NOTES/KORT BYDRAES

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE USE OF EVIDENCE IN DR. P. A. L. GREENHALGH'S ARTICLE ‘HOW ARE THE MIGHTY FALLEN?’ *

INTRODUCTION
Two scholars have recently published articles in which they discuss the collapse of the Late Bronze Age civilization of Greece ca. 1200 B.C., and attempt to identify the agents who (or which) caused it.† Their approach to the subject is strikingly different. Within the compass of a short article (ca. 3500 words) that is very easy to read, and taking the most recent developments into consideration, Betancourt first presents and discusses the various theories, names their proponents, and conveniently lists the sources for us; then, drawing together the disparate threads, to which he adds the documentary evidence, he propounds his own theory, which is that the nature of the Mycenaean economy contributed largely to the collapse. In his concluding sentence he sums up his theory thus: ‘Whether one chooses invasion, local war, or natural disaster as the first step in the end of the Bronze Age, it is here suggested an economic cause must be included as well.’ (p. 45.)

The volume of research that has recently been carried out and the variety of scholarly disciplines involved are reflected in the titles of his extensive bibliography.

His approach is multidisciplinary but excludes linguistic evidence. Greenhalgh, on the other hand, in a long article (ca. 19000 words) draws only on the evidence of ‘archaeology, linguistics, and the ancient traditions, and ignores most of the current theories. He does not provide a brief summary of his theory in his concluding paragraph, but it appears to be that ‘Achaean’ is the name by which the inhabitants of mainland Greece in the Late Bronze Age were known; that internecine warfare so weakened their ‘power-centres’ that most of these succumbed to a series of overland invasions by Dorians and other tribes from

---

* I am most grateful to Professor Lydia Baumbach for reading the latest draft of this article and offering helpful criticism. Those errors which remain are, however, entirely my own.

† P. P. Betancourt, ‘The End of the Greek Bronze Age’, Antiquity 50, 1976, 40-47. P. A. L. Greenhalgh, ‘How are the Mighty Fallen?’, Acta Classica, 21, 1978, 1-38. (Reference hereafter will be to the numbers of pages and/or footnotes). J. T. Hooker has also recently considered all the varieties of evidence that may be used to support theories about the collapse and the agents (Hooker, 1976). He, too, presents his own theories, but this forms only part of his book-length survey of the period ca. 1600 to 1050 B.C.

Publication dates are essential to my argument: abbreviated citations will therefore appear in the text of this article and full details will be given in a Bibliography.
the Northwest; and that the genesis of the Homeric epics is to be traced to the Argolid and to the eleventh century B.C. 2

Certain disquieting errors are immediately apparent in the evidence which Greenhalgh presents in the first part of his article, and it is therefore my purpose to investigate both the presentation of this archaeological evidence and also the use which he makes of it (pp. 3 to 23). The documentary evidence which he discusses requires a separate examination and I shall therefore not deal with it here.

BASIC DOCUMENT OF SITES

For the basis of his archaeological survey Greenhalgh uses Richard Hope Simpson's *A Gazetteer and Atlas of Mycenaean Sites*, (1965), 3 but he subjects its author to a series of severe criticisms (p. 3) without giving specific examples of the inaccuracies and inadequacies he attributes to him. If we have not frequently consulted *Gazetteer* ourselves, we may be tempted to accept these criticisms as valid, but rigorous analysis of all the sites which Hope Simpson lists for the mainland reveals that it is Greenhalgh's generalisations that are inaccurate and misleading.

In the Partial Index Hope Simpson assigns sites to certain conventional categories which Greenhalgh conveniently lists for us, 4 but there is no category to which may be consigned all those other sites which exhibit none of the required features: in this sense the Index is 'Partial'; further, it would have been helpful if Hope Simpson had given not only the site numbers but also their full

---

2. John Chadwick's theory that the 'Dorians' were already present as a substrate in the Mycenaean world (Chadwick, 1976) runs counter to Greenhalgh's and is severely attacked. Greenhalgh fails to acknowledge that Hooker supports Chadwick's theory on both archaeological and linguistic grounds (Hooker, 1976, 169-173 and 173-179 respectively), but he also fails to adduce possible support on archaeological grounds for his own theory from Rutter 1975, 1976, and also French and Rutter, 1977, which appeared early enough in that year to be taken into account.

3. Hereafter *Gazetteer*—to avoid confusion with site numbers, all page references will incorporate 'p.' or 'pp.' Hope Simpson provides a list of 574 sites on the mainland, grouped conventionally according to the Classical regions but numbered sequentially, which were occupied during the Late Bronze Age. For each site he supplies *inter alia*: (a) a toponym, usually followed by the name of the nearest village or town; (b) symbols to indicate whether excavation had taken place and/or he had inspected the site; (c) an abbreviated list of all the periods from Neolithic to Hellenistic to which the pottery belongs; (d) a bibliography; (e) a brief summary report of some of the available evidence, his own findings and the deductions he has made from them, and occasionally his comments on the interpretation placed by the excavators on their findings. He also lists other sites in the north of Greece, on the islands, and on the west coast of Asia Minor. He provides bound-in maps for certain regions and a large pocket map of Greece showing the location of all numbered sites. The work is thus precisely what its title promises: both Gazetteer and Atlas, but sites which were not occupied during the Late Bronze Age are excluded. I shall refer to sites by their full name as shown in the *Gazetteer*, since use of the second place name will often enable the reader to visualise their location without recourse to the map.

4. Some sites appear in more than one category: (1) Mycenae, for example, is to be found under the headings: 'Fortresses (Major)', 'Palaces (Major)', 'Megaron Structures', 'Roads', 'Tholos Tombs (Mycenaean)', all features that are generally associated with that site—and to these we may now add 'Shrines or religious centres etc.' (Taylour, 1969, 1970, 1971, et al.).
In regard to the inaccuracies which Greenhalgh alleges, the detailed analysis of *Gazetteer* shows that in only one instance does Hope Simpson allow his personal opinion to override more generally accepted opinion: he does not include (402) Gla in the category ‘Palaces (Major)’. Further, of the 574 numbered mainland sites only two appear to have been omitted by Hope Simpson, and moreover not one is included which does not warrant inclusion. I base this statement on my analysis of the information given in the brief summaries in *Gazetteer* or in the publications cited in the bibliographies (insofar as I have been able to consult them). The two exceptions are: one site possibly omitted from the category ‘Fortified Settlements etc.’—or perhaps it should be ‘Fortresses (Major)’—and one from the category ‘Tholos Tombs (Mycenaean)’. Greenhalgh’s allegation that Hope Simpson has omitted ‘important tholos tombs mentioned in the gazetteer’ appears to originate from this latter single omission, and the further allegation that he has included ‘sites for with the gazetteer mentions no tholos tombs’ shows that Greenhalgh has failed to read the introductory paragraphs to the Laconian and Southwest Peloponnesian groups of sites (*Gazetteer*, pp. 42, 56) which explain that because full details of these sites have been given in earlier articles (included in the site bibliographies), they ‘will be more summarily dealt with’. The four sites to which Greenhalgh is apparently referring are all in the Southwest Peloponnesian, and the relevant information appears in the articles mentioned in the site bibliographies.  

In his discussion of tholos tombs Greenhalgh also comments on certain ‘tiny little hives that a swarm of bees would have found claustrophobic’, thus once more exposing the inadequacy of his research. He does not tell us where these are to be found, but the only tholos tombs likely to qualify for this description are those at (135) Analipsis (Vourvoura) in Laconia and (90) Synoikismos (Sarandapotamos) in Arcadia, which Hope Simpson calls ‘diminutive’. At the former site ‘eight miniature Mycenaean tholos tombs’, said to be remarkably similar to those at the latter, are ca. 3 metres in diameter (Waterhouse and Hope Simpson, 1961, 130 and n. 119; for the Arcadian site see also Howell, 1970, 96). When we estimate the probable height of these tholos tombs

---

5. See also Taylour, 1966, 244.

6. These omissions are: FORTIFIED SETTLEMENTS etc.: (311) Kalydon; THOLOS TOMBS (Mycenaean): (182) Nichoria (Rizomilo) = AJA 65 (1961) no. 76 = UMME, 1972, no. 100.

7. These are: THOLOS TOMBS (Mycenaean):
   - (197) Ano Englianos (i.e. Pylos) = AJA 65 (1961) No. 42 = UMME, 1972, No. 1,
   - (227) Lezega (near Koilkounara) = AJA 65 (1961) No. 65A = UMME, 1972, No. 36,
   - (later designated Stenosia: Londariti),
   - (236) Elleniko (Mouriatadha) = AJA 65 (1961) No. 22A = UMME, 1972, No. 201,

* I would consider, on the available evidence, that this site should have been shown as doubtful, as is (203) Kanalos (Gargalianoi) = AJA 65 (1961) No. 38 = UMME, 1972, No. 15.
proportionate to that of the Treasury of Atreus or of the Tomb of Clytemnestra, Greenhalgh's comment becomes ludicrous.  

Greenhalgh's major criticism—one which recurs in the succeeding pages, interrupting the flow of the argument—is that Hope Simpson's criteria for a palace are 'bits of cement floor or fresco, regardless of other evidence'. Here he has failed to differentiate between Hope Simpson summarising the reports of others and Hope Simpson reporting his own discoveries and opinions, and when we refer to the sites which appear to be the source of this criticism we find that the relevant sentences express not Hope Simpson's opinions but those of the excavators.  

In conjunction with all these invalid criticisms we meet Greenhalgh's insistence on sheer largeness (not amplitude but extent in space) as a criterion for what he terms a 'power-centre', and, since this term is described rather than defined as 'fortified areas that were attacked and, with a very few exceptions destroyed about 1200', it admits of variation, so that we read of 'major power-centres', 'smaller power-centres', 'political power-centres', 'independent power-centres', 'fortified power-centres' (tautology?), and 'unfortified power-centres' (sic!). There seems little ground for comparison between the conventional palaces, fortresses, etc. and this protean concept.  

In 1976 Hope Simpson announced that he and Oliver Dickinson had almost completed a new Gazetteer of Bronze Age Sites (Hope Simpson, 1977, 55). In view of Greenhalgh's inability to handle the old Gazetteer, it is unfortunate that his article had to be composed before this new Gazetteer was published.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

Greenhalgh says that he has supplemented the information obtained from Gazetteer by that from more recent publications, and that 'I shall give references only to more recent publications that are particularly relevant to my purpose' (p. 3, n. 5). Hope Simpson's Gazetteer was published in 1965; Greenhalgh's article is, I understand, substantially the text of a paper delivered in November 1977. When we analyse the publications dealing with the archaeological evidence, to which Greenhalgh refers us in his footnotes 6 to 22, we find that seven fall within the period 1966 to mid-1967 and may therefore be regarded as the 'more recent

8. We have recently been able to see what sort of hives were provided in later periods for bees: for a Hellenistic beehive (not to be confused with a tholos tomb) see M. I. Geroulanos, 'Appendix I. Beelives at Trachones, Attica', pp. 443-8 in J. E. Jones, A. J. Graham and L. H. Sackett, 'An Attic Country House below the Cave of Pan at Vari', BSA 68, 1973, 356-452. (Ht. 0.535 m., Diam. ca. 0.37 m.), tapering slightly to a very slightly rounded bottom (p. 443).


10. The term 'centre of power' or 'power-centre' has been applied by others to the administrative centre or palace, e.g. McDonald and Hope Simpson, 1969, 148, 177 and Spyropoulos in Spyropoulos and Chadwick, 1975, 66.
publications'. These publications, and the sites to which the information obtained from them refers, are as follows:11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title, Page References, and Site</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Broneer</td>
<td><em>The Cyclopean Wall at (sic!) the Isthmus of Corinth and its bearing on Late Bronze Age Chronology</em>, pp. 346-62.</td>
<td>Isthmia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Broneer</td>
<td>(<em>The Cyclopean Wall on the Isthmus of Corinth</em>) addendum, pp. 25-35, SITE: (63) Isthmia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td><em>The Greek Dark Ages</em>, pp. 87, 94, 110, 336, SITE: (282) KASTRO TIS KALORAIAS (PARALIMNION) = Teichos Dymaion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Schroder (sic!)</td>
<td><em>Ancient Greece from the Air</em>, pp. 78, 80, SITE: (402) GLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Chadwick</td>
<td><em>The Mycenaean World</em>, p. 161, fig. 64, SITE: The site under discussion is (7) PALAIOKASTRO, (Ancient Midea) near Dendra, the panoply was found at (6) DENDRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes

10. SITE: (63) Isthmia
11. SITE: (8) TIRYNs
12. SITE: (12): ARGOS
13. SITE: (282) KASTRO TIS KALORAIAS (PARALIMNION) = Teichos Dymaion
14. SITE: SOUTHWEST PELOPONNESE
15. SITE: (402) GLA
16. SITE: The site under discussion is (7) PALAIOKASTRO, (Ancient Midea) near Dendra, the panoply was found at (6) DENDRA

I think we may discard Eliopoulou Rogan, 1973, which is used to illustrate a fairly modern analogy, and Chadwick, 1975, which provides a frontal view of the panoply from Dendra and to which Greenhalgh refers us in his discussion of the documentary evidence.12 We must assume that the more recent information concerning five sites, provided by the remaining five publications, is all that Greenhalgh considers particularly relevant to his purpose. Although he mentions 76 sites from Gazetteer, and the old wall at Thermopylae, he discusses only 19 at some length and 15 in less detail.

A SELECTION OF THE SITES
THESSALY:
Having described a 'power-centre' as a 'fortified area' and the date ca. 1200 B.C., Greenhalgh nevertheless admits to this category (480) Kastro (Ancient

---

11. I exclude Vermeule, 1972 which is a paperbound new impression of Vermeule, 1964; these do not all appear in my bibliography—for full details, refer to Greenhalgh, nn. 6 ff. Ventris and Chadwick, 1973 (= DOCS'), is also excluded, both because the reference (n. 15) is in connexion with the documentary evidence and also because this work falls outside our temporal limits as it contains Parts 1 and 11 of Ventris and Chadwick, 1956 (= DOCS) unchanged except for minor alterations, none of which appear on the pages to which Greenhalgh directs us.

12. Although the documentary evidence from Pylos cannot be dealt with in this article owing to the need for extensive discussion, it may not be out of place here to mention that Greenhalgh's references are incomplete (p. 18): the tablet numbers should read No. 51, An20 [18] and No. 53, An12 [1]. As Bennett explained (PT', 1955, xiv) the system of numeration was revised so as to agree with the inventory numbers of the tablets; this was also pointed out by Ventris and Chadwick (DOCS xv and 153). The numbers in square brackets are those which have been used since 1955. The incompleteness of the reference confirms the impression I have gained from Greenhalgh's discussion of the Sa set (p. 24), that he has not consulted either PT or, particularly, PTT'.
Iolkos), Volos, although its 'impressive' fortifications are Mediaeval (p. 4). My investigations further reveal that: (a) at (484) Kastraki (Sesklo) the 'spectacular set of tombs (7½m. in diameter)' consists of one Mycenaean tholos tomb, 7½m. in diameter, and some post Mycenaean tholos tombs (Gazetteer, p. 145; Snodgrass, 1971, 330 (the tombs at Marmariani); Desborough, 1972, 102 and n. 14); (b) the destruction of the palace at Iolkos was not contemporary with the close of LH IIIB—its buildings were 'actually extended in the twelfth century' (Hooker, 1976, 141, 149; Snodgrass, 1971, 30); (c) finally, the Sesklo mound is about 18km. by road from Volos and, even if the distance is less as the crow flies, it is still unusually far away from its supposed settlement. Fig. 1 shows the locations of the sites in the Volos area—Greenhalgh does not show (484) Kastraki (Sesklo) on his map (p. 10).

13. Many tholos tombs cannot yet be associated with settlements, e.g. (205) Tragana (The Tholos Tombs), but where they have been found associated, the distances between them are not great, e.g. the Treasury of Atreus or the Cyclopean tomb near (I) The Citadel of Mycenae. At (197) Ano Englianos, Tholos Tomb IV lies ca. 1 km. to the southwest, Tholos Tomb III ca. 145 m. to the northeast of the palace; at (98) Palaiopyrgi (Vaphio) the tholos tomb lay 270 m. northwest of the settlement.
At (499) Petra (on Lake Karla) he describes the LH III sherds as 'found widespread over the whole surface area enclosed by the 5 km. perimeter walls' (p. 5), whereas the Gazetteer entry reads 'Mycenaean surface sherds (LH III) were found in many and widely separated parts (my italics) of this area' (Gazetteer, p. 149). Hooker, 1976, 109 finds it difficult to suggest any people other than the Mycenaeans who could plausibly be associated with the construction of the circuit walls, but it has recently been suggested that the walls of Petra (and of Gla) are very much later, possibly Medieval (MycGeog., 1977, 62); although this does not yet disprove the attribution of the circuit walls to the LH III period, it nevertheless raises an element of doubt.

THE ROAD TO PHOCIS:
When Greenhalgh leaves Thermopylae and travels from the headwaters of the Pleistos down the valley to (447) Krisa (Chryso) (p. 6), he leaves out of account a route which probably commenced closer to Thermopylae. Sections of a road, assumed to be Mycenaean, running from Krisa via the Amphissa area to the Malian Gulf were traced in 1972 (Kase, 1971, 205–6; 1973, 74–77, and, outside our time limit, AR 1977–78, 39 f., s.v. Itea).

BOEOTIA:
Although Greenhalgh is probably correct in his assumption (p. 7) that there was a destruction at (396) Orchomenos ca. 1200 B.C. (Hooker, 1976, 104; AR 1974–75, 19) he is nevertheless incorrect in attributing the destruction of the palace on the Kadmeia at (416) Thebes to LH IIIA (p. 8): Spyropoulos dates this to the end of the LH IIIB period (Spyropoulos in Spyropoulos and Chadwick, 1975, 55, 69–71; Hooker, 1976, 103). If Greenhalgh is aware of this and disagrees, he should say so, for if this new dating is correct it nullifies his hypothesis about the destruction of the power-centre of Thebes a century earlier and its survival as an unfortified place during the troubles, while the palace of its overlord at Orchomenos was destroyed. Moreover, Thebes was fortified at that time (Spyropoulos in Spyropoulos and Chadwick, 1975, 70; Hooker, 1976, 88).

As we have seen above, it is uncertain whether the circuit walls of (402) Gla are indeed Mycenaean—and Mylonas, 1966, 43 pointed out that the appearance of these walls is different from that of the fortifications of Mycenae, Tiryns, and Athens. In 1965, Hope Simpson considered the 'palace' of Gla more likely to have been a barracks (see above), although most scholars disagree with him. Greenhalgh, however, takes him to task for regarding Orchomenos as a 'political power-centre' on the basis of a bit of plaster but Gla as 'a mere barracks despite the vast size of (its) fortified area and the complexity of its buildings' (p. 8). If we had not discovered that Greenhalgh was at fault in attributing the equation 'plaster' = 'palace' to Hope Simpson we might wonder why he has here (pp. 8 f.) chosen to concentrate on the size of the Gla site as a criterion instead of pointing out that it was illogical for Hope Simpson to accept Orchomenos as a palace on the basis of some plaster while rejecting Gla where
Painted plaster has been found in both the 'palace' and also an Agora building—this information appears in publications given in the site bibliography (AR 1960–61, 14; AR 1961–62, 12). It at first appears that Greenhalgh may have rejected what might have been a valid criticism (had his original allegation been correct) in favour of an opportunity to emphasise the right of Gla, by the sole virtue of size, to a status higher than that of a military installation, but when he speculates (p. 9) about the hypothetical preferences of a king of Gla he shows that he has failed to note the implications of the presence of plaster at Gla.

Fig. 2 may help to clarify the topography of the Kopaic basin.

14. Painted plaster was, of course, used for structures other than palatial buildings, e.g. the houses outside the Citadel of Mycenae, including the House of the Oil Merchant (A. J. B. Wace in MT II, 1958, 8 f., figs. 31, 42, 43; E. B. French in MT III, 1963, 32, fig. 59), The West House (N. M. Verdelis in MT III, 1963, 26, figs. 53, 54), and more recently, a house ca. 150 m. north of the Postern Gate (AR 1975–76); also, though later than the temporal limit we have defined, the façade and interior of the chamber tomb with double dromos at Thebes (AR 1977–78, 36).

15. While Greenhalgh regards Orchomenos, Gla, and Thebes as potential rival power-centres in this area, Wallace, 1973, 231 suggests that the Kopaic drainage system points towards co-operation in Boeotia, with Gla a place of refuge for the farmers who had moved into the reclaimed land.
FIG. 3 After Breuen, 1966, fig. 1.
THE Isthmus of Corinth:

When Greenhalgh reaches the Isthmus of Corinth (pp. 11 f.), he says of the Cyclopean wall that 'some 2 km. of this wall remain.' On the contrary, only some sections of this wall have been excavated, although its line has been traced for a distance of about 2 km. (Broneer, 1966, 347—one of the publications cited by Greenhalgh). Fig. 3 shows the state of the excavations at the time when the report was published; the short lengths of solid line which represent the excavations hardly warrant Greenhalgh's statement implying that the wall remains visible for 2 km. Moreover, it has recently been suggested that the courses of stone are a retaining wall for a road (Hooker, 1976, 148—see also Broneer, 1966, 351, n. 9). Greenhalgh further speaks of the projecting towers on the north side as evidence of the purpose of the supposed wall: to hold back attackers from the north (p. 11); Hope Simpson merely mentions that it was 'furnished with projecting towers at intervals'. Broneer himself introduces the idea of a wall holding back assailants, but not entirely on the grounds that there were towers—he calls them 'small tower-like projections' and 'miniature towers'. Broneer's Fig. 2 shows clearly how little these projected beyond the line of the wall in Sections Pe and Ro: in Pe it was 'ca. 0.70m. from the face of the wall' and in Ro there was one which 'jutted out 0.63m. from the face' (Broneer, 1966, 351).

THE SOUTHWESTERN PELOPONNESE:

Greenhalgh's discussion of the sites in the Southwestern Peloponnese is so formulated as easily to mislead the unwary. Firstly, he considers that the name 'Pylos' 'probably was the ancient name of the palace-complex at Ano Englianos' (197) because 'there is a modern Pilos not far away' (p. 17). Perhaps he does not agree with the decipherment of Linear B—though he does not say so—but, as is well known, Pylos (pi-ro) appears frequently in the documents discovered at this site, in contexts that make it virtually certain that this was the name of at least the palace area. Secondly, he speculates that 'perhaps if Pylos was unfortified in the 13th century, it is to Kanalos that the king fled for refuge when his palace was attacked'. The basic supposition is quite legitimate: a ruler whose palace was not protected by fortifications must surely have prepared for some place of refuge, however cramped, for himself and his entourage in those unsettled times, but the concrete statement, notwithstanding the qualifying conditional 'perhaps if', is essentially false, for he further tells us that this fortress, (203) Kanalos (Gargalianoi), is 'only 3km. from Ano Englianos, with tholos tombs and signs of a massive circuit wall'. As will be seen from Fig. 4, Kanalos lies about 9 km., as the crow flies, from the palace, and McDonald, 1964, 234 f. suggests that the nature of the terrain would have caused a

---

16. Hope Simpson wrote '. . . the Mycenaean wall, about two kilometres in length, which runs westward from the Saronic Gulf . . .' (Gazeteer s.v. (63) Isthmia), which is, unfortunately, not much more accurate.

17. I have not been able to consult Broneer, 1968.
Mycenaean road to follow more or less the line of the modern highway, which would lengthen the distance considerably. It appears that Greenhalgh consulted *UMME*, 1972, 266—which must then be a publication particularly relevant to his thesis, though he does not refer us to it—and misunderstood what he read, for only in Register A of this publication (Prehistoric Habitation Sites) does a distance of 3 km. appear; this, however, is the distance as the crow flies between Kanalos and Gargalianoi (the site number here is 15). 18 Greenhalgh aggravates this error by speaking of tholos tombs, whereas there is only a ‘mound’ ca. 400 m. southeast of the site which is described (*UMME*, 1972, 266) as a ‘possible tholos tomb (certainly burial mound)’, and his signs of a massive circuit wall are variously described as ‘possible prehistoric fortifications above the S-E slope’ (*AJA* 65 (1961), 237), ‘some signs of massive foundations of a circuit wall (Mycenaean?)’ (*Gazetteer*, p. 65), and, in *UMME* 1972, 266—after mature consideration—as ‘fortifications (prehistoric?)’. Perhaps Fig. 5 will prove enlightening.

18. The distance by road from Ano Englianos to Gargalianoi is about 17 km.
CONCLUSION

It has been no part of my purpose to discuss Greenhalgh’s views on the use of ‘Mycenaean’ to denominate the inhabitants and the culture of Greece in the Late Bronze Age, or any other of the points which he raises in the first two pages of his article, but only to analyse the use he has made of the archaeological evidence presented in support of those views. It must, however, be pointed out that only his conception of what constitutes a ‘power-centre’ appears to be novel, and that—whereas Betancourt’s hypothetical situation has a basis of amply documented evidence scrupulously presented—Greenhalgh’s picture is based on imperfect research. My analysis has brought to light more disquieting
features than were apparent at a first reading, and from it I have selected the examples presented here, which show that on the basis of inadequate study of the main publication consulted he has made generalisations which not only are without foundation but also present that work in a false light. Further, it appears that he has, by rephrasing certain of the statements, subtly altered the emphasis of the evidence. Moreover, on the basis of slender evidence, misunderstood, he has imagined situations which, in practical terms, are unlikely to have occurred.

Finally, he has not provided references to all the publications that were relevant to his theory, and his use of the evidence has been selective, yet he has missed opportunities of adducing evidence which would possibly have supported his contentions.

ELAINE BALL

Sea Point
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