ninov 2006, 504). Likewise in *pit.40* at the site of Dvora, a 9 year old mare
was found partially articulated, missing the back half of its body, and directly associated
with the fully articulated remains of a 2 year old child (Tonkova 2010, 505-506).

This brings me to my next point concerning pit sanctuaries, and one aspect which
highlights their regional alterity above all else; the presence of partially articulated human
remains with sustained evidence of processing (i.e., heavy cut marks).

The subject of human remains within pit sanctuaries has been the topic of fierce
debate within Iron Age archaeology (see. Tonkova 2003; 2010; Vulcheva 2002; Nechrizov
2006; 2012). Most of the human remains date to around the Late Iron Age (i.e 5th
and 4th century B.C.), with the exception of the Svilengrad sanctuary which revealed a
number of pits containing human remains dated to the Early Iron Age I period (10th-
8th century B.C. (figure 5.9) (see. Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2012). The main sources
of our information concerning human remains in pits comes from the sanctuaries near
Gledacevo (Tonkova 1997; 2001; 2003, 484-495) and at the newly discovered sanctuaries
at the village of Malko Trunovo (Bozhkova & Tonkova 2007) and Yabulkovo (Tonkova
2006), situated on both banks of the Maritsa River.\(^3\)

Beginning with Gledacevo, human remains were found in four pits (Tonkova 1997;
2001; 2003, 484-495; 2010, 504-506). In *pit.9* sector 3 under a layer of black soil contain-
ing a high concentration of charcoal fragments, the skeleton of a young female (roughly
aged around 16) was discovered laying on her chest and missing her right foot. She was
discovered alongside a collection of fragments from three Thassian amphorae, several
grey bowls, and a pestle. Likewise in *pit.12* beneath a layer of charcoal the skeleton
of an ambiguously aged adult male was found on his back in the foetal position. In
*pit.29* – just one metre away from *pit.12* – the remains of an adult male (roughly aged
between 25-40) was discovered partially articulated, missing his parts of his tibia, fibula,
bones from his feet, part of the pelvis, and rib cage (figure 5.10). Just beneath these

---

\(^3\)Yet, as pointed out by Tonkova (2010, 503), human remains have been reported at a number of
other pit sites without osteological examination, for example at Stafiiska mahala (Bonev & Alexandrov
1996), Dourankoulak (Burrow 1994), Debelt (Balabanov 1999), Drama (Yambol province) (Lichardus
et al. 2000), Polski Gradets (Tonkova & Savatinov 2001), Glavan (Agre & Kitov 2002), Mirkovo (Milev
1961), and Koprivlen (Vulcheva 2002).
Figure 5.8: Section of a pit from the sanctuary near the village of Ovchartsi, Stara Zagora (Georgieva 2015, 149)

Figure 5.9: Pit.118, from the sanctuary at Svilengrad two human skeletons of adult males, aged between 45–50 and 50–60 respectively. Osteological examination revealed that the skull of the elder person had traces of trepanation which they survived (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2012, 206)
bones, the remains of a complete child’s skeleton (ambiguously dated and not sexed) was discovered on its back. Lastly, in pit.40 the complete remains of an ambiguously sexed child (roughly aged around 2) was discovered beneath a thick layer of charcoal filled with handmade pottery fragments.

Similarly at Malko Trunovo remains were four in found pits dating to around the 5th century B.C. (Bozhkova & Tonkova 2007; Tonkova 2010, 507-509). Most notably from pit.A in sector 1, a child’s skeleton with its pelvis and lower limbs missing was discovered under a thick layer of silty black soil. The pit also contained the partial remains of a dog, lamb, and a calf, along with fragments of Greek imported ceramics (pieces of a kylikes). Correspondingly in pit.197, the remains of seven children were discovered and roughly aged between 2-14. Five of the remains were of completely articulated skeletons whilst two of the skeletons consisted of skulls, one of which been placed deliberately under a large rock (cf. Tonkova 2010, 520). A piece of human jaw was discovered in a nearby ditch which surrounded the outer limits of the site, although it is not known whether this was connected to the remains within the pits.

At Yabulkovo, a similar number of remains were excavated from five pits out of a total of forty (Tonkova 2006; Tonkova 2010). Three of the pits contained completely articulated skeletons; two males and one mature female (roughly aged around 50). Most notably, however, were the remains from pit.1, which revealed the partially articulated remains an ambiguously sexed adult, who had been deliberately cut apart at the shoulders with a heavy tool. The chest of the skeleton was missing and its lower limbs also exhibited signs additional processing (figure 5.11).

The presence of human remains from pit sanctuaries and the corresponding ways they have been treated is of central importance here. Despite only featuring in relatively few pits at sites, processing of human remains is a point of considerable contrast between pits found within other ‘ritual’ settings in western Thrace. To reemphasise, the concentration of pit sanctuaries within the central Thracian plain is of critical significance. Pit sanctuaries highlight another regionally specific behaviour, which is underpinned by the regional practice concerning the deposition of human remains; specifically older men, women, and children during the Early and Late Iron Ages. Coupled with the regional variability in pottery styles within the north western Rhodope, lowland and highland differences in material practices are more apparent, and this point is further supported by the phenomena of peak sanctuaries and rock-cut niches, which I shall discuss next.
Figure 5.10: Pit.29, from the sanctuary at Gledachevo. Below the same person the remains of a child’s skeleton was found in anatomic order (Tonkova 2010, 517).

Figure 5.11: Pit.1 from the sanctuary at Yabalkovo. The chest was missing and the lower limbs also bore traces of deep cuts marks, but were in anatomic order. Beside the mutilated adult skeleton, the remains of a child aged eight were arranged in anatomic order (Tonkova 2010).
5.4 Material Regionalisms: Peak Sanctuaries

Figure 5.12: Map showing the distribution of peak sanctuaries around Early to Late Iron Age Thrace. Map created using NASA’s Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project

Akin to pit sanctuaries, peak sanctuaries have also confounded academics as to their meaning and use. As it currently stands there is no unified and generally accepted definition within Bulgarian academic literature on how to define these so-called ‘peak sanctuaries’, and unfortunately, no formal definition of what they regularly consist of archaeologically (cf. Bairakov 2015, 132). Typically, publications which reference such places do so on the basis of data obtained from surveys and field walking and less frequently from archaeological excavations (cf. Bairakov 2015, 133). The first data on such sites were collected and published at the end of the 19th century by the Shkorpil brothers (Shkorpil & Shkorpil 1888, 24-26; Bairakov 2015, 133-142). The date of the sites also spans a significant chronological range. Most sites date to between the Early and Late Iron Ages, although Late Bronze Age examples do exist (Baraikov 2015). Within the past decade, Bairakov (2015, 195-205) attempted to create a typology of such
sanctuaries, which evolved around two main groups. He argued that the first group were represented by small-scale open air locations high on peaks which may have functioned akin to small ‘chapels’ and consist of a stone temenos or deliberate demarcation of space within which are often large quantities of ceramic assemblages (ibid). This is in contrast to the second group which he characterised through their monumentality, large area, and multiple associated structures akin to the eastern Rhodope sanctuaries of Tatul and Perperikon (figures 5.15 and 5.16).4

Beyond Bairakov’s typological distinctions, it is more broadly understood that all peak sanctuaries are characterised by their location high on the ridges of the Rhodope and Rila mountains in uninhabited locations, with most associated with the presence of clay altars, monumental stone clusters and/or rock hewing. The highest example comes from Levunovo which is situated 1653 metres above sea level in the Rhodope (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008a). Pits are often found within peak sanctuaries and usually contain substantial evidence for structured deposition, yet in many instances their discovery is often associated with additional significant features. For example, at the sanctuary near Babyak, pits were associated with rectangular foundations of a structure labelled a temenos by excavators (Tonkova 2007, 55) (figure 5.14), and at the sanctuary near Tsruntcha in the western Rhodope, pits were found associated with other negative features, like ditches and clay altars for burnt offerings (Domaradzki 1994, 80–83).5 In recent years, it has become widely accepted that these pits acted as ‘bothroi’ as Nechri-zov (2012, 178) first suggested, functioning as both storage and places for deliberate deposition. Particularly as their fills often included smashed ceramic fragments, animal bones, charcoal, and fragments of ritual hearths, akin to the pit sanctuaries. Yet, within a number of publications on peak sanctuaries, authorities have critically noted their internal differences, particularly in reference to sanctuaries found between the eastern and western Rhodope.

Kulov and Ovcharov (1991, 161; 2002, 113-118) noted several distinctions between sanctuaries in Rhodope. More specifically, they characterised sanctuaries within the

---

4 This grouping was originally theorised by Velkov (1952, 28-36) who argued that ‘peak sanctuaries’ should be divided into two categories (i.e. primary and secondary cult sites) based on location, size, and architectural features.

5 According to Bairakov (2015, 159), Nechri-zov (2005a, 153) further subdivides peak sanctuaries within his doctoral thesis: one group is characterised without a defining peripheral wall, i.e. the sites of Plazishte village (Georgieva 1985), Dolni Glavanak (Nechri-zov 2004; Mikov 2002), Taushan Tepe (Nechri-zov 2005a), and Dzhanks (Nechri-zov 2005a). The other group is defined as those sites which are surrounded stone wall, as was the case at Samokitka (Balkanski 1977) and Dolno Lukovo (Bairakov 2015, 514). Typically, this wall is made from local un-worked stones and is often up to 1 metre thick, and rarely exceeds 1 acre (for extensive list of sanctuaries and references see Bairakov 2015).
eastern Rhodope as being directly connected with broader regional developments, i.e. megalithic monuments and trapezoidal niches which also concentrate within the same area (figure 5.17). Thereafter, Kulov (1991, 71-80) further subdivided peak sanctuaries according to the presence and absence of rock-cut tombs, niches and rock-cut graves, rock ‘thrones’ and platforms which are all clearly exhibited at the peak sanctuaries of Perperikon and Tatul in the eastern Rhodope (figures 5.15 and 5.16).

Beyond architecture, however, additional regional variations have also been spotted on the basis of artefact deposition between eastern and western peak sanctuaries. This was originally noted by Nechrizov (2005a, 95, 123) who remarked that a significant majority of ceramics excavated from the eastern Rhodope were specifically drinking vessels, which contrasted with the western Rhodope where no preference for any particular pottery shape was found (at least prior to the advent of the Tsepina phenomenon). This regional alterity was further underpinned within the western Rhodope by the lack of imported Greek vessels at large sanctuaries like Babyak (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b, 95), which contrasted with sanctuaries in the eastern where Greek vessels were deposited alongside handmade ceramics. On a broader level beyond distinctions concerning peak sanctuaries, significant distinctions have also been noted between pit and peak sanctuaries in terms of use and deposited objects. Tonkova (2008b, 113-114) notes within the excavation reports from Babyak that metal object (weapons, jewellery, and tools) were significantly rare within pit sanctuaries, as opposed to peak sanctuaries where they were much more common. Yet, this also importantly relates to the deposition of human remains, which is conspicuously absent from any peak sanctuary.

These regional variabilities concerning deposited artefacts between eastern and western sanctuaries along with their architectural differences as remarked by Baraikov (2015) are further emphasised by their preference for intervisibilty (figure 5.13). This is not something that has been questioned within current literature surrounding these sanctuaries, however, using geo-spatial data ascertained from Baraikov’s (2015) thesis, I was able to compute possible levels of inter-visibility between sanctuaries of different periods. Through this exploratory analysis, I discovered that sanctuaries in the eastern Rhodope exhibited a distinct preference for inter-visible between peak sanctuaries particularly

---

6As noted in the previous section, Georgieva (2003) notes that Tsepina pottery regionally concentrates around peak sanctuaries in the north western Rhodopes: Babyak (Tonkova & Gotsev 2008b, 120-136); Ostrets (Domaradski 1995); Kaleto (Salkin & Bairakov 2010, 15-22); Alkov Kamak (Domaradski et al. 1990), at Tsepina (Gizdova 1974). For additional discussions on Tsepina see: (Domaradski 1990b, 39; Shopova 1990; Archibald 1998, 36-37; Christov 2001; Georgieva 2003; Kisyov 2003; Bairakov 2012).
in contrast with sanctuaries in the west. This occurred more frequently between Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age sanctuaries, insinuating that a significant quantity of Early Iron Age sanctuaries were built with the purpose of direct sight in mind. Although this was not the case for all of the Early Iron Age sanctuaries in the region, indeed even the majority. However, the fact this occurs much more numerously in the eastern Rhodope cannot be overlooked in light of other evidence mentioned above, and only supports other perceived material variability between the two regions.

Distinctions observed between peak sanctuaries in the Rhodope present additional evidence to support claims of significant divergent material and monumental behaviours around Iron Age Thrace; pottery traditions varied in the Thracian plain during the Early Iron Age, meanwhile the Tsepina pottery tradition developed in the western Rhodope during the Late Iron Age, and this seems to be a point of contrast, alongside the deposition of human remains in relation to pit sanctuaries in the lowlands. From this point, it has also been established that peak sanctuaries whilst covering the whole of the Rhodope mountain range seem to be split between eastern and western traditions. In the east, sanctuaries are constructed using monumental architecture like those at Tatul and Peperikon, with their preference for cups prevail as the most common ceramic type, but also higher levels of sight inter-visibility. Conversely, in the west, sanctuaries are much smaller, and prior to the development of Tsepina, no clear preference for pottery can be observed, and these distinctions are critical to remember.
Figure 5.13: Map showing the number of Early Iron Age dated ‘peak sanctuaries’ in the eastern and western Rhodopes and levels of inter-visibility between them from the LBA-LIA. Data collected from (Baraikov 2015). Map created using NASA’s Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project.
5.5 Material Regionalisms: Rock-cut Niches

The final example of material regionalism concerns the tradition of rock-cut niches, a tradition which concentrates in the south eastern Rhodope, mostly around the Arda river (figure 5.17). A characteristic feature of these niches is that they are all carved into vertical cliff faces and are often found with others to form larger clusters. Single niches have been discovered at Ovchero, Sbor, and Kralevo, yet these are much less common (Nechrizov 2015, 138). The shapes of the niches are very uniform, all of them being roughly trapezoidal. Round niches do exist but have been interpreted to be the result of erosion rather than deliberate (Nechrizov 2015, 138). The spatial distribution of niches on cliff faces can be either chaotic and ordered, as is the case at Gluhite Kameni, and most niches are situated in particularly high and difficult to reach places, some being 50 metres above the ground (figure 5.18) (ibid).

7Hellenistic/Roman niches are also known to be carved into rock faces in low at the ‘Cave of Pan’ at Philippi, near Israel (Berlin 1999). In this case the niches acted as hollows for the image of an idol within the face of the rock.
Figure 5.15: Front view of rock-cut peak sanctuary of Tatul in the eastern Rhodope (author’s photograph)

Figure 5.16: View from the top of Perpericon, the monumental rock-cut peak sanctuary in the eastern Rhodope (Bairakov 2015, 637)
Rock-cut niches are localised to area of the eastern Rhodope (Nechrizov 1996, 9). There are, however, examples of some niches that have been discovered in caves (as was the case at near the village of Oreshari) or crannies below ground-level like at Gluhite Kamani (Nechrizov 2015, 138). Yet, more often are these niches discovered under overhanging cliff-edges, which has been argued to act as a form of protection from the rain (Kulov 2002, 114). The sizes of the niches vary, but on average most of the niches seem to measure around 1 metre in height and have been measured around up to half a metre in depth (Nechrizov 2015).

Nechrizov (2015, 138) has argued that semi-finished or abandoned niches are relatively common, although how he has distinguished these as different from niches that have undergone corrosion is not clear. To date, over 100 sites of rock-cut niches have been recorded within the eastern Rhodope, with the largest concentration of niches are to be found at the site of Gluhite Kamani, where a total of almost 500 niches were discovered (Nechrizov et al. 2012, 219).

Nechrizov (2015, 138) has argued that semi-finished or abandoned niches are relatively common, although how he has distinguished these as different from niches that have undergone corrosion is not clear. To date, over 100 sites of rock-cut niches have been recorded within the eastern Rhodope, with the largest concentration of niches are to be found at the site of Gluhite Kamani, where a total of almost 500 niches were discovered (Nechrizov et al. 2012, 219).

The meaning and function of the niches is still a hotly debated topic within Bulgarian academia. According V. Fol (1993, 151-153), some of the niches can be associated with an initiation ritual involving some cosmic or solar cult, during which sacred objects were placed within them. An additional explanation was offered by Nechrizov (1999, 29) and
Kulov (2002, 115) who argued that there was a direct link between the niches and rock-
cut tombs within the eastern Rhodope; theorising that the niches were involved within
some kind of wider ritual process concerning the dead. Kulov (2002, 113) later used this
theory to divide the niches into two separate groups; one group where niches acted as
functional display platforms for urns and another group which of niches that were purely
symbolic.

Unfortunately, there exists no fixed date for this phenomenon, which undermines
any theory of their possible connection with rock-cut tombs. Recent excavations at
the base of the niches at Gluhite Kameni revealed a high concentration of Early Iron
Age pottery, prompting excavators to maintain an estimated Early Iron Age date of
construction (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2011, 176-179; 2018; Nechrizov et al. 2012). Yet,
sites like Glühite Kameni and others, often had activity surrounding them until the
Medieval period, therefore, it cannot be discounted that this tradition continued in some
form until a much later date (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2011, 176-179). Nevertheless, what
is critical to note about the rock-cut niches is their highly regional nature, concentrating
in the river valleys of the eastern Rhodope. This should not be overlooked, especially
considering the fact that Early Iron Age I pottery styles were found to be spread over
large areas, which should prompt us not to presume that these regionalities were simply
the result of social isolation, but instead to view these regionalisms as a deliberate and
locally maintained response to a specific regional tradition.

5.6 Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this chapter was to assess the extent of some of the most significant
archaeological regional variations within south and south east Thrace during the Iron
Age. For this reason, this chapter outlined the major patterns of certain material and
stylistic forms using pottery, pit sites, peak sanctuaries, and rock-cut niches as its primary
evidence, consequently presenting a general overview of broad scale material variability
within Thrace. From this review several conclusions can be made:

(i) Pottery styles were regionally maintained in certain areas in Thrace during both
the Early and Late Iron Ages;

(ii) Ritual sites varied between regions, emphasised by the association of local pottery
traditions, depositional behaviours, site architecture, and possibly inter-visibility;

(iii) The south east revealed a strong and regionally maintained tradition of niche mak-
ing which appears to have endured through the Iron Age and corresponds to other
regionally specific phenomenon, i.e., rock-cut peak sanctuaries and the preference
for drinking vessels at ‘cult’ sites.

In summation of the above points, pot styles travelled widely during the Early Iron
Age I period in Thrace. These pot styles, through their combined expression, formed
clusters which connected different parts of Thrace. Yet, it is clear that there was also a
maintenance of specific styles only to be reproduced within the south east of Bulgaria
during the Early Iron Age I. This stylistic conservatism was later echoed in the western
Rhodope during the Late Iron Age with Tsepina type pottery. At the most basic level,
social groups throughout the Iron Age were ascribing to a set of specific symbols on handmade pottery that linked them to other areas, whilst at the same time maintaining their own local traditions and styles which bound them to a group in a specific area.

Contrasts between the regional clustering of pit sanctuaries and peak sanctuaries highlight an additional regional trend. The clustering of the pit sanctuaries at the foot hills of the Stara Planina mountain range in central Bulgaria, insinuate a specific type of regional material practice which found success between the groups living north and east of the Maritsa river. Likewise, the occurrence of human deposition within the lowland pits, and not at peak sanctuaries is another display of regional difference during the Early to Late Iron Age.

This summary of the material evidence marks a beginning point for the study of the Iron Age communities within Thrace. Thus far, communities during this period in Thrace have only been discussed in broad terms, especially in reference to their identities. As hinted through the ancient literature, we know that Thracian communities were a distinct series of social groups with their own methods of social practice, and this is certainly confirmed through the archaeological evidence of this section. From this perspective we begin to see enclaves of material clusters which begin to show groups of people linked by the particular ways they engage with material culture. A review of the fragmentary evidence, therefore, hints at a broad level of regionalism within Iron Age Thrace. Indeed I shall argue in the next chapter that further evidence can aid in the identification of ethnic groups in Thrace, specifically through regional differences in the treatment of human remains, tomb architecture, and associated grave-goods.
Chapter 6

A Spatial and Typological Analysis of Tomb Types

This chapter marks the first part of the investigation into the funerary context. In a similar vein to the previous chapter which took a spatial approach to the topic of regional variation beyond the funerary context, this chapter is dedicated to analysing the spatial distribution of different types of funerary architecture throughout Thrace during the Iron Ages. These monuments have been distinguished via methods of construction and physical form and consist of built graves, cist graves, pithoi graves, rock-cut graves, dolmens, and cairn graves. It is hoped that by undertaking such an approach that regional preferences in terms of specific architectural styles may be observed.

This chapter will not, however, document a chronological development of all tomb types throughout Thrace as there does not appear to be any sort of linear development concerning specific tomb types through time. Figure 6.1 attempts to display the six types of funerary architecture found throughout Thrace and their chronological placement. In reality, different types of funerary architecture are contemporary with one another and endure for much of the Early to Late Iron Ages.

In recent years the study of funerary architecture has witnessed several heated debates which have attempted to identify the development and chronology of Late Iron Age/Hellenistic royal Thracian tombs such as those at Mezek, Starosel, Kazanluk, Strelcha, and Mal Tepe (Stoyanov & Stoyanova 2016, 313-327; Tsetskhladze 1998, 55-84; Stoyanova 2008, 92-107). Yet, a typological analysis such as this has not been conducted before within both Greek and Bulgarian regions of Thrace. It is worth noting that not all the architectural types discussed here form part of a conscious cultural phenomenon,
Figure 6.1: Comparable chronology using objects and tomb types from Thrace.
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Figure 6.2: Map showing the distribution of tomb types in Thrace during the Early and Late Iron Ages
and indeed may not have existed as a phenomenon outside the realms of this typology. For example, the construction of pithoi graves, cist graves, and built graves – which were distributed over a large area and considerable time-span – were most likely not the result of a ‘Childean’ cultural group, rather they are likely represent the gradual dispersal of architectural ideas. Nevertheless, to document the regional extent of architectural types is still very much a useful endeavour, particularly as a way to assess levels of regional material variability and broader regional trends concerning architectural similarity and difference.

6.1 Built Graves

![Figure 6.3: Map showing the distribution of cist graves in Thrace](image)

The term ‘built grave’ refers to monuments which are constructed of small bricks and stones to make a composite whole without the help of a binding agent (figure 6.3). This critically differentiates the built grave from dolmens, which could be described as ‘built’ but have been constructed of monumental stone slabs and not composite of many small parts. The strongest concentration of this type come from Thasos, with only a handful of sites outside Thasos. Two examples come from Aegean Thrace near the village of
Each of these examples exhibits the use of dry stone masonry to construct a thick wall that surrounds a central burial chamber, ranging in size from 0.5-1 metre thick (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1992, 634-635; Vavritsas 1967, 93; Ilieva 2006, 3-4; Kisyov 2009, 128). Yet one of the main distinctions between monuments of this type is preference for either a square or circular form. Circular types appear to concentrate within the context of the mainland between both inland and Aegean Thrace regions. Despite most examples from Aegean Thrace having been badly destroyed upon discovery, a circular stone wall was definable around both the Zoni tombs (Vavritsas 1967, 93; 1968). Within inland Thrace, the example from Chepelare exhibits the same circular built wall around a central inhumation chamber (Kisyov 1991a, 66; 2009, 110) (figure 6.4). Both the circular built graves between inland and Aegean Thrace are built close to the same size, with a width often more than 2 metres wide. Despite this, both regions differ in terms of building style. The few examples of built graves from Aegean Thrace are made of unworked rocks, gradually forming a large circular wall with a central chamber. The roof of both examples near Zoni must have been independent, as the rocks made to form both structures were not substantial enough for the creation of a roof. This contrasts with the construction of the example from near Chepelare, which was constructed of slabs. These slabs were then built up and reinforced and used to form the roof of the small central chamber. Yet, the example from Chepelare is the only example, thus far, of a built grave with an accompanying tumulus.

As mentioned earlier, the Thassian built graves differ considerably from examples on the mainland. Despite maintaining similar methods construction of construction as observed at Chepelare (i.e. the stacking of slabs), the Thassian examples exhibit considerably more morphological variations, concerning both shape and size. Circular and square examples have been discovered on the Thasos, yet with a clear preference for square tombs. Other architectural variations were observed on Thasos concerning a tomb from Tsiganathika which featured a monumental façade and enclosure in front of one of its square tombs (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1982; 1992). Other variabilities concerning Thassian tombs involves the number of burial chambers contained within each tomb.  

---

1 The identification of another built grave from inland Thrace comes from Brestovitsa, near Plovdiv (cf. Archibald 1998, 65). Yet, I would argue against the inclusion of this tomb within this typological category for two reasons: firstly, the tomb consists of a monumental dromos which does not occur among any other of the built graves, and secondly, the tomb is bee-hived and is physically closer to later examples of monumental tombs such as those at Mezek or Kazanluk (see. Kisyov 2009, 193-5).
Figure 6.4: Image showing the different types of built graves forms between Aegean Thrace, Thasos, and Inland Thrace.
Single chambered tombs were the most common throughout most of the cemeteries and these tombs were also built independently from one another, yet at the Kastri cemetery, there were many more instances of tombs clustered together connected by a single wall, thereby forming clusters of single tombs.

Unfortunately, built graves in Thrace chronologically vary which undermines the possibility of this tomb type existing beyond being an arbitrary typological category. The built graves from Zoni can be placed around the Early Iron Age II period based on the discovery of fibulae from within the central chamber of Tomb A (Vavritsas 1966, 67-70). No such evidence, however, came from Tomb B, and we can only assume an Early Iron Age II date of construction based on its close proximity to Tomb A. Interestingly, the single example from inland Thrace is significantly earlier in date – around the Early Iron Age I period – which places it potentially closer to the examples on Thasos (Kisyov 2009, 110). However, the Thassian examples themselves are tricky to date, and represent a significantly different chronological trajectory. Despite the current lack of a linear chronological development of the tombs on Thasos, we know from cross referencing types of pottery and fibulae that the tombs on Thasos span from the Late Bronze Age period into, potentially, the end of the Early Iron Age II period (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1992, 634-635, 650, 526). Therefore, we can say with some certainty that whilst this type of tomb was being constructed in Aegean and inland Thrace, it was also the main mode of funerary architecture on Thasos. Yet, what implications this may have had on neigh-
bouring regions developing the same tomb type cannot be commented on until further excavations and examples are found.

Despite forming an independent category within this architectural typology, the overall pattern of distribution of built graves does not suggest strong concentrations in any particular region, except Thasos. Significance, therefore, taken from the spatial distribution of forms suggests that Thasos was increasingly insular in relation to tomb architecture throughout the Iron Age. Separate from this point, built graves between inland and Aegean Thrace do not concentrate in any particular way, and more excavations are needed in order to assess its place within the wider repertoire of Thracian Iron Age funerary practices.

6.2 Cist Graves

![Figure 6.6: Map showing the distribution of cist graves in Thrace](image)

Cist graves are defined as graves that have been lined and covered with stone slabs thereby forming a hollow cist that contains the inhumation and grave-goods. This is sometimes followed by the erection of a tumulus over the top of the cist (cf. Lazaridis 1973, 43-54; 1974, 58-64; 1975, 61-71; Triandafillos 1984, 179-196), although it is more common that cist graves are left without tumuli. In contrast to concentration of built graves in the northern Aegean coast, the location of cist graves are decidedly more dispersed – both geographically and chronologically – appearing in Aegean and inland
Thrace during the Early Iron Age and continuing beyond the Late Iron Age (figure 6.1).

The earliest example of this type of grave comes from the cemetery of Yagodina in inland Thrace (Kisyov 1988a; 1988b). On the basis of dates ascertained from the fibula typology created by Gergova (1987), the existence of cist graves at Yagodina date as far back as the 9/8th century B.C., from the presence of double spiral and ladievidna (ладиевидна) fibulae found in mound 1, graves 1 and 2 (see. Kisyov 2009, 129-130; 1991b; 1988a). The second earliest example of this grave type comes from the contemporary cemeteries at Katrishte in inland Thrace, and Kastas Hill (cf. Triandafillos 1984; Lazaridis 1975; 1976; 1977) and the Filiouri (Triandafillos 1984) cemeteries in Aegean Thrace (figures 6.9 and 6.10), which can all be dated based on grave goods between the 8-7th centuries B.C.² Broadly speaking, architectural forms within the cemeteries do not vary, yet unique variability of this architectural form is observed in inland Thrace, specifically at the Early Iron Age II cemetery of Katrishte and the Late Iron Age cemetery at Stoikite. In each of these sites, several cists have been constructed within a stone ‘peribolos’ made of upright stone slabs (Kisyov 2009, 216). During the shift from the Early Iron Age II into the Late Iron Age, the cist grave appears to experience a change in popularity between inland and Aegean regions. The Late Iron Age cemetery of Stoikite is the only example thus far, during the Late Iron Age in Thrace, which opts for the sole construction of the cist grave (Kisyov 1988d, 67; 1989c, 53-54; 1989b, 13). In contrast, the cist within Aegean Thrace seems to have been more commonly used alongside other architectural forms. Such was the case at the 4th century B.C. Greek colonial ‘North Necropolis’ on Samothrace (Karadima & Koutsoumanis 1995, 677-679). Here, two cist graves were found in direct chronological and spatial association with seven amphorae burials, one pit grave, and two stone sarcophagi.³ Similarly, at the slightly earlier Archaic cemetery of Abdera, cist graves were found in close spatial association with pit graves and amphorae inhumations (Kallintzi 1995, 447-459; 1992b, 562-568), and finally at Mesembria-Zoni, cist graves were found associated with amphorae inhumations and a possible ‘built’ grave (Tsatsopoulou 1993, 586-590).

The spatial patterning of this architectural form is similar to that seen with built graves. That is to suggest that, despite forming as an independent architectural type,

²Triandafillos (Triandafillos 1984, 179-207) dated the cemetery to closer to the 6th century, as he thought that it the cemetery may have been connected to the nearby chora of Maronia (see also Ilieva 2006, 7).

³It needs to be noted here that stone sarcophagi arrive in Thrace with later second-wave colonisation, i.e. during the 5th century, and are not found outside of Greek cemeteries. Therefore, they shall not form part of this funerary typology.
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Figure 6.7: Cist grave no.17 from Stoikite cemetery (after Kisyov 2009, 216)

Figure 6.8: Cist grave no.10 surrounded with a circle of upright slabs, Stoikite cemetery (after Kisyov 2009, 216)
Figure 6.9: Cist grave no.11 from the Filiouri cemetery (Triandafillos 1984, 187)

Figure 6.10: Cist grave no.2 from the Filiouri cemetery (Triandafillos 1984, 187)
it is unlikely to have formed as a conscious cultural phenomenon beyond categorisation within this typology. Yet, the fact that cemeteries within inland Thrace opt for this sole type of architectural form – i.e., Katrishte and Stoikite – suggests that this architectural type was preferred more in the north. Despite this, no real concentration of the form can be seen beyond its distinctive typological nature, and more excavations will be needed in order to understand the extent of this tomb type and its preference within either inland or Aegean Thrace.

6.3 Pithoi Graves

![Map showing the distribution of pithoi graves in Thrace](image)

Figure 6.11: Map showing the distribution of pithoi graves in Thrace

A pithos grave is, by definition, the placing of remains into a pithos followed by its deposition into either a cist (which is the case at the Archaic cemetery of Abdera), or more often into a pre-excavated pit, sometimes followed by the erection of a tumulus. A pithos is a term given to a large storage vessel which has been found in both domestic and funerary contexts, and they become conspicuous within grave contexts from the 8th century B.C. in Thrace (figure 6.11).

The two earliest examples of a pithos grave come from the contemporary cemeteries of Stambolovo from inland Thrace (Nechrizov 2009, 266-271) and the Kossynthos (Triandafillos & Kallidzi 1998, 1-18) and Filiouri (Triandafillos 1984, 179-207) in Aegean
Thrace, which both date to around the 8th century B.C. In each of these cases, pithoi have been used to house both the body and the grave-goods. Yet, in terms of variability, it is only the Stambolovo cemetery where pithoi graves were covered with a single tumulus. There is a possibility that the Kossynthos cemetery also covered their pithoi graves with tumuli, as upon excavation a circular rubble ring was discovered around them, but this cannot be known for certain (cf. Triandafillos & Kallidzi 1998, 6). Interestingly, two slightly later 8th-7th century pithoi graves from The Industrial Plain near Drama and Kastas Tumulus near Amphipolis were both covered with tumuli, possibly akin to the examples from Kossynthos.

During the Late Iron Age, pithoi graves were not widely observed – at least within the context of Aegean Thrace – and become superseded by other architectural types such as cist graves, pit graves, and amphorae burials. Despite this, the tradition endures within Late Iron Age inland Thrace, but due to a lack of archaeological data it is currently impossible to assess its true regional extent. Within the cemetery at Virbovo, in the Rhodope region, a single pithos grave (grave 4) was discovered without a tumulus, dating
between the 5th-4th centuries B.C. (Kisyov 2009, 104-105; 1989a, 55).

Figure 6.13: Late Iron Age pithos grave from the Virbovo cemetery, inland Thrace (after Kisyov 2009, 213)

From the spatial distribution of pithoi graves shown in figure 6.11 it is clear that this form was found more commonly within the confines of Aegean Thrace. Yet, the corresponding lack of pithoi from inland Thrace, in contrast to Aegean Thrace, may in some sense be connected to other differences concerning subsistence behaviour. We know from the destroyed Early Iron Age II pithos grave at Mesembria-Zoni that these objects had everyday use before they were fashioned into a funerary vessel, demonstrated by lead clamps used to repair pithos (Vavritsas 1967, 94; Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi 2001, 24-25). Additional signs of domestic use were also found by excavators on pithoi used in the Archaic cemetery of Abdera (Skarlatidou 2004, 249, 251). By extension, the use of substantial storage vessels seems to be more conducive to the domestic habits of communities who are settled rather than those practicing a high level of transhumance. This would also not run contrary to what we currently think about the subsistence
patterns of Early Iron Age I-II communities within the Rhodope, i.e. practising some form of seasonal transhumant pastoralism (cf. Sobotkova 2016; Popov 2015, 110-114; Bozhkova & Nikov 2010). Therefore, we could speculate the reason for the lack of pithoi within the inland Thrace during this time to be linked more broadly to broader differences in life-ways. Overall, however, the spatial patterning of this architectural form is spread more equally between Aegean and inland Thrace regions, with a noticeable concentration within Aegean Thrace, yet the lack of Late Iron Age pithoi in inland Thrace makes it difficult to determine the extent of such an architectural type, although evidence from subsistence behaviour should not be overlooked.

6.4 Rock-Cut Monuments

Rock-cut monuments that occur in Thrace during the Iron Age can be broadly separated into two categories: rock-cut graves and rock-cut tombs.

![Map showing the distribution of rock-cut graves and dolmens in Thrace](image)

Beginning with rock-cut tombs; the first and only formal investigations into these structures were undertaken by the Shkorpil brothers during the late 19th century (Shkorpil & Shkorpil 1888, 17; Fol & Venedikov 1976, 410-417). During the study it was identified that these tombs types stretch throughout Thrace, and have been observed as far north as the central Balkan mountains (see Delev 1982). In the south east, the majority of tombs concentrate in the Rhodope mountains, where a total of about 20 tombs
have been identified (Fol & Venedikov 1976, 410-417). Outside of the Rhodope, two rock-cut tombs have been discovered in the Sakar mountain region; one near the village of Hlyabovo and another possible example near the village of Matotchina and Radovets (Shkorpil & Shkorpil 1888, 17; Fol & Venedikov 1976, 410-417).

These types of monuments are often found to be solitary, but there are two examples which lie next to one another near the villages of Albanitsi and Skalina in the eastern Rhodope or close to one another like near the villages of Madzhar and Golemanitsi (Necharov 2015, 134). All rock-cut tombs are located in easily accessible areas, carved into the rocky walls and slopes of rock-faces. The main characteristic feature which unites the rock-cut tombs is their closed burial chambers dug into a rock-face (Necharov 1994; 2015, 135). These are preceded by an open vestibule which provides access to the main chamber. Beyond these features, variabilities have been observed between tombs, which resulted in a tripartite distinction created by Delev (1982) which consisted of three repeatedly observed forms:

(i) Tombs carved into the rock with a fully enclosed burial chamber, which is accessible only through one entrance;

(ii) Tombs which have an opening at the top of the chamber covered with a stone slab with an additional front entrance;

(iii) Tombs carved at the top of a rock in the form of a trough, which were (presumably) covered with a slab.

Tombs carved into the rock with a fully enclosed burial chamber are the most numerous within the eastern Rhodope. The tomb’s chambers have been identified to be both rounded and square, with the square shapes being the most prevalent (Delev 1984). The doorways of the tombs themselves also vary, but no such correlation has been identified between those with certain shaped doorways with other variables. More often the shape of the entrances for the tombs are square or arched, with a minority of entrances being more rounded, and this is often accompanied by some kind of hallow niche or frame around the entranceway (Delev 1984). The architecture within the main chamber itself can also vary according to Delev (1984, 27-29), yet he concedes that it lacks any formal consistency, with no formal patterning in regards to rock-cut tombs with particular architectural features like stone beds or additional internal niches.
Figure 6.15: Plans of two rock-cut tombs found in the eastern Rhodope (after Delev 1984, 44)
The date of rock-cut tombs is still a hotly contested matter, as datable evidence has only ever been found in a single example near the village of Shiroko Pole in Kurdzhali (Mikov 1955, 29). Two objects were found within an unopened tomb; a bronze single-spiral arched fibula from 8th-7th centuries B.C. and an ceramic vessel with a long body with decoration around the mouth and legs, which has also been roughly attributed to the 9th-8th centuries B.C. (Mikov 1955, 29; Venedikov & Gerassimov 1973; Delev 1984, 29).

Figure 6.16: Potential ‘rock-cut tomb’ from Petrota, at the base of the acropolis (after Kiotsekoglou 2016)

Figure 6.17: Potential ‘rock-cut tomb’ from Petrota (after Triandaphyllos 1990, fig.11)
Within Aegean Thrace, a cluster of potential rock-cut tombs has been discovered near the Sanctuary of St. Georgios Petrota, on the Aegean coast. These examples are similar to ones found in inland Thrace, yet in this instance there is a circular/entrance, and they appear smaller in size, or at least not large enough to fit a body laying horizontally (Kulov 1991, 80). A provisional date of around the 8th century has been attributed to the Petrota ‘tombs’ based on the discovery of Early Iron Age II pottery fragments nearby, but critically not from within the supposed tombs themselves (Triandaphyllos 1990, 306). Triandafillos (1981) attributes additional evidence concerning the presence of these tombs with arches cut into the rock within Aegean Thrace, which he claimed were around 1-2 metres wide and 1-1.5 metres deep. Rock-cut monuments, should not, however, be taken completely at face value. This was successfully demonstrated by R. Georgieva (2005) who, after conducting a geological survey at the previously identified rock complex of Chobra Tash, found that the features which had been defined as ‘Thracian’ and man-made were actually completely natural (cf. Ilieva 2006; Ilieva 2007).

Other Aegean examples of a rock-cut tombs have also been suggested by Owen (2000a), specifically concerning the so-called ‘Cave of Pan’ on Thasos, which lies on the north side of the island, south west of the Sanctuary of Athena (Owen 2000a, 139-143) (figure 6.18). Owen (2000a, 141) attempted to link the example from the sanctuary of Tatul (figure 6.20) – with its arched vestibule and additional rock-cut features – with the example from Thasos (figure 6.18). However, there are several problems with this interpretation that Owen (2000a) neglected. Firstly, initial investigations into the site by Penoyre-Baker (1909, 216) designated the feature as a ‘shrine to Pan’ rather than a place for burial, on account of the shallow ledge – possibly for offerings – and the depictions of Pan in relief above the recess. Secondly, as can be observed in the figure (6.15), rock-cut tombs are almost always deep within bodies of rock, and always preceded by a vestibule, separating the chamber from the outside, and usually with room for an accompanying door. The example from Thasos – on the basis of Penoyre-Baker’s (1909, 216-218) account and drawings – does not suggest an area capable of holding a body/remains, unless it was for the display of already disarticulated remains. Thirdly, and in connection with this point, Owen (2000a, 143) hypothesises that the ‘tomb’ was later re-modified into a

\[\text{As Ilieva (2006, 3-4) also points out, Triandafillos (1990), does not mention any instance of this occurring in Bulgaria. Ilieva (2006, 3-4) has argued an alternative view to the possible presence of this tomb in Aegean Thrace and adds that this rock-cutting was called ‘sharapana’ within Bulgarian literature and are known to be linked to rituals surrounding wine-making.}\]
Figure 6.18: Plan of the rock-cut ‘tomb’ on Thasos (Baker-Penoyre 1909, 217)
shrine dedicated to Pan by Greek colonists. This runs in direct contrast to what we know about early Greek religion and concepts surrounding purity and impurity within sacred spaces (see Parker 1983, 32-48).\footnote{We know from Classical authors that there was a severe apprehension of corrupting pre-existing sacred areas of local deities that were, quite literally, based in the new land they were occupying; and by way of wanting to seek favour with these local divinities, incoming Greeks had to observe the necessary customs used to placate the local gods (Thuc. 3.50.2; 4.98; Xen. Anab. 4.5.51). These emergent attitudes towards sacred spaces are echoed in Plato, who reemphasizes that places already sanctified cannot be re-consecrated, and therefore, ought to be maintained (Plato. Laws. 955e; Malkin 1987, 159-160). This can also be observed in several instances within some of the earliest Greek colonial activity within Aegean Thrace, i.e. the Rotunda of Arsinoe and the Anaktoron on Samothrace (Lehmann 1950; 1951; 1952).}

Famously, ‘mortality’ was banned from the sacred island of Delos (Thuc. 3.104), and there are many instances within Classical Tragedy that make explicit reference to the dead body as able to pollute and corrupt sacred spaces (cf. Eur. Hipp. 1437; Eur. Alc. 22; Soph. Ant. 999-1046). Therefore, it seems unlikely that – with reference to notions of purity and the body in early Greek religion – the Pan site was used as tomb at all, or at least not when the Parians arrived on the island during the 7th century B.C.\footnote{In addition, no chronological verifiable evidence has been found around the ‘cave of Pan’ which poses additional questions as to whether it should be linked to examples found in the eastern Rhodope (cf. Moutsopoulos 1971; Ilieva 2006, 3).}

The second type connected to the rock-cut tomb is the rock-cut grave, which is distinctly an eastern Rhodope phenomenon (figures 6.19 and 6.20). Unfortunately, unlike the rock-cut tomb and rock-cut niche, the rock-cut grave has not received the same level of academic interest, and therefore suffers from a severe lack of investigation. Consequently, not much is known about them other than they are often found in clusters (Kulov 2002, 107ff) and appear to have also supported doors, which has also been suggested by Nechrizov (2015, 137) on the basis of ‘grooves’ around their rims. Nechrizov (1996) attributes them to the Late Iron Age, on the basis that tumuli fall out of use during this time, and in their place, he argues, the rock-cut grave was used. Yet he also attributes the rock-cut grave as continuing well into the Middle Ages, however, he does not offer evidence for such a claim (Nechrizov 2015, 137). Nevertheless, the spatial distribution of rock-cut graves do represent a strong regional concentration within the eastern Rhodope. The form itself, much like the rock-cut niches in the previous chapter, congregate in the east of the Rhodope mountain range, and the absence of the monument within Aegean Thrace offers additional evidence towards the regional significance of this architectural form.
Figure 6.19: Image of the rock-cut grave from the highest point of the Tatul peak sanctuary (author’s photograph)

Figure 6.20: Rock-cut tomb from Tatul which was situated under another rock-cut grave (author’s photograph)
6.5 Dolmens

The term dolmen is one that has been adopted from the western archaeological tradition and is used to refer to megalithic monuments constructed of huge vertical stone plates that are used to support an equally huge plate that forms the roof. Despite the similarity in names, the dolmens of Bulgaria are very different from their western European counterparts as they often featuring multiple chambers, are used for burials, contain additional antechambers, and often feature carved entrances. In many respects, formative observations made around the Black Sea have revealed a number of very similar dolmen-like structures in the Krasnodar province of modern-day Russia which date to the Middle-Late Bronze Ages.\(^7\)

The construction of a dolmen is undertaken when large stone plates used for the chamber walls are fitted between specially prepared gullies (Nechruzov 2015, 127). Occasionally the upper sections of a dolmen’s walls incline inwards towards each other,\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Like the examples from Bulgaria, Russian dolmens consist of many large chambers with a trapezoidal or circular opening at the front and accompanied with a monumental façade. They have been radiocarbon dated to around the mid-late Bronze Age which makes them chronologically closer to the Bulgarian examples than the examples from western Europe (cf. Trifonov 2014, 119; Kosolapov 2019). The examples from Russia are slightly different as they have shown to often contain pigments of red ochre used to decorate their façades (cf. Trifonov 2001; 2014). The phenomenon of dolmens in Russia stretches beyond the Black Sea coast and have been found as far east as the Ural mountains (i.e. Pishma near Ekaterinaberg).
Figure 6.22: Image of a double dolmen without the presence of a mound near the village of Hlyabovo (author’s photograph)

Figure 6.23: Image of a single dolmen under a very large mound situated in the Sakar mountains near the village of Hlyabovo (author’s photograph)
resulting in a trapezoidal shape to their internal chambers (Delev 1984). The numbers of chambers can vary, but more often dolmens are constructed of a single main burial chamber which is used to house the remains, and this in turn is followed by the construction of one or more antechambers which have been designated within the literature concerning them as dromoi. The front of the dolmen is then finished with a large – often trapezoidal – entrance hole. The size of the entrance hole can vary, but largely they are big enough to fit people into, which suggests that the dolmens were created prior to the deposition of human remains, instead of being built around them.\(^8\) The flooring inside Thracian dolmens is largely the same and made from levelled earth, however, two examples have been found containing paved flooring, but this should be regarded as exceptional (see Late Iron Age dolmen from Pelevun, and the Early Iron Age example from Vaskovo) (Nechrizov 2010, 89-90; Nechrizov & Iliev 2006a; 2007; 2008c). In the last decade, investigations into the orientation of dolmens have also discovered that most them are oriented roughly south, with some found to be facing south east or south west, and interestingly, yet notably, no dolmen has yet been found facing either purely west or north (Nechrizov 2015, 128; Delev 1984, 21).

Typologically speaking, Delev (1982, 404-407) has attempted to distinguish three groups of dolmen types around south eastern Thrace based on their occurrence and architectural styles: stand-alone dolmens, double dolmens, and dolmen-style cists. Nechrizov (2015, 128), however, argues against this and concentrates more on architecture as defining feature within its typology: double-chamber dolmens, dolmen-like cists, and single chamber dolmens often with an antechamber. There are, however, a number of issues with Delev’s typology, as not all of his categories are particularly wide-spread. For example, Delev’s (1982) ‘double dolmen’ is in fact one of the most uncommon types found within Thrace and are secluded to the Strandzha mountain region.\(^9\) Likewise, Delev’s ‘dolmen-style cists’ are also not particularly wide-spread around the Rhodope, and appear to be largely concentrated in small pockets of Aegean Thrace. Moreover, it could even be debated the extent to which Delev’s ‘dolmen-style cists’ are even dolmens at all, as architecturally they are not only much smaller in size than other dolmens, but they also fundamentally lack any sort of entrance, which characterises the dolmens in the Sakar and Strandzha (Delev 1982, 406-407). Problematically, this type of dolmen is very

---

\(^8\)I noticed this during my 2018 Balkan fieldwork expedition, where I was able to fit into the entrance hole of all of the dolmens I visited.

\(^9\)This type of dolmen consists of two dolmens which share a single partitioning wall so as to form a pair of conjoined dolmens.
close to the cist grave in form but, yet Delev (1982, 404) has maintained its classification as a dolmen, on the basis of their large size and presence above ground (figure 6.24).

![Figure 6.24: Dolmen-like cist grave at Roussa, Aegean Thrace (author’s photograph)](image)

The construction of tumuli over dolmens also varies. Previously, it had been thought that all dolmens were covered with a tumulus (cf. Nechrizov 2010, 88-89; Delev 1982, 399), yet recent excavations in and around several dolmens in the eastern Rhodope found dolmens covered with tumuli near to examples that had been left uncovered. This suggests that erosion/human intervention was not the reason behind the lack of a mound, and seems to suggest a deliberate choice on behalf of the community constructing them (cf. Nechrizov 2010, 88-89; Nechrizov & Mikov 2002, 76; Dinchev 2006; Dichev 2008).

Akin to the built graves on Thasos, dolmens also offer considerable evidence to suggest particularly long periods and enduring social significance. For example, excavations at dolmen 2 near Oryaxovo and two dolmens outside the village of Vaskovo in the Strandzha mountains revealed significant quantities of Roman period outside them and in their tumuli, which was also intermixed with equally large concentrations of pottery dating from the 8th century B.C. (Iliev 2015, 157-158; Nechrizov & Iliev 2008b, 160, 182-3). Likewise, inside a dolmen situated near the village of Malko Tarnovo was discovered a roman bronze ring, five coins of Constantius II, and a large portion of roman pottery (possibly samian) intermixed with pottery from the Early Iron Age II (Agre 2003, 88-90). Finally, from the tumulus of a dolmen on the outskirts of the village of Golyam Dervent,
49 silver Roman coins were discovered, the earliest dating from the reign of Vespasian (69-79 A.D.), and the latest to the reign of Marcus Aurelius (198-217 A.D.) (Dinchev 2006, 111).

Relating to the former point, the dating and chronological placement of dolmens is still a hotly debated topic. Thus far, scholarly consensus on the matter agrees that the dolmens began to be constructed around the Early Iron Age I period, on the basis that the earliest pottery found in them is from the Pshenichevo group which provides a *terminus post quem* for their construction (Nechrizov & Petov 2005; Nechrizov 2010; Agre 2003). Nevertheless, despite tracing their origins to the Early Iron Age, it is unknown when these monuments stop being constructed. Initially it was hypothesised that the dolmen phenomenon gradually stopped during the Early Iron Age II period, until excavations in the eastern Rhodope unearthed a Late Iron Age dolmen near the village of Plevun (Nechrizov 2010, 88-89; 1999). The dolmen itself was clearly different from its Early Iron Age I-II counterparts, but importantly showed that the tradition of constructing these megaliths was not restricted to the earlier parts of the Iron Age. What was particularly distinct about the example from Plevun was its structural features which are thus far unique to dolmens found within Thrace. The dolmen was made of a very long narrow series of chambers, which could be entered through a front entrance way, although this was blocked when the dolmen was finished. Among its most distinctive qualities, the dolmen was constructed of a very narrow body, consisting of the main burial chamber, and two ante-chambers, and exceptionally, a stone façade. Yet, what was most interesting about this dolmen was the fact that it clearly mixed architectural traditions from other dolmens. Extended long dromoi and façades are not usually found within the Rhodope – with the exception of a periboloi around the Zhelezino dolmen – but usually within the Strandzha or Sakar mountain regions (Nechrizov 2010, 89). Likewise, the use of thin slabs at Plevun makes it similar to the other dolmens within the Rhodope, and not to the more monumental dolmens within the Sakar or Strandzha. With this in mind, the Plevun dolmen was the only Late Iron Age dolmen that has been found. On this basis, therefore, it can be argued that the existence of dolmens is also contemporary with other forms of burial within Iron Age Thrace, i.e. built graves, pithoi graves, and cist graves (Nechrizov 2015, 127).

Beyond variability expressed by the Plevun dolmen, consistent architectural variability has also been observed between Early Iron Age dolmens, and this concerns the
Figure 6.25: Aerial plans of dolmens found between the three mountain ranges within south east Bulgaria
Figure 6.26: Aerial and front facing drawings of the dolmens from Zhelezino (Rhodope) and Elxovo (Strandzha) (after Yildirim 2016, 361, pl.159)
Figure 6.27: Double chambered dolmen near Hlyabovo, Hakovo region of south eastern Bulgaria (author’s photograph)

Figure 6.28: Photograph from within the largest chamber of the conjoined dolmen near Hlyabovo, Hakovo region of south eastern Bulgaria (author’s photograph)
Figure 6.29: Bar chart showing the percentage of dolmens with 1-3 chambers within the different mountain ranges dolmens are found. Strandzha: n=44, Sakar: n=22, Rhodope: n=12
erection of monumental façades which are not present in the Rhodope. These façades are a characteristic feature of the Sakar and Strandzha dolmens and are made of monumentally large upstanding stones which are placed vertically in rows outside the dolmens, thereby constructing a kind of courtyard for people. Notably during several seasons of excavations within the Sakar and Strandzha mountains D. Agre and her team discovered several dolmens with monumental façades containing high concentrations of artefacts ranging from the Early Iron Age (potentially I and II) into the Roman periods, which suggested that these architectural features played a role in how the dolmens operated (Agre 2003; 2004; 2005a; 2005; 2008). Figure 6.25 shows some of the plans of the dolmens from three of the areas that they are found within Bulgaria. However, it should also be stressed here – at risk of contradiction – that a general typology of dolmens is almost an impossible task (as was attempted by (Fol & Venedikov 1976)), as they are subject to a great deal of architectural exceptionalism based on individual local tastes. On this basis I would argue that experimentation is a critical component when it came to architectural design of most Early Iron Age dolmens as the circular ‘peribolos’ at Zhelezino, the dolmen at Plevun, and the conjoined dolmens at Hlyabovo demonstrate (figures 6.22 and 6.23). Correspondingly, there does seem to be some tentative signs of regional clustering in the percentage of dolmens with 1-3 chambers between the mountain regions. Figure 6.29 shows the percentages of dolmens with 1-3 chambers within the different areas they are found in Bulgaria. The stacked bar-chart demonstrates a clear preference for single chamber dolmens within all of the areas, yet the Sakar mountain region has the most substantial proportion of multiple chamber dolmens out of the three regions.

Yet, broadly speaking concerning architecture, no real correlation can be drawn between type of dolmen and location. The variability of the dolmens seems to be due more to the local wants of the people constructing them rather than due to influence from a specific stylistic canon. The size of the megaliths also varies, and the size of them must have dictated a different organisation in terms of social labour and planning. Smaller dolmens like the ones at Zhelezino and Kobilino may have been constructed by the extended kinship group, yet massive dolmens like the examples near Hlyabovo must have required a significant social undertaking beyond the immediate kin group.

As mentioned earlier, dolmens have been observed farther south within modern-day Greece, yet unlike the dolmen at Plevun, no examples of Late Iron Age dolmens have

---

10 The bar chart was created using data obtained from the author’s 2016 MPhil thesis, entitled: Beyond Stone: Megalithic Monuments and Social Transformations in Iron Age Thrace.
been found in the region (cf. Triandafillos 1973; 1990). Beginning with the Samothrace examples, at least four dolmens have been discovered on Vrychos Hill, on the north side of the island. Four of the dolmens have a single chamber, whilst a fifth one has been described as having two chambers (cf. Matsas 2004, 236; Ilieva 2006, 10-11). Akin to dolmens in Bulgaria, the Samothracian examples were also made of locally quarried stone and finished with a massive stone plate covering the top. Another common architectural feature with the Samothracian dolmens is the construction of an entrance or opening hole situated at the centre of a slab at the front of the dolmen, yet a dolmen has been discovered near Krimniotissa (the south of the island) which has a natural opening, and this is different from most of the other dolmens discovered in Thrace, with one exception near the Buynovo village in Smolyan (Ilieva 2006, 10-11; Matsas 2004, 236). Unfortunately, the Samothracian dolmens have not been subject to any form of archaeological investigation, and therefore, relatively little is known about their use and chronological placement.

In contrast to other types of tombs which occur during the Iron Age in Thrace, the dolmen represents one of the most regionally concentrated types. Despite appearing in a limited capacity in Aegean Thrace, dolmens remain a strictly eastern inland Thrace phenomenon. Variations of dolmen architecture may be due in part to the linear chronological change of dolmen morphology driven by the needs of the social groups constructing them. Yet, when looking beyond minute regional variations within eastern Thrace, dolmens can still be considered as being one of the best examples of regionally specific tomb architecture during the Early Iron Age I-II periods.

Despite being different from the other dolmens in Thrace, there does exist one dolmen in Bulgaria with a natural opening west of Buynovo village. However, it is still disputed as to whether this is even a dolmen or just a dolmen-like cluster of rocks.
6.6 Cairn Graves

The word cairn comes from the Scottish Gaelic word càrn (càirn pl.) and literally refers to a manmade pile of stones. By logical extension, cairn inhumations are defined as those inhumations which are covered by a pile of rocks, directly over the human remains, which is then covered by a tumulus.

Unlike the previous architectural form, the cairn inhumation is challenging to define as it contains a high level of variability between the cemeteries where it has been used, and especially between the eastern and western Rhodope. Fundamentally, this architectural type is characterised by the construction of a mound made of stones, with the body being placed sometimes in a pit beneath the mound, sometimes directly under the stone mound, and at other times on a small stone or clay platform. Despite not being recognised as an independent architectural form within Bulgarian archaeology, the cairn inhumation represents one of the most conspicuous forms of architecture within inland western Thrace. Notably, the geographic distribution of the cairn grave is concentrated within the region of the central Rhodope, although it finds its most substantial concentration within the western Rhodope during the Iron Age (figure 6.30). The sizes of the cairns can vary in size between cemeteries, the largest example of which can reach 7 metres in diameter and almost 2 metres in height (see Kisyov 2009).
The tradition of cairn inhumations is particularly long-lived within Thrace akin to the cist grave and the pithos, and exist from the Bronze Age until the Late Iron Age (see Kisyov 2009). The earliest examples of cairn inhumations come from the cemeteries around the Borino region which date to the Bronze Age (Kisyov 1986; 1987). These examples were cremations that had been placed within urns, which in turn had been placed under piles of stones and then covered with tumuli.

The presence of cairn inhumations, in contrast to most of the previous architectural types, does not occur within Aegean Thrace at all. This form appears to be locally reproduced and maintained within the central and western Rhodope region, with a few examples having been found within the eastern Rhodope.

6.7 Concluding Remarks

From a typological and spatial analyses of tomb types around Iron Age Thrace, three points are worth stressing:

(i) From a typological perspective there exists six different types of tomb found throughout Thrace, excluding further typological distinctions of sub-types;

(ii) Three of these tomb types do not regionally vary and seem to be distributed more or less equally between regions of Thrace with no obvious concentration;

(iii) Yet, three other types do indeed display strong levels of regional concentration in Thrace, and prompt further investigation into the level of material alterity between regions.

From the perspective of typology, clear distinctions can be made between largely contemporaneous architectural forms which, along with their regional distribution, underpin significant evidence for regional material alterity during the Iron Age. These regions have already been suggested through evidence within Chapter 5 which served to assess material variabilities concerning ritual places and pottery styles. The evidence presented here should support the conclusions from the last chapter and suggest that regional material variability is more than arbitrary. Yet the aim of this section was not to define a group of people on the ground of Childe’s (1933b; 1933a; 1935) or Piggott’s (1965) hypotheses, whereby a culture group can be defined on the basis of clearly identifiable typological affinities. Rather, what has been highlighted here is, on one level clear
Who were the Thracians?

Figure 6.31: Cross-section of a cairn inhumation from mound no.82 Borino, Tsirgovishteto (after Kisyov 2009, 168)

Figure 6.32: Picture of excavated cairn inhumation from mound no.78 Borino (after Kisyov 2009, 168)
heterogeneity in terms of funerary architecture with certain regions opting for architectural forms which seem almost isolated within their respected regions, and on another level, strong levels of architectural regionalism which hint at reflecting the wider social similarities and differences between communities in these areas. Typology and spatial distribution, therefore, have served to complement one another in an attempt to better understand the potential nuances concerning regional material variability within Iron Age Thrace.
Chapter 7

A Quantitative Approach to Regional Material Variability

In contrast to the previous chapter which took a typological approach to the question of regional material variability, this chapter takes an alternative socio-statistical approach. The social aspect of this chapter is explicitly in reference to the social group and the methods they employed to process deceased members of their community. As stated in Chapter 4, two separate categories will be dealt with concerning the funerary evidence within this chapter: tomb assemblage data and human remains. Both of these categories offer different perspectives into the various aspects of socio-cultural life of Iron Age communities in Thrace. Yet perhaps more critically, these perspectives can offer additional evidence in favour of identifying regions of material variability, which in turn could underpin burgeoning ethnic sentiment.

From this perspective, it was demonstrated within Chapters 5 and 6 that pottery styles, cultic expression, and some funerary architecture types expressed strong levels of regional variation in Thrace during both the Early and Late Iron Age. More specifically between easterly and westerly regions, but also between coastal and inland regions. As a result, this section will extend questions surrounding the extent of material variabilities towards objects found within the funerary context, but also towards how human remains were processed. This will be undertaken with the specific aim of distinguishing additional layers of material variability in order to conceptualise the presence of unique regional cultural ‘packages’ which I have designed (in Chapter 3) as key to identifying ethnic groups. Figure 7.1 displays the sites that were used within the statistical analysis.

The data from 26 cemeteries – from a total of over 300 tombs – have been compiled
Figure 7.1: Sites used in the statistical analysis within this section: 1) Katrishte; 2) Zornitsa; 3) Kochan; 4) Lyubcha; 5) Batak; 6) Borino; 7) Turlata; 8) Tsirgovishhteto; 9) Yagodina; 10) Grochmoto; 11) Gela; 12) Trigrad; 13) Stoikite; 14) Progled; 15) Pamporovo; 16) Pavelsko; 17) Stambolovo; 18) Filiouri; 19) Kossynthos; 20) Thasos; 21) The Industrial Plain near Drama; 22) Kastas Tumulus near Amphipolis; 23) Malka Detelina/Golyamo Detelina; 24) Bulgarska Polyana; 25) Abdera; 26) Samothrace
during the process of this chapter. Critically, the sites used here were chosen with regards to the amount of published material associated with them. There are indeed more cemeteries within the regions under analysis, yet they have not been fully published and, therefore, could not form part of this analysis. Most of the cemeteries included here, in both Aegean and inland Thrace are severely affected by some sort of excavation bias, i.e., scant published data and/or discrepancies in the level of detail they are discussed within the regional archaeological reports. Nevertheless, the results presented here should be built upon in the following decades when more published data becomes available. Within this next chapter I will analyse the results ascertained from the pre-defined units as established in Chapter 4, during the Early Iron Age I, II, and Late Iron Ages.

Finally, it should be noted that Aegean Thrace during the Late Iron Age could not be formally added to the statistical analysis here. As I will discuss later, material changes which arouse as a direct result of Greek colonisation of the Aegean coast means that identifying ‘Thracian’ material from ‘Greek’ material could not be undertaken. The process of Hellenisation and the effect that colonial communities had on pre-colonial communities was considerable, as I shall demonstrate. Therefore, instead of analysing colonial cemeteries in the region which correspond to the Late Iron Age, the Aegean Thrace Late Iron Age section consists of a brief summary of the evidence available relating to this study.

7.1 Early Iron Age I in inland Thrace (12th-11th century B.C.)

Only two regions formed part of the Early Iron Age I (12th-11th century B.C.) analysis within inland Thrace; the South Central and the Eastern regions. The South Central region is made up of the cemeteries near Borino (Kisyov 1985; 1987a; 2009, 101-103), Yagodina, Turlata, Trigrad, Gela (Kisyov 2009, 98-100, 105-106, 127-128, 129-130; 1988a, 61; 1988b; 1990, 41-51; Vilchanova 1982; Naidenova 1970) and Chepelare (Kisyov 1990; 2002, 137-156; 2009, 128-129). The second Eastern region comprises of a series of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I transitional tumuli around the villages of Malko Detelina and Golyamo Detelina (Kunchev 1991, 41-61; Batsova & Kunchev 1974).¹

¹The burials from the mounds in the region can largely be separated into two periods, with the secondary inhumations situated in the tumulus itself dated to the transitional period (cf. Kunchev 1991, 62).
Figure 7.2: Bar chart showing the relative frequency of grave-goods which occur above 10 percent of the total number of objects found. South Central: n=38; Eastern: n=25

The results from the bar charts show a clear distinction between Early Iron Age I regions within inland Thrace (figure 7.2). Handmade kitchenware seems to have been the only shared material type – at least that occurred above 10 percent – between both regions, and beyond this it appears that the regions did not share many artefact types. The graves found within the Eastern region had a clear preference for handmade cups and bronze needles, with handmade cups forming the second most conspicuous object within the region. Handmade kitchenware was found between both regions, although it had a far greater concentration within the Eastern region, contributing to 50 percent of the overall assemblage data from the region.

In contrast, the South Central region showed clear signs of regional variation concerning the preference for specific grave-goods. Despite being found in relatively low numbers, loom weights, animal teeth (mainly goat teeth alongside a considerable quantity of bear teeth) and river stones were found between a number of the graves in the region. Urns represented the most conspicuous object deposited within the graves in the region but this was to be expected as cremations were the only method of bodily processing within the region. As mentioned above, kitchenware was found within the

\[2\text{ It is interesting to note that the teeth deposited within the South Central region came from goat teeth, although a considerable quantity of the teeth found also came from bears, with one necklace being made entirely from bear teeth discovered at Borino (Kisyov 2009, 101; 1987a, 107; 1987b).]
region, akin to the Eastern region, although in this instance it only contributed to 20 percent of the overall assemblage data.³

7.2 Early Iron Age II inland Thrace (9th-8th century B.C.)

There were four regions which formed part of the Early Iron Age II analysis; the South Central, South Western, Eastern, and Central Eastern regions. The South Central region is made up of tombs from the cemeteries of Kochan (Gergova & Kulov 1976; Gergova & Angelova 1975; Kisyov 2009, 110-113), Trigrad (Vilchanova 1982; Kisyov 2009, 127-128), Yagodina (Kisyov 1988a; 1988b), Grochnoto (Kisyov 2009, 107; Petrova & Kisov 1983), and Lyubcha (Mirchev 1976; Kisyov 2009, 114-115; 1990, 41).⁴ The South Western Thrace region is made of tombs from the cemetery of Katrishte (Georgieva et al. 1998). The Eastern region is made up of graves from the Stambolovo and Ovchartsi cemeteries and two dolmens from Lyubiments (Nechrizov & Iliev 2006b; Nechrizov & Iliev 2007; Nechrizov & Iliev 2008c; Nechrizov & Iliev 2008a), and the Central Eastern region is made up of tombs from Pavelsko (Mikov 1941), Progled (Kisyov 1990), and Pamporovo (Kisyov 1985, 56-57).

³It is worth noting that the proportion of kitchenware within the South Central region may in fact be higher; it has been noted by excavators working on cemeteries in this region, that the mounds themselves contain a very high quantity of pottery fragments which were more richly decorated and deliberately smashed during the mounds’ construction (Kisyov 2002, 138). Therefore, the disparity in kitchenware may represent variations in funerary practice, rather than object preference.

⁴The tombs from Batak area and one of the western cemeteries within the Borino region were also going to be used; however, the estimated date for tombs within these cemeteries was from the 10th-9th centuries and was not enough in number to form part of a separate analysis (cf. Kisyov 2009, 98-103).
Akin to the Early Iron Age I period, the results from the bar chart show additional distinctions between Early Iron Age II regions within inland Thrace, with areas like the South Central and Eastern region maintaining object distinctions that endured from the previous Early Iron Age I period (figure 7.3). Notably within the period, all of the regions share a preference for fibulae, albeit at varying levels. This point in particular shall be discussed in more detail later, but it is worth re-emphasising here the conspicuous absence of fibulae from other cemeteries in Aegean Thrace during the same period.

Beginning with the South Central region, necklaces of bronze spirals and fibulae were the only objects which occurred above 10 percent within the region. Fibulae, on the other hand, represented 50 percent of the region’s funerary assemblage data. This is also critical to note as clearly the region had a significant preference for this jewellery type in contrast to the other regions, excluding the Central Eastern region.

By contrast, the South Western region did not exhibit any significant preference for any particular object, with no one type contributing to over 10 percent of the overall assemblage data. Despite this, the region did prefer a series of objects which did
not occur within any of the other regions at a similarly high level; i.e. iron spearheads, bronze bracelets, bronze applications (potentially for clothing), and spindle whorls. Nevertheless, the region did indeed contain objects which could be found at similarly high quantities within the other regions like fibulae, iron knives, kitchenware, and bronze spiral necklaces. The region, therefore, despite sharing some material types, exhibited a stronger regional preference for particular objects.

The Eastern region – in continuation from the Early Iron Age I period – seems to have retained an enduring preference for kitchenware, which contributed to 60 percent of the overall assemblage data, which is only 10 percent more than it exhibited during the Early Iron Age I period. Beyond kitchenware, the region contained objects which were broadly distributed throughout most of the other regions i.e. fibulae and iron knives, which both shared similar frequencies with the South Western region. Notably, however, the Eastern region did indeed exhibit material preferences which were not found in the other regions, and this specifically concerns handmade pithoi. However, these examples were only found at the Stambolovo cemetery, as discussed in the previous chapter, and therefore, should be taken as somewhat exceptional.

The Central Eastern region represents the smallest sample size with only 10 tombs from three different cemeteries (Mikov 1941; Kisyov 1990; 1985, 56-57). Yet, it is worth noting that the low number of grave-goods found within the region has made the results more anomalous than perhaps it was within the period. Fibulae represent the most significant proportion of objects found within the region, and contributed to 40 percent of the overall assemblage data from the region akin to its South Central neighbour. Spindle whorls represent the second most conspicuous object type which are only found within the South Western region with a similar high frequency of 20 percent. In comparison with the other regions of inland Thrace, the Central Eastern region also exhibited objects which were not found at such high frequency anywhere else, i.e. amber beads, bronze rings, and bronze needles which were all found at 10 percent. However, these objects had a relatively low frequency in terms of quantity, therefore, despite contributing to the material alterity of the Central Eastern region, the region’s results are heavily affected by its overall low sample size and should, therefore, be viewed with caution.
7.3 Early Iron Age Aegean Thrace (13th-7th century B.C.)

There are two fundamental reasons for analysing Aegean Thrace within its own section concerning Early Iron Age II grave-goods:

(i) Available publications from Greek Thrace are not only more fully published, but they include more information and illustrations relating to finds, which help to document the data much more clearly;

(ii) As the site reports from Greek Thrace are often more comprehensive, the level of detail ascertained from the limited number of reports was much greater, which meant that subcategories of grave goods could be documented.

As mentioned in Chapter 5, there exists a sizeable chronological gap within the historical development of Aegean Thrace. The earliest materials that are available to archaeologists come from Thasos, which date between 1200 to 700/650 B.C. The other three sites under analysis within the Aegean catchment area all date between the 9th-7th centuries B.C., with no substantial funerary material available, other than from Greek colonial contexts. This gap not only presents obvious chronological problems within the region – as for the most part archaeologists are only gaining a snapshot of a region between a century or two – but significantly, the lack of earlier archaeological materials prohibits what can be said in relation to the levels of continuity and change at the end of the Bronze Age. Admittedly even the publications from Thasos – where the largest proportion of published data from the Aegean region comes from – contained substantial chronological gaps.\footnote{Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1992, 418-435) admitted that the tomb contexts on Thasos remained open, which resulted in a lack of clear stratigraphic sequencing, and thereby eliminating the possibility of securely attributing objects with specific phases. Instead, Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1992) published an object chronology alongside an object diversity table for the cemeteries on Thasos.} Due to this significant lack of published data, therefore, the Aegean Thrace region shall compare specific sites, with the exception of the Western Area, which has the smallest sample available, and as a result needed to be grouped into its own region (Lazaridis 1976, 88-98; 1977, 38-45).
To begin, the Filiouri cemetery (cf. Triandafillos 1984) is made of 18 graves dating between the 9th-8th century B.C., and lies near to the modern-day city of Komotini. Broadly speaking, the Filiouri site shared most of its grave-good types with the other cemeteries in region, i.e. bronze beads, handmade cups, handmade pithoi, and fibulae. Yet, the Filiouri cemetery did exhibit some signs of variation in reference to the deposition of bronze rings and bronze buttons (for items of clothing). Largely it can be said that the Filiouri had a greater preference for bronze jewellery, but in particular for fibulae, which contributed to 50 percent of the overall assemblage data from the site, and this seems to also have been shared – although at a much lower frequency – with the nearby Kossynthos cemetery. Furthering this point, the fibulae styles that were found at the cemetery were most strongly associated with inland Thrace such as the *aii.3.bulb* and the *bii.2.b* (most frequently found within the South Western region), were found in graves 7 and 8. Likewise, the presence of the *bii.2.b* type found in grave 7 is one of a kind (thus far) within the context of Aegean Thrace (this point shall be discussed later). Handmade pottery also seems to have been largely absent from the cemetery despite

---

"The next instance of the *bii.2.b* type to be found outside of Filiouri was at the Harbour Sanctuary at Emporio, in Asia Minor (Caner 1983)."
occurring at 10 percent, and in sharp contrast to inland Thrace, several examples of
wheel-made pots (specifically skyphoi) were found at the cemetery, although not great
enough to represent 10 percent (Triandafillos 1984, 191-19). Pithoi is perhaps another
notable point of contrast between the inland and Aegean zones. Pithoi are largely shared
between all sites within the Aegean region with the exception of Thasos, and this point
in particular is worth stressing as this phenomenon has only been found once during this
time within inland Thrace, at Stambolovo.

Nearby to the Filiouri cemetery is the Kossynthos cemeteries which is made up of two
sites located close to one another with three inhumations respectively. Unfortunately,
the low sample size of the cemetery means that any results from it must be taken with
cautions, especially as the cemetery contained some exceptional finds. Broadly speaking,
however, the two cemeteries of Kossynthos shared most of their materials types with
the other sites in the Aegean region, i.e. cups, iron blades, and fibulae, handmade
pithoi, and handmade vases. Notably, handmade vases and pithoi have been found in
the largest concentration at the site, consisting of a combined total of 70 percent of
the total site assemblage. Even more interesting was the presence of an iron sword at
the cemetery. Yet, despite occurring at 10 percent, the sword only had an absolute
count of 1, therefore it should be seen as exceptional, particularly as swords are not
familiar among inhumations within Thrace as a whole – as was noted by Morris (1998)
– and they are only found again in Kastas Tumulus 1 (Triandafillos & Kallidzi 1998).7
The Kossynthos cemeteries, therefore, despite containing a largely homogenous series
of grave-goods in comparison with the other sites, does also contain some evidence of
variation and difference, although with such a low sample size the true nature of the
cemetery’s different can only be assumed.

The last area within this part of the analysis, before discussing the results from
Thasos, is the Western Area, which is made of two inhumations from The Industrial
Plain near Drama and the Kastas Tumulus near Amphipolis (Lazaridis 1975; 1976;
1977). Unfortunately, the sample size from the Western Area is so small that the results
here are very likely to be subject to revision and change with the discovery of additional
graves in the future. Despite this, the graves within the region do represent a significant
development from the other sites. Iron blades and handmade cups represent a familiar
10 percent of the overall assemblage data, akin to Kossynthos and Filiouri. Likewise,

7The fibulae from were from grave 2 and belonged to the bi.1g style, which has its strongest parallels
in inland Thrace.
the Western Area shares its presence of bronze beads with the cemeteries on Thasos and at Filiouri, yet this region contained the highest proportion (relative to the overall size of its assemblage data) at 20 percent. Handmade pithoi also represent a significant quantity of the overall assemblage, comprising of 40 percent of the overall assemblage data. The contrast between the Western Area region and the other areas, however, lies in the presence of iron rings, which – to my knowledge – are not found anywhere else outside the Kastas Tumulus.

In sum, it is clear that akin to inland Thrace, Aegean Thrace consisted of regions which both shared and maintained independent preferences regarding the deposition of specific objects. Despite sharing more artefact types than the regions within inland Thrace, the sites within Aegean Thrace largely correspond to my original hypothesis as pointed out in Chapter 4, specifically that objects types and traditions would be both maintained and shared in the signification of ethnic identities, and this seems to be a noticeable trend amongst most regions thus far.

7.4 Early Iron Age Thasos (13th-7th century B.C.)

In contrast to the cemeteries on the Aegean Thrace mainland, Thasos represents the most well-excavated set of cemeteries in Thrace overall, which is why it needs to be analysed separately here (figure 7.5). The island consists of four cemeteries which we currently assume operated contemporaneously with one another, possibly representing extended kinship groups (Owen 2006). The tombs themselves acted like ossuaries which is important to note here as each tombs could have – potentially – been used for centuries, which slightly complicates the situation when assessing levels of material regional variability. As it was mentioned above at the beginning of this section, there have been prior attempts to articulate the different chronological phases within the Thassian tombs, however, this is yet to be successfully completed. Therefore, figure 7.5 exhibits all of the objects found from the Thassian cemeteries which had an occurrence of over 10 percent. Broadly speaking, all of the cemeteries on Thasos shared material artefact types, with preferences for specific artefacts varying between cemeteries.
Beginning with Tsiganathika, which is the largest on Thasos, the graves at the site contained objects which were well-distributed between all of the other cemeteries on the island. The most conspicuous object from the cemetery was handmade cups, which consisted of 30 percent of the cemetery’s assemblage data, yet this artefact type seems to also have been the most conspicuous throughout the whole island. Notably, the cemetery contained two types of metal artefacts which were represented at 10 percent, i.e. bronze blades and bronze beads, which were correspondingly not widely distributed between sites, other than at the Vrousouthes cemetery.

By comparison, the Kendria cemetery shared all of its artefact types with at least one other cemetery. Small handmade vases and handmade cups were the most common objects found at the site, representing a combined total of 40 percent of the overall assemblage data. Yet notably about the Kendria cemetery was the relative absence of metal objects, in contrast to the Vrousouthes and Tsiganathika cemeteries, and this conspicuous absence of metal is also notable within the Larnaki cemetery.
The cemetery at Larnaki did, however, share all of its artefact types with the other cemeteries. The site itself exhibited the strongest preference for handmade cups, contributing to 50 percent of the site’s assemblage data. Handmade bowls and handmade oinochoes were also discovered at the site and these too were shared broadly through the cemeteries.\

In contrast, the Vrousouthes cemetery, which is the smallest cemetery on Thasos with a total of six tombs, was found to contain objects which were not shared between the other cemeteries on Thasos. Handmade cups were the most conspicuous object from the cemetery. Objects like spindle whorls and hand-made oinochoes, were less conspicuous, but shared similar frequencies with the other cemeteries. Small handmade vases, bronze blades, and bronze beads occurred more rarely between cemeteries, and were only shared between Kendria and Tsiganathika. Yet what is most unique about the Vrousouthes cemetery is the relatively high concentration of fibulae and spiral bronze wire found in its tombs. The fibulae variants discovered at the cemetery were ai.1.stretch, aii.3.b and ai.1.a types, which find their expression most strongly within inland Thrace.

This is perhaps unsurprising as the only other example of a fibula from Thasos was from Tsiganathika tomb 19, which featured a ai.3.b type fibulae. Yet, despite the unique nature of the cemetery in reference to its preference for particular metal objects, its low sample size must also be considered.

7.5 Late Iron Age inland Thrace (5th-4th century B.C.)

Unfortunately, there is an inconsistent amount of data available from Late Iron Age sites between inland and Aegean Thrace. This was further complicated, as mentioned earlier, by the arrival of Greek colonists, making it increasingly difficult to differentiate between Thracian and colonial archaeological sites from the 5th century B.C. onwards. Although it has been argued at sites like Apollonia and Mesemvria-Zoni that ‘pre-colonial’ archaeology has been identified, it has not been included in this study precisely because the extent to which ‘Thracian’ identities were retained and expressed after the arrival of the Greeks has not been fully studied (cf. Dimova 2015). Consequently, this last chronolog-

**Notes:**

8 It is worth noting here that some of the names for the objects found in the tombs on Thasos have been given distinctly Greek names by the excavator Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1992). Therefore, it should be made explicit that despite the fact I have kept the name of the object as oinochoe, it is not meant to suggest influence or contact with other Greek traditions further south, rather this is due to the excavator.

9 This type of fibulae is typically regarded as emblematic of inland Thrace during the Early Iron Age II period within Bulgarian academia and is also a type which is absent from Blinkenburgs typology (cf. Agre & Dinchev 2006).
ical section which maps grave-goods from different regions around Thrace, shall focus exclusively on two non-colonised areas from inland Thrace; i.e. the Central Eastern region and the South Central region (figure 7.6).

Figure 7.6: Bar chart showing the relative frequency of grave-goods which occur above 10 percent of the total number of objects found. Central Eastern: n = 26; South Central: n = 33

The Late Iron Age section of this thesis is based on two grouped areas, the first is the Central Eastern region, which is made up of tombs from Pavelsko (Mikov 1941, 19-32; Kisyov 2009, 118-119), Progled (Mikov 1941, 20-23; Kisyov 2009, 120-121), and Stoikite (Kisyov 1989c; 1989b; Kisyov 2009, 124-127), and the South Central region, which is made up of tombs from Zornitsa (Kisyov, 2009, 110), Kochan (Kisyov 2009, 110-113; Gergova & Angelova 1975), Lyubcha (Kisyov 2009, 114-115), Borino (Kisyov 1985), and Batak (Tsonchev & Milechev 1970; Kisyov 2009, 97-98).

Beginning with the Central Eastern region, several artefact types seem to have been shared between both regions although at varying frequencies. Fibulae and urns were the most conspicuous artefacts from the region, with a combined total of 40 percent of the total assemblage data. Interestingly, this preference for fibulae seem to have
endured since the Early Iron Age II period, although now represented with a smaller relative proportion. Handmade kitchenware was also shared between the two regions but to a much lesser extent, yet in contrast to the Early Iron Age II where handmade kitchenware was not represented in the region at all, it now contributes to 10 percent of the total assemblage data. Outside of the shared object types, the Central Eastern region exhibited an independently high preference for glass beads and handmade cups, although these objects had a low relative proportion of 10 percent respectively.

In contrast to the possible continuity of the Central Eastern region, the South Central region exhibited a shift concerning its grave-good preferences after the Early Iron Age II period, with a significant rise in the deposition of handmade kitchenware. This is a significant contrast from the Early Iron Age II period, where handmade kitchenware’s were not represented at all within the region, to the Late Iron Age, where it now represents 40 percent of the overall assemblage data. Beyond this, however, no other object exhibited a relative proportion above 10 percent, despite the region exhibiting a unique but relatively small preference for bronze rings and iron spearheads.

7.6 Late Iron Age Aegean Thrace (5th-4th century B.C.)

As mentioned above, the material record during the periods of intensive Greek colonisation of Aegean Thrace experienced a fundamentally shift away from traditions that had been practiced during the Early Iron Age II. Cemeteries attached to large settlements along the Aegean coast like Abdera (Kallintzi 1995, 447-459 1993b, 561-568), and Mesembria (Tsatsopoulou 1993, 586-590) highlight some of these new developments, customs and material practices which replaced pre-colonial forms and artefact traditions, the likes of which were still being upheld further north.

The most well-published cemetery from this period is on Samothrace, specifically the South Cemetery near the Sanctuary of the Great Gods. The cemetery itself contained over 120 graves, ranging from the mid-6th until the 3rd century B.C, roughly corresponding to the Late Iron Age period used within this thesis (Dusenbery 1998). Broadly speaking, the graves in the South Cemetery on Samothrace were very different from the traditions being practiced on the mainland, with the cemetery practicing mainly cremations in wheelmade ash containers with associated finds consisting of wheelmade attic pottery and a few instances of wheelmade Samothracian local wares (Dusenbery 1998, 12-22). Bronze and silver jewellery was also associated with graves from this cemetery.
– although not frequently – and most of it comes in the form of fibulae (ibid). One of the most notable differences to come out of the South Cemetery on Samothrace was the lack of handmade pottery types that were previously discovered during the Early Iron Age II period on the island, at sites like Vrychos Hill (Andriotis 1929, 54-64; Matsas 2004, 234-23). These handmade wares were completely absent from graves in the South Cemetery, and were continuing to be reproduced within Late Iron Age cemeteries in inland Thrace. The ceramic repertoire alone within the South Cemetery during the Late Iron Age period suggests that even if pre-colonial populations were using the cemetery, they were doing so in a manner which reproduced and aligned themselves with the newly arrived Greek-speaking community. There is no doubt that pre-colonial inhabitants endured on the island and even developed a form of literacy, as suggested by the presence of non-Greek inscriptions found within the Sanctuary of the Great Gods, dating to around the last quarter of the 6th-5th centuries B.C. (Graham 2002, 249-255, 252). Despite this, there does not seem to be a strong non-Greek presence through the cemeteries on the island, which when coupled with the non-Greek inscriptive evidence suggests that locals were changing their death-ways in accordance to newly arrived colonists. Nevertheless, one possible ‘non-Greek’ burial was found identified within the South Cemetery (Grave S252), and dated to around the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. The grave itself consisted of the whole inhumation of a young adult male within a pithos. Deposited with the young man was a single pot which has since been identified as part of the Thracian G 2-3 phenomenon (Ilieva 2007; 2009; Ilieva 2010; 2011; 2014; Love 1964, 207). Yet this one burial is no conclusive proof of enduring Thracian identities on the island, and significantly the sort of syncretisms seen in reference to the Sanctuary of the Great Gods, is not exhibiting itself through the cemeteries on the island.

Outside Samothrace, the artefact alterity between inland and Aegean Thrace is also highlighted. Objects from the ‘Greco-Thracian’ colonial cemeteries near Molivotis Lake (Trandafillos 1995, 655-660), Foinika near Thassaloniki (Tsimibidou-Afloniti 1988, 261ff), Abdera (Kallintzi 1995, 447-459; 1990, 613-625; 1991; 1992a; 1993a; 1994; 1997, 633-644; 1998; Lazaridis 1965; Samiou 1991) and Mesembria (Tsatsopoulou 1993, 586-590) all stand to emphasise the burgeoning identities and new material traditions that were brought with the colonisation of the Aegean coast after the Archaic period. Beginning with the ceramic repertoire in the region; forms of wheelmade pottery such as clay alabasters, Corinthian kraters, skyphoi, pyxides, olpes, kylkes – which were found equally
distributed between most of the excavated cemeteries in the region (including the graves in the South Necropolis on Samothrace) – have not been found at all within the Rhodope during the same time. Likewise, jewellery and precious metal items were also represented more within these cemeteries, especially at the Foinika tomb near Thessaloniki, where cremations were associated with gold wreaths, golden fibulae, ivory tomb furniture, and gold rings (Tsimibidou-Afloniti 1988).

From the perspective of Aegean Thrace, therefore, the Late Iron Age represents a significant break from the traditions which characterised the Early Iron Age II period. New wheelmade ceramics, jewellery, and methods of burial were brought by Greek communities further south, and this seems to have been enthusiastically appropriated by pre-existing communities, as shown by the inscriptive evidence from Zonê and Samothrace. Yet even more critically, the Late Iron Age in the region stands in direct contrast to the material traditions still practiced further north, specifically between regions of inland Thrace. These differences do not just serve to underline the ideological differences between northern and southern communities – although this should still be appreciated – but it more significantly concerns the conscious and enduring traditions chosen by those of the north in the face of cultural change in the south.

7.7 Object Case Study: Early Iron Age Fibulae (9th-7th century B.C.)

Since its inception, the study of Iron Age fibulae in Thrace has been focused on the creation of typologies rather than seeking to analyse the potential socio-cultural meaning behind differences in style and size. Interestingly during the past decade, discussions concerning the archaeology of Medieval northern Bulgaria and Serbia have witnessed an increased academic interest pertaining to the relationship between fibulae style and matters of identity (see Curta 2011b, 51-81; 2007). Through a similar vein, I want to here reassess the relationship between style and sizes of Thracian Iron Age fibulae. Yet, I also want to broaden the analytical horizon, and assess the relationship between fibulae in Thrace in comparison with its surrounding areas, in order to interpret the extent of material variability from the perspective of a specific artefact. In support of the earlier grave-good analysis, this section will deploy a more up-to-date statistical approach in order to discern whether or not regionally specific preferences in shapes and sizes can be
Figure 7.7: Map showing find-spots and units of analysis concerning Early Iron Age Fibulae

observed.

The fibulae within this analysis come from a range of sites and find-spots. Within Bulgaria and Aegean Thrace, most of the fibulae come from inhumations, with a few examples coming from field-walking surveys. However, fibulae from the Aegean Islands come from sanctuary deposits and in Aegean Turkey from former domestic contexts. Therefore, whilst this analysis takes a macroscopic approach to the question of regional variability through fibulae types, it should be made clear that the depositional habits within the various regions were different. Yet, despite these different depositional preferences, I believe that the function of fibulae is shared between all regions; that is, they are used to pin onto clothing (Alexander 1973, 191-192). Therefore, comparisons will still be made between these areas regardless of depositional differences.

The data used within this section was collected through a mixture of articles and field surveys in Greece, Bulgaria, and Turkey. The leading publications that were used as the foundation for this section were the works of Caner (1983) (for Turkey), Gergova (1987) (for Bulgaria), Kilian (1975) (for Greece), and Sapouna-Sakellarakis (1978) (for the Greek Islands). Beyond these publications, a large quantity of fibulae data came
from museum visits, and AOR and AEMTh reports. Finally, the fibulae from the area designated as Macedonia were collected from Brauning (2013) and the excavations at Vegina. The total number of fibulae from the area covered in this analysis was 503. The different regional areas under investigation are displayed in figure 7.7. It should be made explicit that the regions were produced by eye, akin to the previous section, and not using a clustering program like CLUSTAN.

The fibulae under analysis within this section span – according to the chronology created by Gergova (1987) – approximately 150 years.10 The original Thracian Early Iron Age fibulae chronology created by Gergova (1987) is still beset with serious methodological oversights. The main oversight being that fibulae – like other items of jewellery – can be curated for significantly long periods, therefore, using fibulae as a marker of temporal change can often be hazardous (cf. Whitley 2016, 216; Buston 2019, 269). Today, the general view of Thracian fibulae is that they all roughly date between the 9th-7th centuries B.C. which roughly corresponds with the Early Iron Age II period within this thesis. Fibulae do occur within the after 600 B.C., yet not to the same extent and they differ in form being more ‘bowed’ in shape.

As it currently stands, the distribution of fibulae between Aegean and inland Thrace has not yet been formally studied. What exists is a rather fragmentary mosaic of commentaries between similar fibulae from the two regions by Ilieva (2006). There has yet to

10 Although an additional Thracian fibulae chronology was created for the Early Iron Age by Czyborra (2001, 79-95), which back-dated Gergova’s (1987) fibulae by almost three centuries.
Figure 7.9: Different types of fibulae found between Aegean and inland Thrace during the Early Iron Age. Images of fibulae reproduced from (Gergova 1987)
be a study as all-encompassing as the one conducted by Gergova (1987) or even Blinkenberg (1926), which aims at bringing fibulae from these two areas of Thrace together. Furthermore, despite Gergova publishing her book in German, it has failed to make even the bibliographies of anglophone academics studying the fringes of Thrace during this time.

Whilst the data was being collected, two characteristics were being recorded: their typological style – of the body and head – and their size (figure 7.8). The stylistic names given to the fibulae by Gergova (1987) have been maintained for ease of cross referencing.

Beginning with the size, a box-and-whisker plot was produced in order to assess the length of fibulae from each of the regions under analysis, as demonstrated in figure 7.10. The results, highlight an exciting pattern concerning relative sizes of fibulae. From the perspective of the North Hebros region facing south, the sizes of the fibulae become shorter the closer they are to the Aegean coast. The largest median value of fibulae came from the North Hebros region, with its neighbouring region – the South Thrace region – exhibiting slightly shorter fibulae. The shortest fibulae were observed within Aegean Turkey, where the longest of the examples from this area was only 6 cm (with the exception of several outliers). Interestingly, the length of fibulae increased within the area of the Island Aegean, with the region itself exhibiting an overall median in size similar to East Thrace. The strangest outlier concerning the lengths of the fibulae was from Macedonia. The fibulae from this area were much more substantial in length, with the top lengths of the fibulae being akin to the North Hebros region with significantly large outliers of 14 cm. Nevertheless, whilst it may look like the fibulae from this region are the largest, the median from the region is not higher than the median of fibulae lengths from the North Hebros, making fibulae from the region the second largest on average. On this basis, the two most apparent areas of contrast lie between Aegean Thrace and Macedonia; these are two areas which are situated directly next to one another yet feature the most significant differences in terms of fibulae size.

Notably, recent work concerning the manufacturing of potentially heavier textiles between regions of northern Macedonia and inland Thrace during the 10th-9th centuries B.C. offer an interesting point of comparison. Within her study Dimova (2016) wanted to discern whether or not – based on the ancient literary evidence and iconography – items like clothing and fabric were thicker between sites in northern Greece and Bulgaria based on the weights of loom weights from Early and Late Iron Age sites such as Koprivlen
Figure 7.10: Box-and-whisker plot showing the relative sizes of Early Iron Age fibulae between different regions. North Hebros: n = 55, South Thrace: n = 31, Aegean Thrace: n = 98, Macedonia: n = 92, Aegean Turkey: n = 90, Island Aegean: n = 90.
Figure 7.11: Correspondence analysis which shows the relationship between different regional units and different fibulae types and sizes.
(Dimitrova 2002), Vetren (Archibald 2002), Seuthopolis (Dimitrov 1984), and Kastanas (Mauel 2012). The results from the Early Iron Age (10th-9th century B.C.) loom weights potentially support the production of increasingly longer fibulae within the northern reaches of Macedonia and the North Hebros region in inland Thrace. More specifically, Dimova (2016, 660-662) found that the loom weights from Kastanas weighed on average of 1032g, meaning that they were more suitable for weaving thicker material. This is in turn supported by the spindle-whorls excavated at the site which were found to be suitable for spinning heavier and thicker fabrics (Dimova 2016, 661; Mauel 2009, 135-61). Similarly, from the limited amount of data available in the North Hebros region, loom-weights have been identified to be of a similar weight and size. Evidence of this kind comes from the pit sanctuary of Svilengrad, where eight loom-weights were discovered weighing around 1000g (Nechrizov 2006; Dimova 2016, 662). What the results from Dimova’s (2016) study indicate, is that during the Early Iron Age fibulae length between the North Hebros and Macedonia regions correspond to the thickness of fabric being woven within these two areas. This is a substantial finding that is in need of additional evidence, but if true, may insinuate a functional reason behind the fluctuation in fibulae sizes, and could underpin significant differences in regional dress.

Beyond the length of fibulae, additional regional variations were also observed through style. Figure 7.11 displays the association between style and its relationship with different regions of analysis. What should be specified here is the proximity of the fibulae in reference to one another. Specifically, if fibulae are close together it signifies an association and common occurrence within each of the regions marked in red. Beginning with inland Thrace, it is clear that although largely sharing fibulae types, there are notable differences between the North Hebros and East Thrace regions, both opting for specific styles, although as they are close to one another, these styles are most likely intermixed between the two region. Similarly, Aegean Thrace and Macedonia also exhibit increasing distinction, with Aegean Thrace opting for fibulae styles more in line with the Island Aegean and Aegean Turkey, whilst Macedonia shares its fibulae types with other regions of inland Thrace. Broadly, the three regions of inland Thrace are largely the same in terms of fibulae styles, this is not a surprise, as it has been established earlier that concerning lengths, these three regions are generally quite similar. However, the differences observed between Macedonia and Aegean Thrace are re-emphasised here, akin to the differences observed in length, and critically the fibulae between the regions
are considerably different despite being situated next to one another.

In sum, despite sharing fibulae types, Macedonia and Aegean Thrace appear to be completely at odds form one another. The Aegean Island and Aegean Turkey although sharing some fibulae types with the mainland as observed by the pulling effect these regions have on the fibulae styles, they are broadly distinct. Internal divisions can also been observed regarding differences between regions of Thrace. The three regions sit close to one another on figure 7.11, yet they also feature differences; the spatial relationships on the graph indicate that the North Hebros region is distinct from East Thrace, but both are similar to fibulae types found in South Thrace, meanwhile Macedonia is more similar to the northern regions of Thrace than the Aegean coast. Likewise, size of fibulae seems to suggest a similar picture. The three regions of Thrace are largely the same, although both the North Hebros and East Thrace regions are separated by the stylistic buffer of South Thrace. Aegean Thrace fibulae were the smallest in Thrace and are stylistically different than the extremely large fibulae found in Macedonia.

7.8 Object Case Study: Late Iron Age Fibulae (5th-4th century B.C.)

As I have been expressing repeatedly throughout this thesis, the period between the 6th and 4th centuries B.C. in Thrace marks a turning point relating to the arrival of southern Aegean colonisers. These new communities established themselves on the edges of the Aegean – and indeed the Greek-speaking world – and managed to forge strong yet often tested ties with the local pre-colonial populations (cf. Badian 1993, 81–86, 106–107; Archibald 1998, 114). The result of this – from a material perspective – was inevitably a great deal of change and innovation which can be most clearly traced through the distribution of fibulae types. In contrast to Early Iron Age II fibulae, the Late Iron Age marks a significant break between the shared material relationships of inland and Aegean Thrace. The data used for this analysis was collected through a mixture of preliminary site reports and unpublished PhD theses. The result produced a much smaller sample size, a total of 100 fibulae – 50 samples from both inland and Aegean Thrace – which date between the periods of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.11

11 A stable chronology of Late Iron Age fibulae from inland Thrace was only recently created by M. Vasileva (2012), who used fibulae discovered within Aegean Thrace to cross-date more northern examples.
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Figure 7.12: Map showing find-spots and units of analysis concerning Late Iron Age Fibulae

Figure 7.13: Box-and-whisker plot which plots the range of sizes of fibulae in the different regions and the median for each of the areas. Inland Thrace: n=48; Aegean Thrace: n=50
Figure 7.14: Different types of fibulae discovered between Aegean and inland Thrace during the Late Iron Age. Images of fibulae reproduced from (Vasileva 2012)
Beginning with fibulae style, both Aegean and inland Thrace exhibited such divergent stylistic traditions that a correspondence analysis could not be undertaken. Aegean Thrace had an incredibly strong preference for the *type.V* fibulae, with a few cases of *type.10.a* discovered as well. Yet this divergence is perhaps better understood in light of the fact that there were 18 stylistic variations of fibulae discovered within inland Thrace as opposed to only 3 variations of fibulae discovered within Aegean Thrace, 90 percent of which consisted of fibulae *type.V*. In continuation of this point, the *type.V* fibula was not discovered at all within inland Thrace. Following this, it seems to suggest that new traditions in fibulae styles were being maintained within both inland and Aegean regions, with little to no cross-over in stylistic traditions this time.

Additionally, the lengths of the fibulae from both regions also exhibited considerable shifts from the earlier period. Within inland Thrace, fibulae length is slightly larger and exhibits an overall larger median, in contrast to the Aegean region where fibulae are shorter (figure 7.13). Whether this preference for longer fibulae was a stylistic hangover from the Early Iron Age cannot be completely proven, yet with this evidence it could certainly be suggested.

Nevertheless, additional perspectives are again offered through the results of Dimova’s (2016, 662-668) study concerning loom weights. Dimova found that both inland and Aegean Thrace Late Iron Age loom weights were largely the same, but critically both regions exhibited a shift concerning the manufacturing of lighter loom weights, which Dimova hypothesised would be more suited for the manufacturing of lighter fabrics. Dimova’s (2016, 666-668) results, therefore, offer a plausible and rather practical explanation for the overall decreasing in fibulae length, yet interestingly, inland Thrace seems to have continually maintained a preference for, on average, longer fibulae which were also completely visually different from those that were found further south.

From an analysis of fibulae, therefore, it is clear that this object was no less prone to being used to negotiate and construct social identities during the Late Iron Age period between inland and Aegean Thrace. The possibility cannot be disregarded that these fibulae reflect a very deliberate articulation of territorial concerns, especially considering data from the Early Iron Age II. Yet, without wanting to overemphasise the data, clear boundaries regarding fibulae styles and length are most clearly seen within the corresponding Late Iron Age. Whether this was as a direct result of Greek influence requires additional evidence. Yet, the erosion of shared fibulae styles between the Aegean and
inland regions after the Early Iron Age II cannot be overlooked when attempting to articulate a historical narrative of the regions. Likewise, the obvious limitations of the current state of published data also cannot be forgotten. Large gaps still exist in and around the modern-day areas of Komotini and Alexandropoli, where potentially fibulae styles could have been more in line with traditions from inland Thrace, yet without this data, the picture of Aegean Thrace is one that lies at considerable odds to the inland region during the Late Iron Age.

### 7.9 Methods of Processing the Body

The previous two sections of this chapter have been dedicated to analysing the expression of identities from different perspectives of the funerary context: what the body has been processed within and what it has been processed with. This final section shall approach the question of material variation, and its potential change over time, through three different ways that human remains have been processed within Iron Age Thrace: cremation, inhumation, and deliberate disarticulation (i.e. partial inhumation). The data within this section has been processed in the form of ternary graphs which display the data through calculated percentages from each of the regions discussed earlier.\(^\text{12}\) It should be stressed here that a minimal view of Aegean Thrace can only be ascertained due to the limited number of excavations from that region. Therefore, the Aegean Thrace region shall only be discussed concerning the Early Iron Age II period. In continuation of the previous section, the same regions of analysis have been retained and are analysed (for map, see figure 4.2).

The current state of research concerning the ways in through which human remains have been treated in Iron Age Thrace is an incredibly small and underdeveloped avenue of investigation, which is mostly due to the absence in osteoarchaeologists but also due, in part, to the scant amount of excavated data. As it currently stands, it generally accepted that there was a shift in methods of bodily processing between the Early Iron Age I and the Early Iron Age II periods, from cremations towards a preference for whole inhumations (cf. Baralis & Riapov 2007; 2008; Gergova 1989). The results from this study largely confirm this. Yet in qualification, the subsequent image created using these methods of processing was limited by the infrequency of excavated data.

\(^\text{12}\) There potentially exists a fourth method of bodily processing, partial cremation. As from archaeological reports it cannot be determined whether the partially burnt remains of individuals were the result of insufficient heat during the cremation process or whether the remains were deliberately left partially burned (cf. Kisyov 2009, 102; 1985, 53).
results from both Aegean and inland Thrace is far from clear-cut. In actuality, what the next section shows, is that Thrace was filled with a diversity of traditions concerning how the dead body was treated during the funerary process.

7.10 Early Iron Age I inland Thrace (12th-11th century B.C.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Whole Inhumation</th>
<th>Partial Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Table showing the percentages of each method of bodily processing during the Early Iron Age I period

During the Early Iron Age I period in inland Thrace, cremations seem to have formed the main method of bodily processing for much of the central Rhodope (Nenova 2018, 125-126) (figure 7.15 and table 7.1). However, this generalisation does not evidently cover the whole of inland Thrace during this time. Evidence of this kind comes from the Eastern region which exhibits considerable levels of regional variability concerning bodily processing during this time.

More specifically, large degrees of variability concerning cremation versus whole inhumation are evident particularly evidence between South Central and Eastern inland Thrace. The Eastern region exhibits a much stronger preference for whole inhumations with few cremations and even fewer partial inhumations. In stark contrast, the South Central region consisted almost entirely of cremations, far higher than was observed in the Eastern region, with no examples of partial inhumations at all.

Unfortunately, there is not enough data to include the Aegean Thrace region within this section. Yet, from the limited data available, Aegean Thrace looks considerably different from the central Rhodope, and much more similar with the Eastern region.

From this transitional period, currently the only published data concerning methods of bodily processing comes from the cemeteries of Faia Petra and on Thasos (Valla 1997a; 1997b; Valla et al. 2013; Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1992). From these cemeteries it is still currently assumed that the bodies were inhumed whole within the tombs, although

---

13Yet, with the few completely excavated and published dolmens from the region, the total regional proportion of partial inhumations may in fact be much higher.
Figure 7.15: Ternary plot which shows the regional inhumation preferences between regions during the Early Iron Age I period. South Central: n=38; Eastern: n=25
there has been some evidence to suggest disarticulation of the body after death, i.e. the presence of skulls grouped together in the centre of enclosure 2 at Faia Petra (Valla 2004, 379-380) and the possible disturbance and processing of the skeletal remains at the Tsiganathika cemetery on Thasos (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1992, 647). Yet both of these theories cannot be definitively proven due to the high levels of re-use experience by these tombs. There was one cremation in an urn at Faia Petra located in one of the enclosures next to the partial remains of several individuals (Valla 2004, 380), however, this is currently not thought to be a regular practice relating to cemeteries during this transitional period within Greece (cf. Asouchidou 2001; Savvopoulou 2001). Overall, therefore, with the small amount of data available, Aegean Thrace suggests a potentially similar preference for whole inhumations within collective tombs which only occurs again in areas with dolmens, i.e. the Eastern region.

7.11 Early Iron Age II inland Thrace (9th-8th century B.C.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Whole Inhumation</th>
<th>Partial Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Eastern</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Table showing the percentages of each method of bodily processing during the Early Iron Age II period

Concerning methods of bodily processing, the Early Iron Age II proved to be a period which was filled with great diversity, not too dissimilar from its image concerning grave-goods (figure 7.16 and table 7.2).

Beginning with the South Central region, during the Early Iron Age II the areas undergoes a significant shift away from cremations to 70 percent whole inhumations, with a much lower level of cremations around 26 percent, and fewer still partial inhumations. Likewise, the Central Eastern region exhibits a level of similarity with the South Central region, as it only contains 10 percent more inhumations, with a similarly low level of cremations, and few partial inhumations. The Eastern region marks a considerable break from the traditions in the central Rhodope. The area contained only 56 percent whole inhumations, with a much larger proportion (25 percent) of partial inhumations, yet with a similarly low number of cremations. Nevertheless, it was the South Western
Figure 7.16: Ternary plot which shows the regional inhumation preferences between regions. South Central: n=29; South Western: n=19; Eastern: n=16; Central Eastern: n=10
region which exhibited the most unique preference for methods of bodily processing in contrast with the other regions of inland Thrace. The region contained no cremations, and partial inhumations formed the preferred method of bodily processing at 53 percent, with whole inhumations only marginally lower at 47 percent of the total number of graves. Overall it seems that all of the regions had a considerable shift away from cremations and towards whole or partial inhumations, yet each of these regions exhibited a unique preferences for each of the methods discussed.

7.12 Early Iron Age II Aegean Thrace (13th-7th century B.C.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Whole Inhumation</th>
<th>Partial Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filiouri</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossynthos</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Area</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Table showing the percentages of each method of bodily processing during the Early Iron Age II period in Aegean Thrace

During the Early Iron Age II within inland Aegean Thrace, additional differences in traditions can be seen. Yet in contrast to the earlier section, methods of bodily processing represent a noticeable contrast from the traditions within the north, and both table 7.3 and figure 7.17 this explicitly. The Kossynthos cemetery and the Western Area both had 100 percent whole inhumations, with no cremations or partial inhumations, and this seems to have also been the case on Thasos, which also contained a significantly high concentration of whole inhumations, and a very small proportion of cremations. Variability within the region seems to have only been expressed in the Filiouri cemetery. In this instance, 22 percent of the bodies found in the cemetery were cremated, which is unusually high for the Aegean Thrace region. Correspondingly, the amount of whole inhumations was still relatively high at 78 percent, which makes it similar with the other cemeteries on the Aegean coast.

Yet it is worth stressing here that due to the limited preservation of the osteological material and the gradual destruction of some of the tombs over time, it is impossible to comment whether these bones were disarticulated and processed after being interred (i.e. subject to partial inhumation) or left within the tombs as whole inhumations. For the purposes of this thesis, Thasos was identified as having practised the whole inhumation of the body after death.
Figure 7.17: Ternary plot which shows the regional inhumation preferences between regions. Thasos: n = 92; Filiouri: n = 18; Kossynthos: n = 3; Western Area: n = 4
Overall the image produced from the results in Aegean Thrace prompts new questions about the connectedness of Thrace as a whole during this time. Despite the fact that it was highlighted within an earlier section of this chapter that the two regions did in fact share several artefact types like fibulae, it seems that there were significant differences concerning how the body was treated after death. The image from Aegean Thrace suggests that communities living here were very much different, at least in terms of their ideologies surrounding the body. Partial inhumations were not practiced at all, with cremations being very few in number. These point in particular shall be elaborated upon in the discussion.

7.13 Late Iron Age inland Thrace (5th-4th century B.C.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Whole Inhumation</th>
<th>Partial Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Eastern</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4: Table showing the percentages of each method of bodily processing during the Late Iron Age

The periods proceeding the end of the Early Iron Age II in inland Thrace marked a significant change concerning the way people were processing their dead. The results presented here from the data collected concerning the 5th-4th centuries B.C. are only representative of inland Thrace. Unfortunately, there remains a significant gap in what we know about the Thracians during the period of intense Greek colonisation after the 6th century. During this time, indigenous and Greek communities were interacting and communicating in such a way that new traditions and customs were being formed and altered both intentionally and unintentionally as a result of contact (cf. Dimova 2015). Archaeologically, this process of assimilation and alteration makes it much more difficult to spot what is left of the pre-colonial archaeology and what is the result of cultural mixing.

The view from inland Thrace, however, does suggest a significant degree of change from the Early Iron Age II period (figure 7.18 and table 7.4). It is clear from the data that there was another major shift in terms of methods of bodily processing in comparison to the Early Iron Age I-II periods, with cremations now constituting the main method of processing between the regions. The Central Eastern region in this instance
Figure 7.18: Ternary plot which shows the regional inhumation preferences between regions. Central Eastern: n = 26; South Central: n = 33
is quite different from its South Central neighbour with 67 percent of its tombs containing a cremation, whereas only 35 percent contained a whole inhumation. Interestingly, partial inhumations between the two regions remains the same at 24 percent, which is a marked increase for both of the regions in contrast to the previous Early Iron Age II period. Meanwhile, the South Central region displays a more equal preference between its cremations and whole inhumations, with only 6 percent separating the two methods.

Overall, the two regions are indeed different, which is most notable between their respective preferences for whole inhumations and cremations. Yet what is more critical about the Late Iron Age results is the extreme shift from the preceding period, away from whole inhumations and in favour of cremations. What exactly spurred these changes is not known, but it cannot be overlooked – akin the Late Iron Age fibulae – that significant changes and transformations may have been a reaction against increasing foreign colonisation in the south.

### 7.14 Late Iron Age Aegean Thrace (5th-4th century B.C.)

As expressed earlier, there is currently a severe lack of information regarding funerary processes involving pre-colonial peoples during the corresponding Late Iron Age in Aegean Thrace. Likewise, the archaeological publications that do mention non-colonial Late Iron Age excavations are too few and insufficiently published to use within any sort of statistical analysis. What is known, is that during this time in Aegean Thrace, whole inhumations appear to have been the main method of bodily processing. Within the cemeteries of Abdera (Kallintzi 1995, 447-459; 1993b, 655-660; Samiou 1991, 471-479), Mesembria (Tsatsopoulou 1993, 586-590), and at Molivotis Lake (Trandafillos 1995, 655-660), whole inhumation was the only method to be practiced. Yet, this contrasts significantly with the elite burial at Foinika and the Samothrace South Nekropolis, where during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., cremations represented the prevailing mode of bodily processing, which seems to have endured – at least on Samothrace – from the 6th century. Most interestingly during this time, however, it the complete absence of any partial inhumations. Granted, this method was always secluded to inland Thrace and potentially to Thasos as well during the Early Iron Age II (although this is still disputed), its persistent presence within Late Iron Age inland Thrace adds additional evidence towards the corresponding cultural dissonance felt between the two regions before and after Greek colonisation.
7.15 Concluding Remarks

During this chapter I have demonstrated that ‘uniform’ cultural practices did not exist in Thrace during the Early and Late Iron Ages. What in fact existed was a diversity of regional traditions which changed over time, strengthening and weakening of social identities, and changes in taste. Nevertheless, a key point of this chapter was to map material continuity and change within Iron Age Thrace through time in an attempt to highlight Thrace’s internal heterogeneity, which until this point has not been comprehensively discussed. On the basis of the results presented here, three distinct conclusions can be made which I shall elaborate upon in more detail within the following chapter:

(i) Objects found within graves significantly differed between regions, more obviously between Aegean and inland Thrace. This was expressed through certain pottery types, but was further underpinned by regional preferences in fibulae style and size;

(ii) Methods of bodily processing exhibited strong regional differences between Aegean and inland Thrace but also between regions within inland Thrace, and this was heightened especially during the Late Iron Age.

(iii) Throughout the Early to Late Iron Age, familiar areas of regional distinction seemed to repeatedly exhibit material cultural variabilities. Despite the fact that regions shared some material traits, different types of material evidence reemphasised these regions as materially distinct.

Overall, the presence of overlapping material cultural traits displays a significant and deliberate process of active differentiation, which could help to identify the presence of ethnic signalling within regions of Iron Age Thrace.
Chapter 8

Discussion

Reconstructing the ethnic realities of Iron Age Thrace was never going to be a simple task. The evidence within the preceding chapters – much of which has only now been brought into anglophone academia – stands to highlight the often overlooked reality of variability in Iron Age Thrace. Through the evidence presented in the preceding chapters, distinguishable boundaries have been observed between regions. Yet this is not where ethnicity is to be expressed as I defined in Chapter 3, and instead its signification is to be found within the specific patterns (or packages) of material variability created by successive layers of cultural overlap within different regions. In order to make this answer explicitly clear, I shall here draw out these patterns in connection with the earlier established theoretical framework in order to attempt to answer ‘Who were the Thracians?’ Or more specifically, what can a materialist perspective on ancient ethnicity add to what we understand about the communities who were later named ‘Thracian’?

The evidence presented within this thesis has attempted to established a more nuanced understanding of Thracian Iron Age society more generally. Hitherto academic consensus concerning Thrace in both the ancient literary evidence and Archaeology – as was documented in Chapters 2 and 3 – shared problems relating to a substantial lack of consensus and, therefore, a dearth of knowledge regarding basic questions surrounding parallel developments outside the Greek world.

In order to overcome this dearth and, in an attempt to fully answer the aims which were established in Chapter 1, I will here do three things; firstly, I will discuss whether or not we can define ethnic groups within Iron Age Thrace on the basis of the material record. This question lies at the heart of this thesis and serves to underpin any further investigation into Thrace that is conducted. Secondly, and relating to the former
question of ethnicity, I shall discuss what the evidence from Chapter 3 has added to our understanding of ethnic groups within Thrace and who the Thracians were. Thirdly, I shall compare these results with the archaeological evidence presented earlier, in order to create a more nuanced understanding of the communities and their identities in this part of the Balkan Iron Age.

In sum, the breadth of observations presented here will contribute to a more detailed and complete picture of Thrace during the Iron Age. At first glance, it may not be obvious how evidence that clearly demonstrates regional material variability relates to ‘ethnicity’ at all. Yet, I argue that by developing an analytical account of ethnicity – beyond a descriptive model which relies on similarity and difference – a more comprehensive narrative of the past can be created. Moreover, this is the only way forward if we are to understand how the process of ethnicity functioned within the past using the material evidence available.

8.1 A Material Perspective on Ancient Ethnicity

Reconstructing past ethnic identities through the material record of Iron Age communities living in Thrace should not, at this point, be too much of a theoretical leap. On account of a series of overlapping yet regionally specific patterns of material cultural distributions, clues can be seen regarding sentiments of ethnic affiliations and difference. Since, however, the identification of ethnicity can only be demonstrated concerning its adherence to the definitions mapped in Chapter 4, I will here discuss the three chronological periods of investigation (i.e., Early Iron Age I, II, and Late Iron Age) in light of their overall ethnic significance to my framework. Yet before this we should briefly note the criteria which archaeologically underpin its identification. The key concept within this criteria is variability, and in order to identify ethnicity materially, I have argued:

(i) Clues to recognising the process of ethnicity are to be found within the articulation of specific clusters (packages) of material variability in social processes (i.e., variability in settlements, cemeteries and ways of dying, and religious spaces) which are underpinned by regional preferences in terms of style and contextual use of artefacts;

(ii) Material culture represents the discursive and socially agreed upon objective community practice, through which ethnicity can be highlighted with its members
(iii) Changes in material styles, forms, and practices stand to represent dynamic shifts and re-formation of the ethnic group, which may be a result of one or more significant socio-political changes experienced by the community and how it materially expresses itself.

As was expressed within Chapter 4, these regional variabilities were expected to manifest as intricate patterns of overlapping stylistic distributions, particularly when certain practices, and material forms crossing large areas are taken into account. It was imagined that aspects of material culture were to be found widely distributed and stylistically reproduced, yet used in a variety of contexts and consumed in different ways in different regions, which signified its involvement in the articulation of different types of ethnicities (cf. Jones 1997). It was thought, therefore, that ethnicity should extend beyond the Barthian and indeed Hall-ian mode of investigation, and instead view this phenomenon as consisting of a graded scale of similarity and difference, with each ethnic community expressing a unique cultural ‘package’ consisting of both shared and independent materials and practices (Clarke 1968, 263-269, 311).

By comparing overlapping distributions of material culture we are able to more precisely locate ethnic areas. Identifying packages – or clusters – which are distinct from other areas, stands to represent independently articulated material traditions. This, then underscores a distinctive regional ethnic identity (cf. Emberling 1997; Clarke 1968). Material variability is, therefore, not arbitrary and signifies an important maintenance of locally sanctioned cultural traditions, which regional communities sought to either share or locally maintain. Consequently, whilst regionally maintained materials and practices are more likely to be characteristic of specific regional ethnic groups, it is the specific regional material pattern created by overlaps in material variabilities which should be used to identify ethnicity (cf. Emberling 1997, 319; Jones 1997, 129-130, 140; Devalle 1992, 18). Indeed, a similar theoretical position was taken by Jones (1997), who argued that artefacts play an active role in communicating social identities through regional iterations of their use and deposition (cf. Parker-Pearson 1999). It was hypothesised here, therefore, that through their context of use, artefacts are able to communicate the social relations in which they are embedded, whilst also communicating wider-reaching stylistic articulations of ethnic similarity or difference. It is also necessary to state here that these observations vary with the amount of evidence available to underpin them,
this is also true of the chronological periods used to separate parts thesis. Therefore, conclusions drawn from this discussion are perhaps more firmly based on the data collected from the Early Iron Age II periods rather than the Early Iron Age I or Late Iron Age, where data is regionally restricted to the Rhodope mountains in inland Thrace. Hereafter, each of the arbitrarily defined analytical regions shall be discussed in light of the theoretical framework set out in Chapter 4, this is in order to determine whether or not an effective ethnic claim can be made, and if so where.

8.2 Ethnicity in Early Iron Age I

As demonstrated in Chapter 8, basic material traditions between Eastern and South Central regions in inland Thrace differed. The Eastern region displayed a much higher preference for the deposition of handmade kitchenware and cups, which had a sustained preference well into the Early Iron Age II period, especially in the context of peak sanctuaries (Nechrizov 2005a, 95, 123). The South Central region, however, differed with its grave-goods; despite sharing a significant preference for handmade kitchenware, the presence of processed animal remains and urns were not observed outside this area. It was also identified by the excavators that urns deposited within the region also differed from the other ceramics deposited within the graves (Kisyov 2002, 138). In most, if not all instances, the urns were made from well-purified clay, with evenly thick walls, spherical bodies, conical mouths, and covered in graphite. Thereafter, during the latter parts of Chapter 8 it was established that the two regions were further distinguished by their preference for radically different methods of bodily processing. The South Central region was almost completely composed of cremations, whereas the Eastern region preferred whole inhumations, with cremations being in the minority, along with a total lack of partial inhumations.

Further distinctions between the regions were also observed in Chapter 7 with an examination of the spatial analysis of tomb types. Cairn graves were beginning to rise in popularity during this time (cf. Kisyov 2009, 98-103, 151-153; 1990, 41-53), and it was observed in Chapter 7 that this type of tomb features heavily within the area corresponding to the South Central region. Furthermore, the erection of the cairn and the mound over human remains was often accompanied by the localised practice of depositing significant amounts of ceramic fragments within them, using specifically small decorated cups and large decorated vessels. The contrasting architectural and ritual
practices within the South Central region are met with additional divergence in funerary
behaviours within the Eastern region, with the formal construction of dolmens and other

An additional sharp point of cultural difference also comes from the limited number
of inhumations excavated from Aegean Thrace, specifically Faia Petra and some of the Late
Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I tombs from Thasos (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1982; 1992;
both contexts, the tombs contained a significantly different repertoire of local artefacts
featuring Mycenaean wheelmade pottery (both imported and imitated), jewellery, amber,
glass, and painted ceramic drinking sets, which are either significantly rare or absent

Concerning architecture and methods of processing the body from Aegean Thrace, the
presence of rectangular built graves on Thasos, and stone enclosures at Faia Petra further
emphasised significant differences in the formation and social negotiation of funerary
monuments in contrast to inland regions (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1992, 646; Valla et al.
2013). The existence of possible partial inhumation at both Thasos and Faia Petra place
them in direct contrast with the results from the South Central regions further north.
The results revealed – from the limited excavation reports within Aegean Thrace – a
picture of Aegean Thrace that may be similar with the occurrence of partial inhumations
within dolmens from the Eastern region, Samothrace, and Roussa (cf. Triandaphyllos
1981, 60-61; Andriotis 1929, 54-64; Moutsopoulos 1989, 246-279).

Beyond the funerary context, it was highlighted within Chapter 6, using Czyborra’s
(2001) data that patterns of ceramic stylistic clusters changed depending on the types
of style the cluster featured. The data presented in Chapter 6 highlighted the possibility
that pottery decorations do not appear to be static, and, as the maps demonstrate,
certain styles and stylistic clusters travel beyond natural boundaries like the Rhodope
mountains between inland and Aegean Thrace. Whether this was the result of trade, gift
exchange, or itinerant potters cannot be specified, but it does indeed suggest a high level
of communication between the areas that share the styles, and perhaps more critically,
the maintenance of ceramic style suggests a deliberate attempt to keep certain forms of

1Despite the differences, there are notable similarities between the Faia Petra funerary enclosures
and the inhumations from the South Central region relating to the processing of animal remains. In
both regions, goat remains were found processed, partially articulated, and directly associated with the
inhumations. The discovery of these associated remains prompted the excavator to argue that their
disposal within the inhumation was a distinct regional practice surrounding the funerary ritual (Kisyov
material practice within the confines of the local community.

From the evidence discussed here it is evident that important social decisions were being made about certain objects and practices which were wide-spread, as opposed to others which were likely to have been specifically maintained. From this perspective and in reference to the ethnic framework, three distinctive ethnic regions are observed between the South Central, Eastern, and Aegean Thrace regions during the Early Iron Age I period. As stated earlier, variability is distinct within each of the regions, yet the unique ethnic makeup of these regions is articulated through the overlapping clusters or packages of material practices. The South Central and Eastern region may have differed in reference to methods of bodily processing and tomb type, but they largely shared types of handmade ceramics. Correspondingly, the Eastern and the Aegean Thrace regions may have shared partial articulation of the body, but fundamentally different in terms of grave-goods and funerary architecture.

As was identified in Chapter 4, the identification of distinct material boundaries was not the aim of the investigation here, as it was assumed that different material culture artefacts would indeed cross large geographic areas and ethnic boundaries, which they evidently did concerning pottery types and styles. Rather, ethnic significance in this instance is observed in reference to the overlapping of several material variabilities (i.e. grave-goods, architecture, and processing the body) which highlighted the existence of several distinct ethnic regions within Early Iron Age I Thrace.

8.3 Ethnicity in Early Iron Age II

The results from the Early Iron Age II emphasise a degree of continuity in terms of ethnic self-definition, particularly between South Central, Eastern, and Aegean regions. Within this period in particular, inland Thrace revealed regions which exhibited substantial levels of material distinction cross-cut by broader similarities concerning both fibulae types and cult places. On this basis, the period was characterised by four ethnically distinct regions.

South Central Thrace, despite sharing its preference for bronze jewellery with the South Western region, contained the highest degree of fibulae out of all of the regions. The high concentration of fibulae deposited within this region was also underpinned by the preference for particular fibulae styles, mainly the \( aii.3.g \) type. The size of the fibulae from the South Central region also proved to be anomalous, being the second
longest out of all of the regions analysed. Similarly, the region also exhibited a material break from its Early Iron Age I past, as demonstrated through a shift from cremations to almost entirely whole inhumations, some cremations, and a very small amount of partial inhumations. Cremations did endure within the region, but to a much lesser extent than they had done several centuries earlier, and largely the region seems to have experienced a degree of ideological and/or cultural change in terms of how the body should be treated after death. Other material distinctions within the region are emphasised by the presence of peak sanctuaries which begin to develop after the Early Iron Age I period, more commonly in the eastern regions of the Rhodope. In contrast to the large-scale rock-cut sanctuaries of the Eastern region, the sanctuaries found in the South Central exhibit additional architectural differences, as emphasised within Chapter 6, and consisted of temenoi, a lack of pits with human remains, and concentrating around high-peaks (Tonkova 2007, 55; Domaradzki 1994, 82-83).

The neighbouring South Western unit was another region which demonstrated a similar level of cultural variability. Whilst sharing a comparable level of bronze jewellery with the South Central region, the South Western region displayed a distinct series of grave-goods, which were either not present within the other areas, or at least not present in a similarly high quantity. Iron and bronze objects consisted of a significant proportion of the overall objects found within the graves, which was not observed outside this region. Additionally, despite the low quantity of fibulae, the South Western region also revealed itself to have a strong preference for particular types of fibulae, namely the bii.2.b type which is commonly found within other more northern sites such as Pilatovichi and Razhana in modern-day western Serbia and southern Romania (cf. Vasic 1977, pl.24, 26-27; Czyborra 2001, 90-91). Likewise, the size of the North Hebros fibulae were the largest on average, out of all the regions under study. Concerning methods of bodily processing, the South Western region displayed a break from the neighbouring traditions with the highest proportion of partial inhumations and almost no cremations, and all deposited only within cist graves, which were not observed in inland Thrace until the Late Iron Age. The alterity of bodily processing methods alone, places this region at odds with its neighbours, although large amounts of unexcavated and unpublished dolmen data within the Eastern region may hint at underlying similarities regarding partial inhumations between the two geographically separate regions.

The Central Eastern region showed some signs of distinct object preference, namely
for certain types of bronze objects, amber objects, and fibulae. The area was, however, included within the South Thrace catchment area for the fibulae analysis, as the fibulae within the region were stylistically too similar to ones found in the South Central region to be analysed separately, i.e. the \textit{aii.3} variant. The region also showed close affinities to the South Central region concerning methods of bodily processing, with similarly low levels of partial inhumations, strong preferences for whole inhumations, and relatively few cremations. The Central Eastern region, therefore, confirmed what had been hypothesised during Chapter 5; i.e. that material similarities and differences would transcend arbitrarily defined units on the basis of a macro-scale analysis.

The final region studied within inland Thrace is the Eastern region. This, akin to the South Central region, consisted of many layers of regionally distinct practices. The Eastern region – concerning grave-goods from the Early Iron Age I period – displayed a higher preference for handmade kitchenware than other regions and a smaller preference for iron knives, fibulae, and handmade pithoi. Further material distinctions, relative to fibulae length and style, were observed with the Eastern Thrace region exhibiting a significant preference for the \textit{ai.2} and \textit{ai.3} types, and opting for on average shorter fibulae. Methods of bodily processing also diverged from other regional traditions with a strong preference for partial inhumations. Cremations and inhumations were of a similar level to that of the Central Eastern and South Central regions as well, which introduced elements of similarity between the three neighbouring regions. Architecturally speaking, the Eastern region practised the construction of large megalithic monuments which – apart from a few examples in Aegean Thrace and Samothrace – emphasise a significantly different approach to the funerary process, towards cult practices, and the way communities within the region engaged with their landscape. This region is also the only area which contained rock-cut niches, rock-cut graves, and monumental peak sanctuaries like Tatul and Perperikon. The differences, therefore, between the Eastern region concerning grave-goods, fibulae styles, methods of bodily processing, and cult architecture consistently re-emphasise the region as one of the most ethnically distinct material zones within inland Thrace during this time.

The Aegean Thrace region also stands at considerable odds with the rest of inland Thrace during the Early Iron Age II. Despite lacking additional evidence to underpin the region’s material distinctiveness, like cult places, the cemeteries within the region provided ample evidence for their ethnic independence. Between themselves, the sites
within the region shared a higher proportion of grave-good types than did sites in the north, i.e. bronze beads, handmade cups, and handmade pithoi, and few of the cemeteries within Aegean Thrace displayed a high concentration of site-specific objects akin to inland Thrace. Yet, broadly speaking, Aegean and inland Thrace did share grave-good types, i.e. iron blades, fibulae, and large handmade vases. This point in particular concerning fibulae is worth re-emphasising. Within Aegean Thrace, it was found that fibulae types did vary, with sizes being smaller than the inland Thrace regions, yet despite this – and at odds with the methods of bodily processing – the stylistic examples found in the Aegean Thrace correspond to types which concentrated in the South Thrace region. This is significant as it demonstrates one of the key hypotheses expressed in Chapter 4, e.g. that artefacts and styles were expected to cross-cut ethnic boundaries, whilst other significant traditions like methods of bodily processing were rigidly upheld.

Within the region, site exceptionalism did occur with the presence of an iron sword at Kossynthos, the quantity of bronze objects at Filiouri, and iron rings in the Western Area. This is most likely the result of low sample size, rather than ethnic signalling between micro-regions, and this is supported by the homogeneous methods of bodily processing observed throughout Aegean Thrace as a whole. Nevertheless, additional variations within the region were expressed concerning architecture, despite the homogeneity expressed through grave-goods and methods of bodily processing. Pithoi graves, cist graves, and built graves were all built around the same time and side-by-side as was the case at the Filiouri cemetery, which may suggest that there may have been more to the selection of certain architectural forms beyond arbitrary choice. Moreover, these tomb types were also broadly shared within areas of inland Thrace, however, due to problems of dating, the origin of shared architectural types cannot be specified.

The Early Iron Age II period within Thrace is characterised by the presence of four ethnically distinct regions. Two of these regions – i.e., the South Central and Eastern – appear to have maintained some of the material distinctions which served to underpin their independent material traditions several centuries earlier. A greater diversity in grave-good artefacts was witnessed in general during this period, and through this, communities embedded the funerary context with artefacts that expressed their group identity. The period of the Early Iron Age II represents an explosion in terms of regional ethnic signalling. Many of the regions contain additional unique practices which were underpinned through the statistical analyses. It was clearly demonstrated
that Aegean and inland regions differed in several respects concerning artefacts, but more clearly through the differences in methods of bodily processing. Unique to inland Thrace was the diversity in methods of bodily practice that seems to have been performed within each of the regions contemporaneously. This is particularly noteworthy as it clearly demonstrates the non-arbitrary nature of methods of bodily processing in Early Iron Age II inland Thrace, but also suggests that there may have been additional socially deciding factors behind each method of deposition which we are not completely able to understand yet.

Therefore, we can now say with certainty during this period that areas of inland Thrace did share material types although many of its regions were distinct concerning their overall preference for one particular grave-good or method of bodily processing, and indeed these differences were further underpinned by differences in cult expression. Yet, turning south, regional variation between regions of inland Thrace are met with even more regional variations in Aegean Thrace. Inland and Aegean regions do share some material types, and both practice whole inhumations to varying degrees. Yet, broadly speaking the artefact traditions, funerary architecture, and methods of processing the dead are all significantly different in this region in comparison with the north and this in particular is worth reemphasising. In this respect fibulae played an important role concerning the transmission of regional identities through their specific type and size, as stylistically they seem to have been shared with areas further north. From these perspectives, two additional packages or clusters can be observed; the Aegean Thrace and the South Western region. Each of the units under analysis clearly demonstrated preferences for grave-goods, grave architecture, and ways of processing the body. Clearly from the fibulae stylistic distribution analysis, distance did not prohibit the transmission of objects throughout Thrace akin to pottery from the Early Iron Age I, although, clear signs of regional object preference were observed.

8.4 Ethnicity in the Late Iron Age

The Late Iron Age within inland Thrace witnessed a significant change in terms of depositional practice. Arguably this could have been a response to the gradual increase in activities of Greek colonists to the east and the south. In comparison with the Early Iron Age II, regions within inland Thrace do share a considerable level of cultural similarities, like cups, glass beads, fibulae, urns, and kitchenware. Yet during this later period,
kitchenware becomes much more popular within the context of graves within the South Central region, than it was observed during the Early Iron Age II. The large increase in handmade kitchenware within this region also happened to correspond with the distribution and manifestation of the Tsepina pottery phenomenon in the context of peak sanctuaries, which builds momentum from the early 6th century B.C. This contrasts with the consistent use of pit sanctuaries in the Eastern regions with its deposition of human remains, and its consumption of Greek imported pottery. These regional differences are further emphasised by differences in methods of bodily processing. The Central Eastern region contained very few whole inhumations and revealed mainly partial inhumations and cremations, whilst the South Central region opted for a higher percentage of whole inhumations and fewer cremations. Additional differences were also observed in the types of fibulae being used within Late Iron Age Thrace. The inland analytical units as a whole, displayed a relative heterogeneity in terms of type and shape during the 5th-4th centuries B.C. with much larger fibulae variations than had been observed further south.

More interesting, however, were the types of fibulae discovered from Aegean Thrace which completely differed from inland examples being shorter and much more elaborate. In many respects, inland and Aegean Thrace, during this time begin to exhibit much stronger regional variations than in the previous Early Iron Age II period. This also corresponded to the increase in activities involving Greek colonists on the Aegean coast, and the cultural syncretism created by pre-colonial communities using newly established Greek cemeteries (cf. Dusenbery 1998; Dimova 2015). In these cemeteries, wheelmade Greek ceramic forms replaced traditional handmade vessels which continued within the inland region. Yet as a possible reaction against the growing Greek presence on the Aegean coast, the South Central region developed its own unique stylistic repertoire which it kept conservatively within the remits of the western Rhodope. Concerning methods of processing the body, it is apparent that whatever Thracians were in the area – and we know this due to additional epigraphic evidence from Samothrace and its opposite coast (Graham 2002, 250-255; Georgiev 1977, 143-151; Georgiev 1957; Lehmann 1955) – that they were inhuming members of their community in such a way that aligned themselves within the new Greek customs, and therefore, cannot be easily found nor decoded from non-Thracian inhumations. Within the cemeteries of Abdera (Kallintzi 1995, 447-459; 1993b, 561-568; Samiou 1991, 471-479), Mesemvria-Zoni (Tsatsopoulou
1993, 586-590), and at Molivotis Lake (Trandafillos 1995, 655-660) whole inhumations formed the majority of methods used to process the body. This contrasts significantly with the elite burial at Fonika and the Samothrace South Necropolis, where from the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., cremations represented the prevailing method of bodily processing.

The differences between the South and Central Eastern regions of inland Thrace during the Late Iron Age are overshadowed by the large amount of cultural upheavals seen within the context of Aegean Thrace. This point should not be understated, as critically the region represents a high ethnic contrast between the Thracian interior. The South Central and the Central Eastern regions suggest additional ethnic differences, despite being in close proximity to one another. Yet, as I suggested at the beginning of this chapter, ethnicity should perhaps be viewed as a graded cultural difference rather than a stark difference as the Barthian framework would suggest. The two ethnic regions from the Thracian interior may be ethnically distinct but they are more similar than any of the material cultural practices occurring near the Aegean coast. Certainly the two interior regions of Thrace share many material types, albeit at varying levels. The only difference being the quantity of these materials and overall preference for methods of bodily processing. Yet, like the corresponding Early Iron Age II period, these local differences between regions of inland Thrace and met with stark differences concerning the new material traditions established on the Aegean coast.

8.5 Who were the Thracians?

The distinction between patterns of artefact distribution and their significance in terms of human interaction and identity has been pursued within the preceding chapters. Between the arbitrarily defined units of South Central, Eastern, Aegean, and South Western Thrace there were clear distinctions in preferences for particular grave-goods, methods of bodily processing, and even architecture which were underpinned by additional regional preferences concerning expressions of cult and pottery style (figure 8.2). Through the archaeological data it was shown that boundaries formed on the basis on material cultures did not exist, and what did exist – in much agreement with Clarke’s (1968, 364) hypothesis – were areas which exhibited varying levels of material overlap, and whose regional identity was expressed through the uniqueness of its collection of preferred material traits (figure 8.3). Indeed, this observation runs contrary to many of the fundamental
critiques levied towards the identification of ethnicities as a reductive manifestation of the ‘culture’ concept, which seeks to define ethnic clusters through clear-cut material dichotomies of similarity and difference (Binford 1972; Childe 1929). Instead, spatial patterning of material culture types, styles, and practices have resulted unquestionably in the identification of distinct regions of material expression. Yet, as was demonstrated, particularly in reference to pottery styles from the Early Iron Age I period and fibulae during the Early Iron Age II, geographic distance should not be used to assume levels of material similarity and dissimilarity, as potters and fibulae manufacturers were clearly reproducing certain styles over large areas.

Figure 8.1: Map of the Balkans showing the four designated ethnic regions in Iron Age Thrace

This evidence – as I have argued in Chapter 4 – stands to suggest that there were four areas which qualify for the identification of ethnic groups in Iron Age Thrace. These regions have repeatedly demonstrated the re-occurrence of material variabilities in terms of the funerary record, but also more broadly in terms of cult sites and pottery styles. Yet, it is not the purpose here to attempt to infer the socio-political nature of these ethnic regions and how they were structured; indeed many discussions concerning ethnicity tend to become discussions surrounding the social structures and institutions
Figure 8.2: Visual depiction of the relationship between artefact-types emergent ethnic groups. As an example, the visualisation uses artefact types from the four ethnic groups in Thrace during the Early Iron Age II period.

Figure 8.3: A visual depiction of the distribution of overlapping cultural packages within the different regions of Thrace, taken from Clarke’s (1968, 311) visual polythetic distribution model.
within which ethnicity operated. Rather, it is the purpose here to infer on the basis of these distinct material regions, that Iron Age Thrace was inhabited by potentially four ethnically diverse regions, and that this specificity is beyond what the ancient literary evidence could have told us. Likewise, I would even question to what extent the ancient Greek historians, who designated the Thracians into ἐθνεά, had the linguistic apparatus available to articulate the social infrastructure of Thracian Iron Age society particularly considering their confusion in depicting their socio-political institutions (cf. Hdt. 7.110).

We are then left with the question: who were the Thracians? The answer, perhaps slightly more confusingly is: not who we thought they were. From the evidence presented as part of this study, it is clear that Iron Age Thrace was home to a number of ethnically diverse regions who had their own methods of doing things. Unsurprisingly, this does not correlate with the tribes that were established within Herodotus’ *Histories*, and it may even be impossible to geographically situate the tribes Herodotus mentioned without the help of additional evidence such as epigraphy and numismatics. Yet, we can say for sure that throughout the Iron Age, there did exist four regions of ethnic difference, which have critically been overlooked until now, with Aegean and inland Thrace representing the strongest regional expressions of ethnic difference than between any of the other regions. Yet, what these regional ethnic differences looked like on the ground and whether or not they were consciously articulated into everyday life cannot be known but only imagined (figure 8.4).

The image of the ‘Thracians’ or, more specifically, members of one of the several ethnic communities from the Iron Age is certainly contrasting. On the one hand, the ancient literary evidence constructs an image of the Thracians which only offers hints to their diversity through their many different depictions, and on the other hand, the archaeology reveals an image of considerable diversity, continuation, and conservatism in terms of the maintenance of certain practices and the change of others. Indeed, we are left with an image of the Thracians from both perspectives which confirm and support each other, and critically each of these perspectives independently offer a unique insight into these Iron Age communities which would have been weaker using only the archaeology

---

2 This is certainly true concerning Clarke (1968, 394-404) himself, who grappled with the concept of group ethnology and its operation within the ‘tribe’ (cf. Hodder 1977, 313-314).

3 Critically, no tribal names are recorded on Greek inscriptions beyond coins. There are examples of historical individuals that have been recorded by the ancient Greek historians, i.e. Teres, Seuthes, and Spardokos but no tribal names, which undermines the possible idea that the names ascribed to Thracian communities during the corresponding Late Iron Age were recognised and used by people on the ground (cf. Graninger 2018, 178-194; Dana 2015, 245-253).
Figure 8.4: Hypothetical illustration of how these different materially based ethnicities may have expressed themselves through their adornments. The objects the figures are wearing correlate with items of wearable jewellery found in each grave. Drawing developed from (Arnold 2012, 103)
8.6 Between the Archaeology and the Ancient Literary Evidence

Since Chapter 2, I argued that the origins of how the Thracians were depicted are to be found more broadly within the concept of ancient Greek ethnicity. Beyond this, the broader socio-political situation of the 5th century B.C. – post-Persian wars – worked as a catalyst for the construction of a Hellenic ethnicity, as echoed in Herodotus’ (8.144.2) account. Members of Herodotus’ newly articulated Hellenic *ethnos* were attributed with a consistent series of essential attributes, i.e., language, kinship, the same gods, and the same ways of life. Yet, from an investigation into these tropes and beyond it was shown that they served more to distinguish and separate the Thracians than bind them as a consistent whole. Indeed, from the literary perspective we can say that the Thracians were as different as they were numerous, as shown through their many different socio-political formations, cultural practices, and elite descent groups. This is something the archaeology could never have told us. The nuances of social and political life in Thrace as seen through Greek eyes is crucial in providing another perspective to what we know about these ancient communities, which enriches rather than detracts from the corresponding image as ascertained using archaeological evidence.

Through the written testimonies of Xenophon, Thucydides, and particularly Herodotus we become aware that these northern communities did indeed participate in difference cultural traditions which, from the perspectives of outsiders, marked them as distinct. These discursive and embodied differences through culture were obviously important for these communities in defining themselves. Certainly Herodotus confirmed this by identifying these differences in the face of Thracian cultural unity. Similarly, we also know from Herodotus and Thucydides that the Thracian elite were, by the 5th century, beginning to conceptualise themselves as ethnically distinct. Beyond ascribing this practice to any specific Thracian community, the notable inclusion by two ancient authors only supports the idea that the social landscape of Thrace was divided along many ethnic lines, and this ethnic differentiation supports the corresponding archaeological observations made

---

4 Although Herodotus does not even mention the enigmatic ‘Thracian language’ (or the ‘Thracian address’) which is referenced once within Euripides’ *Rhesus* (Eur. *Rhes*, 284), despite the fact that we now know that one did exist as evidence by inscriptions from Zonê and Samothrace.
Yet we must remember that although supportive, these impressions left to us are only given through Greek eyes, and whether the Thracians actually defined themselves as such is still out of the reach of our current literary-based understanding. Although critically, this was not the aim of this project. Echoing a point made by Siapkas (2014), in identifying ethnicity, we use our concept against those in the past in order to conceptualise what we would now call ethnic groups. What this project was not attempting to ascertain is whether a Thracian thought they were a Thracian, or an Odrysian an Odrysian. The literary record has been incredibly useful to this extent in helping identify something the archaeology could not, i.e., a contemporary understanding of how these communities differentiated themselves along cultural lines.

Perhaps then it can be said that with the literary and the archaeological evidence together, two perspectives at different scales are appreciated; on the one hand, literary accounts of ancient Thrace offer a nuanced and intimate perspective of the Thracians, recording them distinct, but critically helping elucidate the nuanced and intricate series of practices and ways of living which defined them; on the other hand, the archaeological image of Thrace provides additional but different, and broader picture about the particular ethnic expression of these communities, how they materially represented themselves, and how this differed between each region through time. This distinction could even be defined as an etic and emic one on the basis that one is from the perspective of the inside looking out and the other is from the outside looking in. By equal measure, therefore, we can appreciate that each perspective offers a significant but no-less valuable insight into ethnic life in Thrace. We can say for certain that the Thracians had a very salient ethnic form within the mindset of the ancient Greeks and certainly for audiences of ancient Greek drama. From the perspective of the archaeology and the theoretical framework used within this thesis, however, these ethnicities were of course more nuanced and more detailed; overlapping material variabilities along with continuities and discontinuities in material practice could be mapped and measured, offering important evidence in support of the expression of ethnic identities between several regions across Thrace as a whole. The majority of such evidence came before the literary accounts of Thrace, but it has been demonstrated that across several periods, ethnic distinctions have been maintained and developed in different areas in Thrace as a result of the moving of peoples and material culture, beyond what the ancient literary evidence could tell us.
Overall, I hope I have proved or at least contested within this thesis, that there is no singular discourse through which ethnicity should be investigated. Contrary to past attitudes concerning archaeology which contended that it was merely the “...handmaiden of history”, both text and material evidence within have served to more fully understand the Thracians and have thus far complemented each other by offering two perspective which neither discipline could have held independently (cf. Hume 1964, 215-255). On account of the evidence that both of these lines of academic discourse offer, Thrace clearly displays a strong ethnic significance. From the Greek perspective, Thrace was a dynamic ethnic entity which created its identity in many of the same ways and methods that were used further south. The archaeology complements this view of active ethnic dynamism by underscoring the consistent regional ethnic continuities and discontinuities which are shared and restricted throughout Thrace consistently from the Early Iron Age I to the Late Iron Age periods.

8.7 The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Thoughts After the Study

In many respects there have been two lines of argument here concerning ethnicity and the Thracians. It was argued in Chapter 3 that the Thracians were depicted through a series of consistent ethnic stereotypes that the Greeks came to call ‘Thracian’ and on the other hand it was demonstrated above that Iron Age Thrace consisted of a series of ethnically diverse regions that consistently maintained independent material traditions during the Iron Age. What I am not suggesting is that somehow these groups thought of themselves as ‘Thracian’, this is beyond the remit of our understanding and lacks evidence, nor am I suggesting that the communities living within Thrace maintained a conscious sense of our concept of ethnicity through the ways they buried members of their community. What I am suggesting from the analytical framework of this thesis and the results from the earlier chapters, is simply that what the communities within the regions did with their dead mattered to them, and that the grave-goods, monuments they created, and methods they processed the body through were not arbitrary but carefully selected. These aspects of burial mattered and had an enduring significance for the communities within the region, precisely due to the context in which they occupied relating to the burial of the dead (cf. Tarlow et al. 2000; Tarlow 2012). From this perspective, these practices are highly localised and reflect the desires, traditions, and shared beliefs of the wider community, which I have argued is, therefore, reflective of
underlying ethnic identity.

Reconstructing ethnic identities based on broader associations and relationships between ways of doing things and people is particularly important and not, as I hope I have demonstrated, an impossible task. Yet despite often being the subject of critical scrutiny and dismissal, ethnic identity can provide ways through which archaeologists can interpret how identities operated in the past and the ways they manifested though the material context in order to express similarity and difference to those around.

The ethnic meaning of various overlapping material culture traits, of one group's ethnic package or another, were significantly constructed and re-constructed as observed through both the changing and constant material practices throughout the first millennium B.C. It is only through such an approach that the distribution and variation of material culture can be identified as directly relating to the formation of ethnicity. Such variations must form part of future analyses instead of being considered as 'unreliable' or 'too descriptive'. The theoretical framework submitted in this thesis holds that assumption accountable, and questions its validity when such important patterns can be seen archaeologically with the right tools and questions. Moreover, there is a critical need – as shown by J. Hall's (2002) comments – to revise our theoretical preconceptions.

Through a contextual re-examination of key variables, a complex and heterogeneous set of artefact patterns was observed, which experienced a cultural shift during the Early Iron Age II to Late Iron Age. The heterogeneity in regional artefact assemblage data between sites in different regions can be better understood using the theory of ethnicity developed here, rather than through the simple spreading of stylistic motifs as demonstrated by Nikov (2011). Any simplistic correlation which identifies the material culture of Thrace as Thracian must be, therefore, rejected as well as the ethno-political identities such as Triballian, Diian, or Odrysian questioned without parallel epigraphic or numismatic evidence. Yet, changes in the material culture of Thrace do reflect shifts in the articulation of different kinds of ethnic identities in the past, i.e. the development of Greek colonial interests in Aegean Thrace – which we know also from ancient literary evidence – corresponding directly to shifts in the articulation of new forms of material identities, through which old ideas of identity were transformed in a series of new distinct material traditions.

Variations in methods of bodily processing and grave-goods in certain regions and its absence in others are likely to have been the result of different types of ethnic identi-
ties. Yet, variations expressed through other aspects of objects, like pottery and fibulae types, cut across regions of distinction to form part of a broader set of identities, beyond the local level. Thus, different configurations of ethnicity were expressed with different aspects of material culture. The palimpsest of traditions, therefore, within which ‘Thracian’ identity was constructed appears to have been appropriated by regions consisting of several independent material packages concerning both the funerary context and beyond it. Furthermore, what archaeologists and indeed ancient literary authors have regarded as ‘Thracian’ has been shown not to be a consistent whole. Rather this was formed of varying configurations of material expression between regions which I have shown.

The relationship, therefore, between these lines of evidence prompts the identification of ethnic groups most strongly between the regions of South Central, South Western, Eastern, and Aegean Thrace which has not been articulated until now. Between these regions, significant differences of material traditions serve to emphasise important ideological differences. As stated within Chapter 4, beyond a simple Barthian model of identifying ethnic self-definition of boundaries, my polythetic definition has been able to encompass the larger and multivariate social process connected with the material expressions of the funerary ritual. What has been shown within this thesis is that despite the sharing of material artefacts and artefact styles, areas could also have contrasted in terms of methods of processing the body or funerary architecture. In many ways, this is in agreement with what Jones (1997) was attempting to articulate, i.e., that ethnic identities are constituted of many overlapping layers of shared and independent ways of doing things, and it is only when these ways of doing things are grouped and then plotted against broader material phenomena that regions of alterity and similarity can be realised.

Nevertheless, there is still a lot left to be desired about the Thracians that the archaeology has not been able to tell us yet, but what the ancient literary evidence has. This specifically concerns the many ways through which these communities lived and organised themselves, and the beliefs that they held which bound them together. The shared nomoi, as mapped within Chapter 3, is perhaps impossible to capture in equally as fine detail as has been documented by the likes of Herodotus. This is where J. Hall’s (1997; 2002) comments can, admittedly, finally be appreciated. Indeed, there is a certain level of detail we fundamentally miss when dealing solely with the archaeological evidence, that is correspondingly so richly captured by text. Yet all is not necessarily lost.
I would argue that a large component of this study has been to bring out new evidence in support of the literary evidence rather than in alienation of it. The literary evidence, as established in Chapter 3, has been fundamental in understanding the nuanced and, at times, confusing nature of how the Thracians were conceptualised in the eyes of the Greeks, shifting from an *ethnos* to a *genos*, with attributed mythical and divine ancestors (cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1090; Hdt. 5.7; 7.110-111). Indeed, the inconsistency and diversity of Thracian depictions within Greek literature stands as proof that their ancient reception was no less contested and hotly debated. Helpfully, with the archaeology we are able to cross reference these Thracian images. Whilst they may have been somewhat ethnically ambiguous to external Greek audiences, the archaeology reveals a no less dynamic and ongoing process of identity maintenance involving numerous material traditions and this, critically, has not been explicitly articulated before within scholarly literature surrounding these communities.

8.8 Further Observations

Since it has now been established that Thrace consisted of a series of regionally distinct ethnic groups, I want to dedicate the final parts of this chapter to discuss an important theme found within this thesis, and what implications it may have for our understanding of Thrace and Thracian society, in particular concerning fibulae and what enduring additional implications this items may have for our understanding of ethnic diversity within the region.

8.9 Fibulae and Dress

It is now certainly undeniable that Thracian fibulae experienced a sort of social explosion during the course of the Early Iron Age II. As has been recently argued by Buston (2019, 272, 292), fibulae popularity and variety were underpinned by emerging social ideologies, which used fibulae as vehicles of status competition but also as objects with particular relational agency. Yet despite recent discussions surrounding Iron Age fibulae, Thracian fibulae and fibulae as indicators of both ethnicity, or more broadly identity, have seldom been discussed at all within anglophone academia, with the exception of work conducted by Dimova (2014, 33-47). It is, therefore, the reason why I shall attempt to situate the results from the investigation into Thracian fibulae here into its appropriate social
historical setting, with the aim of discussing more broadly the implications this has for future work and for the study of emerging ethnic consciousness during the Iron Age.

As stated above, fibulae experienced a great deal of popularity within most regions of Thrace during the Early Iron Age II period, contributing to at least 10 percent of the total assemblage data from the regions analysed during this time, and this continues into the Late Iron Age. Yet, strangely – given their continued popularity in Thrace – they are conspicuously absence within the written historical accounts of the region by ancient Greek authors.\footnote{Both times Thracian dress is discussed by near contemporary writers of Herodotus and Xenophon, no brooches are discussed at all (Xen. \textit{Anab.}\,7.4.4; Hdt. 7.75).} Concerning fibulae in Thrace, the only explicit reference that is available is from Euripides’ \textit{Hecuba} (1145), specifically when the Thracian Polymestor is blinded by one. However, the women preforming the blinding are not ‘Thracian’, rather they are Trojan, and if these objects were worn in Thrace as suggested by the funerary evidence surely then Polymestor would be wearing one or more himself? This absence is compounded within recent discussion on dress within the ancient world and its connection with the literary evidence. Llewellyn-Jones (2003) adds an explanation in remedy of this noticeable void, adding that the literary evidence only informs us about such specific objects if they are used within the narrative, i.e. when they are being used to blind Polymestor (see also Brøns 2014, 61). Additional critique of the ancient literary record has also been offered by Gleba (2008), who has articulately critiqued the reliance on ancient literary evidence as proof of ancient dress, adding that information given by the ancient authors is often very non-specific and should not be taken, therefore, at face value.

Beyond the ancient Greek literary evidence, however, several depictions of fibulae have been found on examples of Attic pottery during the corresponding Thracian Late Iron Age. Many of these examples have formed part of Brøns’ (2014) impressive study of the depiction of brooches in the ancient world, therefore, I shall not document them here, but I will note critically that none of the corresponding vase paintings that have survived from antiquity with depictions of fibulae reflect examples that we know were being circulated during this time in Thrace. Despite this, examples of fibulae discovered in Greece have been found on pottery (Brøns 2014, 67, 86).

In order to find contemporary depictions of fibulae, we must turn eastwards towards Anatolia, and beyond to Persepolis. Perhaps the oldest known depiction of fibulae is of a supposed ‘Phrygian-type’ from the Khorsabad frieze at the Palace of Sargon II.
in east Syria, which dates roughly to around the 8th century B.C. (Muscarella 1967). Notably, this type of fibulae also appears a century later on the Apadana reliefs and on the ‘Throne room’ of Artaxerxes I, and what is notable about these reliefs is that clothing and items like fibulae have been used to characterise the representatives from each of the regions of the Persian Empire (Schmidt 1953). More importantly for this study were the depictions found in the so-called Throne Room. On these reliefs two representatives are found to be wearing distinctive fibulae; no. W5, who has been identified as ‘Cappadocian’ (inhabitants of modern-day central Turkey) and wears a medium length cloak which is fastened by a fibula; and representative no. W12, who has been identified as a ‘Scythian’, or a ‘Skudrian’ – an ethnonym that has been linked to the Thracians – who wears much the same as no. W5. It is here we find distinctive parallels with Thrace. Firstly it must be stated that the ethnic designation of the subjects depicted on the Persepolis reliefs should not be taken at face value. Indeed they are approximations based on the clothing that they wear, and in this instance both members no. W5 and no. W12 are dressed in much the same way, despite being labelled differently. Yet an unique additional observation can be offered here; that is, that these two people could be Thracian. Indeed, the fibulae being worn by representatives no. W12 and no. W5 both find similar expression within inland Thrace, specifically concerning Late Iron Age types iii.1 and pod.1.2 (figure 8.5). By equal measure, the fibulae being worn by the ‘leader of the Cappadocians’ on the Apadana stairs finds similar – albeit slightly earlier – types from examples discovered in Turkey and Asia Minor, specifically the aii.3.kugelgliedern and the paf.aiv4 types. In relation to its chronological placement of the depicted fibulae, we know that building efforts began surrounding Persepolis started around 518 B.C., and finally completed during the reign of Artaxerxes I around the end of the 6th and firmly in the 5th century, which excitingly places the similar-style fibulae as almost contemporary with these Late Iron Age examples in Thrace. This is critical to note.

Clearly from the perspective of the Achaemenid elite at Persepolis, the power of the kings rule was depicted with the diverse range of ethnic groups portrayed under its rule. This indeed is the nature of the reliefs at Persepolis, which depict gifts being offered to the king (Schmidt 1953). Moreover, this cultural diversity was, in turn, clearly expressed.

---

6For the parallels between Thrace and the erroneous Satrapy of Skudra see Balcer (1988). It is also worth noting that fibulae are not common within corresponding Late Iron Age Scythian graves. Minns (1913, 126) notes that La Tène fibulae appear in Scythian kurgans around modern-day Ukraine, but these date to around the 4th-3rd centuries B.C., and this is supported by recent excavations around the Dnieper (Sinika 2017; Sinika & Telnov 2017). The parallels between the fibulae on the reliefs and similar examples from Thrace, therefore, should not be overlooked.
Figure 8.5: Corresponding Late Iron Age inland Thrace fibulae with similar examples found at Persepolis: A) Throne-bearer no.W5; B) Throne-bearer no.W12; C) leader of the Cappadocians, eastern staircase of Apadana (after Brøns 2014, 83).
on the reliefs through a series of visual schema like clothing and accessories, which not only gave hints about where a person came from, but also more interestingly suggests that the observer of the frieze would have been able to articulate where these people came from as well. This is not unlike the sort of visual schema that we find in Greece as well. For example we know from Attic pottery that depictions of Scythians, Amazonians, and indeed Thracians all exhibit unique and carefully depicted types of clothing in order to underpin their character (cf. Brøns 2014; Gleba 2008). Indeed it was even pointed out in Chapter 3 that this has been used in relation to the depiction of Thracian women and their visual association with tattoos. Nevertheless, these observations ultimately lead to two conclusions; firstly, it is clear from the depiction of specific fibulae that these items did indeed matter, even beyond the immediate kinship group using these items as grave-goods; secondly, and in continuation of this point, fibulae could then potentially signal where you came from; and thirdly, on the basis of different fibulae being represented on the supposed Scythian and Skudrian in the Throne Room (see Schmidt 1953), there was also clearly an awareness and a visual connection between object types and ethnic identity well into the 5th century B.C.

If we are able assume that Late Iron Age Skudrian/Thracian fibulae were implicated in the signification of particular ethnicity identities as suggested at Persepolis during the corresponding Late Iron Age, then this has additional implications for how we conceive of the data from the preceding periods in Thrace. Looking back slightly earlier in time during the Early Iron Age II, I have already demonstrated that fibulae regionally varied both in terms of style and length, and these variations also seemed to have been underpinned by additional regional cultural variabilities. Therefore, it may not be too much of a conceptual leap to assume that styles of fibulae may have served, at least on some level, as potential markers of regional identity, both inside and outside of Thrace, and this is beyond what the ancient literary evidence has been able to tell us. Whether this was realised locally, or only conceptualised on a supra-regional level cannot be securely assumed. It would be helpful to imagine that someone wearing a fibulae from the South Central region who travelled to Aegean Thrace or Macedonia would perhaps notice objective differences between fibulae styles across regions. Yet we must not forget that despite seeing patterns of regional material variability on a broad level, this need not directly corresponded to the daily material conditions of life for Early Iron Age life. A good example this comes from a communal burial mound no.2, grave 4 at a cemetery
near Kochan in the South Western region. Here four different styles of fibulae were found (the aii.3.g, ai.2.b, bi.2.g, and aiii.1) associated with a single grave (Gergova 1987, 30-31). This is perhaps the most extreme example of fibulae variation with an associated inhumation out of this study, yet it stands to suggest that despite broad-scale regional variability and patterns of preference and difference, material variation at ground level at least could have been considerably more nuanced than we initially appreciate.

There is still a lot to be desired in relation to Iron Age dress in Thrace. The corresponding patchy, inconsistent, and often incompletely published excavation reports do not offer much solace in terms of a sufficient answer. Yet, at least what I have attempt to show here, and more broadly within this project was that fibulae during the Iron Age, and especially during the Early Iron Age, did indeed regionally matter to the communities living there. Different types and sizes were maintained and regional differences were strongly observed. These differences were also observable in relation to other variables during the Early Iron Age II like the differences concerning the weights of loom weights, which was established to be heavier in inland Thrace, perhaps corresponding to larger fibulae, and potentially differences in dress.

Vase painting along with ancient literary evidence offer vague and generalised accounts of ancient dress, and seldom ever mention fibulae. Yet from a study of Early Iron Age II and Late Iron Age fibulae from Thrace demonstrate that despite being overlooked or marginally portrayed by Greek authors or playwrights, fibulae obviously played an important part in the regional identities of those who wore them. Much further work is still to be undertaken on this topic and questions such as ‘who made the fibulae’, ‘how did styles travel’, and ‘to what extent the fibulae that were discovered and included in this study repaired and recirculated’ are still in desperate need of answering. Yet, with strikingly similar fibulae being found on potential ‘Thracians’ at Persepolis, along with the Early Iron Age II regional variation between inland Thrace and other parts of the northern Aegean, we can begin to presume that fibulae played more of a significant role in the signification of ethnic sentiments of ethnic self-representation, and this is an important point to remember.

---

7Excitingly, Buston (2019) claimed to have identified evidence of ‘repaired’ and ‘re-circulated’ Iron Age fibulae in Greece, which if applied to Iron Age Thrace would provide additional interesting perspectives concerning the possible longevity of certain types.
8.10 Concluding Remarks

There is much work still to be done concerning the identity of the Thracians yet I hope that an important step has been undertaken here in deconstructing what we have currently assumed about the communities who were labelled by that name. Using the methodology constructed in Chapter 4, four distinct ethnic regions existed within Iron Age Thrace, that is Aegean, South Central, Eastern, and South Western Thrace. In each of these respective regions, significant variations could be seen in terms of the types of grave-goods included within burials, the architecture of the tombs of the area, and the ways the body had been processed after death. Yet, these pieces of evidence were then underpinned by additional regional concentrations concerning cult places and pottery styles. Throughout the Iron Ages these traditions were strengthened and weakened with additional traditions concerning fibulae and pottery styles being used to articulate newly established identities. Archaeology and ancient literary evidence has been successfully used during the process of this study, which have enabled a new and exciting conceptualisation of the Thracians to be articulated.
Chapter 9

Summary and Conclusion

Within the final chapter of this thesis, I shall briefly summarise what had been argued within each of the chapters up to this point. This is critical if we are to fully conceptualise the totality of the argument since Chapter 1. Thereafter, I shall explore some of the enduring themes of the thesis and the scope for future work as a result of it. In relation to this, three points in particular will be discussed; the lasting impressions created by the theoretical debate, new conceptualisations of the Thracian archaeology after the elucidation of new data within anglophone academia, and the enduring difficulties this thesis had in attempting to coalesce written histories with the archaeological evidence.

It is hoped that by finishing this study on some final impressions that it may help future work on the topic by extending the types of analyses and investigates undertaken here.

9.1 Summary

9.1.1 Chapter 1

Chapter 1 established the need for a renewed investigation into the Thracians and more broadly, further scrutiny of their identity within anglophone academia. Another problem that the chapter outlined was the need to synthesise the two disparate archaeological traditions which separate Thrace today; those of Greece and Bulgaria. During the chapter, I established the geographical and chronological scope of the thesis which identified the divergent chronological traditions between Greek and Bulgarian archaeology. The geographical extent, as previously explained was tricky to define, as questions relating to where the Thracians begin and where they ended is still as much of a topic of debate today as it was in the past. The chronological scale of the thesis was no less complicated,
and it was demonstrated that Thrace currently straddles two archaeological traditions which deal with the question of chronology in two very different ways. On the one hand, Thracian Iron Age chronologies have been created using a myriad of artefact typologies to varying degrees of success (cf. Bozhinova 2012), meanwhile chronological developments to the south have been influenced by the likes of connoisseurship and text based synchronisms which, I argued, has negatively impacted the success to which it can be applied to the archaeology of Thrace. In order to remedy this, I suggested that a new scientific chronology, based on radiocarbon samples from various sites around north and south Bulgaria (Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2018) should be used in order to overcome the fragmented chronological resolution created by the two pre-existing traditional chronologies on either side of the Thracian border.

9.1.2 Chapter 2

Chapter 2 investigates the ethnic claims made by the likes using Herodotus’ (8.144.2) attributed speech as a framework of analysis. The chapter opens by trying to understand complicated Greek ethnic terminology like *ethnos* and *genos* within the context of ancient Greek literature during the 5th century B.C. I note here that authors like Herodotus have depicted the Thracians as a bounded *ethnos* (Hdt. 5.3), whilst also a series of distinct *ethnea*. In light of this, I proceed to discuss the ethnic criteria for binding social groups as listed by Herodotus (8.144). However, I discuss the context of this remark and the possible implications such context has for the speech itself. Beyond this, I proceed to investigate how the Thracians have been ethnically depicted through criteria like shared culture and mythic descent. It was then identified that behind such criteria which often attempted to group the Thracians as a consistent whole, actually served to highlight their variability and distinctiveness. In this respect ‘territory’ was also briefly discussed, especially in relation to Herodotus, as offering further proof of the Thracians’ ethnic disunity and variability. Thereafter I moved onto other evidence to support the initial observations of Thracian variability. This was undertaken using coin evidence but also some results from the IACP. Henceforth it was argued that corresponding ancient evidence offered supporting perspectives concerning Thracian variability and distinctiveness.
Chapter 9. Summary and Conclusion

9.1.3 Chapter 3

As it was established how the Thracians were ethnically constructed in antiquity, Chapter 3 focused on establishing a definition of ethnicity which could identify these communities within the archaeological evidence. Building on work previously established by Jones (1997), the chapter concentrated on further developing theories of ethnicity which had been largely overlooked since their publication during the late 1990s. I began the chapter by mapping the origins of the formalised study of ethnicity within anthropology beginning with E. Leach’s (1954) *Political Systems in Highland Burma* and Evans-Pritchard’s (1940) *The Nuer*. Whilst mapping its development through anthropological literature, I showed that – at least within anthropological circles – the study of ethnicity began with identifying its material expression within the context of ‘traditional societies’. This was the case *par excellence* in Barth’s (1969) seminal publication *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, which identified the prevalence of self-conscious boundary maintenance within the context of pre-industrial economic change. After the 1960s, however, I demonstrated that anthropological debates surrounding ethnicity, became increasingly concerned with its formation within the context of an increasingly globalised and interconnected world.

Beyond Barth (1969), therefore, I argued that archaeology had borrowed very little from contemporary anthropology, due mostly to the different ways archaeology as a discipline has developed. Through this, I argued that archaeology has taken a radically different approach to the topic of ethnicity and its identification, and broadly speaking it was argued that archaeological concepts of ethnicity originated within the discussions of the cultural historical paradigm, which directly equated certain people (race) with certain cultures. V. G. Childe (1935, 198-19) was one of the main components in regards to this new theoretical and methodological trend, who also sought to gradually dismantle this rhetoric by separating ‘race’ from concepts from conceptualisations of the past, through defining past cultures as ‘ethnic’.

After Childe (1935), the disentanglement between the concept of ‘people as culture’ was only fully acted upon again, in the work of G. Clarke (1968) within his *Analytical Archaeology* which focused on an increasingly positivist and quantifiable methodology. Clarke’s (1968, 37-38) answer was to define cultures as ‘polythetic’, which meant that it consisted of a group of entities which shared many attributes, yet whose attributes were not sufficient or necessary for group membership.

As the debate stands today, I argued that there is still a persistent gap between what
we think ethnicity is, and how it is linked/expressed through material culture. Despite the conclusions made by ethnoarchaeological studies from the 1980s – which identified the mobilisation of identities through both artefacts and artefact styles – no concrete definition of ethnicity had yet been formally introduced into academic discourse. I argue, therefore, that there is a need for a more practical conceptualisation of ethnicity, beyond Jones (1997), which overcomes many of the critiques that have been attributed to it. In response to this need, I defined a criteria using which ethnicity could be observed within the material record. Specifically, through the complex material ‘packages’ of overlapping material traditions.

9.1.4 Chapter 4

After discussing the nuts and bolts of the theoretical framework – which would be implemented within Chapter 8 – it was then time to outline how the thesis would analyse the data feeding into the wider discussion, involving the ethnicities of Iron Age communities in Thrace. Chapter 4 was, therefore, dedicated to establishing the methods of data analysis within the thesis. Within the chapter, I stated that I would be explicitly focusing on the funerary assemblage (consisting of tomb architecture, grave-goods, and the body itself) as the main context of analysis. It was important here to also show how I was dividing up Thrace into analytical units, which I undertook arbitrarily with the explicit hope that small-scale variabilities would be suppressed at a broader level to reveal regions of similarity and difference. Likewise, I also used this section to discuss the quantitative techniques which were more suitable for the analysis of different types of key variables, involving univariate, bivariate, and multivariate modes of analyses.

9.1.5 Chapter 5

Within the previous chapter, I specify that I was going concentrate on the funerary assemblage as the main context of investigation. However, beyond the funerary evidence there is a wealth of data which exhibits additional strong regional variations that could be used as evidence towards the signification of ethnic identity. Consequently, Chapter 5 was spent signposting other material variabilities beyond the funerary context, like pottery styles and cult places to further support claims that Thrace consisted of a socially diverse landscape.

The chapter found that during the Iron Age, material regionalisms could be observed.
This specifically pertained to pottery styles during the Early Iron Age I period, Tsepina pottery during the Early Iron Age II-Late Iron Age period, pit sanctuaries, peak sanctuaries, and rock-cut niches during the Early Iron Age II-Late Iron Ages. It was then concluded that on the basis of numerous expressions of regional material variabilities, that we could begin to see evidence of distinct material regions through the material evidence.

9.1.6 Chapter 6

This was in many ways stage 1 of the investigation into the funerary context. The chapter was dedicated to analysing the spatial distribution of different types of funerary architecture in Thrace during the Iron Age. The chapter defined 6 key types of architecture that could be mapped in Thrace: pithoi graves, dolmens, rock-cut graves, cist graves, cairn graves, and built graves. The aim of the chapter was similar to the previous chapter, as it documented the spatial distribution of each tomb type in Thrace, in order to distinguish whether or not distinct regional clustering of particular tomb types could be observed.

The chapter also spent time discussing the particular architectural features which made these forms unique and analysed how each of the types were distributed throughout Thrace. It was found that built graves did not seem to exhibit any sort of strong regional concentration in Thrace. However, the rest of the architectural types that were analysed did in fact express strong regional variations.

9.1.7 Chapter 7

Following the analysis of the spatial distribution of tomb types in Thrace, Chapter 7 set out to analyse quantities and types of grave-goods and methods of bodily processing from each of the arbitrarily defined units of analysis. Critically, this chapter took a specifically socio-analytical approach to the question of regional material variability, with its analysis of grave-goods and methods of bodily processing.

To begin, the chapter highlighted the different types of grave-goods which exhibited a relative proportion of over 10 percent and compared these results to other pre-defined units within the same time period. This was undertaken during each of the three periods under analysis, i.e., Early Iron Age I, Early Iron Age II, and Late Iron Age, in order to identify historical changes in identified material variabilities.
During this analysis, fibulae were also analysed as a mini case study in order to assess whether they exhibit similar patterns of variation that had been expressed with the Chapters 6 and 7. The object case study was split into two parts, consisting of data from the Early Iron Age II and Late Iron Age periods. During this analysis, 600 fibulae samples were collected from Thrace, Aegean Turkey, Macedonia, and the Aegean Islands which were then analysed in terms of style and length in order to underpin the analysis of grave-goods.

Thereafter, the chapter moved onto its final part; the analysis of methods of bodily processing in Thrace. During this part of the chapter, overall percentages of mortuary data were presented from each of the arbitrary analytical units through turnery graphs. The graphs were made up of three of the main methods of bodily processing, i.e. cremation, whole inhumation, and partial inhumation, and this was also undertaken within each of the periods under analysis akin to the earlier grave-goods section.

Overall the results from the chapter supported additional patterns highlighted in Chapters 5 and 6 by demonstrating that strong regional material variabilities can be observed. More specifically, it was shown that material regions were not established via the creation of boundaries, rather regional variations were made clear through a unique series of shared overlapping material distributions, which I had previous argued in Chapter 3, was crucial in understanding how ethnic units could be observed through the archaeological record.

9.1.8 Chapter 8

Henceforth, I attempted to elaborate further on the implications that these materialities have for the study of ethnicity within Iron Age Thrace. In order to assess this explicitly, I first re-establish how we are meant to view and understand ethnicity through the archaeological record in light of what I had previous discussed in Chapter 3. After this, I discussed each of the chronological periods that were under analysis and how ethnicity is expressed during each of them. In doing so, I attempt to link-up material developments that were originally mapped during Chapters 5 and 6 with the results from Chapter 7, in order to create a coherent historical narrative concerning the development of ethnicity within the context of Iron Age Thrace, with specific focus on how this was expressed, and how this changed.

Thereafter, I turned my attention to the question:‘who were the Thracians’. This
was undertaken in light of the theory developed within Chapter 3, and it was discussed what new light Chapter 7 could shed on the depiction of the Thracians, when compared to their ancient stereotype produced by the ancient historical authors as discussed in Chapter 2. It was then argued that – using the theoretical framework in Chapter 3 – four distinct ethnic regions of Thrace can be defined as repeatedly expressing themselves throughout the Iron Age. This was not too dissimilar from the image of the Thracians that we receive from the ancient historians, who characterise them as an incredibly diverse series of communities. From this perspective it was understood that each of the avenues of academic inquiry offer contextually different but complementary understandings of the past, and this is critical to be understood in order to articulate a more nuanced perspective of social groups in the past.

9.2 Conclusion

Through a mixture of historical and archaeological evidence, I have attempted to holistically assess the reality behind the expression of ancient ethnicity. This was undertaken by examining existing historical and archaeological approaches, in order to assess whether or not the Thracians could be discussed in ethnic terms, and whether material ethnic expressions could be observed using an updated statistical and theoretical framework.

One of the main points within this thesis was that ethnic identity was an ongoing process of choice and symbolic signification of material culture. The importance of this thesis, however, lay not just with the propagation of previously agreed definitions of ethnicity, but in outlining a series of new archaeologically applicable classifications. This was in order to make its use in archaeology less abstract and more practical. Hereafter, I will discuss some of the lasting impressions and contributions that this thesis has made in updating the concept of ethnicity within archaeology, what this study tells us about the communities living in Thrace during the Iron Age, and what has been achieved in attempting to utilise both history and archaeology as tools of academic inquiry.

9.3 An improved theoretical framework

A clearer picture of the historical narrative in the (pre)historic Balkans is one achievement of this thesis, yet it is not the only important insight gained from the material evidence. A central point here was the identification of ethnicity through the archaeo-
logical evidence, and at its core was the issue of how social groups expressed themselves and with what objects and practices revealed themselves, with particular emphasis on how these practices changed over time. I argued within this thesis that identifying ethnic behaviour can be an archaeological issue, yet I contended that it critically needs a more nuanced understanding of how it operated and expressed itself, beyond how it has been discussed in the past (cf. Jones 1997; Broodbank 2004; Hall 2002). The hitherto creation of a descent-based definition of ethnicity as proposed by J. Hall (1997) had significant implications for the engagement and lasting legacy of ethnicity in relation to the ancient literary record. Much to the detriment of archaeology, J. Hall chose to exclude it on the basis of its inability to aid in the identification of key ethnic components, like mythic descent.

It was demonstrated that in the last decade, typological approaches to ‘reading’ ethnic expression through archaeological contexts did not work (cf. Curta 2011a; Härke 1990). This is not to suggest that the act of classifying artefacts and mapping their distributions did not reveal important insights into behaviours underlying these patterns, yet these types of investigations were not sufficient for ascertaining ethnic sentiment through the archaeological record.

The theoretical framework modified within this thesis, therefore, updates the discussion around ethnicity in archaeology on the basis that it acknowledges that the key to ethnicity was to be found within the overlapping distinctive material distributions between regions. Yet these distributions were not solely concerned with artefact types, which would have relegated the theory to propagating a similar culture/people assumption which ethnicity is often perceived as being in archaeology. Conceptually, the framework used here allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the expression of ethnicity through ‘packages’ of variability which included object variations, architectural differences, and variations concerning methods of processing human remains. Ultimately, all of these processes of variation of objects, context, and material practice were considered when assessing areas of ethnic difference, which is held together by several different, non-essential types of material practice.

Building on what Jones (1997) created within her own work, I hope that by establishing a loose criteria within this thesis for its identification, it has opened up the doors for this theory to be used by other areas of archaeology beyond Thrace in order to test its feasibility and use for establishing ethnicity elsewhere. Yet what is fundamental to
remember for the future of the study of ethnicity within archaeology is, if we are to advance its use, that there needs to be a series of set definitions which are continually used and built on. This is in order to transcend the abundance of purely descriptive models which plague theories like ethnicity in archaeology, and to create a method of looking for ethnicity that allows for a more standardised approach.

9.4 New Horizons for the Thracian Iron Age

From the beginning of this thesis it has been repeatedly emphasised how the Thracians have been overlooked within the Aegean. From this perspective, I hope this thesis has contributed to the narrative of the Iron Age Balkans through combining data from two disparate archaeological traditions, in order to form a more complete picture of the past. Within this section I wish to reflect on some of the important implications that this study has had on how we conceptualise the Iron Age in Thrace.

The past decade has witnessed a slew of papers which have taken the ethnic autonomy of 5th century tribes within Thrace at face-value, on account of them existing within the ancient literary evidence (cf. Delev 2007, 85-106; 2012; 2014; Yanakieva 2017, 91-94; 2018). Within Chapter 5, I also demonstrated that additional attempts had been made by the likes of Nikov (2011) to support the idea of tribal diversity in Thrace during the Early Iron Age II on the basis of the distribution of pottery styles. Yet, as it was later demonstrated with the help of GIS and data compiled by Czyborra (2001), these regions either did not exist – in the same way that Nikov (2011) had imagined – or they were much more nuanced. Clearly, the idea that during the Iron Age, regions displayed high degrees of material variabilities, had been brewing within the minds of Thracian archaeologists. Yet, until now this question has neither been formally articulated nor a methodology created, which has left many pieces of work – which have attempted to touch on the idea – lacking verifiable data beyond the descriptive level (Archibald 1998; Delev 2007; Yanakieva 2017; 2018).

This project has – it is hoped – contributed in part to the lively discourse concerning Thracian identities. Yet, it is not just within Bulgarian Thrace that I hope I have contributed, Aegean Thrace as well has been perhaps one of the most overlooked areas regarding studies into the Thracians. In this thesis I have shown that there were substantial similarities between inland and Aegean Thrace regions during the Early Iron Age II period. This completely changed during the Late Iron Age, most likely due to
the colonial interests of the Greek city-states. The most significant contribution that this work makes, is in urging historians and archaeologists alike to not conceptualise Thrace as a homogeneous cultural entity. In many ways saying ‘Thrace’ is akin to saying ‘Greece’. Both labels gloss over the complex socio-political realities behind such a term (cf. Whitley 2001, 231-265; Morris 1998, 14-75). Yet, in contrast to Thrace, Greece has had more academic discussion dedicated to unpacking its ethnic terms within the context of historical developments and political institutions (Hall 1997; 2002; Fraser 2009).

The historical developments within Thrace during the Iron Age should not be overlooked, especially with reference to future work on the topic. Critically, further work needs to be undertaken once additional data becomes available. This in order to assess the extent of regional ethnic identities beyond the funerary context. Yet the ‘new horizons’ revealed from this study, indicate that a shift in our perception of Thrace is needed. This is in light of new conceptualisations involving how people chose to define the dead as a reflection of how they saw themselves. Of course, there is still a lot left to be learnt about the history of Thrace. Whether or not gender identity and/or status played a major role in deciding who was buried with ‘what’ and ‘how’, must have been a deciding factor, as there existed no single period that contained 100 percent of one certain method of bodily processing, and issues like this need further future investigation.\footnote{It is worth bearing in mind Herodotus’ (5.5.1) account of the sacrificing of the ‘most loved wife’ amongst the Crestonaean Thracian community. In this instance gender and social status directly affect the ways that women within these communities are killed and subsequently processed (i.e. buried with her husbands).}

9.5 Archaeology and its sister History

It is 20 years since C. Renfrew (1980) gave his key-note lecture on the ‘Great Tradition versus the Great Divide’, pinpointing the contemporary gulf between the traditions of Anthropology and Archaeology within the context of America. Concerning Classical Archaeology, Renfrew (1980, 292) recognised a different sort of situation within the traditions of Britain, acknowledging three separate divides, not just between archaeology and anthropology (as these are distinct separate traditions within Britain) but between prehistoric and Classical Archaeology. I draw attention to this as one of the enduring issues to be faced by this project, i.e., the lack of pedagogical literature dealing with methodological issues relating to the synthesis of ancient literary evidence with archaeological materials. During this thesis it also became apparent that there was another
divide which had been entirely overlooked by Classical Archaeology within Britain, which concerns the substantial lack of literature engaging with areas of the Classical world outside centres such as Greece and Rome.

These two divides are very much intertwined, as the seminal work by E. Minns (1913) *Scythians and the Greeks* demonstrates. Minns (1913, vii) himself noted, within the preface of this publication that the divide between Classical Archaeology outside Greece and local archaeological narratives from – in this case – Russian archaeology were becoming increasingly disparate since the adoption of the Russian language for use in scientific literature during the 1880s. The use of foreign languages, ancient literary sources, and non-Greco-Roman archaeologies have not only become increasingly rare within the realms of contemporary British Classical Archaeology, rather questions that should be directed towards these regions are just not being asked. Whether this is due to a fundamental lack of interest in non-western archaeologies from the perspective of anglophone students, an increasing divide between Classics and Archaeology within British university settings, or a deeper problem relating to the systemic failure of language teaching in British schools cannot be known for certain.

My aim here is not to sound alarmist akin to Hume (1964), in stating that somehow archaeology has been treated as the ‘handmaiden to history’, although I do feel that there is a growing apathy amongst some historians of Greece relating to attitudes towards the archaeology. This is directly reflected through the superficial ways – in a number of publications – in which material remains have been used and discussed, especially when dealing with topics such as identity (cf. Hall 1997; 2002; Sears 2013). I must also specify that my grievances here are not directed solely towards historians. Archaeologists too have been mishandling and avoiding historical texts for the most part of the 20th century. M. Finley (1975, 87-95) decried this very topic only 5 years before Renfrew gave his keynote speech concerning archaeology and anthropology, and since this point, sadly there has been little done in an effort to bridge any of these divides.

As M. Finley (1975, 88-90) specified, both Archaeology and Classics deal with different types of evidence, which fundamentally offer answers that neither can know independently. For example, the discovery of inscriptions found on the Athenian Acropolis relating to the construction of the Erechtheum during the end of the 5th century can tell us that its masonry and indeed carpentry was undertaken by skilled Athenian slaves and metics working side-by-side (IG I3 476). This is of critical importance, as the build-
ing itself, from an archaeological perspective would not have indicated, through any means, the diverse nature of its workforce. By equal measure, we know that during the late 5th century B.C. Athens witnessed the revival of the family grave enclosure, with graves becoming larger and increasingly ornate with some enclosures eventually containing almost four generations of a single family (Humphreys 1987; Morris 1992, 128-149). Correspondingly, we also know from literary testimonies that after the mid-5th century B.C., changing political reforms meant that any Athenian citizen had to have an Athenian mother and father which not only helps us contextualise the archaeology, but is something that the archaeology critically could not have told us (Plut. *Per.* 37.3; Aris. *Con.* 26.4).

My point here is that these two avenues of historic inquiry have not yet sufficiently been used to complement one another beyond the sporadic use within both traditions. My thesis, hopefully has challenged the assumption that the two cannot be brought together. Likewise, both historical literature and archaeology have contributed a unique insight into the depiction of Thracians through the lens of Hellenic identity, and in this regard, the archaeology alone could not have told us this. In many ways my question ‘who were the Thracians’ was directed as much towards the literary evidence as it was towards the archaeology. On several levels each of these traditions have helped answer my question in different ways. From the literary evidence we managed to penetrate the Hellenic ethnic psyche to understand that the Greeks did, in fact, portray the Thracians through a consistent ethnic stereotype. Correspondingly, the archaeology offered a considerably broader perspective, demonstrating to us that the communities of Iron Age northern Greece and southern Bulgaria actively engaged and maintained long-lasting regionally distinct material traditions, which have enabled us to identify potentially four distinct ethnic regions within Thrace.

It is from this perspective that I consider these two veins of academic discourse to offer novel insights for the future of classical archaeological enquiry, especially in areas outside Greece. I hope, therefore, this prompts future students who wish to investigate non-Greek antiquity, to do so armed with a methodological framework which is conducive for the deployment of both ancient literary evidence and up-to-date quantitative archaeological approaches.
9.6 Future Work

There are new questions on the horizon after this study. The results presented here are only the beginning of such an ethnic investigation into Thrace. This thesis does not represent the end of the road for quantitative approaches towards the funerary record in Iron Age Thrace, nor should it represent the last word on ethnicity. There is considerable work still to be undertaken on both of these topics and this thesis represents its beginning rather than its end.

One of the more pressing issues to be explored after this study involves questions surrounding how the Persian invasions shaped Thrace after years of successive invasions. This topic in particular is relevant within discussion of identity and ethnicity, especially considering how Greek colonisation of the region shaped pre-colonial identities. There have been a number of studies, to-date, within Bulgaria which have attempted to trace ‘Persian’ artistic influence on Hellenistic gold metalworking from tumuli in the central Thracian plain. Indeed, this discussion formed part of Archibald’s (1998) seminal book on Thrace, who briefly identified the lasting impact of Persian influence in Thrace was to be recognised through the artistic depictions on metal objects. Problematically, these ways of ‘looking’ for Persian influence or ‘volgeist’ through Thracian metal working is, as I discussed in Chapter 3, inherently problematic, and harks back to methods employed by likes of Kossina, that is ascribing ‘ethnic significance’ to archaeological material. Yet these invasions must have more tangible evidence, especially considering the fact that we know from the likes of Herodotus (7.22-25), that around 480 B.C. the Persians, led by Xerxes, entered Greece via the Aegean Thracian coast, and forcibly subdued the tribes and colonies along this northern stretch. This is in particular no small event, yet we have very little to archaeologically substantiate such a large-scale invasion. The literary evidence in this case in the only testimony we have, and the archaeology does not offer much if any corresponding hints at this event. Beyond the large-scale cultural changes enacted by the Thracian communities in the Aegean region, there has yet to be any evidence which points towards Persian presence on the Aegean coast, and this must form part of future work in the area in order assess the archaeological reality behind such a major event.

Another fruitful avenues of possible future work would be to coalesce past anthropological investigations of ethnicity with the huge amount of literature and archaeological evidence of Classical Athens. In this instance Glazer and Moynihan’s (1963) study would
be a good starting point for this type of research, and concerning specifically Athens’ metic community. Indeed I mentioned in Chapter 3, as a result of Glazer and Moynihan’s study, it was discovered that the ethnic salience of second and third generation immigrant communities were generally eroded and subsumed within a more generic middle-class, whereby indicia of ethnic difference – perhaps a hangover from the first generation immigrants – were generally changed and eroded as a result of economic competition and inter-ethnic marriages. In respect to this, it would be important to assess whether or not the same was being done within the context of 5th century Athens, where we know there was a considerable non-citizen population resident within the city who were allowed to marry and mix amongst themselves. The question is, therefore, whether or not pre-immigrant identities were retained in Athens among the non-citizen body, or whether one would – after a generation – think of oneself as ethnically metic, or even Athenian? This would obviously be extremely difficult to locate and analyse, yet I do not think that it is impossible. Within Chapter 2 I mentioned that names are often retained – in the case of Thucydides’ father – as a possible sign of ethnic history, even if that link is not immediate but a few generations removed. Perhaps then 5th and 4th century onomastics pertaining to the names of metics and slaves could be used in order to map the ethnic nature of the Athenian non-citizen community. Which, in turn, could easily be mapped and visually presented with the help of code not too dissimilar from methods being undertaken within other areas of archaeology today.

Beyond ethnicity, urgent work does need to be undertaken on the Aegean coast, concerning its Thracian presence during the periods after initial colonisation. As I mentioned briefly in the sections which discussed ‘Late Iron Age Aegean Thrace’, material traditions seemed to have radically changed. New burial traditions emerge alongside new artefact types which were brought with the newly established communities and these were – as seen through the complete change in material evidence – enthusiastically consumed by the communities living in the area, especially regarding the changes in fibulae. Yet, as we know that there was a degree of co-habitation between the Greek-speaking communities and the Thracians, as clearly seen at Zonê with the Thracian inscriptions, it is worth hypothesising that they were buried together as well. The purpose of future work, therefore, should be focused on attempting to understand whether or not minute differences can be seen within these Greek cemeteries, which may suggest ‘Thracian’ presence. This project has attempted this, but not in such serious detail as generally
this topic has not been studied before, and would require a different a doctoral project
to do it justice. Consequently, future work should be spent trying to ascertain the extent
of Thracian-Greek interaction and symbiosis within the context of the Aegean Coast.

This leads me to my final submission of future work, which concerns the application
of my ethnic criteria onto the communities of Samothrace and Thasos, in order to assess
if and how Greek identities changed and altered as a direct result of cohabitation be-
tween pre-colonial communities. Such instances of syncretism are tentatively observed
already in reference to the early layers of the Rotunda of Arsione and the Hall of the
Choral Dancers on Samothrace. Yet insights gained from such an investigation would
not only offer fruitful result for how we conceptualise the process of colonisation within
the northern Aegean coast, but it would also allow to test further J. Hall’s (2002, 24)
claim that there can be ‘...no archaeology of ethnicity among societies who have left us
no [written] record.’
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Appendix A

Catalogue of sites

This gazetteer offers an up-to-date record of the sites, some used for the statistical analysis within this thesis, whilst others are relevant more broadly to the study of the Thracians in the north Aegean. The point of these appendices is to provide a point of reference for Anglophone academics interested in the Iron Age archaeology of Bulgarian and Greek Thrace. It should be noted, however, that this list is neither exhaustive nor complete. The point of such a list is to provide the reader with a degree of transparency behind the statistical analyses rather than the definitive ‘last word’ on Iron Age sites in Greece and Bulgaria. For other well-written appendices, see Dimova (2015) and an earlier versione by Archibald (1998) and Owen (2000b). The large majority of sites used within the thesis have been documented in Bulgarian within Kisyov’s (2009) *Pogrebna Praktiki v Podopite*. Other sources of information were journals such as *AOR*, *AEMTh*, *PAE* and for Thasos, see Koukouli-Chrysanthaki (1992). The information recorded about each site varies as to the amount of information provided by excavators, but the main point being of this list is that each site has a corresponding overview written about them and references for those interested in collecting data on them.

Sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name in English</th>
<th>Site name in Bulgarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: (References)
A.1 Bulgarian Thrace

Virbovo | Върбово

Smolyan Region

Data was taken from four graves containing the remains of six individuals. Graves date to the Late Iron Age (i.e. 4th-3rd century B.C.). The graves are ‘flat’ meaning they do not seem to have been built with mounds. The methods of bodily processing were two cremations and two partial inhumations. Grave 1 and grave 2 were damaged in antiquity with no associated finds. Remains were burnt in an urn which was placed in a ditch lined with slabs. Grave 3 was much the same, i.e., in a stone lined pit, several fragments of bone were found which the excavator identified as a felange (sic)? Over the pit was scattered pieces of grey hand-made cups. In grave 4 were found the remains of three children which were most likely cremated together and scooped into a pithos.


Pavelsko | Павелско

Smolyan Region

The Pavelsko cemetery consists of 10 mounds overall, although data was only able to be collected from 7. The cemetery consists of mounds dating from the transitional phases at the beginning of the Early Iron Age and until the Late Iron Age. The graves in the cemetery were a mix of inhumations, cremations, and partial inhumations. A large part of the grave goods found in the cemetery consisted of fibulae. Notable finds from the cemetery consist of one grave with a spiral and a ‘glasses’ (очилата) fibula found across the chest of an individual in one of the graves along with an iron pendent.

References: Kisyov 2009, 120-121; 1990, 41; Mikov 1941, 20-23; Mirchev 1976, 57-58

Progled | Проглед

Smolyan Region

The cemetery lies east of the village of Progled and contains around 20 mounds. The total area covered by the mounds is around 1,200 square meters. Excavation of the
mounds began around 1940 by V. Mikov. Only 8 out of 20 mounds have been published and date from around the end of the Late Bronze Age (mound 2, grave 3) until the Late Iron Age (mound 3). A number of the graves that were published were so-called cenotaph (кенотаф) graves, meaning they did not contain any remains, but still had grave-goods. Two of the grave mounds (mound 3 and 6), had been partially destroyed by illicit digging.

References: Mirchev 1976, 57-58; Kisyov 1990, 41; 2009, 118-119

Gela | Гела

Smolyan Region

The cemetery consists of 25 mounds, which cover an area of around 1,500 square metres. The cemetery lies 6 km south of a Bronze Age settlement and a fortress which dates to the Late Iron Age. Excavations began at the settlement between 1968 and 1970, where a total of ten mounds were excavated. These excavations were carried out by V. Naidenova. One from the Late Bronze Age, three from the Early Iron Age, and six from the Hellenistic/Roman periods. Only four mounds have been properly published, and these date from the Late Bronze Age (1) until the Early Iron Age (3). Notably in one of the mounds (mound 8) 13 individuals were found buried whole. There was only one cremation out of the published mounds (mound 7), and this also happened to be the Late Bronze Age mound. Mound 10, which consisted of a cist grave was also unusually well-furnished with a pair of silver earrings.

References: Naidenova 1970, 26-27; 1971, 32; Kisyov 2009, 105-106

Trigrad | Триград

Smolyan Region

Two cemeteries were found in this region, near Ravnishta and the other near Chairite. The site near Ravnishta was a cemetery consisting of 5 tumuli, although only one was recorded by Kisyov (2009, 127). The grave in question dates to the 7th-6th centuries B.C. The site has only been analysed by Kisyov (2009). No additional references were provided. The other site near Chairite consisted of 4 mounds situated along a high terrace. These mounds were excavated around 1981, and partially published in 1982 by
Appendix A. Catalogue of sites

Vilchanova. Only one grave has been properly published, and dates to the Late Bronze Age (although a date for this time is never specified).
References: Vilchanova 1982, 43-64; Kisyov 2009, 127-128

Yagodina | Ягодина

Smolyan Region

The cemetery of Yagodina consists of 25 mounds which range from the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I to Early Iron Age II period (11th-6th centuries B.C.). Most of the mounds within the cemetery have been destroyed by treasure hunters. The mounds lie on a very high peak outside the town, 100 metres west of two settlements dating from the Late Iron Age and Roman periods. These are not contemporary with the cemetery, however. The total area of the cemetery, according to Kisyov (2009, 129) is around 20,000 square metres. Only a portion of the intact mounds have been excavated, the first of these excavations were during 1975, and again in 1982. Only six of these mounds have been adequately published.
References: Kisyov 1991, 41; 1988, 23-34, 61, 98; 2009, 129-130

Borino | Борино

Smolyan Region

The Borino cemeteries made up the majority of funerary data from the Iron Age in Bulgaria. There were four cemeteries around this area ranging in date from the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I cross-over, until the Late Iron Age. The first cemetery of Turlata in Borino consists of 5 tumuli all of which are published, one in particular (mound 1) contains 11 graves all dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I period. Although other graves in the cemetery date to around the Early Iron Age II period. The second cemetery of Borino is Tepe Bair which is 3 km southeast of the village of Borino. The cemetery consists of three mounds, only one of which is published and according to Kisyov has been destroyed multiple times (“многократно разрушавана”) by both illicit digging and locals celebrating Ilinden there. However, Kisyov recorded a mound containing a whole skeleton and beside it was placed an iron spear head and a Thessalian-type fibula, dating roughly to the Early Iron Age II period. The final se-
ries of graves belong to the cemetery of Tsirkvishteto, which comprises of 10 published mounds and 41 more unpublished mounds. The cemetery near Tsirkvishteto could in fact be additionally subdivided into two more cemeteries, as they lie on opposite sides of the modern village - with one cemetery containing 6 mounds and the other containing 45. The group of 6 mounds all roughly date to the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age I cross-over period and contain predominantly cremations. The second group of 45 mounds which are located 1km northwest of Tsirkvishteto, date around the Early Iron Age I and II periods. Akin to the other mounds around Tsirkvishteto they exhibit a preference for mounds with multiple inhumations. There was no information as to when these sites were originally discovered and excavated.

References: Kisyov 1985, 53; 2009, 98-103

**Batak | Батак**

Velingrad Region

In the area of the Batak valley 97 mounds have been documented of which 32 have been excavated, but not all published. Researchers working in the area have separated these mounds into 11 necropoli. This was based on the distances between the individual mounds and the visual clusters they were in. Investigation into the Batak mounds began in the mid-1950s by Tsonchev, and archaeological excavations in the area continued into the 1970s. The published mounds from this area all date to around the 6th-5th centuries B.C., which is roughly between the Early Iron Age II-Late Iron Age periods. The mounds were all cremations with one ‘cenotaph’ grave (mound 1).

References: Tsonchev 1959, 3-4; Tsonchev and Milchev, 1970, 149-205; Kisyov 2009, 97-98

**Grochnoto | Грохното**

Smolyan Region

The cemeteries of Grochnoto lie near to Borino but have been identified by researchers to be their own separate funerary entities. Each of the cemeteries are very small in comparison to other cemeteries like the ones around Batak. Each cemetery consists of 4 and 3 mounds respectively. In each of the cemeteries, the mounds date to around the
7th-6th centuries B.C., i.e. Early Iron Age II period. The mounds consisted mostly of whole inhumations with one ‘cenotaph’ grave (mound 2) from the first cemetery and one partial inhumation (mound 1) from the first cemetery. Both cemeteries were excavated during the early 1980s by N. Petrova and K. Kisyov. Information about the site has been published periodically in annual reports, but no extensive and detailed published excavation report exists of either site.


Zornita | Зорница

Smolyan Region

Similar to Grochnoto, the cemeteries consist of two sites, with 2 and 5 mounds respectively. Only a single mound from each site has been published and their contents listed. One of the mounds dates to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I cross-over (11th-10th centuries B.C.), whilst the other dates to the Late Iron Age (4th-3rd centuries B.C.) One site is notably very close to a Late Bronze Age and Late Iron Age settlement. Both investigated mounds consists of cremations. In the first site, there were five in a single Late Bronze Age mound. The second mound in the second site, however, dated to the Late Iron Age and consisted of a single cremation.

References: Kisyov 1991a, 66; 1992; 2009, 110

Kochan | Кочан

Blagoevgrad Region

Laying between the modern-day towns of Kochan and Satovcha, the Kochan cemetery is the largest in this study, comprising of over 100 mounds dating from the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. until the Roman period. The cemetery clearly had an enduring significance with the communities dwelling around it. The published graves (situated within the mounds) from the cemetery are, unfortunately, much fewer than 100, around 36. The published graves date between the Early Iron Age II (8th-7th centuries B.C.) and the Late Iron Age (4th-3rd centuries B.C.). The site was first excavated around the 1970s by M. Domaraski, D. Gergova, and I. Kulov. Unfortunately, however, no full excavation report exists of the site with a lot of the data from the site currently unpublished.
Interestingly, a lot of the published mounds within the cemetery contained several inhumations, and at times as many as 16. It would be interesting to consider whether the practice of multiple and near contemporary inhumations were practiced throughout the site and for how long.

References: Gergova & Kulov 1976, 35-36; Gergova & Angelova 1975; Kisyov 2009, 110-113

**Lyubcha | Любча**

Smolyan Region

The mound cemetery of Lyubcha contains 23 mounds located on the southern slope of a hill in the ‘Burdtseto’ locality. The mounds have been studied since the mid-late 1970s by V. Milchev, the information of which is kept in the ‘Diary of the archaeological excavations in the village of Lyubcha’ (Дневник на археологическите разкопки в с. Любча - Исторически музей Смолян) (1976), however, the author of this thesis has not managed to read this. It is also unknown whether the site has been fully published. The mounds that have been published date from the Late Bronze Age (mound 4 and 8) to the Late Iron Age (mound 3). According to the investigators, 700m north of the cemetery are two settlements which date to the Late Iron Age and Early Bronze Age, and are visible from the cemetery.

References: Mirchev 1977; Kisyov 1990, 41-53; 2009, 114

**Pamporovo | Пампорово**

Smolyan Region

The cemetery of Pamporovo consists of 4 mounds, only two of which have been fully published. The mounds date to the Early Iron Age II period (7th-6th centuries B.C.), although one grave within mound 4 has been dated by excavators to the 5th-4th centuries B.C. All of the graves in the cemetery were whole inhumations. According to Kisyov (2009:119), the cemetery of Pamporovo was originally excavated during the 1970s by D. Raichev, under the auspices of the Archaeological Museum of Smolyan. Although no publication of these excavations has been provided.

**Stoikite | Стойките**

Smolyan Region

The Stoikite cemetery was exclusively a Late Iron Age cemetery which consists of flat graves. This is perhaps the only use of such in this thesis. There were 25 graves in total which were published from the cemetery. According to the excavator there were around 30, although only 25 have been published. Excavators of the cemetery dated it to the latter parts of the 5th century and the 4th century B.C., so it was used for the Late Iron Age parts of this project. The cemetery exhibited a mix of inhumation types, i.e. whole, partial, and cremation (with three 'cenotaph graves'). To the west of the Stoikite cemetery, around 120 metres east, is a Late Iron Age settlement, which was perhaps connected to the cemetery itself. Excavations of the site began around the late 1980s by K. Kisyov. Akin to most other cemeteries, no complete excavation report of the cemetery exists, with the exception of the partially complete report given by Kisyov (2009, 124-127).

References: Kisyov 1988c, 67; 1988a, 53-55; 2009, 124-127

**Chepelare | Чепеларе**

Smolyan Region

There are several cemeteries around the village of Chepelare, however, most are either not published or partially destroyed, and thereby unable to provide a secure context for its finds. The cemeteries that were included within this project came from two sites. One with 4 mounds and the other with 3. The cemetery with 4 mounds contained cremations which dated to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I period. Two were destroyed and only two were found undisturbed and complete. 700 metres east of the site was located a Late Bronze Age settlement, which was possibly linked to the discovered 4 mounds. The second site contained only one published mound (despite 3 being found), which was comprised of 5 contemporary whole inhumations dating to the Early Iron Age II period (8th-7th centuries B.C.).

References: Kisyov 1991b, 1-18; 2002, 137-156; 2009, 128-129
Stambolovo | Стамболово

Haskovo Region

The cemetery of Stambolovo was discovered in July 2008. The site consists of two mounds. The site itself is located in Harmandzhiyska Rechka, about 4 km south-southwest of the village of Stambolovo. In September 2008, rescue excavations were carried out on mounds 1 and 2, which had already been affected by treasure hunters. In mound 2, 9 inhumations were found, 6 within pithoi and two which were found burned and disturbed belonging to three individuals. These were found on the second expedition in 2009. The analysis of the finds from the cemetery led the site to be placed chronologically within the Early Iron Age I/II period (somewhere between the 10th-8th centuries B.C.). Whilst the ceramic material excavated from the site was more characteristic of a later period (i.e. Early Iron Age II), the metal finds (fibulae and knives) point towards a slightly earlier date (cf. Gergova 1987).

References: Nechrizov 2009, 266-271; Nechrizov & Tzvetkova 2010a, 221-224

Katrishte | Катриште

Kustendil Region

The cemetery of Katrishte was initially excavated in the spring of 1979 when researchers found a scattering of metal grave goods, which led to the additional investigations by P. Alyakova, G. Nechrizov, and R. Georgieva (1998). The cemetery is located in a place called ‘Kargovite tarli’ or ‘Tepeto’, and is situated 2.5km south of the village after which it gets its name. Although only 19 graves were excavated, there was approximately as many as 23, but some had been looted by treasure hunters and other had been destroyed by the construction of a road which ran on the periphery of the cemetery. On account of the grave goods found, all of the graves in the cemetery date to around the Early Iron Age II period (8th-7th centuries B.C.). Akin to the Late Iron Age cemetery of Stoikite, the cemetery of Katrishte contained simple pit graves without a tumulus. This is one of the few pit cemeteries that the author is aware of in Bulgarian Thrace which date to the period of Early Iron Age II. Of note, there were two graves which were structurally interesting. Graves 6 and 7 were nearby one another and encircled by a ring of stones. Similarly, graves 14a and 14b were also next to one another, almost in a communal pit.
and covered with stones. To an extent, graves 11 and 12 could also been seen as having some form of spatial relationship between one another, but it is uncertain. These spatial relationships are significant as they present additional information about the possibility of linked individuals in death.

References: Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50

**Malka Detelina | Малка Детелина**

Nova Zagora Region

The mounds which generally make up the cemetery of Malka Detelina or more generally the “Maritsa-East” area began in 1965 and were ongoing until the late 1980s. During this time 16 sites in the area were identified, 4 settlements and 12 tumuli. These excavations were led by E. Batsova, M. Kinchev, B. Borisov, T. Kincheva, and I. Georgiev. These are perhaps the earliest of the graves in this study and many of them retained the ‘hoker’ position, which is characteristic of the Bronze Age of the region. Overall from the region, around 23 graves were analysed from the mounds which dated to around the end of the Bronze Age/beginning of the Early Iron Age I period. Most of the graves within the tumuli contained nothing apart from handmade pottery and a few metal objects like knives and spear heads.

References: Kunchev 1991, 41-70
A.2 Greek Thrace

**Kossynthos | Κόσσυνθος**

Aegean Thrace Region

In the summer of 1998 during illegal sand extraction an early Iron Age pithos was discovered containing a burial. The Kossynthos features three graves which date to the mid-Early Iron Age II period (8th-7th centuries B.C.). All of the tombs were whole adult inhumations, and all three were in pithoi. One of the pithoi (grave 1), there were three individuals found in one pithos. All three skulls were in the mouth of the pithos. Osteological analysis determined the remains to be of a mature female around 35-45 year old, a mature male over 45 years old, and a younger woman around 18-23 years old.

References: Triandafillos & Kallidzi 1998, 1-18

**Filiouri (Mikro Doukato) | Φιλιουρί (Μικρό Δουκάτο)**

Aegean Thrace Region

During the early 1970s Triadafillos undertook the excavation of the Early Iron Age II cemetery of the area of Mikro Doukatos (Filiouri). There discovered were box-shaped pit graves beginning from the Early Iron Age II period. A total of 13 graves were found, mostly whole inhumations with adults but with a minority of infant cremations found in urns. Notably from the cemetery was the presence of fibulae which were found in abundance in some of the graves.

References: Triandafillos 1973, 802-803; 1984

**Thasos | Θάσος**

Eastern Macedonia Region

Thasos is home to some of the most well-published Iron Age cemeteries from the Aegean Thrace region (Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1996). The island plays host to four large cemeteries - Kastri (around 23 tombs), Larnaki (around 14 tombs), Tsiganathika (around 50 tombs), and Vrisouthes (around 6 tombs). Owen (2006, 359) hypothesised that there could be around as many as over 150 family interments between the cemeteries, however,
she concedes as this number may in fact be considerably higher on account of the ex-
tant bias of the bones and the intermingling of inhumations which could cloud the true
number of individuals interred between all four cemeteries. The excavator, Koukouli-
Chrysanthaki (1992) has likened to these tombs to the megalithic dolmen phenomenon
on the mainland.

The cemeteries on Thasos are no-doubt long-lasting, yet their true chronological
placement, particularly of each tomb is a topic of debate. This has been touched upon
within the authors thesis, and will therefore not be part of a discussion here. However, it
will be said that generally these tombs are placed within the period beginning in Early
Iron Age I (11th-10th centuries B.C.) and ending around the end of Early Iron Age II
(8th-7th centuries B.C.). However, attempts have been made by Koukouli-Chrysanthaki
(1996, 578-592) to date particular objects within each tomb, however, such an endeavour
is likely only able to tell us about the terminus post and ante quem of a tomb, and even
then, objects in some tombs dating to either later or earlier periods may have in fact
have not survived.

References: Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1982; 1990; 1992

Faia Petra | Φαιά Πέτρα

Eastern Macedonia Region

The cemetery of Faia Petra was excavated by Valla (2004), and consists of a up to
6 rectangular stone enclosures, 6 of which had already (by 2002) fallen into the ravine
to the east of the cemetery. Two of the enclosures (no.2 and 5) were intact were able to
be analysed. The enclosures were covered with an earthen mound and stones, although
the overlain materials did not form a tumulus. In the excavated intact enclosures, it
seems that the dead were placed laying on a levelled floor. The enclosures contained
both cremations (although only one was found) and the rest are thought to be partial
inhumation. This is important to note within Aegean Thrace as this practice does not
seem to be widespread, with the possible exception of the dolmens in the eastern Thrace
region, and possibly Thasos. Also found in the enclosures were jewellery, weapons, and
handmade pottery, both local and Mycenaean imports. The tombs date to around LHI-
IIC, but were included in the discussion with Early Iron Age I tombs as a point of
comparison. Only partial information of this cemetery exists in site reports.
References: Valla 2004; Valla et al. 2013

**Regio Didymoteicho | Ρήγιο Διδυμοτείχου**

Eastern Macedonia Region

In the context of the rescue excavations carried out by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Thrace, burial tombs of northern Evros were excavated. Two tombs were found, covered with mounds, and inside consisted of a chamber made of large limestone slabs. Tomb A had a large chamber which was accessible through an entrance. Although it was not clear from the excavation reports whether this was an actual door or a faux-door built in front of the chamber. The second tomb was a cist tomb made from limestone and covered with a mound. These tombs date to the second part or in the middle of the 4th century B.C.

The excavators also noticed that there was a considerable presence of Early Iron Age pottery around the area which confounded them as to the location’s previous significance. This included fragments of handmade amphorae, a handle of a Thassian amphora (?) and other burned handmade pottery fragments, some with incised decorations, which helped attributed the date to the Early Iron Age. It was later identified that there was evidence of a previous mound at the location, which had been built to cover a much earlier cremation on the same location as the later tombs. Only partial information of this cemetery exists in site reports.

References: Trandafilos 1995, 473-482

**Koukou Sikias | Κούκο Συκιάς**

Eastern Macedonia Region

At the top of Koukos Hill in southern Sithonia, a cemetery was discovered dating primarily to the Early Iron Age. Excavations were carried out in collaboration between the 16th Ephorate of Antiquities and the University of Tasmania, Australia. The team discovered ninety-eight tombs in the cemetery, of which 49 were cists and 34 were in pits. Cremations formed the main method of bodily processing. Only partial information of this cemetery exists in site reports.

References: Karington-Smith & Vokotopoulou 1988, 356-364
Ancient Strymi | Αρχαίας Στρύμης

Eastern Macedonia Region

Four mounds were excavated in the Mitrichos area dated to the late-5th century B.C. near the ancient city.

Mound A

It is the first large mound came a significant amount of ceramics that includes many fragments of amphorae. A total of three cist graves were uncovered in the mound at different levels. Apart from pottery the graves in the tumulus did not yeild many other grave-goods, as was noted by the excavators, it had been looted many times.

Mound B

Tumulus B’s embankment consisted of many black figure vessels which were found scattered along with bases and handles of amphorae. The tomb inside the mound was a cist, orientated NW-SE and surrounded by large limestone slabs 0.22-0.25m thick. On the floor of the tomb was found two copper nails, a fragment of alabaster, and a silver Mero- nian coin (437/36-436/35 B.C.), an areballos portraying a young woman playing the lyre with her left hand, a black-bellied aryballos without decoration, and a lekythos depicting a young man holding a spear.

Mound G

In the mound was excavated a stone sarcophagus grafted from soft limestone. The only object on the floor of the sarcophagus was a few pottery fragments mainly from aryballoi. Significant quantities of amphorae were discovered in the mound itself.

Mound D

Mound D is located south and a short distance from the previous mounds, yet has been heavily damaged through continuous agricultural cultivation and according to excavators was barely visible from the ground. The centre of the mound revealed a large burnt layer (the remains of a cremation?) around 1.30x0.50 m. Mixed in the burnt layer were four large kitchenware vessels, fragments of iron objects, along with several iron and copper nails. This mound may be earlier than the previous mounds, potentially to Early Iron Age II/Late Iron Age period. Although this was not noted by the excavators.

References: Trandafillos 1995, 655-660
Hagios Yiannis | Άγιος Ζήσης

Eastern Macedonia Region

A large cemetery of pithoi inhumations, consisting of both cremation and whole inhumation were found at the site of Hagios Yannis. Over 50 graves were found within the cemetery. The cemetery dates to the Early Iron Age II on account of the pottery and the bronze jewellery found in the graves.

References: eleni Trakosopoulou-Salakidou 1988, 347-551

Kastas Tumulus | Νεκροταφείο του λόφου Καστά κοντά στην Αμφίπολη

Eastern Macedonia Region

Kastas Hill is located to the south of Amphipolis. The cemetery of Kasta Hill is near to one of the most important Macedonian tombs of Alexander. Only two mounds have been excavated. The mounds contain burials in pits and cists, and consists of both cremations and whole inhumations. The ones used for this study were whole inhumations which were richly furnished with mental jewellery and weaponry.

References: Lazaridis 1965-1982

Drama Industrial Plain | Νεκροταφείο βιομηχανικής ζώνης Δράμας

Eastern Macedonia Region

This cemetery is located in the area of the current industrial zone of Drama and consists of several low-lying burial mounds, consisting of both whole inhumations and cremations and covered by a layer of stones. The tombs as a whole must were dated during the Early Iron Age II. The few fragments of the grooved pottery found in the deeper layers of the embankment of tumulus C was discovered, along with a central burial with a Naue 11 iron sword. The presence of the sword with its associated pottery places the mounds around the Early Iron Age I-II 10th-8th B.C.

References: Nechrizov & Iliev 2006a
Nea Zoi (Edessa) | Νεα Ζοϊ

Aegean Thrace Region

On the side of Teriklia Hill an Early Iron Age II cemetery was found, containing 12 graves. 1 in a pit and 11 in large handmade ceramic vessels (pithoi-like). The longest of which (1.80m) had evidence of being sealed at the mouth with a flat stone. The rest of the inhumations had been covered with rubble. Associated finds with the pithoi inhumations were mostly handmade ceramics (kitchenware) with some wheelmade examples. Ceramics were made of gray clay with and some with twisted handles. The excavator adds that infant remains were found in one of the vessels although it is not specified whether this was the results of cremation, whole inhumation, or partial inhumation.

References: Chrisostomou 1993, 117

Abdera | Αβδήρα

Aegean Thrace Region

During 1995, 9 tombs were excavated near Velonis Farm, SE of Abdera. Only 3 remained undamaged and revealed substantial finds (tomb. 95.05, tomb. 9509, tomb 95.18). These were a pit grave, a pithos burial and a cist-grave made from substantial cut stone blocks. The pit-grave contained a large amount of gold-jewellery, a bronze mirror, an ionic clay kylix, and a coin of Phillip II. Dated to the second half of the 4th century B.C. The grave contained a whole inhumation of a female, aged around her 20-30s.

The pithos burial was 2m in length, and and contained a large quantity of wheelmade pottery, i.e., skyphos, aryballoid lekythoi, kanastrom, a bronze strigil, and a silver Abderan coin. The tomb contained the whole inhumation of a man, aged between his 30s-40s. The date of the tomb itself (on the basis of the coin), was ascribed to the late 6th century B.C.

The cist-grave contained a large quantity of metal items, i.e., a bronze mirror, three gold rings, a lead pyxis, a iron dagger, gold finger ring, and gold earrings. On account of the grave-goods, the tomb was dated to around the end of the 4th century B.C. The grave contained the whole inhumation of a woman, who the excavators aged around 40s-50 years old.
In the winter of 1994-1995, a short rescue excavation was carried out on plot 1832 of the farm of Agios Christoforos in the prefecture of Serres. A total of 20 cist graves were found and excavated, 19 of which were concentrated in the southwestern part of the site. Burial type at the site consisted completely of whole inhumations. The box-shaped cists were made of slabs of marble, slate, porphyry and famitolite. The grave-goods from the site conformed strongly with those of the mid-late 5th century. All pottery was typical of Attic wheelmade repertoire with pot types like lekythoi and aryballoi found. Bronze jewellery, like bracelets, rings, and fibulae (type V) also found in the graves.

References: Poulios 1995, 411-422

40 Early Iron Age II tumuli were discovered south of the village of Konstandia, Pella prefecture. According to the excavator, the tumuli range in diameter from 8-14m (with 2 exceptions measuring 20x8 m and 17 x 11m). They consist of built up dry-stone masonry rubble rings circling a single chamber. The chambers were then connected to ‘dromos’, made from upright stones. The excavator adds that some of them were sealed with a stone at the front. Found in one of the tombs (tomb 5) were bronze fibulae (similar to aii.1.b type). The excavator adds, on account of a discovery of a complete roof of tomb 2, that the rest of the tombs in the cemetery had ‘false-corbelled’ roofs, which were removed during each burial. Within tomb 2, was also found 10 skulls all mixed together, along with (handmade?) two-handed vessels, spindle whorls, knives, glass-inlays for jewellery, hairslides(?), bracelets, an amulet, octagonal and bow-shaped fibulae.

References: Chrisostomou 1995, 155-163; 2000, 505-515
Palaio Gynaikokastro | Παλαιό Γυναικόκαστρο

Aegean Thrace Region

6 burials dated to the Early Iron Age were discovered in the late 1980s at the site of Palio Gynaikokastro. 3 of these were funerary platform-shaped structures. The structures had a diameter between 1.60-2.20 m and a height of 0.30m, and consisted of rubble rings around a central cluster of stones, used to secure the funerary urn or amphora. Fragments of other amphora were found around the structures, along with skyphoi-shaped vessels. These 3 ‘structures’ all housed cremations. The other 3 burials found at the site were ‘box-shaped tombs’. Within these burials were found a sword, iron knives, and golden jewellery. The remains in the box-tombs are not much discussed, and it is not specified whether they were inhumation or cremation.

References: Savopoulou, 1988:221-222

Agios Hristoforos (Serres) | Αγίος Χριστοφόρος

Eastern Macedonia Region

During September 2004 a total of 15 tombs were discovered and investigated. Their positioning on the site was organized into rows of tombs, spaced at a distance of at least 6 m from each other.

The 6 tombs out of 15 were box-shaped with careful construction. In most cases the looting had already taken place in antiquity, resulting in the rescue of only some clay vessels. The inhumations were placed in a supine position with their hands sometimes placed on the pelvis and sometimes on the side. Only in one case was there evidence of cremation. The only undisturbed burial found to be intact was that of a child. The grave-goods in this case were clay vessels, most of which were wheelmade. A total of 19 vessels were found, five of which were handmade. Vessels were placed in both female and male adult burials with no particular preference for the type of vessel. From the excavation data, arched fibulae were found in 2 burials, 1 male and 1 female, along with 2 bracelets with a thick stem from a female burial. A “cross-shaped” piece of jewelry was found in a woman’s burial, perhaps part of a belt. The burials date to the end of the Early Iron Age II period.

References: Valla 2005, 109-116
**Trapeza Polichne | Τράπεζας της Πολίχνης**

Eastern Macedonia Region

In the western cemetery of the tell “Trapeza Polichne” 549 graves were discovered from three different periods. Most of the excavated graves date to the Iron Age, but there are some that can be dated to the late Classical, Hellenistic and Roman period. The investigated tombs are of pit graves, cist graves, and amphora burials. The funerary offerings included, bronze, iron and silver jewelry, beads, daggers, spindles, clay busts, vases, etc.

References: Kotsos et al. 2011, 255-260

**Imathiotika Pieria | Ημαθιώτικα Πιερίας**

Eastern Macedonia Region

The rescue excavations in the cemetery at the location of Pierias revealed a total of 58 tombs. 23 of them date to the post-archaic era, 21 to the classical and 14 to the Hellenistic, and the rest Roman. The tombs are pit-like, lined up in dense rows oriented North-South or East-West. Significant finds from the tombs in the area include sword and bronze spiral fibulae.

References: Kottaridi & Berkoulaki 1997, 109-112
Appendix B

Gazetteer of Dolmens

This gazetteer offers an up-to-date record of the dolmens discussed within this thesis. The list of sites and information about the dolmens here were mostly taken from an online database in Bulgarian (http://www.balkanmegaliths.bgjourney.com) which has been compiled by Bulgarian dolmen enthusiasts and academics alike. I also used the works of scholars who spent time documenting and excavating some of the various different dolmens currently still in existence (Nekhrizov 2005b; Delev 1984 1984; Agre2005a; 2005b; Shkorpil 1888; 1896). Annual site reports (AOR) also served as sources of information about the excavated dolmens and their locations (although some GIS coordinates approximate). The layout and descriptions from this section were written as part of my unpublished MPhil Thesis titled, Beyond Stone: Megalithic Monuments and Social Transformations in Iron Age Thrace. The thesis examined the relationship between the location of these monuments in the environment and the social transformations they inspired on account of their difficult to reach locations and function as communal ossuaries. Not all of the dolmen entries have corresponding references, this was due to both the lack of systematic excavation surrounding the dolmens but also mostly due to the inaccessibility of the scant published material on them. Thus, all information provided about them was either gained from visiting the dolmens in person or through the website (http://www.balkanmegaliths.bgjourney.com).

Sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name in English</th>
<th>Site name in Bulgarian – [dolmen reference number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude/Latitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

References: (References)

B.1 Rhodope

Buïnovo | Буйново

Smolyan – D01
24.29025833/41.55355278
Giant partially destroyed single chamber dolmen. One giant rock slab supported by two lower ones. Situated on mountain side. Very abstract. No excavation has been conducted. No evidence of mound or monumental façade.

Chernichevo | Черничево

Kirdzhali – D03
25.84191667/41.38058333
Three well-preserved double-chambered dolmens and one utterly destroyed example. All south facing. Set up on the side of mountains but also situated in a dense forest. No evidence of mound or façade.
References: Kulov 1992, 47-6

Kobilino | Кобилино

Haskovo
26.13713889/41.96216667
Two single-chambered dolmens which face north-west and are very badly damaged. They both show remnants of a mound. No bones or finds from these dolmens. Evidence of mounds on top of these dolmens, however, no monumental façades.

Ostir Kamik | Остър Камък

Haskovo – D02
25.86294444 /41.88786111
Single chamber dolmen with no antechamber. Destroyed but reconstituted later. No finds specifically from this dolmen. Interestingly, it is situated in an open plane with
wide stretching views. It is the only one within the data set to not be situated on a mountain side. No mound evidence of mound of façade.

**Plevun | Плевун**

Haskovo – D06  
26.00430556/41.48102778  
Very large triple-chambered dolmen which was covered with a great mound and sealed. The long entrance chamber led to the middle chamber which contained ceramic vessels. This middle chamber then led through to the elongated and slightly trapezoidal back chamber which contained the human remains. Although as the soil is so acidic, no human remains survive. Once had a mound, but no façade.

**Zhelezino | Железино**

Haskovo – D04  
25.95775/41.46938889 [D04.1]  
25.96733333/41.48502778 [D04.2]  
Four single-chamber dolmens, the largest of which faces east, and the other three face west. One in particular is surrounded with vertical stones. Dolmens made of local slate from a nearby quarry. The rest of the dolmens are very poorly preserved and consist of a single chamber, some submerged in the ground. All except the largest are destroyed or very heavily damaged. No evidence of mound or façade.
B.2 Sakar

Cherepovo | Черепово

26.10475/41.97394444 [D12.1]
26.10819444/41.98147222 [D12.2]

Three destroyed dolmens grouped together. They all seem to have had only one chamber each and no antechamber or façades. The dolmens are situated just off the road on a large hill with long ranging views, but still situated within an area of dense tree coverage. No evidence mound.

Hlyabovo | Хлябово

Haskovo

26.25911111/42.04369444 [D08.1]
26.27525/42.00388889 [D08.2]
26.27327788/42.00286111 [D08.3]
26.25134722/42.03910833 [D08.4]
26.25152778/42.02483333 [D08.5]
26.25152778/42.02333333 [D08.6]
26.25496111/42.02093056 [D08.7]
26.24076944/42.01866389 [D08.8]
26.24104444/42.02347222 [D08.9]
26.24003056/42.03087778 [D08.10]
26.23953056/42.04663889 [D08.11]
26.25152778/42.02483333 [D08.12]

Numerous different types of smaller dolmens within this location, all surrounding the town of Hlyabovo.

They are not necessarily near to one another and it would take almost a day to walk between some of them. D08.1 a rather abstract dolmen that resembles dolmens from the British Neolithic. It is constituted of two huge boulders which are balancing a third dolmen on to, creating a single large chamber. It is situated in dense woodland and with no obvious path towards it. If approaching it from behind it is easily missed, as it is partially submerged. Whether this was because it was originally covered by a mound is
unknown. No evidence of mound or façade.

D08.2 is single chamber dolmen with an antechamber. The boulders used to create the partitions within this dolmen are thicker than others, and look as if some of the stone was not worked as much as the others. This dolmen is also situated in very dense forest. No evidence of mound or façade.

D08.3 is a very large dolmen situated further away than the others, and consists of three large chambers. The dolmen itself is almost still fully covered by a mound. No monumental façade.

D08.4 destroyed dolmen which left a very large crater with floor still intact, consisting of flattened plates of stone.

D08.5 is a very large dolmen with three chambers and a preserved monumental façade. It is partially subsumed within a larger mound. This dolmen is interesting as, although situated in woodland, it has wide reaching views of the area. There was, however, no sign of a monumental plate blocking the doorway and the doorway was large enough to let people pass through it. D08.6 is a very badly damaged small double chamber dolmen situated on the side of a large hill within the woods. No façade or mound.

D08.7 very large single chamber dolmen, destroyed and situated in dense woodland. No evidence of mound or façade.

D08.8 is a very large dolmen with three well-preserved chambers, situated in a field with almost no tree cover. Two large openings led into the main chamber and then a third small opening leads into the main large burial chamber. Today this dolmen is situated very close to a gypsy cemetery, making it difficult to access. No mound or façade.

D08.9 is a destroyed dolmen which had at one point very wide reaching views. No evidence of mound or façade. From the remains it looks like it was a single chamber dolmen. D08.10 is a flooded two chamber dolmen situated closest to the modern town. No façade or mound.

D08.11 is a very well preserved dolmen with three chambers. The dolmen was originally covered by a mound and has at its entrance, remains of a monumental façade. The dolmen today is situated in long grass with no tree coverage. Its entrance hole was not big enough for a complete human to pass through, but large enough to let arms into it.

D08.12 are perhaps the largest, and only case of two large dolmens built into one another (side by side). The left hand dolmen has a much larger front opening than the
right, whose opening is very small. Both dolmens consist of three chambers, with very large inhumation chambers. They are situated on a hilltop with little coverage and far reaching views of the surrounding area. No evidence of a mound but evidence of what could be considered some evidence of a shared monumental façade.

References: Fol 1976

**Izvorovo | Изворово**

Haskovo – D11

26.13713889/41.96216667

Small single chamber dolmen within an open field. There is no back to the dolmen so the one chamber is open from both sides. In addition, there is no evidence of a mound or façade.

Reference: Fol 1982

**Oryachovo | Оряхово**

Haskovo – D10

26.19005556/42.93944444

Two very large dolmens near one another, one with two chambers and the other with three. Like previously, only one GIS coordinate was provided in the survey. They are both in a very bad state of preservation. The largest dolmen here was studied in a formal archaeological excavation in 2004, which found five human skulls in the inhumation chamber alongside bracelets and brooches. These dolmens are situated in light woodland. Both dolmens show evidence of mounds and blocked entrances. Some evidence of a mound but none to suggest a monumental façade. Covered by mound with possible evidence of façades.

References: Iliev 2005

**Radovets | Радовец**

Haskovo – D09

26.53069722/41.94092222

A group of five or perhaps six small single chamber dolmens. Most are badly destroyed, but look like they each consisted of a single chamber which was closed and covered with a mound. Work has been conducted by Kolev (2009) in which he suggests that dolmens
in this area may all point specifically towards three high mountain peaks, although this is speculative. The dolmens today are difficult to access - they are off road and are situated on a large hill without any tree coverage. There is no evidence that the dolmens had a monumental façade.

**Sakartsi | Сакарци**

Haskovo – D07

26.29813889/42.0275 [D07.1]

28.98815/42.02809444 [D07.2]

Two dolmens containing two chambers, one main inhumation chamber and an antechamber. Both lie within deep woodland. D07.1 is much larger and has a monumental façade. D07.2 does not have a façade, but similar to D07.1 in that it has two chambers. They both suffer from degradation, however, D07.1 is in a better state of preservation, as its façade is still visible. Possible remains of mound found over this dolmen (D07.2) but not the rest.

References: Fol 1976
B.3 Strandzha

Ashlamata | Ашалмата

Burgas – D22
27.27125/42.2003056
This dolmen is situated in a heavily wooded area but was covered almost completely by a mound (which looks like it was excavated to reveal the dolmen – yet not record of the excavation seems to exist). The dolmen consists of an inhumation chamber and an antechamber. It looks as if the antechamber was closed. The surviving opening from the antechamber into the main inhumation chamber is very large and could have accommodated for people to pass through. No evidence of façade.

Bakira | Бакъра

Burgas – D24
27.36588889/42.12941667
This dolmen has two chambers and an antechamber. It is situated in an area with relatively little tree coverage. It was covered by a very large mound. No monumental façade.
References: Agre 2004, 88-90

Beklik Tash | Беклик Таш

Primorsko – D13
27.76241667/42.31111111 [D13.1]
27.75047222/42.30911111 [D13.2]
27.76213889/42.31658333 [D13.3]
Three dolmens in this area that are very different from one another. Moreover, all of the dolmens are today situated in dense woodland. D13.1 is much more abstract than the rest and consists of a massive roof slab on top of three huge boulders. There is no mound and the front has been left open. The dolmen is so large that one could easily walk straight into the main chamber. D13.2 is more like the other dolmens in the Strandzha. It has a single inhumation chamber with no antechamber. Its entrance has been blocked and was covered by a mound. D13.3 is a destroyed dolmen, possibly only consisting of a single chamber like the former, but it is too badly damaged to make any
judgments. Different from other dolmens, these dolmens are near to the settlement of Elya Bay. There is no evidence at any of the dolmens to suggest a mound or monumental façade.

**Belevren | Белеврен**

Burgas – D30

27.18194444/27.18130556 [D30.1]
27.18130556/42.09891667 [D30.2]
27.19816667/42.10163889 [D30.3]
27.15769444/42.10513889 [D30.4]

The dolmens here are all situated in the hills surrounding the modern-day town of Belevren, near the Turkish border. D30.1 is situated in a clearing on the mountain and from it, one can see the vastness and beauty of the mountain range. The dolmen itself is in a state of ruin, and from its remains could perhaps be suggested that it consisted of a single inhumation chamber. There is no sign of a mound and it may or may not have also had an attached antechamber. There is also no evidence of a façade. D30.2 is different as it is situated in dense forest. The dolmen itself is in a good condition. Its constructed of three chambers, a monumental façade, and a large mound. The dolmen looks as it was excavated, yet unfortunately there seems to be no record of excavation. D30.3 is situated in a clearing like D30.1 but is in a good state of repair. The dolmen consists of three chambers, a monumental façade, and a large mound. D30.4 is located near to D30.3 and consists of the same layout: three chambers, a mound, and a façade. Like D30.3, D30.4 is also located in dense woodland.

References: Agre 2005, 52-54

**Brishlyan | Бръшлян**

Burgas – D21

27.45069444/42.04097222

This dolmen is situated in a location with spectacular views. There is only a light concentration of trees around it. The dolmen itself consists of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber. No mound or façade.
Chambarcheto | Хамбарчето

Malko Tarnovo – D19
27.43505556/42.01905556

Very badly damaged dolmen that possibly consisted of a single inhumation chamber with antechamber. The dolmen is situated in dense woodland and covered in shrubbery.

Dolno Yabilkovo | Долно Ябълково

Ябилково Burgas – D32
27.16055556/42.12491667 [D32.1]
27.12980556/42.11816667 [D32.2]
27.12852778/42.11225 [D32.3]

All three of these dolmens are situated in very dense woodland on top of considerably high hills near the mountains. None of the dolmens here have monumental façades. D32.1 is a destroyed dolmen situated on a flatter part of the hill. No views from the dolmen are limited by the sheer concentration of trees. By the remains of the dolmen it seems reasonable to suggest that it consisted of a single chamber and an antechamber. The construction of the dolmen is slightly different than the rest as the cap stone placed on top to cover the dolmen consisted of just one huge stone instead of one cap stones for each chamber. No evidence of a mound or façade. D32.2 consists of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber. There is no evidence of a mound here, but there is a huge stone fallen at its entrance which suggests that it could have been closed and may have had a façade. This dolmen, like the former, is in relatively bad condition. D32.3 is also in bad condition, possibly due to specifically illicit digging. The dolmen consists of a single chamber and an antechamber. There is no evidence of a mound here or a façade.

Gogovo | Гогово

Malko Tarnovo – D20
27.449/42.02069444

Heavily damaged single chamber dolmen with no antechamber. Situated in dense woodland on a slight embankment. This dolmen is almost completely submerged in the ground. No evidence of mound or façade.
**Golyam Dervent | Голям**

Дервент Бургас – D34

26.75202778/41.98277778 [D34.1]
27.16055556/42.12491667 [D34.2]
26.74044444/41.97091667 [D34.3]

The dolmens of Golyam Dervent are very close to the Turkish border. D34.1 is located in dense shrubbery at the back of a modern-day cemetery. The views from it are very limited. There is no evidence of a mound or evidence that it was closed. The dolmen consists of an antechamber and a main inhumation chamber. No evidence of a façade or mound. D34.2 is a very large dolmen and is situated in dense woodland. It consists of three chambers and was completely covered with a huge mound until it was excavated. Yet there is no evidence for a façade. D34.3 consists of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber. It is located in clearing in the middle of the woods. There is some evidence to suggest that it was covered with a mound. This dolmen is particularly special as it has a very elaborately carved (but partially destroyed) plate which separates the main inhumation chamber from the antechamber. No other dolmen displays this type of ornamentation and must have taken considerable time and effort. Unfortunately, not much of the relief survives to make any comment on what the carving could have been but the fact that there was a carving in the dolmen adds further questions as to whether there may have been more. Yet, there is no evidence for a monumental façade.

References: Dinchev 2008; 2006

**Golyamo Bukovo | Голям Буково**

Бургас – D29

27.15755556/42.17338889

The dolmen is situated in dense woodland and consists of a single main chamber and an antechamber. Although it is very badly damaged, there is evidence for a mound surrounding the dolmen. Yet, there is no evidence of a façade.

**Gorno Yabilkovo | Горно Ябилково**

Бургас – D31

27.12055556/42.10577778

The dolmen is situated in extremely dense shrubbery and can be easily missed. It is
very badly destroyed and perhaps consisted of three chambers. There is no evidence of a mound or façade. Although it can be added that the inhumation chamber is very large, which suggests the extent of the dolmen when it was fully above ground.

**Granichar | Граничар**

Burgas – D27 27.27606667/42.12383333 [D27.1]
27.23916667/42.116075 [D27.2]
27.22961111/42.116075 [D27.3]
27.22916667/42.13222222 [D27.4]
27.21247222/42.14313889 [D27.5]

These dolmens are located surrounding the village of Granichar. They are mostly located on the highest hills on the foothills of the Strandzha. Most also have long distance views of the surrounding mountain range.

D27.1 is situated almost on the side of the hill and consists of three chambers. The entrance has been blocked and there is some evidence of a mound. This dolmen is badly damaged, yet the chambers can still be seen. No evidence of a façade. D27.2 is quite different from D27.1 in that the entrance slab is much more rounded. There is some evidence that there was an antechamber although what survives is the main inhumation chamber. This dolmen is situated within dense woodland and is on top of a large hill. The cap stone on the main inhumation chamber, however, is much more rough than the other dolmens in the region and looks as if it was just place on top without any aesthetic attention. It is too difficult to address whether or not this dolmen was open or closed. No evidence of mound or façade. D27.3 is much like the former in that it has a very round entrance plate. It is situated in an area relatively devoid of hills and has views stretching across the mountains. Is consists of only a single chamber and was most likely closed as today, it is still partially submerged within its mound. No evidence of a façade. D27.4 is very close to D27.3 but is situated in deeper woodland with restricted views. It is very badly damaged and probably only consisted of a single inhumation chamber and perhaps an antechamber. There is no visible evidence of a mound but there are large stones situated outside of its front entrance plate which suggests that this was either a closed dolmen or is evidence of a façade. D27.5 is situated in very dense forest yet is relatively well preserved. The dolmen consists of two chambers, the main one is very badly damaged, however, the front chamber still survives in good condition. There is no
stone outside the front of the entrance chamber which may suggest that it was open. In addition, there is no visible evidence of a mound. There are many rocks around it which may have formally been a mound, but it is too badly preserved to say. No evidence of a monumental façade.

Kakachina  |  Какачина

Malko Tarnovo – D17
27.45705556/42.00625

The dolmen here is situated in deep woodland and consists of a single inhumation chamber. The dolmen is so badly damaged that it resembles D13.1 in that it looks rather abstract; balancing on top of two boulders. The front and back of the chamber have fallen away to reveal a completely open chamber. No evidence of mound or façade.

Kalovo  |  Калово

Burgas – D14
27.52725/42.13741667 [D14.1]
27.52763889/42.13269444 [D14.2]
27.496/42.11747222 [D14.3]
27.49677778/42.11736111 [D14.4]

Four dolmens in this area are all in quite close proximity to one another and are situated in dense woodland. D14.1 is heavily damaged and consisted of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber but no evidence of mound. D14.2 looks much the same, apart from it did not have an antechamber and no evidence of a mound. D14.3 is almost destroyed and consisted of a single inhumation chamber with an antechamber and no mound. D14.4 is the same as D14.3. All the dolmens here are in a very bad state of repair and no excavations have been conducted around them. None of the dolmens had monumental façades.

Kirovo  |  Кирово

Burgas – D28
27.19541667/42.15233333 [D28.1]
27.15952778/42.13919444 [D28.2]

D28.1 is a destroyed dolmen situated in an area of relatively few trees. From the dolmen
one has a vide ranging view of the mountains. The dolmen had a very large inhumation chamber and may have consisted of two chamber (main inhumation chamber and an antechamber). There is no evidence here of a mound, and too little of the dolmen is left to say whether it was open or closed. No evidence of a façade. D28.2 is a much better preserved dolmen and consists of a three chambers. It is situated in an area of relatively dense woodland. It has a mound (removed by excavators). The dolmen has a monumental façade and large openings into one of the antechambers.

Krainovo | Краиново

Burgas – D33
26.83391667/41.98494444
There are two dolmens at Krainovo, however, only one GIS point was provided for both of them. Each of the dolmens are very badly damaged and both are situated next to one another on the side of a mountain. They are situated within a light wood and views of the surrounding mountains are still visible from the site. Unfortunately, both of the dolmens are destroyed and the only assumption that would could perhaps make about them is that they both consisted of a single chamber and no mound or monumental façade.

Zabernovo | Заберново

Malko Tarnovo – D15
27.54086111/42.10697222
The two dolmens at Zabernovo have been excavated by Agre (2005) but publications were unfortunately unobtainable. However, both dolmens were excavated and revealed a high concentration of fragmented bones along with metal jewellery and large concentrations of ceramic fragments in the antechambers and outside the front of both dolmens.

Both dolmens consist of a single inhumation chamber with an antechamber. One has a monumental façade. Both were fortified with a mound which also contained a high concentration of pottery fragments. Unknown as to whether they had a mound but they did have monumental façades.

References: Agre 2005a
**Likata | Лъката**

Burgas – D25  
27.33/42.1366666

The dolmen is very badly damaged and looks as if it may have consisted of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber. The dolmen is situated on the side of a steep hill which may be one of the reasons it has not survived well. No monumental façade but possible traces of a mound detected.

**Raikov | Райков**

Burgas – D26  
27.30866667/42.10552778 [D26.1]  
27.31/42.10422222 [D26.2]

Two destroyed dolmens. In areas with a low concentration of trees and vegetation. D26.1 was possibly made of a single chamber and antechamber as some of its façades have been preserved but for the most part it is destroyed. D26.2 is too badly destroyed to make any assumptions.

**Stankovo | Станково**

Malko Tarnovo Region – D16  
Coordinates: 27.46677778/41.98852778 [D16.1]  
27.46613889/42.98947222 [D16.2]

There are three dolmens at this site. All of the dolmens are almost completely destroyed and only an outline of their forms remain in the ground. All the dolmens here are situated in dense woodland. D16.1 is a very large dolmen that may have consisted of a single inhumation chamber and an antechamber. No remains of a mound can be seen for any of the dolmens. D16.2 two dolmens near to the former, both consist only of a single inhumation chamber. One of the dolmens at D16.2 shows evidence of being closed but the others are too badly damaged to assess whether they were open or closed.

**Zhivak | Живак**

Malko Tarnovo Region – D18  
Coordinates: 27.43427778/42.01516667
Single chamber dolmen, almost completely destroyed, situated in dense woodland. No antechamber, mound, or monumental façade.

**Zvezdets | Звездец**

Burgas Region – D23
Coordinates: 27.39288889/42.09327778

Single chamber dolmen with antechamber. The dolmen today is half submerged within the ground. It is partially preserved, and looks at is it may have been left open. No evidence of mound or façade.
B.4 Dolmens in Greek Thrace

Excavations have been undertaken by D. Triantaphyllos in recent years in relation to some of the dolmens in the Greek Rhodopes. On account of these excavations, the dolmens were able to be dated on account of Pshenichevo ceramic material and cross-dated to other examples in Bulgarian Thrace.


Samothrace | Σαμοθράκη

Aegean Thrace Region

Coordinates: Unknown The dolmens on Samothrace resemble more examples already discussed from Bulgaria. Despite only being two examples on the island, both exhibit an entrance with a trapezoidal-like shape, leading into a single chamber, presumably for the disposal of remains. No systematic excavation of the dolmens has been conducted, however, significant observations have been made through field surveys undertaken by Matsas (see Ilieva (2006)).

Roussa | Ρούσσα

Aegean Thrace Region

Coordinates: Unknown There are three or four dolmens in the vicinity of the village of Roussa in northern Greece. They are distinct from the Bulgarian examples as they do not exhibit the same complexity. The Roussa examples exhibit a single chamber with no obvious entrance. They resemble more cist graves above ground. No systematic excavation of the dolmens have been published, but detailed observations and surveys undertaken by D. Triandafillos (see above) have contributed significantly to what we know about these megalithic monuments in the region of Thrace.
Appendix C

Supporting Graphs

This part of the appendix is for the additional supporting graphs that document the full list of grave-goods from the regions around Thrace. Three types of bar-charts will be shown here, 1) simple relative frequencies, which give the relative percentage of object quantities per tomb, 2) absolute counts of objects found in tombs, and 3) bar-charts which show the total number of object per tomb in each grouped region. This is an important endeavour as it reveals the full extent of material discoveries from each of the regions within the thesis. The graphs are presented in chronological order, beginning with the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age I and ending with the Late Iron Age. The regions are given in the titles of each of the graphs and the number of tombs each graph represents is shown in the caption below with "n=".
Appendix C. Supporting Graphs

Figure C.1: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 27

Figure C.2: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 27
Figure C.3: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 27
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Figure C.4: Absolute count of the different objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 37

Figure C.5: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 37
Figure C.6: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age I, n = 37
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Figure C.7: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 13

Figure C.8: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 13
Figure C.9: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 13$
Figure C.10: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 16

Figure C.11: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 16
Figure C.12: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Eastern region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 16
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Figure C.13: Absolute count of the different objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 29$

Figure C.14: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 29$
Figure C.15: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 29$
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Figure C.16: Absolute count of the different objects found within the South Western region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 19

Figure C.17: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the South Western region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 19
Figure C.18: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the South Western region during the Early Iron Age II, n = 19
Figure C.19: Absolute count of the different objects found at the Filiouri cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 18

Figure C.20: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found at the Filiouri cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 18
Figure C.21: Frequency of the total number of objects found at the Filiouri cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 18
Figure C.22: Absolute count of the different objects found at the Kossynthos cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 3

Figure C.23: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found at the Kossynthos cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 3
Figure C.24: Frequency of the total number of objects found at the Kossynthos cemetery during the Early Iron Age II, n = 3
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Figure C.25: Absolute count of the different objects found in the Western region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 4$

Figure C.26: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found in the Western region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 4$
Figure C.27: Frequency of the total number of objects found in the Western region during the Early Iron Age II, $n = 4$
Figure C.28: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Kendria cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 23

Figure C.29: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Kendria cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 23
Figure C.30: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Kendria cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 23
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Figure C.31: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Larnaki cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, $n = 14$

Figure C.32: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Larnaki cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, $n = 14$
Figure C.33: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Larnaki cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 14
Figure C.34: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Tsiganathika cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 49

Figure C.35: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Tsiganathika cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 49
Figure C.36: Frequency of the total number of objects found within Tsiganathika cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, $n = 49$
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Figure C.37: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Vrousouthes cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 6

Figure C.38: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Vrousouthes cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 6
Figure C.39: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Vrousouthes cemetery on Thasos during the Early Iron Age, n = 6
Appendix C. Supporting Graphs

Figure C.40: Absolute count of the different objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Late Iron Age, \( n = 26 \)

Figure C.41: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Late Iron Age, \( n = 26 \)
Figure C.42: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the Central Eastern region during the Late Iron Age, $n = 26$
Figure C.43: Absolute count of the different objects found within the South Central region during the Late Iron Age, \( n = 33 \)

Figure C.44: Relative proportion of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Late Iron Age, \( n = 33 \)
Figure C.45: Frequency of the total number of objects found within the South Central region during the Late Iron Age, n = 33
Appendix D

Supporting Data - Iron Age Fibulae

The non-funerary data was used within the thesis concerned the lengths of the fibulae. Many of the lengths taken are, however, approximate as the author did not measure all of these fibulae in-person. Therefore, the exact lengths of some fibulae may vary.

D.1 Late Iron Age Fibulae Data

The data used for the Late Iron Age fibulae analysis comes from a variety of sources. Data from Bulgaria, concerning the Late Iron Age (5th-3rd centuries B.C.) was very kindly given to me by Vasileva (2012), from her own thesis which classified Late Iron Age fibulae found in Bulgarian Thrace, with some examples from Greek Thrace. Other fibulae from Aegean Thrace and areas including modern-day eastern Macedonia came from the AEMTh reports. On this point, it should also be noted that there were several Late Iron Age sites in Aegean Thrace such as Palonia Keramario cemetery (Karamitrou-Mendesidi 2007b, 23-35) and the Hellenistic graves at the Aiani east cemetery (Karamitrou-Mendesidi 2007a, 37-45) but as these images did not include a scale, it was not possible to ascertain even a semi-accurate reading on their size, which resulted in them being excluded. This was also similar for other Late Iron Age fibulae which were only mentioned in passing within the reports. Similarly, in a lot of instances type.V fibulae exhibited morphological similarities with the globular Asia types of fibulae. Of course, a more qualified expert such as Bouston (2019) could distinguish additional sub-types of fibulae between the two on the grounds of physical variation, however, for the purposes of this study, close parallels to type.V have been designated as as such.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Length (cm)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Belitsa</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>i.1a</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pisteros</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1b-1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pisteros</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1a</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pisteros</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1c</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pisteros</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>pod.1.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Progled</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>i.1c-3</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Duvanilj</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>pod.1.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Duvanilj</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>pod.1.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Duvanilj</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>pod.1.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Vasil Levsky</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>ii.1a</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pleven - Ivaylovgrad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1a</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Vinogradets</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1b</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Belovo</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1c</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.1c</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>hib.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>hib.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Abalanitsa</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>hib.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Levovo</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ii.3</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Dragoinovo</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Dragoinovo</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Dragoinovo</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Dragoinovo</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Gorno Belo</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Koprivlen</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Koprivlen</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>hib.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Babyak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Babyak</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>hib.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Babyak</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bab.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Babyak</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bab.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Belovo</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bab.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>iii.1</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pavelesko</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>iii.2</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pavelesko</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Pavelesko</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Mezek</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Satovcha</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Satovcha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.iv</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Stoikite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>pod.1.3</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Stoikite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>pod.1.3</td>
<td>Vasileva 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1a</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1a</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1b-1</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1c-2</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1c-2</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.1c-2</td>
<td>Robinson 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Samothrace</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>i.5b</td>
<td>Dusenbury 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Samothrace</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Dusenbury 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Paionias Kilkis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>spiral</td>
<td>Chrisostomou &amp; Chrisostomou 1992, 425-428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Gazarou Serres</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Poulis 1995, 411-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Gazarou Serres</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>10.a</td>
<td>Poulis 1995, 411-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Gazarou Serres</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>10.a</td>
<td>Poulis 1995, 411-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Gazarou Serres</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Poulis 1995, 411-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Vergina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>10.a</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Vergina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Vergina 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Vergina 3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Vergina 3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Vergina 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Faklaris 1996, 69-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Phagres (Drymo) 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Phagres (Drymo) 5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Phagres (Drymo) 4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Phagres (Drymo) 6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thessaloniki 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Tsimbidou-Avloniti et al. 2005, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Yannitsa 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2000, 473-485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Yannitsa 2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2000, 473-485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Yannitsa 3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2000, 473-485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Yannitsa 3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2000, 473-485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Yannitsa 3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2000, 473-485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Pella Ditiko 4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2006, 703-710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Pella Ditiko 4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2006, 703-710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Pella Ditiko 4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2006, 703-710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Pella Ditiko 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>tip.5</td>
<td>Chrissostomou &amp; Chrissostomou 2006, 703-710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.2 Early Iron Age Fibulae Data

In contrast to the Late Iron Age fibulae, the Early Iron Age examples were more numerous in number and, therefore, more statistically significant. The data used in the thesis was collected from numerous different sources. In Bulgarian Thrace these were mainly in the AOR journals and Gergova’s (1987) seminal publication on Bulgarian fibulae. For Greece, the data used in the thesis was principally collected from the AEMTh reports, but also from Sapouna-Skellarakis (1978) (who work focused on the islands in the north Aegean). The dating of the fibulae is a contentious matter still, and this should be signed-posted again. The fibulae used here have been broadly dated to the Early Iron Age II period, however, as mentioned in chapter 8, variabilities in fibulae chronology, particularly in Bulgaria, has no current consensus. Thus, I take liberty in assigned these examples to the Early Iron Age II, in contrast to Czyborra (2001) who dated some of the types used here to around 1000 B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Length (cm)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Skobelovo</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Skobelovo</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Dobralak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova, 1987:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Debraštica</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Dobralak</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Svoboda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova, 1987, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Bogdanica</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.1.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Míkov 1940, 41, 27; Gergova 1987, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Dobralak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Dobralak</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.d</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Duvanlij</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Skobelovo</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Dobralak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavesko</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavitsa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyassachnik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyassachnik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyassachnik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyassachnik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyassachnik</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pyasachnik</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Lakavika</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Varben</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavelsko</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavelsko</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Pavelsko</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Katrishte</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Georgieva et al. 1998, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hebros</td>
<td>Nevestino</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Progled</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Koprivljen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Progled</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.1.d</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Dagonovo</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>bi.2.d</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Progled</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Progled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Grochnoto</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Chepelare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.1.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Pamphorovo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Pamphorovo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Solishta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Ovnyanovo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Lyubica</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.1</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thrace</td>
<td>Kochan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Gergova 1987, 30-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Thrace kochan 7 bronze aii.3.g Gergova 1987, 30-31
South Thrace kochan 8 iron aii.3.g Gergova 1987, 30-31
South Thrace kochan 8 bronze kochan 7 South Thrace 1987, 30-31
South Thrace Kochan 5 bronze aii.2.b Gergova 1987, 22
South Thrace Kochan 5 bronze aii.2.b Gergova 1987, 22
South Thrace Kochan 5.4 bronze aii.2.b Gergova 1987, 22
South Thrace Kochan 5 bronze aii.2.b Gergova 1987, 22
South Thrace Progled 8 bronze aii.1.a Gergova 1987, 25
South Thrace Kochan 6 iron aii.1.a Gergova 1987, 23
South Thrace Kochan 5.5 iron aii.1.a Gergova 1987, 23
East Thrace Jambol 11 bronze aii.2.g Gergova 1987, 22
East Thrace Studena 8 bronze aii.2 notch Gergova 1987, 22
East Thrace Madan 6 bronze aii.2 smolyan_museum_website
East Thrace Stambolovo 3 bronze aii.1.a Nechrizov 2009, 267
East Thrace Stambolovo 5 bronze aii.3.a Nechrizov 2009, 267
East Thrace Stambolovo 5 bronze aii.1.a Nechrizov 2009, 267
East Thrace Stambolovo 5 bronze aii.1.g Nechrizov 2009, 267
East Thrace Sakartsi (dolmen) 4 bronze aii.1.a Gergova 1987, 20
East Thrace hlyabovo 9 iron aii.1.g Gergova 1987, 20
East Thrace hlyabovo 4.5 iron aii.1.g Gergova 1987, 20
East Thrace Zabernovo 7.2 bronze aii.2 single Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 4.5 bronze aii.1.b Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 4.5 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 5.3 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 4.3 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 5.4 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 4.7 bronze aii.3.b Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 5.8 bronze aii.2 Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Zabernovo 5.5 bronze aii.2.b Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evrenezovo 5.8 bronze aii.1.a Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evrenezovo 6.3 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evrenezovo 4.8 bronze aii.3.b Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evrenezovo 7 bronze aii.2.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evrenezovo 4.7 bronze aii.2 Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Evromozovo 4 bronze aii.3.b Gergova 1987, 25
East Thrace Evrenzezovo 4.5 bronze aii.3.b Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Belevren 10.4 bronze aii.1.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Belevren 5.2 bronze aii.1.a Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Belevren 8.5 bronze aii.1.a Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Belevren 3.8 bronze aii.3.g Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Belevren 7.4 bronze aii.3 bulb Agre & Dinchev 2006, 9-28
East Thrace Sakartsi (dolmen) 6 bronze aii.3.a Gergova 1987, 24
East Thrace Sakartsi (dolmen) 4 bronze aii.1.a Gergova 1987, 20
East Thrace Mezek 4 bronze aii.1.b Velkov 1937, 132; Gergova 1987, 21
Aegean Thrace Samo 5.5 bronze aii.3.g Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo 2.3 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo 2.2 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo 4.1 bronze paf.j.var Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.6 silver asia.minor Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.5 silver aii.1.a Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.5 silver aii.1.a Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.4 bronze aii.2 Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3 bronze aii.1.a Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 2.8 bronze aii.1.a Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.5 bronze aii.1.a Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 7 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 5.5 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 4 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 4 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 4 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Aegean Thrace Samo nek 3.5 bronze aii.3 bulb Dusenbery 1998
Crystal D., Who were the Thracians?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Samo_nek</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Dusenbery 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aiii.5</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>aiii.5</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aiii.5</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aiii.5</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bii.2.g</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Thrace</td>
<td>Diktea</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>aii.2.b</td>
<td>Triantafillos 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>aii.1.a</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 1995, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>aii.1.a</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 1995, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>aii.1.a</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 1995, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>asia.minor</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 2000, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 2000, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 2000, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Konstandia</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Chrissotomou 2000, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aii.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Inventory Code</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.g</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Drymos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.a</td>
<td>Keramaris 2009, 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Koukou</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td>Karington-Smith &amp; Vokotopoulou 1988, 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Koukou</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Karington-Smith &amp; Vokotopoulou 1988, 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Sourou</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.5</td>
<td>Soueref &amp; Havela 2002, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Sourou</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bi.2.g</td>
<td>Soueref &amp; Havela 2002, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.5</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.a</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Agios Hristofero</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Valla 2005, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c.1.b</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia Vergina</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td>Brüning and Kiliyan-Dirlmeier, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macedonia</td>
<td>Vergina</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>c1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey</td>
<td>Troja</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.f3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.leech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.leech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.aiv4</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.dv2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.eii</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.f2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.f3</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.g1</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.gii</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.bi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.hi3</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ji5</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.jii</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ki2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.li</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni3</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.ni2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>paf.sii</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.2</td>
<td>Caner</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.g</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean Turkey Ephesos</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.d</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.kugelglieder</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.b</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Emporio</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>aii.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean Region</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>bii.2.b</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.stretch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.plain</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>psf.j.var</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.a</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.kugelgliedern</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.bump</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.arch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporiaia</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.2.notch</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.bulb</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.b</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.1.strech</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.a</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.a</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Aegean</td>
<td>Hephaisteia</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>bronze</td>
<td>ai.3.a</td>
<td>Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>