Use and Appreciation of Mycenaean Pottery outside Greece
van Wijngaarden, G.J.M.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
PART I

Introduction

Purpose of this study
In this thesis, I aim to investigate the variations in the cultural significance of the imported Mycenaean pottery in the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean. Such pottery has been widely distributed in almost the whole Mediterranean. This body of material constitutes one of the archaeological sources by which to study relationships between the Aegean and other areas in the Mediterranean. As such, it has served as evidence for Mycenaean colonization and commercial pre-eminence. The same body of evidence, however, has also been used to dismiss the importance of long-distance trade for the Mycenaean world. In my opinion, such a variability of interpretations on the basis of the same archaeological data has been possible because the role of Mycenaean pottery in international exchange during the Late Bronze Age is not understood. That role is dependent on the different patterns of consumption in the various areas where these ceramics have been imported. The main purpose of this research is to identify and compare these patterns of consumption for the three Mediterranean areas which have produced the largest quantities of Mycenaean pottery: the Levant, Cyprus and the Italian area.

The Aegean background
On the mainland of Greece, at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, substantial changes are visible in the archaeological record, which have to do with an increase in social complexity. The most obvious examples of these changes are the South-Greek in Mycenae, which are indicative of material social differentiation. In the surrounding regions, increasing centralization resulted in the development of the Mycenaean palaces, of which those at Mycenae, Tiryns, Pylos and Thebes are the most notable. These palaces can be understood as centres which managed to control and manipulate specific aspects of society, such as the flow of goods and craft production, as well as military and various ceremonial functions. Increasingly, however, it becomes clear that the palaces were never able to control the whole economy and it is possible that goods were produced and distributed outside the influence of the potential centres. The Mycenaean palatial centres essentially were all destroyed and not rebuilt.

Changes in the settlement pattern and material culture indicate that, from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age onwards, the Argolid emerged as a leading centre in the development of
CHAPTER 1

The argument

Purpose of this study
In this thesis, I aim to investigate the variations in the cultural significance of the imported Mycenaean pottery in the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean. Such pottery has been widely distributed in almost the whole Mediterranean. This body of material constitutes one of the archaeological sources by which to study relationships between the Aegean and other areas in the Mediterranean. As such, it has served as evidence for Mycenaean colonisation and commercial pre-eminence. The same body of evidence, however, has also been used to dismiss the importance of long-distance trade for the Mycenaean world. In my opinion, such a variability of interpretations on the basis of the same archaeological data has been possible because the role of Mycenaean pottery in international exchange during the Late Bronze Age is not understood. That role is dependant on the different patterns of consumption in the various areas where these ceramics have been imported. The main purpose of this research is to identify and compare these patterns of consumption for the three Mediterranean areas which have produced the largest quantities of Mycenaean pots: the Levant, Cyprus and the Italian area.

The Aegean background
On the mainland of Greece, at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, substantial changes are visible in the archaeological record, which have to do with an increase in social complexity. The most obvious examples of these changes are the Shaft-Graves in Mycenae, which are indicative of marked social stratification. In the succeeding periods, increasing centralisation resulted in the development of the Mycenaean palaces, of which those at Mycenae, Tiryns, Pylos and Thebes are the most notable. These palaces can be understood as centres which managed to control and monopolise specific aspects of society, such as the flow of goods and craft production, as well as military and various ceremonial activities. Increasingly, however, it has become clear that the palaces were never able to control the whole economy and it is likely that goods were produced and distributed outside the influence of the palatial centres. The Mycenaean palatial centres eventually were all destroyed and not rebuilt.

Changes in the settlement pattern and material culture indicate that, from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age onwards, the Argolid emerged as a leading centre in the development of

---

3 Kilian 1987, 212-217; Barber 1992, 21-23; Shelmerdine 1997, 558-559. Even though there were impressive ruler’s dwellings already in the earlier stages of the Late Bronze Age, the true palatial age begins during the Late Helladic IIIA1 period.
5 Dickinson 1994, 81-83; Halstead 1992a, 72; 1992b, 113-114; Gillis 1995. For similar arguments with regard to the Near Eastern palaces, see Yoffee 1981, 22-23;
Mycenaean culture.\(^6\) Wheel-made pottery from the first part of the Late Bronze Age was probably manufactured in a restricted number of production centres and was distributed all over the Peloponnese.\(^7\) During the palatial period, the Mycenaean world was probably made up of a number of independent polities.\(^8\) Nevertheless, there is a marked homogeneity in the material culture of the Greek mainland, while Mycenaean influences are visible in, for example, Crete, the Cyclades and Rhodes.\(^9\) Even though the actual presence of mainlanders elsewhere in the Aegean cannot be excluded, there is little evidence of a Mycenaean Aegean empire. Instead, we should envisage a cultural and technological koine in which the standards were set in the Argolid. In spite of this koine, local traditions in material culture seem to have continued in many regions of the Aegean.\(^10\) As is especially visible in ceramic production, the regional variations in the material culture increased during LHIIIB2 and became particularly strong after the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces.\(^11\)

The specific development of the Mycenaean palatial civilisation is primarily due to internal Aegean factors.\(^12\) The material culture of mainland Greece during the Late Bronze Age clearly developed from the earlier Middle Helladic material record.\(^13\) In addition, relationships with other Aegean areas, in particular Minoan Crete, were important for the development of the Mycenaean civilisation.\(^14\) Nevertheless, this development cannot be separated from a wider Mediterranean context, as is particularly evident from the long history of palatial societies in the Near East.\(^15\) There are several sources by which we can investigate the relations between Mycenaean Greece and the Mediterranean. Firstly, epigraphic evidence in the Aegean, as well as in Anatolia, Egypt and the Levant may be considered.\(^16\) Secondly, a number of shipwrecks dating to the Late Bronze Age present physical evidence for the circulation of goods.\(^17\) Thirdly, there is a substantial number of objects in the Aegean, which came from other areas in the Mediterranean.\(^18\) Finally, Mycenaean objects have been discovered outside the Aegean. Among these, ceramic vessels and figurines constitute the majority by far.\(^19\) This thesis, then, is

\(^{6}\) Dietz 1991, 326.
\(^{8}\) Chadwick 1976, 35-60; Renfrew 1977; Kilian 1986.
\(^{9}\) For Crete, see Farnoux & Driesen 1997; Haskell 1997. For the Cyclades, see Schallin 1993. For Rhodes and the Dodecanese, see Mee 1982, 88; Benzi 1988; 1992; 1996.
\(^{10}\) See, for example, Schallin 1993, 174-177; Benzi 1996, 973-974; Haskell 1997, 191-193 and other articles in the same volume.
\(^{11}\) Mountjoy 1990, 245.
\(^{12}\) Kilian 1988a, 298-300; Barber 1992, 22-23.
\(^{13}\) Dietz 1991, 300-303; Rutter 1993, 776-778.
\(^{14}\) Dickinson 1977, 56; Tournavitou 1995, 113-114.
\(^{15}\) Foster 1987, 15-16.
\(^{16}\) Palaima 1991; Cline 1994, 108-131. References to international contacts in Homer's Iliad and, especially, the Odyssey cannot be considered suitable to investigate Bronze Age trade due to the many Iron Age elements in these myths, see Crielard 1994, 134 (with extensive bibliography on the subject).
\(^{17}\) To my knowledge, four wrecks dating to this period have so far been discovered in the Mediterranean. For the wreck near Cape Gelidonya on the south coast of Turkey, see Bass 1967; 1991. For the Ulu Burun wreck in the same area, see Bass 1967; 1991; Pulak 1988; 1997. For the wreck excavated off the coast near Haifa in Israel, see Galili, Shmuei & Artzy 1986. For the wreck near point Iria, off the Argolid coast in the Aegean, see Lolos, Pellas & Vichos 1995; Vichos & Lolos 1997.
\(^{18}\) Lambrou-Philipson 1990a; Cline 1994.
\(^{19}\) It is difficult to identify objects from other materials which unambiguously can be related to the Aegean. A variety of glass beads which occur in the central Mediterranean in particular, may have an Aegean origin; see Taylor 1958, 51-52; Vagnetti 1989. Arguments against this hypothesis, however, are given by Harding (1982, 87-103). Objects from the Mycenaean ivory industry may have circulated within the eastern Mediterranean, but they often cannot easily be distinguished from products made elsewhere, especially on Cyprus, see Poursat 1977, 250-251. The sword-type known as Naue type II has been found on several sites in Cyprus and the
restricted to one group of material - pottery - which is related to other evidence. Ultimately, I hope to contribute to our understanding of the Mycenaean world in its Mediterranean setting.

The ceramic styles which can be associated to the period of the development of Mycenaean palatial civilisation range from Middle Helladic III until Late Helladic IIIB2, covering more than four centuries (c. 1600-1180 BC) according to traditional chronology.20 I have not included in my research pottery produced after the destructions of the palaces, which is much less homogeneous and to a far larger extent imitated outside the Aegean.21 Considering the difficulties outside Greece to distinguish between LHIIB and LHIIC stratigraphically, this distinction has not been applied too rigidly. As a general rule, I will include LHIIC pots in those cases where they occur in the same archaeological contexts as earlier pottery. I will adopt a similar attitude with regard to the origins of the vessels which are the subject of my research. Pottery produced in other areas of the Aegean than the Greek mainland, especially on Crete, should properly not be considered as Mycenaean. However, in some cases, especially when dealing with small fragments, Minoan and Mycenaean pots are difficult to distinguish. Moreover, pots from various parts of the Aegean probably were transported together to the east and west, both in the earlier and later periods.22 Sites with exclusively Minoan pots will not be discussed,23 but when such pots were found on a site which has yielded Mycenaean pottery as well, they are included. Likewise, Mycenaean-type pottery made in the Levant, Cyprus or Italy will be included when found together with true Aegean imports.

The Mediterranean background

The geographical area in which Mycenaean pottery has been distributed, is exceptionally large. The westernmost finds have been made in El LLanete de los Moros in Spain, in the Guadalquivir-valley in the province of Andalusia.24 Finds at Meskene-Emar along the Euphrates river in Syria represent the easternmost finds,25 although a Mycenaean sherd is reported from Babylon in Iraq.26 The southernmost finds come from Argo Island in ancient Nubia.27 A sherd found at Treazzano di Monsampolo in the province of Le Marche in Italy is the northernmost find.28

The societies which existed in these regions in the period during which Mycenaean pottery circulated, vary highly in their socio-political and economic organisation and complexity. In Egypt, this is the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties of the New Kingdom with its centrally

---

20 Warren & Hankey 1989, 162. See below, pages 23-24, for a note on the chronological definitions maintained here. Throughout this thesis, the abbreviation LH is used to indicate ‘Late Helladic’, while LM and LC refer to ‘Late Minoan’ and ‘Late Cypriot’ respectively.
23 Middle Minoan finds have, of course, not been included here, see Kemp & Merrillees 1980; Catling 1997, 378-381.
24 Martin de la Cruz 1988, 86, 88; 1990.
25 Caubet 1982a, esp. 76.
26 Deubner 1957, 51-52, Plate 47. The photograph of this fragment is too unclear to say anything about the vessel type, its decoration, or its Mycenaean origin.
27 Hankey 1993b, 114.
28 Lollini 1982, 197-199. Mycenaean finds in the Po-area and the Veneto all seem to be of LHIIC-date; see Bietti Sestieri 1982, 201-207.
governed, large empire and its developed, complex social and administrative structure.\textsuperscript{29} Large parts of Anatolia fell under the Hittites, who, likewise, ruled a centrally governed empire.\textsuperscript{30} In the Levant, there were a number of smaller states based upon large urban centres with a centralised political system. In the course of the period under consideration, these city-states came under Egyptian or Hittite domination, but they kept a relatively large autonomy.\textsuperscript{31} Each of these three areas may be considered as historical during this period, since contemporary textual sources are available to us, due to a variety of inscriptions as well as the existence of archives with cuneiform tablets. Similar epigraphical sources have not been discovered in Cyprus. On this island, a process of urbanisation began during this period and the practice of writing in Cypro-Minoan script was limited.\textsuperscript{32} The societies in the central Mediterranean should be considered as prehistoric and proto-urban.\textsuperscript{33} The level of social-economic organisation in this area was far lower than in the eastern Mediterranean.

The international economy and diplomacy within the Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age constitutes a field of research which is much too large to adequately deal with here. One aspect of it concerns the nature of the flow of goods. This subject has been investigated in particular by scholars using textual evidence that has been found in Egypt, the Levant and Anatolia. Also relevant is the study of trade in (raw) metals, which is considered to have been the binding force of the international economy in the Mediterranean during the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{34}

Study of the international relations in the Late Bronze Age was prompted by the discovery of archives at Tell el-Amarna and Bögazkoy in 1887 and 1907 respectively.\textsuperscript{35} Archives were also discovered in the Levant, of which those at Ras Shamra (Ugarit), discovered in 1929, are the most notable.\textsuperscript{36} Although the various archives contain documents that deal with the exchange of diplomatic gifts between rulers, the texts were initially mostly interpreted as a disguise for commercial exchange.\textsuperscript{37} From the early 1970’s onwards, however, the cuneiform documents have increasingly been interpreted as documents reflecting the workings of reciprocal gift-exchange.\textsuperscript{38} M. Liverani, in particular, showed how certain transactions - for example the exchange of ivory against ivory - are irrational when perceived as commercial trade.\textsuperscript{39} He argued that the main aim of the flow of goods among rulers of equal rank was the giving itself, not the expectation of receiving in return.

It is important to realise that the cuneiform texts that deal with exchange should not be seen as facts, but rather as interpretations thereof. M. Liverani has convincingly demonstrated that the texts are cultural products themselves and not devoid of ideology or even propaganda.\textsuperscript{40} Moreover, the texts reflect the life of the same social sector in different political units: the royal palaces.\textsuperscript{41} It is now generally accepted that the societies in the Near East had multi-centered economies in which several spheres coexisted.\textsuperscript{42} From the third millennium onwards international exchange occurred both as ceremonial gift exchange among palaces and as more

\textsuperscript{29} See, for example, Trigger et al. 1983.
\textsuperscript{30} See, for example, MacQueen 1986; Gurney 1990; Masson 1994; Bryce 1998, 44-63.
\textsuperscript{31} For overviews, see Leonard 1989; Falconer 1994.
\textsuperscript{33} For overviews, see Barker & Stoddart 1994; Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994.
\textsuperscript{34} Sherratt 1999, 175-180.
\textsuperscript{35} On these discoveries, see Moran 1992, xiii; Puchstein 1909, 489.
\textsuperscript{36} Schaeffer & Dussaud 1929, 295; Virolleaud 1929, 304-310.
\textsuperscript{37} See, for example, Helck 1962, 391-460. Liverani 1972, 297 comments on this paradox.
\textsuperscript{38} Liverani 1972, 297-299.
\textsuperscript{39} Liverani 1972, 298.
\textsuperscript{40} Liverani 1990, 292-293.
\textsuperscript{41} Liverani 1990, 294.
The texts provide accounts mainly of the exchange conducted in the sphere of the palaces. The nature of the trade outside this sphere largely escapes us.\textsuperscript{44}

The ceremonial exchange that is reflected in the Near Eastern accounts, was based on the political relationships among rulers. The language used, with the title ‘brother’ when equal partners were concerned and ‘father’ or ‘son’ for unequal relationships, reflects the diplomatic position of the sender. C. Zaccagnini has shown how this system, which originated in the third millennium BC, had acquired many commercial elements in the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{45} Economic purposes - the need to import certain goods - had become important in establishing and maintaining diplomatic relationships. This commercialisation is visible, for example, in the role of silver as a standard of equivalence.\textsuperscript{46}

Transactions outside the sphere of ceremonial exchange are only attested indirectly in the texts. It seems clear that raw materials and semi-elaborated goods found their way outside the sphere of the palace and circulated not only among élites, but also among lower strata of the population, being essentially employed as exchange goods and means of payment.\textsuperscript{47} However, private trade also seems to have been conducted by traders who were connected to the palace.\textsuperscript{48} These tamkars not only served as moneylenders using silver from their personal possessions, they are also known to have paid taxes out of income derived from private trading. Letters between administrators of different palaces show that prices for certain goods were established precisely before sending the shipment and that trade commodities were distinguished from additional gifts.\textsuperscript{49} Another reflection of commercial trade may be identified in the Amarna letters from Alashiya that have to do with the circulation of raw metals.\textsuperscript{50} In these letters a silver standard is used to calculate the value of gifts.

Commercial trade might also be reflected by the distribution of raw copper in the shape of so-called ‘oxhide’ ingots that have been found in many parts of the eastern and central Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{51} These ingots characterise a ‘trade koine’ for metals from the 16th to the 12th century BC. Although Egyptian pictorial evidence show ingots being offered as ceremonial gifts,\textsuperscript{52} the occurrence of over two hundred tons of these ingots in the Ulu Burun wreck indicates that this metal was also traded in bulk.\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, the ship’s diverse cargo shows that this was the case for other raw materials (tin, ivory, glass) and finished goods (glass beads, lamps, ceramics) as well.\textsuperscript{54} The ‘oxhide’ ingots are found on land in different types of context, both palatial and non-palatial, and there is a concentration of such finds in Cyprus, Crete and Sardinia.\textsuperscript{55} In the view of some scholars this distribution pattern can only be explained by

\textsuperscript{44} Zaccagnini 1976, 501; 1984, 159.
\textsuperscript{45} Zaccagnini 1973, 117-121.
\textsuperscript{46} Liverani 1972, 308-310.
\textsuperscript{47} Zaccagnini 1984, 159.
\textsuperscript{49} Liverani 1972, 310-311. Especially when administrators were of unequal rank, the transactions often had a purely commercial character.
\textsuperscript{50} Liverani 1972, 308-309; 1990, 215. In the Amarna corpus, the Alasia letters show a high concern for the utilitarian, economic aspects of the partnership.
\textsuperscript{51} For the most recent distribution maps of these ingots, including representations, see Gale 1991, 200-201. The majority of findspots on land are on Cyprus, Crete and Sardinia, suggesting a prominent role for these islands.
\textsuperscript{52} See Bass 1967, 62-67, figs. 62, 64, 67, 68, 74, 75, 79, 82.
\textsuperscript{53} Pulak 1988, 6; Muhly, Maddin & Stech 1988, 281.
\textsuperscript{55} Muhly, Maddin & Stech 1988, 289; for contexts, see Buchholz 1959, 28-39; 1988, especially 203-212; Bass 1967, 57-62.
assuming a commercial directional trade in metals, while others envision independent, travelling merchants.

Whatever the character of non-ceremonial exchange, it seems clear that extra-economic factors always played a constraining role. Conversions between the two basic spheres of exchange were possible and goods belonging to different spheres seem to have participated in the same circuits of exchange in a fairly loose way. It is necessary, also, to realise the extreme slowness of international exchange. The Amarna letters testify to messengers having been away from home for years. This slow rhythm was partly due to the technology of transport, but also to political considerations. In any case it will have influenced the commercial nature of any trading activity.

**Mycenaean presence in the Mediterranean**

Another issue which is closely related to the subject of this thesis concerns the degree to which Aegeans actively participated in the international economy of the Late Bronze Age. Ideas about this topic have been formulated since the days of Heinrich Schliemann, who believed that the Shaft-Graves at Mycenae could only be accounted for by a Phoenician invasion. The discovery of large amounts of Mycenaean pottery in tombs at Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra (Ugarit) led C. Schaeffer to believe that these were the graves of Mycenaean colonists. Sir Arthur Evans endorsed this view by comparing the architecture of the Ugaritic tombs with the Royal Tomb at Isopata near Knossos in Crete and by suggesting that the origin of the Syrian graves “...should be sought on Cretan soil.” Several scenarios of Aegean pre-eminence have resulted from this view. Erik Sjöqvist imagined groups of Mycenaeans colonising Cyprus and the Near East in the 14th century BC, while Sarah Immerwahr had no doubts about a “Mycenaean commercial empire.”

In 1964, H.W. Catling was among the first to challenge this view. After a review of the available evidence he concluded that Mycenaeans could not have been present in Cyprus during LHII-LHIIIB (LCI-LCII). The large amounts of LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB pottery on the island could, according to Catling, only be explained by trade between Cyprus and the Aegean, without a Mycenaean presence on the island. Arguments against Mycenaean domination of Mediterranean trade were given by G. Bass. After excavating the wreck of Cape Gelidonya on the south coast of Turkey, he believed the ship to have belonged to ‘Phoenicians’ trading with the Aegean. He suggested that trade in this region in general may have been handled by Levantines rather than Mycenaeans. A Canaanite thalassocracy was likewise proposed by

---

56 Muhly, Maddin and Stech 1988, 289.
57 Buchholz 1988, 227.
58 Liverani 1972, 305; Zaccagnini 1976, 468.
59 Zaccagnini 1987, 58.
60 Liverani 1972, 316-317; EA 3, 13-14: “But now when I sent a messenger to you, you have detained him for six years...” (The king of Karaduniyas to the pharaoh; translation by Moran 1992, 7).
62 Schaeffer 1936b, 78-99. He went so far to assume that the city of Ugarit was under Mycenaen political control.
63 Evans 1935, 776.
64 Sjöqvist 1940, 183-184.
65 Immerwahr 1960, 4; for Aegean thalassocracies, see also Knapp 1993, 333-334.
67 Bass 1967, 164. Later he declared that his use of the word ‘Phoenician’ had been incorrect and that he had meant people from the northern Levant in general, see Bass 1991, 70.
68 Bass 1967, 165. He upheld this standpoint after excavating the wreck of Ulu Burun, which he likewise presumed to have been Canaanite (Bass 1991, 74), although his excavation co-director, C. Pulak, believed the crew of the ship to be Mycenaen (Pulak 1988, 37).
J.M. Sasson and E. Linder; A. Yannai suggested a leading role for Cypriots in the trade between the Aegean, the Near East and Egypt.

Ideas about Mycenaean colonisers and traders in the Eastern Mediterranean were also influenced by the decipherment of Linear B in the 1950’s. According to Moses Finley, the absence of references to trade and traders in the Linear B archives tablets indicates that long-distance exchange was not important for the Mycenaean palatial economies. Such trade as occurred, in his view, was controlled by the palace and took the form of diplomatic gifts. J.L. Bintliff likewise regarded the Mycenaean economy as based upon the redistribution of local foodstuffs rather than upon commerce. Marine trade occurred, in his regard, only in association with fishing activities.

Since the 1980’s, there appears to be a renewed interest in long-distance trade and foreign contacts of the Bronze Age Aegean. Finds of the LHI period in Italy, for example, have been used to explain the sudden rise in material wealth attested by the Shaft Graves. In addition, it has been proposed that control of contacts with the Eastern Mediterranean by the Aegean élites was a factor in the forming of palace societies on Crete and the Greek mainland. The hypothesis put forward by Susan Sherratt that Mycenaean pottery in the Aegean was specifically produced with the Near Eastern markets in mind, would mean that craft-production in the Aegean was influenced by wider economic developments. Such an influence may be visible in the evidence presented by Nicolle Hirschfeld that Cypriots somehow were involved in Mycenaean ceramic production. Foreign imports within the Aegean have also been used as evidence for the importance of long-distance exchange. According to Eric Cline, the orientalia found in the Aegean in LHIIIB contexts show that Mycenaean merchants and vessels were present in the Near East during this time, although C. Lambrou-Philipson has suggested that they testify of the presence of Near Eastern traders and craftsmen in the Aegean. The Linear B tablets have also helped to identify Mycenaean foreign relations. Although these do not mention trading or traders, names of persons and goods that have a foreign origin are considered testimonies of foreign contacts. Exciting evidence for the presence of Mycenaeans in Egypt may be a papyrus from El Amarna which shows warriors with possible boar’s tusk helmets who might be interpreted as Mycenaean. The large-scale manufacture of Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean from LHIIIB onwards is thought to indicate that Mycenaean craftsmen were present in this area.

The ‘pendulum’ in thinking about a Mycenaean role in the trade networks of the Bronze Age Mediterranean underlines the fact that archaeological (and textual) data do not speak for themselves, but are subject to multiple interpretations. In this study, I accept the view of M. Liverani that there was a conditioned co-existence in the Mediterranean during the 15th-13th

---

69 Sasson 1966; Linder 1981.
73 Rutter 1993, 796; with bibliography on the subject.
75 Sherratt 1982, 183; Jones 1986a, 599-600; Åkerström 1987, 119.
77 Cline 1994, 92; Lambrou-Philipson 1990b, 164; her evidence for enclave-colonies in Thebes (and earlier on Thera) is however controversial, see Tournavitou 1990.
79 Schofield & Parkinson 1994. Even though the warriors might not represent Mycenaeans, the papyrus seems to indicate that Egyptian iconography from the Amarna period had conventions for depicting Mycenaean attributes, a significant fact in itself.
centuries. This means that there were no thalassocracies, but that trade was carried out by many, among whom were local producers and distributors, palace-based traders and independent merchantmen. The mechanisms at work in such a system were diverse and complex, with objects travelling through several modes of exchange run by different participants before being deposited at their place of archaeological recovery.

The presence of foreign objects in the Late Bronze Age Aegean, as well as the Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean show that Mycenaean took part in the multi-faceted trade networks that are indicated above. The degree of this involvement is difficult to ascertain, although it seems clear that there was not a process of colonisation that is comparable to the later Greek expansion. The existence of Mycenaean trading colonies of merchants living among indigenous populations is, however, possible. Colonies of this kind have been proposed for the central Mediterranean, and for Troy. Such colonies are, however, very difficult to recognise archaeologically and their existence is by no means undisputed. That the ships were employed in the Mycenaean world is without doubt and, since the Mycenaens are here considered to be part of the international economy, it is likely that these ships were involved in long distance trade. However, it is not certain that they reached all the coastal places at which Mycenaean pottery is found.

The uncertainty about the presence of Mycenaens in various areas of the Mediterranean is also due to the nature of the archaeological evidence. With a few exceptions, finds in Mediterranean areas which can be identified as Aegean with any degree of certainty, consist of ceramic vessels and figurines. The significance of these ceramic items in an international economy that was probably based on the circulation of metals is by no means clear. But this, of course, is a subject to which this thesis hopes to contribute.

---

81 Liverani 1987, 67-68. He comments on the fact that, because of the nature of diplomatic contacts, kings of equal rank could not surpass each other in their contacts with other rulers. Thus, Syrian exchange with Mycenaean Greece, for example, would have to include in some way the kingdoms of Cyprus and/or southern Turkey that are situated between these areas. Means existed to block messengers and merchants travelling through intermediate areas. This would make any thalassocracy impossible.

82 Knapp 1993, 340-341.


84 This kind of colony have been called community colony or enclave-colony, see Branigan 1981, 26; Lambrou-Philipson 1990b.


86 Kilian 1990, 458; he refers to the period “after the catastrophe of Troy VI”, which would be Troy VIIa, dated from the middle of the 13th century until a time after the arrival of LHIIIIC pottery; see Sams 1992, 56.

87 See for example Bietti Sestieri 1988, 23-51, who believes that relations between Sicily and Mycenaean Greece did not involve a Mycenaean presence.

88 On ships, see Casson 1973, 30-33; Morgan 1988, 212-223 (with bibliography). For their involvement in trade, see Knapp 1993, 339.

89 See note 19.
CHAPTER 2

Theory and methodology

Introduction
The wide distribution of Mycenaean pottery in many areas of the Mediterranean may be the result of various processes. As has become clear from the discussion in chapter 1, there is little evidence for Mycenaean colonisation on a significant scale. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that Aegean traders or travelling craftsmen deposited personal ceramic possessions in places that they visited, for example as votives in foreign temples. It is also possible that visitors to the Aegean took back pots and figurines as personal souvenirs. However, the quantities of Mycenaean pots at many places in the Mediterranean are too large to be explained in this way. I consider the bulk of Mycenaean pots in overseas areas to be the result of exchange processes.

Archaeological investigation of trade and exchange has a long tradition. In this chapter, I will give a brief overview of various theoretical approaches towards ancient trade, which allows definition of various concepts. In particular, the concept of consumption will be discussed, which is crucial to the theoretical perspective chosen for this research. In addition, I will explain the methodology by which I intend to investigate the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy.

Approaches towards ancient trade and contact
Trade is a concept used by archaeologists ever since objects turned up in excavations that were similar to archaeological artefacts elsewhere. In the nineteenth and early parts of the twentieth century, changes in material culture were generally seen as the result of the arrival of newcomers. Thus, the presence of Late Minoan III pottery in Sicily led Sir Arthur Evans to believe that there had been a Minoan colony on the island. Scholars generally viewed contact between peoples and cultures in terms of domination. Trade, therefore, was often interpreted as a means of controlling a certain area. The ideas about Minoan and Mycenaean thalassocracies are examples of this view.

Anthropologists in the second half of the nineteenth century formulated the theories of diffusionism and evolutionism. Evolutionists regarded the history of mankind as progress from undifferentiated homogeneity to complex heterogeneity. They stressed the relative independence of culture groups. Diffusionists, on the other hand, believed that peoples and cultures influence each other through the exchange of ideas, objects and individuals, which
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1 Adams 1968, 194; he calls the ‘theory of successive populations’ the oldest and most widespread theory of historical causality.
2 Evans 1906, 109; he was referring to the pottery found in a tomb at Cozzo Pantano near Syracuse.
3 Evans 1906, 108-110; Fimmen 1924, 113.
4 These interpretations were probably influenced by the reality of imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, see Sherratt & Sherratt 1991, 351.
5 Cf. Tylor 1878, 1-7, 376.
6 Spencer 1896, 600. These ideas were of course inspired by Charles Darwin’s *The origin of species*, which had been published in 1859, although Spencer outlined his ideas already in 1857.
leads to ever increasing similarities between civilisations.\(^7\) In the first half of the twentieth century, diffusionism, through the work of Gordon Childe, was to have the greatest impact on archaeology. The assumed spread of culture from the Aegean into other parts of Europe occurred, according to Childe, not through sequences of migrations, but through a more gradual process in which ‘lower’ cultures were influenced by ‘higher’ cultures. The main vehicle for this process was trade.\(^8\) In this, Childe was one of the first to recognise that economic processes could account for changes in the material record.

In the first half of the twentieth century scholars, whether they were evolutionists or diffusionists, generally assumed trade to be self-evident and not in need of further evaluation. This changed when the writings of the economic historian Karl Polanyi reached archaeology. Polanyi concerned himself not so much with change and development of societies. Rather, he studied the organisation of early state systems in which markets are not dominant, focussing in particular on the sociology of economic institutions, such as foreign trade or money.\(^9\) His main point of argument was that ancient economies were not early variants of nineteenth- and twentieth century capitalism. To describe and analyse such economies, a terminology different from that of modern economic theory was necessary.\(^10\) The terminology that Polanyi arrived at was called ‘substantivism’.

Central to substantivist analysis is the integration of economic processes that is visible in the institutional arrangements dealing with economy.\(^11\) Polanyi recognised three levels of increasing integration: reciprocity, redistribution and market-exchange.\(^12\) Each of these levels corresponded with forms of long-distance trade. Gift-exchange links trade partners in relationships of reciprocity.\(^13\) Administered trade, which is conducted through government-run channels in which there are no fluctuations of prices, is based on administrative methods and treaties between separate redistributive systems.\(^14\) In market-trade, the exchange itself relates the partners to each other.\(^15\) This last form is current in the capitalistic world, but, according to Polanyi, redistribution and administered trade were dominant among tribal and ancient societies.\(^16\) From the substantivist point of view, in non-monetary situations the organisation of foreign trade, its purposes and its importance are all direct consequences of the internal organisation of the economy.\(^17\) Moreover, long-distance trade did not play a great role in tribal and archaic economies.\(^18\)

Influenced by the ideas of Polanyi, Moses Finley was among the first to interpret the Mycenaean palaces as redistributive centres.\(^19\) In his opinion, long-distance trade was not important in the Mycenaean economy. Such exchange as there may have been, was probably

\(^7\) See, for example, Elliot Smith 1933, 6, 232.
\(^8\) Childe 1925, 302.
\(^9\) Dalton 1975, 81.
\(^10\) Polanyi 1957, 250.
\(^11\) Polanyi 1957, 251-256.
\(^12\) In Polanyi’s earlier writings there is a fourth form of economic relationships, - householding - which is later left out, as it represents the economic aspect of the basic social unit, whereas the other three categories all refer to economic relations between units. See Humphreys 1978, 65.
\(^13\) Polanyi 1957, 262.
\(^14\) Polanyi 1957, 262-263.
\(^15\) Polanyi 1957, 263.
\(^16\) Polanyi 1957, 256.
\(^17\) Dalton 1975, 84. The emphasis on internal organisation and the idea of levels of increasing integration show the basic evolutionary character of Polanyi’s scheme. However, since these levels do not necessarily succeed each other and because normative (and racial) aspects are absent, substantivism might best be labelled as neo-evolutionary.
\(^18\) Dalton 1975, 102.
controlled by the palaces and likely to have taken the form of diplomatic gifts. This view of the Mycenaean economy and trade still prevails among Aegean Bronze Age archaeologists. The sheer quantity of Mycenaean vessels distributed outside the Aegean appears to be incompatible with these ideas, however. There is no evidence that pottery was considered suitable as a diplomatic gift, as may be indicated by its absence in the diplomatic records in the Near East. The possibility of specialised ceramic production for the eastern market in Mycenaean Greece is incompatible with a purely redistributive system in Polanyi’s terms. Obviously, substantivism is not a suitable framework to investigate the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean.

The most important contribution of substantivism to the study of ancient trade is the realisation that exchange in early societies differs from that in the modern world. Polanyi makes clear that ancient trade was, to a large degree, constrained by the social organisation of the societies concerned. With respect to the subject of this thesis, Polanyi’s ideas have the implication that we must take into account the socio-political organisation of the societies that were involved in the exchange of Mycenaean pottery. It may be expected that the large differences between the societies in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy constrained the circulation of Mycenaean pottery in different ways.

The ‘New’ or processual archaeology, which enjoyed popularity especially in the 1970’s, has influenced the study of ancient trade in several ways. Processual archaeologists stressed that their discipline belonged to the social sciences and should look to anthropology in particular for its theoretical concepts and methodology. As a result, research focused on social organisation and change of past societies. For the archaeological study of trade, this has meant support for the substantivist position which also emphasised social organisation. In addition, the perceived general applicability of Polanyi’s scheme contributed to its popularity among New Archaeologists, who claimed to be looking for general laws of human behaviour.

To processual archaeologists quantification of archaeological data was of the utmost importance. Studying the distribution of traded objects statistically through spatial analysis was, among other things, a result of this approach. A methodology often used to verify trade mechanisms was regression analysis. This type of spatial analysis of archaeological objects has become known, in particular, through the work of Colin Renfrew. He set out the frequency in which foreign objects occurred on a given site against the straight-line distance from site to source. This could be done for a number of sites and graphically visualised, resulting in a specific ‘fall-off curve’ for a certain group of objects. The fundamental assumption of this approach was that these different fall-off curves reflect specific trade-mechanisms.

Several objections can be raised against this approach. The first is that the distribution of archaeologically recovered objects not necessarily reflects the actual spread of objects through trade. Many perishable objects are not included and formation processes are not taken into account. Also, distances in early societies cannot be measured as the crow flies, but depend on geographical factors - winds and currents, mountains and passes - and on the technology available to deal with these. Finally, it is not firmly established that different trade mechanisms

20 For example, Halstead 1988, 520; Snodgrass 1991.
22 Trigger 1978, 6-10.
25 McCAdams 1974, 24; Earle 1982, 7. This was realised by the practitioners themselves; see Renfrew 1972, 441; Hallam, Warren & Renfrew 1976, 103.
result in distribution patterns that vary accordingly. Indeed, it has been shown that different mechanisms can produce similar fall-off patterns.

Spatial analysis of the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean will reveal areas and places that imported this material. In addition, such analyses are useful to describe where concentrations of this pottery are present. In the previous chapter, I argued that the movement of goods in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean was highly complex and involved many groups of people and different types of exchange. Mycenaean pottery was only one part of a wider repertoire of goods that circulated in these complex distribution networks. It seems unlikely that spatial analyses of the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery will reveal the complex mechanisms at work in the distribution of this material. Other than as a tool to describe the archaeological distribution pattern, spatial analysis does not seem to be a suitable framework to investigate the exchange of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean.

A fruitful impact of processual archaeology on the study of ancient trade is the insistence that archaeological propositions should be verified scientifically. In the study of ancient trade this is taken up especially with respect to the provenance of traded objects. In the past, similarities in form and decoration of objects found in different places were often merely taken to mean trade or contact between areas. The use of technical and statistical methods to analyse obsidian, pottery, metal and various other materials has proven wrong many of these assumptions. Identifying the exact origin of presumed imports through archaeometric methods is nowadays essential to establish the presence and extent of prehistoric exchange. Mycenaean pottery is one of the fields of research in which such investigations have had a particularly marked impact.

Since the late 1970’s the interest of archaeologists in long-distance trade and contact has increased, due in particular to World Systems theory. According to this theory, which was first fully formulated by Immanuel Wallerstein, regions can be systemically linked by economical processes. In such systems there is a geographical division of labour in which elites of core areas exploit the labour and surpluses of peripheral areas. This means that tasks requiring higher levels of skills and greater capitalisation are reserved for higher ranking areas. In these areas there exist strong state machineries with elites whose interests are served by the state being an autonomous entity, often resulting in a strong bureaucracy. Peripheral areas sometimes have state organisations as well, but they are weak and often have a low degree of autonomy, as in a colonial situation. Economical tasks performed in these areas are dependant on incentives from the centre and are usually labour intensive, such as the provision of raw materials. Relations within such dependency systems are ever-changing and shifts of cores and peripheries may occur frequently.
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26 Earle 1982, 7.
27 This has become clear from the excavations of the shipwreck near Ulu Burun, where a few Mycenaean pots were part of a varied cargo including a wide range of raw materials and finished objects from various areas in the Mediterranean and beyond, see Bass 1967; 1991; Pulak 1988; 1997
28 Renfrew, 1972, 441: “spirals in Malta, decorated pottery in Iberia, figurines in the Balkans - an Aegean origin was for a long time accepted.”
29 For an overview of methods available and of possibilities and problems involved, see Cherry & Knapp, 1991.
30 Wace & Blegen 1939, 7; Earle 1982, 4.
31 For an overview, see Van Wijngaarden 1999b, 27-28.
33 Wallerstein 1974, 350-351.
Wallerstein formulated his ideas in order to explain the spread of capitalism since the sixteenth century AD; others have modified the model so that it could be applied to earlier periods as well. In pre-capitalist situations, core-areas can be described as groups of polities that have become net consumers of resources from other polities by a variety of relations of exploitation, while peripheries are polities of which the economies are directed to meet the demands for surplus product. Because bulk trade was assumed to have played a less dominant role in antiquity than in modern economies, core-periphery relations were seen as created, maintained and changed mainly through the (unequal) exchange of prestige goods. The ruling élites, both in peripheries and cores, were viewed as the most important groups involved in such dependency relationships.

Among scholars working from a World Systems perspective, there seems to be the tendency to view all relations between societies in terms of dependency and much discussion seems to concentrate on the identification of cores and peripheries. However, many prehistoric societies in which evidence of foreign contact is attested, do not fit the definitions of either category. The possibility of foreign relations on a different, for instance reciprocal, basis seems to be ruled out in advance. Secondly, the nature of this theory is highly economic. Central in World-Systems theory stands the capitalist notion of the accumulation of wealth in core areas. Apparently, this is regarded as a universal feature of societies. It is questionable whether such a concept can be applied to early economies, without taking the differences between these and modern society into account.

It is questionable whether Mycenaean pots found outside the Aegean, in many cases only a few, can be considered as prestige goods that helped to create dependency relationships. Mycenaean pots can be understood as value-added products, which acquire significance not through the preciosity of their raw material, but through manufacture and the associations with other products. It is unlikely that such a product alone constitutes the result of a peripheral economy modified to suit the demands of centres elsewhere in the Mediterranean. The role of Mycenaean Greece in the Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, then, does not seem to fit Wallerstein’s model and it is doubtful that World Systems theory provides a proper theoretical framework to study the Mycenaean pottery outside Greece. It is, however, important to realise that trade and foreign contacts are processes which contribute to the development of societies. Prestige goods have travelled often in small quantities, but their importance may have been “out of proportion to their bulk, for it was the need to acquire [such] supplies of valued materials which motivated the intensification of local production.”

In a way, World Systems theory underlines the need to investigate the role of Mycenaean pots in the society in which they were imported.

A consumption approach
Artefacts which are thought to have originated in a geographical area different from the one they are found in, constitute the main body of archaeological evidence for the study of ancient
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34 Kohl 1987, 14.
35 Rowlands 1987, 5.
36 Rowlands 1987, 6-8.
37 Arafat & Morgan 1994, 132.
38 Rowlands 1987, 5; Frank 1993, 390.
39 J.A. Barceló in Frank 1993, 406: “to speak of ‘accumulation of capital’ (...) is inappropriate when all we have is some evidence of prestige items”.
trade. In general, such objects have been found in contexts in which they have been used and discarded.\textsuperscript{43} It is logical to assume that the activities in the importing societies in which these objects have played a role have affected their deposition in the archaeological record.\textsuperscript{44} Rather than the act of exchange, archaeological artefacts represent patterns of use and discard by importing consumers. In addition, it needs to be acknowledged that the specific nature of archaeological distribution patterns is the result of complex processes in which factors relating to production, circulation and consumption interact.\textsuperscript{45} The consumption of traded artefacts constitutes a dimension which has been neglected by many earlier approaches towards ancient exchange.

Since the 1980’s, increasing attention has been given in a number of academic disciplines to the consumption of material objects and to their relationships with human behaviour.\textsuperscript{46} A central concept within such \textit{material culture} studies is that people do not only classify the world of objects according to their physical properties.\textsuperscript{47} Of course, artefacts can be defined by the fact that they are products of human labour, and the materials from which certain artefacts are made, impose constraints on the range of purposes for which they can be used. Also, the functions which objects can fulfil have proven to play a key role in people’s categorisation of the material world around them. However, in most societies there exist a wide variety of different forms which are designed to serve identical purposes. For example, the many different ceramic containers which are used in the Dangwara tribe in central India for a limited range of purposes, shows that there is only a rather loose relationship between form and function.\textsuperscript{48}

The ways in which particular objects are used and appreciated, then, are the result of other factors than function and material properties.\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, it is an object’s relationship to social groups and cultural practices which imposes meanings on it.\textsuperscript{50} The workings of such processes of meaning-giving to the material world have been aptly described by Pierre Bourdieu. In his opinion, the social world does not function according to rules and models that scholars only have to find, but is shaped by strategies of social actors.\textsuperscript{51} An example is the case of gift-exchange. According to Bourdieu, the essence of this system does not lie in the fact that there is a gift and a counter-gift, but in the lapse of time between the two, the size and value of each of the gifts, the persons who bring them, the phrases that are used, and other elements which allow room for manipulation.\textsuperscript{52} Such manipulation creates numerous ways and degrees in which parties can be offended, honoured or in subtle ways be approached otherwise.

It is the suitability of objects to serve in strategies adopted by social actors, which endows objects with specific meanings. Social strategies develop through conscious and unconscious choices which are determined not only by the circumstances, but also by the chooser’s \textit{habitus}, i.e. his social, economical and individual background.\textsuperscript{53} Social reality, and hence the material

\textsuperscript{43} An exception to this are objects in shipwrecks, which, if part of the cargo, may be considered to have been found in a context of circulation.
\textsuperscript{44} Earle 1982, 9-10
\textsuperscript{45} Van Wijngaarden 1999a, 7-10.
\textsuperscript{46} For a history and overview of ‘consumer studies’, see Miller 1995, 1-2 and other articles in the same volume.
\textsuperscript{47} Miller 1987, 112-118.
\textsuperscript{48} Miller 1985, 51-74.
\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, a case can be made for the hypothesis that an artefact’s capacity to disguise the immediacy of utility enhances the status of an object and its owner, see Veblen 1899, 97-101. A good example are ornate, fragile, porcelain tea-cups.
\textsuperscript{50} Miller 1987, 118; Wiesner 1989, 57.
\textsuperscript{51} Bourdieu 1977, 9.
\textsuperscript{52} Bourdieu 1977, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Habitus} is a central concept in Bourdieu’s work. In its widest sense it can be understood as an individual’s view of the world. More narrowly defined it consists of all the concepts and experiences that allow a person to
record, is thus shaped by cultural choices, which are determined by many variables such as honour, local tradition, material need, individual ideas and the like. Because these elements are themselves part of the social reality, it can be stated that the material record is systematically structured according to social relations which are, in turn, influenced by material culture. Material artefacts participate actively in shaping social relationships between groups of people. Objects may also be active components in the relationships between people and the spiritual world of gods and supernatural powers, as well as between the living and their ancestors. For this reason, the significance which objects acquire through their inclusion in strategies is not only social, but, in a wider sense, cultural.

When the significance of objects is related to social reality and cultural practices, it is logical to expect that it is highly variable across cultural contexts. Indeed, anthropological research has revealed the extreme varieties of uses and connotations which can be attached to similar physical objects in different cultural contexts. Imported objects, in order to be relevant in their new surroundings, need to be recontextualised by the imposition of indigenous cultural associations. Often, these cultural associations have to do with the fact that imports derive from far-away and mysterious places. They make the owner share in the world from which the artefacts derive and emphasise his or her capacity to extract the objects from that world. Objects which circulate in systems of supra-local exchange may be expected to experience various phases of such recontextualisations.

The cultural meanings which become attached to objects when they are associated with social strategies and cultural practices, are prime reasons why they are desired. According to Arjun Appadurai, demand and consumption are socially regulated. In modern society this is done through taste-making mechanisms such as fashion. In primitive societies, objects can, for example, be allowed to circulate only among certain groups of people. In such a situation, there are often restrictions in the exchange of objects as well. While such ‘enclaving’ is in the interest of the ruling elites, the diversion of artefacts to zones where exchange is less confined is frequently the recourse of the individual and of traders. Obviously, even within one cultural context, similar objects may have different significances for different groups of people.

The idea that the significance of material objects is determined by the cultural associations which are imposed on them by their inclusion in social strategies has been taken up by the so-called contextual archaeology, of which Ian Hodder is a notable exponent. In his view, the archaeological record is the meaningful result of cultural choices made by social actors. An important consequence is that, according to Hodder, archaeological objects can only be understood within their proper cultural context. They have a meaning as members of categories opposed to other categories and as material expressions of associations and

classify the social world. It is influenced by the social and historical reality and by individual characteristics. See Bourdieu 1984, 170; 1989, 150-154; Hodder 1986, 11-12; 1987, 4.

54 Bourdieu, 1977, 69.
56 Bourdieu 1977, 41-43
59 Strathern 1992, 177
60 In this respects, Kopytoff (1986) speaks of cultural biographies of things. See, also, Thomas, 1991, 28.
61 Thompson 1979, 9; Bourdieu 1984, 100-101; Van Wijngaarden 1999c, 3-5.
62 Appadurai 1986, 32.
64 Thompson 1979, 52; Appadurai 1986, 21.
65 Hodder 1982a, 207.
66 Hodder 1982a, 207.
evocations. This meaning can be called the symbolism of an object.\textsuperscript{67} Any study of prehistoric exchange should, according to Hodder, take into account the symbolism of the exchanged artefact in the receiving society.\textsuperscript{68} The symbolism of types of traded objects can be inferred, according to Hodder, from its different associations: it may or may not be present in certain types of burials, in different types of settlements or in particular buildings within settlements, and so on.\textsuperscript{69} From the various and contrasting associations of exchanged objects, some picture can be obtained of their cultural significance.

I have dwelt at some length on these considerations because of their particular relevance for this research. Contextual archaeology provides a framework of analysis for the study of consumption and demand of Mycenaean pottery found in the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean. In each of these three areas, Mycenaean pots became actively involved in social strategies and cultural practices relating to the importing societies.\textsuperscript{70} These factors have determined the deposition of the Mycenaean artefacts in the archaeological record. The meanings attached to these pots within importing societies are, at least to an extent, responsible for the archaeological distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery. To understand this distribution pattern, then, we need to investigate the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pots within importing societies. A systematic investigation of the cultural contexts in which these pots have been found, can provide important information about their meaning.\textsuperscript{71}

According to Hodder, in order to gain more insight in the exchange process, the differences in cultural significances of a type of object among regional units and at different distances from sources should be examined.\textsuperscript{72} As described in chapter 1, the socio-economic and political organisation of the contemporary societies in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy during the Late Bronze Age varied enormously. It may be expected that similar pots, produced in the same area of Greece, acquired different meanings in these societies. Variations in associations and contexts of Mycenaean pots in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy may shed light on variations in social strategies of which these objects were part.

The cultural meanings attached to a Mycenaean ceramic vessel at a given time in a place somewhere in the Levant, Cyprus or Italy surely varied from person to person.\textsuperscript{73} Any person’s individual’s biography results in psychological dispositions towards the material world. Even though such individual attitudes towards specific objects are not invisible in the archaeological record, they are hard to deal with on a general level.\textsuperscript{74} However, the same dispositions will have resulted in Mycenaean pots having been used in social strategies and cultural practices which supersede the individual. The cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery will have had local, regional and supra-regional or Mediterranean dimensions. On each of these three levels I will investigate a number of aspects to assert the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean. Of particular importance are the social groups who used specific parts of the Mycenaean repertoire, the objects and activities with which they were associated and the extent to which these pots were part of social strategies.

\textsuperscript{67} Hodder 1987, 3. Symbolism can also be understood as the purpose that an object was used for; see Whitley 1994, 52. Because producers, distributors and consumers have different purposes for the same object, its symbolism varies according to social context.
\textsuperscript{68} Hodder 1982a, 207-208.
\textsuperscript{69} See also Voutsaki 1995, 13.
\textsuperscript{70} Melas 1993; Van Wijngaarden 1999c.
\textsuperscript{71} Hodder 1982a, 207-208. Cf., also, Whitley 1994, 54.
\textsuperscript{72} Hodder 1982a, 208.
\textsuperscript{73} Bourdieu 1984, 170; 1989, 150-154; Thomas 1991, 33.
\textsuperscript{74} Melas 1989, 138-142.
Methodology

The total area in which Mycenaean pottery is distributed comprises at least fourteen modern nation states. The archaeology and history of each of these countries is completely different. Political events have greatly influenced the accessibility of regions and sites to conduct archaeological research. The conservation of excavated material in storerooms, as well as its accessibility also varies highly, as is sadly illustrated by the Turkish occupation of northern Cyprus. The history of archaeological research is also completely different in each of these areas. The large number of sites with Mycenaean pottery in Israel, for example, is partly due to the long history of research by scholars interested in the archaeology of the Bible. Finally, the organisation and interests of archaeological heritage and of the academic world is different in each of these countries. For all these reasons, it could be argued that it is impossible to include such a wide area in one doctoral thesis. However, we should also notice that the areas in which Mycenaean pottery has been discovered have experienced many of the same long-term processes concerning landscape and human settlement and interaction. In fact, the distribution map of Mycenaean pottery outside Greece (Map 1) coincides very well with definitions of the Mediterranean on geological, climatic and historical grounds. This Mediterraneanism justifies an investigation into a cultural aspect of such a large geographical area.

Because the cultural significance of Mycenaean pots is determined by the cultural contexts in which they were used, the material culture of various areas should be investigated in some detail. For reasons of time, it is impossible to acquire such detailed knowledge of the material culture in all areas which have yielded such pottery. I have chosen to focus here on the three areas which have produced the majority of sites with such pottery: the Levant, Cyprus and the Italian area. From Greece, each of these geographical areas can only be reached by ship. Moreover, the material culture in each of these three areas is completely different from that in Greece and it is very clear that Mycenaean pots constituted a foreign element due to maritime exchange rather than to processes of acculturation. Also, the long archaeological traditions in each of these three selected regions allow detailed contextual analyses, as well as general overviews of the material culture. Finally, the great differences in the level of socio-political complexity between the contemporary cultures in these three areas will emphasise the different cultural associations attached to the Mycenaean ceramic objects.

57 Spain, Italy, Malta, Albania, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, the Palestine autonomy, Jordan, Egypt, Sudan. The report of a Mycenaean sherd in Iraq cannot be considered as secure, see chapter 1, note 26. A Mycenaean stirrup jar has been reported from Carthage in Tunisia, see Annabi 1996, 54-55. The vessel was brought to an antique dealer. Reportedly, it came from a garden in Le Kram, but this origin could not be confirmed.

76 See, for example, Knapp & Antoniadou 1998. Other articles in the same volume provide an interesting insight in the interplay between politics, national identity and archaeology in various areas in the eastern Mediterranean.

77 Braudel 1972; King 1997.

78 Compare, for example map 1 of this thesis with the six maps provided by King (1997, 4-7) which show various definitions of the Mediterranean. Only the sites along the Nile river do not fall within the Mediterranean.

79 Of course, the Italian area can be reached from Greece via the Balkan coast. Since the bulk of the Mycenaean vessels has been found in southern Italy, however, it is more likely that a maritime route was followed.

80 For this reason, the south-western Aegean coast of Anatolia would not be suitable for my purposes. The chamber tombs present in Muskebi and the Mycenaean settlement at Miletus, indicate that this area was, at least to a degree, incorporated in the Mycenaean sphere of cultural influence, see Boysal 1969, Mee 1978, 137-142; Gates 1995, 293-297; Niemeyer 1998, 27-41. Even though it would be interesting to investigate the role of Mycenaean pottery in such an area, that would be outside the scope of this thesis.

81 Cf. Hodder 1982a, 208.
In the previous section, it has been argued that the cultural significance of imported objects is the result of social strategies and cultural practices, which have local, regional and supra-regional dimensions. In order to assess the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery, each of these three different geographical scales needs to be investigated. In the three areas which have been singled out in this thesis, more than 250 sites have produced Mycenaean pottery. It is obvious that not all of these sites can be analysed in detail here. In order to deal with the large number of sites, as well as with the three different geographical scales, the analysis in this thesis will follow several steps, in which subsequently the local, regional and Mediterranean levels will be assessed. Before proceeding to these levels, the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean is presented in more detail by a spatial analysis of the distribution pattern (chapter 3).

The spatial analysis of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery will serve as the basis to select a number of sites in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy which are suitable for contextual analysis on the local level. For this selection, the three general areas will be subdivided in several heterogeneous regions. Among the criteria which define these regions, the distribution of Mycenaean pottery, of course, is the most important. Geographical factors such as mountain ranges, valleys, rivers and the like are taken into account. In addition, the concept of cultural area will be used to define various archaeological regions. This term indicates a region in which various aspects of material culture coincide and where the level of interaction among sites seems to be higher than with places outside the unit. Within these archaeological regions, sites will be identified that are suitable for contextual analysis.

The most important criterion used in the site selection is the amount and quality of the published information available about sites with Mycenaean pottery. This quality has been assessed in the catalogue of sites (catalogue I) by a context rating. Two additional distinctions need to be made concerning the notion of context. First of all there is the direct archaeological context: the stratum in which the find has been made and the objects with which it is associated. The more general use of the word ‘context’ signifies the type of situation in which an object is found: domestic, religious, funerary, etc. Both the general and the direct archaeological context can shed light on the consumption of Mycenaean pottery. Preferably, sites possess both settlement and funerary contexts in order to be selected. A second distinction must be made between ‘use context’ and ‘deposition context’. Discovery of Mycenaean pots in the context in which they were used provides a direct insight into their
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82 Regions can be established on various principles. For an overview of ways to characterise regions, including a bibliography, see Feuer 1983, 5-6. Important here is the distinction between homogeneous regions (distinguished by one criterion) and heterogeneous regions (distinguished by several criteria). Homogeneous regions are in general easier to define, as they are one-dimensional: they depend on the degree to which a certain variable is present. Heterogeneous regions, however, are multi-dimensional and the geographical extent of the criteria may not coincide.

83 Hankey (1993a, 101) comments on the importance of these factors which delineate routes of communication via which the Mycenaean pottery must have travelled.

84 Ehrich 1956, 2-5; Frankel 1974, 203; Hodder 1978, 93,110; Feuer 1983, 8.

85 See the foreword to catalogue I for more information about the grounds on which the quality of contextual information is rated.

86 As explained in the foreword to catalogue I, all non-funerary architecture has been considered as settlement evidence.

87 Barrett & Needham 1988, 129, 138. Hodder 1987. These type of contexts can both be considered as primary (either intentional or accidental) in the classification of E. French, see MacGillivray 1997, 194. In addition, we should recognise the other types of contexts distinguished by her: cumulative, re-deposited and severed, which I simply considered as secondary contexts.
consumption. However, the way in which objects are discarded can also shed light on their appreciation.

In addition to geographical divisions and the quality of contextual information, the role of sites within regional networks of distribution is importance for a site to be selected. Preferably, the selected sites vary in the extent to which they constitute primary trading centres, regional centres or smaller sites. The procedure of selecting three sites for each area makes it possible to present in some detail the regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery and the material cultures of the Levant, Cyprus and Italy. Consequently, the chapters in which these selections are conducted can also be considered as introductions to these areas (chapters 4, 9, and 14). These introductions begin with a brief overview of the history of research concerning the Mycenaean pottery in the three areas.

The analysis on the local level aims to assess the significance of the Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of the selected site. The basis of the local analyses will be constituted by catalogues in which the published Mycenaean pots are listed (catalogues II-X). Archaeological assemblages are the product of selection processes which are the result of various depositional and post-depositional factors. According to Pantzer, the unit which archaeologically represents human interaction is the archaeological feature (Befund), which consist of finds and the non-material relationships between them. These relationships are the result of the cultural activities leading to the formation of archaeological features. We may assume that specific types of activities will often leave traces in the archaeological record that are characteristic of those activities. However, there is no straight equation between type of deposit and the activities that led to its formation. Consequently, we need first to isolate archaeological features and, secondly, to review the relationships between the finds within an interpretative framework.

An archaeological feature can be defined as a group of finds, which are systemically related. As such, features can be recognised on different levels, depending on the kind of research: in regional analysis, a site will be considered as an entity, in settlement analysis this will be the case for one building, while in research that focuses on the use of space, a room or part of it will constitute a unit. Each of these different levels provides information on different kinds of relationships between the finds. The first level of analysis of the selected sites in this thesis, concerns the on-site distribution of the Mycenaean pottery. It may be expected that this distribution provides information on the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was used by groups of people living in different parts of the site.

It is not only the spatial distribution of the Mycenaean pots that is of concern here. I will also investigate the types of context in which the Mycenaean pottery has been found. Four broad categories of contexts will be distinguished on this first level: Funerary (F), meaning that the find is made in a tomb or in the dromos leading to it; Domestic (D), in which case the artefact was found in a house on the floor, or in a layer that can be associated with upper floors; Ritual (R), which means that the object was found in a temple, sanctuary or in other clear 'cultic' circumstances; and Settlement (S), which signifies that the object was found in the settlement, but cannot be attributed to a specific building: finds in streets, squares, etc., but

---

89 Pantzer 1995, 47, 160.
90 Cf. Needham & Sorensen 1988, 117, who make the same statement for single finds.
92 Of course, non-material 'finds', such as soil characteristics, are included in this definition. Likewise, architecture, which is not deposited in a literal sense, is included.
also in pits which do not clearly belong to a house. At the level of the spatial and contextual distribution, the various excavated parts of the site constitute the unit of analysis.

The second level of analysis is the investigation of closed contexts, of which there exist two broad categories: funerary and settlement. The interpretation of finds in settlement contexts is less clear-cut than tomb analysis. The reason for this lies partly in the difficulty to assess whether finds are in situ or not. Moreover, the circumstances of deposition are not readily known in settlement contexts and need to be reconstructed. The distribution of Mycenaean pots within individual buildings and the finds associated with them may provide information about the place of these artefacts in the building’s material culture. The function of the building is likewise of importance. The unit of analysis on this second level are single structures. Mycenaean finds in refuse contexts will also be reviewed.

The funerary analyses will be conducted on the assumption that the social life of deceased persons is reflected and reinterpreted in mortuary practices. Tomb inventories are the result of funerary ceremonies connected with the deposition of the dead. By studying the number and distribution of tombs with Mycenaean pottery, the extent to which this class of material was considered appropriate as a funerary gift can be established. Whether the inclusion of Aegean wares was restricted to certain social groups in the respective societies of the selected sites, or a widespread phenomenon will also be investigated. Finally, the question will be addressed whether all types of Mycenaean pottery were suitable for funerary use, or if such a use was restricted to a limited range of pot shapes and classes of decoration. At this level, single tombs constitute the unit of analysis.

The local analyses will conclude with an assessment of the place of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of the selected site. The on-site spatial and contextual distribution patterns and the investigations of the closed settlement and funerary contexts will be related to other evidence, such as the presence of imports from other areas and the extent to which Mycenaean pottery may have been imitated by local potters. Also, it will be investigated to which extent Mycenaean pottery occurs in the immediate vicinity of the selected site. All these elements should suffice to indicate, for the local level, the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pots. Of particular importance are the social groups who used specific parts of the Mycenaean ceramic repertoire, the objects and activities with which Mycenaean vessels were associated and the extent to which they were part of social strategies.

It is important to realise that the sites selected for detailed contextual analysis do not constitute type-sites in the regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery. The conclusions of the local analyses cannot simply be applied to other sites in the region. Instead, I will compare the results of the local analyses for all three sites within one geographical area. This will reveal similarities and differences in the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery among the selected sites. Using evidence from all other sites with Mycenaean pottery in the area, I will investigate the extent to which these similarities and differences represent more general patterns in the role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of the region as a whole. The unit of analysis, on this level, is the site.

The first aspect to be investigated on the regional level is the repertoire of Mycenaean pots. By comparing the catalogues of Mycenaean pottery which have been compiled for each of the selected sites with other sites, spatial and chronological variations in the repertoire of

---

94 Refuse contexts, such as pits in which pottery is discarded, will not be separately distinguished at this level. They will be attributed to a domestic context if the pit could be assigned to a house and to a settlement context if this was not the case.
95 See, for example, MacGillivray 1997, 194.
96 Binford 1971; Hodder 1982b, 141-146.
Mycenaean pots can be identified. Such variations may pertain to ceramic styles, to vessel types or the extent to which Aegean wares other than fine decorated pottery are present. The spatial patterns which will be the result of these comparisons may shed light on the existence of regional strategies in the distribution of Mycenaean pottery. The next step will be to investigate to what extent the social groups that have been identified on the local level as using Mycenaean pottery can be considered as representative for the region as a whole. For example, I will investigate to what extent Mycenaean finds have been discovered in average dwellings, in industrial contexts, in contexts testifying of a certain level of wealth and in contexts relating to ruling élite groups. Also, I will try to find out whether Mycenaean pots were employed in religious ceremonies or not.

Once the social groups that used Mycenaean pottery within the societies of the Levant, Cyprus or the central Mediterranean have been identified, we may assess the cultural associations that these people attached to the Mycenaean pots. On a regional level, this will be done by investigating whether specific parts of the Mycenaean repertoire can be associated with particular groups of people or with certain activities. In addition, I will review the extent to which Mycenaean vessels occur in tombs. Spatial variations within the funerary use of Mycenaean pots, as well as variations in the Mycenaean pot shapes which occur in tombs, may be indicative of differences in the cultural associations attached to these pots. Also, such variations may be the result of specific sumptuary strategies within the funerary ritual. Together, all these elements will suffice to give a description of the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery in the three regions. Chapters 8, 13 and 18 constitute the conclusions for the regional level.

The final step in this thesis will be to compare the conclusions reached for the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean to each other. This comparison will include all the elements which have been identified previously on the regional level. The identification of variations among the three areas in the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery will constitute the main result of this research. As such, chapter 19 represent the conclusions of this thesis. As an addendum, some of the consequences of these conclusions for our ideas about the role of Mycenaean pottery within Late Bronze Age Mediterranean exchange will briefly be discussed in chapter 20.

A note on chronology
This thesis concerns a body of ceramic material, which stylistically ranges from LHI to LHIIIB2. The absolute chronology of these stylistic phases is by no means undisputed. Various scholars have suggested that the beginning of the Late Bronze Age should be dated around 1700 BC, based primarily on the redating of the Thera eruption by scientific methods. Suggestions to lower the date for the end of the Late Bronze Age to ca. 950 BC have also been made, but the highly selective use of the available data makes such a low date extremely doubtful. Dendrochronology has now firmly established the LHIIIA2/LHIIIB transition has at ca. 1320/1300 BC. It is likely that in the near future reliable absolute dates for the Late Bronze Age will be established by this and other scientific methods. Until then, the so-called traditional absolute chronology, with a beginning for the Aegean Late Bronze Age around 1600 BC, will be followed here.

---

97 See, for example, Voutsaki 1997, 41-47.
100 See, for example, Ward (1994) for a thorough critique of these proposals.
102 See Warren & Hankey 1989, 162. For recent confirmation of such a low chronology, see Warren 1996.
The chronological frameworks in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy depend to a considerable extent on the stylistical classifications of the Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{103} Because of the interdependance of the various chronological frameworks, the absolute chronologies for each of these areas are as hotly debated as Aegean chronology - often involving the same arguments. For this reason, I will generally refrain from using absolute dates. In each of the introductions to the selected sites that will be subject to detailed analysis on a local level, I will investigate the local stratigraphy. Aegean pottery styles can then be correlated to the strata in which they have been found. For the regional analyses, when necessary, I will adopt the chronological frameworks which seem to me to possess the highest level of consensus among specialists.\textsuperscript{104} A provisional chronological chart is given in Table I, which is presented in the tables section of this book.


\textsuperscript{104} For the Levant, see the overviews in Leonard 1989, 6-7; Foucault-Forest 1996, 11-17. For Cyprus, see Karageorghis 1982a, 9; Kling 1989, 2-4; Knapp 1994, 275. For Italy, see Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 170.
CHAPTER 3

The distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean

Introduction
The main purpose of this chapter is to present the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean as a whole. In the first section, some general characteristics of the pots themselves will be discussed. In addition, I will present a classification of Mycenaean vessels according to function; this will be an important aspect of the contextual analysis on the local and regional levels.

In the second part of this chapter, the spatial distribution pattern of Mycenaean pots in the Mediterranean will be analysed statistically. The basis of this analysis is a catalogue of sites in the Mediterranean where Mycenaean pottery has been found (catalogue I). This catalogue has been compiled in order to indicate the relative position of sites within the general framework of the spatial distribution of Mycenaean pottery. Considering the large differences between sites and areas in the intensity of archaeological research and publication, this catalogue should be understood as much a result of archaeological research (including my own) as an indicator of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery.¹

The character of Mycenaean pottery found outside Greece
Mycenaean pottery, as a class of archaeological artefacts, is very well studied indeed. Soon after Schliemann’s discovery of Mycenae, it was realised that pottery similar to that found in his excavations had also been found elsewhere, in Greece and abroad. Already in 1886 Furtwängler and Löschke compiled a corpus of Mycenaean pottery and discussed vessels from Cyprus, Egypt, Asia Minor and Italy.² The discovery by Sir Arthur Evans of the Minoan civilisation and his construction of a three-tiered chronological framework enabled Carl Blegen, in co-operation with Alan Wace, to work out a parallel chronology for the Mycenaean pottery at Korakou.³ The standard classification of Mycenaean pottery was published by Arne Furumark, who classified all vessels known to him according to shape and decorative motives and devised a numerical system for reference.⁴ His typology enabled further refinement of the existing chronological framework.⁵ His work was elaborated upon, among others, by Elisabeth French, who used evidence from closed deposits at Mycenae to define Furumark’s stylistic phases in even more detail.⁶ In recent years the work of Penelope Mountjoy has added to the

¹ See the foreword to catalogue I for the way in which it has been assembled.
² Furtwängler & Löschke 1886, 24-31 for Cyprus, pp. 31-32 for Egypt, pp. 33-34 for Asia Minor and pp. 44-48 for the Italian region.
³ Blegen 1921, 36-37.
⁴ Furumark 1941a.
⁵ Furumark 1941b.
typology of shapes and styles through the inclusion of material from post-war excavations mainly in the Argolid.\(^7\)

Early on in these, and other, studies it was realised that the corpus of Mycenaean pottery found outside the Aegean differs in several respects from that found on the Greek mainland.\(^8\) One of the most readily apparent differences is that wheel-made, decorated fine wares constitute a far larger proportion of the material than in the Aegean.\(^9\) In fact, with a few notable exceptions, undecorated coarse ware and plain fine wares imported from Mycenaean Greece are almost non-existent in most areas.\(^10\) Other differences are visible in the range of pot shapes found in the eastern and central Mediterranean. The occurrence in Cyprus, and to a lesser extent in the Levant, of vessel types which are rare in Greece led to the term Levanto-Helladic ware, to indicate a group of pot shapes believed to have been produced in Cyprus.\(^11\) Shallow bowls (FS 295-296), chalices (FS 278), angular jugs (FS 53-55) and zoomorphic rhyta were all believed to belong to this class.\(^12\) The Mycenaean pottery with pictorial decoration, likewise found more often in the eastern Mediterranean than in Greece, was believed to belong to this class of Levanto-Helladic ware as well.\(^13\)

The claims for large-scale production of Mycenaean pottery outside the Aegean before an advanced stage of the LHIIIIB style could not be upheld, due to extensive research into the provenances of such pottery by scientific investigation of the clays.\(^14\) Analyses carried out on material from Enkomi (site no. 50), Kouklia-Palaeopaphos (site no. 105), Kition (site no. 57), Tell Atchana (site no. 125), Ras Shamra (site no. 128), Tell Dan (site no. 158), Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) and Tell el-Amarna (site no. 256) established that most of the LHIIIA-LHIIIIB material found in the eastern Mediterranean had been produced in Greece.\(^15\) The area of production, in most cases, seemed to have been the north-eastern Peloponnesia; some pieces derived from Crete and Boeotia, while others came from areas in Greece that have not yet been identified. In the Italian region, analyses of LHI-II vessels from Vivara (site no. 324) and Capo Piccolo (site no. 306) pointed to an origin in the southern Peloponnesian or Kythera.\(^16\) Investigation of LHIII A2-LHIII B imports from Scoglio del Tomno (site no. 300), Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303) and Termititio (site no. 302) revealed Peloponnesian, Rhodian and Cretan origins for the clays.\(^17\)

---


\(^8\) See, for example, Furtwängler & Löschke 1886, IX, who comment that the Cypriots had a preference for chariot kraters and geometrically decorated flasks.

\(^9\) Compare, for example, the figures provided by French et al. 1984, 12, with those by Åström 1973, 123.

\(^10\) Substantial quantities of coarse and plain wares have been found at Miletus (Niemeyer 1997, 347; Mee 1978, 234) and the Aeolian and Flegrean islands (Re 1993, 331-334; Re 1994) only. A few fragments of imported coarse ware have been found in Porto Perone and Molinella in Southern Italy (Vagnetti 1996, 141), while seven plain fine ware sherds - possibly deriving from decorated pots - occurred at Tell Abu Hawam (Balensi 1980, 464).

\(^11\) The term was first used in the first volume of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, 1934; see Sjöqvist 1940, 3 where he explains his use of the word. The term was adopted by Furumark (1941a, 9-10) as “Levanto-Mycenaean”.

\(^12\) Karageorghis 1965a, 204-228.

\(^13\) Vermeule & Karageorghis 1982, 8.

\(^14\) For an overview of the techniques involved, see Jones 1986a, 15-85.

\(^15\) For Enkomi, see Asaro & Perlman 1973, 220-221; for Kouklia-Palaeopaphos, see Asaro & Perlman 1973, 222; for Kition, see Asaro & Perlman 1973, 222; for the origins of Mycenaean pots from various other sites in Cyprus, see Bryan 1997. For Alalakh/Tell Atchana (site no. 125), see Jones 1986a, 561, for Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida, see Jones 1986a, 563; for Tell Dan (site no 158), see Gunneweg et al. 1992; for Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), see Asaro & Perlman 1973, 222-223; French 1991, 123; 1993; for an overview of the origin of Mycenaean vessels in the Levant, see Killebrew 1998. For Tell el-Amarna (site no. 256) in Egypt, see Mommsen et. al. 1992, 298-299.

\(^16\) Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131.

\(^17\) Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131-133.
Finds on the Greek mainland of pots typical of the Levanto-Helladic repertoire, likewise, have cast strong doubts on a Cypriot origin for this group of ceramic types. Shallow bowls (FS 295-296) have been found in Greece, for example in the Argolid and, possibly, in Boeotia. A number of chalices (FS 278) were discovered in the Peloponnese and in Boeotia. Moreover, the shape of the chalice appeared to have a Cretan, rather than an oriental, origin. As far as the pictorial pottery is concerned, Åkerström showed stylistic similarities between the pictorial representations found in Greece and those from the eastern Mediterranean; in some cases the hands of the same artists could be identified. This indicated a production of such pottery in one cultural area. Because the pictorial representations are part of the Minoan and Mycenaean artistic tradition, and the non-pictorial ornaments on these vessels are in accordance with the corpus of Mycenaean ceramic motifs, this area could only be Greece.

Even though it is unlikely that there existed a school of Mycenaean potters based somewhere in the eastern Mediterranean which specialised in a particular range of vessel types, pottery in Late Helladic style was produced regionally or locally in all importing areas. For Egypt, such local production of Aegean-style ceramics seems to have been limited to only a small number of vessels. Additionally, Mycenaean stirrup jars were imitated in stone and faience. In the Levant, imitations of LHIIIA and LHIIIB vessels occur. At the end of the LBII phase, a limited range of Mycenaean closed vessels, in particular stirrup jars and flasks, were produced in the Levant. On the island of Cyprus, the local ceramic industry incorporated a wide range of Mycenaean elements during an advanced stage of LCII, mainly relating to open vessel types such as bowls and kraters. One aspect of this development was a Cypriot version of the Mycenaean pictorial style, the so-called 'Rude-' or 'Pastoral Style'. In Miletus, there is evidence for the manufacture of Mycenaean ceramics from LFIIIIA onwards, which is to be considered in relation to the likely presence of a Mycenaean population in the town. The regional production of pottery in Mycenaean style seems to have been most extensive in the Italian area. Such production probably already began in a period contemporary to LHIIIA2 and increased with LHIIIB, during which imports seem to constitute a minority at many sites.

The debate concerning the Levanto-Helladic ware found its origin in differences in the frequency of Mycenaean vessel types between Greece and the eastern Mediterranean. Such differences can also be attested among the various importing areas. For example, the mug (FS

---

18 This issue is extensively discussed by Sherratt 1980, 195-199; see, also, Jones 1986a, 599-601.
19 Demakopoulou & Crouwel 1984, 43-45.
22 Åkerström 1987, 104-114.
23 Crouwel & Morris 1985, 98.
24 Aegean-style pottery of obviously non-Aegean provenance is often referred to as “local imitation”. However, such vessels need not necessarily be produced at the place of recovery, but may be transported and traded. A stirrup jar from Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186) which is of non-Greek manufacture, but certainly not produced in the area of the site, is a point in case; see Leonard et al. 1993, 106 note 7, 121.
25 Bell (1982, 150) identified only two imitations of the stirrup jar, probably based on LHIIIB prototypes.
26 Hankey 1995a, 117, 123.
225-226) and the rhyton, in conical or zoomorphic form, occur in larger quantities in the Levant than in Cyprus; the same is true for Mycenaean figurines. In general, Cyprus has proportionally more fine table wares than the Syro-Palestinian littoral. V. Hankey has remarked that, even though the ceramic types of LHIII ware in Egypt follow the pattern in Cyprus and the Levant, the range of shapes is sharply reduced. She also stated that the vertical flask (FS 187-189) is probably the most frequent vessel type, which distinguishes Egypt from other importing regions. For the central Mediterranean, Smith argues that pottery types vary per region, with Sicily possessing mainly small containers, while large and small storage vessels are predominant in peninsular Italy; on the Aeolian and Flegrean islands, there is a comparatively high proportion of drinking vessels. In Anatolia, open vessel shapes are relatively abundant already at an early phase, which is in contrast with other regions in the Mediterranean. Also, handleless and piriform jars seem to constitute a relatively high proportion among the LHIII A2-LHIIIB vessels in Anatolia.

For the eastern Mediterranean, at least, there is evidence that individual importing towns were able to exert preferences for certain Mycenaean pot shapes. Even though the most frequently occurring vessel types have been found at the majority of the important sites, there are quantitative differences among them. For example, in Tell Abu Hawam, open vessels are more common than closed pots, which is in contrast with most sites in the Levant. Ras Shamra-Ugarit has produced a relatively high number of conical rhyta (FS 199), while Tell el-Amarna possessed a large proportion of vertical flasks (FS 189).

In spite of these differences among areas and sites, the variation within the repertoire of Mycenaean vessels in the eastern Mediterranean is minor in comparison with the differences with mainland Greece. Åström makes an interesting comparison between the repertoire of vessel types in Cyprus and Achaia (NW Peloponnes). While the stirrup jar is the most common vessel type everywhere, the piriform jar enjoyed a far larger popularity in Cyprus than in Achaia, as did amphoroid and ring-based kraters. In contrast, the kylix occurs more often in Greece. The most notable difference, of course is the predominance of decorated fine wares in

---

33 See Gilmour 1992, 115, for the mug and the zoomorphic rhyton. The conclusions about conical rhyta are based on a quantitative comparison between the catalogues provided by Åström (1972b, 354) and Leonard (1994, 90-93): Åström lists 11 conical rhyta (0.6 % of the total corpus) for Cyprus, while Leonard identifies 60 such vessels (2.7 %) for the Levant. Of course, additional Mycenaean rhyta may have been found in Cyprus since the publication of Åström’s list. I know only of a conical rhyton at Kition, while two more occurred in Hala Sultan Tekke, see Karageorghis 1985a, 89 no. 3442; Niklasson-Sönnerby 1989, 78 fig. 143, 79 fig. 147.
34 Hankey 1993b, 112.
35 Smith 1987, 128. It needs to be remarked that the material from Sicily investigated by Smith has to a far larger extent been found in tombs than on the Italian mainland. This difference in archaeological context may bear some responsibility for the attested variation in Mycenaean pottery types as well. Likewise, the chronology of the Mycenaean imports is not the same for the various regions, with the Aeolian and Flegrean islands possessing more imports from an early era (LHII-LHIII).
36 Özgünel 1997, 27. Open vessels in LHIIIA1 style are more abundant than closed shapes.
37 Özgünel (1997) list 35 of such vessels, which is almost 10 % of the total. It needs to be remarked, however, that his list is not a full corpus. In comparison, such jars constitute 3.7 % of the total in Cyprus (Åström 1972) and 2.7 % in the Levant (Leonard 1994).
39 Balensi 1980, 485. Open shapes are more abundant than closed vessels at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida as well; see chapter 3.
40 Karageorghis 1998, 1.
41 Hankey 1973, 130.
42 This was established also by Hankey (1967, 246) when she stated: “...the difference between (...) Cyprus and the Middle East is one of quantity, not of quality or type.” See, also, Gilmour 1992, 115.
43 Åström 1973, 126.
overseas areas, while in the Aegean coarse and plain ware vessels are more abundant. All these differences have led to suggestions of specialised ceramic production for overseas markets within Mycenaean Greece.

There is also some evidence that certain individual sites in the Mediterranean obtained their Mycenaean pottery from specific areas in the Aegean. For example, most of the LHII pottery from Ayia Irini (site no. 87) in western Cyprus seems to derive from the island of Aegina, while the contemporary pottery from nearby Toumba tou Skourou (site no. 116) is predominantly Minoan in character. After a stylistic and typological analysis of the Mycenaean pottery at Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), Jacqueline Balensi concluded that this material derived almost exclusively from the Argolid, which was confirmed by neutron activation analysis of a number of sherds. Likewise, analyses of sherds from Tell el-Amarna (site no. 256) indicated that the Mycenaean pottery found there had been produced in the Berbati area. On the basis of such evidence, hypotheses of direct trade contacts between these sites and the respective regions in the Aegean have been formulated. However, at most sites, the Mycenaean pottery appears to derive from multiple sources in the Aegean. In Enkomi, for example, about a quarter of the LHIII A samples analysed by Asaro and Perlman were thought to have been produced in the Argolid, while the remainder had originated elsewhere in Greece. Pottery from Minet el-Beida (site no. 129) and Ras Shamra (site no. 128) appeared to derive not only from mainland Greece, but also from Crete, the Dodecanese and Cyprus. The analysis of eleven sherds from Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300) in Italy revealed Rhodian, as well as Cretan and Peloponnesian-type compositions. It remains therefore questionable whether exclusive connections between overseas places and particular regions in Mycenaean Greece were common practice.

In this thesis the contextual analysis of Mycenaean pottery will not be conducted on the basis of Furumark’s classification of shapes and motifs, which was devised in order to clarify the chronology and history of the Mycenaean culture. In a study dealing with the use and appreciation of the vessels themselves, a classification according to the purposes for which vessels may be employed seems more appropriate. Of course, the uses to which an object is put is to a large extent determined culturally and does not necessarily reflect the original intention of the manufacturers. However, physical characteristics limit the range of cultural interpretations available for a product. Ian Hodder has distinguished three kinds of knowledge about objects: general knowledge about categories and associations, which places an item in a cultural framework, ideational know-how about its material properties, which is

44 See French et al. (1984, 12) for the proportions of coarse, plain and fine decorated wares in the Argolid during the Late Bronze Age.
45 Sherratt 1982, 183; Jones 1986a, 599-600.
47 Balensi 1980, 472
49 Momm 1992, 298-299: twenty-one of the twenty-three analysed sherds fell into the Berbati group and could be distinguished from samples from the Tiryns-Asine region.
50 Balensi 1980, 568; Cline 1994, 86-87.
51 Asaro & Perlman 1973, 221. Professor Perlman suggested Messenia as a possible origin (see the discussions in the same volume on p. 331), but this hypothesis has — to my knowledge — never been investigated.
52 Immerwahr 1945, 555: note 77; Anson 1980, 117, 121, fig. 2; Courtois 1973, 149-164. The vessels produced in Cyprus are of the so-called 'Rude' or 'Pastoral' style, see Leonard 1994, 9 (9 specimens). Nicolle Hirschfeld also commented on the wide range of fabrics from this site (pers. comm.). See also chapter 5.
54 Furumark 1941a, XVII.
56 See Hodder 1992, 201-207.
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Fig. 3.1 Various Mycenaean vessel types which occur frequently outside Greece (cf. Table II).
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imperative for the uses to which it is put, and motor know-how, important for daily practices such as carrying and prevention of breaking. All the archaeological regions included in my study had a long-standing indigenous pottery industry. Knowledge about ceramics of Hodder’s second and third kind, therefore, can be assumed to have been present in all cases. It is suitable, therefore, to classify the Mycenaean pots according to functional properties. The cultural significance of these functional properties depends on symbolical, social and ideological associations which are part of Hodder’s first type of knowledge.\textsuperscript{57}

The functions of a ceramic vessel can, to some extent, be inferred from its morphological characteristics.\textsuperscript{58} Prudence Rice distinguished three broad functional categories to classify ceramic vessels: storage, processing and transfer.\textsuperscript{59} Vessels in the first category are meant to hold substances for longer or shorter periods. Pots in the second category are usually referred to as cooking pots. Ceramic types in the third class serve to transport materials, either over long distances, such as transport amphorae, or over short distances, such as between kitchen and dining table, or between table and mouth. This general scheme has been worked out by Iphigenia Tournavitou for Mycenaean pottery found in four LHIIIB\textsuperscript{1} houses in the lower town of Mycenae.\textsuperscript{60} She distinguished six functional categories: storage vessels, pouring vessels, drinking vessels, eating vessels, cooking vessels and accessory vessels. Tournavitou emphasised that the distinction between the different categories is not always clear and that some vessels may have served multiple purposes. A different approach towards functional groups of ceramic vessels was adopted by Mountjoy, who classified Mycenaean pottery according to their occurrence in certain contexts: domestic, ritual, funerary or trade.\textsuperscript{61} Again, certain vessel type may fall into more than one class.

In this thesis, it is the contexts of Mycenaean pots which are the subjects of research. It seems best, therefore, to categorise the Mycenaean pottery according to its morphological properties, as has been done in Table II in the tables section of this book (fig. 3.1).\textsuperscript{62} The first broad category that I distinguish (see Table II and fig. 3.1) is identical with Tournavitou’s first group: storage vessels.\textsuperscript{63} These pots are designed to hold liquid or dry substances for longer or shorter periods. They are generally characterised by a narrow neck and by handles to enable carrying.\textsuperscript{64} My second category concerns dinner vessels and includes Tournavitou’s functional groups for pouring, drinking and eating. Open vessels, such as cups and bowls, fall into this class, as well as jugs, suitable for pouring and large open vessels in which substances could be mixed and served.\textsuperscript{65} A third category consists of domestic vessels, which are generally of coarse clay, with large inclusions and suitable for a range of activities in the house, in particular

\textsuperscript{57} Of course these types of knowledge are interdependent. For example, even if it is realised that a pot is suitable for cooking, the knowledge that it is antique, or exotic, may prevent it from being used as such.

\textsuperscript{58} Sinopoli 1991, 84; Rice 1987, 237-238. Another way to infer the function of ceramics is by looking at physical characteristics of the clay.

\textsuperscript{59} Rice 1987, 209.

\textsuperscript{60} Tournavitou 1992.

\textsuperscript{61} Mountjoy 1993, 121.

\textsuperscript{62} If the classification would be based on contexts, this would lead to circular arguments: a funerary vessel would, indeed, have been found in a tomb. If the initial classification is based on morphological function, contextual analysis may identify instances where vessels, produced by the Mycenaean potters with a specific set of functions in mind, are put to entirely different functions.

\textsuperscript{63} Of course, some vessel types may have fulfilled multiple functions and should properly be classified in more than one category. Also, individual vessels may change function during their life-span.

\textsuperscript{64} Tournavitou 1992, 205. Vessels designed to hold dry substances generally have wider necks; see Leonard 1981, 94. Not all storage vessels possess handles.

\textsuperscript{65} A number of vessels in this category could serve storage functions as well. The design of most types of jugs, for example, is specifically aimed to fulfil more than one function, such as to transport water from a well to the house (storage) and to pour liquids (dinner). My classification is, therefore, not absolute.
the preparation of food. My fourth category consists of a few shapes which cannot be included in the storage, dinner or cooking classes. It concerns vessels such as conical rhyta (FS 199), the ring kernos (FS 197) and zoomorphic askoi and rhyta. These vessels obviously served special functions and have been found in ritual contexts. Therefore, such vessels are tentatively labelled ritual vessels. A final category is taken up by terra-cotta figurines.

General characteristics of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery
In catalogue I, a total of 347 sites are listed which have produced LHI-LHIIIIB pottery. For each site, a number of characteristics are indicated in the catalogue, among which are the quantity of the Mycenaean pots and their stylistic dates. Such a database offers the possibility of reviewing the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in a statistical way. The use of statistics in archaeological research is not unproblematic, mainly because it is never clear what population is represented by the material. With regard to distribution maps, specific circumstances of site survival and detection highly influence the reliability of such maps. Places that have not survived or been detected, naturally, will be absent. Other distortions might be even more serious. For example, if Ugarit, Troy, Enkomi or Tell el-Amarna, had not been extensively excavated but only been subject to archaeological survey or even chance discoveries, they certainly would have figured less prominently in the distribution pattern. Since the history of archaeological research for all countries involved here varies considerably, this factor makes a comparison between geographical areas particularly hazardous.

For the reasons outlined above, the statistical and spatial characterisation of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean presented in this section should be considered as provisional in two ways. First, it must be clear that what is presented here is an archaeological pattern. Most likely, it reflects the historical distribution of this class of material. To what extent and in what way, however, is a matter for debate. Secondly, any conclusion drawn in this section should be subjected to further research. One way of doing so, is analysis of the contexts in which the Mycenaean pottery is found. That, of course, is the main subject of this thesis.

The distribution of the 347 sites in Anatolia, Cyprus, the Levant, Egypt and the central Mediterranean is presented quantitatively in Table III, while it is spatially represented in Map I. The Levant possesses the highest number of sites at which Mycenaean pottery has been found, followed by Cyprus, Egypt, Italy and Anatolia respectively. The spatial distribution of sites with Mycenaean pottery shows that, in all areas, they are located both on the coast and in

---

66 Sinopoli 1991, 84; Tournavitou 1992, 205-210. True cooking vessels generally have wide openings and particular clay compositions to enable them to withstand high temperatures. They are sometimes legged so as to be placed above a fire.
67 Mountjoy 1993, 124. For the conical rhyton religious as well as domestic functions have been proposed; see Koehl 1981, 182-184.
68 As with the other categories, contextual analysis would have to determine whether these vessels possessed ritual functions in the importing societies.
69 The Mycenaean fragments which have been found in Spain have not been included, see Martin de la Cruz 1988, 86, 88; 1990. Likewise, the stirrup jar from Carthage has not been included here, see Annabi 1996, 54-55. See the foreword to the catalogue for more information about the way this list has been compiled.
70 Orton 1978, 400. For difficulties presented by pottery in particular, see Orton 1980, 156-157.
71 Orton 1980, 179-182.
72 The five areas are Anatolia (the Turkish mainland, including Cilicia, and the Aegean isles of Lesbos and Chios), Cyprus, the Levant (Syria, Lebanon, Israel - including Gaza and the West Bank - and Jordan), Egypt (including the Sinai and Nubia) and Italy (including Malta, Sicily and Sardinia).
the interior. An exception to this is the Italian mainland, where all sites are located in the vicinity of the coast. In Sardinia and Sicily interior sites are present.

Given the variation in size of these areas and the differences in the history of archaeological research, the absolute numbers of sites with Mycenaean pottery do not tell us much, just as any comparison between areas in absolute numbers is useless. The totals for each area presented in Table III can, however, serve to calculate proportions of sites with certain characteristics. These figures can fruitfully be compared among each other and with the average for the whole Mediterranean.

In the catalogue the amount of Mycenaean pottery found on a site has been estimated on a scale from 1 to 5. Table IV shows the relative proportions of these classes of sites in the five general areas. It is evident that everywhere the great majority of sites are of class 1, i.e. they have yielded less than ten Mycenaean finds. We are, therefore, dealing with a distribution pattern that includes many sites with a few Mycenaean finds and some, but not many, concentrations.

In comparison with the Mediterranean average, the Levant, Cyprus and Italy, the three areas on which this research will focus, possess relatively few class 1 sites. Most likely, this reflects the absolute numbers of Mycenaean pottery in these areas, which are higher than in Anatolia and Egypt; this results in many class 2 sites in our areas. In the Levant the proportion of class 2 sites is lower than in Cyprus, while the proportion for Italy is lower still. In both Italy and the Levant the relatively low number of class 2 sites is partially caused by an abundance of sites of classes 3 and 4. In Cyprus, as is the case for Egypt as well, there are relatively few sites of classes 3 and higher. All this suggests that there is variation in the concentration of Mycenaean pottery among the five areas.

If Mycenaean pottery would be concentrated in a few large centres, this would result in a distribution pattern in which there are many class 1 sites among a few but significant number of sites of classes 5 and 4. The concentration in the distribution pattern diminishes when a given area has a high proportion of sites of classes 2 and 3. On this basis, we can state that in Anatolia the concentration of Mycenaean pots is highest, since there are many sites of class 1, while Troy (site no. 1) and Miletus (site no. 15) are both of class 5. In Egypt too, there are many sites with less than ten Mycenaean finds, while only Tell el-Amarna (site no. 256) falls into class 5. Only because there is also a class 4 (Deir el-Medina: no. 263) and a class 3 (Tell Dab’a-Qantir: no. 234) site, the concentration in Egypt is less marked than in Anatolia. In Italy Mycenaean pottery also seems to be concentrated at a few sites, but it should be noted that these fall mainly into class 4, while only Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303) belongs to class 5. Cyprus has the lowest frequency of sites of class 1 and there are relatively many sites of class 2. The concentration of Mycenaean pottery on this island is enhanced, however, by the relative scarcity of sites of classes 3 and 4, while there are three class 5 sites: Enkomi (site no. 50), Kition (site no. 57) and Hala Sultan Tekke (site no. 59). The concentration of Mycenaean pottery seems least marked in the Levant, where there are many sites of classes 2 and 3, while only Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) has been classified as belonging to class 5.

73 Only Sassano (site no. 344) in Campania, where one Mycenaean cup was found in a cave is an exception to the coastal pattern.

74 1 means less than 10 ceramic units, 2 means 10-50, 3 means 50-100, 4 means 100-500 while 5 signifies more than 500 ceramic units.

75 It is very possible that at Ras Shamra (site no. 128) more than 500 Mycenaean finds have been made. According to N. Hirschfeld (pers. com.), more than 400 Mycenaean pots or fragments are in the storerooms of the Louvre museum. These are not yet published, however, and at least some of them come from Minet el-Beida (site no. 129).
Map 2 presents the spatial distribution of sites of class 2 and higher. In Anatolia, such sites are absent in the interior. The same is true for Italy, where this was to be expected, since on the Italian peninsula virtually all sites with Mycenaean pottery are on or near the coast. In Sicily, where sites with Mycenaean pottery do occur in the interior, the three larger sites are likewise on the coast. A coastal pattern is less marked in Cyprus, where several sites of class 2 occur in the islands' interior. However, it should be noted that all sites of class 3 and higher are situated near the coast. In the Levant, there are several sites of class 2 and higher in the interior; among these are Megiddo (site no. 175) and the Amman airport (site no. 189), which both belong to class 4. In the northern Levant (Syria), however, Alalakh (site no. 125) is the only site of class 2 or higher situated far from the coast. However, Alalakh is located along the Orontes river which leads to the sea. In Egypt a coastal preference cannot, of course, be discerned.

To sum up, it can be stated that all areas show a similar distribution pattern of many sites with little Mycenaean pottery and a concentration at some larger sites. Within this overall pattern, however, the areas reveal variations, especially with regard to the concentration of Mycenaean pottery at larger sites. This concentration seems to be very significant in Anatolia and Egypt, while it is low in the Levant. Differences are also discernible in the extent to which a coastal preference is apparent from the location of sites of class 2 and higher. Such a pattern is clear in Anatolia and Italy, while it is less marked in Cyprus and, especially, the southern Levant.

The five areas can also be compared with regard to the presence of ceramic phases. In Table V, the extent to which sites with LHI-LHIIIA1 pottery occur is presented. The spatial distribution of these sites is shown in Map 3. This early material has been found at less than a third of all sites in the four areas in the eastern Mediterranean. Taking the duration of the period involved into consideration, this distribution is limited indeed. Cyprus and the Levant have the lowest proportions of sites with early material. This indicates that the rise in imports which occurred from LHIIIA2 onwards was most marked in these two areas. In Anatolia and Egypt, sites with early Mycenaean pottery constitute a somewhat larger proportion of the total. A totally different pattern is visible for the Italian area, where LHI-LHIIIA1 pots have been found on more than forty percent of all sites.

Regional variations become more apparent when the presence of Mycenaean pottery of an early period is related to the overall quantities of this material (Table V). In Anatolia and Italy, LHI-LHIIIA1 pottery is found at the majority of sites of class 2 and higher. This is not the case in the three other areas, where there are more sites of classes 2, 3, 4 and 5 without early Mycenaean material than with it. This pattern is most marked in Egypt, but also characteristic for Cyprus. We can also look to the proportion of sites with LHI-LHIIIA1 pottery that fall into class 2 or higher. Again there are variations among the five areas. In Cyprus, especially, but also in the Levant the majority of sites with early Mycenaean material fall into classes 2, 3, 4, or 5. In Anatolia, this is the case for about half of the sites. In Italy and especially in Egypt only a minority of the sites which have yielded early Mycenaean finds fall into a class higher than 1.

The point made here concerns the relationship between early contacts and overall intensity of import. Only in Anatolia, such a relationship seems clear: many sites which imported...
Mycenaean pottery at an early stage became large receivers of this pottery in a later era. Moreover, only a few sites that did not import Mycenaean pottery from an early age on, became large importers in later periods. In Italy, the situation is similar, but less marked. Many sites which received early material became important. However, an equal number of early importers never received large amounts of later Mycenaean material. The early receivers which did become important, were joined by some, but not many others. In Cyprus and the Levant, many of the sites which have provided early Mycenaean pottery, possess large quantities of later Mycenaean material. However, many major receivers of Late Helladic pottery started importing this material after LHIIIA1. In Egypt, there does not seem to be a relationship at all between the presence of Mycenaean pottery of an early period and the influx of large quantities of this material during a later era.

With regard to the location of sites that have yielded early Mycenaean material (Map 3), a coastal preference is clear for Anatolia and Italy, where virtually all such sites are located close to the sea. In Cyprus, only a few sites with LH1-LHIIA1 pottery are situated in the island’s interior. In the Levant, however, early Mycenaean pottery is widely distributed in the interior, even though in the north there is only one inland site with this material, namely Alalakh (site no. 125), which is situated along the Orontes river leading to the sea. More to the south, however, there are various places with early material, as far east as Transjordan. In Egypt, sites with early Mycenaean ceramics seem to cluster in three regions (the Saqqara area, the Fayum, and the area of western Thebes), although two sites with early material do occur in Nubia.

To summarise, it should be emphasised that a fundamental difference can be observed between Italy and the eastern Mediterranean with regard to the presence of LH1-LHIIA1 pottery. Not only is the frequency of sites in the central Mediterranean with such early material far higher than elsewhere, it also appears that many sites imported small quantities of early Mycenaean pottery and continued to do so in later phases. There are differences between the five areas in the location of the sites with early Mycenaean pottery. For the Levant a coastal pattern cannot be observed, while for Cyprus it is less marked than for Italy and Anatolia. In Egypt, the distribution of early material seems to be limited to specific regions. There are also remarkable differences among the areas in the extent to which sites that began to import Mycenaean pottery at an early date became large receivers of this type of pottery in a later era. For Anatolia such a relationship between early Mycenaean pottery and large overall quantities has been detected, but it was absent in Egypt. In Italy, Cyprus and the Levant, a relationship between early imports and overall quantities appears to exist at a number of sites, but other factors appear to have been at work as well.

Table VI shows the proportion of sites in the five areas at which LHIIIA2 pottery is found. Map 4 presents the spatial distribution of this material. It is immediately clear that the pottery of this phase is abundant: in all areas it occurs at more than 50% of the sites. Anatolia and the Levant plot above the Mediterranean average, while Cyprus has a slightly lower proportion. In Egypt and Italy, LHIIIA2 pottery is present at slightly more than half of the total number of sites with Mycenaean pottery. The small differences between the proportions of sites with LHIIIA2 pottery result in a graph, which is very shallow and unpronounced.

---

78 It is presupposed here that the early material also arrived earlier than pottery of later ceramic styles. That this is not always the case is illustrated at the Amman airport site (site no. 189), where LHII pottery has been found in association with LHIIIIB and other later material. See Hankey 1974, 136, 142.

79 This might also indicate that the distribution of Mycenaean pottery through regional exchange networks in Italy was extensive from an early age onwards.

80 It should be remembered that sherds classified as LHIIIA2-LHIIIB have been included in both classes, see the foreword to catalogue I.
This graph shows that the distribution of LHIIIA2 pottery in the Mediterranean is fairly homogeneous.\textsuperscript{81}

If we review the extent to which class 2 sites or higher have produced LHIIIA2 pottery, we find that there is a high correlation almost everywhere. In the Levant and on Cyprus, LHIIIA2 style pottery is present at more than 90% of the sites of classes higher than 1, while the somewhat lower frequencies for Anatolia and Egypt are still well above 80%. This signifies that in these areas only a very small number of places with large overall quantities of Mycenaean pottery did not import LHIIIA2 ceramics.\textsuperscript{82} In the Italian area, this pattern is much less marked. Even though the majority of sites of class 2 or higher possessed LHIIIA2 pots, there is a substantial number of large receivers without Aegean pots in this ceramic style.\textsuperscript{83}

If we look at the proportion of all sites with LHIIIA2 that have yielded more than ten Mycenaean finds in general, we see fairly low figures, with a maximum (for Cyprus) just below 50%. This is of course due to the large number of sites of class 1 that possess LHIIIA2 and signifies that this material was well distributed to sites of all classes. The relatively high figures for Cyprus and for the Levant are probably caused by the abundance of class 2 sites in these areas.

The high proportion of sites at which LHIIIA2 is present, is also recognisable in a spatial sense (Map 4). The distribution pattern of this material is almost identical to that of all Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean (Map 1). The conclusion of this section is that the distribution of LHIIIA2 pottery is wide and relatively homogeneous.

Table VII indicates the frequencies of sites with LHIIIB pottery in the five areas, while Map 5 presents the spatial distribution of this class of ceramics. Pottery in LHIIIB style is widely distributed; it is present in all areas on at least half of all sites, even though this pattern is much less marked for Egypt. In general, the graph showing the proportions of sites with LHIIIB pottery is much more pronounced than the corresponding graph for LHIIIA2 (see Table VI). This illustrates the relatively large quantitative differences between the various areas. The distribution pattern of LHIIIB pottery is less homogeneous than that of LHIIIA2 pots.\textsuperscript{84}

If we review the presence of LHIIIB pottery on sites of class 2 and higher, we see that in Anatolia and Cyprus all sites in a class higher than 1 possess this class of pottery (100%). The figures for the Levant and Italy are only slightly lower. The proportion for Egypt is comparatively low, albeit still more than 50%. This indicates that there are comparatively many sites in Egypt with much Mycenaean pottery in general, but without LHIIIB ceramics. Egypt is the only area for which the proportion of large sites with LHIIIB is lower than the corresponding figure for LHIIIA2 pottery (see Table VI). This indicates that the import of Mycenaean pottery in Egypt declined somewhat during the LHIIIB period. In Anatolia, the absolute number of sites that have yielded LHIIIB pottery is lower than that of sites with LHIIIA2 pottery. The high proportion of large sites with LHIIIB pottery, however, shows that in Anatolia there was not a decline in imports of this period comparable to Egypt. Rather, we see a slightly growing concentration of LHIIIB pottery on larger sites in the area.

The proportions of sites with LHIIIB that fall into class 1 or higher, are low in all areas; in all cases below 50%. This reflects the wide distribution of LHIIIB material among class 1 sites. For Anatolia, the proportion of sites with LHIIIB that can be classified as large, has

\textsuperscript{81} The standard deviation $\delta = 5.57\%$.

\textsuperscript{82} In fact, outside Italy, only five sites are listed as such: Besik-tepe (site no. 2) in Anatolia, Pyla-Kokkinokremos (site no. 52) and Maa-Palaeokastro (site no. 107) on Cyprus, Dothan (site no. 179) in the Levant, and Bir el-Abd (site no. 226) in the Sinai.

\textsuperscript{83} Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287), Porto-Perone (site no. 299), Casale Nuovo (site no. 325), Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328), Roca vecchia (site no. 347).

\textsuperscript{84} The standard deviation $\delta = 9.13\%$. 
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grown somewhat with respect to the comparable figure for LHIIIA2 pottery. This seems to confirm my suspicion of a slight concentration of LHIIIB pottery on larger sites. In none of the other areas such a concentration can be observed. In Egypt, there is a very low proportion of sites with LHIIIB which fall into class 2 or higher. At the same time, comparatively few large importing sites in Egypt have yielded LHIIIB ceramics. This indicates that the more limited distribution of LHIIIB in Egypt as compared to that of LHIIIA2 is not due to any sort of concentration at larger sites, but represents a general phenomenon.

In the Italian area, the frequency of sites with LHIIIB pots among class 1 sites has grown with respect to the corresponding figure for LHIIIA2 pots. This indicates that there are relatively many large sites with LHIIIB pots without LHIIIA2. For the LHIIIA2 period, we had also noted a relatively large number of sites of class 2 or higher which had not yielded Aegean pottery dating to LHI-LHIIIA1. Obviously, in Italy more than elsewhere, clear shifts occurred in time with regard to sites where Mycenaean pots were concentrated. Similar shifts can also be noted in a spatial sense, which is visible in Map 5. The Adriatic coast, as well as Sardinia figure more prominently in the distribution of LHIIIB pots than in that of previous periods. Elsewhere, the distribution of LHIIIB pots is virtually identical to that of all Mycenaean pottery.

To sum up, it can be stated that the distribution of LHIIIB pottery in the Mediterranean is wide, but less homogeneous than that of the previous ceramic phase. With regard to the spatial distribution, a notable difference from the LHIIIA2 phase can be observed in Italy, where regions which did not receive Mycenaean ceramics before begin to do so during LHIIIB. In Anatolia, the concentration of Mycenaean finds at larger sites seems to grow slightly, while in Egypt the import of Mycenaean pottery seems to have declined.

Conclusion
This overview of the distribution of Mycenaean pots in the Mediterranean shows that there are some general characteristics common to all geographical areas in which it has been found. In all areas outside the Aegean, the repertoire of Mycenaean pots differs in several respects from that found in Greece itself. The most notable difference is the predominance of wheel-made, decorated fine wares. The majority of the Mycenaean pots which occur outside the Aegean appear to have been made in Greece itself. However, everywhere a local industry inspired by this type of pottery developed. A general observation about the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pots is that everywhere there are many sites which have yielded only a few Mycenaean finds, while there are concentrations in a few, but not many sites. In addition, it may be observed that Mycenaean pottery from the first stylistic phases was imported in all the five areas and relatively widely distributed.

In spite of these general characteristics, we have also noted some differences between the five areas with regard to the presence of Mycenaean pottery. There are variations in the repertoire of Mycenaean pots. Indeed, substantial differences may occur in the Mycenaean repertoire between individual sites within one region. A significant difference has also been observed with regard to local manufacture of Mycenaean-type pots. Only in Cyprus and the central Mediterranean did such vessels become very abundant, especially towards the end of the LHIIIB phase. In a statistical sense, the distribution of LHIIIB pottery is much less homogeneous than that of the previous LHIIIA2 phase. This is possibly related to the presence of regional ceramic industries which incorporated elements characteristic of Mycenaean pottery.

85 In fact, all other areas reveal a slight decrease (see Table VII). The differences in frequency are rather small, however, and we should not take these statistics as reflecting patterns on such small margins.
86 As such classify Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287), Porto-Perone (site no. 299), Casale Nuovo (site no. 325), Antigori (site no. 329), Roca Vecchia (site no. 347).
87 See also Vagnetti 1982a, 30; 1993, 147.
pottery. A final difference in the distribution pattern which should be mentioned concerns the central Mediterranean. There, clear shifts in time can be observed with regard to the geographical areas where this type of pottery was imported and with regard to the sites at which it was concentrated. Similar shifts are not visible in other areas in the Mediterranean.

We are dealing, then, with a distribution pattern, which at first sight is appears relatively homogeneous. When regarded in detail, however, variations on local and regional levels become visible. It is possible that these differences in the distribution pattern are related to variations in the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pots.