

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## A SOCIAL ARCHAEOLOGY OF HOUSEHOLDS IN NEOLITHIC GREECE

The study of households and everyday life is increasingly recognised as fundamental in social archaeological analysis. This volume is the first to address the household as a process and as a conceptual and analytical means through which we can interpret social organisation from the bottom up. In detailed case studies from Neolithic Greece, Stella Souvatzi examines how the household is defined socially, culturally, and historically: household and community, variability, production and reproduction, individual and collective agency, identity, change, complexity, and integration. Her study is enriched by an in-depth discussion of the framework for the household in the social sciences and the synthesis of many anthropological, historical, and sociological examples. It reverses the view of the household as passive, ahistorical, and stable, showing it instead to be active, dynamic, and continually shifting.

Stella G. Souvatzi received her Ph.D. from Cambridge University and teaches in the School of Humanities, Greek Culture Studies, Hellenic Open University. She has conducted archaeological fieldwork on prehistoric sites in Greece and has lectured on archaeological theory and the European Neolithic in Britain and Greece. She has published widely on Greek Neolithic households, architecture, material culture, and social organisation.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzis

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

A SOCIAL  
ARCHAEOLOGY OF  
HOUSEHOLDS IN  
NEOLITHIC GREECE

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL  
APPROACH

STELLA G. SOUVATZI

Hellenic Open University



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107684843](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107684843)

© Stella G. Souvatzi 2008

This publication 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 2008

First paperback edition 2014

Printed in the United States of America

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data*

Souvatzi, Stella G., 1966–

A social archaeology of households in Neolithic Greece : an anthropological approach / Stella G. Souvatzi.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-83689-0 (hardback)

1. Neolithic period – Greece. 2. Social archaeology – Greece. 3. Households – Greece.

4. Greece – Antiquities. I. Title.

GN776.22.G8S68 2008

938 – dc22 2007027759

ISBN 978-0-521-83689-0 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-68484-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

*For my father,  
GEORGIOS EMM. SOUVATZIS,  
who made the difference*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzis

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

## CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures</i>	page xi
<i>List of Tables</i>	xv
<i>Preface</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xix
INTRODUCTION: WHY THE HOUSEHOLD?	1
Aims and Structure of the Book	4
1 THE HOUSEHOLD IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES	7
A Brief History of ‘Household’ as an Analytical Concept	7
Defining Household	9
Household, House, and Co-Residence	11
Household, Family, and Kinship	12
Household and Domestic Group	14
Household Production	14
Household Distribution and Consumption	15
Household Transmission	16
Household Reproduction	17
Conclusion: Household as Process in the Social Sciences	18
2 THE HOUSEHOLD AS PROCESS IN A SOCIAL ARCHAEOLOGY	21
Previous Approaches	22
‘Household Archaeology’, 23 • Architecture and the Built Environment, 25 • Household and Social Practice, 28	
An Alternative Framework for Interpretation	31
The Problem of Indeterminacy, 31 • The Issue of Variability, 33 • Household Economics, 35 • The Individual and the Collective, 38 • Social Complexities, 48 • Structure and Agency, Reproduction and Change: A Historical Dimension, 43	
Conclusions	45

3	THE NEOLITHIC OF GREECE	47
	History of Research and the Production of Archaeological Knowledge	48
	Time Framework	51
	The Built Environment	53
	Material Culture	56
	Greek Neolithic Households and New Questions	61
4	THE IDEAL AND THE REAL: THE EXAMPLES OF EARLY NEOLITHIC NEA NIKOMEDEIA AND MIDDLE NEOLITHIC SESKLO	63
	Early Neolithic Nea Nikomedeia (ca. 6250–6050 BC)	64
	A Rich and Meaningful Daily Life, 64 • Patterns of Variation, 69 • Communal Social and Ritual Practices?, 70 • Continuity and Change, 74	
	Conclusions	76
	Middle Neolithic Sesklo (5800–5200 BC)	76
	History of the Site and Interpretations, 78 • Architecture and Social Life, 81 • Architecture and Symbolic Representation, 85 • Household Practices and Activity Patterns, 91 • Household Morphology, 96 • Household Histories and Ideologies: Households as Agents of Change, 98 • A ‘Dual’ Household Organisation? History, Memory, and Social Reproduction, 101	
	Conclusion: The Social Organisation at Sesklo	105
5	COMPLEXITY IS NOT ONLY ABOUT HIERARCHY: LATE NEOLITHIC DIMINI, A DETAILED CASE STUDY IN HOUSEHOLD ORGANISATION	107
	History of the Site	108
	History of Research	108
	The Nature of the Evidence: Accounting for the Data	
	Limitations	112
	Architecture: Diversity in Uniformity	114
	Material Culture: Uniformity in Diversity	118
	Pottery Production, 118 • The Spatial Distribution of Pottery, 127 • The Spatial Distribution of Small Finds and Subsistence Data, 131	
	Contextual Associations: Houses and Structures	134
	Spatial and Architectural Patterns, 140 • Subsistence and Craft Activities, 140 • The Spatial Organisation of Specialised Craft Production, 141 • Socio-Ritual Practices, 144	



## CONTENTS

ix

Identifying Households	146
Northeast Spatial Segment, 146 • Northwest Spatial Segment, 148 • Southwest Spatial Segment, 148 • The Remaining Parts, 149	
Comparing Households	150
Connecting Households	153
Social Differentiation or Social Cohesion?	156
6 HOMOGENEITY OR DIVERSITY? HOUSEHOLDS AS VARIABLE PROCESSES	161
Settlement Organisation	161
Thrace and Macedonia, 162 • Thessaly and Central Greece, 169 • The Peloponnese and the Aegean Islands, 172	
Boundaries	175
Household Forms	178
Household Activities and Economic Functions	179
The Example of Pottery, 180 • The Example of Chipped Stone Tools and an Axe Workshop, 182 • The Example of Spondylus Items and Other Shell Ornaments, 184	
Burials in Everyday Contexts	186
Household Ideals, Ideologies, and Social Reproductive Strategies	193
Domestic Rituals and Symbolism, 194 • House Replacement and Continuity, 199 • House Abandonment and Discontinuity, 201	
Conclusions	203
7 EVOLUTION OR CONTINGENCY? HOUSEHOLDS AS TRANSITIONAL PROCESSES	205
The Political Economy and the Moral Economy	207
Modes of Production, Craft Specialisation, and Economic Rationality, 207 • Social Division of Labour, 209 • Patterns of Distribution, 211 • Patterns of Storage, 214	
Social Integrative Mechanisms	216
Communal Social and Ritual Structures, 216 • Shared Storage and Work Areas, 222 • The Social Values of Material Products, 224 • Architecture as Process, 227 • Kinship and Corporate Groups, 229	
Households as Transitional Processes	230
The Short Term and the Long Term, 231 • Household and Community, 233 • Autonomy and Interdependence, 235 • Social Balance and Social Transformation, 237	

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

## CONTENTS

Conclusions: The Diversity of Social Relations and the Complexity of Social Processes	241
8 HOUSEHOLD AND BEYOND: IMPLICATIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR SOCIAL ARCHAEOLOGY	244
APPENDIX A. DIMINI: CORRESPONDENCE OF RECORDING SYSTEMS	251
APPENDIX B. THE MAIN DATABASE USED TO ANALYSE THE CERAMIC MATERIAL FROM DIMINI	253
APPENDIX C. DESCRIPTION OF VESSEL TYPES, DIMINI POTTERY	255
<i>Notes</i>	263
<i>Bibliography</i>	267
<i>Index</i>	297

## LIST OF FIGURES

3.1.	Map of Neolithic sites from Greece mentioned in the text	page 49
3.2.	The tell of Sesklo, aerial photograph, with closely spaced rectangular buildings with stone foundations	54
3.3.	The flat site of Galene with widely spaced elliptical wattle-and-daub pit buildings	55
3.4.	Miniature clay models of houses from Thessaly	57
3.5.	Typical painted pottery shapes and decoration of the Sesklo Ware	58
3.6.	Typical painted pottery shapes and decoration of the Dimini Ware	59
3.7.	<i>Spondylus</i> bracelets from Dimini	61
4.1.	Plan of Nea Nikomedeia showing the building phases of the structural groups	65
4.2.	Structural group 4 at Nea Nikomedeia	67
4.3.	Multiple burial of children in a pit at Nea Nikomedeia	73
4.4.	Plan and general topography of Sesklo	77
4.5.	Plan of the tell of Sesklo showing the layout of buildings, squares, and lanes	78
4.6.	Plan of Sesklo B showing the buildings, pebbled yards, and external stone-built structures in the main excavated area	79
4.7.	View of Sesklo B	79
4.8.	Plan and reconstruction of House 11–12 at Sesklo showing the changes in layout and internal organisation over the two building phases	82
4.9.	Room 12 of House 11–12 at Sesklo	88
4.10.	Occupation phases of buildings A, Γ, and Z2 at Sesklo showing the changes in floors and internal organisation through time	89
4.11.	Building complex 1–7 and open spaces 8–12 at Sesklo	92
4.12.	Red-on-White bowl of the Sesklo Ware with ‘flame pattern’, groups of parallel bands, and cruciform motif at bottom	93
4.13.	Miniature clay model of house interior from Platia Magoula Zarkou	99
5.1.	The settlement of Dimini, aerial photograph	109
5.2.	The layout of Dimini as excavated and planned by Tsountas	110
5.3.	The large spatial segments at Dimini as excavated and distinguished by Hourmouziadis	111
5.4.	The architectural units and structural features at Dimini as recorded and analysed by the author	115
5.5.	Relative frequencies of characteristics of the Dimini pottery	119

5.6.	Correlation of monochrome, painted, and incised pottery with clay quality	120
5.7.	Correlation of monochrome, painted, and incised pottery with vessel shapes	120
5.8.	Correlation of clay quality with vessel shapes	121
5.9.	Correlation of common vessel types with monochrome, painted, and incised pottery	121
5.10.	Correlation of common vessel types with clay quality	122
5.11.	Correlation of painted pottery with decorative styles	122
5.12.	Monochrome hole-mouth jar from Dimini	123
5.13.	Monochrome neck jar from Dimini	123
5.14.	Monochrome bowl with pedestal base from Dimini	124
5.15.	Painted Dimini Bowl with dense geometrical motifs arranged in alternating panels	124
5.16.	Painted deep bowl from Dimini with double handles bearing painted human or animal faces	125
5.17.	Painted clay basket from Dimini	125
5.18.	Incised globular jar from Dimini with dense and highly structured decoration	126
5.19.	Incised bowl from Dimini with spirals and concentric circles highly visible	126
5.20.	Distribution of monochrome, painted, and incised pottery in the contexts of Group A	128
5.21.	Distribution of coarse, medium, and fine clay pottery in the contexts of Group A	128
5.22.	Distribution of common serving vessels in the contexts of Group A	129
5.23.	Distribution of common storage and cooking vessels in the contexts of Group A	129
5.24.	Distribution of monochrome, painted, and incised pottery in the contexts of Group B	130
5.25.	Distribution of common serving vessels in the contexts of Group B	130
5.26.	Figurines from Dimini decorated on the typical Dimini Ware	131
5.27.	Schematic representation of some variables of the distinction between residential spaces and nonresidential spaces	135
5.28.	Interior of House 23 at Dimini showing the linear arrangement of features on the three successive floors	141
5.29.	Black-and-White-on-Red 'spit stand' from Dimini	142
5.30.	Workshop S8 at Dimini with stone and clay pottery firing facility and circular stone platform	143
5.31.	Households and work/communal spaces at Dimini as identified by the author	147
6.1.	Large long house at Makri found in the habitation area around the mound	162
6.2.	House at Makri with successive plastered floors visible in the foreground	163

## LIST OF FIGURES

xiii

6.3.	Large long House 4 at Dikili Tash, aerial photograph, with three autonomous rooms packed with features and finds in analogous spatial associations, found under thick layer of burnt superstructure debris	164
6.4.	Clay domed oven with adjacent platform and large double clay basin with plates on top inside House 4 at Dikili Tash	165
6.5.	Incised storage jar, four-legged clay table next to it, and clay bench inside House 4 at Dikili Tash, with a variety of complete but crushed pots around and clay basin with internal partitions in the background	165
6.6.	Elliptical semisubterranean and surface domestic structures at Promachonas-Topolnica	166
6.7.	Pit-dwelling at Stavroupolis with oven and storage area in external pits	167
6.8.	The settlement of Mandra showing pit-structures, later structures with stone foundations, and stone enclosure	170
6.9.	The settlement of Palioskala, aerial photograph	171
6.10.	Double ditch and later stone enclosure at Mandra	176
6.11.	Retaining wall at the tell of Sesklo	177
6.12.	Stone-cut ditches at Makrychori 1	177
6.13.	Stone axe workshop at Makri	184
6.14.	Stone axes found <i>in situ</i> in the workshop at Makri	185
6.15.	Domed oven at Makrychori 1, on top of which an adult was found buried in contracted position	188
6.16.	Cremation of an adult in a pot at Stavroupolis	189
6.17.	Pit burial of an adult female at Stavroupolis	189
6.18.	Skeletal remains of a young male at Stavroupolis	190
6.19.	Pit burial inside ditch B at Mandra of a mature adult female whose limbs were removed at a later stage and were reburied in another pit inside the ditch	191
6.20.	Secondary burial of human limbs inside ditch B at Mandra, probably belonging to the adult female interred in another pit inside the same ditch	192
6.21.	Primary burial inside ditch B at Mandra of a mature adult male in flexed position, with two large limestones placed near the head and on top of the right arm and a smaller one at the feet	193
6.22.	Bucranium inside the communal subterranean building at Promachonas-Topolnica	196
6.23.	Central building at Palioskala with interior covered with multiple layers of field stones	197
7.1.	Plan of the communal subterranean building at Promachonas-Topolnica showing distinct differences in size and architecture from the domestic buildings around it	217
7.2.	Architecture and stratigraphy of the communal subterranean building at Promachonas-Topolnica	218
7.3.	Large-scale deposition of material on layer 28 of the communal subterranean building at Promachonas-Topolnica	219

## xiv LIST OF FIGURES

7.4.	Large-scale deposition of material on layer 31 of the communal subterranean building at Promachonas-Topolniča	219
7.5.	Red painted fruitstands from the Promachonas-Topolniča subterranean building	221
7.6.	Uncovering the storage bin complex at the central part of Makri	222
7.7.	The storage bin complex at Makri after the excavation	223
7.8.	Large bins in the centre of the floor of the storage complex at Makri	223

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## LIST OF TABLES

3.1. Chronology and phases for the Greek Neolithic and the sites discussed in the text	<i>page 52</i>
4.1. Orientation and order? Floor types and entrance locations at Sesklo	84
4.2. Orientation and order: Location of structural features inside the buildings at Sesklo	86
4.3. Associations of features and finds inside the buildings at Sesklo	87
5.1. Evaluation of spatial contexts at Dimini	116
5.2. Spatial distribution of features and finds at Dimini	133
5.3. Associations of features and finds at Dimini	136

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzis

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---



## PREFACE

THIS BOOK SHOWS HOW THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF HOUSEHOLD, WITH ITS wealth of cultural and empirical information, its rich variability, and the multitude of ways in which it interacts with the wider society, can provide a very meaningful framework from which to conduct a social archaeology. The chapters rearticulate the notion of household at and between different scales of space and time and through key issues, such as the definition of household and its relationship with community, autonomy and interdependence, diversity and homogeneity, individual and collective agency, domestic and public ritual, intrasettlement burials, architecture and symbolic representation, and production and consumption, as well as social reproduction, change, complexity, and integration, in order to capture some of the many dimensions of household and to show how many theoretical issues and areas of common interest intersect.

In recent years, the archaeological literature has been undergoing a change and has been obliged to reconsider its traditional epistemological focus on large scales of space and time, towards an inclusion of smaller scales. There are now a growing number of works on individuals, houses, households, communities, and other social categories and the conduct of everyday life. However, this has not resulted in the emergence of a truly alternative and coherent approach to households as dynamic social entities, which have instead continued largely to be viewed as passive responses to wider and longer-term changes and through old, top-down perspectives and traditional assumptions. In addition, the boundaries between theoretical traditions and research agendas (and sometimes between Anglo-American and 'other' archaeological-sociological perspectives) result in a compartmentalisation in these studies. At the same time, the interaction between anthropology, history, and sociology has led to a clearer conceptual and analytical framework for household in a variety of past and present social contexts.

This book has grown out of (a) the desire to provide an integrative theoretical and methodological approach to household as a social process and (b) a concern with how archaeology, rather than merely borrowing theories, models, and concepts from other disciplines, can evaluate them against its own concerns, data, and experience and make genuine and influential contributions to wider social research. The origins of the book lie in 1993, when

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-68484-3 - A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach

Stella G. Souvatzi

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## xviii PREFACE

as a doctoral researcher at the Cambridge Department of Archaeology I first encountered, and decided to face up to, the challenge of the household. It is based on continued research carried out since and presents significant analysis of primary unpublished data and of much new material that has emerged in the last few years, as well as reinterpretations of older material. Although the case studies are from Greece, I have tried to make clear the implications for archaeologists and anthropologists in other areas and periods. Likewise, I have synthesised a rich wealth of often little-known discussion and examples of the idea of household in anthropology and the social sciences.

The present volume is offered as one step in the path towards a more interpretative understanding of household, and, from that, of social organisation, as a dialectical, historical, and dynamic process. As such, I wish to relate it to the recovery of difference and varying social realities underneath the bigger picture, as a critical part of archaeology's sociological and intellectual practice and of its position and relevance in the contemporary world. In this way I aim to add my voice to those wishing to take a new look at the body of knowledge and the set of theories we have built up concerning social units. The result is, I hope, interesting and challenging to the reader, but, above all, I hope that it will stimulate dialogue and exchange.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THIS VOLUME OWES MUCH TO THE SUPPORT AND KINDNESS, of numerous friends, colleagues, and institutions, whom I am pleased to thank here.

I have benefited greatly from the stimulating ideas and intellectual support of many people, most of all those who have commented on all or parts of the book at various stages. I am very grateful to Ian Hodder for his unfailing support in reading and for helping me to develop the work that has led to this volume. He has been a constant inspiration, especially during those times when I have found this subject frustratingly difficult and have felt my determination failing. I am indebted to Anthony Snodgrass for his constructive advice on earlier versions, his encouragement with the publication project, and his many kindnesses. Bob Chapman, John Chapman, and Alasdair Whittle have read more or less all of the chapter drafts and the final version faithfully and enthusiastically; I thank them for the many discussions, comments, and suggestions that have helped me to sharpen my approach and opened up new intellectual challenges.

I am grateful to Giorgos Hourmouziadis for granting me permission to study the ceramic material, small find records, daybooks, and all of the archive of his excavation of Dimini and for sharing with me his deep insight into the Neolithic world. Vassiliki Adrymi-Sismani enabled access to all these materials and shared with me valuable information from her participation in that excavation and her continued work in the vicinity. Special thanks to Evangelia Skafida, who variously assisted me with my fieldwork and collection of illustrations, showed me materials from the Volos Museum, discussed figurines, sent publications, and obliged me with her hospitality in Volos.

I am indebted to Maria Theochari for her kindness, for pointing out to me the directions of Dimitris Theocharis' research and ideas on Sesklo and other sites, and for allowing me to use illustrations from his celebrated volume. I owe a further debt to Kostas Kotsakis for many discussions about the Greek Neolithic and for providing me with his work on the stratigraphy and architecture of Sesklo.

The late Professor Robert Cook, Colin Renfrew, and Judith and Robert Rodden warmly encouraged me to include Nea Nikomedeia as a special section in this book and provided me with the first volume of the final publication while this was still in press, as well as bringing to my attention Gillian Pyke's

and Paraskevi Youni's unpublished dissertations on the site. For this and for our discussions about Nea Nikomedeia in the memorable dinner parties at Professor Cook's in Cambridge I owe them my sincere thanks. I also thank the British School at Athens for allowing me to use illustrations from the Nea Nikomedeia publications.

I am grateful to a number of friends and colleagues for their hospitality on their excavations, for providing information concerning their research, for allowing me to use illustrations from their work, and for sending references, publications, and photographs. Special mention must be made of Giorgos Toufexis for his warmest welcome to his excavations in Thessaly, for his generosity with his data, papers, and photographs from Palioskala, Mandra, Makrychori 1, and Galene, and for many enthusiastic conversations about the Neolithic and other things; to Katerina Skourtopoulou for introducing me to the excitements of lithic technologies and for many discussions and ideas about Makryalos and flat sites in general; to Dimitris Grammenos and Stavros Kotsos for the tour of Stavroupolis and for sending publications and illustrations; to Chaido Koukouli-Chrysanthaki for the many photographs from Dikili Tash and Promachonas-Topolnica; to Vassiliki Adrymi-Sismani for the aerial photographs of Sesklo and Dimini; to Nikos Efstratiou for photographs from Makri; to Kostas Gallis for the photograph of the house model from Platia Magoula Zarkou; to Lia Karimali for her thesis and articles on lithic production and exchange patterns; and to Nina Kyparissi-Apostolika, with thanks for her books on the prehistoric ornaments from Thessaly. Last, but not least, I wish to thank Vania Tloupa for her kind and immediate response to my request for the cover image.

I am also happy to recognise the contribution of a number of university departments and archaeological and anthropological societies that gave me the opportunity to try out several of the ideas and arguments presented in this book through teaching, presentations, conferences, and seminars. These include the universities of Cambridge (which also granted me a visiting scholarship in 2004), Cardiff, Manchester, Oxford, Athens, Thessaloniki, and the Aegean; the National Polytechnic School of Greece; the British School at Athens; the McDonald Institute "Socialising Complexity" conference; the Cardiff "(un)settling the Neolithic" and "Building Communities" conferences, the European Science Foundation conference on "Early Symbolic Systems for Communication" at Karlovo; and the meetings of TAG at Bournemouth, SOMA at Edinburgh, and EAA at Thessaloniki and at Zadar. In all these I have enjoyed discussions with Radian Andreescu, Douglass Bailey, Bob Chapman, John Chapman, Pavlos Chrysostomou, Carole Crumley, Ian Hodder, the late John G. Evans (who also sent me his stimulating book on environmental archaeology), Bernard Knapp, Jonathan Last, Magda and Ghița Lazarovici, Dan Monah, Vassil Nikolov, Lolita Nikolova, Colin Renfrew, Colin Richards,

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

xxi

Catherine Perlès, Mirel Popovici (with thanks for posting me the volumes on the Cucuteni and Pařa settlements), Christian Schuster (who also presented me with his book on the archaeology of fire), Katherine Spielmann (with thanks for the many references on the prehispanic North America), Ruth Tringham, and Alasdair Whittle. I also thank James Whitley and Christina Hatzimichael-Whitley for their hospitality in Cardiff and for our cooperation in the Praisos project in Crete.

Funding for this and related research was obtained from several agencies. These include the A. G. Leventis Foundation, the Hellenic State Scholarship Foundation, Clare Hall (Bursary), the Department of Archaeology at Cambridge (Garrod Fund Award), and the Institute for Aegean Prehistory (New Research Grant).

I am happy to thank Cambridge University Press, and especially Simon Whitmore (Cambridge) and Beatrice Rehl (New York), for placing their faith in my book in the way they did and for their understanding through difficult stages. Thanks as well to Peter Katsirubas, of Aptara, Inc., for managing the production and for our many discussions during this process.

The contribution of my long-term friends in Britain and Greece has been multifaceted and invaluable. My deepest links are with Maxine Clarke, David Clifford, and Stamatia Marketou, who have dispensed much valuable advice and never failed to give me unconditional support. I also thank Doreen Thompson for her generous hospitality in Milton. To the anthropologist Sotiris Dimitriou I owe my original acquaintance with anthropology, philosophy, and methodology many years ago. For this, but particularly for his invaluable friendship, I owe him my deepest thanks. My warmest note of appreciation is offered to Makis Plageras for being incredibly patient and for never allowing me to lose perspective. I also thank him, as well as my brother Manolis Souvatzis, for their help and suggestions concerning the appearance of the book's illustrations and for bringing order to a wide variety of originals.

None of this research or writing would have been realised without the unconditional love and unfaltering support of my family, foremost of my parents Georgios and Anastasia, who have been the driving force behind every productive stage of my life. My last word is for my father, who was suddenly and violently taken from us before this book was completed. Nothing is the same without him, but his open mind, kindness, and exemplary life attitude were the guiding light for the book's completion, and more.