ARCHAEOLOGIES OF THE GREEK PAST

Landscape, Monuments, and Memories

SUSAN E. ALCOCK

Professor of Classical Archaeology and Classics,
The University of Michigan

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

© Cambridge University Press 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Minion 11/14 pt *System* LaTeX 2ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 81355 7 hardback
ISBN 0 521 89000 4 paperback

CONTENTS

List of illustrations *page* viii
Preface xi
List of abbreviations xiv

1 Archaeologies of memory 1

2 Old Greece within the empire 36

3 Cretan inventions 99

4 Being Messenian 132

5 Three short stories about Greek memory 176

Bibliography 184
Index 213

ILLUSTRATIONS

1.1 Aquatint of the Athenian Acropolis, published in *Views in Greece, from Drawings by Edward Dodwell* (1821) *page* 4
1.2 Twentieth-century view of the Athenian Acropolis (courtesy of J. F. Cherry) 5
1.3 The "cruciform monument" from the temple of Shamash at Sippar (from King 1910) 8
1.4 Aerial view of Hambledon Hill, Child Okeford, Dorset (RC8-CM 263; courtesy of the Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photographs: copyright reserved) 10
1.5 The entrance to the post-rebellion kiva at Pecos Pueblo (courtesy of J. F. and C. B. Cherry) 14
1.6 Photograph of "Golgotha" taken by G. R. Swain in 1920 (KS 7.299; courtesy of the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan) 26
1.7 Special medal struck by the Israeli government to commemorate events at Masada (from *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand*, by Yigael Yadin, © 1966 by Yigael Yadin; used by permission of Random House, Inc.) 29
2.1 Map of the provinces of Achaia and western Asia, showing the location of principal places mentioned in the text 37
2.2 Map indicating early imperial population movement and resource displacement in western Greece (after Alcock 1993) 46
2.3 Traces of centuriation in the hinterland of Dyme, western Greece (after Rizakis 1997) 47
2.4 Plan of the Athenian Agora in the second century BC (courtesy of J. M. Camp) 52
2.5 Plan of the Athenian Agora in the second century AD (courtesy of J. M. Camp) 53
2.6 Altar of Zeus Agoraios (?), Athenian Agora (courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 57
2.7 Sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania in the northwest corner of the Athenian Agora (courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 59
2.8 Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios in the Athenian Agora (after Walker 1997) 61
2.9 General map of Athens, the Agora and its environs in the second century AD (courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 62
2.10 Model of the Athenian Agora in the second century AD (courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 63

2.11 Fifth-century BC cup tondo by the Triptolemus Painter (courtesy © The Trustees of the National Museums of Scotland) 75
2.12 Map of the Plain of Marathon (after Vanderpool 1966a) 77
2.13 View of the Marathon tumulus, believed to be the tomb of the Athenian war dead (courtesy of J. F. Cherry) 78
2.14 Artist's reproduction of a view, looking toward the propylon, of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias (courtesy of R. R. R. Smith and the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies) 90
2.15 Nero conquering Armenia, from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias (courtesy of the New York University Excavations at Aphrodisias) 92
2.16 Modern touristic foot traffic through the streets of ancient Ephesus (From S. Erdemgil, *Ephesus*; courtesy of Net Turistik Yayinlar A.Ş.) 95
3.1 Map of Crete, showing the location of principal places mentioned in the text 102
3.2 Comparison of the distribution of independent Hellenistic cities with that of sites with evidence for city status in Roman times (after Sanders 1982) 103
3.3 View of excavations in the "basilica" of the Praetorium at Gortyn (courtesy of the Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene) 104
3.4 Plan of the multi-phase Bronze Age site of Ayia Triada, showing the location of subsequent Hellenistic finds (after D'Agata 1998) 110
3.5 Balloon photograph of Kamilari Tholos I (courtesy of J. Wilson Myers) 111
3.6 Plan of the Late Minoan IB country house at Pyrgos (after Cadogan 1977–78) 112
3.7 Map of Cretan cave cults, in the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods (after Tyree 1974) 114
3.8 Hellenistic graves carefully inserted between larger, flanking Iron Age tombs, Knossos North Cemetery (photograph H. W. Catling, courtesy of the British School at Athens) 116
3.9 Probable Hellenistic dedication from the Psychro Cave, with three deep-cut "Linear A" symbols (courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 117
3.10 Summit of Mount Iuktas (courtesy of the Publishing Committee for the Swedish Institutes at Rome and Athens) 125
3.11 Plan of an early Greek temple within the Palace of Minos, identified by Evans as the "Temple of Rhea" (from Evans 1928) 126
3.12 Excavations in the 1980s at the Idaian Cave (source: *Ergon* 1984; courtesy of the Archaeological Society at Athens) 126
3.13 Sixth-century BC shield cover, rededicated in early imperial times at the Idaian Cave (source: *Ergon* 1984; reproduced courtesy of the British School at Athens and the Archaeological Society at Athens) 127
3.14 Provincial coins of Crete depicting Zeus Cretagenes (after Svoronos 1890) 128
3.15 Provincial coin of Crete with Caligula on the obverse (from Svoronos 1890) 129
4.1 Map of Messenia, showing the location of principal places mentioned in the text 133
4.2 View of Mount Ithome, showing the line of the renowned fourth-century city wall of Messene (courtesy of J. F. Cherry) 136

4.3 A rare visual representation of helots found in *The Cartoon History of the Universe* (courtesy of L. Gonick) 139
4.4 Inscription of "the Methanioi" ("the Messenians") on a bronze spear butt from the sanctuary of Apollo Korynthos (after Bauslaugh 1990) 144
4.5 Map of Archaic and Classical tomb cults 148
4.6 Plan of Tholos F at Nichoria (after McDonald 1975) 149
4.7 View down over the acropolis of Classical Pylos, looking into the survey territory of the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project (courtesy of J. F. Cherry) 151
4.8 Statue of Zeus Ithomatas represented on a civic coin of Messene (from Frazer 1898b) 159
4.9 Plaster cast of the Nike of Paionios (courtesy of the Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Cambridge) 161
4.10 Plan of the Asklepieion at Messene (after Themelis 1994b) 169

1

ARCHAEOLOGIES OF MEMORY

Memory – what a strange thing it is!
(Bachelard 1964: 9)

The present is "haunted" by the past and the past is modeled, invented, reinvented, and reconstructed by the present.
(Assmann 1997: 9)

. . . memory is a process, not a thing . . .
(Olick and Robbins 1998: 122)

This book is about something difficult to define, something troublesome to pin down, and in which not everyone entirely believes. It is also about something vital to our understanding of the ancient world. People derive identity from shared remembrance – from social memory – which in turn provides them with an image of their past and a design for their future.[1] What people remember of the past fashions their sense of community and determines their allies, enemies, and actions; they will argue over it and kill for it. Social memory is manifestly a mighty force, but also a fugitive one. Memories overlap and compete; over time they change or are eradicated; people forget.

As this chapter will demonstrate, it is hard enough to follow the mutabilities of memory in the present day; so, inevitably, the problems are all the more compounded for long-gone times. How to study a present "haunted"

1. Fentress and Wickham define social memory as "an expression of collective experience: social memory identifies a group, giving it a sense of its past and defining its aspirations for the future" (1992: 25). Olick and Robbins define memory studies as "a general rubric for inquiry into the varieties of forms through which we are shaped by the past, conscious and unconscious, public and private, material and communicative, consensual and challenged" (1998: 112). A closely related concept is Assmann's "cultural memory," summed up tersely by Jonker as "the sum of the memories which a society needs to emulate its past and from which it derives its identity": Jonker 1995: 30; Assmann delimits four spheres – mimetic memory, material memory, communicative memory, and cultural memory – with the first three entering into the space created by the fourth: Assmann 1992: 21, 48–66. Some recent general reviews of social memory include Bourguet *et al.* 1990; Connerton 1989; Fara and Patterson 1998; Klein 2000, esp. 134–38; Lowenthal 1985: 193–210; Olick and Robbins 1998; Roth 1994.

by the past, when even that present lies far removed from us in time, leaving only fragments behind? How are we to conceive the memories of past peoples such as, for example, the ancient Greeks? Two academic strategies have evolved to deal with such questions. The first has been simply to relieve dead populations of the burden of their past, proceeding to analyze and assess their activities as if they had no memories at all. The second has been solely to rely on surviving documentary evidence when attempting to recover what societies valued and recalled. Neither strategy is satisfactory – the first based on an arrogant and unsound premise, the second on a severely limited view of what constitutes relevant data.

This book proposes another way forward by espousing the cause of archaeology, in particular the evidence it affords of monuments and landscapes. In archaeology the term "matrix" defines the material in which artifacts are embedded and supported; I shall argue here that memories are similarly embedded and supported within a material framework. To examine that framework is to expand the range of commemorative practices and impulses we can actually recognize and study, giving back to peoples in the past – if only ever partially – some of the vigor of their remembrances.

To make my argument, I will consider three specific case studies, each set in a different time period and with a different geographical scope. They are, however, related analyses, for each revolves around peoples at a time of especial stress and transformation (notably the impact of military conquest and annexation), and each employs archaeological evidence to trace responses to those challenges. To begin, however, I want to explore in somewhat more detail the nature of social memory and the present state of its study. The role of archaeology in this endeavor also requires clarification, detailing just which categories of material culture are most helpful in approaching anything as intangible and frangible as memory. At the chapter's conclusion, I introduce the three studies in which we will explore remembrance of things past – in the past.

SIX SHORT STORIES ABOUT SOCIAL MEMORY

I find talking in the abstract about social memory a rather arid discourse for such a dynamic subject. To that end, six short stories are here told that delineate the power and complexity of remembering. Myriad tales could have been invoked, but I deliberately chose the six to represent diverse contexts and approaches. The first vignette serves as a bridge to the principal focus of the book – ancient Greece – but the remainder are admittedly a geographically

and temporally mixed bag. The short stories also display the mélange of means through which memory is sustained (including ritual performances, archival documentation, oral traditions, ethnographic testimony, and physical mementoes) – or erased – as well as a variety of scholarly styles. The cumulative impact of these short stories makes a variety of points essential to my argument, and these will be reviewed after the stories have been told.

Stripping the Parthenon

The story of the Greek Revolution against Turkish dominion – its enthusiastic European backing, its heroic indigenous leadership – has been recounted many times. Memories of past freedom stirred all parties involved; the invocations most frequently recorded called upon the classical age and, in particular, upon the liberty ensured by the Persian Wars. Innumerable quotations come to mind; Byron musing at Marathon "that Greece might still be free," or Alexander Ypsilantis proclaiming:

> Let us recollect, brave and generous Greeks, the liberty of the classic land of Greece; the battles of Marathon and Thermopylae; let us combat upon the tombs of our ancestors who, to leave us free, fought and died. The blood of our tyrants is dear to the shades . . . above all, to those of Miltiades, Themistocles, Leonidas and the three hundred who massacred so many times their number of the innumerable army of the barbarous Persians – the hour is come to destroy their successors, more barbarous, and still more detestable. Let us do this or perish. To arms then, my friends, your country calls you.

Pressure to locate the source of Greek identity in that particular, classic epoch continued in the wake of statehood – a choice externally urged by the influential "Philhellenes" of Europe and by the geopolitical situation of the young nation. Today, the history, art, and culture of the High Classical age still dominate global conceptions of what is truly significant about Greek history.

Also demanding recognition within this modern nation, however, are divergent patterns of commemoration, versions of Greek cultural origins that refused to forget the centuries intervening between Pericles and Kolokotronis. Advocates remember and speak for the heritage of Byzantium, and for indigenous developments in the country, even under Turkish rule. The title *Romiós* (or Romeic), derived ultimately from "Roman," has been used to sum up this stance, which (such is the authoritative power of the "Hellenist" image) has often been conceived in pejorative terms. The co-existence of these distinct memorial positions, and the contestations between them, have been

Fig. 1.1 Aquatint of the Athenian Acropolis, published in *Views in Greece, from Drawings by Edward Dodwell* (1821). A Turkish mosque would have stood within the Parthenon at this time, but that fact seems discreetly veiled.

remarked in many spheres – in poetry, in politics, in folklore, in music, above all in language.[2] But they could also be visible to the eye.

An aquatint published in 1821 (the very year of Revolution) by the British traveler Edward Dodwell helps to make the point (Fig. 1.1). That is indeed the Parthenon on the Athenian Acropolis, but here it stands side-by-side and surrounded by dwellings, religious structures, fortifications, and monuments belonging to quite distinct historical epochs – a palimpsest of construction and experience. For viewers and passers-by, elements within this collection would stimulate memories of different episodes, gods, or heroes; they would activate remembrance of different moments in the past. The continuing physical juxtaposition in Greece of churches and temples, Byzantine mosaics and

2. For a scholarly study of "Hellenist" and "Romeic" conceptions, as manifest particularly in folklore studies, Herzfeld 1982. Patrick Leigh Fermor was once told by a Greek friend that (in some uses) "Romiós" represented "our dirty linen" – or, in Leigh Fermor's words, "the helplessness of subjection and the strands of Turkish custom which . . . wove themselves into the web of Greek life." Fermor discusses the "Helleno-Romaic dilemma" at length in *Roumeli*, creating a list with sixty-four diverging characteristics and preferences. The last of these contrasts the Dome of St. Sophia with the columns of the Parthenon (1966: 96–147, quotation at 100). The Ypsilantis proclamation is quoted in full in St. Clair 1972: 23; out of a vast bibliography, see also Brewer 2001; Tsigakou 1981: 21–62.

Fig. 1.2 Twentieth-century view of the Athenian Acropolis.

Classical statues, allows both Hellenist and Romeic conceptions of the past to persist, and persistently to contend with each other.

That only remains true, however, if the structures themselves are allowed to survive. These observations cast new light upon a well-documented phenomenon: the stripping of the Athenian Acropolis over the course of the nineteenth century. Medieval and early modern monuments and structures – the Turkish mosque within the Parthenon, parts of the Ducal Palace, the Frankish Tower – were all demolished, with little record kept of their "destruction."[3] Left behind is a polished limestone surface on which stand scattered edifices and monuments dating almost exclusively to the classic "golden age" (Fig. 1.2). Explanations for these actions are numerous, complex, and deeply bound up with the emergence of Greek national identity and the *Megali Idea*, and with the imperatives of western cultural (not least touristic) expectations. The appearance of the present-day Acropolis must also be taken, however, as the result of a battle over social memory; it represents a struggle for control over a highly memorable space. The loser, characteristically, becomes invisible.

3. For an overview of this "destruction," McNeal 1991. A similar pairing of illustrations, as in Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 here, is employed in Schneider and Höcker 1990: 11.

The Camisard rebellion

In the early eighteenth century, Louis XIV, the Sun King, revoked the Edict of Nantes and outlawed Protestantism. Local enforcement of this central edict led, in the Cévennes mountains of southern France, to desperate revolt. Whipped up by Messianic exhortations and waging guerrilla-style warfare, the Camisards (as they are known) for a short time beat back the Royalist troops before being crushed. Over 250 years later, the historian Philippe Joutard discovered that the people of the Cévennes were still happy to talk about this Camisard rebellion. They described its leaders and heroes (one evocatively nicknamed "Roland," after the hero of the medieval narrative, *The Song of Roland*), as well as the course of various clashes; in particular they could identify geographical locales associated with the revolt, not least the refuge caves of the Camisards. To some extent these communal memories were fed by historical accounts and by formal monuments; on the other hand, such honors were late in coming – the rebels were widely condemned until a nineteenth-century Romantic reappraisal. Moreover, the fact that many of the anecdotes revolve around minor events – a particular skirmish, the exploits of a familial ancestor – points to the work of long-term oral tradition, rooted in strong memories of specific places.

These stories – some academically verifiable, some not – all work to the same end: "that of constituting the Protestant community's identification of itself as a community of resistance, which is partly backed up by and partly creates a tradition of resistance that has continued to exist in the area until today." The paradigmatic eighteenth-century outbreak invades and shapes remembrance of other historical events which become "camisardized," as James Fentress and Chris Wickham put it in their 1992 book *Social Memory*. Other groups at moments of opposition (notoriously the French Resistance of World War II) are cast very much in the Camisard mold, while men or events which fail to fit this pattern (even such "greats" as Napoleon or World War I) are disregarded – much to the horror of more conventional nationalist historians. This commemorative structure guides the region's ongoing political stance: steadfastly in favor of opposition, in favor of resistance.

Relative stability of population clearly contributed to this deep-running pattern of social memory; by contrast, neighboring areas, more transformed by processes of industrialization, possess far sketchier notions about the uprising. As the people of the Cévennes themselves become increasingly mobile, the detail of Camisard memories, and their inherent power, is also becoming attenuated.[4]

4. Fentress and Wickham 1992: 92–99, quotation at 93.

Digging Sargon

In the successive and competing dynasties and empires of ancient Mesopotamia, regimes continually invoked memories of their predecessors, using them to create and promulgate structures of political identity. A principal stimulus for these shared memories, Gerdien Jonker has argued, was the physical trace of the past in the present-day landscape: old cities, old walls, old temples, old statues – in other words, the material framework of the past in the present (termed, after Halbwachs [see below, pp. 24–25], the *cadre matériel*). While this led to a complicated "topography of remembrance," the most powerful commemorative magnet was late third-millennium BC Akkad and its legendary rulers Sargon and Naram-Sin. This "Akkad orientation" offered a legacy of centralized rule and state strength, in contrast to which names and events lacking such ingredients fell into "the black holes that recur in reconstructions of Mesopotamian memory patterns."

As the centuries passed, however, invoking the necessary *cadre matériel* became harder and harder to do, as the Mesopotamian landscape was profoundly rewritten, with new structures and features threatening or erasing those older traces. Yet Assyrian and Babylonian rulers of the first millennium BC still desired connections back in time, not least to the now distant days of Akkad. Kings thus turned philologist, reading (as one inscription claims for the seventh-century BC ruler Ashurbanipal) "the obscure Akkadian which is difficult to master. I inspected stone inscriptions from before the flood on which the dynasties had stamped their seal." Babylonian rulers, with monumental ruins in their territories, took an even more direct approach, purposefully digging at Akkad, at Ur, at Sippar, and elsewhere. Excavated discoveries were carefully recorded, resulting in texts oddly reminiscent of modern museum records: "Copy of a baked tile from the ruins of Ur. The work of Amar-Sin, king of Ur . . . Nabu-shuma-idinna . . . examined it and copied it for further surveying."

Not only did Mesopotamian kings practice excavation but, in a good cause, they would even salt their sites. Nineteenth-century AD excavations at Sippar discovered a container under the floor of the Ebabbar (the "White House"), abode of Shamash, god of the sun. In it were found building inscriptions of Nabonidus, last of the Babylonian kings (556–539 BC), together with a strangely shaped stone tablet (the "cruciform monument"; Fig. 1.3). Nabonidus, in recording his restoration of the Ebabbar, claimed to be building on the very foundations of Sargon the Great himself; there he discovered an inscription of Naram-Sin unseen by any other monarch, the king himself calculated, for 3200 years. This, the cruciform monument, bore Naram-Sin's

Fig. 1.3 The "cruciform monument" from the temple of Shamash at Sippar.

"original" regulations for the Shamash temple. Nabonidus implemented these rules, which seemed to come – in every sense – straight from the past, before reburying Naram-Sin's message with accounts of his own activity. A statue was also found in the old foundations, unequivocally identified by Nabonidus as an image of the great Sargon although the king noted "half of its head had broken off and it had disintegrated so that he did not find its face." The statue too was restored to a cultic function.

The strategy here is clear. Nabonidus sought, as a Babylonian king in an era of Assyrian decline, to claim the mantle of Akkad and thus of universal empire. If the necessary *cadre matériel* to summon up the necessary memories had vanished, then it was necessary to rediscover it. Nor should this be taken as an isolated royal fantasy. Through their engagement in ritual activity along lines laid down millennia before, broader communities came to see themselves as part of an ongoing chain of activity, anchored back in a hallowed time. Yet these links to the past, and the authority and pride they channeled, emerged only in carefully predetermined situations. As Jonker stresses, not all aspects of the past were equally important: not just any old excavation, in any old place, finding any old artifacts would do. The targets selected and the "chosen interpretation depended on the identity of the community that did the digging." The statue's face may have been missing, but Nabonidus none the less knew he had found Sargon.[5]

Neolithic gatherings

The prehistoric monuments of Britain are almost preternaturally long-lived. One example, Hambledon Hill in Dorset, is a local landscape inscribed with Neolithic long mounds, Bronze Age barrows, an Iron Age hillfort, and Anglo-Saxon burials; it has been documented as a notable regional landmark in accounts of the English Civil Wars, in the writings of Thomas Hardy, and in modern parish records (Fig. 1.4). Throughout this remarkable span of occupation, each period, in its own way, recognized its predecessors: earthworks respect earthworks, present-day archaeologists carefully disentangle the site's stages of activity.

5. Jonker 1995, quotations at 68, 156, 155, 170, 174. Another chest, this one dating to the ninth century BC, was also found (just below that of Nabonidus) in the nineteenth-century excavations of the Ebabbar temple. It too contained inscriptions and a cult relief of the god. Eleventh-century invasion had eradicated the cult of Shamash from Sippar; the "discovery" of this image, it was said, allowed new statues to be made and the cult renewed with honor. The king Nabu-apla-iddina then buried the relief "to prevent such a loss occurring again" (p. 163). Nabonidus must have been aware of this other casket, but makes no mention of it; his discoveries are turned to a different purpose. For other archaeological acts of Nabonidus, Schnapp 1996: 13–19, 31. For deliberate mutilation of another image of "Sargon": Nylander 1980.

Fig. 1.4 Aerial view of Hambledon Hill, Child Okeford, Dorset.

For the generations alive during the earlier British Neolithic (the fourth millennium BC), monumental complexes such as Hambledon Hill appear to have served as points in the landscape for the intermittent meeting of a population that was otherwise for the most part dispersed. Such gatherings allowed bonds of recognition and kinship to form, defining a larger social world for these small and scattered groups. Meeting at monuments provided contexts for exchange and feasting, for display and competition. These rituals and conversations provided the space necessary for the communication and consolidation of shared memories: "Within and around these arenas, it was possible to renew a sense of the collective, to mediate conflicts between lineages and confirm distinctions within groups . . . more often than not, these practices drew upon the past, the past of earlier generations and the past of ancestral

time." To return again and again to the same places, over the decades and over the centuries, affirmed collective traditions and common respect for the past.

Such interpretations, of course, are based upon the results of detailed archaeological work, upon the assessment of artifact provenience, of human skeletal and faunal remains, of the changing shape and size of the monument as a whole. In his book *Ancestral Geographies of the Neolithic*, Mark Edmonds has tried to move beyond such ostensibly objective reportage, writing in a deliberately emic, empathetic vein to convey the human atmosphere of such Neolithic gatherings:

> Before the sun had set, all would gather again . . . Within talk of what would happen, most knew that the night was important because it was almost the last . . . Most trades had been concluded, and there was agreement among many on rights of access. Spring would see new calves and help with new ventures, confirmation of bonds that had been recognised in the circle. With help and good fortune, there would be no conflict when the land was reborn.
>
> The old ones watched. They had made the pattern many times and looked on as it was formed again. Each time it seemed that a new element was added, a twist in the tale. It was never repeated exactly . . . There was always a chance that the pattern would be lost. That was why they watched. The dead held the circle together and everything else in its place.

The "old ones" imagined by Edmonds were prescient about change and the possibility of change. Over the course of the Neolithic, gathering places were continually reworked and their practices recast. The increasing proximity of settlements and elaborate burials to the enclosures, for example, suggests the growing promotion of more sectional or familial interests, whose own readings of the past presumably now competed with those of the collective. Neolithic monuments follow a variety of subsequent trajectories, but some at least (including Hambledon Hill) ended violently. There, oak outworks were burnt, rubble filled its ditches, bodies were left for scavenging animals, the site – for a time – was abandoned. Whatever specific forces lay behind this destruction, they must in part reflect a rejection of a dominant pattern of memories, the weight of invested tradition, contained by Hambledon Hill.[6]

The Rock War of Kalymnos

In 1935, the women of the Greek island of Kalymnos clashed with Italian *carabinieri*, fighting as a group ("shouting, hooting, resembling a human ocean")

6. Edmonds 1999, quotations at 134, 131–32.

with their bare hands, and – in the final encounter – with rocks. The Italians occupied the island at this time, but the specific catalyst to violence was a perceived threat to the Greek Orthodox Church, a fear that the Italians wished to place it under the control of the Pope. The women's opposition lasted for three days, ending when a man, against their wishes, joined the fray with a slingshot and was killed. All in all, this *Petropolemos* ("Rock War") was no small affair, but "the largest and most violent protest that the Italians faced during their thirty-year rule over the Dodecanese."

The *Petropolemos* is today remembered in several fashions, as David Sutton observes in his study of Kalymnos, *Memories Cast in Stone.* Older participant women speak of it proudly in everyday conversation, emphasizing its collective nature and reveling in the memory of their strength. In some forms of official discourse, such as newspaper accounts, the "Holy Rock War" is invoked whenever new threats to traditional Kalymnian religion, such as prosyletization by Jehovah's Witnesses, appear on the scene. Male memories, by contrast, tend to be more guarded and less frequently proffered; those that do find expression downplay the women's efforts, as compared to the parts played by the murdered slingshotter or by a vocal Orthodox priest, Papa Tsougranis. An accompanying shift of emphasis, moving the event from its local context to more national significance, was also witnessed by Sutton in an annual commemorative ceremony in 1993:

> This celebration involved the typical elements of a Kalymnian historical celebration: the presence of the political and religious dignitaries of the island (almost exclusively men), the playing of the Greek national anthem by the local philharmonic band, and the laying of the wreath by the mayor of Kalymnos on the bust of the priest, Papa Tsougranis . . . In the audience of approximately 200 people, only a few were old enough to have participated in the Rock War. The schoolteacher's speech emphasized how the Rock War was one of many similar acts of resistance to foreign tyranny in Greek *national* history No longer an outstanding act of collective resistance on the part of unarmed women, the Rock War had become, in his account, an example of Kalymnos living up to the ideals of a united Greece.

In this version of events, the schoolteacher's keynote speech mentioned the women only once, and then he described them as swept into resistance by the leadership of Papa Tsougranis.

How to remember the "Rock War" of less than a century ago, when women took to the streets and fought in the center of their community, is clearly

problematic in Kalymnian society. The "human ocean" of their struggle is "preserved in the memories and writings of a few, disputed by others, and for the rest . . . assimilated to the canons of legitimate history." As time and the generation of participants passes, its memory will not be reinforced in the living community and may ultimately disappear, outside the realm of academic accounts.[7]

Pecos Pueblo

The Pueblo Revolt of the American Southwest – "the first American revolution" – was a successful, if short-lived, rebellion. In 1680, an alliance of native villages temporarily drove the Spanish conqueror from their lands. Harsh levels of economic exploitation and determined missionary efforts to extirpate "idolatrous practices" underlay the formation of this ultimately shaky Pueblo coalition. Much aided by its internal dissensions, the Spanish under Diego de Vargas would return only a dozen years later, although completion of the *reconquista* would take some time.

The inhabitants of the Tano pueblo at Pecos, numbering about 2000 in 1680, participated vigorously in this revolt; the "fury of the Pecos" helped spearhead the siege of nearby Santa Fe and led to the slaughter of friars and settlers. But they fought in other ways as well, burning and leveling the monumental church (Nuestra Señora de los Ángeles de Pecos) which the Spanish had built within their pueblo in the 1620s. They then established a new kiva on the very grounds of the church's *convento* (rectory), with its entrance in full view of the now-ruined church (Fig. 1.5).[8] Kivas, subterranean circular chambers, were traditional spaces for religious ceremonials and other gatherings integral to pueblo society; not surprisingly, they became conspicuous points of contestation between indigenous peoples and Spanish missionaries. Kivas in several pueblos were visibly terminated through Christian activity; Alfred Kidder, the foremost early excavator of Pecos, noted that of the ten kivas in use at the beginning of the mission period, eight would either be stripped of their roofs or filled with garbage.

The symbolic juxtaposition of forsaken church and reasserted kiva would seem to point to an absolute and unified rejection of Christianity and of the Spanish by the Pecos community. Documentary sources, however, provide a somewhat different picture. It is attested that the pueblo's native governor warned the Spanish of the coming revolt. Pecos Pueblo emerged as an early

7. Sutton 1998, quotations at 89, 87, 93–94 (original emphasis), 95.
8. The kiva was placed in the *convento*'s corral; bedrock formations on site may well have prevented its establishment in an even more defiant location, such as the cloister: Hayes 1974: 33.

Fig. 1.5 The entrance to the post-rebellion kiva at Pecos Pueblo. In the background stand the foundations of the church destroyed in the Pueblo Revolt and its subsequent monumental replacement.

and firm ally of de Vargas in his campaign of recovery, although this split the community: dissidents either fled elsewhere or, in some cases, were actually executed by village authorities. The stamping out of one tradition and the reestablishment of another, so apparently clear in the site's architectural sequence, only partially reflects the decisions taken by the pueblo and masks its internal conflicts. The later construction of a new church on the ruins of the old, and the backfilling of the post-rebellion kiva, no doubt equally mask disagreement about right tradition and wrong memory.[9]

*

9. Hayes 1974; Sando 1979; Schroeder 1979; Simmons 1979. For other examples of symbolic "superposition" of monuments around the time of the revolt, Hayes 1974: 32–33. On the Pueblo Revolt, see Knaut 1995; Wilcox 2001. For later historic and present-day ethnic contestations, see Gonzales-Berry and Maciel 2000; Levine 1999.

I said at the beginning of this chapter that not everyone believes in social memory; even some believers are uncomfortable with certain aspects of the concept. A central concern is the straddle that must be made between individual reminiscences and their collective expression: how does a "society" remember? Amos Funkenstein (and many others) says "it" cannot: "consciousness and memory can only be realized by an individual who acts, is aware, and remembers. Just as a nation cannot eat or dance, neither can it speak or remember. Remembering is a mental act, and therefore it is absolutely and completely personal." A great fear arises that social memory offers a back door to re-creating essentialized categories ("collective," "people," "folk") of the very sort archaeologists, historians, and anthropologists have long sought to escape. In its more extreme forms, a denial of the individual can seem implicit, which leaves "the individual a sort of automaton, passively obeying the interiorized collective will."[10] These are serious methodological issues, made even more vexing by the fact that quite how individuals "remember" is not yet fully understood.

On the other hand, it is impossible to deny that social groups do share common memories (if not in lockstep and not to the exclusion of all else), and that those memories do powerfully inflect group perceptions and actions. The frameworks through which that shared shaping of remembrance takes place will be further discussed below (pp. 28–32). One other way to square this circle is to admit the existence of numerous "memory communities," with different sets of mnemonic practices, at work at any one time. The short stories illustrate this well, from the regional limits of the Cévennes, to the gendered remembrances of the Rock War, to the internal divisions of Pecos Pueblo. Memory communities are far from fixed or all-consuming entities, even when they encompass the "imagined communities" of national traditions or the bonding passions of ethnic groups. Other bodies – cities, institutions, regional associations, labor unions, and families – are also legitimate bearers of memory, and individuals are clearly capable of participating in more than one of these domains. This insistence on multiplicity avoids the danger of reifying some monolithic, mystical group mind.[11]

10. Quotations from Funkenstein 1993: 6; Fentress and Wickham 1992: ix, who compensate in part by using the term "social memory" rather than "collective memory." Touching on this point, from varying critical stances, see Gedi and Elam 1996 (who consider collective memory a "myth"); Klein 2000; Young 1993: xi. Olick and Robbins term the study of social memory a "nonparadigmatic, transdisciplinary, centerless enterprise," yet still end their review by saying "Sociology . . . cannot afford to forget memory" (1998: 105, 134). On recent advances in the "archaeology of the individual," see Meskell 1996; 1999; Tarlow 1997.

11. Halbwachs 1925. On national memories: Anderson 1991; James 1997; Kammen 1991; Olick and Robbins 1998: 116–19; see also references in n. 21. The term "memory community" is borrowed

What we are talking about, instead, is a plurality of concurrent, possibly conflicting, and potentially competing memories available to peoples at any given time. Dominant versions of the past obviously do exist (such as the traditions of the modern-day nation-state), but even these never stand alone. Subversive "counter-memories," chiefly belonging to a society's disempowered or deviant branches, forcibly challenge master narratives; in other cases, memory communities co-exist peacefully, if not always comfortably; in still other cases, they may operate in happy ignorance of each other.[12] So in the six stories above, we see different degrees of tension or contestation. Friction is averted with silence on Kalymnos, where men and women rarely confront each other about just what happened under Italian occupation. The people of the Cévennes preserved their Camisard memories, if at the expense of things the rest of France found more worthy of remembrance; in Greece the virtues of "Hellenist" and "Romeic" positions have been alternately promoted in both scholarly and popular culture. Memories came in more explosive conflict at Hambledon Hill, as well as at Pecos Pueblo, where choices about which past to acknowledge and which future to pursue were burnt and hammered into the site and where even a tiny community could further divide itself.

The story line, in each of these cases, is noticeably dynamic. Neolithic enclosures were constantly reworked over the generations; the destruction of Hambledon Hill represented its "death" in one incarnation, before it moved on to assume other meanings. Nabonidus, lacking the required link to a specific past, created his own version of Babylonia's relationship to ancient Akkad; the monuments of Pecos rise and fall. These observations raise a fundamental point: people may well represent their memories as constant and immutable (and firmly believe them to be so), yet – to return to Jan Assmann's quote at the chapter's head – "the past is modeled, invented, reinvented, and reconstructed by the present." Forgetfulness is as pivotal to this process as remembrance.[13] The medieval and Turkish Acropolis is gone; the inhabitants of the Cévennes region are beginning to forget the Camisards, as others have already done. As the older women of Kalymnos die, common knowledge of their saga goes with them. It is no longer in anyone's interests – political, economic, personal – to remember. These stories can never be

from Burke (1989), who patterns it on Stanley Fish's "interpretive communities" – subcultures within which criteria for judgment are implicitly or explicitly understood.

12. Davis and Starn 1989; Wickham 1994: 276; Zerubavel 1995: 10–11. On counter-memories: Foucault 1977: 139–64, though the term is currently little employed; given the inherent tensions in remembrance, it would be "redundant" (Klein 2000: 146, n. 6). For a famous debate about negotiation of "the present in the past": Appadurai 1981; Bloch 1977; see also Schudson 1992.
13. On forgetting: Battaglia 1992; Carsten 1995; Taylor 1993.

entirely lost, captured ("cast in stone") as they have now been by historians and anthropologists. But in the absence of such interventions, many former channels of memory have surely been erased beyond reconstruction, or even imagination.

This potential malleability of memory, coupled with its galvanic emotional charge, makes it too powerful, and too volatile, a forcefield to ignore. We are familiar with the politics of memory, not least in Northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia, and the Middle East, places where conflicting, equally strongly affirmed, accounts of the past are sent into battle, much as people are. Yet the politics of remembrance were equally operative in the British Neolithic, in first-millennium BC Mesopotamia, or in seventeenth-century New Mexico. Memories often cluster around particular paradigmatic events (what Assmann terms "constellative myths") or around particular charismatic figures. The Camisard Rebellion and the Persian Wars fall in the first category, Sargon and Leonidas in the second; like lightning rods, they drew energy to select versions of the past.[14] Conversely, amnesias – be they encouraged by the male-dominated discourse of Kalymnos or enforced through the back-filled kivas of the pueblos – likewise play a part in creating a "correct past." But who makes those decisions? Or, as Peter Burke put it: "It is important to ask the question, who wants whom to remember what, and why? Whose version of the past is recorded and preserved?"[15]

An obvious aspect of memory politics is the manipulation of the past by rulers or ruling elites. As Jacques Le Goff states flatly, "To make themselves the master of memory and forgetfulness is one of the great preoccupations of the classes, groups, and individuals who have dominated and continue to dominate historical societies."[16] Authoritative pronouncements formed one part of this process, such as when Nabonidus "reminded" his people of their historic link to Akkad. But material acts also created "masters of memory," as with the encroachment of elaborate family burials onto Hambledon Hill, or with the stripping of the Acropolis to fit a philhellenic, externally acceptable image of nationhood.

14. Assmann 1997: 7; Fentress and Wickham 1992: 92–114. Schwartz (1982: 290) uses the phrase "charismatic epoch," another example of which is the Greek Civil War (Collard 1989). Other charismatic figures include the hero *caciques* (hereditary chiefs) of the colonial peoples of the Columbian Andes (Rappaport 1998: 31–41), the Madagascar ruler Andrianampoini-Merina (Larson 1999), and the Messenian hero Aristomenes (see chapter 4).
15. Burke 1989: 107. See also Davis and Starn 1989: 2.
16. Le Goff 1992: 54. Foucault put it this way: "If one controls people's memory, one controls their dynamism . . . It is vital to have possession of this memory, to control it, administer it, tell it what it must contain": quoted in Baker 1985: 134. See also Alonso 1988; Duby and Lardreau 1980; Geary 1994: 3–9, 12; Gillis 1994b; Wachtel 1990.

Elite commemorative choices are ultimately – inevitably – going to prove most visible and effective; it is their version of the past that, most frequently, will be "recorded and preserved." Having admitted that, however, other possible answers do exist to Burke's questions. As he himself remarks:

> Given the multiplicity of social identities, and the co-existence of rival memories, alternative memories (family memories, local memories, class memories, national memories, and so on), it is surely more fruitful to think in pluralistic terms about the uses of memories to different social groups, who may well have different views about what is significant or "worthy of memory."[17]

Attempts to determine (and to agree on) what is "worthy of memory," of course, are where things get sticky. It is not an accident that so many of my short stories revolve around episodes of contestation, resistance, and violence.

I said earlier that the short stories were also intended to illustrate the various means by which memories travel and can be traced. "*How* societies remember" is a vastly complex matter. Here I merely outline some of the principal components of that process; each will reappear in action in the book's case studies. To begin, we can name ritual and ritual performances; the cult activities prescribed by Nabonidus and the gatherings at Hambledon Hill were what activated links to the past. Often related to ritual is the viewing of artistic representations, another means of conjuring recollection.[18] Crucial perhaps above all is the working of oral tradition, many of the characteristics of which (hardly surprisingly) echo those associated with social memory. Students of oral lore stress its selective, often anachronistic nature; its embeddedness as a "social product"; its structural amnesias; its political and contingent nature. With the "technological miracle" of writing (to quote Jan Vansina), such evanescent traditions can be permanently recorded, irrevocably affecting the flow and character of available information.[19] Writing (or other modern modes of capturing material) preserves stories that may

17. Burke 1989: 107.
18. For a general overview of "how societies remember": Connerton 1989. On artistic imagery: Grütter 1997; Küchler and Melion 1991. A related issue, not taken up here, is Aby Warburg's conception of "social memory" in his study of artworks as repositories of history, and of the recurrence and meaning of motifs and gestures in western art: Gombrich 1970.
19. Vansina 1985: 199; 1980; 1985; see also Bohannan 1952; Henige 1982; Tonkin 1995. For ancient Greece, and for further references and discussion, see Thomas 1989; 1992. The concept of dynamic homeostasis – in which traditions are perfectly congruent with their society at any given point in time – is obviously relevant here: Goody and Watt 1968; for a partial critique, Vansina 1985: 120–23.

otherwise be lost, such as those of the women of Kalymnos. In all cases, however, someone must first consider them "worthy of memory."

All these elements make up the normal arsenal of those broaching the subject of social memory. One additional source, however, can be identified. In each story, the physical world and tangible objects prompted and guided the course of memory; each possessed strong material correlates. Formally constituted memorials are part of this picture, from the belated monuments to Camisard heroes to the bust of Papa Tsougranis. But people of the Cévennes could also identify with confidence the battlefields and refuge caves of a Camisard topography; Mesopotamian dynasts worried about the disappearance of an ancient and valuable material record to the point of digging it up; monumental building testifies to Neolithic community and Pueblo confusion. In other cases, as on the Athenian Acropolis, things must be destroyed. In short, there is a strong *materiality* to these memories, and that provides archaeology with a space in which to work.

QUESTIONS OF MEMORY

"Welcome to the memory industry" runs the slightly sour beginning of a recent article. Twentieth-century crises (from the Holocaust to the rise of multi-culturalism), capped by the turn of the millennium, have for the past few decades fueled an intense absorption with memory in all manner of guises: social, individual, animal, autobiographical, psychological, physiological. The subject's intersection of humanistic and scientific perspectives, of the political and personal, makes it highly appealing; everyone has something to offer and much to say.[20] The appearance of yet *another* book with memory in the title would thus seem to carry the proverbial coals to Newcastle. I defend this enterprise on two grounds. First, while archaeologists are beginning to recognize the unique power of their data, specifically *archaeological* research into the dynamics of social memory remains by and large at a relatively early stage. And second, modern obsessions with memory revolve chiefly around the modern; this book pushes that inquiry back to the ancient Mediterranean world.

Inevitably, however, the broader scholarship that swirls around this topic has directly impacted my own treatment. One chief defining characteristic of that scholarship is a focus on "Disturbing memories," to cite the title of the

20. Memory industry: Klein 2000: 127; warnings of "burn out" have begun to appear: Confino 1997; see also Chippindale 1993: 33–35; Maier 1993. On other archaeological studies, see nn. 46–47; Alcock and Van Dyke, in prep.; Hall 2001.

first of the 1996 Darwin College Lectures (on "Memory") at the University of Cambridge. Trauma – loss, dispossession, moments of crisis, death – is an inexorable magnet for attention, as are the threatened subaltern memories of the colonized or oppressed.[21] Heroes or martyrs of resistance are standard charismatic figures; glorious defeats provide fertile ground for constellative myths. More rarely do happy moments appear the focus for collective remembrance: "Only that which does not cease to hurt remains in memory."[22]

It has been shrewdly argued that this very "boom" in memory studies is trauma-derived: "academics speak incessantly of memory because our epoch has been uniquely structured by trauma."[23] The most fraught of our memorial controversies turn on just how to commemorate victims of war or of genocide. How to remember the Holocaust is a particularly unceasing zone of debate, especially as the last generations of survivors pass on. Communities have been torn apart merely by discussing the design of Holocaust monuments.[24] War memorials too prove perennially divisive; the Vietnam Veterans Memorial may be the most prominent recent example of a monument's angry reception, but it is far from an isolated instance.[25] Other, still burning issues revolve around past shameful episodes or historical injustices, such as the legacy of fascism or the iniquitous treatment of indigenous peoples.[26]

Also considered "disturbing" are perceived contemporary changes in the way we remember, and relate ourselves to, the past. Authentic memory is

21. Sennett 1998; see also Olick and Robbins 1998: 107–8. A range of illustrative studies (appearing since the mid-1980s) include Abercrombie 1998; Bahloul 1996; Borofsky 1987; Darian-Smith and Hamilton 1994; Davis and Starn 1989; Gurahian 1990; Hall 1998; Healy 1997; Hutton 1994: 102; Rappaport 1998; Silverblatt 1988; Slyomovics 1998.
22. Nietzsche, quoted in Huyssen 1994: 9. Or one could quote Walter Benjamin (1965: 255): "To articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it 'The way it really was' (Ranke). It means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger." The link of change and trauma, remembering and forgetting, is also central to Anderson's conception of the "imagined communities" of nationality: "All profound changes of consciousness, by their very nature, bring with them characteristic amnesias. Out of such oblivions, in specific historical circumstances, spring narratives" (1991: 204).
23. Klein 2000: 138–42 with references, quotation at 138; Olick and Robbins 1998: 119–20.
24. Out of a vast body of writings: Friedlander 1993; Koonz 1994; LaCapra 1994; 1998; Lappin 1999; Linenthal 1995; Olick and Levy 1997; Roth 1995; Vidal-Naquet 1992. On monuments: see Young 1993; 1994b. For new technologies of remembering the Shoah, see the website of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (www.ushmm.org/).
25. Hass 1998; Lin 1995. Controversies still rage over the ongoing modification of that memorial's site, as well as over the commemorative landscape of Washington, DC as a whole: note, for example, the uproar over the planned World War II memorial on the Mall. The Enola Gay controversy could also be cited: Linenthal and Engelhardt 1996. On war memorials generally: Azaryahu 1993; Borg 1991; Davies 1993; Harbison 1991: 64–66; Rowlands 1993: 146; Winter and Sivan 1999; and papers by Laqueur, Piehler, Savage, and Sherman in Gillis 1994a. An especially vibrant literature revolves around the memorialization of World War I: Lipstadt 1999; Tarlow 1997; Winter 1995.
26. See, for example, Barkan 2000.