

“Little women”: Gender, performance, and gesture in Mycenaean female figurines

Louise Steel

Faculty of Humanities,

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

College Street

Lampeter

Ceredigion SA48 7ED

Wales

l.steel@uwtsd.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper examines Mycenaean female figurines, focusing on their gesture, posture, and dress as evidence for somatic messages of Mycenaean female personhood and identity and what this might tell us about women’s lives in Late Bronze Age Greece. The primary focus is on the corporeal messages encoded in the figurines, with reference to Butler’s understanding of gender performativity and Connerton’s notion of incorporated body knowledges, to better understand how the figurines were embedded in Mycenaean habitus. This includes an experiential study of the gestures and posture of the figurines, to explore ancient embodied experiences, and analysis of the painted and applied details of clothing of the three main female types. The aim of the paper is to explore becoming a Mycenaean woman through the medium of sculpted clay.

Keywords

Figurines; gender; performativity; embodiment; identity; dress

Declarations of Interest: None

1. Introduction

This paper examines Mycenaean female figurines and what they might tell us about women's lives in Late Bronze Age Greece. It explores the figurines as mimetic images (Insoll 2017) of Mycenaean women, drawing upon Butler's (1986, 1988) gender performativity, theories of embodiment (Mauss 1973), and incorporated body knowledges (Connerton 1989). The focus is on the figurines' gesture, posture, and dress, which I argue encoded somatic message of Mycenaean female personhood and identity. This paper makes the case that although seemingly homogenous, the figurines in fact communicate something of what it was to become a Mycenaean woman – and here I suggest becoming to be an ongoing, open-ended process reflecting the fluidity of gender roles assumed and enacted throughout an individual's lifetime rather than simply a progression from child through puberty to adult. This paper embeds discussion within figurine studies, specifically to bridge a conceptual divide separating studies of prehistoric figurines from the art historical approaches more traditionally applied to their protohistoric (e.g. LBA) cousins (Mina 2008: 214). In studies of prehistoric figurines, these have been explored as agents that play a significant role in the mediation of social relations (Bailey 2005; Mina 2008; Insoll 2017), as expressions of individuality, personhood and identity (Bailey 1994, 2014b; Kuijt and Chesson 2004; Insoll 2017), and as a window on the construction of ancient gender roles (Kokkinidou and Nikolaidou 1997; Mina 2008; Bailey 2012; Insoll 2017).

2. Background to Mycenaean Figurines

Small terracotta figurines are a typical element of the Mycenaean cultural repertoire from the c.1420/10-late 11th century BC (LH IIIA1-LH IIIC; see Table 1). These have been known since the rediscovery of the Mycenaean world in the late 19th century and substantial numbers were found during Schliemann's excavations at Mycenae and Tiryns (Schliemann 1878). This paper focuses on the female figurines, which Furumark (1941: 86–7) categorized into three main types, based upon distinct gestures made by the arms: one with the arms folded over the chest (represented by two strips of clay), one apparently with hands clasped below the stomach in a *bras bas* position (suggested by the disc-shaped torso), and the third with arms raised on either side of the head. These Furumark termed tau, phi and psi respectively, due to their perceived similarity with letters of the Greek alphabet (Fig. 1). A variation, especially for the phi and tau figurines, is the so-called kourotrophos, representing a female holding an infant (Fig. 2; Olsen 1998: 384–8; Pilafidis-Williams 2009; Budin 2011: 300–02). In addition to the female figurines examined in this paper, the full range of Mycenaean coroplastic art included quadrupeds (bovines and equids), skeuomorphs (model furniture, ships, wheeled transport), and group figurines (enthroned females, chariot groups, horse and rider) (French 1971; Vettors 2011b, 2015: 340). There are also rare examples of figurines attached to the rim of vessels (Mylonas 1966: fig. 152). These figurines are found in a variety of contexts – settlement (domestic and discard), religious, and funerary (Tzonou-Herbst 2009) – suggesting a multiplicity of human-object interactions.

<Table 1; Figs. 1 and 2 about here>

Detailed typological studies (French 1971: fig.1, 2009: fig. 1; Weber-Hiden 2009: table 1) reveal that the type of female figurine (phi, tau, and psi) changed over their long period of use (Fig. 3),

perhaps reflecting shifts in female social roles through time, or at least of those roles deemed socially significant for representation. Their earliest production dates to the early 14th century BC (LH IIIA1), when they were developed in the Peloponnese, apparently from Minoan prototypes, for the emergent Mycenaean elite (French 1971: 105, 1981: 173; Hägg 1981: 36-7; Vetters 2016: 39–40). The earliest forms were naturalistic (French 1971: 109–12, fig. 2), which were restricted in production and circulation to LH IIIA1. These were quickly superseded by the phi figurine and the earliest kourotrophos (Fig. 2), also in LH IIIA1; the phi figurine continued in use until the 13th century BC (LH IIIB), when they fell out of production. Psi figurines emerged in the late 14th century (LH IIIA2), and variants of this type persisted in production and consumption until the late 11th century BC (LH IIIC Late), the latest surviving examples of Mycenaean figurines. The tau figurines were relatively short-lived, contemporary with the height of the palaces. These first appeared in LH IIIB1 (c. 1330/15 BC) and survived until the LH IIIB/C transition, c.1200/1190 BC.

<Fig. 3 about here>

Traditionally, the figurines have been viewed as evidence for popular cult, distinct from the state-sponsored cult practised inside the palace citadels (Hägg 1981, 1995; Budin 2011: 315–16) or as grave goods (Nilsson 1950: 305–06), typically associated with child burials (Blegen 1937: 255–6; Mylonas 1966: 115; Cosmopoulos 2015: 120) – perhaps placed in tombs as divine nurses, or otherwise as attendants for the dead (Persson 1951: 255). More recent studies have focused on production (Shelton 2009; Weiberg 2009; Vetters 2011a), context (Tzonou-Herbst 2002, 2009; Albers 2009; Vetters 2015, 2016: 44–6), and object biography (cf. Kopytoff 1986; Tzonou-Herbst 2002, 2009). Other approaches situated within wider figurine studies, such as gender and markers of personhood and identity, have not been employed – a gap which this paper aims to address.

The following discussion focuses on mimetic aspects of the female figurines, in particular details of gender, posture, gesture, and dress, which it explores through the lens of performativity and gender with a view to determining what, if anything, these objects might reveal about (ordinary) female lived experiences in Mycenaean Greece. For this reason, I have chosen not to include the rare examples of figurines associated with furniture (thrones and beds), which tend to be associated with palatial/wanax ideology (Vetters 2011b, 2016: 46), or male figurines (including bull-leapers).

3. Exploring Figurines

Figurines provide a vehicle for exploring peoples' relationship with the human body, how this was perceived, displayed, performed, and transformed as a medium of symbolic communication (Bailey 2005: 141–2; Mina 2008: 215). Miniaturization and three-dimensionality are key to our understanding of how figurines were handled, viewed, and socialized, creating 'encounter[s] of intimate proximity' (Bailey 2005: 38, 2013; Insoll 2017b). The process of miniaturization inevitably involves some abstraction – the choice between what should be included and what can be left out of the representation (Bailey 2014a: 10). These were not intended to be accurate copies of the human form, but instead are stereotypes, simplified and formulaic representations

of the human form with repetitive pose and gesture, which Bailey argues imposes order on the social world (2014a: 11–12). The cloroplast might choose to highlight specific socially relevant details (modelled, incised, painted) which require the viewer/handler to draw inferences from their own personal knowledge (Bailey 2005: 32; Foxhall 2015: 3). It is argued that the cerebral efforts involved in making sense of the visual illusion of the miniature alter perceptions, for example of time, and give access to alternative realities (Bailey 2005: 33–4, 2014a: 10, 2014b: 30), an understanding which might help us better understand how/why they were embedded within socialized practices.

3.1 Mycenaean figurines

Mycenaean figurines range in height between 5 and 20cm, but typically stand at around 10cm; these are freestanding and fashioned from clay. As fired, they are smooth and inviting to the touch. These objects are easily held in the hand and their tactile form suggests that handling them would create a close or intimate relationship between figurine and owner. These were formulaic representations characterized by their repetitive gestures. Specific characteristics, primarily clothing, have been emphasized in some detail with fine lines of reddish-brown or brown-black paint, while the actual physical form of the human body (e.g. facial features, arms) are reduced and schematized. This compression of detail and abstraction is typical of miniature objects. The posture of the three types is at first glance very similar. They all stand upright with their torso and head held upright, tilted back slightly (Fig. 4). There is no implied movement other than the gestures made by the arms. The proportions emphasize the upper body and head. The lower body is tubular, typically solid, but between LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB/C (1390/70-1200/1190 BC) there are variants of hollow-bodied Psi figurines. These may have a splaying flat base suggesting a long robe. The figurine is typically high-waisted, the upper body is flattened and the face is pinched giving the impression of a prominent nose. Additional schematic facial features might be added in paint. The limited detail and homogeneity of the faces might be because these were rapidly made and mass produced (cf. Veters 2011), or possibly reflects a certain anonymity or lack of individuality typical of ancient figurines. Breasts might be indicated by rounded pellets of clay and some figurines have an applied or painted band down the back, representing braided hair (Fig. 5). The head might be slightly flattened (typically phi figurines) or the clay might be splayed out into a wide flat-topped headdress; the phi figurine is the most likely not to have this headdress. They all face forwards and direct their gestures frontwards, towards the viewer (Fig. 1). The form of the upper body of the figurine varies according to the gesture made by the arms. There are also more naturalistic figurines belonging to the earlier stage of production (French 1971: 109-12, fig. 2; Weber-Hiden 2009: 25) and the so-called transitional, or hybrid, figurines (Fig. 6; French 1971: 123–4; Pilafidis-Williams 1998: 13–14, 33, 2009: fig. 5; Demakopoulou and Divari-Valakou 2001: 185), which represents an intermediate between the tau and phi types, but have not been securely fitted into the chronological sequence of figurines. Once production of the canonical forms was established in the late 14th-13th century BC (LH IIIA2-B; see Fig. 3) the production of figurines was standardized and repetitive, reflecting their mass production in workshops. Other than the transitional/hybrid type there was no blurring of boundaries between the different forms.

<Figs. 4, 5 and 6 about here>

The most standardized of the figurines was the tau type (Fig. 7). During manufacture the upper body of the tau figurine was pulled out horizontally, in a T-shape, over which two flattened horizontal strips of clay were placed (occasionally crossed), indicating arms folded or crossed over the chest. Weilharter (2012: 292, pl. LXVI 9j) notes that a variant of the Linear B female logogram with arms folded over the breasts (Fig. 8) is reminiscent of the gesture made by the tau figurines. He suggests that the implicit touching or holding of the breasts communicated nurturing and fertility, which might reiterate these as important female social roles. This possibly corroborates Budin's (2011: 311) interpretation of this specific type as a copy of Levantine Astarte plaques.

<Figs. 7 and 8 about here>

The upper body of the phi figurine (Fig. 9) was formed from a flattened disc and typically no arms were indicated, although the shape of the body suggests arms lowered in a *bras bas* position. The arms of the phi kouroutrophos however, are indicated with applied pieces of clay across the front of the body, as is also the case with the transitional figurines (Fig. 6). The clay forming the upper body of the psi figurine (Fig. 10) was pulled upwards on both sides, suggesting raised arms. The hands are not usually indicated and their exact position, whether facing each other or facing forwards, is not clear. The probable Minoan derivation of this figurine type does not resolve this query – there are examples with hands facing each other, for example from Kavousi (Gesell 2004: fig. 7.2), and also facing forwards, such as the figure from the Shrine of the Double Axe at Knossos (Borgna 2012: pl. LXXVb). A rare example of a figurine from Hala Sultan Tekke however, has hands indicated by flattened, forward-facing discs (Fischer and Bürge 2017: fig. 31.1).

<Figs. 9 and 10 about here>

That they all represented females was important, as the breasts are clearly indicated on the phi and psi figurines; this is reiterated by the heavy robing worn by all three types. This appears to reflect standard artistic representation of gender roles and in particular a clear distinction between male and female. Both Weilharter and Vetter have discussed how within Mycenaean visual arts in various media, depictions of males tended to emphasize (although not exclusively) the physicality of the body – their broad shoulders, narrow waist and muscular thighs (Weilharter 2012: 289; Vetter and Weilharter 2018: 554) – while the female body was depicted fully clothed, covered by long robes down to the floor, and hidden the gaze. This might suggest it was considered inappropriate to depict the naked female form and the emphasis instead was on clothing and personal adornment.

4. Performing gender

Simone de Beauvoir (2011: 283) famously wrote 'one is not born, but rather becomes a woman'; drawing upon this Butler (1986: 35–6, 1988: 520–2) makes a clear distinction between a person's biological sex and their culturally informed gender roles. In so doing she develops an understanding of how myriad social roles of women are performed, being mediated through language, gesture and material symbols, such as costume and personal adornment. In the following discussion of Mycenaean figurines and their entanglement within peoples' lives, I will

be drawing upon Butler's nuanced understanding of gender. Instead of simply being the biological female this approach highlights performativity, the agency of doing and thus becoming various types of socially-constructed woman, and also implies a certain fluidity in gender roles. 'Material culture, whether in the form of personal adornments, tools, figurines, buildings and structures, as well as its effect on embodiment through repeated practice, is understood in this approach as internal to identity creation' (Alberti 2014: 94). Therefore, rather than stable, unchanging, biologically determined ways of being, gender is continually produced through material engagements and the repeated corporeal performance of acts; it is grounded in lived, embodied experiences and is how people choose to situate their identities and social roles within accepted cultural rules (Butler 1986: 39). Through these daily materialized performances (Alberti 2014: 95), not just actions and gestures but also the material layering of the body (cf. Knappett 2005: 241–2) – creating a second skin through body modification (such as tattooing, scarification, depilation), cosmetics, hairstyles, apparel and ornamentation – gender is continually shaped and/or contested. Although the agentive possibilities of becoming a woman are emphasized within this approach, Butler (1988: 523–4, 526, 530) reminds us that these possibilities are culturally and historically situated as well as being socially shared – the gendered body is sedimented through repeated actions across the generations and women can only draw upon (or equally contest) bodily performances that are deeply entrenched and socially sanctioned according to the acts of previous social agents: 'As observed by Joyce (2000: 7), '[g]endered performances are learned and practiced, and they gain their intelligibility through social acts of interpretation'.

Insoll (2017: 8) suggests that ancient figurines might be considered socially important as a means of representing gender ideals; the viewer/handler was able to explore culturally situated notions of identity and social roles 'through the agency of miniature three-dimensionality, object intimacy and tactility'. The commonality of the Mycenaean figurines indicates these to be everyday objects consumed in daily household and ritual practices (Albers 2009: 87-90, table 2; Tzonou-Herbst 2009). For example, numerous (exact count not given) fragmentary figurines found in the LH IIIC Early (early 12th century BC) cult room 117 in the lower citadel at Tiryns (Kilian 1981: 53, fig. 4; 1988.); Tzonou-Herbst has catalogued some 881 female figurines from various contexts at Mycenae (2002: Table 3). At Midea some 158 fragmentary female figurines have been found, mostly by the West Gate and along the fortification walls of the Southwest slope (Demakopoulou and Divari-Valakou 2009). Large numbers are likewise recorded at two open air sanctuaries: 123 fragmentary female phi and psi figurines at Ayia Triadha in the Argolid (Kilian 1990) and some 339 female figurines (mostly fragmentary) have been catalogued by Pilafidis-Williams (1998) Aphaia on Aegina. Potentially, therefore, these figurines will shed some light on ideal female social roles, perhaps opening a window onto the lived experiences of Mycenaean women beyond the palaces. Despite the wealth of research on woman, in particular wall paintings, there has in fact been only limited integration of gender archaeologies into discussion of male/female roles in Bronze Age Aegean (see Leith 2013: 54–6). Textual evidence tells us Mycenaean palatial society was rigidly gendered with sexually segregated workforces, with the largest group of women listed working within the palace-controlled textile industry (Olsen 1998, Olsen 2014; Schepartz et al. 2017). However, potential gendered interpretations of the Linear B archives are limited in scope and whether we can extrapolate similar strict gender divisions to wider Mycenaean society needs further exploration (Leith 2013: 63).

Mycenaean iconography typically depicts men engaged in physical activities such as hunting or warfare scenes, while representations of women, including those with martial attributes, tend to be static. These images largely derive from palatial or elite contexts, reiterating problems of status bias in interpreting gender roles. In contrast, the widespread distribution of the figurines in a variety of contexts suggests these were used, consumed and handled by a wide range of Mycenaeans across the status spectrum. We might assume then, that these mimetic clay models of women performing culturally significant gestures will throw some light upon Mycenaean gender constructs, namely how being a woman was performed materially in Mycenaean society. The following discussion examines several ways in which a Mycenaean woman might be performed – how they were socially sedimented and their identities were experienced and advertised, and how they “existed” (Butler 1986: 39, 47) their bodies – highlighting those aspects that we can explore through the medium of sculpted clay. The emphasis is on gesture, posture and the clothed body.

5. Performing bodies, gesture and posture

‘The body...recognizes and receives communication directly from other bodies, allowing posture, gesture, and imagery to develop as alternative means of transmitting knowledge’ (Norris 2001: 117); such an approach has great potential for analyzing ancient figurines. Although highly schematized, the figurines clearly make distinct gestures that would have been meaningful to the Mycenaean viewer. Gombrich (1966: 394–6) noted how artists use conventional gestures that convey meaning within human interactions, especially those performed in ritual. He also highlighted problems modern scholars might have using ancient art forms to make sense of gesture, posture and movement; namely art is static, depicting arrested movement(s) and is somewhat restricted in capturing the essence of how these gestures were incorporated within a flow of bodily movements. Any attempt to make sense of the figurines’ gestures therefore should consider that while these conventions made visual sense to the Mycenaean viewer, they might not present us with a full understanding of how such gestures were incorporated and experienced within everyday embodied practices.

Different groups of people have their own culturally-learned body practices, socially accepted postures and ways of moving, handling objects, ingesting food and drink, as well as gestures and ritual actions (Mauss 1973: 72). Connerton (1989: 22–3) identifies these embodied practices as habit-memory, an important aspect of habitus. Repeated bodily acts performed unconsciously, frequently within ritual contexts, are a means through which social order is reinforced. Kendon’s detailed work on gesture as a form of non-verbal communication highlights the distinction between unconscious or inadvertent body movements (including nervous habits, such as twisting rings, playing with hair) and more structured, deliberate motions that are intentionally communicative (Kendon 2004: 7–8, 11). The latter Kendon identifies as gestures – culturally learned ways of holding the body, positioning arms, hands, and head to communicate meaning. Such gestures are distinct from unconscious, socially learned embodied practices, such as the correct way to hold tools and utensils. Connerton’s habit-memory, or incorporated practices,

elides with Kendon's gestures specifically in the realm of ritual or ceremonial performance. The ability to read gestures underpins social exchanges and communication.

Figurines provide important insights into the ways in which ancient peoples experienced and practiced gender embodiment, such as their manipulation of appearance, for example clothing and personal adornment, and also posture and gesture (Mina 2008: 215). Similarly, I contend here that the Mycenaean figurines under discussion represent our primary source for embodied practices amongst a sector at least of Mycenaean (female) society and thus that consideration of their gestures and posture will plausibly open a window into peoples' somatic experiences. Indeed, a similar approach has previously been argued for the gestures made by Minoan figurines from peak sanctuaries (Morris 2001, 2009: 182–3; Morris and Peatfield 2006: 45–7, 53–4). Such representations 'shape peoples' embodied experience by providing enduring points of reference both discursive and affective' (Lesure 2005: 238).

Three gestures (four if we include the *kourotrophos*) were consistently repeated within the corpus of Mycenaean female figurines, suggesting that they were habitual patterns of behavior that were socially significant and reflected lived experiences and actions of (some) Mycenaean women. These, I argue, were a culturally constructed medium of expression deployed within certain contexts to communicate distinct messages to a specific audience and indeed might be viewed as specific bodily performances constituting the gendered Mycenaean self (cf. Butler 1988: 528; Mina 2008: 216.). The gestures would have been embedded within repeated actions that were immediately recognizable to the individuals who used these figurines, although we ourselves might not be able to decode the meaning. These repeated, formulaic gestures presumably mimicked gestures used repeatedly within specific embodied, ritualized practices, be it in the household, at the graveside, or in a religious environment, comprising an important aspect of social reproduction within the Mycenaean world.

5.1 Investigating communication through body language

The Mycenaean figurines under review are repeatedly depicted making the same three types of gesture, from which we might conclude that they have body language, which potentially will reveal clues as to action and emotion (cf. Schebesch 2013: 61). In her study of European Palaeolithic figurines, Schebesch developed a methodology for exploring the body language of ancient figurines and peoples' emotional response to these objects. Her study is based on an understanding of the workings of the mirror neuron system and how this affects the way in which people learn habitus and body language through imitation. As a person observes and learns embodied practices their mirror neurons transform visual information into physical body knowledges; indeed, the very observation of someone performing an action activates not just the brain's motor cortex but also the corresponding muscles of the observer. It does not matter whether someone observes or performs an action, both the mirror neuron system and muscles are activated. This is the case even when the observed action (gesture, posture, or expression) is culturally meaningless. Schebesch explains that people are hard-wired to read the body language and that gestures, actions, postures, and in particular visual expressions will elicit an emotional response in the observer. Indeed, she notes that people will even experience an emotional

response to unfamiliar gestures and actions, concluding that humans are designed to be emotionally attuned to other humans, albeit subconsciously. Thus, Schebesch theorizes that body language contains emotional and emotive messages and that visual experiences become internalized corporeal knowledge (Schebesch 2013: 68–9). As Norris also observes, emotions provide a link between the body and mind and should be considered another form of body knowledge: ‘[j]ust as postures and gestures of a given culture are learned through imitation, usually during childhood, so are emotions and feelings’ (Norris 2001: 113). Accordingly, culturally prescribed gestures, postures and movements make up a grammar of the body used in communication, transmitting shared somatic, emotional experiences as much as cultural meaning.

Schebesch extends this approach of reading body language to the posture of Palaeolithic figurines, which, as miniature representations of humans, she contends can be viewed as ‘anthropomorphic systems in analogy to humans’ (Schebesch 2013: 69; see also Gell 1998: 150). Potentially these objects will tell us about the gestures, posture and potentially even movement within culturally-learned actions, and moreover the body language(s) concealed within them provides us with a means to access the sensory experiences of ancient populations as well as some of their emotional responses. Accordingly, Schebesch suggests that our analysis of figurines should treat them as ‘interesting strangers’ (2013: 69) from another culture whose engendered body languages might be foreign to us but will inevitably elicit some sort of emotional response.

This phenomenologically-situated approach recognizes that the material world is experienced and mediated via peoples’ bodies; however, we also need to be aware that we can only describe our own experiences and reactions (to space, gesture, performance) and cannot claim that our experiences are similar to those of people in the past because of a shared ‘common biological humanity’ (Tilley 1994: 74). Our bodies (and thus our embodied experiences) are ‘a product of cultural values...[which] forms a locus for the construction of identity and the mediation of the relationship between individual and society’ (Brück 2005: 55). Nonetheless, Schebesch highlights a basic emotional character set (anger, joy/love, grief, and fear) shared by all humans and makes a case that we can seriously attempt to read the emotion(s) intended by ancient craftsmen. Certain gestures will elicit certain emotions and these cannot be randomly associated, therefore ‘taken as primary gestures, the body language of the figurines should tell us the underlying basic emotion(s). Our body language shows influence of culture and gender, but its basis is a set of culture/age/gender independent universal elements’ (Schebesch 2013: 70). This analysis therefore, recognizes the inherent problems of extrapolating the physical, sensual, and emotional responses of a twenty-first century westernized mindset to a pre-industrial, hierarchically organized, and heavily gendered Bronze Age society from southern Europe. The aim is not to claim a shared experience of (for this study) the Mycenaean female body, but instead to provide an experiential approach to the material world and explore embodiment, and performative practices which ‘may allow a few steps further down the line towards understanding the statements made by’ these ancient objects (Schebesch 2013: 70).

5.2 Performing Mycenaean figurines

Adopting the criteria and methodology developed by Schebesch (2013: 70) I completed a pilot study examining how modern participants would articulate their emotional and visceral responses to making the three gestures repeatedly found in Mycenaean coroplastic art, with the ultimate objective of better understanding the body language implicit in the figurines. A random sample of twenty-one participants was drawn from undergraduate and postgraduate students, academic colleagues, and acquaintances, all with limited or no knowledge of the Aegean Bronze Age. Prior to the experiment the goal of the exercise was briefly explained and, given the importance of the clothing in the Mycenaean context, we also discussed what the figurines might have been wearing, focusing on heavy woolen clothing and flowing linen garments – both textiles used by the Mycenaeans (Nosch 2012: 51) – and large headdresses, where appropriate. The participants were then asked to perform the gestures and to answer a series of questions concerning their emotional response. As with the original study, the emphasis was on immediacy and ‘spontaneous and simple answers’ (Schebesch 2013: 71). Although the figurines under consideration are female, to avoid modern western gender-age biases, the respondents were drawn from a mixed group of participants – two-thirds women and one-third men as a control – and from three broad age groups (twenty to thirty; thirty-one to fifty, and fifty-one to seventy). They were asked to react according to their own emotional responses rather than assumed ancient gender constructs.

Schebesch’s original questions (2013: 72) were adapted in this study:

1. Is the position extrovert or introvert?
2. Is your emotional response overall positive or negative?
3. Do you feel a mix of emotions? If so, are they ambiguous or harmonizing emotions?
4. Is this a static gesture or do you sense movement? If movement how would you categorize this?
5. Are there possibilities of communication?
6. How do you perceive the status/social role of the individual making this gesture?
7. What does this gesture represent?

Intriguingly, there were substantively different emotional responses to the three gestures and, in one instance, a clear gender divide. It is interesting to note that, subsequent to this pilot study, the exercise has been repeated in several workshops and the results consistently repeat those described below.

5.2.1 Tau figurine

The arms of the tau figurines are folded across the chest, or sometimes crossed, and the pose of the figurine appears very upright and rigid, with legs together and head held high. This closed posture and seemingly taut, static pose was primarily viewed as introverted and negative. The gesture was perceived to be ambiguous and closed in, described by one respondent as ‘defensive and contained, holding thoughts in...no intrusion from outside’. One response described the pose as ‘a bit scolding and “school-marmish”, slightly angry, slightly withdrawn...Old, an old person. Old age, closing in and shrinking’ and ‘inaccessible, closed in, swaddled’. A small number of responses highlighted a possible funerary association: ‘recalls ancestors in tombs’, ‘death pose, the pose of a corpse’. Several respondents however, viewed the stance more

positively, commenting: it ‘feels like a queen’ or the ‘head of the household’ and ‘feeling a sense of importance and an aura of authority’. These individuals cited being influenced by the very upright posture, and in particular the position of the head, as much as the idea of balancing a heavy headdress. All but two of the participants perceived the pose and gesture to be high status and the overall consensus was that it represented some sort of role of (possibly religious) authority.

5.2.2 *Phi figurine*

The placement of the arms of the phi figurines is less clearly indicated, but the hands appear to be clasped in front of the body, the elbows jutting out slightly, more or less in a *bras bas* position. The majority of the participants felt this to be a more fluid, relaxed position, in contrast to the rigid posture experienced for the tau figurine. This was perceived for the most part to be positive, open, and extrovert, with the potential for movement, and was variously described as a feeling ‘of movement, more of a flow... and a tendency to sway in this position’, ‘there is movement, swaying. Controlled motion – forced to stand in position’, a ‘light, gentler, kind posture’, ‘gentle and flowing’. One (male) respondent suggested this was a more feminine pose: ‘...men are quite brutish and more aggressive in movement. This is more gentle, like bamboo flowing’, while another described it as ‘graceful, balanced and poised’.

There was a clear gendered response to this gesture; while it was an easy, contented and relaxed pose for most of the female participants, the position was unnatural and even uncomfortable for some of the male participants. One commented he felt ‘quite exposed’ with his chest out and his hands ‘pointing to genitalia; quite uncomfortable because quite exposed’, also observing this pose was ‘quite illustrative of fertility and female/womaness [sic]; at the same time, objectified and quite vulnerable as a collection of bits. Very exposed and out there in a sexual way and very uncomfortable’. This sexualized perception was echoed by a second male respondent, who described the stance as that of a ‘breeding mare, wife... subservient and sexually available’. Intriguingly, this was picked up by the majority of the female participants, albeit framed more positively. Several commented specifically on ‘fertility’, ‘motherhood’, ‘womanhood’, ‘nurturing’, and ‘comfort and protection’. The overwhelming response was that this was a gendered gesture, which invokes an almost visceral reaction to female fertility in the modern performers. It is interesting to note therefore, that this was the figurine most frequently used for the kourotrophos, suggesting that the pose might equally have referenced female social roles centered around fertility, nurturing, and motherhood to the Mycenaeans who would have owned and handled these figurines.

5.2.3 *Psi figurine*

The psi figurine with upraised arms was viewed by most respondents as a positive and extrovert figure who exuded authority and confidence. The gesture was largely perceived to be communicative and proclaiming a message, ‘a pose that calls attention’, ‘really forceful... a clear positive symbol’, one designed to draw attention to the viewer, making the performer taller and more visible. A few participants commented that the actual gesture, holding the arms high in the air, was ‘a difficult position’, an uncomfortable and difficult pose to hold, which took a lot of

discipline and hard work to maintain: ‘a lot of self-control in pose’, ‘not a natural gesture...not a natural pose’, ‘I can’t hold the gesture – a very heavy gesture’, equated by one respondent with the effort involved in learning to hold their left arm up when learning the violin.

There was also a degree of ambiguity in emotional responses to the psi gesture. Although primarily perceived to be a dominant, commanding gesture, several respondents also experienced a more negative response: ‘a feeling of subjugation – you don’t greet your inferiors in this way’, ‘hands up is submissive’, ‘surrender’, ‘hands up can mean despair’, and it was likened by one respondent to the masonic hailing sign of distress. For the most part however, responses to this gesture were positive. It was viewed as religious, representing supplication, prayer, oratory, ‘some form of worship, praise. Some expression of cultural appreciation’, representing some form of intercessory. The figurine was identified by several as a priestess and one participant suggested she was ‘always interceding, making prayers for the owner or household’. This emotional response to the gesture made by the psi figurine ties in neatly with the traditional interpretations of these figurines outlined above.

5.2.4 Discussion

The results of this study are intriguing, revealing very different emotive states invoked in the modern ‘actors’ when performing the gestures. The question remains however, whether these observations allow us some meaningful discussion of the sensory performance (and possibly even the meaning) of the gestures. For each of the ‘actors’ performing them, these gestures encoded body language and invited an emotional response. As observed by Schebesch (2013), our emotional responses to body language, in particular the conscious and deliberate performance and imitation of gestures and postures, are embedded physically and mentally through the stimulus of the circuits of mirror neurons. The body uses these as a means of transmitting knowledge, including emotive states of being (Norris 2001: 14). As Schebesch has previously argued for the Palaeolithic figurines, we might conclude that the participants’ unconscious and visceral emotional response is meaningful and might allow us to think about the embodied experiences of the Mycenaeans who used and handled these figurines, and perhaps also performed the gestures in certain social situations.

‘Meaningful action in social and individual contexts is stored through our figurines’ body language. It can be said that the figurines store social memory’ (Schebesch 2013: 87) and this I argue is something we can explore experientially. Results from performing the figurines suggest the psi gesture of upraised arms to be communicative; the actor is performing an otherwise unnatural gesture to make itself visible and proclaim a message. There was some ambiguity as to the nature of this message, reflecting various cultural influences on the modern participants; similarly, the recipient of the message – human or divine – remains elusive. The obvious way to explore this further is through the context and associations of this specific form. It is worth noting that this pose is most typical for the large wheelmade figures, which served as cult images in the Mycenaean sanctuaries (Pliatsika 2012: 611) and it has typically been interpreted as the greeting or blessing of a deity or a sign denoting power, authority, or even epiphany of a deity (Moore and Taylour 1999: 91). Ambiguity also surrounded the emotional responses to the tau

figurine. In contrast to Weilhartner's emphasis on female sexuality (2012: 292), the participants (both male and female) invariably experienced this as an introverted and closed pose; it also communicates calm, dignified control and status, a message reiterated by the clothing. I would argue it was intended to cover and conceal female sexuality and the emphasis was on the social stature of the individual, revealed through their posture and clothing. The clearest somatic message was expressed by the gesture of the phi figurine; although the physical, sexual attributes of the female form are again concealed by clothing, the gesture seemingly embodied a general idea of fecundity, mothering, and womanhood, perhaps highlighting the importance of women in ensuring the continuity of the family line and nurturing the next generation. Indeed, we should note that this is reiterated by common association of the kourotophos, or 'mother and child' figurines, with the phi figurine. These three postures therefore potentially reveal specifically engendered gestures, part of the performances involved in becoming distinct types of Mycenaean woman.

The gestures made by these figurines were part of the habit-memory, or incorporated practices (Conerton 1989), of Mycenaean women, a part of their daily embodied experiences and were specifically chosen for representation because of their social importance. They were culturally learned gestures (Kendon 2004) which made visual sense and communicated social information to the people who made, used, and handled them. Mapping this against the typological development of the figurines (French 1971) it also becomes clear that as the Mycenaean period progressed the figurines reflected very different types of embodied practices, presumably reflecting distinct gendered social roles and possibly very different women. The earliest figurines used throughout the 14th century (LH IIIA1 and 2) were the phi figurines and the closely related kourotophos. The responses from the participants in the performing figurine exercise clearly indicates that these images should be associated with female fertility, nurturing, and possibly motherhood (although there is no direct reference to pregnancy or child birth). These figurines appear to have encapsulated a Mycenaean woman's fundamental role in social (and physical) reproduction, and they no doubt spoke directly to the lived experiences of many of their female users. This might receive some confirmation from the Linear B archives, albeit slight later at the height of the palace period in the 13th century BC (LH IIIB), in which primary childcare provider is highlighted as an important social role for lower status female workers in the palaces (Olsen 2014: 103, 175). The continuity of familial wealth and lineages through marriage and childbirth was plausibly a significant female social role within Mycenaean society, which I would argue is reflected in the popularity of the phi and kourotophos figurines. Intriguingly, the gestures made by the tau and psi figurines do not explicitly refer to female fertility (beyond the rare tau kourotophos). The tau figurine was viewed as remote but dignified, while the upraised arms of the psi figurine made a deliberately communicative and commanding gesture. This suggests that these objects expressed a very different type of Mycenaean womanhood, one which was performed through distinct embodied practices. Plausibly, this change reflects the changing nature of Mycenaean society with the emergence of the palaces, in particular the appearance of some women whose standing and authority within the community was not primarily derived from their reproductive capacities. The following discussion explores whether we can further explore gender performativity in the figurines through the layering of the body (Knappett 2005) with distinctive elements of clothing.

6. Clothing, dress and identity

The Mycenaean figurines provide significant information on the clothed body, a subject for which we are otherwise largely dependent on the palatial arts – items extraneous to the daily reality of most Mycenaean. Aegean Bronze Age textiles and clothing have been the subject of considerable discussion (Barber 1993; Jones 2000, 2009, 2015; Nosch 2012), primarily focusing on evidence from the wall-paintings, although Borgna (2012) and Pliatsika (2012) have extended discussion to the Mycenaean wheelmade ceramic figures. The numerous smaller Mycenaean figurines however, have largely been overlooked, although French (1971) makes occasional passing reference to clothing of the figurines (see also Pliatsika 2012: 613). Nonetheless, these small objects have much to reveal about Mycenaean dress and personal adornment. While diminution in scale inevitably entails reduction in detail, it follows that the aspects emphasized by the figurine maker (in this case details of dress) will be culturally significant.

Mycenaean figurines did not overtly celebrate the female form or sexuality; instead, the body was entirely covered and obscured, down to the feet, including the arms. Although it was evidently important that these were female, there is only schematic representation of their primary sexual characteristics (breasts), albeit covered by clothing. This was the norm for Mycenaean depictions of women; other than Minoan-inspired representations of bare-breasted women in the palatial arts, the female body was not meant to be displayed and female primary sexual characteristics were hidden from view, in contrast to the male ithyphallic clay figures from Phylakopi (French 1985: figs. 6.12–114, 2009: fig. 4) and Tiryns (Vetters and Weilhartner 2018: 554, fig. 1). Instead, the emphasis was on textiles and garments that swathed and concealed the body. In all media (ivories, wall painting, and pictorial vase painting for example, as well as figurines) Mycenaean female social roles were primarily indicated through hairstyle, apparel, adornment, gesture, and posture (cf. Weilhartner 2012: 287, pl. LXVI.1), thus the ‘representation of a standing, passive figure clad in a long costume serves to construct female gender’ (Vetters and Weilhartner 2018: 553) in the Mycenaean world.

At first glance, it appears there is little detail on the figurines; however, the lines of paint over the bodies draw attention to their clothing, as do the body form, and some applied features. These details of clothing allow us to explore how Mycenaean gender was embodied, specifically how being a woman was performed. Femeness was represented by long robes, which covered the entire body, and seemingly static (seated or standing) posture. All three types wear robes, reaching down to the floor, hiding their legs and feet. The robes of the tau figurines (Fig. 11) fall straight and appear heavy, suggesting a thick and weighty woolen garment. The upper body of the tau figurine was covered by a closely fitting high-waisted garment, apparently belted just below the breasts. Two long tassels hang from the belt over the front of the skirt. The arms appear to be covered by sleeves indicated by short vertical strokes over the applied arms, or in some cases as though wrapped in a shawl (Fig. 13). In contrast, the base of the phi and psi figurines flares out (Figs. 11, 12), suggesting a fuller skirt and a lighter, more flowing garment, perhaps woven from linen. Rippling wavy lines over the upper body of the phi figurines give the impression of a loose-fitting, flowing linen blouse, belted at the waist, with a loose skirt (Fig. 11). The psi figurines wear a similar, high-belted flowing garment, again represented by lines loosely painted over the upper body and arms (Fig. 12). Sometimes the rippling wavy lines cover

the torso and lower body of the phi figurine, with no indication of a belt (Fig. 11), suggesting a single sinuous garment woven from linen. The clothing worn by the phi and psi examples is reminiscent of that worn by women depicted on Mycenaean pictorial pottery, such as the charioteers on the krater from Pyla Verghi, Cyprus (Fig. 15). A similar costume to these belted garments is also painted onto some of the larger wheelmade figures (Pliatsika 2012: 612–13). Presumably, the loose garments suggested for the phi and psi figurines would allow a certain freedom of movement. This would allow them (or their real-life counterparts) to make the upraised arm gestures, or equally to perform daily household tasks (including nursing children) on the part of the kourotophos. Such freedom of movement was seemingly not considered an issue, or even appropriate, for the female social roles indicated by the more closely fitted garments of the tau figurines. The postpalatial psi figurines of the 12th-11th century (LH IIIC) are more stylized, but with greater variation in the decoration of the upper body, which drew upon the contemporary concentric semicircles, zigzags and chevron motifs of the contemporary pottery rather than an attempt to suggest the details of clothing (Fig. 14).

<Figs. 11-15 about here>

Personal adornment might be indicated by dotted lines or bands of paint around the neck, which seem to represent a beaded necklace: this is attested from earliest naturalistic figurines through to the latest psi figurines (cf. French 1971). Beads of semi-precious stone (carnelian, agate, rock crystal, and amber) and relief beads of blue glass and gold, many belonging to necklaces and bracelets, are attested in various contexts throughout the Mycenaean world. These are most commonly found in tombs, but also in foundation deposits, cult places, and as stray settlement finds (Hughes-Brock 1999). Iconographic evidence from Mycenaean wall paintings suggests that necklaces were gendered objects, regularly worn by women but not often by men (Younger 1992: 261–9; Tzonou-Herbst 2009: 168). Women are also depicted holding strings of beads (Jones 2009: 322, fig. 1), usually interpreted as offering scenes. Beads and necklaces therefore should be considered as part of the extended female body, a means of layering the body (Knappett 2005: 241) to perform (Butler 1986, 1988) a specific gendered identity. Intriguingly, this association between women, ritualized practice, and beads is reiterated by the repeated occurrence of beads and figurines (Tzonou-Herbst 2002: 160, 2009: 167–8). Beaded adornment, including necklaces, therefore was intrinsically associated with becoming a Mycenaean woman, a reality which is reflected in the miniature mimetic figurines.

Based on a detailed study of the wall paintings from Xeste 3 at Akrotiri, Davis (1986) has suggested that there were clear age distinctions in the way that hair was worn in the Bronze Age Aegean: from shorn heads with side locks for children through to full heads of hair for mature women. Although the figurines do not provide the same level of detail as the wall paintings it is possible to make some observations. The phi figurines are typically bare-headed but might have an applied plait painted with short horizontal lines hanging down the back (Fig. 5). The tau and psi figurines habitually wear a large headdress, formed out of clay into a flattened cone splaying out from the head, and with painted decoration of rays, bands or festoons (Fig. 16). Tau figurines might have an applied braid of hair attached over the top of this or simply indicated by dashes in a vertical band painted down the back of the neck. Similarly, the hairstyle of the psi figurines might be indicated by a painted fringe peeping out from below a headdress and a braid of hair

down the back, either painted or an applied strip of clay. We might assume then, that a Mycenaean woman would wear her hair long, as is also indicated in the wall paintings (Hsu 2012), but typically this would be tied back and braided, rather than the free-flowing tresses more characteristic of the women depicted in wall paintings. The elaborate headdresses were worn by some, but not all women, and not by the mother/nurturer phi figurines. Instead, this element of costume probably communicated status and authority. Certainly, in other media headdresses appear to be the preserve of goddesses, sphinxes, and priestesses (Pliatsika 2012: 614), suggesting that within the Mycenaean artistic canon these were an indicator of status and (divine) authority. Indeed, the closest parallel to the splaying headdress of the figurines is perhaps the headdress worn by the White Goddess at Pylos (Hsu 2012: fig 9). This headdress, therefore plausibly illustrates a specific costume associated with ritual performance – a specific layering of the body to communicate social position and status. Its recurrent association with the tau and psi figurines reiterates observations from the gesture study, which distinguished the more formalized somatic messages embodied in these two figurine types from the nurturing role embedded in the phi figurines. Very different social meanings therefore are implicit in the very materiality – form, gesture, and details of costume painted or molded in clay – of the female figurines.

<Fig. 16 about here>

Connerton highlights appropriate clothing and ‘the grammar of dress’ as a significant element of embodied practices, a means by which societies create structures and meanings which are at once exclusive and inclusive (Connerton 1989, 12). Effectively, clothing creates a second skin through which a person’s identity is layered onto their body and through which their gendered self is performed. Performing ‘gender is a way of being in the world, a way of dressing, of using the body, of revealing, concealing, modifying, and presenting the physical self’ (Joyce 2000: 7). The emphasis on the clothing of these figurines highlights the importance of cultural competence in reading dress codes within Mycenaean society. There is a clear correlation between choice of gesture and the requisite form of clothing, which further suggests these objects mirror real Mycenaean women performing actual embodied practices within specific social settings; these objects then provide an insight into the reality of being Mycenaean and a woman. Although fertility, reproduction, and mothering were important female social roles, the physical female form was not celebrated and female nudity, or sexuality, appears to have been a taboo. Instead women were expected to be fully covered, swaddled in long garments of linen or wool, and the only bare flesh on display was the face. Hair was bound up in long braids. Practicalities of performing certain tasks allowed for some clothing with movement, at least for the phi and psi figurines and presumably their human counterparts. Specific types of clothing were important in organizing society and undoubtedly served as an indicator of status or social role, in particular the headdress. This headdress and the stiff, heavy clothing specific to the tau figurines suggests restriction of movement for some women; this appears to be status related, associated with mimetic representations of women who exercised, or at least embodied, some form of authority. This authority was articulated physically through the sheer presence woven into their clothing, their stately posture, and imposing headdresses.

Female display of wealth and status through elaborate clothing and costly textiles was undoubtedly their prime significance in Mycenaean society, possibly as dowry wealth or reflecting the wealth and position of a patriarchal family, or possibly even their own personal wealth. In contrast to the Near East, where there is plentiful textual evidence for control and ownership of female property including dowries (Dalley 1980), this important aspect of Mycenaean women's lives largely remains unknowable to modern scholarship (Olsen 2014: 42). Nonetheless the Linear B archives do throw some light on female wealth and authority. Some women, identified as the wives of officials (Olsen 2014: 150–53) are mentioned in the Pylos tablets; these women appear to be considered important, of high (aristocratic?) status, but with no independent wealth or economic autonomy. There is also evidence from the Pylos archives that some high status, titled women did control and distribute property, including land, commodities, and personnel, in their own right (Olsen 2014: 135–6). Typically, these were religious officials, but other named women, who are not listed by a specific title, could also administer property in their own right (Olsen 2014: 146–7). Therefore, the texts indicate that some Mycenaean women did have some control over property, and we might expect that this status and position would be communicated through the elaboration of their costume and personal adornment, as is evident in various classes of Mycenaean iconography including the figurines.

7. Conclusions

This paper explores Mycenaean female figurines, focusing on performativity, gesture, and variations in costume, with a view to throwing light on becoming a woman in Mycenaean Greece. Like their prehistoric cousins, these formulaic miniature representations shed light on how the female body was perceived, displayed, and performed. They communicate something of the essence of Mycenaean womanhood and how ideal gender roles were constructed through physical actions, habit-memory, and dress. Through the lens of the figurines and Butler's performativity (1986, 1988), this paper addresses various ways in which biological females might become Mycenaean women. It explores the key attributes emphasized by the coroplast, and how these change through time, identifying these as markers of specific gendered social roles that reflected very real embodied actions and incorporated practices experienced by (some of) the Mycenaean women who owned and handled these objects.

First, drawing upon studies of embodiment and somatic communication (Connerton 1989; Kendon 2004; Schebesch 2013), this paper looks at how the gendered body is sedimented through repeated gestures and postures. It argues that the distinct gestures of the phi, tau, and psi figurines were deliberately communicative and would be immediately comprehensible to a Mycenaean viewer. Intriguingly, it appears that the modern viewer can also access some understanding of this body language by physically performing these gestures (cf. Schebesch 2013); indeed a performative study of the figurines suggested that the three gestures referred to distinct social roles – mothering or nurturing and possibly fertility for the psi figurine, the commanding authority and remote presence of the tau figurine, and the expressive, active communication of the phi figurine. Moreover, the consistency of the responses of the modern participants to these gestures was striking, supporting Schebesch's assertion of 'some universal elements in human communication on the physical level' (2013: 94).

Details of dress (textiles, robes, adornment, hairstyle, and headdress) comprise the other consistent attribute of the Mycenaean female figurines explored here. These items of apparel are examined as a second skin, layering and shaping the gendered body (cf. Knappett 2005), and another mode of incorporated practice (Connerton 1989). All three figurine types wear long robes, which cover the entire body and conceal the primary sexual characteristics. The display of female sexuality was not considered important (or was perhaps a taboo) even for those (phi) figurines apparently associated with female fertility. There was also a clear correlation between apparel and gesture, reinforcing the somatic messages conveyed by these objects. Headdresses, for example, were restricted to the tau and psi figurines, emphasizing the significant social/ritual role associated with the gestures of upraised arms and arms folded across the chest.

This study of Mycenaean female figurines therefore demonstrates that these miniature objects were a means of conveying gender ideals and communicating important social roles. Focusing on their gesture and costume illustrates the very agency of becoming a Mycenaean woman. It shows us how different female identities were mediated through the material world and grounded within embodied experiences: through clothing, personal adornment (e.g. necklaces), and the gestures made. The figurines therefore throw considerable light on how becoming a Mycenaean woman was materially performed. Furthermore, the mimetic replication in clay of these daily bodily acts and actions serves to reiterate the cultural significance of the identities and social roles being enacted.

8. References

- Albers, G., 2009. Figures and figurines in Mycenaean sanctuaries: Patterns of find distributions and contexts. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 85–98.
- Alberti, B., 2014. Queer prehistory: Bodies, performativity and matter. In: D. Bolger (ed.) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 86–107.
- Bailey, D., 1994. Reading prehistoric figurines as individuals. *World Archaeol.* 25(3), 321–31.
- Bailey, D., 2005. *Prehistoric Figurines: Representation and Corporeality in the Neolithic*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Bailey, D., 2012. Figurines, corporeality and the origins of gender. In: D. Bolger (Ed.) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. Oxford, John Wiley, pp. 244–64.
- Bailey, D., 2014a. The corporeal politics of being in the Neolithic. In: D. Borić and J. Robb (Eds) *Past Bodies: Body-Centred Research in Archaeology*. Oxford, Oxbow Books (reprint), pp. 9–18.
- Bailey, D., 2014b. Touch and the cheirotic apprehension of prehistoric figurines. In P. Dent (Ed.) *Sculpture and Touch*. London, Ashgate, pp. 27–43.
- Barber, E.J.W., 1993. *Prehistoric Textiles: The Development of Cloth in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages with Special Reference to the Aegean*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Blegen, C., 1937. *Prosymna. The Helladic Settlement Preceding the Argive Heraeum*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Borgna, E., 2012. Remarks on female attire of Minoan and Mycenaean clay figures. In: M.-L. Nosch and R. Laffineur (Eds) *Kosmos. Jewellery, Adornment and Textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Aegaeum 33. Liège, Peeters, pp. 335–42.
- Brück, J., 2005. „Experiencing the past? The development of a phenomenological archaeology in British prehistory. *Archaeol. Dial.* 12(1), 45–72.
- Budin, S.L., 2011. *Images of Woman and Child from the Bronze Age: reconsidering Fertility, Maternity and Gender in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, J., 1986. Sex and gender in Simone de Beauvoir’s *Second Sex*. *Yale French Studies* 72, 35–49.
- Butler, J., 1988. Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theater Journal* 40(4), 519–31.
- Connerton, P., 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cosmopoulos, M.B., 2015. *Bronze Age Eleusis and the Origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dalley, S., 1980. Old Babylonian Dowries. *Iraq* 42(1), 53–74.
- Davis, E.N., 1986. Youth and age in the Thera frescoes. *Am. J. Archaeol.* 90(4) 399–406.

- de Beauvoir, S., 2011. *The Second Sex*. trans. C. Borde and S.M. Chevallier. New York, Vintage Books.
- Demakopoulou, K. and Divari-Valakou, N., 2009. Mycenaean figures and figurines from Midea. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 37–53.
- Fischer, P. and Bürge, T., 2017. Tombs and offering pits at the Late Bronze Age metropolis of Hala Sultan Tekke, Cyprus. *Bull. Am. Schools Oriental Res.* 377, 161–218.
- Foxhall, L., 2015. Introduction: Miniaturization. *World Archaeol.* 47(1), 1–5.
- French, E., 1971. The development of Mycenaean terracotta figurines. *Ann. British School Athens* 66, 102–87.
- French, E., 1981. Mycenaean figures and figurines: Their typology and function. In: R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (Eds) *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 173–7.
- French, E., 1985. The figures and figurines. In: C. Renfrew, *The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi*. London, the British School of Archaeology at Athens, pp. 209–80.
- French, E., 2009. Figurines revisited and the importance of Phylakopi. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 15–21.
- Furumark, A., 1941. *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery*. Stockholm, Kungl Vitterhets, historie och antikvitets akademien.
- Gell, A., 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Gesell, G.C. 2004. From Knossos to Kavousi: The popularizing of the Minoan Palace Goddess. In: A. Chapin (Ed.) *XAPIΣ: Essays in Honor of Sara A. Immerwahr*. Hesperia Supplements 33. Princeton, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, pp. 131–50.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1966. Ritualized gesture and expression in art. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 251, 393–401.
- Hägg, R., 1981. Official and popular cults in Mycenaean Greece. In: R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (Eds) *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Stockholm: Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 35–40.
- Hägg, R., 1995. State and religion in Mycenaean Greece. In: R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds) *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*. *Aegaeum* 12. Liège, Université de Liège and UTASP, pp. 387–91.
- Hsu, F. S.-c., 2012. Ritual significance in Mycenaean hairstyles. *Chronika* 2, 92–102.
- Hughes-Brock, H., 1999. Mycenaean beads: Gender and social contexts. *Ox. J. Archaeol.* 18(3), 277–96.
- Insoll, T., 2017. Introduction. In: T. Insoll (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Prehistoric Figurines*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 1–15.
- Jones, B.R. 2000. Revealing Minoan fashions. *Archaeology* 53(3), 36–41.

- Jones, B.R., 2009. New reconstructions of the 'Mykenaia' and a seated woman from Mycenae. *Am. J. Archaeol.* 113(3), 309–38.
- Jones, B.R., 2015. *Ariadne's Threads: The Construction and Significance of Clothes in the Aegean Bronze Age.* Aegaeum 38. Liège: Peeters.
- Joyce, R.A., 2000. *Gender and Power in Prehispanic Mesoamerica.* Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Kilian, K., 1981. Zeugnisse mykenischer Kultausbung in Tiryns. In: R. Hägg and N. Marinatos (Eds) *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age.* Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 49–58.
- Kilian, K., 1988a. Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1982/1983. *Arch. Anzeiger*, 104–51.
- Kilian, K., 1990. Patterns in the cult activity in the Mycenaean Argolid: Haghia Triada (Klenies), the Profitis Elisa Cave (Haghios Hadrianos) and the Citadel of Tiryns. In: R. Hägg and G.C. Nordquist (Eds) *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid.* Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 184–97.
- Kendon, A., 2004. *Gesture. Visible Action as Utterance.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kokkinidou, D. and Nikolaidou, M., 1997. Body imagery in the Aegean Neolithic: Ideological implications of anthropomorphic figurines. In: J. Moore and E. Scott (Eds) *Invisible People and Processes.* London: Leicester University Press, pp. 88–112.
- Kopytoff, I., 1986. The cultural biography of things. Commoditization as process. In: A. Appadurai (Ed.) *The Social Life of Things Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–91.
- Kuijt, I. and Chesson, M.S., 2004. Lumps of clay and pieces of stone. Ambiguity, bodies and identity as portrayed in Neolithic figurines. In: S. Pollock and R. Bernbeck (Eds) *Archaeologies of the Near East: Critical Perspectives.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 152–83.
- Leith, K.E., *Expressions of Gender in Mortuary Behaviour from Middle Helladic and Mycenaean Burial Samples in the Aegean,* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College London.
- Lesure, R.G., 2005. Linking theory and evidence in an archaeology of human agency: Iconography, style and theories of embodiment. *J. Archaeol. Method Theory* 12(3), 237–55.
- Manning, S.W., 2010. Chronology and terminology. In: E.H. Cline (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean (ca. 3000-1000BC).* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 11–28.
- Mauss, M., 1973. Techniques du corps; Techniques of the body. *Economy and Society* 2(1), 70–88.
- Mina, M., 2008. Carving out gender in the prehistoric Aegean: Anthropomorphic figurines of the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. *J. Med. Archaeol.* 21(2), 213–39.

- Moore, A.D. and Taylour, W.D., 1999. *The Temple Complex: The Helleno-British Excavations within the Citadel of Mycenae, 1959-69*. Well Built Mycenae 10. Oxford, Oxbow Books.
- Morris, C., 2001. The language of gesture in Minoan religion. In: R. Hägg and R. Laffineur (Eds) *Potnia: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Aegaeum 22. Liège, Université de Liège and UTASP, pp. 245–51.
- Morris, C., 2009. Configuring the individual: Bodies of figurines in Minoan Crete. In: A.L. d'Agata and A. van de Moortel (Eds) *Archaeologies of Cult: Essays on Ritual and Cult in Crete in Honor of Geraldine C. Gesell*. Hesperia Supplement 42, Princeton, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, pp. 179–87.
- Morris, C. and Peatfield, A., 2006. Experiencing ritual: Shamanic elements in Minoan religion. In: M. Wedde (Eds) *Celebrations: Anthropological and Archaeological Approaches to Ancient Greek Ritual*. Bergen: Norwegian Institute in Athens, pp. 35–59.
- Mylonas, G.E., 1966. *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Nanoglou, S., 2005., Subjectivity and material culture in Thessaly, Greece: The case of Neolithic anthropomorphic imagery. *Cam Archaeol J* 15(2), 141–56.
- Nilsson, M.P., 1950. *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*. Lund, C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Norris, R.S., 2001. Embodiment and community. *Western Folklore* 30(2/3), 111–24.
- Nosch, M.-L., 2012. From texts to textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age. In M.-L. Nosch and R. Laffineur (Eds) *Kosmos. Jewellery, Adornment and Textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Aegaeum 33. Liège, Peeters, pp. 43–53.
- Olsen, B.A., 1998. Women, children and the family in the Late Aegean Bronze Age: Differences in Minoan and Mycenaean constructions of gender. *World Archaeol.* 29(3), 380–92
- Olsen, B.A., 2014. *Women in Mycenaean Greece: The Linear B tablets from Pylos and Knossos*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Persson, A.W., 1931. *The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea*. Lund, C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Pilafidis-Williams, K., 1998. *The Sanctuary of Aphaia on Aigina in the Bronze Age*. Munich, Hermer Verlag.
- Pilafidis-Williams, K., 2009. The Mycenaean kourotrophos figurine at the sanctuary of Aphaia on Aigina. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm: Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 113–24.
- Pliatsika, V., 2012. Simply divine: The jewellery, dress and body adornment of the Mycenaean clay female figures in light of new evidence from Mycenae. In: M.-L. Nosch and R. Laffineur (Eds) *Kosmos. Jewellery, Adornment and Textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Aegaeum 33. Liège, Peeters, pp. 609–26.
- Schebesch, A., 2013. Five anthropomorphic figurines of the Upper Paleolithic: Communication through body language. *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Urgeschichte* 22, 61–100.
- Schepartz, L.A., Stocker, S.R., Davis, J.L., Papathansiou, A., Miller-Antoniou, S., Murphy, J.M.A., Richards, M., and Malapani, E., 2017. Mycenaean hierarchy and gender roles: Diet and health inequalities in Late Bronze Age Pylos, Greece. In: H.D. Klaus, A.R.

- Harvey and M.N. Cohen (Eds) *Bones of Complexity: Bioarchaeological Case Studies of Social Organization and Skeletal Biology (Bioarchaeological Interpretations of the Human Past)*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, pp. 141-72.
- Schliemann, H., 1878. *Mycenae: A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries at Mycenae and Tiryns*. London, John Murray.
- Shelton, K., 2009. The figurines from Petsas House. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean figures and figurines*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 55–60.
- Tilley, C., 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape. Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford, Berg.
- Tzonou-Herbst, I., 2002. *A Contextual Analysis of Mycenaean Terracotta Figurines*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Cincinnati.
- Tzonou-Herbst, I., 2009. Trashing the sacred: The use-life of Mycenaean figurines. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm: Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 161–75.
- Vermeule, E. and Karageorghis, V., 1982. *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Vetters, M., 2011a. ‘Thou shalt make many images of thy gods’: A chaîne opératoire approach to Mycenaean religious rituals based on iconographic and contextual analyses of plaster and terracotta figurines. In: A. Brysbaert (Ed.) *Tracing Prehistoric Social Networks through Technology: A Diachronic Perspective on the Aegean*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 30–47.
- Vetters, M., 2011b. Seats of power? Making the most of miniatures – the role of terracotta throne models in disseminating Mycenaean religious ideology. In: W. Gauß, M. Lindblom, R.A.K. Smith and J.C. Wright (Eds) *Our Cups Are Full: Pottery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age. BAR IS Series 2227*. Oxford, Archaeopress, pp. 319–30.
- Vetters, M., 2015. From discard patterns to enacted rituals? Contextualizing Mycenaean terracotta figurines in settlement deposits. In: S. Huysecom-Haxhi and A. Muller (Eds) *Figurines grecques en context. Presence muette dans le sanctuaire, la tombe et la maison*. Lille, Universitaires du Septentrion, pp. 337–60.
- Vetters, M., 2016. All the same yet not identical? Mycenaean terracotta figurines in context. In: E. Alram-Stern, F. Blakolmer, S. Deger-Jalkotzy, R. Laffineur and J. Weilhartner (Eds) *Metaphysis. Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age. Aegaeum 39*, Leuven, Liège, Peeters, pp. 37–48.
- Vetters, M. and Weilhartner, J., 2018. Conceptions of gender and body images in the Aegean world and East Mediterranean societies in the Late Bronze Age. In: M. Luciani (Ed.) *Images in Context: Agency, Audiences and Perception*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 551–62.
- Weber-Hiden, I., 2009. The stylistic development of Mycenaean terracotta female figurines. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm: Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 23–36.

- Weiberg, E., 2009. Production of female figurines at Mastos, Berbati. In: A.-L. Schallin and P. Pakkanen (Eds) *Encounters with Mycenaean Figures and Figurines*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute at Athens, pp. 61–75.
- Weilhartner, J., 2012. Gender dimorphism in the Linear A and Linear B tablets. In: M.-L. Nosch and R. Laffineur (Eds) *Kosmos. Jewellery, Adornment and Textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age*. *Aegaeum* 33. Liège, Peeters, pp. 287–95.
- Younger, J.C. 1992: Representations of Minoan-Mycenaean jewelry. In: R. Laffineur and J.L. Crowley (Eds) *EIKON. Aegean Bronze Age Iconography: Shaping a Methodology*. *Aegaeum* 8. Liège, Peeters, pp. 257–92.

9. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Eloise Govier for inviting me to present an earlier version of this paper at the 2014 Experiencing Material Worlds workshop at Lampeter, University of Wales, Trinity Saint David. Particular thanks to Anja Ulbrich and the Ashmolean Museum for the opportunity to study the Mycenaean figurines in their collection and permission to reproduce photographs. Thanks to Madog Thomas for help with preparation of the line drawings. Several colleagues, friends, undergraduate and postgraduate students have provided much useful discussion about embodied practices and the experiencing of gestures. I am also grateful to colleagues for stimulating discussions, which informed this article: Luci Attala for our ongoing materialities debates and Adrian Davis for discussions of miniaturization, as well as Amy Maitland Gardner, UCL, for discussions of gesture and posture in ancient art. Thanks, as always, to Steve Thomas for reading several early drafts of this paper and his helpful comments.

Captions

- Fig. 1. Psi, phi and tau figurine © Trustees of the British Museum. [colour]
- Fig. 2. Kourotrophos (Proto-phi type), after Pilafidis-Williams 2009, fig. 8.
- Fig. 3. Chart showing development of figurines, after French 2009, fig.1.
- Fig. 4. Profile view of tau and two phi figurines, courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- Fig. 5. Detail of figurine fragment, showing braided hair (AN1966.585), courtesy of the Ashmolean Museum. Photo L. Steel. [colour]
- Fig. 6. Transitional figurine from Kara Hymettos (AE309), courtesy of the Ashmolean Museum. Photo L. Steel.
- Fig. 7. Tau figurine, courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Fig. 8. Mycenaean logogram with arms across chest, reminiscent of tau gesture, after Weilhartner 2012, pl. LXVI/9j.
- Fig. 9. Phi figurine from Kara Hymettos (AE 315). Drawing L. Steel.
- Fig. 10. Psi figurine from Mastos, Berbati, after Weiberg 2009, fig. 5.

Fig. 11. Details of dress: tau and phi figurines, courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 12. Details of dress: phi and psi figurines from Eleusis, photo L. Steel.

Fig. 13. Detail of tau figurines wearing shawl, after French 1971, pl. 18a.

Fig. 14. LH IIIC Psi figurines, after Weber-Hiden 2009, Fig. 1.

Fig. 15. Detail of robed women on Mycenaean chariot krater from Pyla Verghi, Cyprus, after Vermeule and Karageorghis 1983, pl. III.13

Fig. 16. Detail of figurine headdresses, after Weiberg 2009, fig. 6: 1-3.