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PART IV

The central Mediterranean

Previous research

The 57 sites in the central Mediterranean at which Mycenaean pottery has been found are situated in a large area encompassing the Italian Peninsula and the two largest islands in the Mediterranean, Sicily and Sardinia (Map 53). Malta and the Aeolian islands are also included. In 1977, L. Masson determined two unplaced sites from which faintly Symanace which had been found in 1977, without knowing they were Mycenaean. This was realized by Fortunat and Lusicka, who mentioned pottery from Orsina in Apulia as well. P. Orsi discovered Mycenaean pottery on several Sicilian sites, and commented on their historical significance. The large quantities of Late Helladic pottery in the upper stratum of the site of Argos-Aspromonte and in Tarentum (also in 1990), excavated by Quatrusio in 1969-1970, made it clear that southern Italy had known important Mycenaean contacts with Greece, and mentioned five sites in Sicily and three on the mainland where Mycenaean pottery had been found, while J. D. Boardman added another site, in 1950. According to D. D. Jones, the ceramic evidence and the literature of Bronze Age and a new type of Late Helladic pottery in the presence of permanent Mycenaean settlements on Sicily.

In 1969 and 1990, L. Dornay-Stein and M. Calvarino noted several important excavations on the Aeolian islands, north of Italy. The Aeolian pottery of Pisciano (also in 1956, Lipari, and Cefalù and Panarea (also in 1950), were discussed by Taylor in his overview of Mycenaean pottery in Italy. He stated that much of the Aeolian pottery was early 10th century BC, and that the Olympos-Graimigli sites contained parts of Middle Helladic LHIIIA and LHIII pottery. The presence of these islands of early Mycenaean was identified as the LHIIIAI and LHIIIA pottery had important implications for the nature of the Aeolian contacts with the central Mediterranean. Taylor also discussed the Mycenaean pottery from Scopello del Vecchio (also in 1950) which had been found by Quatrusio, stating that there had been a Mycenaean settlement at this site from LHIIIAI onwards, and that the inhabitants must have been familiar with Late Helladic material.

1 Masson 1977, 206-207, "Cefalù, l'Orsa", and other provinces for these issues, despite the significance of Early Helladic and Mycenaean sites in Sicily, it is necessary that Masson also familiarize himself with Late Helladic material.

2 See Quatrusio 1973, 365-368, for a discussion (and "proto Greeks", main references: Shirley, also in Quatrusio 1967.


4 Piggott 1926, 91, Excav. British 1920, 2. Bortolo, D. B. (1954) and stated that Mycenaean sites had been found in Tarentum on the Messinian plain. However, since then, no sites were found in Argos or Tarentum.

5 Dornay-Stein, 1936; 36, 365-366.

6 Piggott 1926, 91, Excav. British 1920, 2. Bortolo, D. B. (1954) and stated that Mycenaean sites had been found in Tarentum on the Messinian plain. However, since then, no sites were found in Argos or Tarentum.

7 Dornay-Stein, 1936, 36, 365-366.

8 Taylor 1926, 91, Excav. British 1920, 2. Bortolo, D. B. (1954) and stated that Mycenaean sites had been found in Tarentum on the Messinian plain. However, since then, no sites were found in Argos or Tarentum.

9 Taylor 1926, 91, Excav. British 1920, 2. Bortolo, D. B. (1954) and stated that Mycenaean sites had been found in Tarentum on the Messinian plain. However, since then, no sites were found in Argos or Tarentum.
Steel has also shown, Mycenaean storage vessels were not primarily related to elite practices. A process of emulation comparable to that of Mycenaean pottery vessels is not apparent with regard to storage pots. Nevertheless, it is of significance that such vessels appear to have been used in some important sanctuaries. Such may be concluded from the concentrations of these vessels in Building 4 at Apliki and in the eastern part of the sanctuary at Athens. Also, Mycenaean storage vessels seem to have played a major role in the libation ceremonies of people living in the interior of the island. Rather than in elite practices, the significance of these Mycenaean storage vessels appears to have been related to their character as imported export products. They may be compared to other paraphernalia of international trade which played a role in supra-local relations, such as the ivory rhytons and stone cylinder seals at Athens and the seals, the ivory box stopper and the bronze steatite Apliki.

The cultural significance of Mycenaean pots in Cyprus, then, was connected to the symbolic meanings they carried as artefacts indicative of a broader international world and a cosmopolitan lifestyle. By subscribing these imported vessels to strategies of nuanced difference, they become active parts of rituals that redefined the intra-local power of specific sites.

Several observations have been made, however, which indicate that Mycenaean vessels could be endowed with a variety of other meanings as well. First of all, such vessels could circulate for substantial periods of time in regional exchange networks. This meant the possibility that they were part of systems of gift-exchange, and referred to owner-owners and owner-wealth of which they had previously been part. Secondly, it has been shown that later Ancient Cypriote ware storage jars, which originally must have been intended for local transport, were included in occasional quantities in contexts of Cyprus. Obviously, these vessels had acquired a cultural meaning that made them suitable to be part of assemblies of a symbolic nature. Finally, specialised Mycenaean ceramic shapes, such as aryballoi or flagon, have been part of Cypriot rituals of cult. Such was also the case for the Mycenaean pots discovered at Athenoi. This indicates that religious meanings could also be a part of the cultural significance of these imported vessels. Mycenaean pots, therefore, were endowed with a variety of meanings which derived from indigenous cultural practices. It is legitimate to assume that the relative importance of these cultural meanings was the cultural behind the unusual distribution of Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus.

---

Footnotes:
30 East 1969, 284-292.
32 Lefkandi 1982; Marn 1987. For more recent literature of this theme, see, for example, Demarg 1991; Harry 1981; see also with specific bibliography in the paper.
**CHAPTER 14**

**Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean: introduction**

**Previous research**

The 52 sites in the central Mediterranean at which Mycenaean pottery has been found, are situated in a large area encompassing the Italian peninsula and the two largest islands in the Mediterranean, Sicily and Sardinia (Map 34). Malta and the Aeolian islands are also included. In 1877, L. Mauceri described two amphoroid jars from a tomb near Syracuse which had been found in 1871, without knowing they were Mycenaean.¹ This was realized by Furtwängler and Löschke, who mentioned pottery from Oria in Apulia as well. P. Orsi discovered Mycenaean pottery on several Sicilian sites and commented on their historical significance.² The large quantities of Late Helladic pottery in the upper stratum of the site at Scoglio del Tonno in Taranto (site no. 300), excavated by Quagliati in 1899-1900, made it clear that southern Italy had known important Mycenaean connections.³ Fimmen mentioned five sites in Sicily and three on the mainland where Mycenaean pottery had been found, while T.J. Dunbabin added another to both regions.⁴ According to Dunbabin, the ceramic evidence and that for the introduction of fibulae and a new type of tholos-tomb pointed to the presence of permanent Mycenaean settlements on Sicily.⁵

In the 1940's and 1950's L. Bernabò Brea and M. Cavalier started several important excavations on the Aeolian islands, north of Sicily.⁶ The Aegean pottery of Filicudi (site no. 316), Lipari (site no. 319) and Panarea (site no. 320) was discussed by Taylour in his overview of Mycenaean pottery in Italy.⁷ He stated that much of the Aegean pottery was early in comparison with most other sites: the Capo Graziano levels contained sherds of Middle Helladic, LHI and LHII ware. The presence on these islands of early material in quantities that equal the LHIIIA and LHIIIB pottery has important implications for the nature of the Aegean contact with the central Mediterranean.⁸ Taylour also discussed the Mycenaean pottery from Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300) which had been found by Quagliati, stating that there had been a Mycenaean settlement at this site from LHIIIA1 onwards, and that the inhabitants most

---

¹ Mauceri 1877, 57-58, Tav. E6. He does not mention an Aegean, or, indeed, any other provenance for these vases. However, as Schliemann started his work in Mycenae in 1874, it is unlikely that Mauceri was familiar with Late Helladic material.
² See Orsi 1893, 29-36. He concludes that 'proto Greeks' must have visited Sicily. See also Orsi 1906.
³ Quagliati 1900, 416-420. He found over 750 Aegean sherds and 2 figurines of probable Mycenaean provenance.
⁴ Fimmen 1924, 99; Dunbabin 1948, 2. Earlier, Dawkins (1904) had claimed that Mycenaean vases had been found in Torcello in the Venetian laguna. However, these pots were not Aegean.
⁵ Dunbabin 1948, 5-6.
⁶ Full publication of these excavations was realised in *Melingunis Lipàra* Vols. I-VI, see Bernabò Brea & Cavalier 1980.
⁷ Taylour 1958, 7-53.
⁸ Taylour 1958, 182-183.
likely came from Rhodes and maybe Cyprus. Chemical analyses, however, seemed to prove that the pottery of LHIIIA and LHIIIB was produced in mainland Greece. The excavation of Porto Perone (site no. 299), also in the region of Taranto, not only reasserted the importance of this area in Mycenaean times. It also provided a better understanding of the stratigraphical sequences in which the Mycenaean pottery in Apulia occurred.

The decipherment of the Linear B tablets in Greece and the conclusion that references to the Italian region were absent led to a revision of the nature of the Aegean contacts with the central Mediterranean. The view of Mycenaens colonizing the Italian coasts was abandoned and scholars began to focus on the interaction between Aegeans and native populations. L. Vagnetti and S. Tinè gave an overview of the Mycenaean finds in Italy and discussed the integration of the Mycenaean finds in the local material culture. Like previous scholars, Vagnetti saw the search for raw materials as the main motive for the Mycenaean contacts with the central Mediterranean. However, she interpreted these contacts in terms of levels of integration that influenced the Italian societies. One of these influences could be the processes of urbanisation in Apulia and Sicily, which might have resulted from the Aegean trade. An important study was presented by M. Marazzi and S. Tusa in 1979. They gave an overview of theoretical and methodological approaches by which the Mycenaean relation with the Italian region should be studied. Among other things, they stressed the need to consider the Mycenaean imports in the cultural context into which they arrived. They also reviewed the development of the Mycenaean contacts and showed that there is a difference between the early phase (LHI-LHII), in which the level of integration was low, and the second phase, which had a higher level of integration.

Excavations at the small island of Vivara (site no. 324) revealed that Mycenaean pottery similar to that from Filicudi (site no. 316) and Lipari (site no. 319) had arrived at the Campanian coast as early as LHII. Recent discoveries have also added the island of Sardinia to the distribution map of Mycenaean pottery in Italy. Although most of the material on Sardinia seems to be of LHIIIC style, some LHIIIB has been found as well, while an alabastron from Nuraghe Arrubiu (site no. 329) may be of LHIIIA2 date.

---

9 Taylour 1958, 81-137, especially pp. 128-136.
10 Biancofiore 1967, 88. More specifically in Attica and the Argolis. LHIIIC material was found to have been produced locally as well as in the eastern Aegean.
12 See Carratelli 1958; Stella 1958, both with bibliography. Before this time, the myth of the burial of Minos on Sicily had been seriously explored. See, for example, Dunbabin 1948.
13 Vagnetti 1970.
15 Whitehouse 1973, 622-623; Voza (1973a) claimed that the houses in Thapsos (site no. 309) can be compared to those in Gla in Boeotia. See, however, Ross Holloway (1981, 85) and Karageorghis (1995) who prefer a Cypriot source for these buildings.
16 Marazzi & Tusa 1979a, 309-323. In this study, interaction is viewed in terms of economical systems: “Wenn auch die Mykenischen Kontakte Veränderungen ökonomischer und sozialer Natur verursachen, finden sie immer dort statt, wo eine bestimmte gesellschaftliche Organisation die Erfüllung ihrer Beschaffungsinteressen garantieren kann” (p. 351). See, also, Marazzi & Tusa 1979b.
17 Vagnetti & Tusa 1979a, 340-341.
18 Buchner et al. 1978, 215-225. Buchner had found Mycenaean sherds on the island already in 1937. See, also, Marazzi & Re 1986. The excavations on Vivara 1976-1982 have recently been published, see Marazzi 1993c, 1994 and other articles in the same volumes. The work on the island was resumed in 1994, for a preliminary report, see Marazzi 1995.
An overview of the Mycenaean contacts with the central Mediterranean has been given by Lucia Vagnetti, who distinguishes three successive chronological phases. The first phase starts in the age of the Shaft Graves at Mycenae and involves the distribution of LHI and LHII pottery. In addition to Helladic pottery with lustrous decoration, a variety of coarse and matt-painted wares have been found in Italy. Most of the Aegean pottery from this period seems to have come from mainland Greece, but some fabrics have Minoan features. Concentrations of these types of pottery have been attested at the Aeolian island and on Vivara, while smaller amounts have also been found in Apulia and Sicily. The second chronological phase in the Mycenaean contacts with the Italian region comprises the distribution of LHIIIA and LHIIIB pottery. In the early part of this phase (LHIIIA), the distribution centres on the Aeolian islands and Vivara, on south-eastern Sicily (Thapsos culture) and various parts of Apulia. Later in this phase (LHIIIB), the imports diminish in Sicily, while sites in Apulia and Basilicata seem to have gained importance. In this later period there is also a notable rise in the local manufacture of Aegean-type pottery. The third phase in the Mycenaean contacts with Italy covers LHIIIB-IIIC, which are often difficult to distinguish. Sardinia and the Adriatic coast seem to have gained prominence during this era.

An analysis of Mycenaean trade with the central Mediterranean was given by Thyrza Smith in 1987. Among other things, she found that different Mycenaean pottery types were preferred by different Italian regions. The context in which this pottery is found also seemed to vary according to region. In Sicily, the evidence comes mainly from tombs, where mainly small, closed shapes have been found, while in Vivara (site no. 324) and on the Aeolian islands open shapes, found in settlement contexts, predominate. On the Italian mainland, Mycenaean open and closed shapes are found in both funerary and settlement contexts.

Recent research has revealed the enormous complexity of the corpus of Aegean pottery in Italy. Chemical analyses show that a substantial part of the Aegean pottery is of local manufacture. In Termitito (site no. 302) and Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303) this is true for over 90% of the sherds analyzed. In Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300), analysed imports point to Rhodes, central Crete and the Peloponnese as places of origin. Connections between western Crete and southern Italy during LHIIIB and LHIIIC have been proposed on the basis of impasto wares found in Chania. The LHI-II finds from Vivara (site no. 324) seem

---

20 Vagnetti 1982a; this picture has later been refined, see Vagnetti 1993, 145; 1999, 138-142.
21 Vagnetti 1982a, 15-18.
22 Vagnetti 1982a, 16-17; Cavalier & Vagnetti 1983, 343-344; 1984, 150-151; Marazzi 1994, 30-31. Initially it was thought that these matt-painted wares represented imports from the Middle Helladic period, see, for example, Taylour 1958, 16, 33, 47. However, they are contemporary to the LHI and LHII pottery with lustrous decoration.
23 See also Marazzi 1994, 30-32.
24 Vagnetti 1982a, 18-19.
25 Vagnetti 1993, 147.
26 Vagnetti 1982a, 19-20; 1993, 139.
28 Smith 1987, 128.
29 Smith concludes that these variations reflect differences in the nature of the trade with the Aegean: prestige trade where Mycenaean pots are found in tombs and trade of a more utilitarian character in the case of settlement deposition. It is, however, more likely that differences in find context are responsible for the variation in pot shapes, rather than the nature of the exchange.
30 Jones 1986b, 207-208.
32 Hallager 1985, 302-303, with bibliography.
to derive from mainland Greece, although their exact place of origin is not certain. The imported domestic wares on Vivara from this early period seem to have come not only from various places in Greece, but possibly from the Levant as well. These wares can be associated with the import of decorated pottery of either LHI-LHIIA or LHIIIB-LHIII A.

Regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean

The northern border of the distribution of LHI-LHIIIB ware lies in central Italy: in the modern provinces of Latium and Le Marche, from Luni sul Mignone (site no. 326) to Treazzano di Monsampolo (site no. 285). The overall distribution of Aegean pottery reveals a distinctive coastal pattern on the Italian mainland, the only exception being Sassano (site no. 344) in the interior of Campania (Map 34). This is different in Sicily and Sardinia, where Mycenaean pottery is found in the interior.

Within this overall distribution pattern, there are several clusterings of sites. In Apulia, a grouping of sites can be distinguished from along the coasts of the Adriatic and the Ionian sea. The westernmost site of this group is Torre del Mordillo (site no. 305) in the Sybaris plain in Calabria. A notable clustering of sites is also visible in central and south-eastern Sicily, where Late Helladic pottery is found at ten sites. The Aeolian islands, from Filicudi (site no. 316) to Panarea (site no. 320), are likewise a separate spatial group. In Campania, only four sites have yielded Mycenaean pottery, of which three are situated on the mainland: Praia a mare (site no. 321), Paestum (site no. 322) and Sassano (site no. 344) each have yielded one Mycenaean find. Two sites are situated on isles in the gulf of Naples: Vivara (site no. 324) and Ischia (site no. 323). In Latium, there is a scatter of three sites with LHI-LHIIIB pottery, while in south-eastern Sardinia two such sites are located. Treazzano di Monsampolo (site no. 285) at the central Italian Adriatic coast, Capo Piccolo (site no. 306) at the Calabrian Ionian coast and the two sites at Malta - Borg en Nadur (site no. 283) and Tas Silg (site no. 284) - can be considered as isolated.

If we look for sites that have yielded substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery (Map 35), some of these can be noted along the Gulf of Taranto: Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300), Termitito (site no. 302) and Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303). In the Aeolian islands, Lipari (site no. 319) is a class 4 site, just as Vivara (site no. 324) in Campania and Antigori (site no. 328) in Sardinia. The site of Thapsos (site no. 309) is the only one in the area of Syracuse with substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery; in southern Sicily, the sites of Cannatello (site no. 289) and Monte Grande (site no. 293) are situated close together. Casale Nuvo (site no. 325) is the only site in Latium with substantial amounts of LHIIIB pottery, while this is the case for Antigori (site no. 328) in Sardinia.

Within the central Mediterranean a geographical distinction must, of course, be made between the Italian mainland, Sicily and Sardinia. The Italian peninsula is geographically determined by the Apennine mountain range, which stretches from Piemonte (near Genoa) into northern

33 Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131. They suspect that the character of the clays from Vivara is most typical of the southern Peloponnese and Kythera.
34 Re 1993, 331-334 she calls her class 5 pottery 'Levantine ware' and states that the texture is similar to that of Canaanite jars. Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131 state that some Aegean-type domestic pots have a composition indistinguishable from local material.
35 Re 1993, 334; Marazzi 1993a, 337 note 7.
36 This is not due to an absence of Middle and Late Bronze Age sites in the interior: see Barker & Stoddart 1994, 148 fig. 5.3; Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 173.
Calabria. A general distinction can be made between the coastal plains and valleys and the highlands in the interior.

The central Adriatic coast, on which the site of Trezano di Monsampolo (site no. 285) is located, is formed by the eastern slopes of the mountains, which are cut by numerous rivers, forming an eroded landscape of plateaus, generally without a coastal plain. This region opens up in the south to a second geographical unit, that of the large Tavoliere plain, which lies between the southern Apennines and the Gargano peninsula. Trani (site no. 288), Molfetta (site no. 289) and Giovinazzo (site no. 290) are sites with Helladic pottery located at the coast in the plain proper, while Molinella (site no. 286) and Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287) lie on the Gargano.

Apulia and Basilicata can be considered the third geographic unit. They are formed by lowlands surrounding the limestone Murge plateau and the southern ridge of the Apennines. Several river valleys crossing this region provide routes of communications into the Apennines and beyond. The most important sites with Mycenaean pottery in this region are Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300) and Termittito (site no. 302). In the south-west of this region, the Apennine mountains reach close to the coast, thus creating a narrow corridor to the more mountainous Calabria, a fourth geographical unit. Near this route of communication lies the important site of Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303), while, more inland, Francavilla Marittima (site no. 304) and Torre Mordillo (site no. 305) have produced Mycenaean pottery. Capo Piccolo (site no. 306) is the southernmost site in Calabria with such material.

The Tyrrhenian coastal lands of Calabria open up to southern Campania without a notable break in the vicinity of Praia di Mare (site no. 321). In fact, the extreme south of Campania shows many similarities with Calabria. Near Paestum (site no. 322) the landscape changes into a series of coastal plains, cut by rivers that provide communications into the mountains. In these plains, no Mycenaean pottery has been found. The only other sites in Campania with Mycenaean pottery are off the coast of Naples: Ischia (site no. 323) and Vivara (site no. 324). Mycenaean finds on Vivara have, in fact, been made at three locations - Punta Capitello, Punta d'Alaca and Punta Mezzogiorno - which in the catalogue are indicated as one site because of the small size of the island. On the mainland, the Garigliano valley provides access to the southern coastal plain of Latium, where Casale Nuovo (site no. 325) is located. Two other sites in this geographical unit with Mycenaean pottery, Luni sul Mignone (site no. 326) and Monte Rovello (site no. 327) are situated in the hills north of the Tiber river.

Eastern Sicily is dominated by Mount Etna's lavas, which provides fertile soils, especially in the plain of Catania. Our sites, however, are mainly located south of this plain. In the narrow coastal strip east of the Iblei hills lies the important site of Thapsos (site no. 309) on a peninsula, while two tomb sites - Floridia (site no. 313) and Buscemi (site no. 314) are situated in the hills themselves. The southern coast of Sicily is mountainous, but at several places rivers valleys open up to form more a gentle hilly landscape. In one of such regions, near the modern town of Agrigento, three sites with Mycenaean finds are situated: Cannatello (site no. 289), Monte Grande (site no. 293) and Madre Chiesa di Gaffa (site no. 310). In the rugged interior of the island, Mycenaean finds have only been made at Milena (site no. 315).

---

37 Barker & Stoddart 1994, 149.
40 Bietti Sestieri 1983, 85.
41 The small island is less than half a kilometre in length, see Rosi, Sbrana & Vezzoli 1991; Tusa 1991a.
The Aeolian islands north of Sicily are all volcanic in origin and have prominent resources of obsidian. All of the eight islands, of which Lipari is the largest, have fertile soils, but limited resources of surface water. Five sites in this geographic unit have yielded Aegean pottery, of which two lie on the island of Salina: Portella (site no. 317) and Sierra dei Cianfi (site no. 318). The most prominent site - as far as amounts of Mycenaean pottery are concerned - lies on the Capo Graziano acropolis at Lipari (site no. 319).

South of Sicily, the Maltese islands constitute a geographic region of their own. Both sites at which Mycenaean finds were made - Borg en Nadur (site no. 283) and Tas Silg (site no. 284) - lie on the island of Malta proper, which has good harbours on the north and east side, thus allowing easy maritime access.

Although Sardinia belongs to the modern state of Italy, it is nearer to the north African coast. The relative isolation of the island is enhanced by its rugged interior. An important feature of the geography of Sardinia is the Campidano plain in the south-west, which stretches from modern Cagliari to the west coast near Oristano. This plain is situated between two mountain ranges, both of which provide little room for coastal plains. The most important site with Mycenaean pottery on this island, Antigori (site no. 328), lies on the coast in the south-western corner of the Campidano. Another site, Nuraghe Arrubiu (site no. 329), is situated in the mountainous interior north-east of that plain.

After the intrusion of many cultural elements during the Italian Early Bronze Age, the peninsula seems to have acquired a relatively uniform material culture in the Middle and Late Bronze Age. This culture, which developed from proto-Apennine B to Apennine into Sub-Apennine, is characterised by hand-made impasto pottery, which was characteristically decorated in the first two phases, while left plain in the Sub-Apennine period. Prior to the Late Bronze Age, the settlement pattern in the Italian peninsula appears non-hierarchical with evenly-spaced sites of moderate size. There seems to have been an interdependency between upland and lowland sites based on agriculture and pastoralism. A modest number of sites, generally located on major communication routes, show signs of centralisation, such as a large size, elaborate tombs and an extensive artefact range. However, there are no signs of a complex economy or of the centralisation of ritual activities. This pattern changes in the Late Bronze Age, which reveals a growing number of settlements. Many of these are situated inland on locations that are naturally defended, while on the Adriatic and Ionian coast heavily fortified settlements appear that are associated with ports.

Several attempts have been made to regionally subdivide the (proto-)Apennine culture on the basis of the distribution of variations in artefact and pottery characteristics. These attempts have been heavily criticised, partly because the distribution of the different characteristics does not overlap and partly because the cultural significance of these variations is disputed. A more useful differentiation can be made by reviewing the nature of external influences that are recognisable in separate regions. On this basis, Bietti Sestieri makes a distinction between the Ionian and Adriatic regions on the one hand and Calabria and the

---

45 Radmilli 1974, 488.
48 See for example Peroni 1994a.
49 Lukesh 1984, 14.

266
Tyrrhenian coast on the other hand.\textsuperscript{50} The material culture in Apulia and Basilicata, although typologically connected with the rest of Italy and with trans-Alpine Europe, shows strong evidence of contact with the Aegean, especially in its bronze industry. Our sites, Porto Perone (site no. 299), Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300), Termitito (site no. 302) and Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303), belong with this group. The material culture in Calabria and the Tyrrhenian coast, on the other hand, is characterised by a strong connection with contemporary societies in Sicily and the Aeolian islands. Our sites in Campania and Latium belong to this group, even though Vivara and Ischia “do not entirely correspond to the general cultural trend of the region.”\textsuperscript{51}

The culture of eastern Sicily in the Middle and Late Bronze Age is characterised by the type site of Thapsos (site no. 309). In its first, Middle Bronze Age phase, this settlement consisted of circular and oval huts separated by a grid of streets.\textsuperscript{52} In the Late Bronze Age, quadrangular and polygonal house are introduced. The site is generally referred to as proto-urban during this period. Evidence for the Thapsos culture comes mainly from cemeteries which are scattered over the eastern and central part of the island. In the Late Bronze Age a move away from the coast to large inland sites seems to have taken place.

The Bronze Age on Malta and Gozo can be divided into two phases: that of the Tarxian cemetery site from the Early and Middle Bronze Age and that from the Late Bronze Age type site of Borg en Nadur (site no. 283).\textsuperscript{53} The material culture of the Tarxian cemetery is radically different from that of the previous Neolithic period and shows some affiliations with the finds at Capo Graziano on Lipari. The ceramics of the Borg en Nadur phase, on the other hand, show affiliations with that of the contemporary Thapsos cultures on Sicily. Borg en Nadur itself was a fortified settlement. Too few remains of the Bronze Age have, however, been discovered on Malta to say much more about these societies.

On the Aeolian islands, the Early and Middle Bronze Ages are the scene of the Capo Graziano and Milazzese cultures - named after type sites on the islands of Lipari (site no. 319) and Panarea (site no. 320) respectively.\textsuperscript{54} The material culture of the Capo Graziano phase distinguishes itself from that of the Italian mainland, as well as from that of Sicily.\textsuperscript{55} Instead similarities exist with the contemporary cultures in the Maltese islands, with which the practice of cremation is shared.\textsuperscript{56} The succeeding Milazzese culture, however, shows close relationships with the Sicilian Thapsos culture, as is visible in the oval and circular huts found at Milazzese and Lipari. However, more than in the Thapsos culture there also seem to have been strong ties with mainland Campania. The material culture of the Aeolian islands during the Late Bronze Age is called Ausonio I, which represents a complete break with its predecessors. Instead of Sicily, the material record suggests close ties with sub-Apennine mainland Italy. The abandonment of many settlements in the archipelago and evidence for destructions in the beginning of the Late Bronze Age suggest the arrival of new population groups during this period.\textsuperscript{57}

Sardinia, of course, must be culturally distinguished from the other regions in the central Mediterranean. This island is characterised by the imposing Nuraghe, of which there are said to

\textsuperscript{50} Bietti Sestieri 1984, 66-102; 1988, 33.
\textsuperscript{51} Bietti Sestieri 1984, 87.
\textsuperscript{52} Voza 1973a, 136-138; Tusa 1983, 393-395; Leighton 1999, 150-152.
\textsuperscript{53} Evans 1959, 168-188.
\textsuperscript{55} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 688-696.
\textsuperscript{56} Giannitrapani 1997, 431-439.
\textsuperscript{57} Bernabo-Brea 1979, 582-583; Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 705.
exist at least 7000 which were built in the period from 1500-500 BC.\textsuperscript{58} The possible functions of these Nuraghe are still being debated, but they hint at architectural skills and capabilities to mobilise manpower that surpass that of contemporary mainland Italy.\textsuperscript{59} The period from 1500 to 1200 BC is generally referred to as the proto-Nuragic age, of which the material culture – other than Nuragic architecture - has not been sufficiently studied to draw conclusions about its connections with other regions.

Selection of sites for detailed contextual analysis

On the basis of the descriptions above, heterogeneous regions can be distinguished within the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Italian region. The first group of sites is located along the southern Adriatic coast and around the Gulf of Taranto. Trezano di Monsampolo (site no. 285) must be considered an isolated site, but the spatial grouping on and around the Gargano peninsula is included here. The four sites with notable amounts of Mycenaean ceramics in this region - Porto Perone (site no. 299), Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300), Termitito (site no. 302) and Broglio di Trebisacce (site no. 303) - are all situated around the Gulf of Taranto and have yielded more than 100 ceramic units, except for Porto Perone, which is a class 2 site. All these sites can be considered multi-period sites, although only at Porto Perone LHI-LHIIIA1 material has been found. Porto Perone and Broglio di Trebisacce are the only sites with a contextual rating higher than 3. Considering the necessity to include a site from the later period of Mycenaean pottery in Italy into our analyses, Broglio di Trebisacce is most suitable to be selected.

A second heterogeneous region comprises the Tyrrhenian coast all the way up to Latium and including the Aeolian islands. The sites within this region with more than fifty Mycenaean finds are Lipari (site no. 319) and Vivara (site no. 324). Both sites have produced Mycenaean pottery from various periods, but at Vivara LHIIIB pottery is not present. Lipari, then, is the most suitable site select for detailed contextual analysis in this region. Since much of the Mycenaean pottery at this island is of the first phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy, this site also represents this early period.

A third heterogeneous region comprises central and eastern Sicily. The sites on Malta can also be taken into account in this region or, because of the scarcity of information about the Bronze Age on Malta, can be considered as isolated cases. Three sites on the island of Sicily have produced more than ten Mycenaean finds: Cannatello (site no. 289), Monte Grande (site no. 293) and Thapsos (site no. 309). Of these, Monte Grande has produced Mycenaean pots from the earliest ceramic phases only. Even though Cannatello can be considered a multi-period site, the contextual rating for Thapsos is higher. In addition, the Mycenaean finds from Thapsos which have been published derive from tombs. At Lipari and Broglio di Trebisacce tombs have not been found. The selection of Thapsos for detailed contextual analyses, therefore, brings the use of Mycenaean pots in funerary practices in Italy into the research.

The final region to be distinguished is Sardinia. Of the two sites on this island that have produced Aegean pottery in ceramic styles before LHIIIC, only Antigori (site no. 328) has yielded more than ten ceramic units. However, only LHIIIB and LHIIIC material has been found here, while the contextual rating of this site is not sufficient to warrant selection for contextual analysis. Thus, no site can be selected on Sardinia. Indeed, one may wonder if the LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pottery on this island did not arrive there in conjunction with the more extensive LHIIIC finds.

\textsuperscript{58} Lo Schiavo 1981, 255-341.

\textsuperscript{59} Balmuth 1992, 677.
CHAPTER 15

Lipari

Introduction

Lipari is the largest of the seven islands in the Aeolian archipelago. All these islands are of volcanic origin and the northernmost of them, Stromboli, is still an active volcano. On the south-eastern coast of Lipari, the acropolis, nowadays called il Castello or Cittàde rises to a height of almost 44 meters. It actually is a large block of volcanic glass on the flanks of which the modern town of Lipari spreads into the fertile Diana plain. The present shape of the acropolis is substantially different from that in prehistory. Research on pumice found during the excavations indicate strong volcanic activities around 1000 BC, as well as during the Middle Ages. In addition, defensive walls were built during the sixteenth century AD and a road was cut into the rock in the eighteenth century. Finally, continuous building up to the present day on top of the steep hill has formed a tell, which is up to nine meters thick. The town possesses two harbors: north of the acropolis there is the Marina lunga, while to the south lies the Marina corta. These certainly will have served naval communication with the other Aeolian islands, all of which, with the exception of Vulcano, have produced Late Bronze Age settlements. On three other Aeolian islands Mycenaen pottery has been found: Filicudi (site no. 316), Salina (sites nos. 317, 318) and Panarea (site no. 320). Sicily and the Italian mainland are less than a day’s sailing away and on clear days both are visible with the naked eye.

The first archaeological activities at Lipari were conducted by Paolo Orsi in 1928, who discovered the Greek and Roman necropoleis at contrada Diana. He also excavated some houses and cisterns from the same periods and commented on the presence of prehistoric archaeological material. In 1946 Professor Luigi Bernabò-Brea and Madeleine Cavalier from the Soprintendenza alle Antichità della Sicilia Orientale had started excavations on Filicudi and Panarea, but Lipari remained inaccessible because of the presence of a concentration camp. Only in 1948, when a school was built at the foot of the acropolis, was there a chance to investigate the area. From 1950 to 1952, when the concentration camp had been removed, exploratory campaigns were held under the direction of Bernabò-Brea and Cavalier. More than thirty soundings of limited size were made on the acropolis and the lower Cività plateau north of the Castello. In 1952, large-scale investigations started in the southern part of the main excavation area on the acropolis: at insula IV of the Greek and Roman town, the modern
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3 Keller 1957; Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 653-655.
5 Cavalier 1960, 319.
6 Cavalier 1979; 1981.
7 Orsi 1929.
8 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1976, 6.
9 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1976, 6; 1980, 6.
10 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1976, 6-7
11 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 6-7.
Piazza dell’Immacolata. The excavations in this area lasted until 1954; from 1953 until 1959 the excavations included areas at insulae III and II of the Greek and Roman town. During the same years, excavations were also conducted in the plain to the west of the acropolis, the contrada Diana, where Greek and Roman cemeteries were excavated, as well as settlement levels from the Neolithic and the Middle Bronze Age. From 1953 to 1955 soundings were made on the slopes of the acropolis in the modern village in order to find the Bronze Age necropolis. In 1964 and 1965 two additional campaigns were conducted on the acropolis, in which a number of British universities participated. In 1966 a series of trenches were dug on the plateau of the Cività, directly north of the acropolis. Cleaning and restoration work in the excavation area on the top of the hill in the 1970’s exposed parts of Bronze Age huts, which had hitherto been covered by pavement. A Bronze Age tholos, which had been discovered during reconstructing works at the thermal complex at Lipari, was investigated in 1984 and 1985.

To understand the development of settlement at Lipari, the discoveries at contrada Diana and at the acropolis ought to be viewed together. The archaeological strata in the plain which have produced the most extensive remains, are precisely those with less finds on the acropolis, the same is true the other way around. The earliest phase of the Neolithic, the Castellero Vecchio, has been attested in the Diana plain only. It is part of the wider Stentinello culture, named after a ditch-enclosed village discovered near Syracuse, which is to be dated around 4000 BC. Three subsequent settlement phases of the Neolithic have been attested, each covering large areas. The wealth of the island during the Neolithic era clearly indicates the importance of the obsidian trade. The coming of the Copper Age, of which the Piano Conte culture (c. 3500-2500 BC) is characteristic, is marked by an abrupt change in the ceramic record, which may testify to the arrival of new population groups. During the succeeding Piano Quatara phase (c.2500-2000 BC), however, Lipari seems to have been almost abandoned, with only one settlement at contrada Diana. A radical change in material culture is visible with the beginning of the Capo Graziano culture of the Early Bronze Age (c. 2000-1400 BC), of which extensive remains have been found in the lower plain, as well as on the acropolis. The abundance of a type of black, thin-walled pottery, as well as the complete absence of Mycenaean finds in the plain suggest that the Diana site represents an earlier phase of the Capo Graziano culture and that habitation later shifted to the acropolis. The main settlement remained on the acropolis during the subsequent phases of the Bronze and Early Iron Ages (see below). The acropolis was also inhabited in the Greek and Roman periods.

12 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 8-11.
14 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 3-29. Excavations at contrada Diana took place from 1952 until 1956.
17 Cavalier & Vagnetti 1984, 143; Cavalier 1995, 7-9.
19 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1960, XXII.
20 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 31-32: trenches XVII and XXII.
21 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1960,32, 36-64, 65; 1980, 665-680; these three periods are labeled ceramica tricromica, Serra d’Alto, and Diana style respectively.
23 Bernabö-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 66; 1980, 685-687. Bernabö-Brea (1997, 45) mentions a dozen sherds from the acropolis, which have been dated to this period.
during which extensive necropoleis developed in the plain at contrada Diana.\textsuperscript{28} During the Middle Ages the acropolis appears to have been settled continuously.\textsuperscript{29} Until the eighteenth century, the town of Lipari was confined to the top of the acropolis, within the city walls. In the nineteenth and particularly in the twentieth century, the town of Lipari spread to the slopes and into the lower plain. Since the Second World War, the Castello is a monumental area, with five churches, a park and the archaeological museum.

The Bronze Age layers in the main excavation area have been disturbed by a large number of cisterns dating to the Greek, Roman and later periods.\textsuperscript{30} However, a sequence of four Bronze Age layers has been distinguished below a thick fill with Bronze Age and Greek finds. The earliest Bronze Age layer can be assigned to the Capo Graziano culture of the Early Bronze Age. On the basis of the Mycenaean pottery, it seems that only the second phase of this culture is represented, which should be dated in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries BC.\textsuperscript{31} Even though localized destructions of Capo Graziano structures have been identified, there is not a general, stratigraphical break with the next phase, that of the Milazzese period (c. 1400-1300 BC). However, the latter does represent a substantial change in material culture.\textsuperscript{32} A general destruction is visible between the Milazzese culture and the succeeding layer of Ausonio I, which, again, represents a break in architecture and material remains. Ausonio I has been dated to the thirteenth century, probably extending into the beginnings of the twelfth centuries BC.\textsuperscript{33} This period slowly developed into that of Ausonio II, which was of a longer duration, most likely lasting until the middle of the ninth century BC.\textsuperscript{34}

Remains of the Capo Graziano culture have been found in the main excavation area, as well as in the majority of trenches elsewhere on the acropolis (Map 36).\textsuperscript{35} Only in the test trenches in the south-eastern part of the acropolis, this cultural phase was found lacking. Since much soil must have been taken away in that area in the seventeenth century AD to build the nearby church, it is likely that the settlement occupied the whole surface of the Castello. The discovery of a building dating to this period on the Cività plateau may suggest that the settlement extended outside the acropolis.\textsuperscript{36} Some twenty architectural structures of the Capo Graziano period have been found in the main excavation area (Map 38), while others have been attested in trenches B, G and AP. Most of these huts are fairly small, some 4.5 x 3 meters, and oval in shape.\textsuperscript{37} They appear to have been situated in concentrations of five to six structures, which were separated by empty spaces. Such a spatial organization suggests an important role for kinship groups in the society. In the south of the main excavation area, a structure larger than all others, capanna 6 IV, has been discovered. In association with this hut, which had an internal division and a surrounding wall, a large number of miniature vases have been found. This structure has been interpreted as a possible location for religious

\textsuperscript{27} According to literary tradition, Lipari was colonized around 580 BC by Greeks from Knidos and Rhodes, who settled among the native population, see Cavalier 1957, 14; Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1976, 7, 18-21.
\textsuperscript{28} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1965.
\textsuperscript{29} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1976, 21-22.
\textsuperscript{30} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 8-14.
\textsuperscript{31} Bernabò-Brea 1976-1977, 36; Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 688-698.
\textsuperscript{32} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 699-704.
\textsuperscript{33} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 705-709.
\textsuperscript{34} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 710-718.
\textsuperscript{35} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 509-510.
\textsuperscript{36} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 411. It is unclear whether these remains are contemporary to the settlement at contrada Diana or to the later remains at the acropolis. Mycenaean pottery has not been reported from this structure.
\textsuperscript{37} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 510-514.
practices, while it may also be indicative of social stratification. The vicinity of a small round structure - 8 I - which has been interpreted as a silo, could also be important in this respect. Burials dating to the Capo Graziano period have been discovered at contrada Diana; they involve cremation and secondary burial in large pithoi.

The material culture of the Capo Graziano phase distinguishes itself from that of the Italian mainland, as well as from that of Sicily, even though some imports from both areas have been found. The practice of cremation is very similar to burial practices at the Tarxien cemetery in Malta. Many ceramic forms appear to be related to those of the Tarxien cemetery culture, of which remains have also been discovered on the island of Ognina near Syracuse. Apparently, the material culture of the Capo Graziano phase at Lipari formed part of a wider cultural group in the Mediterranean area. Only a very limited number of bronzes have been found, but the find of a stone mould for bronze tools indicates that objects of this metal are manufactured at the site itself. Obsidian, stone and bone, likewise, appear to have been worked on the island. Among the imports were glass beads, while a similar object in amber has also been found. The local ceramic industry produced a large variety of open and closed vessels in hand-made impasto, both decorated with incision and plain polished wares. Ceramic imports came from Sicily, the mainland and the Aegean.

Remains from the Milazzese phase have been unearthed in various trenches and in the main excavation area, which suggests that habitation at that time covered most of the top of the acropolis. Eighteen huts have been found in the main excavation area (Map 39), while another has come to light in trench F in the north-west. As in the preceding phase, these structures are generally small and they have a round or oval shape; in several cases the walls of houses from the Capo Graziano phase appear to have been used as foundations. The architectural quality visible in the choice of stones and in the presence of foundations varies, but, generally, is somewhat better than that of the preceding phase. Also, there seems to be a wide variation in architectural types. Hut y XI seems to be of a somewhat better quality than other huts, especially because of the presence of rectangular slabs, which have been used as foundations. Moreover, this hut has an oblique, rectangular side. Structure y VI has extensions, of a type also known from Capo Milazzese on the island of Panarea (site no. 320). Structure y XII is of an uncommon polygonal shape and much larger than any of the other huts. Possibly, this exceptional structure served some special function.

In terms of material culture, the Milazzese culture is closely related to the contemporary Thapsos culture in eastern and central Sicily. The local ceramic record at Lipari shares some vessel types - such as the bowl with extremely high stem - with the Thapsos culture. The two phases, while distinct, share common cultural traits and practices, suggesting a strong regional influence. Further study of the material culture and the contextual evidence is necessary to fully understand the dynamics of this complex period in Lipari's prehistory.
repertoires appear to be indebted to one another, but not identical. The ceramic repertoire of the Aeolian islands in this period is much smaller than in Sicily and has much less internal variation. The hand-made impasto includes vessels decorated with incision, among which are a group of ring-shaped vase stands. Apart from the Aegean pottery, a substantial number of vases originating in the Apennine culture of mainland Italy have been discovered at Lipari. Only very few bronzes have been found; a dagger and a ring show that both jewelry and weapons of this material were present.

Outside the main excavation area, structural remains from the Ausonio I phase have also been discovered in trenches B, F, and AH-AH’ (Map 36). This suggests that the village of this period occupied a large part of the top of the acropolis. However, no Ausonio I structures have been attested outside the acropolis, nor is this period represented on the smaller islands of the archipelago. The main excavation area produced the remains of some twenty Ausonio I structures (Map 40). Most buildings, however, are too badly damaged to say anything about their architecture. In comparison with the previous periods, the habitations of Ausonio I appear larger and the variety in plan is generally larger. A number of huts (6 I, 6 IV, 6 V) retain the traditional, oval house plan. Others have a quadrangular or rectangular (6 II, 6 III) plan. Moreover, there is a variety of annexes and straight walls associated with the houses. Variations are also visible in the thickness of the walls and in the techniques used to build them. Below the floors of a few huts, for example below capanna 6 I in the south of the main excavation area, large jars have been found with contemporary cremation remains.

The material record of the Ausonio I culture represents a complete change with that of the previous period. In combination with the visible evidence for destruction and with the abandonment of settlements at the smaller islands and at contrada Diana, it is likely that the beginnings of Ausonio I are connected with the arrival of new population groups. The material culture of this period shows strong affinities with that of the sub-Apennine culture in mainland Italy. A number of bronzes have been discovered in Ausonio I layers, among which are fibulae and crucifix-shaped clothing pins. Two bronze fragments belonging to daggers indicate that this material was not confined to jewelry. The local hand-made impasto, with a repertoire in accordance with its sub-Apennine affiliations, consists of two distinct classes. Non-specialized shapes such as certain cups, buckets and jars, as well as cooking vessels are generally coarse and may be decorated with cords. More specialized vessels, in particular bowls, are of finer clay and have decorated handles and a slip made from imported clay. Apart from the Aegean pottery, a number of painted fragments have been found of a type originating in southern Sicily, even if some specimens were produced on Lipari itself. Another class of pottery, of so-called proto-Villanovan type may have come from the Italian
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52 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 552-557.
54 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 557-558. Probably, some of the bronze objects found in Ausonio II levels in the area of hut α II find their origin in Milazzese levels.
55 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 261-262.
56 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 268-270.
58 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 559.
60 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 112-114, 563. Such burials have also been found in trench B and in association with hut 8 V.
61 Bernabò-Brea 1979, 582-583; Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 705.
62 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 583-586.
63 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 563-565.
64 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 564. Apparently, this slip originates at the nearby coast of Sicily.
65 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 565-568.
mainland. The same may be true for a single sherd of wheel-made gray “Pseudo-Minyan” pottery, of which manufacture has been attested in the region of Broglio di Trebisacce.66 A number of glass beads, most probably imported, and one bead made of amber have been discovered as well.67

**Quantity and quality of the data**

Catalogue VII lists 319 Mycenaean finds, all from settlement levels at the acropolis.68 With one exception, the female figurine with catalogue no. 501, all are sherds of ceramic vessels, many of which are very small. None of these finds have been subject to scientific provenance research and the place of their manufacture cannot be stated with certainty. A number of early finds (cat. nos. 46, 192, 202) have been assigned a Minoan origin. However, most of the earlier material has affinities with the finds at Mycenae rather than with Crete.69 This would suggest an Argolid provenance for the majority of finds. However, Taylour also noted some stylistic similarities with pottery found in Messenia.70 A specific group of Mycenaean finds was labeled as local matt-painted by Taylour, who believed this class to be of Middle Helladic, Cycladic or local origin.71 It has been shown, however, that such pottery continued to be produced, for example in Attica, as late as the LHIII A period.72 Possibly, the matt-painted finds at Lipari originated in Attica, or in another Greek region which continued a local production of this type of pottery into the Late Bronze Age.

Given the care with which the excavations of Lipari have been published, we may assume that the catalogue includes all the Mycenaean pottery that was found. Considering the importance of this class of material for the chronology of the Bronze Age at Lipari, we may also assume that any such find in areas outside of the acropolis would have been reported. We may assume, therefore, that our data-set is complete. It must be acknowledged, however, that the main excavation trenches cover some 1500 sq.m., which is only a fraction of the total surface of the acropolis plateau (ca. 9 ha.). All habitation phases occupied the whole plateau and it is likely that additional Mycenaean pottery is still buried at the site. In particular, the virtual absence of funerary data is disturbing. The Capo Graziano necropolis discovered at contrada Diana probably pre-dates the settlement on the acropolis hill.74 No Milazzese burials have been reported, while only three Ausonio I cremation burials have been discovered.75 A substantial necropolis with some sixty cremation urns has been discovered near Piazza...
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66 Belardelli 1994, with full bibliography.
67 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 586.
68 In my catalogue, 303 finds derive from the catalogue published by Taylour in 1980, which contained 327 entries. The difference between these figures is largely due to the fact that some of Taylour’s fragments derived from the same vessels. In addition, a hand-made fragment (Taylour 1980, 809-810: no. 247) and the “pseudo-Minyan” bowl (Taylour 1980, 815: no. 327) have been excluded by me on the grounds of their Italian manufacture. Cavalier & Vagnetti (1984, 149-150) show that the jar fragments with catalogue nos. 81, 109 and 219 also belong to the same vessel. Because they have been found in different levels they have been kept separate here. According to Lucia Vagnetti (pers. comm.) two Mycenaean sherds have been found elsewhere on Lipari, at the minor site of Castellaru. These have not been included by me.
69 Taylour 1958, 48.
70 Taylour 1958, 51. In particular, these similarities concerned a number of Vapheio - cups (FS 224) with rounded base and decorated with spirals.
71 Taylour 1958, 33-35, 51. The vessels with catalogue nos. 81, 102, 103, 109, 193, 225 belong to this class. They should be distinguished from the imported matt-painted pottery which occurs in Ausonio I and Ausonio II levels. The latter type are early examples of the Italian matt-painted pottery of the Early Iron Age, see Bernabò-Brea 1979, 584; Yntema 1985, 32.
72 Vagnetti 1982, 16-17; Cavalier & Vagnetti 1983; 1984, 150-151.
73 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 509-510; 545-546, 559-560.
74 Cavalier 1980; see above, p. 270.
75 see note 59
Monfalcone on the slope of the acropolis.\textsuperscript{76} These burials have been dated to an early phase of Ausonio II and post-date our period.

The acropolis of Lipari has been continually inhabited from the Bronze Age until the second World War. Extensive leveling operations and the construction of cisterns and the foundations of churches in the main excavation area have considerably altered the topography of the area.\textsuperscript{77} The movement of soil which has been the result of these operations may have resulted in unequal data for the various periods. For example, in the southern part of the site, insula IV of the Greek and Roman town, the Ausonio I layers had largely disappeared, while these remained intact in the northern part of the excavation area.\textsuperscript{78} Doubtlessly, such earth removal has influenced the depositional patterns of the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari. However, in general, the Bronze Age levels, although badly damaged in some parts, have been found in surprisingly good condition.\textsuperscript{79} In my opinion, we may consider our data set representative of the Mycenaean pottery deposited in the settlement at Lipari.

On-site distribution of the Mycenaean pottery

The main excavation area at Lipari can be divided into four parts which have been numbered from south to north (Map 37). Each of these parts is subdivided in excavation trenches of varying size, which are referred to by letters of the alphabet. This sub-division, to which the soundings outside the main area may be added, can be used to study the spatial distribution of the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari (Table 15.1 and Map 37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>area 1</th>
<th>area 2</th>
<th>area 3</th>
<th>area 4</th>
<th>remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trench</td>
<td>amount</td>
<td>trench</td>
<td>amount</td>
<td>trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CC-CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>H-HX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H-I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>H-V</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HX-V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BG-BH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BL-BI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.1

From these figures, it is evident that relatively many Mycenaean finds have been found in the rather small area 1 of the main excavations. This is due to a large extent to trench AO, which produced sixty-three Mycenaean finds. In this part of the site, two thick layers were attested directly below the surface, which produced finds from various periods and which have been interpreted as leveling strata.\textsuperscript{80} Thirteen entries in our catalogue derive from these strata.\textsuperscript{81} In trench N, a layer was encountered more than two meters in thickness.\textsuperscript{82} It produced a wealth of finds, all from the Capo Graziano period, among which are sixteen of our sherd.\textsuperscript{83} Since no

\textsuperscript{76} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 97-192.
\textsuperscript{77} See Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier (1976, 7-22) and Bernabo-Brea (1985) for overviews of activities on the acropolis during its long history.
\textsuperscript{78} Taylour 1980, 816.
\textsuperscript{79} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 8, 11.
\textsuperscript{80} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 342. The uppermost layer contained finds ranging from the Bronze Age to the modern period; the lower layer produced objects datable from the Bronze Age to the Roman empire.
\textsuperscript{81} Catalogue nos. 278, 279, 284-286, 291, 293-296, 300-302.
\textsuperscript{82} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 311-312.
\textsuperscript{83} Catalogue nos. 252-266, 277.
structures, or even a surface, were attested in this layer, it is probable that this was a leveling stratum. An additional thirteen finds included among those ascribed to trench AO derive from the cleaning operations near capanna 6 III. These came from mixed layers in a hole dug behind a wall of that hut, and their stratigraphy is not altogether clear. If we leave out these forty-two finds, the figure for area 1 would be fifty-two Mycenaean finds. Even though less than the figures for areas 2 and 3, this is still a relatively high figure in comparison with the limited surface of area 1. It appears, then, that there was a concentration of Mycenaean finds in the southern part of the main excavation area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part of site</th>
<th>unstratified</th>
<th>C.G.</th>
<th>C.G.-Mil</th>
<th>Mil</th>
<th>Mil-Aus I</th>
<th>Aus I</th>
<th>Aus II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trench AG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trench AH-AH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trench F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.2

Such a concentration may be explained if we investigate the spatial distribution for the various stratigraphical phases (Table 15.2). It is evident that most Mycenaean finds found in stratified contexts derive from Capo Graziano and Milazzese levels. The higher levels yielded far less Mycenaean finds. The northern part of the main excavation area, areas 3 and 4, have produced a relatively high number of Mycenaean finds from the Ausonio periods. It appears that the concentration of our finds in the southern part of the site has to do with the extent to which the Ausonio I and II levels have been excavated. These strata were not present in the south. In the northern area, however, they are well represented and at various places prevented investigation of lower levels. Even though we must acknowledge that the upper levels suffered worse damage through later activities, it is clear that the quantities of Mycenaean pottery imported at Lipari were larger in the Capo Graziano and Milazzese periods than later.

Taking into account stratigraphical variations, then, the Mycenaean pottery is fairly widely distributed in the excavation areas. A large number of trenches have produced limited amounts of Mycenaean pottery, varying from one to ten sherds. A few trenches, however, have produced substantially more of such pottery. In some cases these concentrations cannot be associated with structures or surfaces. In trench AO, however, a concentration is visible in association with hut 6 III of the Capo Graziano period, in which twenty-one Mycenaean finds were made. In trench W, twelve Mycenaean finds were associated with the annex of Milazzese structure γ VI. In trench BM, twelve Mycenaean finds pots were found inside hut γ XII of the same period, while ten additional finds were associated with a wall, the so-called dromos, of Ausonio I hut 6 IV. Such a distribution pattern suggests that Mycenaean pottery was not restricted to specific groups in the society of Lipari; it is possible, however, that some inhabitants made substantially more use of this material than others.

---

84 A concentration of charcoal and ashes were encountered in spit 9, see Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 312.
85 Cavalier & Vagnetti 1984, 144-145.
86 Taylour 1980, 816.
87 Catalogue nos. 173-193.
88 Catalogue nos. 91-103.
89 Catalogue nos. 155-166.
The occurrence of Aegean chronological styles in the successive archaeological strata at Lipari is indicated in Table 15.3. From these figures it is evident that pots in ceramic styles earlier than LHIIIA2 are more frequent than later Mycenaean finds. Indeed, LHIIIA2 finds are rather scarce at Lipari, even though we must allow for the high number of sherds which could not be assigned to a specific stylistic period. LHIIIB finds appear to be somewhat more frequent than those dating to LHIIIA2, but, given the difference in duration between these two periods, it may be concluded that the import of Mycenaean pottery at Lipari dropped sharply with the beginning of LHIII. 91

Stratigraphically, the Mycenaean vessels from the earlier stylistic phases are concentrated in the Capo Graziano and Milazzese levels, while LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB finds occur from the Milazzese period onwards. 92 The LHI-LHII rounded alabastron (cat. no. 271) from an Ausonio I context was found in a pit. 93 It is a relatively small fragment and the varied contents of the pit suggest that it was not in its primary context. This fragment, therefore, cannot be considered as evidence that Mycenaean pots were used as heirlooms or antiques long after their manufacture. The Milazzese period has produced Mycenaean finds from all periods, including a base fragment (cat. no. 60) which Taylour assigned to LHIIIC. 94 This fragment was found associated with the floor of hut γ II, together with eight other Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 52-59) ranging in style from LHI to LHIIIA2-LHIIIB. Such a mixture of chronological styles could indicate that vessels from different periods were used together. However, the small size of the fragments and the fact that a structure of the Capo Graziano (hut δ VII) period has been found directly below γ II indicate that we cannot consider this a closed context. 95 At the lower floor of hut γ I, seven Mycenaean finds dating to LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB (cat. nos. 39-45) were found together with part of a LMI hole-mouthed jar (cat. no. 46). Again, however, the small size of this fragment makes it doubtful that it was retrieved from its primary context. In other words, there is no evidence that the wide chronological variety of the Mycenaean finds from the Milazzese period is due to long use of Aegean ceramic vessels.

91 Taylour 1958, 1980, 816.
93 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 350-352.
94 Taylour (1958, 42: no. 111, Plate 6:26) assigns this fragment to LHIIIC without further comments. It is the base of a closed vessel, on which the marks made by the string in detaching it from the potter’s wheel are visible. Only the underside of the fragment is illustrated and there does not seem to be any decoration. In my opinion, the fragment ought to be classified as of undeterminable date.
95 In fact, Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier (1980, 171) note that these sherds come from the floor of capanna γ II and from directly below the floor.
Table 15.4

The spatial distribution of the Mycenaean chronological types at Lipari, which is indicated in Table 15.4, is of course influenced by the variations in the stratigraphy among the four parts of the main excavation area. The apparent concentration of LHI and LHII finds in area 1, for example, is partly due to the large number of Mycenaean sherds from the leveling strata in areas AO and N below the Graeco-Roman levels. However, sixteen Mycenaean finds dating to these periods have been found in association with capanna 8 III, which suggests that the people associated with this structure had special access to this material in the Capo Graziano period. In general, however, Mycenaean finds in all chronological styles have been found in various areas at the site, suggesting that this material was not restricted to specific groups among the inhabitants of Lipari.

Table 15.5

When we differentiate the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari according to functional vessel type, as is done in Table 15.5, it seems that dinner vessels are more abundant than storage vessels. Such a pattern, however, is due to the large number of fragments of which the vessel types cannot be determined exactly. For many fragments, Taylour has indicated whether they were from a closed or open vessel type, and there are somewhat more closed vessels than open shapes. Even though closed vases, in particular jugs, may be considered dinner vessels, the abundance of closed fragments suggests that the proportion of storage vessel types may be larger than indicated in Table 15.5. In any case, the occurrence of both dinner and storage vessels in most parts of the main excavation area suggests that neither type was restricted to particular groups of people.

---

96 Seventeen Mycenaean finds dated from LHI to LHII (cat. nos. 198, 200, 202, 207, 252-257, 262, 265, 266, 277-279) have been found unstratified in areas N, AO and AP.
97 Catalogue nos. 176-185, 192, 308, 310, 313, 314.
98 A total of 146 entries in the catalogue has been assigned to a closed, shape. There are 110 open shapes, while for 62 fragments it could not be established to what type they belonged. It must be emphasized that Taylour does not specify which vessel types he regards as open or closed. Kraters and some bowls, for example, are classified by him among closed vessels, see Taylour 1980, 807, 811, 812.
The stratigraphy of the Mycenaean functional types is presented in Table 15.6. It is clear that, from the Capo Graziano period onwards, both dinner and storage vessels were imported.

This remained true for all periods, even though the relative proportions of these two Mycenaean functional vessel categories may have varied somewhat. A similar conclusion may be drawn when we look at the stylistical chronology of different Mycenaean vessel types at Lipari, which is presented in Table XXII in the tables section of this book. Among the earlier vessels - LHI and LHII - cups were particularly popular, but a number of jars dating to these stylistical phases have also been found. From LHIIIA onwards, jugs take up an sizable proportion of the imported Mycenaean repertoire, while cups remain important as well. Kraters begin to be imported from LHIIIA2 onwards, just as amphorae, but drinking cups remain the most frequent vessel type. It is evident that the repertoire of Mycenaean pots imported at Lipari remained fairly constant over a long period of time.

Table 15.7 shows the spatial distribution at Lipari of various Mycenaean decorational types. From this table, it is clear that the majority of Mycenaean finds at the site was decorated with abstract and floral designs. The predominance of Mycenaean vessels with patterned decoration is probably even larger, since plain, monochrome and linear sherds may have belonged to vessels with patterned decoration. Indeed, all monochrome sherds are very small and probably belonged to a vessels decorated with lines or patterns. The same can be said of plain sherds, none of which constitutes a substantial part of a vessel. Matt-painted pottery appears to be concentrated in area 2. However, three sherds assigned to this class (cat. nos. 81, 109, 219) and found in this area belong to the same vessel. The stratigraphical distribution of the various decorational types, presented in Table 15.8, shows that the predominance of Mycenaean vessels with patterned decoration is marked only during the Capo Graziano and Milazzese periods. All the plain ware sherds may be attributed to these early periods as well, as is also the case for matt-painted pottery. It appears that the Mycenaean pottery imported at

---

99 The differences in quantity between dinner and storage vessels in the different levels are, as before, due to the high number of fragments. When open and closed vessels are considered instead, there is an equilibrium for the Capo Graziano period (36 open and 37 closed Mycenaean vessels), while during the Milazzese (27 open, 50 closed), Ausonio I (8 open, 13 closed) and Ausonio II (3 open, 8 closed) periods, closed vessels predominate.

100 Among the monochrome sherds, there are several belonging to rims (cat. nos. 22, 139, 181, 212 and 266), handles (cat. nos. 36, 231) and bases (cat. no. 89).

101 Cavalier & Vagnetti 1984, 149-150.
Lipari during the later periods, in terms of decorations, was less varied than that of earlier periods. The wide spatial distribution of the various Mycenaean decorational types at Lipari does not indicate that there were any restrictions in the use of this class of pottery based on its decoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATUM</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>matt-painted</th>
<th>monochrome</th>
<th>linear</th>
<th>patterned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G.-Mil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-Aus I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.8

Apart from giving an overview of the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari, the purpose of this section is to see if any restrictions are visible in the use of this material among the inhabitants of the settlement. The answer to this question appears to be negative, as Mycenaean pottery was widely distributed in the main excavation area. However, in several periods Mycenaean finds are concentrated in specific structures, indicating that the inhabitants associated with them made more extensive use of this material than others. It should also be noted that the occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in the trenches outside the main excavation area is rather limited and that such pottery has not been found off the acropolis. This may suggest that this material was concentrated in the central part of the successive acropolis settlements, where habitation may have been most extensive.

Closed contexts: settlement
The three successive settlements at Lipari which concern us here each consist of groups of structures, generally possessing a single room only. The walls of the buildings are made of unworked fieldstones, which were carefully selected and placed. Even though different groupings of huts may be distinguished, there is no sign of any spatial planning or urban layout. Moreover, in none of the successive strata has it been possible to distinguish clear functional or social variations between the structures, even though signs of specific activities exist. In all three phases, then, we appear to be dealing with relatively undifferentiated settlements. The single-room structures make it impossible to study the distribution of the Mycenaean vessels in individual buildings. In order to assess the cultural associations attached to this material, we need to investigate its distribution in the settlements in general and to study in more detail its occurrence in the buildings of the different phases. Table XXII in the tables section of this study lists all contexts in which Mycenaean pottery has been found on floors.

Capo Graziano levels: H29-H34 (Map 38)
In the southern part of the main excavation area, a concentration of Mycenaean pottery is associated with structure 8 III (H29). This is a building of average size, of which the interior

---

102 The Ausonio II layer is dated from the twelfth to the ninth century BC; it is excluded here, even though Mycenaean pottery has been found in contexts belonging to this phase.
104 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 510-511.
105 The presence of wasters, for example, in hut 8 XII suggests activities of potters, see Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 243-244. The inventory of the building indicates that other artisan and domestic activities took place as well.
has been exposed completely. Possibly, the door of the house was situated in its northern wall. The floor of the building was of battered earth. In the eastern end, two large, almost complete vases have been discovered, set on a stone base. The earth around this base was heavily burned and it is likely that this feature constitutes a fireplace. On the floor of this building, twenty-one Mycenaean finds were made, which is the largest concentration of this class of material at Lipari. In addition, thirteen unstratified finds (cat. nos. 306-318) can be associated with the building. Among the Mycenaean finds on the floors, four are sherds of LHI-LHII cups (cat. nos. 176-178, 184), one belongs to a goblet (cat. no. 173: fig. 15.1) and three to rounded alabastra (cat. nos. 181-182, 185). All other finds are small fragments of uncertain vessel types. These Mycenaean sherds were found together with a great many vases of local impasto, among which are both dinner and storage types (fig. 15.1). A schist plaque was also found. Obviously, this concentration of Mycenaean vessels has primarily domestic associations.

![Fig. 15.1 Mycenaean pottery from the floor levels of caponna 5 III (cat. nos. 173, 185, 181, 182, 176, 177)](image)

Just north of capanna 6 III lay the exceptional structure 6 IV (H2). It is an oval building, three times the size of the average Capo Graziano hut. On the outside, it was surrounded by a perimeter wall, which delineated a rectangular area. The room inside the building was divided into a larger hall and a smaller room in the west. On the floor of the building lay large masses of sherds, from which several complete vases have been restored. Twelve miniature vases suggest that specific activities, possibly of a cultic nature, took place in this building. Mycenaean pottery has not been discovered on the floor. However, two fragments of Vapheio cups (cat. nos. 208, 210) and one handle fragment of a LHIIB goblet (cat. no. 209) were found.

---

in the fill above the floor. The presence of additional miniature vases in this fill suggests that the Mycenaean pots may have been part of the inventory of the building. If so, it would mean that the people associated with this exceptional building did make use of Mycenaean drinking vessels. Structure 6 V (H31), situated adjacent to 6 IV immediately to the west, yielded seven Mycenaean finds. Only a very small section of wall and floor have been exposed, since two fruit trees prevented further excavation to the west. In such a limited area, the seven fragmentary Mycenaean finds, among which are a LHIIA bridge-spouted jug (cat. no. 212) and three semi-globular cups (cat. nos. 213, 214, 216), represent a considerable concentration. Other finds in 6 V included impasto globular vases and carinated cups.

To the north of structure 6 IV, in area 2, much less Mycenaean pottery has been found in situ, which is at least partly caused by the concentration of Milazzese huts in this area. In the quadrangular hut 8 VII (H32), a small Mycenaean fragment (cat. no. 220) was found on the floor, associated with local bowls and jars and carinated cups. Directly below the floor, however, in a level belonging to an earlier phase of the structure, a large part of a LHIIB-LHIIIA1 shallow cup was found, together with some spindlewhorls as well as a large variety of local pottery. To the northwest of 8 VII, structure 8 VIII has been exposed which was almost circular in shape and had a doorway to the south-east. The floor of this building produced soil and animal bones which have been described as kitchen waste. Two Mycenaean fragments (cat. nos. 222-223), as well as part of a Vapheio cup (cat. no. 224) have also been found on this floor, in association with spindlewhorls, jar fragments, a pithos, jugs and carinated cups. On a somewhat higher level, a fragment of a LHII jar (cat. no. 225) was found. Again, the Mycenaean pottery in this area has clear domestic associations.

Directly north of the cardo III of the Graeco-Roman city, parts of hut 8 XII have been discovered (H34). It was a small oval hut of standard size, which was cut into the terrain. In the north-eastern part, burned earth and wasters suggest the presence of a pottery kiln. The burned layer continued into the eastern part of the structure, where a large open vase was sunk into the floor. This floor was made of battered earth on a foundation of small stones. On the floor, a number of stone axes were discovered, together with a bronze needle and some spindlewhorls. None of the Mycenaean sherds found near the floor were associated with the pottery kiln; all were found in the eastern and southwestern part of the structure. Among the vessels were a LMI jug (cat. no. 235), a LHI hole-mouthed jar (cat. no. 231) and a LHIIA semi-globular cup (cat. no. 228). In addition, five Mycenaean fragments of undeterminable type were found (cat. nos. 229, 230, 233, 234). This concentration of Mycenaean pottery - the northernmost in Capo Graziano strata - obviously can be associated with the activities of artisans.

In considering the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the Capo Graziano phase at Lipari, we must allow for the disturbances post-dating this period. The absence of Mycenaean finds in situ from the northern part of the main excavation area is surely caused by the presence of many later structures; because of these the deepest level could be explored only to a limited extent. The on-site distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery as a whole (section 3), as well as the cultural associations which have been investigated here, show that the Aegean vessels were an integral part of the material culture at Lipari. Three concentrations of Mycenaean ceramic vessels are apparent, in huts 8 III, 8 V and 8 XII, suggesting that these vessels were used more extensively by specific groups among the inhabitants at Lipari. The two largest concentrations have been observed in structures adjacent to the exceptional structure 6 IV. The exact nature and status of this building is unclear, but it is possible that it served exclusively ceremonial
functions.\textsuperscript{112} If true, the virtual absence of Mycenaean pottery in this building indicates that this material was not extensively used in ceremonies, but had mainly domestic associations. The fact that the people living nearest to this exceptional structure made the most extensive use of Mycenaean, however, testifies to the social significance of these vessels.

\textbf{Milazzese levels: H35-H41 (Map 39)}

The southernmost part of the main excavation area has not produced any structures from the Milazzese period.\textsuperscript{113} Area 2, however, produced a group of at least eight buildings, most of which were fairly small and of oval shape. The smallest of this group of huts is γ I, which is situated in the south-west (H35).\textsuperscript{114} The stones of the superstructure of this building had fallen into the single room. In this destruction layer, two Mycenaean fragments have been found (cat. nos. 37-38), among which was one from a LHIIIB shallow cup. Below this layer, a floor was attested at the level of the base of the walls. On this floor lay a bronze ring, and a large amount of decorated and impasto pottery, among which were a great many cups. Together with these vessels, eight Mycenaean fragments have been found (cat. nos. 39-46), of which one came from a LHIIIB cup (cat. no. 45), one from a LHIIIA2 jug (cat. no. 40) and one from a LMI hole-mouthed jar (cat. no. 46). The small size of each of these fragments makes it doubtful that they were still \textit{in situ} at the time of their discovery.

To the east of γ I lay the larger cabin γ II (H36),\textsuperscript{115} which used the walls from the Capo Graziano cabin β VII as foundation. In addition, there is evidence for at least one rebuilding during the Milazzese period. A floor level was indicated by a line of objects, such as a grinding stone and a pounder, but the actual floor itself has not been recognized. The approximate floor level contained eight Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 52-60), among which were a fragment of a LHII Vapheio cup (cat. no. 54) and a rounded alabastron (cat. no. 53). Two jugs (cat. nos. 55, 56) have been dated to LHIIIB-LHIIIA1 and LHIIIA1-LHIIIA2 respectively, while a shallow cup (cat. no. 57) is in LHIIIA2-LHIIIB style. The small size of the fragments, the variety in their stylistical chronology and the absence of a true floor suggest that these finds were not \textit{in situ}. In the destruction debris of this building, a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB fragment was found which may belong to an amphoroid krater (cat. no. 50); the debris also contained a Mycenaean fragment (cat. no. 51) of undetermined shape. The Mycenaean fragments in both levels were associated with some pottery fragments imported from mainland Italy and with an abundance of local decorated and impasto vessels.

To the north of γ I lay the quadrangular structure γ III (H37).\textsuperscript{116} This building, in general, is of less architectural quality than others of the same period, which is particularly apparent in the choice of stones for the walls. The floor was constructed of a layer of pebbles pressed into battered earth. In the western corner, a large grinding stone lay on this floor, while a pounder lay close nearby. In a level directly above the floor, fragments of a Mycenaean jug (cat. no. 65) were found, of which other fragments have been discovered in structure γ II. A small fragment of a LHIIIA1-LHIIIA2 shallow cup (cat. no. 66) and one of a stirrup jar (cat. no. 67: fig. 15.2)) were discovered as well. This stirrup jar is the only one of this vessel type found at Lipari. Another unique discovery is a large part of a Mycenaean female proto-phi figurine (cat. no. 501). A fragment of imported Apennine pottery, as well as local dinner and storage vessels

\textsuperscript{112} It needs to be acknowledged that the inventory of β IV included many items which may be assigned a domestic function, among which is a grinding stone.
\textsuperscript{113} Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 163. Finds dating to the Milazzese period in this area have been made only in levels associated with modern disturbances. The uppermost undisturbed layer has been dated to the Capo Graziano period.
\textsuperscript{114} Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 163-167.
\textsuperscript{115} Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 168-172.
\textsuperscript{116} Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 174-177.
were associated with the Mycenaean finds. An anthropomorphic figurine of local clay was also recovered.\textsuperscript{117} Even though the internal stratigraphy of this hut is not altogether clear, it is obvious that the Mycenaean pottery in structure υ III had predominantly domestic associations. The fact that the only Mycenaean figurine found at Lipari occurred together with a local statuette suggests that it was employed in local cultural practices. This is testimony of the extent to which the imported Mycenaean items were part of the local material culture.

The largest Milazzese structure in this part of the excavation area is υ VI (H38), which is also of superior architectural quality.\textsuperscript{118} It is an oval structure, orientated roughly east-west, with the doorway in the northern wall. On the northern side, two walls suggest the presence of an annex or courtyard, similar to the ones known from contemporary structures on the island of Panarea.\textsuperscript{119} Below the destruction level, which contained the stones of the superstructure, a floor was attested. In the layer associated with this floor, an LHII Vapheio cup (cat. no. 85), as well as two LHIIIA jugs (cat. nos. 86, 87) and a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB shallow cup (cat. no. 88) have been discovered together with two small Mycenaean fragments (cat. no. 89-90), Appennine dinner and storage vessels imported from the Italian mainland, and a wide variety of local pottery, much of it decorated with incision. The annex of υ VI extends below the cardo III of the Greek and Roman town and, for that reason, could not be fully excavated. The stratigraphy of the annex is not altogether clear, but a total of thirteen Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 91-103) have been made in the small section that was excavated. Among the Mycenaean finds were fragments of a LHIIIB miniature jug (cat. no. 93), a matt-painted carinated cup (cat. no. 102) and an amphora (cat. no. 103). All other Mycenaean finds are fragments of undeterminable shape, except for a jug fragment (cat. no. 97). This material was associated with a fragment of imported impasto and with a variety of local pottery. The Mycenaean repertoire from the annex is varied, with two vessels - the miniature jug and the carinated cup - of types unique to Lipari. The amphora has only two parallels at the acropolis site (cat. nos. 18, 27), both from Ausonio I contexts. The association of these vessels with a large and elaborate structure may indicate that the people associated with this structure had access to a wider repertoire of Mycenaean vessels than inhabitants from most other buildings.\textsuperscript{120}

Fragmentary remains of building υ VIII (H39) have been discovered somewhat north of cardo III of the Greek and Roman town.\textsuperscript{121} Some of the walls of this structure were founded on those from cabin δ XII, but the Milazzese structure appears to have been substantially larger than its predecessor. Only a very small part of the floor of υ VIII remained, which was of battered earth covered with pebbles. A fragment of a LHII-LHIIIA1 goblet (cat. no. 114) was found on this floor, associated with a wide variety of local impasto vessels. The destruction layer above the floor produced three Mycenaean fragments (cat. nos. 110, 11, 113) and a large part of a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB kylix (cat. no. 112), together with a spindlewhorl and various local open and closed pot shapes. Capanna υ VIII may be considered average, both in terms of architecture and in terms of inventory. The presence of two Mycenaean stemmed cups in such a building shows the extent to which these vessels were part of the material record at the site during the Milazzese period.

Structure υ XII (H40) differs completely from all other Milazzese structures.\textsuperscript{122} It has a polygonal shape, with five regular sides. The floors of this building were at a much deeper level than the corresponding level outside, showing that the structure had been cut deep into the

\textsuperscript{117} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, Plate 185: no. 1.

\textsuperscript{118} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980,181-186.

\textsuperscript{119} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1968, 50-70.

\textsuperscript{120} Possibly, the same statement should be made for structure υ III, which yielded a Mycenaean stirrup jar and a figurine.

\textsuperscript{121} Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 188-190.

\textsuperscript{122} Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 201-206.
surface. The northern and south-eastern walls of the structure were made of large stones, which were rounded by water and must have been transported from a beach specifically for this purpose. Such stones do not make very good walls and it is questionable whether the structure was roofed. The southern wall, however, was of good quality. The inside of this structure was destroyed to a large extent by a later cistern. In the central and northern parts, however, a floor was attested, on which lay fragments of a LHII cup (cat. no. 155), a LHIIIA2 mug (cat. no. 156), a LHII squa jug (cat. no. 159) and a LHII Vapheio cup (cat. no. 162), along with eight fragments of indeterminable shape. These sherd were associated with an imported Appennine jar and a variety of local impasto vessels. The fill above the floor produced a fragment of a large piriform jar (cat. no. 154), together with three Mycenaean fragments (cat. nos. 151-153), local pottery and a stone axe. The nature of this extraordinary building is not known. Even though unconventional in terms of architecture, the inventory of y XII, including the Mycenaean pottery, compares well with that of contemporary structures.

The last Milazzese structure to be discussed is cabin y XIV (H 13), which is situated in the northernmost part of the main excavation area, where a modern drainage system had caused much destruction. Only a small section of wall from y XIV remains, which shows that this building must have been quite substantial in size. A fragment of a LHII cup (cat. no. 171) was found on the associated floor, together with a large mass of local pottery.

From the distribution of Mycenaean pottery among the Milazzese structures, we may conclude that this material was widely used by the population of the village. A large number of buildings from this period has produced substantial amounts of this pottery, usually including a standard repertoire of Vapheio and shallow cups, as well as jugs. In a few Milazzese structures, some vessels were found which are not very common at Lipari. This is the case for the alabastron and krater at y II, the stirrup jar and figurine at y III, the stemmed cups at y VIII and the mug at y XII. A small concentration of three uncommon Mycenaean vessels has been found in the annex to y VI. This may suggest that the people associated with this extraordinary structure had special access to imported Mycenaean goods. It may also be that the extraordinary repertoire is related to the activities carried out in such an annex, which may be different from those inside the cabins. All that can be said with certainty is that Mycenaean pottery during the Milazzese period was widely used among the inhabitants at Lipari and that it was an integral part of the local material culture.

Ausonio I levels: H42-H43. S2 (Map 40)
Levels belonging to the Ausonio I period had all but disappeared in the two southern areas of the main excavation. In area 3, however, several large huts have been found, which, unfortunately, were heavily damaged by cisterns dating from the Greek period to the modern age. In the eastern part of area 3, a well preserved oval hut was attested, which has been labeled B IV (H42). The architecture of this building is of exceptional quality: the thickness of the walls is very regular and some blocks appear to have been worked. The doorway of this cabin was in the north and it was approached by a long pathway, flanked by a wall extending for almost seven meters, which has been called the dromos. Within the structure, a succession of three floors dating to Ausonio I has been attested, while two later floors yielded Ausonio II material. On the latest Ausonio I floor, a LHIIIB krater fragment has been discovered, in association with a possible bronze weapon, a fibula, ovoid stone bowls and a variety of local pottery. The second floor of the building did not produce Mycenaean finds, but on the original floor, a fragment of a Mycenaean amphora has been found, together with imported pottery from an unknown origin. A stone bowl, terra-cotta spindlewhorls and local impasto pottery

were also present on the original floor. The area of the *dromos* (S2) was heavily disturbed by a modern cistern. It was excavated in two parts, one near the doorway of the cabin and one in the area of the lower cabin y XII. Ten Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 19-28) were made in the second part, but their stratigraphy is not certain. Among them are two LHIIIB deep bowls (cat. nos. 19, 21), an amphora dating to the same period (cat. no. 27) and a LHIIIB-LHIIIC kylix (cat. no. 28). Numerous fragments of two vessels of Sicilian type were also found in the *dromos*.\(^{125}\)

In the northernmost part of the main excavation area an unusual structure 6 X (H43) was discovered.\(^{126}\) The building had a rectangular shape, was orientated north-west to south-east, and had very thick walls. A doorway has been attested in the northern corner of the structure. A substantial number of Mycenaean finds were made in this building, belonging to seven vessels (cat. nos. 29-35), among which were a LHIIIB-LHIIIC deep bowl (cat. no. 34) and a LHIIIB stemmed bowl (cat. no. 35). All other fragments belonged to large, closed vessel shapes. These fragments were found together with local cups and jars.

In comparison with the earlier stratigraphical phases, Mycenaean pottery was not very abundant during the Ausonio I period. The number of Mycenaean finds made in closed contexts is very low indeed, due to the disturbances of this level. Yet, it is remarkable that two concentrations of Mycenaean finds during this phase have been found in association with atypical structures. One of these, structure 6 IV, also produced relatively large numbers of pottery imported from Sicily and Sardinia.\(^{127}\) The concentration of the Mycenaean vessels suggests that the use of this pottery during this period was not widespread, but restricted to specific groups among the inhabitants at Lipari.

One purpose of this section is to review whether a differentiation can be made according to Mycenaean vessel types regarding their use among the inhabitants of the successive villages at Lipari. During the Capo Graziano period, cups and jugs are relatively widely distributed and they occur in most of the contexts investigated here, being absent only in H33. A similar situation is visible for the Milazzese period, in which various cups and jugs also form the majority of the Mycenaean finds. During this period, however, a wider variety of other vessel types has been found as well, in particular in association with the annex of H38. A sharp break in the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery is visible with the coming of Ausonio I. No cups or jugs occurred in the contexts investigated here,\(^{128}\) but bowls and amphorae have been found. The Mycenaean finds from the Ausonio I period were restricted to specific buildings. It appears, then, that the monopolization of Mycenaean pottery by specific groups at Lipari during this period is related to the exclusion of vessel types which had had a wide distribution during previous centuries.

**The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Lipari**

The three successive strata vary in the extent to which they have produced objects other than the Mycenaean ceramic vessels deriving from international and regional exchange. In the Capo Graziano level, a bead of white-blue glass paste was found in structure 6 XXI.\(^{129}\) An Aegean

---

\(^{125}\) Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 566. It is not sure whether these vessels are the result of a local production in imitation of Sicilian vessel types or that they constitute genuine imports.

\(^{126}\) Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 155-156.

\(^{127}\) Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 566, 568.

\(^{128}\) In fact, only one of each of these Mycenaean vessel types have been discovered in Ausonio I levels (cat. nos. 13, 14).

\(^{129}\) Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 516.
origin for the glass beads in Italy has been proposed. However, a production of glass products within the central Mediterranean cannot be excluded, as is suggested by the evidence for the circulation of glass ingots in the eastern Mediterranean. Together with the glass bead from 6 XXI, an amber bead was found, which must have been imported. The same may be said of a decorated comb made of bone (fig. 15.2). This object is exceptional in comparison with the other items of worked bone found in the same level and an Aegean origin has been suggested. The Lipari comb is earlier than a series of similar combs in ivory found in Italy, for example at Torre Mordillo (site no. 305) in the Sybaris region. The example from Lipari is decorated with circled dots, of a type with a long tradition in Sicily and southern Italy. Similar circled dots occur on a comb dating to the Middle Bronze Age from a tomb in southwestern Sicily. The place of manufacture of the Lipari comb may well be in the Italian area, but other bone combs from the Bronze Age are known from the Levant, Greece and the Balearic islands. The Lipari comb, then, may be understood as an object associated with an international world. Additional imports at Lipari constitute a few ceramic vessels found in Capo Graziano levels which may have been produced in Sicily.

Fig. 15.2 Decorated bone comb from the Capo Graziano period

The finds mentioned above testify that Lipari participated in inter-regional exchange during the Capo Graziano period. In comparison with the Mycenaean pottery, however, imported objects are relatively scarce. In such a material environment ceramic vessels of Aegean origin

---

130 Taylour 1958, 51-52; Vagnetti 1989. See, however, Harding (1982, 87-103), who concludes that most beads of glass/faience in the central and western Mediterranean, as well as in trans-alpine Europe, are local or regional products.

131 Pulak 1988, 14; Vagnetti, personal communication.

132 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 516, Plate 158: no. 1.

133 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 516.

134 Arancio et al. 1995, 230 fig. 7 no. 6. This comb is probably made from hippopotamus ivory and decorated with dots surrounded by double circles. It has a good parallel in a comb from French tomb 6 at Enkomi, which has been dated to LCIIA-LCIIB; see Schaeffer 1936a, 100 fig. 41: upper right corner. For a discussion of the relationship between the Lipari bone comb and the later ivory examples, see Vagnetti 1986, 211.

135 Tusa 1986, 134. For a parallel to the decoration on the Lipari comb, see the small circled dots on a bone disk from Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287); Wilkens 1998, 236.

136 Tusa 1986, 134, fig. 3. This is a comb of rectangular type decorated with circled dots. It was found in a tomb dated to the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 1400-1300 BC) near Castelvetrano.

137 For a brief overview of the distribution of combs during the Bronze Age, see Tusa 1986, 134-136. For an overview of the distribution and cultural significance of combs, mainly pertaining to the Early Iron Age, see Buchholz 1984-1985.

constitute imports which were present in relative abundance. We have seen that during the Capo Graziano period Mycenaean pottery was widely available to the inhabitants of Lipari. At the same time, residents living in the vicinity of the exceptional building 6 IV possessed more of this material than others. This indicates that this material was part of consumptive strategies. It seems logical to assume that the fact that these vessels were imported was an important ground for their social significance.

The Milazzese levels at the acropolis of Lipari have produced far fewer objects which may be identified as imports than the previous phase. A number of Appennine vessels imported from the Italian mainland have been found in several structures belonging to these levels. However, such pottery is much less frequent at Lipari than in contemporary levels on Panarea and Salina. In addition, few metal objects have been found and no objects other than pottery which were clearly imported. Within such a material environment, it is possible that Mycenaean pottery acquired a special significance since it represented a class of objects from international exchange, which were available. Precisely during the Milazzese phase, however, the Mycenaean pottery is widely distributed and an integral part of the local material culture in almost all structures. Apparently, the fact that these vessels were imported did not result in sumptuary restrictions to specific social groups. Even though Aegean vessels during this period may have been highly appreciated for their quality, they do not seem to have been part of social strategies.

In comparison with the previous periods, Mycenaean ceramic vessels were relatively scarce during the Ausonio I period. Other imports dating to this period are a glass bead and one made from amber, which were found in cremation urns on the acropolis. In comparison with earlier periods, metal objects were relatively abundant, among which were pins, fibulae and a dagger. The metal hoard discovered below hut α III, which comprised a large number of bronze weapons and tools and initially was assigned to Ausonio I, however, probably belongs to the earlier stages of Ausonio II. Among the impasto pottery, vessels imported from Sicilia, Sardinia and the Italian mainland have been attested. Within such a material environment, Mycenaean pottery is only one class of objects associated with maritime exchange. Sicilian and Sardinian pottery was found associated with the Mycenaean ceramics in the exceptional building 6 IV. It seems, then, that the restricted distribution of the Mycenaean pottery during the Ausonio I period has to do with its imported nature. Apparently, ceramic imports were socially significant and used in sumptuary strategies. The differences between the three periods at Lipari in the appreciation of Mycenaean ceramic vessels appear to be related to the degree to which maritime contacts were significant.

In various periods during the Neolithic and the Bronze Age, the Aeolian islands featured a local pottery industry. The local impasto from the Capo Graziano, Milazzese and Ausonio I phases varies considerably in repertoire and technique. Whereas the Capo Graziano pottery is, generally, rather coarse, the finest wares from the Milazzese and Ausonio I periods are made

---

139 Such pottery has been found in contexts in structures γII, γIII, γIV,γVI, γVII, γ XII, see Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 171, 176, 179, 183, 187, 205.
140 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 551.
141 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 586.
142 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 583-586.
143 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 733-789. The catalogue includes more than three hundred bronze items.
144 Moscetta 1988.
145 Bernabò-Brea 1979, 583; Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 566-568.
146 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 566, 568.
147 Williams (1980) carried out an extensive petrological program in order to investigate the feasibility of a local ceramic industry on the islands.
of well levigated clay and are covered with a slip layer. Moreover, some vessels are decorated with incised abstract and floral designs, elements which already occur occasionally during the Capo Graziano period. Elaborate handles and stems, likewise, add a decorative element to the Milazzese and Ausonio I pottery. Notwithstanding the quality and variation of the local impasto, the imported, wheel-made and painted Mycenaean vessels stand out as distinctive, high-quality items.

John Williams has identified three different paste groups among the impasto sherds found at Lipari. The first, group A, to which the overwhelming majority of finds on the island can be assigned, consists of fabrics evidently manufactured locally. Even though clay sources are not very abundant on modern Lipari, in antiquity the island obviously did support an indigenous potting industry. Fabric group B does not originate in a volcanic area and this pottery must have been imported, most probably from northwestern Sicily. Fabric group C does not come from a volcanic region either, but this fabric has volcanic inclusions. Such a combination of minerals would suggest that the pottery was manufactured locally on Lipari, but that the clay was imported and local minerals were added to it.

With only a few exceptions, the impasto pottery found in Capo Graziano levels at the Castello belongs to William's group A and, consequently, can be considered to have been produced locally. The kiln in cabin 5 XII (H34), in fact, is evidence for local pottery manufacture during this period. In addition, pits have been attested with thick layers of clay, which have been interpreted as containers in which clay meant for pottery production was kept cool. Capo Graziano vessels, in particular pithoi, have been found at Tindari in Sicily, which suggests that there was regional exchange of such pottery. A wreck dating to the first Capo Graziano phase has been discovered in the bay of Lipari. It contained a wide range of local ceramics from this early period, showing that such pottery could be transported. However, the impasto pottery from the Capo Graziano settlement on Filicudi (site no. 316) was produced on that island itself and shows substantial typological differences from that found on Lipari. This fact suggests that regional exchange of ceramics during the second Capo Graziano phase was of a limited scale. The small number of vessels produced in Sicily found at Lipari during Capo Graziano may be evidence of the same phenomenon.

During the Milazzese and Ausonio I periods, the ceramic repertoire of the Aeolian islands is much more homogeneous than in the preceding period. Moreover, the finest ceramics are made of local clay and covered with a slip originating in Sicily. This pottery falls into William's group C and testifies of a regional transport of clay for pottery production. In comparison with the Capo Graziano period, regional pottery exchange seems to have been much more substantial during Milazzese and Ausonio I, as may also be deduced from the larger quantities of pottery imported from the Italian mainland, Sicily and Sardinia. It is possible that the Mycenaean pottery was supplemented to the objects circulating in regional exchange networks.

149 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 519.
150 Williams 1980, 863-866.
151 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 517-518.
153 Cavalier 1970. Since these pots have not been subject to William's research, it is impossible to establish whether they are of local manufacture or actual imports.
155 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 518-519, 549.
156 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 548-550, 563-565. During the Milazzese period, the pottery at Filicudi differs somewhat from the other islands in the sense that fine wares are absent.
157 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 564. Apparently, the region in which this slip originates is different for the two periods.
Lipari is the largest of the Aeolian islands and the successive settlements discovered at the
acropolis are generally larger than their counterparts on the other islands. In addition, the
Lipari Castello has by far the most strategic position and it is the only location with a
continuous settlement lasting from the beginning of the Neolithic until the Iron Age. It is
tempting, then, to regard Lipari as a center in successive systems of regional exchange. The
Mycenaean pottery, which has been found in smaller quantities on Filicudi (site no. 316),
Salina (sites nos. 317, 318) and Panarea (site no. 320), would also appear to fit such a pattern.
We need to realize, however, that all settlements on the islands are very small, containing only
a few hundred inhabitants at the most. In terms of the sophistication of architecture or the
presence of imported goods and metals, there is little evidence for a social-political hierarchy,
both within and among the settlements on the islands and the nearby coasts. It is uncertain
whether the Lipari acropolis can be considered a political or economic maritime center in the
region before the Ausonio I period, when it became the only inhabited village in the region.

At the site of Vetta della Montagnola on Filicudi (site no. 316), more than eighty
Mycenaean finds have been made in levels dating to the Capo Graziano and Milazzese
phases. Even though such an amount is smaller than that found at the acropolis of Lipari, it
should be acknowledged that the latest Mycenaean imports at Filicudi have been assigned to
LHIIIA1, while Lipari has produced pottery in later ceramic styles. If we compare the
number of finds from Lipari in styles earlier than LHIIIA1, the difference with Filicudi is not
substantial. The Mycenaean vessels on Filicudi were distributed rather homogeneously
among the structures at the site. The repertoire of Mycenaean decorated vessels found on
Filocudi compares well to that of Lipari. However, an important difference with the acropolis
site on Lipari is the presence of substantial quantities of early matt-painted pottery and of
coarse ware. On this basis, it may be stated that the corpus of Mycenaean pottery on Filicudi
is different from that found at Lipari, especially during the earlier Capo Graziano period.

The settlement at Punta Milazzese on Panarea (site no. 320) produced some fifty huts,
which have all been dated to the Milazzese period. Some forty Mycenaean sherds have been
found, dating from LHII to LHIIIB and which occurred in twenty huts, with a concentration in
cabins X and XI. Disturbed levels of the Capo Graziano and Milazzese period were also
found near Serro dei Cianfi (site no. 318) on Salina. The nearby site of Portella (site no.
317) on the same island, has been assigned to the Milazzese period exclusively and produced
only eight buildings. The few Mycenaean vessels, dating to LHIIIB-LHIII A, were found

159 It is estimated that the largest village, the one on the Lipari acropolis during the Capo Graziano phase,
could have contained five to six hundred residents, but was probably inhabited by much less people, see
Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 509-510. For the Milazzese village at Panarea an estimate has been made of
only one-hundred fifty inhabitants, see Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1969, 55.
161 Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 705.
164 A total of 198 Mycenaean finds, which have either been assigned a stylistical date before LHIII A1-LHIII A2
or remain undated, derive from Capo Graziano and Milazzese levels. If we exclude the undatable fragments,
102 Mycenaean finds fall into this category.
167 Bernabô-Brea and Cavalier 1968, 50-70.
168 Bernabô-Brea and Cavalier 1968, 186-189. Structures X and XI also yielded higher quantities of local
pottery, indicating that the concentration of Mycenaean pottery in these huts depended on an extensive use here
of pottery in general.
169 Cavalier 1957, 9; Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1968, 138-143.
170 Cavalier 1957, 10; Bernabô-Brea & Cavalier 1968, 144-148.
concentrated in cabin F, together with items from at least two necklaces containing beads of stone, glass and faience.\textsuperscript{171} It is clear that the three chronological periods differ in the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was distributed among the islands.

The use and appreciation of the Mycenaean pottery at the acropolis site on Lipari seems to have varied according to the social significance of maritime contacts. Given their geographical position, we may assume that maritime contacts have always constituted an important element in the societies of the Aeolian islands.\textsuperscript{172} Regional pottery exchange, however, appears to have been relatively limited during the Capo Graziano period and it is possible that the Mycenaean pottery arrived on Filicudi and Lipari relatively independently. During this period at Lipari, Mycenaean pottery was widely used, but some groups among the inhabitants made more use of this material than others. In the Milazzese period, there appears to have been extensive regional pottery exchange and Mycenaean vessels were widely distributed as well. At Lipari during this period, Mycenaean pottery was widely used among the inhabitants of the village and it was not subject to sumptuary regulations. This may have been different, however, on Panarea and at Portella on Salina, where concentrations of this material have been noted. Finally, during the Ausonio I period, exchange among the islands was halted, due to the destructions of the villages on the minor ones. By this time, Mycenaean pottery had become scarce at Lipari and it was monopolized by specific social groups. There appears to have been a correlation between the intensity of regional maritime exchange and the social role of Aegean pottery. Such a correlation is an indication that Aegean contacts were of importance for the scale and scope of regional exchange.\textsuperscript{173} In addition, it may be stated that their association with maritime trade made the Aegean vessels at Lipari suitable to be part of social strategies during different periods.

\textsuperscript{171} Bernabô-Brea \& Cavalier 1968, 166-167.
\textsuperscript{172} Bernabô-Brea 1976-1977, 40; Di Gennaro 1997, 423.
\textsuperscript{173} See also, Bernabô-Brea 1976-1977, 40; Bernabô-Brea \& Cavalier 1980, 695. According to Bietti-Sestieri (1997, 475), small groups of Mycenaeans were gradually incorporated in local communities during the Milazzese period.
CHAPTER 16

Thapsos

Introduction

Halfway between Augusta and Syracuse, at the Ionian coast of Sicily, the peninsula of Magnisi, ancient Thapsos, stretches into the sea.\(^1\) It consists of an oval strip of land, ca. 2150 by 800 meters, which is connected to the Sicilian mainland by a narrow strip of land. The limestone bedrock rises above sea-level to a maximum of eighteen meters and is covered by a thin and discontinuous layer of soil. Agriculture, therefore, will have been practiced in the plain at the base of the isthmus connecting Thapsos to Sicily.\(^2\) To the north, this plain rises up to the Iblei mountains, while to the south-west lay the Epipoli terraces.\(^3\) The narrow isthmus could easily be fortified for defensive purposes, while the coast is difficult to approach by sea.\(^4\) Near the isthmus, there are at least two good anchorages and the site is situated in proximity to several Mediterranean maritime routes.\(^5\)

The first archaeological interest in the site was taken by F. S. Cavallari, who explored several tombs during two campaigns in 1873 and 1879.\(^6\) These investigations were followed by a campaign in 1894 directed by Paolo Orsi, who excavated a large number of tombs. Many of these were published, with descriptions of the tombs and summaries of their contents.\(^7\) In 1951 nine additional tombs were excavated,\(^8\) which have not been published. Another five tombs, likewise awaiting publication, were investigated by L. Bernabò-Brea in 1962.\(^9\) During the following campaign directed by the same scholar in 1964, the first traces of the settlement were found.\(^10\) Industrial expansion threatened the site at the end of the 1960’s and the archaeological service conducted a series of excavations at the peninsula from 1968-1975, which were directed by Giuseppe Voza.\(^11\) In doing so, the site has been salvaged from further destruction and it is now protected by a wall.

All tombs at Thapsos seem to belong to the fifteenth to thirteenth centuries BC.\(^12\) Habitation on the peninsula seem to have taken place even earlier, however, as is testified by a fortification wall with towers that dates to the Castellucia period of the Early Bronze Age.\(^13\) Most of the settlement remains date to the Middle Bronze Age, a period of which Thapsos is

---

\(^1\) Bernabò-Brea 1970, 139; Voza (1985) shows some beautiful aerial photographs.
\(^2\) Orsi 1895, 90-91. At present, the plain is an industrial zone and salt production is practiced.
\(^3\) Voza 1972, 175.
\(^4\) Bernabò-Brea 1970, 139.
\(^5\) See, for example, Marazzi 1988, 6-7.
\(^6\) Cavallari 1880, 122. He gave descriptions of the tombs, but did not publish their contents.
\(^7\) Orsi 1895.
\(^8\) Gentili 1953, 215-216.
\(^9\) Bernabò-Brea 1966, 113.
\(^10\) Bernabò-Brea 1966, 113-114; 1970.
\(^12\) Bernabò-Brea 1973a, 144. Orsi (1895, 95) believed the oldest tombs to belong to the seventeenth or sixteenth century BC, but evidence for such an early dating is missing.
\(^13\) Tusa 1983, 303.
the Sicilian type site. A second settlement phase may be dated from the twelfth to the ninth centuries BC. It is uncertain whether any of the graves may be assigned to this period. The famous Thapsos-class cups, as well as fragments of proto-Corinthian ware, all of which were found in re-used tombs, appear to post-date the settlement. Although Thucydides (VI, 97) mentions that Greek colonists from Megara occupied the site before establishing Megara Hyblaia in 729 BC, remains from this period have not been discovered. The same is the case for the alleged Athenian presence during the siege of Syracuse in 414 BC. The peninsula appears to have remained uninhabited for a very long period, but the tower of the lighthouse dates to the sixteenth century AD. The island served as a quarry for limestone until the end of the nineteenth century.

The settlement at Thapsos is located in the area where the narrow isthmus joins the peninsula (Map 41). The first settlement phase consisted of small round, oval and irregular huts, while the second phase produced at least two large buildings consisting of rectangular chambers, connected to each other by hallways and streets and incorporating smaller round structures. Large irregular blocks which are the remains of a defensive wall with towers have been discovered to the south-east of the settlement. The necropolis extended outside these fortifications. Most tombs were situated near the lighthouse along the northern and the north-eastern coasts, but smaller concentrations of tombs have been found in the center of the peninsula and in the south. The majority of tombs consists of a chamber which is hewn out in the rock. In some cases, niches of varying size are present. Only a few tombs possess a vestibule next to the burial chamber. A number of tombs built on the northern coast have long, shaft-like dromoi leading in the direction of the sea. Other tombs, especially those on the rocky plateau, have a chimney-like entrance into the chamber. Orsi estimated that some three hundred tombs were present at Thapsos, of which more than one hundred have been excavated. Apart from these rock-cut tombs, nine enchrytrismoi have been found, for which large pithoi have been used. Apparently, these pithos burials are contemporary with the rock-cut funerary chambers.

Chamber tombs of the type found at Thapsos have been discovered at a number of sites in eastern and central Sicily and seem to be characteristic of the culture. They have been used

---

14 Voza 1973a, 136. The 'Thapsos culture' is generally dated to the thirteenth century BC, see Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 176-178.
15 Bronze objects suggest that the second settlement phase is contemporary with the first period at Pantalica, which should to be dated to the twelfth and eleventh centuries BC, see Bernabò-Brea 1976-1977, 96-97. Finds which may stylistically be related to the Maltese Bahrija period indicate that the settlement was used at least to the ninth century, see Voza 1973b, 15.
17 Orsi 1895, 91.
19 Orsi 1895, 95.
20 Bernabò-Brea 1970, 142-144; Voza 1972, 177-178; Tusa 1983, 391-393
22 Voza 1972, 190; Tusa 1983, 395.
23 Orsi 1895, 92-94; Voza 1972, Tav. 1; Tusa 1983, 395-396.
24 Orsi 1895, 94. Earlier, Cavallari had arrived at a figure of 260 tombs.
25 Bernabò-Brea (1970, 140) arrives at a figure of 104 of which the inventories could be identified at the Syracuse museum. The tombs excavated by Orsi (1895) are numbered from 1 to 66, but of twenty-four tombs no description is given. The nine tombs excavated in 1951 have never been published, although Taylour (1958, 58: nos. 10 and 11) studied the Mycenaean material. The five tombs excavated in 1962, likewise, have never been published. Two tombs excavated in the most recent campaigns have been published, see Voza 1973b.
26 Voza 1972, 200-204.
for multiple burials; in two cases almost fifty skeletons were retrieved from one tomb.\textsuperscript{28} The grave goods deposited in these tombs contained jewelry such as beads, bronze weapons and tableware, and included a wide variety of ceramic types.\textsuperscript{29} The number of dining vessels and some animal bones suggest that ritual feasting was part of the funerary rites.\textsuperscript{30} Vessels which may be considered ceremonial, in particular decorated bowls on extremely high stems, as well as some figurines, point to the symbolic significance of burial practices. Apart from the Mycenaean vases, Cypriot pottery\textsuperscript{31} and ceramic types from Malta\textsuperscript{32} have been found in the tombs, showing that Thapsos was part of the international Mediterranean world.

**Quantity and quality of the data**
The Mycenaean finds found in a funerary context at Thapsos are presented in catalogue IX, which contains thirty-eight entries. None of the material in the catalogue has been subject to scientific provenance research. Taylour noted that many of the decorative motifs on the Mycenaean pottery from Thapsos had their best parallels at Chalcis on Euboea in Greece.\textsuperscript{33} In his opinion, various other vessels were related to the ‘Levanto-Helladic’ class of pottery. It would seem, then, that most of the Mycenaean vessels from the tombs at Thapsos were indeed imported from Greece. Taylour ruled out a Rhodian origin, as had been suggested previously.

All the vessels and sherds in catalogue IX derive from the tombs at Thapsos. In the settlement at Thapsos, Mycenaean pottery has also been found.\textsuperscript{34} However, these vessels or their context have not been published and they are excluded here. It is not certain that the thirty seven vases in the catalogue are all the Mycenaean pots found at the necropolis. Even though not from every tomb the inventory has been published,\textsuperscript{35} the special attention for Aegean pottery, as well as its distinctiveness from the impasto wares make it not very likely that sherds have been thrown away. However, the fact that all published Mycenaean items from Orsi’s excavation appear to belong to almost complete vessels, argues for some caution.\textsuperscript{36}

A large number of tombs were in a very bad state when excavations began.\textsuperscript{37} Many of the dromoi were open to the sea, through which water and sand could enter the funeral chambers and it is likely that archaeological material has been washed out. In addition, there was clear evidence of looting from ancient time onwards, while the limestone miners or calcarari had substantially damaged the tombs as well.\textsuperscript{38} The amount of information available for the funerary inventories, therefore, varies highly. The number of tombs excavated, as well as the stylistic unity of the Mycenaean material at Thapsos, however, suggest that the vessels in the catalogue may be considered as representative for all the Aegean pottery at the necropolis.

\begin{itemize}
\item Tomb 10 and the tomb excavated in 1970 each contained forty-nine skeletons, see Orsi 1895, 105; Voza 1972, 195.
\item Orsi 1895; Voza 1972, 195-200.
\item Orsi 1895, 142-144.
\item Voza 1973b, 36: nos. 85-87 show two Base Ring jugus and a jug in White Shaved ware. According to Karageorghis, these vessels are not of Cypriot manufacture, but imitations made in Sicily, see Karageorghis in the discussion in Muhly 1986, 61. Vagnetti (1986, 201-202) also comments on the fabric of the White Shaved juglet, which may not be of Cypriot origin.
\item Voza 1973a, 146-156.
\item Taylour 1958, 65-66.
\item Voza 1972, 205. According to Leighton (1999, 152) the Mycenaean pots from the Thapsos settlement are to be dated LHIIIAl-LHIIIC.
\item See note 24.
\item In later excavations Mycenaean fragments of indeterminable vessel shape has been found, see Bernabò-Brea 1966, 113.
\item Orsi 1895, 94-95.
\item Orsi 1895, 96.
\end{itemize}
Funerary analysis

In total, sixty-seven tombs from Thapsos have been published, including the nine enchytrismoi. Mycenaean pottery has been reported from twenty-two of these, as is indicated in Table XXIV in the tables section of this book. Such a figure could indicate that only a minority of the tombs contained Mycenaean pottery. However, the heavy disturbances in many of the funerary cellars, as well as the small number of Aegean vessels in most of the tombs argue for caution in this respect. Little can be said about the spatial distribution of the tombs with Mycenaean pottery. Most tombs excavated by Orsi were situated in the large necropolis near the lighthouse in the north of the peninsula (Map 41); although he excavated some tombs in the south as well, we may assume that most of our tombs were located in the area near the lighthouse. Tomb A1 was also situated in this area. The tomb excavated in quadrant XXI/47, however, is situated in the necropolis at the center of the island (Map 41), while this was also the case for the tombs excavated by Bernabò-Brea in 1962. It appears that Mycenaean pottery was not concentrated in a specific spatial group of tombs.

The descriptions of the tombs given by Orsi, in some cases, are very short. Nevertheless, it is clear that Mycenaean pottery has been found in tombs with a dromos, as well as with so-called chimney entrance. Moreover, tombs with only one funeral chamber, as well as those with a vestibule have produced Mycenaean material. Finally, the tombs with Mycenaean pottery vary in the number of niches attached to the funerary chamber, the same can be said for the size of the cellar and the elaborateness of its entrance. Among the tombs without Mycenaean pottery the same characteristics can also be found. Our vessels, therefore, do not seem to be limited to a specific type of tomb. We may state that Mycenaean pottery, even though very limited in a quantitative sense, was relatively widely distributed in the necropolis of Thapsos.

Such a wide distribution is also apparent when we look at the quantities of Mycenaean pottery in each of the Thapsos tombs (Table XXIV). The large majority of tombs have yielded only one Mycenaean find, whereas only four tombs have produced two or three of our vessels. One funerary cellar constitutes an exception to this rule: tomb XXI/47 produced nine Mycenaean finds, which is three times the maximum of any other tomb. Tomb XXI/47 has been excavated recently and it may be that the more thorough methodology used by Voza in comparison with that of Orsi seventy-five years earlier is partly responsible for this large quantity of finds. Moreover, this tomb is situated at the center of the island and had not been

---

39 See note 24. The figure of sixty-seven tombs includes forty-two tombs published by Orsi (1895), the nine tombs from the 1951 campaign, the five tombs from 1962, two tombs (XXI/47, A1) from the most recent campaigns and the nine enchytrismoi.
40 The finds from 1951 have all been considered as coming from separate tombs because Taylour (1958, 58), who studied these finds, does not mention that they were found together. From the 1962 campaign it is known that several fragments of Mycenaean pottery have been found, see Bernabò-Brea 1966, 113. We do not know whether these were found in one or more tombs.
41 Orsi 1895, 94.
42 Voza 1973b, 31.
43 Voza 1972, 195.
44 Tusa 1983, 395.
45 For example, tombs 1, 2, 28, 37, 48, 61.
46 For example tombs, 51, 53 and XXI/47.
47 Tombs I and XXI/47 possessed a vestibule, see Orsi 1895, 95-98; Voza 1972, 195.
48 Tomb XXI/47 possessed two niches, while tomb 48 possessed five of them. For all the other tombs with Mycenaean finds no niches have been described.
49 Whereas most of our tombs had a rather small funerary chamber, tomb 10 was particularly large. Tomb 28 possessed a monumental entrance consisting of posts cut out in the rock, see Orsi 1895, 113-116.
50 The enchytrismoi did not contain any goods, see Voza 1973, 200.
51 This tomb was excavated in 1970, see Voza 1973b, 34: tomba D.
subject to the heavy erosion by the sea. Nevertheless, it would seem that there is a relative concentration of Mycenaean pottery in this tomb.

Table XXV shows the vessel types which occur in the funerary cellars at Thapsos. The only types which occur in substantial quantities in the tombs are piriform jars and alabastra. Together, these two classes of storage vessels constitute more than half of the total number of Mycenaean pots at the site. A limited range of other vessel types are also present, none of which occurs more than a few times in the tombs. Stylistically, these vessels range from LHIIIA1 to LHIIIA2-LHIIIB. There do not seem to be any concentrations of vessels from specific stylistical periods, which is in agreement with the idea that these tombs have been used for substantial periods of time.

Fig. 16.1 Mycenaean and Cypriot vessels from Thapsos tomb XXI/47 (cat. nos. 31, 35, 36)

The distribution of the Mycenaean vessel types is rather uniform. Many tombs have produced one, in some cases two, piriform jars, while the alabastra, likewise, are generally found in isolated, single examples. Neither of these vessel types appear to be concentrated in one tomb, although it is clear that tomb XXI/47 has produced more of these Mycenaean types than any other tomb. All other vessel types occur as single, isolated examples in a number of

52 Orsi 1895, 94-95; Voza 1972, 195.
53 Thirteen of these are small types with horizontal handles of FS 44-48 (cat. nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 34, 38). One small piriform jar (cat. no. 3) has two horizontal handles only, which is comparable to a similar vessel (labeled FS 45) from Enkomi, see Dikaios 1969, 372: no. 147, Plate 210: no. 44. Two piriform jars (cat. nos. 32-33) have vertical handles and are larger (FS 35-36).
54 There are nine straight-sided alabastra (cat. nos. 2, 5, 6, 20, 26, 29, 30) and two rounded alabastra (cat. no. 25, 31), the first of which with a squat shape. The rim fragment of catalogue no. 22 can only generally be assigned to an alabastron.
55 A small piriform jar (cat. no. 7) and a squat alabastron (cat. no. 25) can be assigned a LHIIIA1 date. Two small piriform jars (cat. nos. 1, 18) are classified as LHIIIA1-LHIIIA2. Eight piriform jars (cat. nos. 6, 8, 13, 19, 24, 33, 34, 38), two jugs (cat. nos. 12, 17), one straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 29), one shallow cup (cat. no. 35) have a LHIIIA2 date. Five straight-sided alabastra (cat. no. 2, 5, 20, 26, 30), four piriform jars (cat. nos. 1, 9, 16, 18), a globular jug (cat. no. 4), a stirrup jar (cat. 15), a stemmed cup (cat. 36) and a deep bowl (cat. no. 37) have been assigned to LHIIA2-LHIIIB. The remaining eight finds (cat. nos. 10, 11, 14, 21-23, 27, 28) have not been assigned a stylistical date.
56 Such would be indicated by the large number of burials, see Tusa 1983, 480.
toms. It is remarkable, however, that all three open dinner vessels - a shallow cup (cat. no. 35), a stemmed cup (cat. no. 36) and a stemmed bowl (cat. no. 279) - have been found in tomb XXI/47.\(^\text{57}\) It appears that this tomb did not just possess a larger quantity of Mycenaean pots of vessel types which also occur in other tombs; it produced a wider variety of Mycenaean pots as well.\(^\text{58}\)

Given the natural and man-caused destructions, it is difficult to classify the Thapsos tombs according to the wealth of their inventories and architecture. Orsi has indicated for each tomb the number of burials, mainly based on the presence of human skulls, which varied from one to forty-nine.\(^\text{59}\) Most tombs, however, produced less than twenty-five skeletons and the two which yielded forty-nine burials, tombs 10 and XXI/47, are exceptional. Both of these tombs have produced a wide variety of grave goods, such as bronze jewelry and local pictorial pottery in the case of tomb 10,\(^\text{60}\) and gold, a bronze sword and glass beads in the case of tomb XXI/47.\(^\text{61}\) Both tombs also contained Mycenaean pottery. These tombs indicate that the wealth of the funerary inventory is, at least to some degree, dependent on the sheer quantity of burials and the number of funeral ceremonies.

The presence of a *dromos* in front of a tomb cannot be considered an architectural feature indicative of status or wealth, since it seems to have been determined mainly by the location of the tombs. The tombs in the depression in the northern part of the island possess a *dromos*, but such a feature would have been impractical for the funerary caves hewn out in the plateau itself.\(^\text{62}\) The presence of a vestibule in front of the actual burial chamber is rare, however, and may be indicative of a certain elaborateness of the funerary ritual.\(^\text{63}\) The same can be said of a number of niches in the main funeral chamber and of a certain monumentality in the tomb entrances through carved posts and lintels.\(^\text{64}\) Two tombs are described as “exceptionally large” by Orsi.\(^\text{65}\) On these grounds, twelve tombs may be considered to be of elaborate architecture, which, in terms of effort expenditure,\(^\text{66}\) could indicate a special status for the group associated to these tombs. Of these twelve tombs, a minority of five (tombs 1, 10, 28, 48 and XXI/47) produced Mycenaean pottery. With the exception of XXI/47, each of these tombs yielded only a single specimen of such pottery. In terms of the presence of Mycenaean pottery, therefore, these tombs do not distinguish themselves from the others.

As far as the funerary inventories are concerned, there are a few classes of artifacts which may be considered special because of their scarcity in the tombs, in particular gold, bronze jewelry and weaponry, as well as glass beads (Table XXIV).\(^\text{68}\) Among the thirteen tombs possessing such special objects, eight (tombs 1, 2, 10, 14, 37, 51, 61 and XXI/47) did also produce Mycenaean pottery. Most of these eight funerary cellars produced only one

---

\(^\text{57}\) Closed dinner vessels, *e.g.* jugs, have been found in single specimens in three tombs (cat. nos. 4, 12, 17), which is in accordance with the pattern for the storage vessels.

\(^\text{58}\) Such a wider variety is an argument against the possibility that the abundance of Mycenaean pottery in this tomb is due to conservation and excavation techniques only.

\(^\text{59}\) From many tombs Orsi (1895) does not report skeletons.

\(^\text{60}\) A local impasto jar has incised figures of animals, see Orsi 1895, 104, Tav. IV 14.

\(^\text{61}\) Voza 1973b, 34-40.

\(^\text{62}\) Orsi 1895, 92-94; Tusa 1983, 395. Of course, the location of the tombs itself may be of great importance for the symbolism of the burials. Chronology possibly plays a role in the location of the tombs as well.

\(^\text{63}\) Such a vestibule is present only at tombs 1, 6, 25, 31, and XXI/47, see Orsi 1895, Voza 1972, 195.

\(^\text{64}\) Such niches have been reported for tombs 25, 31, 33, 38, 48 and XXI/47, see Orsi 1895, Voza 1972, 195.

\(^\text{65}\) Tombs 23, 28 and 62 possess such a monumental entrance, Orsi 1895, 11-114, 134.

\(^\text{66}\) Tombs 10 and 25, see Orsi 1895, 104-105, 112.

\(^\text{67}\) Brown 1981, 29.

\(^\text{68}\) Gold has been found in tomb XXI/47 only; bronze jewelry appeared in tombs 1, 6, 10, 14, 57, 59, 60; bronze weaponry was found in tombs 2, 10, 37, 41; glass beads were found in tombs 29, 51, 61 and XXI/47.
Mycenaean vessel; tomb 2, however, possessed three imported pots and tomb XXI/47, of course, produced nine such specimens. In terms of the presence of Mycenaean pottery, however, the tombs with rare objects in their funerary inventories do not stand out from others.

A few classes of ceramic objects in the Thapsos tombs may be considered to have possessed a high symbolic significance. This may have been the case for the elaborately decorated stemmed basins, which appear to have served a special role in funerary ceremonies since they have been found in most of the tombs at the site (see fig. 16.1). Local pottery decorated with incised representations of animals occurred in only a limited number of tombs, of which the majority (tombs 10, A1 and XXI/47) produced Mycenaean pottery as well. Only two tombs produced pottery imported from Cyprus, both of which also yielded Mycenaean pottery. In a few tombs, cups have been found which have their best parallels at Borg en-Nadur on Malta, a concentration of such vessels was found in tomb 64, in which three Mycenaean pots were also found. Even though it must be acknowledged that Mycenaean pottery is more abundant in the Thapsos tombs than Maltese or Cypriot vessels, it appears that these imported classes are associated with each other. In this respect it may be of importance that three of the four tombs with glass objects, which possibly were imported as well, also contained Mycenaean pots. It appears that the imported nature of the Mycenaean pots was of significance in their inclusion in the tombs at Thapsos.

On the basis of its architecture, as well as because of its inventory comprising metal, glass and imports, tomb XXI/47 can be considered the most wealthy by far. Even though, as stated above, this may be due to the number of burials in this funerary cellar, tomb 10, with an equal number of burials, cannot be considered nearly as wealthy. The fact that a relatively large quantity of Mycenaean pottery has been found in tomb XXI/47 indicates, firstly, that this material was considered suitable to be associated with a wealthy inventory. Secondly, in comparison with the scatter of Mycenaean pots in the other tombs, it suggests that Mycenaean vessels through variations in quantity and variety could actively be involved in strategies of display. The fact that Mycenaean open dinner vessels were concentrated in this tomb indicates that such vessels possessed a special significance in the funerary practices of Thapsos.

The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Thapsos
Mycenaean, Cypriot and Maltese imported pottery form only a small part of the ceramic record in the tombs at Thapsos. Maltese cups have been found in relative abundance in the

69 Orsi 1895. One of these basins was found in quadrant XLVI/32 in the settlement of Thapsos, suggesting that this type of vessel had wider ceremonial use; see Voza 1973a, 144-145.
70 Tombs nos. 10, 38, A1, XXI/47.
71 Tomb XXI/47 produced two Base Ring II ware vessels and one White Shaved ware jug. In tomb A1 another White Shaved ware jug was discovered, see Voza 1973b, 36, 40: nos. 85-87, 118.
72 Bernabò-Brea 1958, 133. Tombs 22 and 64 have produced such vessels, in particular one-handled stemmed cups, cups with conical stem and conical cups. Such vessels have also been found in tombs A1 and XXI/47.
73 Taylour 1958, 51-52; Vagnetti 1989. See, however, Harding (1982, 87-103), who concludes that most beads of glass/faience in the central and western Mediterranean, as well as in trans-alpine Europe, are local or regional products. In any case it is clear that glass was among the goods circulating in the Mediterranean, see for example the glass ingots found in the Ulu Burun wreck, Pulak 1988, 14.
74 Glass beads have been found in tombs 29, 51, 61 and 2147; of these tomb 29 did not produce any Mycenaean pottery.
75 Thompson (1979) makes a distinction between goods that provide status because of their single presence and goods which may be collected in order to increase prestige. This last category is especially suitable to serve in strategies of conspicuous consumption, where food and objects are taken out of circulation, see Voutsaki 1997, 37-40. Funerary deposit is a form of such conspicuous consumption.
76 This can easily be deduced from the descriptions of the tombs by Orsi (1895) and Voza (1973b).
settlement contemporary with the necropolis. The same cannot be said for Mycenaean or Cypriot pottery, which appears to have been scarce among the settlement finds. This could indicate that Mycenaean pottery served predominantly for funerary purposes at Thapsos. However, the scarcity of Mycenaean finds at Thapsos could also have a chronological cause, and it seems best to be cautious in this respect until the full publication of the settlement. For now it seems clear that Mycenaean pottery could serve in strategies of funerary display. As concluded above, the imported nature of Mycenaean vessels appears to have been important for their social significance.

Thapsos is the type site of Late Bronze Age culture of south-eastern Sicily, which is mainly known from tombs. A number of necropoleis have been discovered in the area of Syracuse. At Syracuse (site no. 346) itself, a group of tombs has been discovered of which one contained a LHIII/2 straight-sided alabastron and a Cypriot Base Ring jug. At Molinello (site no. 308), a LHIII/2 piriform jar was found in a tomb which was part of a group of six tombs in the southern part of the site. At Matrensa/Plemmyrion (site no. 311), some forty tombs were excavated, all dated by Orsi to the Bronze Age. Only one tomb, accidentally discovered in 1871, produced two Mycenaean piriform jars. At Cozzo del Pantano (site no. 312), likewise, a substantial necropolis of at least thirty-six tombs has been excavated. Only one Mycenaean vessel was discovered in tomb VII: a LHIII/2 kylix. At Floridia (site no. 313), two tombs have been discovered close to one another, one of which yielded a LHIII/2-LHIIIIB straight-sided alabastron. The LHIIIIB stirrup jar from Maiorana (site no. 314) was also found in a tomb, but nothing is known about its location. Similar necropoleis and isolated tombs have also been discovered further away from Thapsos, in the Ragusa valley and in the interior of Sicily.

In the area of Syracuse, then, all necropoleis from this period have produced some Mycenaean vessels. The actual quantity of this type of pottery is very low, but, at the same time, it must be acknowledged that the cemeteries are much smaller than the one at Thapsos. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that Thapsos yielded a relatively high proportion of ceramic vessels imported from the Aegean. In terms of Mycenaean vessel types, the repertoire of pots found in the cemeteries in the area is comparable to the corpus in Thapsos. The Mycenaean kylix found at Cozzo del Pantano, however, may be considered remarkable, since such vessels have been shown to be very rare at the type site and restricted to the group of people associated with tomb XXI/47.

---

77 Voza 1973a, 147-149.
78 See the reply by G. Voza to a question in: Voza 1972, 205. Only full publication of the settlement, of course, will reveal the extent to which Mycenaean pottery has been found in the two successive settlements.
79 Vagnetti pers. comm.
80 On the Thapsos culture, see Tusa 1983, 399-425 (with bibliography).
82 Orsi 1902, 413-421; Tusa 1983, 482-485. Other tombs, dating to various periods, were found to the north; a Mycenaean sherd was discovered in a cave near the southern necropolis; see, also Taylor 1958, 60-61.
83 Orsi 1899, 26-42; Tusa 1983, 490-491. Two pieces of amber, which were discovered together in another tomb than the Mycenaean pots, are the only other clearly identifiable imports in this substantial necropolis.
84 Taylor 1958, 62.
85 Orsi 1893, 1-36.
86 Taylor 1958, 61-62.
87 Orsi 1909, 374-378.
88 Taylor 1958, 64.
91 At Matrensa/Plemmyrion, as well as in Cozzo del Pantano only one in some forty excavated tombs (ca. 2.5%) produced Mycenaean pottery. At Thapsos, 22 of 106 excavated tombs yielded such ceramics (ca. 20.5%).
Thapsos, with its large proto-urban settlement, its extensive necropolis and its coastal location, probably constituted the center in a regional system of exchange. The fact that Mycenaean pottery comparing well to that of Thapsos has been found in necropoleis in the interior shows that such ceramics were not restricted to the coastal center, but circulated, to a limited extent, in regional exchange networks. Even though wealth appears to have been concentrated at Thapsos, the Mycenaean vessels in the hinterland suggest that there existed a system, which linked the coastal proto-urban inhabitants to groups in the interior through the limited distribution of wealth (wealth finance). The role of imported Mycenaean pottery in the relationships between the communities in the interior and on the coast is testimony of the symbolic value embodied by these objects deriving from maritime trade. It is likely that it was exactly this symbolism which made these vessels suitable to be employed in strategies of funerary display.

92 Tusa 1983, 504.
93 Tusa 1983, 504-505.
In the type of Syracusan, thirall, all excavations from this period have produced some Mycenaean vessels. The actual quantity of this type of pottery is very low, but at the same time, it must be acknowledged that the sites do not seem to have been occupied by many. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the sites on this type of pottery are very rare. Such sites are known to have been occupied by many.

Vaccaro 1972: 147-129

6. See the reply by G. Mora to questions on Vaccaro 1972: 295. Only 125 pieces of this type of pottery have been found in the two excavations.

7. Vaccaro pers. comm.

On the Mycenaean context see Tsou 1983, 389-428 (in Archi


9. Orci 1982, 81-821, 142-403. Other sites dating to various periods, were found in the north and southern Mycenaean settlement at the type site, the Cretan 1935, 53-54.

10. Orci 1989, 26-42. The type site, which was discovered in 2000 near the southern Mycenaean town at the Archi 1935, 53-54.

11. Vaccaro pers. comm.

CHAPTER 17

Broglio di Trebisacce

Introduction
The plain of Sybaris consists of thick alluvial deposits surrounded by mountain ranges to the north-west and south-west, while to the east stretches the Ionian sea. Several wide rivers cross the plain, containing water only in spring when the snow in the surrounding mountains has melted. Broglio di Trebisacce is situated one kilometer from the coast on a high terrace in the foothills of the Pollino massif at the northern end of the plain of Sybaris. The plateau of Broglio, the highest of a series of terraces which are separated by pronounced gorges, overlooks the plain and the long coastline. It controls the coastal passage to the plain of Basilicata, which provided access to sites such as Termilito (site no. 302) and, ultimately, to the region of Taranto and coastal Apulia. The location of Broglio, thus, was favorable with regard to interregional traffic, both by land and by sea. On a regional level, more than twenty pre- and protohistoric sites have been identified in the hills surrounding the plain of Sybaris, suggesting that the area was substantially populated from the Middle Bronze Age onwards.

Even though the region of Sybaris has been the focus of archaeological attention since 1879, when Cavallari began the search for the archaic city of that name, Broglio has, as far as I know, not been visited by these explorers. Attention was first drawn to the site when Middle and Late Bronze Age sherds were found there in 1978. Excavations at the site started in 1979, conducted by the Cattedra di protostoria Europea of the University of Rome ‘La Sapienza’, in collaboration with the Centro studi di Protostoria and headed by Renato Peroni. From that year onwards a series of seven excavation campaigns were conducted up to 1985, which have been fully published. Since 1990 excavations have resumed at Broglio, again headed by Peroni. A total of nine campaigns have been carried out up to 1998, which have only been published in preliminary fashion.

Broglio di Trebisacce appears to have been settled continuously from the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 1400-1300 BC) into the Early Iron Age (ca. 900-700 BC). Even though some finds dating to the Neolithic period have been made, the lowest level at the site, immediately upon the very compact, stony earth which constitutes the virgin soil, has produced finds from the

---

1 Cotecchia 1993, 32-34.
3 Peroni & Vagnetti 1982; Buffa & Peroni 1982; Belardelli et al. 1994. The concentration of sites in the foothills may be caused by the alluvial nature of the plain itself, with sediments possibly covering other sites. Sybaris itself was covered by deposits of 3-4 meters thick (pers. obs.)
4 Rainey & Lerici 1967, 26-35.
5 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982a, 37.
6 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b; Peroni 1982b; Peroni 1984; Peroni & Trucco 1984; Peroni & Trucco 1994. See also, the other articles in the same volumes.
8 Peroni 1982a, 1-2; Peroni 1994. For absolute dates, see Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 170; Peroni 1998.
9 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 84.
Middle Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{10} Above this level, a sequence of strata has been attested,\textsuperscript{11} which can be assigned to the Late (ca. 1300-1200 BC) and Final (1200-1000 BC) Bronze Ages respectively. Above these, the uppermost layer, which can be subdivided into several phases has produced finds and structures from the Final Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (1000-700 BC).\textsuperscript{12} After the latter period, the site appears to have been abandoned. The hill itself has remained uninhabited, but medieval and modern sherds which have been attested in the topsoil testify of agricultural activities at the site.\textsuperscript{13} The report of a necropolis from the fifth century BC in the town of Trebisacce indicates that some kind of habitation took place in the near vicinity of the site.\textsuperscript{14} The plain of Sybaris and its surrounding foothills have produced ample evidence for habitation during later periods, of which the site of Sybaris itself, of course, is the most notable.\textsuperscript{15} In 1928-1932 the plain was drained and improved for agriculture, during which large masses of earth were removed.\textsuperscript{16}

The site of Broglio di Trebisacce seems to have covered the whole terrace already from an early period onwards.\textsuperscript{17} Apart from the main plateau, a small hill directly to the south, the so-called Castello, should be considered as part of the site, since a Bronze Age tomb was discovered there.\textsuperscript{18} On the plateau itself, five restricted areas have been excavated up to 1985 (Map 42). The two areas situated on the top of the hill, A and C, were heavily damaged by erosion and ploughing, and the virgin soil appeared directly below the top soil.\textsuperscript{19} The fact that finds dating to all settlement periods have been attested in the topsoils, suggests that the area was inhabited from the Middle Bronze Age onwards. Area E, which encompasses ca. 25 sq. m and has been excavated in 1983, likewise, was damaged by erosion and ploughing.\textsuperscript{20} Directly below the disturbed layers, however, in the virgin soil, five postholes have been interpreted as the remains of an oval hut,\textsuperscript{21} which can be dated to the second phase of the Middle Bronze Age.

Trench B was first excavated in 1979-1980 and was enlarged to the west from 1983 onwards, to encompass ca. 130 sq. m.\textsuperscript{22} In the south-eastern part of this trench, in the virgin soil (level 4 inf.), a ditch has been discovered with eight post-holes and field stones, which may have served as a foundation for a stone wall with wooden posts.\textsuperscript{23} Somewhat to the north of this ditch, three additional post-holes have been attested, while a few meters away there was a

\textsuperscript{10} Peroni & Trucco 1994, 40. The earliest levels have been discovered in area E, which appear to date from the second phase of the Middle Bronze Age, see Peroni & Trucco 1994a, 80-84.
\textsuperscript{11} Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 42; Peroni & Trucco 1994. Each of the main phases have been subdivided into substrata sometimes indicated by capitals (levels 2A, 2B, etc.) and sometimes referred to by the terms ‘inferiore’ and ‘superiore’ (3 inf., 3 sup., etc.).
\textsuperscript{12} Bergonzi & Cardarelli (1982b, 42-43) made a distinction between ploughed topsoil (S) and a layer of humus (H), which they interpreted as non-ploughed topsoil. Later it was established that these layers actually contained remains of the latest settlement phases, see Peroni & Trucco 1994, 28-29, 68-80.
\textsuperscript{13} Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 42.
\textsuperscript{14} Guzzo 1976, 48, figs. 10-12. A red-figured stamnos and three lekythoi are the only evidence of the necropolis at Trebisacce. According to Bergonzi and Cardarelli (1982a, 38 note 7), villagers reported that the necropolis had been situated at the site of the present grammar school, some two hundred meters from the coast.
\textsuperscript{15} For Sybaris, see, Sybari m 1972; Sybari IV 1974.
\textsuperscript{16} Rainey & Lerici 1967, 26.
\textsuperscript{17} Peroni 1982a, 2-3.
\textsuperscript{18} The tomb was discovered during construction work on the road leading to the site. The workmen salvaged an impasto vase, which was part of the funerary inventory, it seems certain that it concerns an inhumation grave; Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982a, 37; Peroni 1994, 839; Peroni & Trucco 1994a, 39, tav. 26.14. A fragment of a bronze fibula has been found near the road below the Castello, see Buffa 1994, 571-573 Tav. 120.15.
\textsuperscript{19} Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 42.
\textsuperscript{20} Peroni & Trucco 1994, 80-84.
\textsuperscript{21} Trucco 1994, 85-86.
\textsuperscript{22} Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 42-50; Peroni 1982b, 5-15; Peroni 1984, 10-17; Peroni & Trucco 1994, 23-40.
\textsuperscript{23} Trucco 1994, 86-89.
group of six postholes. No pavement or surface has been found associated with these features, which may all be dated to the latest phase of the Middle Bronze Age. There are some doubts whether this structure was meant for habitation. No clear structures have been found in later levels in this area, but pits and post-holes, dating to the Late Bronze Age (levels 2A-2B), probably represent two or three successive structures. Other levels produced isolated pits, but a cut in the terrain dating to the Final Bronze Age (level 1B) probably indicates the existence of a building in this area.

Trench D was begun in 1980 and enlarged after 1983, to encompass some 170 sq.m. In this sector, which is situated directly above the steep southern slope, a sequence of terraces has been discovered, the earliest of which can be dated to the Middle Bronze Age. A short section of a wall, as well as pavement dating to an advanced stage of the Middle Bronze Age have been discovered in the eastern and southern parts of the trench (levels 2C2-2D). These possible structures may have been the predecessors of the earliest Late Bronze Age structure, of which a ditch with six postholes has been attested (level 3F in D west), possibly to be associated with three pits in the eastern part of the trench (levels 2A-2B). In turn, this building was superseded by a structure which was cut into the slope and which has been labeled the ‘central habitation building’, or complesso a monte (Map 43). This building, which is only partly preserved, had a plan in the shape of a horse-shoe, as can be reconstructed from the six remaining postholes, in between which stones probably were laid. Two successive levels (IB and 1A), each possessing a pavement of battered and burned earth intermixed with pebbles and sherds, can be associated with this building. The lower level, which can be considered to represent the period of construction in an advanced phase of the Late Bronze Age, produced two very small ovens and a stone slab, which may have served as a basis for a post.

In higher levels, a large rectangular pit has been discovered in area D-north, which contained at least five pithoi. With this pit, a series of postholes was associated, which may represent the remnants of a wall. This structure, probably specifically meant for storage, has been dated to the beginnings of the Final Bronze Age. A similar deposit of pithoi dating to the same period, as yet unpublished, has been discovered in the excavations since 1990 in the area between sectors B and D. A structure dating to the Early Iron Age has produced evidence for the working of Iron. A wall at the bottom of the plateau indicates that defensive works were conducted during the Final Bronze Age. Traces from a previous period near this wall may indicate that such defenses - or at least a terrace - had already existed during the Late Bronze Age.

---

24 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 32-35.
26 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 29-32; Trucco 1994, 103-104.
28 For an overview of these terraces, see Trucco 1994, 89-93.
30 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 55-58.
33 For a discussion of the reconstruction, see Trucco 1994, 95-97.
34 Peroni 1982b, 18-21.
36 Trucco 1994, 100-102.
37 Peroni & Vanzetti 1993, 140. The new excavations more or less connect areas B and D. Even though heavily subject to erosion, structures dating to the Early Iron Age and the Late Bronze Age have been found. A few postholes from the Late Bronze Age have also been attested; pers.comm. S. Levi and M. Bettelli.
38 Peroni & Vanzetti 1993, 141. A shallow pit was filled with slags and a fragment of a tuyère.
The material culture at Broglio di Trebisacce, in general, corresponds to that of contemporary sites of peninsular Italy. During the Middle Bronze Age, the material record of the site is very similar to that of sites in the Taranto region, rather than to that of sites more to the south or on the Aeolian islands. Typical regional developments are, however, also visible, for example in the adaptation of impasto vessel types. The Late Bronze Age on the mainland of southern Italy is characterized by the koine of the so-called sub-Appennine culture. The material record at Broglio is in accordance with such a homogeneity, which seems to have been the outcome of a conversion of a number of regional developments. This process shows dramatic changes in the Final Bronze Age, in which the material culture displays influences which derive, ultimately, from transalpine Europe. To a far larger extent than before, Broglio in this period became part of a true supra-regional culture.

It has been estimated that the population of Broglio during the Bronze Age consisted of some 1100 individuals. Quite probably, this population was internally stratified from the Middle Bronze Age onwards. Finds from the Late Bronze Age reveal an increasing preference for agricultural products as opposed to pastoralism, hunting and fishing. According to Peroni, this indicates strategic choices pertaining to the whole settlement, which would indicate some form of central authority. Judging from the concentration of metal finds and prestigious ceramics at the complesso a monte, such a central authority may have been associated with this complex. A bowl found below a stone slab near this building had one of its handles removed and a swastika was engraved below the break. This find has been interpreted as a foundation offering, showing that activities of a cultic nature were carried out and possibly were related to a central authority. The concentration of imports at this building suggests that this authority directly controlled the circulation of foreign goods. During the Final Bronze Age, this situation appears to have changed and the circulation of goods may have been more accessible to different groups in the society.

It is not quite certain which role Broglio di Trebisacce played in the settlement system of the Sibaritide during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. The regular spacing of sites with finds dating to these periods argues against a site hierarchy depending on one site. Moreover, the Bronze Age sites in the Sibaritide may be subdivided into two classes: one of sites occupying less than three hectares and the other of sites spread out over a surface large than ten hectares. The larger sites all are situated in locations with good defensive possibilities. All this suggests that there was competition among the major sites and that each, among which were Broglio di Trebisacce, Francavilla Marittima (site no. 304) and Torre del Mordillo (site no. 305), controlled a specific territory and agricultural production. The relationships of Broglio di Trebisacce with other areas in the Mediterranean are visible through ceramic material in particular. Chemical analysis has proved that more than ninety percent of the Aegean pottery at Broglio di Trebisacce was manufactured locally, apparently

---

40 Peroni 1994b, 838-839.
43 Peroni 1994b, 848.
44 Peroni 1994b, 860.
45 Vallino 1984, 315; Peroni 1994, 835.
46 Peroni 1994b, 837-838.
49 Peroni 1994b, 852-853.
50 Peroni 1994b, 866.
51 Peroni 1994b, 840, 850.
52 Peroni 1994b, 835.
53 Peroni 1994b, 840, 850.
from an advanced stage of the Middle Bronze Age onwards.\(^{54}\) In addition, the local ceramic industry reveals strong influences of Aegean pottery techniques, as can be deduced by the existence of wheel-made grey ware, often decorated with Aegean motifs, and wheel-refined dolia, both of which differ radically in technique from the hand-made impasto.\(^{55}\) Such an extensive Aegean influence on the local ceramic industry has been explained by the transference of Aegean craftsmen to southern Italy.\(^{56}\) The few bronzes which have been found at Broglio, have their best parallels within Italy,\(^{57}\) and it seems that Aegean artistic influence was limited to ceramic products. In any case, the Aegean ceramic influence shows that Broglio participated in networks connecting the site, directly or indirectly, to the Aegean world.

**Quantity and quality of the data**

The Aegean type pottery found at Broglio di Trebisacce is presented in catalogue VII, which contains a total of 352 entries.\(^{58}\) The catalogue has been subdivided into two parts: the first part (cat. nos. 1-12) contains the twelve finds which are considered to be imports.\(^{59}\) The clay of most of these finds (cat. nos. 6, 7, 10, 11, 12) has chemical compositions indicating that they were produced on the Peloponnes.\(^{60}\) Three finds (cat. nos. 2, 8, 9) derived either from central Greece (Boeotia, Locris), or from Crete; on stylistical grounds production on the Greek mainland seems most likely. Two Mycenaean finds (cat. nos. 3, 5) revealed compositions distinct from those of the Sybaris region, although the area of their production has as yet not been determined and may even be in Italy. Two finds (cat. nos. 1, 4) are suspected to be imports on visual grounds only. The second part of the catalogue (cat. nos. 1001-1340) presents all Aegean type finds of local manufacture. These fragments, possibly made of clay from a source near Corigliano in the western part of the Sybaris plain,\(^{61}\) reveal stylistical influences from the Greek mainland, but in particular from Crete.\(^{62}\) The many amphorae with pronounced neck and horizontal handles have their best parallels in Crete.\(^{63}\)

It is certain that these 352 sherds do not represent all Mycenaean pottery which has been found at Broglio; in total a number of 647 Aegean-type sherds have been found during the 1979-1985 excavations.\(^{64}\) The remaining unpublished finds were all very small and undiagnostic.\(^{65}\) In addition, Mycenaean finds from the excavations since 1990 have not been

---

\(^{54}\) Jones 1986b, 205-214; Vagnetti & Jones 1988, 337-347; Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131-132; 1992; Jones et al. 1994. Five Mycenaean finds of local manufacture in catalogue VII have been made in contexts ascribed to the Middle Bronze Age: cat. nos. 1011, 1012m 104, 1236, 1237.

\(^{55}\) Vagnetti 1998 b.


\(^{57}\) Buffa 1994, 571-574.

\(^{58}\) This figure differs somewhat from that given by Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 399), who state that somewhat less than 350 Mycenaean finds from Broglio have been published. The difference is caused by the inclusion in my catalogue of a few finds which were not drawn, but referred to in the publications (cat. nos. 1215, 1230-1234, 1238, 1240, 1242, 1266, 1275, 1340).

\(^{59}\) In many cases this has been verified by petrological and chemical analysis (see note 54); in other cases the imported character has been inferred on stylistical grounds, see Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 399.

\(^{60}\) Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 399.

\(^{61}\) Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 132. Clay beds have also been reported in the area between Broglio and the town of Trebisacce itself and near the center of the town of Amendolara some eight kilometres along the coast north of the site, see Jones et al. 1994, 417.


\(^{63}\) Vagnetti 1984b, 189 notes 11-13. In the catalogue these vessels are referred to as FS 58-62, which would be the nearest Mycenaean vessel type. In reality, however, the shape is distinctly Minoan. They are considered to be closed vessels, even though it is often difficult to distinguish the type from Minoan-type kraters with horizontal handles. The interior decoration of some examples indicates that these are open vessels.

\(^{64}\) Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 412.

\(^{65}\) Vagnetti pers. comm.
included in the catalogue. According to the excavators, however, relatively few Mycenaean finds have been made so far, all very small and most of them thought to date to LHIIIC. It may safely be assumed that the catalogue constitutes a representative range of Mycenaean vessels found at Broglio di Trebisacce.

The total surface of the plateau at Broglio constitutes some 2.7 ha., of which only a small part has been excavated (Map 42). The top of the plateau appears to have been subject to heavy erosion and ploughing, because of which data for areas A and C are unavailable. In addition, the presence of Late Bronze Age finds at the Castello suggests that the adjoining plateaus may also have known some kind of activity during the Bronze Age. It is entirely likely, therefore, that Mycenaean pottery is still buried at the site. In particular, the absence of a cemetery belonging to the settlement is disturbing. The funerary inventories which at other sites accompany the dead during the Middle and Late Bronze Age, would have revealed important information about the use and appreciation of Mycenaean pottery in ceremonies of a highly symbolical content. The fragmentary nature of many of the Aegean-type finds has prevented a stylistical classification, leads to a degree of uncertainty in the on-site distribution patterns.

The on-site distribution

Aegean-type pottery from the 1979-1985 campaigns has not been reported from areas A, C and E, all of which had been subject to heavy erosion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>area</th>
<th>imports</th>
<th>local produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B west</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D east</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D south</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D west</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.1

The figures in Table 17.1 show that the spatial distribution of Aegean imports and local products of Aegean type is similar, with a concentration in areas D and D west. This concentration can to a large extent be ascribed to the successive levels (1A, 1A' and 1B) which can be associated with the complesso a monte. This building produced a total of 101 Aegean-type finds, among which were three imports. Moreover, thirty six Aegean-type finds derived from the contemporary layers (2B, 3, 3 inf) in area D west, which was situated at a short distance from the building. This concentration of Aegean-type ceramics has been an

66 S. Levi & M. Betelli pers. comm.
67 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 42.
68 The Timpone della Motta at Francavilla Marittima (site no. 304), likewise, consists of several plateau’s. Survey results indicate a wide area of use of this hill during the Bronze Age; Kleibrink and Attema pers. comm.
69 Peroni 1994a, 15-17.
70 See, also, Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 412-413.
71 Level 1A produced fifty-one Mycenaean finds, among which is one imported jar (cat. no. 3). Level 1A' yielded seven Aegean finds of local imitation, while level from level 1B forty-two Mycenaean finds have been reported, among which are two imported fragments (cat. nos. 4 and 5). One fragment (cat. no. 1277) was found between 1A and 1B.
72 Level 2B and level 3 each produced twenty two Mycenaean finds all of local manufacture. At the surface of level 3 inf, fourteen Aegean-type finds were made, among which are three imported LHIII B amphorae (cat. nos. 9-11)
73 The eastern part of D west is situated only some fifty centimeters from the perimeter of the complesso a monte, see Peroni & Trucco 1994, 65.
important argument in assigning a special function to the *complesso a monte*. In addition, a concentration of bronze finds in this area may also be noted.

It should be acknowledged that few other structures have been discovered at Broglio. Even though Aegean-type sherdsw have been found in levels dating to the Middle Bronze Age, none of our sherds can be associated with the MBA structures attested in area E, B-B west and D west, all of which were very damaged. To the scanty remains of a possible structure discovered in D west and D east, which are assigned to the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, a total of thirty-eight Aegean-type finds have been attributed, among which are four imports (cat. nos. 9-12). To the pits and postholes dating to Late Bronze Age levels (2A-2B) in area B-B west, which may present the remains of one or several successive structures, six Aegean-type sherds can be related, all of local manufacture. From the pithos magazine in D north, which has been dated to the Final Bronze Age, no Mycenaean pottery has been reported. Two Mycenaean sherds, one of which is a fragment of a LHIIIB2-LHIIIIC cup (cat. no. 6), may be associated with two postholes in a level dated to the same period in area B-B west.

The only structure contemporary to the *complesso a monte*, then - the Late Bronze Age features in B-B west - has yielded few Mycenaean finds. In fact, the only other structure which has produced substantial quantities of Aegean-type pottery are the remains from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age in D-east and D west. These remains pre-date the *complesso a monte* and the relative abundance of Mycenaean finds may indicate that a predecessor of the central habitation building was situated in the same area. In any case, even though the fragmentary nature of many of the structural remains argues for some caution, the concentration of Mycenaean finds in the *complesso a monte* appears to be a true phenomenon.

A concentration of Mycenaean pottery in area D is apparent, but it must also be noted that this material was not restricted to this area, as substantial amounts have also been found in area B. Rather, the concentration of Mycenaean finds in area D indicates that the people associated with the *complesso a monte* made more extensive use of Mycenaean pottery than inhabitants of other parts of the site. There does not seem to be a difference in the spatial distribution of imported Mycenaean vessels and those of local manufacture. Even though the number of imports is too small to be certain, Table 17.1 seems to indicate the same pattern for both classes: a wide distribution, with a concentration in D and D west. This suggests that these classes of pottery were used by the same groups among the inhabitants of Broglio.

---

74 Peroni 1982a, 3.
75 A bronze violin fibula, a bronze ring, a fragment of a bronze vase and a bronze pendant can be associated with the structure, see Capofierri & Giardino 1984a, 28, Tav. 4.10, 9.1, 9.12; Buffa 1984b, 197-198, Tav. 58; 1994b. Only in levels dating to the Final Bronze Age and Early Iron Age have similar quantities of metal finds been attested: level S1 in sector B (Peroni 1982c, 114) and level H in sector B west (Buffa 1994, 571-572).
76 Trucco (1994) gives descriptions and reconstructions of eight structures dating from the Middle Bronze Age to the Final Bronze Age.
77 See below
78 Trucco 1994, 85-86 (area E, below level 3B), 86-89 (area B-B west, levels 4 inf/4A), 91-93 (area D east, level 2F).
79 Trucco 1994, 93-95: area D east, levels 2C, 2B, pit below level 1 east, area D west levels 3 and 3 inf.
80 Three LHIIB3 amphora fragments (cat. nos. 9-11) were found in level 3 inf., while the spout of a LHIIIIB stirrup jar (cat. no. 12) was found in level 3.
83 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 29: level 1A. A piece of amber was found in the same level, see Buffa 1994, 572, Tav. 120.1.
84 Trucco 1994, 95.
Only a small part of the Aegean-type sherds found at Broglio can be stylistically classified.\(^8^5\) At least twenty of the Aegean-type vessels which are locally produced reveal Minoan influences,\(^8^6\) but none of the imports can be assigned a certain Cretan origin.\(^8^7\) Only one locally produced LMIIIB fragment (cat. no. 1217) has been found in area B. All the other ‘Minoan’ finds derive from area D and D west. Fragments originating on the Greek mainland or with strong Helladic influences seem to have been more homogeneously distributed.\(^8^8\) The distinction between Minoan and Helladic is problematic for vessels which have been locally produced and, in any case, many fragments cannot be ascribed to either of these classes. Yet, it appears that Minoan-type pottery was more or less restricted to the central habitation building in area D.\(^8^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>B imported</th>
<th>B west imported</th>
<th>D imported</th>
<th>D west imported</th>
<th>D south imported</th>
<th>D west imported</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undatable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIIA1-LHIIA2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHLM IIIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIA2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHLM IIIB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIII B IIIIC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHIIIC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17.2**

The earliest Aegean type vessel can be dated to LHIIIA1-LHIIIA2, as is clear from Table 17.2. An imported jar (cat. no. 2), which was probably produced in central Greece,\(^9^0\) can be assigned to this early phase. The fact that the earliest vessel has a Greek provenance indicates that Aegean-type pottery was imported before it was manufactured locally. A locally made mug (cat. no. 1278), as well as three fragments (cat. nos. 1005, 1204, 1251), which have been assigned a LH/LM IIIA date, however, show that local production began not long after the first imports arrived. Imports with a secure LHIIIA2 date are lacking, even though the fragment decorated with wavy line (FM 53) (cat. no. 5) may belong to this style. Only one local product in LHIIIA2 style has been found (cat. no. 1135) and it is clear that the LHIIIA style in general is scarce at Broglio. It is evident from Table 17.2 that both imports and local production of Aegean-type pottery at Broglio increased sharply from the LHII/LMB period onwards and continued well into LHIIIIC. The fact that this chronological pattern is the same for imports and locally produced vessels indicates that these two classes were complementary. This means that, for Broglio di Trebisacce, the local produce did not replace the imports for reasons of scarcity,\(^9^1\) or for any other reason. Such a complementarity can also be inferred.

---

\(^8^5\) Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 411) state that only fifty-five Aegean type sherds can be assigned with certainty to a specific Helladic or Minoan ceramic class. Following the stylistic dates suggested by them in the various reports, many of which have a certain measure of uncertainty, I arrive at 119 finds, which can be given a stylistic date.

\(^8^6\) Catalogue nos. 1019, 1025, 1033, 1049, 1081, 1105, 1106, 1146, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1156, 1164, 1167, 1217, 1251, 1267, 1294, 1295, 1297.

\(^8^7\) The finds with catalogue nos. 2, 8 and 9 have chemical compositions indicating that they derive either from central Greece or from Crete. According to Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 399), visual examination makes a mainland origin more likely.

\(^8^8\) Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 411) assign a Helladic style to twenty-four finds. Six of these are found in area B, while D east and D west have produced five and eight finds respectively.

\(^8^9\) Eleven ‘Minoan’ finds (cat. nos. 1019, 1025, 1033, 1049, 1146, 1152-1154, 1156, 1164, 1167) have been recovered directly associated with this building. Four Minoan-style finds (cat. nos. 1267, 1294, 1295, 1297) were made in contemporary levels in the adjoining trenches D east and D west.

\(^9^0\) Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 398-399.

\(^9^1\) The rise of local production of Mycenaean-type pottery in Cyprus has been explained by suggesting that the original products were available to a far lesser extent, see Sherratt 1982, 185.
from the spatial distribution of the two classes, which, likewise, correlates for the various chronological styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>unstratified</th>
<th>MBA early</th>
<th>MBA late</th>
<th>LBA early</th>
<th>LBA late</th>
<th>FBA early</th>
<th>FBA late</th>
<th>EBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA IIIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA IIIIC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA IIIIC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA IV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.3

As is clear from Table 17.3, the earliest levels in which Aegean type pottery has been found date from the Middle Bronze Age. The imported LHIIIA1-LHIIIA2 fragment of a jar (cat. no. 2) was found between levels 3 west inf. and 4A in area B, both of which can be dated to an advanced stage of the Late Bronze Age. In level 3 inferior proper, a locally made cup or bowl (cat. no. 1011) was discovered, proving stratigraphically that local production of Aegean-type pottery at Broglio di Trebisacce already began at an early stage. The other finds in Middle Bronze Age contexts (cat. nos. 1012, 1204, 1236 and 1237) testify of the same practice.

The fragmentary nature of many of the Aegean-type finds, as well as the fact that ceramic styles of vessels produced in Italy may not always reflect Aegean styles directly, argue for some caution in applying a chronology to this pottery. Yet, the stylistical chronology appears to follow the stratigraphy at Broglio quite consistently, with LIIIIB finds concentrated in the Late Bronze Age and LIIIIC, which begins during the LBA, continuing into the Final Bronze Age. The LHIIIA fragment decorated with a wavy line (cat. no. 5), which has been found in the complesso a monte, may be testimony of use for a substantial period of time. However, its small size argues for caution in this respect. The relative scarcity of clear LIIIIB finds in contexts dating to the later phase of the Late Bronze Age or to the Final Bronze Age suggests that such pottery was not used for a long period of time.

The small size of the Aegean-type sherds at Broglio does not allow the majority of finds to be assigned to specific vessel types. Moreover, in several of the 110 cases where a pot shape has been suggested the classification should be considered tentative. Nevertheless, it is clear from Table 17.4 that only a limited ceramic repertoire has been discovered at Broglio, with slightly more storage than dinner vessels. Imported Mycenaean vessels are, with the exception of the cup or bowl with catalogue no. 6, mostly of storage type. This situation is different for the locally made repertoire, among which there is a substantial proportion of dinner vessels. This suggests that the range of production by the local manufacturers was not determined by the Aegean pottery arriving at Broglio, but by a wider repertoire. This, in my opinion, reinforces

92 Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 399) tentatively suggest that the fragment may have belonged to a small handleless jar (FS 77), in which case it should be dated no later than LHIIIAI.
93 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 47-49.
94 Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 408.
95 It should be noted that a distinction between LIIIIB and LIIIIC is often very difficult to make on the basis of very small - locally made - fragments; see Vagnetti 1998 b. Consequently, a relative large number of sherds have been assigned a LIIIIB-LIIIIC date.
96 In the cases of many fragments, it was possible to indicate whether they derived from closed or open pot shapes. In total, a number of 223 closed shapes have been discovered, against 78 open vessels. Even though we must allow for closed shapes which can be considered dinner vessels (i.e. jugs), the predominance of storage pottery seems to be even more marked than apparent from table 4.
97 Such a wider repertoire would consist of vessels well known in the Aegean and beyond, such as the mug (FS 226) and the deep bowl (FS 284); for parallels, see Mountjoy 1986, 112, 128, 147 (FS 226); 91, 117, 130-131,
the hypothesis that itinerant craftsmen were to some degree responsible for the production of Aegean-type pottery at Broglio. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHAPE</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B west</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D east</th>
<th>D south</th>
<th>D west</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>import</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>import</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>import</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amphora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collar-necked jar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alabastron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phiale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kantharos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carinated cup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kylix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mug</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowl or cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep bowl</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.4

A second observation to be made on the basis of Table 17.4 is that Aegean type storage vessels appear to be more widely distributed than dinner vessels. Twenty four Aegean-type dinner vessels have been found in area D, of which eighteen can directly be associated with the *compresso a monte*. In addition, nine Mycenaean finds were discovered in levels contemporary to this complex in area D west. Even though the large number of fragments argues for caution, it appears that Aegean-type dinner vessels were concentrated in the central habitation building, which implies that the inhabitants associated to this structure made more extensive use of this ceramic class than other groups in the town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>coarse ware</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>linear</th>
<th>patterned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B west</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D east</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D south</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D west</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17.5

The fragmentary nature of many of the Mycenaean finds casts doubts on the classification of decorational types and different kinds of ware, which is presented in Table 17.5. Many of the small plain sherds or those with linear decoration may have belonged to vessels that were more elaborately decorated and the apparent predominance of linear decoration is probably emphasized by these circumstances. It is clear that only a few coarse ware vessels have been found, one of which is an imported stirrup jar (cat. no. 12). All other Aegean-type coarse ware finds are fragments of locally made closed vessel types, possibly including jars meant for

189-193 (FS 284). The carinated cups, however, have their best parallels in local impasto and grey ware, see Vagnetti 1984b, 193; Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 408-410.

98 See note 56.
99 Catologue nos. 1023, 1029, 1030, 1061, 1073, 1145, 1148, 1151, 1162, 1166, 1168-1170, 1171, 1182.
100 Catologue nos. 1278, 1289, 1290, 1306, 1310-1313, 1325.
101 Catologue nos. 1018, 1027, 1037-1040.
transportation. Five of these (cat. no. 1027, 1037-140) have been found in the *complesso a monte*, while another (cat. 1018) came from the topsoil above this structure. The imported stirrup jar derived from an LBA surface in area D west, close to the central building. It seems, therefore, that such coarse ware vessels were restricted to this structure.

Among the imported pottery, seven finds (cat. nos. 1, 3-8) have a patterned decoration, while a fragment of a jar is decorated with a line only. Considering the high number of linear decorated sherds among the pottery of local manufacture, it would seem as if the imported vessels, in general, were more elaborately decorated than the Mycenaean-type pottery made at Broglio. In any case, the spatial distribution of linear sherds and those decorated with geometric and floral motifs as indicated in Table 17.5, shows that the use of Aegean-type pottery was not restricted on the basis of its decoration.

The purpose of this section is to see if any restrictions in the use of Aegean-type pottery among the inhabitants of Broglio can be discerned on the basis of the spatial distribution of this class of material. In general, such restrictions do not seem to be present, as this material has been found in different areas of the site, suggesting that various groups among the inhabitants at Broglio made use of it. However, there is a clear concentration of Mycenaean finds in contexts belonging to the *complesso a monte*, suggesting that the people associated with this structure made more extensive use of this material than other groups. The on-site distribution pattern appears to be the same for true imports as for Aegean-type pottery of local manufacture. However, vessels in Minoan style are associated in particular with the central habitation building. The same can be said for Aegean-type dinner vessels and large coarse ware vessels. Apparently, the inhabitants associated with the *complesso a monte* had a special desire for and greater access to these vessel types.

**Closed contexts**

Due to the fragmentary state of many of the architectural remains, very little can be said about the layout of the settlement at Broglio di Trebisacce. During the latest excavations, between areas B and D, some habitation structures have been discovered dating to the Final Bronze Age, which appear to have been arranged along a straight line. According to the excavators, this constitutes a re-orientation of the settlement’s plan, suggesting that before this period there was no systematic layout. The houses in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages are characterized by posts at a relative large distance from one another, sometimes set in a ditch, while stones are used for reinforcements only. The houses are built on artificial terraces which have been cut into the natural slope of the hill. Houseplans are generally oval, although during the Late Bronze Age rectangular plans also emerged, as is shown by the structure in area B-B west.

Mycenaean pottery has been found in association with only three of the total of seven architectural structures which have been identified at the site. Thirty-eight Aegean-type finds

---

102 Vagnetti & Panichelli (1994, 405-406) suggest the possibility that the decoration of the sherds with catalogue no. 1285 constitutes a bird (FM 7). If so this sherd would constitute the only pictorial specimen found at Broglio. However, the strange loop on the larger fragment, as well as the occurrence of a type of net pattern on vessels from the same site, make it highly unlikely that it is a bird motif; J.H. Crouwel, pers. comm.

103 Apart from a larger quantitative proportion of Aegean-type pottery associated with this building, sherds from area D were generally larger and stylistically more diagnostic than elsewhere on the site; pers. comm. S. Levi, Betelli.


106 See above, p 304-305. The Middle Bronze Age structures in area E, B-B west and D west have not produced any Mycenaean pottery, nor has any been reported from the pithos magazine in D north.
are associated with a structure of which traces have been discovered in D east and D west. The remains of this structure, however, are too scanty for further analysis. Only two structures, both dating to the Late Bronze Age, can be fruitfully analyzed.

H44 area B-B west: Late Bronze Age structure (levels 2A-2B)

At level 2B in trench B west, which was excavated between 1983 and 1985, a few stretches of battered earth were uncovered. Six postholes which were uncovered in the same level indicate the presence of an architectural structure in this area; unfortunately, it had been heavily disturbed. During the first campaign in 1979 in the adjacent trench B, three postholes have been found in level 2, as well as an occupation surface at the same level in the eastern part of the trench. Even though it is not entirely certain whether the remains from trenches B and B west belong to the same building phase, the reconstruction shows a large rectangular building. Level 2B is associated with this structure, while level 2A, in which three postholes were attested, either belongs to the same building, or to a slightly later phase. Both strata have been dated to the Late Bronze Age.

Eight Aegean-type finds may be associated with this building. Three fragments from level 2B (cat. nos. 1213-1215) are decorated with lines only, but a fragment with patterned decoration found between 2A and 2B has been assigned to a LHIIIIB2-LHIIIC collar-necked jar (cat. no. 1216). Level 2A yielded one linear fragment (cat. no. 1218) and one (cat. no. 1217) with patterned decoration which has been classified as LMIIIB. Level 2B west in trench B also produced a linear fragment (cat. no. 1010), as well as an imported LHIIIIB2-LHIIIB fragment from a straight-sided alabastron (cat. no. 1), the only one of its kind found at Broglio. Level 2B also yielded bowls, cups, jars and cooking pots in local impasto, as well as carinated cups and bowls in wheel-made grey ware and some fragments from rounded dolia. Pounders and pestles and a piece of engraved bone were also found.

It is of interest to note that the two Mycenaean vessels of which the type can be identified are closed pot shapes, while in other ceramic classes there is a high proportion of dinner vessels. It should also be noted that an original import and a fragment of local manufacture with Minoan affiliations were present in this house. It is at this stage uncertain whether these pots and the object of worked bone should be considered luxury objects. In any case, the direct association of Aegean type pottery with various local ceramic classes indicates the extent to which this class of material was part of the local material culture.

H45 area D: complesso a monte (levels 1A-1B) (Map 43)

This building was first discovered during the campaign of 1980, when a level was discovered containing a large amount of pottery. The trench was subsequently enlarged and the structure was excavated during the campaigns of 1981-1982. The building was situated directly above the steep descent of the southern slope and, in fact, only the northern half has been recovered, the southern part having been washed down the hill. Six postholes and several lines of fieldstones have been identified. The reconstruction shows a horse shoe-shaped building, ca.

---

107 Trucco 1994, 93-95: area D east, levels 2C, 2B, pit below level 1 east, area D west levels 3 and 3 inf.).
109 Trucco 1994, 98. If the remains in trench B do not belong to the same building, the reconstruction reveals a smaller, but roughly similar, building.
110 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 32-36. There seems to be some confusion about the relationship between the two levels, especially in the higher, northern part of the trench.
111 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982b, 47; Capofieri & Giardino 1984a, 58; Giardino 1994a, 185-195.
113 Giardino 1994a, 190. In level 2A an engraved bone disk was found.
nine by seven meters, and roughly east-west orientated (Map 43). It is set on an artificial
terrace, which was horizontally cut into the hill. The floor of the building, consisting of
battered earth, was in the west substantially higher than in the east, and a number of small
postholes suggest that a wooden floor may have been used to make up for the difference. On
the floor, two large stones and the remains of two small ovens were found;\textsuperscript{115} in the area of the
ovens the floor was heavily burned. In the northernmost corner of the terrace on which the
structure was set, a series of stones was laid, below which a possible foundation offering was
found.\textsuperscript{116} Above the floor, two strata were excavated. Layer 1B, which was situated directly
above the floor, is to be associated with the period of use of the building, while layer 1A
probably constitutes a fill dating to the period after the abandonment of the building.\textsuperscript{117}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig17-1.png}
\caption{Fig. 17. 1 Ceramic objects from the floor of the \textit{compless\o a monte}: Aegean-type
amphora (cat. no. 1146), impasto and grey ware carinated cups, \textit{dolium}}
\end{figure}

On the floor of the building three Aegean-type vessels have been found (fig. 17.1). A small
fragment of a LHIIIC deep bowl (cat. no. 1145) decorated with a wavy line was recovered at
the western end of the pavement. Part of an LMIIIB-style amphora (cat. no. 1146) decorated
with linked whorl-shells was found in the area of the little ovens, while several fragments of the
same vase were also found in levels 1B and 1A. The same levels contained fragments of a
similar vase (cat. no. 1049) decorated with isolated semicircles and paneled patterns found in
the north-eastern part. These vessels were associated with three carinated cups and a jar in
local impasto, as well as with a carinated cup in grey ware and three \textit{dolium} fragments.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{115} For descriptions of the ovens, see Peroni 1982b, 18-19; Barbieri, Peroni & Trucco 1984, 21-22.
\textsuperscript{116} See above, p. 306 and note 48.
\textsuperscript{117} Peroni 1982b, 21; 1984, 19.
\textsuperscript{118} Capofieri & Giardino 1984b, 68; Bellardelli 1984, 137; Buffa 1984a, 161.
In level IB a small fragment of an imported open vessel (cat. no. 4) decorated with a possible spiral was found, as well as a fragment of an imported closed pot (cat. no. 5). A number of amphorae (cat. nos. 1019, 1033, 1152-1156, 1164) were also discovered, most of which with Minoan affiliations. In addition, level IB contained another LIIIB deep bowl (cat. no. 1151), along with some cups and bowls of uncertain shape dated to LIIIB-LIIIC (cat. nos. 1029, 1030, 1148, 1163). The level also produced a full range of open and closed shapes in local impasto, as well as a variety of carinated cups, bowls and jars in wheel-made grey ware and eleven dolia fragments.

Level 1A, which should be considered later than the complesso a monte itself, but which is associated with it through fragments of vessels of which other parts were found in level IB and on the floor, was particularly rich in ceramic finds. Apart from a full range of vessels in local impasto, grey ware, and dolia, fifty-nine Mycenaean-type finds were made, among which is a small fragment of an imported jar (cat. no. 3) with linear decoration. Locally made carinated cups (cat. nos. 103, 1061, 1166) in LIIIB style, as well as LIIIB mugs (cat. nos. 1169-1182), a LIIIB-LIIIC deep bowl (cat. no. 1168) and a possible LIIIC krater or bowl (cat. no. 1070) were also found. Among storage vessels, amphorae (cat. nos. 1025, 1026, 1167, 1173, 1183, 1184) in LIIIIB-LIIIIC style were most numerous, although two similar fragments (1054, 1072) showed Helladic affiliations. The level also produced a small fragment of a possible coarse ware stirrup jar (cat. no. 1021). All the bronzes associated with the complesso a monte - a ring, a fragment of a vase, a violin fibula and a fragment of a pendant - came from level 1A as well.

The direct association of Aegean-type pottery with various classes of local material show that it was an integral part of the material culture in this building. In particular, it may be noted that Aegean-type storage and dinner vessels are both well represented. This corresponds to the repertoires of types in local impasto and grey ware. There are no indications that the two imports associated with this building were regarded differently from locally made Aegean type pottery.

There appears to be a differentiation with regard to vessel type within the general class of Aegean-type pottery at Broglio di Trebisacce. As already noticed in the previous section, Aegean type dinner vessels are concentrated in the complesso a monte. A similar concentration is not visible in local impasto or in the grey wares, indicating that there existed a specific appreciation for Mycenaean-type dinner vessels. It needs to be emphasized that the difference between the contexts H1 and H2 in the appreciation of Mycenaean dinner vessels is visible for both imports and local Aegean-type products, showing that these two classes were similarly appreciated by the inhabitants at Broglio. The large number of Minoan-style amphorae at the complesso a monte may be the result of a special significance of these type of vessels, but it should be noted that a Minoan-type sherd was also associated with the building in B-B west.

---

119 The chemical composition of the clay of this vessel indicates that it may have been produced in Italy, but not in the region of Broglio; see Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 399.
120 Giardino 1982, 50; Capofieri & Giardino 1984a, 58; 1948b, 68-74.
121 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982c, 86-87; 1984, 137; Belardelli 1984, 137-139.
122 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982c, 96; Buffa 1984a, 161.
123 For example, see Vagnetti 1984b, 173-175.
124 Peroni 1982b, 15.
125 Giardino 1982, 50-54; Capofieri & Giardino 1984a, 60-74; 1984b, 74-92.
126 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982c, 85-86; 1984, 137-141; Belardelli 1984, 139-145.
128 Capofieri & Giardino 1984a, 28; Buffa 1984b, 197-198; 1994b.
The role of Mycenaean pottery in the material culture of Broglio di Trebisacce

Apart from a small piece of amber discovered in levels dating to the Final Bronze Age, the twelve Aegean pots are the only clearly identifiable imports which have been discovered at Broglio di Trebisacce. The few bronzes from the site may have also been imported from elsewhere, but they have their best parallels on the Italian mainland and do not seem to derive from international maritime exchange. Moreover, Mycenaean pottery, which consists of well-levigated clay and is wheel-made, is of an entirely different technical tradition than the local hand-made impasto. It may be argued that within such a material environment Aegean pots possessed a special significance, probably based on its association with a far-away, international world and on the ability to acquire objects from such a world. Indeed, the observed concentration of Aegean-type finds in the complesso a monte seems to confirm such a high regard for this class of material.

This being said, a number of observations have been made in this chapter which shed light on the use and appreciation of Mycenaean-type pottery at the site in more detail. Firstly, the spatial distribution, as well as the contextual associations of Aegean imports and Aegean type vessels of local manufacture proved to be similar, which suggests that these two classes were appreciated in the same way. Possibly, this signifies that a notion of originality and a high regard for it did not exist during the Bronze Age at Broglio. It is also possible that the distinctive technique of Aegean type pottery alone was sufficient to invoke prestige. The fact that a difference in origin appears to have been irrelevant for the appreciation of Aegean-type pottery, however, may also be taken as evidence that Aegean craftsmen were involved in the local production of this type of material at Broglio.

A second important observation is that the use of Mycenaean dinner vessels in particular was concentrated at the complesso a monte. The fact that a similar observation cannot be made for local impasto or grey wares indicates, firstly, that Mycenaean-type pottery was indeed perceived as a distinctive category of material by the inhabitants at Broglio. Secondly, it shows that the restricted distribution of Mycenaean dinner vessels should be related to a high regard for such vases and was not due to a specific functional differentiation to do with activities associated with the buildings. All this suggests that Mycenaean-type pottery was a culturally

---

129 Peroni & Trucco 1994, 29; Buffa 1994a, 503; 1994b, 572, Tav. 120.1
130 The evidence for metalworking at Broglio, which has been found during the recent campaigns in the area between sectors B and D, has been dated to the Early Iron Age, see Peroni & Vanzetti 1993, 144.
131 Buffa 1994. The bronze industry in southern Italy during the Late Bronze Age shows Aegean influences, but also original elements, which foreshadow proto-Villanovan types. In general, the bronze industries in the central Mediterranean, the Aegean and in Cyprus appear to have been heavily indebted to one another, see Bietti-Setsieri 1973, 408; Lo Schiavo, Macnamara & Vagnetti 1985.
132 Bergonzzi 1985, 361-368; Vagnetti forthcoming. The wheel-made grey wares, in many cases decorated with Aegean motifs and encompassing vessel types familiar to the Aegean and to the local repertoires, may be considered as a class of material which developed locally under Aegean influence.
134 The high appreciation for authenticity has been explained as a reaction to the growing influence of bourgeois culture in early modern Europe, see Elias 1969. The technical possibilities for mass-production and imitation which have arisen since the nineteenth century, have strengthened the notions of authenticity, see Benjamin 1974. A critique of Benjamins strong opposition between ‘original’ and ‘reproduction’ is given by Adorno (1984, 89-90), who states that such a distinction cannot always be made and that both notions, to a degree, depend on each other. In any case, it may seriously be questioned whether the distinction between ‘original’ and ‘imitation’ has any relevance in pre-modern situations.
135 Anthropological research has revealed the possibilities of technically different objects for symbolical and cultural innovation, see, for example, Hugh-Jones 1992, 59.
relevant class of material at Broglio and could actively be involved in strategies of consumption.\textsuperscript{136}

The site of Broglio di Trebisacce has been interpreted as constituting an autonomous socio-political unit in the \textit{Sibaritide} area during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages.\textsuperscript{137} Among the more than twenty pre- and protohistoric sites in the region,\textsuperscript{138} only at Torre del Mordillo (site no. 305) have substantial quantities of Mycenaean pottery also been found.\textsuperscript{139} From the site of \textit{Timpone della Motta} near Francavilla Marittima (site no. 304) one fragment of a Mycenaean stirrup jar has been reported, which, to date, remains the only find of its kind at this site, even though the recent excavations have exposed Middle and Late Bronze Age features and levels.\textsuperscript{140} It appears, then, that the circulation of Aegean-type pottery was restricted, which is in contrast with the evidence for a considerable regional exchange of \textit{dolia} and impasto vessels.\textsuperscript{141} This indicates that Aegean-type pottery remained confined to a few centres, such as Broglio di Trebisacce, which probably were in direct contact with the Aegean world. In these centres, Mycenaean decorated vessels, although they were used by various social groups, served specifically as means of expression for élites.

\textsuperscript{136} The evidence for restricted distribution of pottery with Minoan affiliations is not very strong, since this pottery occurred in both contexts investigated in the fourth section of this chapter.
\textsuperscript{137} Peroni 1994b, 834-853.
\textsuperscript{138} Peroni & Vagnetti 1982; Buffa & Peroni 1982; Belardelli et al. 1994.
\textsuperscript{139} Arancio et al. (1995, 227-239) report on nine decorated sherds, which are to be dated between LHIIIA and LHIIIIC. L Vagnetti (pers. comm.) reports that about one hundred Mycenaean finds, almost all very small sherds, have been made at this site. Chemical analyses have indicated that, just as at Broglio, some of these vessels were manufactured locally.
\textsuperscript{140} Lattanzi & Vagnetti 1983-1984; Kleibrink & Attema, pers. comm.
\textsuperscript{141} Levi et al. 1998, 437.
CHAPTER 18

Cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery in Italy

Introduction

The detailed contextual analyses of the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari, Thapsos and Broglio di Trebisacce allow a comparison between these sites. In Table XXVI, which is presented in the tables section, the main conclusions reached for each of these three places are put together. The similarities and differences between the sites enable a discussion of the use and appreciation of Mycenaean pottery in Italy.

Lucia Vagnetti has sub-divided the distribution of Mycenaean pottery into three broad chronological periods: LH1-LHII, LHIIIA-LHIIIB and LHIIIB-LHIII. Even though each of our sites covers more than one of Vagnetti's periods, the Mycenaean pottery at each of the three sites is concentrated in specific periods. Most of the Mycenaean pottery at Lipari belongs to the early period (LH1-LHIIIA1); at Thapsos most Aegean vessels can be assigned a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB date, while Broglio produced predominantly Mycenaean material from LHIIIB and later. The differences and similarities between these sites, therefore, may be the result of chronological developments. They may also be caused by the different nature of the archaeological remains at these three sites. The evidence from other findspots in the central Mediterranean will reveal chronological patterns and variations according to the type of site. We may also use that evidence to check how representative the conclusions for Lipari, Thapsos and Broglio di Trebisacce are.

Mycenaean repertoire

As is clear from Table XXVI and especially from a comparison between catalogues VII, VIII and IX, the Thapsos cemetery has produced a smaller repertoire of Mycenaean vessels than the other two sites. This is due, at least to an extent, to the larger quantities of Aegean-type pottery found at Lipari and Broglio di Trebisacce. Such large quantities are paralleled only at a few other sites in the central Mediterranean. From the island of Vivara (site no. 324) more than 340 Mycenaean sherds have been published, while the excavations at Scoglio del Tonno in Taranto (site no. 300) produced more than 150 Mycenaean finds. In Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328), where Bronze Age levels have been reached in a limited number of rooms, more than forty Mycenaean finds were made, but over one hundred Mycenaean sherds were found in a

---

1 Vagnetti 1982a, 18-19; 1993, 145-147; 1998b. The separations between the phases ought not to be taken too strict. On the basis of the local manufacture of LHIIIB pottery, the second phase has been subdivided into an earlier stage covering LHIIIA and a later stage contemporary with LHIIIB, which should be discussed together with the LHIIIB-LHIIIC phase. The earliest of Vagnetti's phases may possibly be subdivided into earlier and later stages as well, see Marazzi 1994, 30-32.

2 Panichelli & Re 1994; Re 1994. This figure concerns the finds from excavations until 1982 only. The excavations have been resumed since 1994 and yearly campaigns have been conducted; additional Mycenaean pottery has been found, see Marazzi 1995; pers. com. G. Matteo.

3 Taylour (1958, 81-137) published 152 Mycenaean finds from the excavations at Scoglio del Tonno by Quagliati in 1899. A Mycenaean sherd and a stirrup jar have recently been found in excavations near the church of San Domenica ca. 200 m. from the location of Punta del Torno; see Gorgoglione 1996.
dump of clandestine excavators. Two trenches of limited extent at Termitito (site no. 302) yielded more than forty Mycenaean sherds. The latest Mycenaean find on Vivara dates to LHIII A1 and the sites on this island should be grouped with Lipari in Vagnetti's first phase of the import of Mycenaean pottery in Italy. Scoglio del Tonno, instead, has produced substantial amounts of Aegean pottery in LHIIIA style and later, and this site belongs to Vagnetti's second and third phases. As in Broglio di Trebisaccia, most Mycenaean finds at Termitito and Nuraghe Antigori are in LHIIIB and LHIIIC style, and these sites belong to the third period. Obviously, in each chronological phase of the Mycenaean contacts with Italy, only very few sites imported large quantities of this material.

The smaller quantity of Aegean pottery at Thapsos in comparison with Lipari and Broglio may be corrected when the settlement finds from the Sicilian site will be published. However, it should be noted that the repertoire of Aegean-type pottery from the Thapsos tombs is less varied than that from the other two sites, where not only Mycenaean decorated pottery has been found, but also classes such as matt-painted Aegean pottery, coarse ware, local imitations and wheel-made grey ware. Some matt-painted pottery discovered at Lipari derives from Ausonio I and II levels and should be considered as predecessors of the Italian Protogeometric pottery. The matt-painted pottery from earlier levels, however, is of Middle-Helladic tradition and probably was imported from various regions within Greece. A large concentration of matt-painted Aegean pottery has been found at Vivara (site no. 324), while from Filicudi (site no. 316) nine finds of such pottery have been reported. Smaller quantities of similar pottery have been found in Apulia at Grotta Manaccora (site no. 342), Giovinazzo (site no. 290), Punta Le Terrare (site no. 292) and Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299), in Sicily at Monte Grande (site no. 293), Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 294) and in the Vallo di Diano in the interior of Campania at Sassano (site no 344). Different kinds of matt-painted pottery of Middle Helladic tradition circulated in the Aegean during the early stages of the Late Bronze Age. Its occurrence in the central Mediterranean at a number of sites indicates that the circulation of pottery in Italy was related to Aegean networks, as may also have been the case for other goods. Objects from different areas in the Aegean, could thus end up together at an Italian site.

---

6 Marazzi 1994, 18; Vagnetti 1993, 145.
7 According to Voza (1972, 205), very few Mycenaean finds were made in the settlement of Thapsos.
8 Bernabo-Brea 1979, 584; Bernabo-Brea & Cavalier 1980, 730; Yntema 1985, 32.
9 Vagnetti 1982a, 16-17; Cavalier & Vagnetti 1983, 343-344; 1984, 150-151; Marazzi 1994, 30-31. For the circulation of matt-painted pottery in Greece during the early stages of the Late Bronze Age, see for example Mountjoy 1981, 70-79; Rutter 1990, 453-455; Dietz 1991, 297-303.
10 Re 1994, 225: 94 fragments of such pottery have been found on the island, among which some large closed vessels (class 6), smaller closed vessels (class 2) and at least two open vessels (class 1) could be distinguished.
11 Vagnetti 1991, 264-279. The matt-painted pottery of this site can be divided into two different classes: yellowish-greenish matt-painted (1) and polychrome matt-painted (2); a third class is red lustrous painted pottery, which may be Aegina red surface ware.
12 Marazzi 1993, 402-405. Two sherds are classified as matt-painted similar to that found at Vivara.
13 Radina & Battisti 1987, 60; Cataldo, Radina & Wilkens 1989, 194 fig. 11 No. 7; Vagnetti 1998, 278: one sherd.
14 Franco 1996, 1564-1565; Vagnetti 1998, 285-286: one fragment of an open vessel is described as of burrished ware.
16 Castellana 1993-1994, 51: one sherd of orange burrished ware (LHII-II) has been found on the acropolis.
17 Pellegrini & Piperno 1998, 45: one fragment has recently been found in a cave in association with Middle Bronze Age burials.
At Broglio di Trebisacce seven Mycenaean coarse ware finds have been made, of which one fragment of a large stirrup jar was imported, while the other fragments were of local manufacture. Coarse ware fragments of Aegean type have also been found in substantial quantities at Vivara (site no. 324).\(^{19}\) At Filicudi (site no. 316) such pottery constituted more than a quarter of the Mycenaean finds.\(^{20}\) The coarse ware vessels from these islands should be distinguished chronologically from those at the site in the plain of Sybaris. The Aegean coarse pottery at Vivara and Filicudi compares well to that found in the wells at the Athens acropolis.\(^{21}\) It can be dated to the beginning of the Greek Late Bronze Age and, consequently, may be considered as one of the classes of ceramics which were in circulation alongside Aegean matt-painted pottery and decorated fine ware.\(^{22}\) Similar coarse ware pottery dating to this early period has been found at Punta le Terrare (site no. 292)\(^{23}\) on the Adriatic coast of Apulia and at Monte Grande (site no. 293)\(^{24}\) in southern Sicily. The Aegean-type coarse ware found at Broglio di Trebisacce should be dated to LHIIIb or even later. The imported stirrup jar from Broglio may be compared to similar vessels, which have been distributed widely in the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean.\(^{25}\) One fragment of a coarse ware amphora found in an Ausonio I context at Lipari has also been dated to LHIIIb.\(^{26}\) In the settlement at Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291) numerous coarse ware jars of Aegean type have been found in association with LHIIIc material.\(^{27}\) Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299) produced two large coarse ware storage vessels in LHIIIb style,\(^{28}\) while a sherd at Grotta Manaccora (site no. 342) has been interpreted as belonging to transport stirrup jar from the same period.\(^{29}\) It appears that both in the earliest and latest phases of Mycenaean pottery in Italy, Aegean coarse ware pottery circulated in addition to the Mycenaean decorated fine ware.

Scientific analyses have shown that some of the coarse ware Aegean-type pottery found at Vivara was made in the region of Naples, while the fine ware vessels and most of the coarse pots from the island were imported from the Aegean.\(^{30}\) These results seem to suggest that some local production of Aegean-type pottery, albeit only coarse ware, occurred already in the earliest phase of Mycenaean imports into Italy. For LHIIIb-LHIIIc pottery, such a local or regional production has been proven not only at Broglio di Trebisacce, but also at Termitito (site no. 302), Casale Nuovo (site no. 325)\(^{31}\) and in Sardinia.\(^{32}\) At Broglio, the existence of ceramica grigia and large wheel-refined dolia has been interpreted as evidence for Aegean

\(^{19}\) Re 1994 227-228: 106 fragments may be considered of coarse fabric, of which 68 did not have decoration (classes 3 and 9), while 38 had painted decoration (classes 4, 7 and 8).
\(^{22}\) Dietz 1991, 300-303.
\(^{25}\) Haskell 1990; Day & Haskell 1995.
\(^{26}\) Catalogue VII: no. 27.
\(^{27}\) Vagnetti 1998, 274.
\(^{28}\) Lo Porto 1963, 336.
\(^{29}\) Marazzi 1993, 402-404.
\(^{30}\) Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 131; Jones 1994, 307. Petrographic analyses and atomic absorption spectrometry determined that the Mycenaean decorated fine ware could be classified into two groups, one consistent with an origin in the southern Peloponnese and another with an origin either in the Argolid, the Peloponnese at large or on Kythera. Some of the unpainted wares fell into these clusters as well; others had clay compositions of which the origin is as yet not known. The composition of some of the Aegean-type coarse ware vessels compares well to that of the local impasto and is consistent with an origin in the bay of Naples.
\(^{31}\) Angle et al. 1993, 212-213.
\(^{32}\) Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 132-134.
influence on the local pottery industry. Similar vessels in grey ware have been found at Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287), Torre Castelluccia (site no. 297), Taranto (site no. 300), Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299) and at Torre del Mordillo (site no. 305). In addition, this pottery has been discovered at sites without Mycenaean-type pottery. It may be of significance that ceramic grigia has not been reported from other sites with much LHIII-B-LHIIIC material such as Santa Maria di Leuca (site no. 295), Scalo di Furno (site no. 296), Termitito (site no. 302) and Antigori (site no. 328). The absence of grey ware at these sites could indicate that such pottery was locally produced at specific sites and did not circulate regionally.

The unequal distribution of grey ware in the latest phase of Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean resembles similar concentrations of matt-painted and coarse ware pottery in the first phase. Such unequal distribution patterns may be the result of developments in the circulation of Mycenaean pottery which cannot be detected due to the relatively wide margins of the stratigraphical and ceramic chronology. For example, the higher quantities of Aegean matt-painted pottery and coarse ware on Vivara and Filicudi, in comparison with Lipari, may be explained by suggesting that the bulk of the imports at the latter island arrived at a later moment - when the circulation of matt-painted and coarse wares had diminished. Similarly, the absence of grey ware at a number of sites with LHIII-B-LHIIIC pottery may be caused by a relatively short-lived production of this pottery within the long LHIII-B and LHIIIC phases. However, such unequal distribution of various Aegean-type wares may also be the result of choices made by the inhabitants of different sites in various periods regarding the Mycenaean pottery to be imported or to be locally manufactured. The unequal distribution of different Mycenaean wares would then be related to the use and appreciation of the Mycenaean pottery at specific sites.

The repertoire of Mycenaean vessel types at Lipari and Broglio di Trebisacce includes both dinner and storage vessels in substantial quantities. The high number of LHI-LHII cups, particularly of Vapheio type, at Lipari show that Mycenaean dinner vessels constituted a substantial proportion of the imported repertoire from the earliest period onwards. Among the Aegean decorated fine ware found on Vivara (site no. 324) open pot shapes constitute only a

33 Vagnetti 1999 (with full bibliography).
35 Taylour 1958, 152.
36 Gorgoglione (1996, 1574-1577) has identified a stemmed bowl of grey ware in the material found at San Domenico.
38 Arancio et al. 1995, 230.
40 Benzi and Graziaido (1996, 1526) report that most of the Mycenaean pottery at this site belongs to LHIIIC and is of non-Aegean manufacture.
41 De Siena (1986, 46) states specifically that wheel-refined dolia and ceramic grigia have not been found at Termitito, even though Aegean-type pottery was manufactured in the area of the site, see Jones & Vagnetti 1991, 132.
42 For the chronology, see, for example, Lukesh 1983, 21-23; Sheates 1994, 197-199.
43 In that case we would have to assume that the diminishing of the circulation of matt-painted and coarse ware pottery took place within the duration of Late Helladic I, of which sixteen finds have been made at Lipari. Within Greece, such pottery seems to have been in circulation well into LHIII, see Mountjoy 1981, 74-79; Dietz 1991, 297-305.
44 Wheel-made grey ware at Broglio di Trebisacce developed in association with LHIII-B-type pottery and, with very few exceptions, did not continue into LHIIIC, see Vagnetti 1999.
small proportion. The same can be said for the matt-painted and coarse Aegean-type fabrics found at the same site. Among the LHIIIA material on Filicudi (site no. 316) open vessels are a small minority and the Mycenaean repertoire on this island seems to be comparable to that on Vivara. At the sites with smaller quantities of early Mycenaean finds, dinner vessels dating to this period have not been found at Cape Piccolo (site no. 306) in Calabria, at Madre Chiesa di Gaffa (site no. 310) in Sicily, and at the two sites on Salina (sites no. 317-318). The earliest Mycenaean finds at Punta le Terrare (site no. 292) date to LHII-LHIIIA1 and include several storage jars, whereas a LHII-LHIIIA1 cup has also been reported.

The large number of early Mycenaean dinner vessels at Lipari is unparalleled elsewhere in the central Mediterranean. However, there are a few sites where open vessels constitute the only early Mycenaean finds: Giovinazzo (site no. 307), Monopoli (site no. 336), Porto-Perone-Saturo (site no. 299). Clearly, there is a variation among the sites in Italy with Mycenaean finds from the first chronological phase in the extent to which open drinking vessels were imported.

The majority of the Mycenaean finds at the Thapsos cemetery belongs to Vagnetti’s second phase of Mycenaean connections with Italy. At Thapsos, the majority of the Mycenaean vessels is from closed pot shapes. This is a different situation than at Lipari, where most of the finds dating from LHIIIA2 to LHIIIB-LHIIIC are of open pot shapes. The site in the central Mediterranean with the widest variety of contemporary Mycenaean finds is Scoglio del Tonno at Taranto (site no. 300), where more than one hundred Mycenaean finds dating from LHIIIA2 until LHIIIB-LHIIIC have been made. Among these finds there is a slight majority of storage vessels in comparison to dinner vessels. The relative proportions of these two Mycenaean ceramic functional classes appear to have changed over time, as the frequency of storage vessels is highest among LHIIIA finds, while LHIIIB dinner vessels occur more often than contemporary storage vessels. Among the storage vessels at Scoglio del Tonno, the large piriform jar (FS 34-36) occurs most often, while there are many stirrup jars as well. Among the dinner vessels, the kylix is most common, but there are also a fair number of kraters. The repertoire of Mycenaean pot shapes at Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299) is very similar to that found at Scoglio del Tonno, even though LHIIIA finds are absent. The LHIIIA2-LHIIIB
finds at the Milazzese levels at Panarea are comparable to those at Lipari. At sites in the central Mediterranean with smaller quantities of Mycenaean pottery, both dinner and storage vessels occur.

Possibly, the relatively high proportion of Mycenaean storage vessels at Thapsos is due to the funerary context in which the finds at that site have been made. At other cemeteries in Sicily contemporary to Thapsos, mainly storage vessels have been found as well. In addition, the only funerary context in Apulia which dates to the same period - grave no. 12 in the tumulus at Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291) - yielded one LHIIIA2 cup and a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB alabastron. Apparently, the inhabitants of the sites in Sicily had a preference for Mycenaean storage vessels during the second phase of Aegean connections with Italy, while in other regions larger quantities of Mycenaean dinner vessels were imported. To a larger extent than in the LHI–LHII phase, which showed significant local differences, regional patterns are visible in the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in Italy.

At Broglio di Trebisacce, both Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels have been found in substantial quantities. It has been noted that among the genuine Mycenaean imports, storage vessels were more frequent, while among the local produce there was a higher frequency of dinner vessels. Among the LHIIB–LHIIC pottery from Scoglio del Tono (site no. 300), dinner vessels predominate, but storage vessels dating to LHIIC are numerous as well. In particular, a variety of LHIIC amphorae have been found at this site, of types (FS 58-70) which also occur at Broglio di Trebisacce. At Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299), where substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery from this later period have also been found, dinner vessels are the most frequent. At the site of Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287), where most of the Mycenaean pottery appears to be of LHIIC date, closed vessels are more numerous, even though there is a fair proportion of open vessels. Among the Mycenaean finds from the settlement at Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291), which date to an early phase of LHIIC, dinner

---

59 Taylour 1958, 44-47. One piriform jar (FS 44-45) and at least three kylikes have been reported in addition to sherds of indeterminable open and closed vessel types.

60 An LHIIB2-LHIIIB closed vessel has been reported from the site at Via Papacencere in Monopoli (site no. 336), see Cinquepalini 1995, 325-326. A LHIIB krater has been reported from Avetrana (site no. 297), see Puglisi 1953, 91. LHIIBA2 kylikes have been reported from Torre Castelluccia (site no. 298), see Biancofiore 1967, 187-188. At Praia a Marc (site no. 321) in Campania a sherd from a LHIIB2 cup or kylix has been found in a cave deposit, see Bernabò-Brea & Vagnetti 1982, 121-122. From the site of Castiglione (site no. 323) on the island of Ischia, a LHIIC2 piriform jard has been reported, see Taylour, 1958, 8. A LHIIB2-LHIIIB fragment found in the southern structure at Luni sul Mignone (site no. 326) has been assigned to a jug or stirrup jar, see Östenberg 1967, 128. At Antigori (site no. 298) in Sardinia, a shallow cup dating to LHIIB2-LHIIIB has been found in a cave deposit, see Ferrarese-Ceruti & Assorgia 1982, 176: no. 29. A LHIIB2 straight-sided alabastron was discovered at Nuraghe Arrubiu (site no. 329), see Lo Schiavo & Vagnetti 1993, 134-135. A kylix dating to an early phase of LHIIB has been found at Borg en Nadur (site no. 283) in Malta, see Buchholz 1974, 328-329.

61 At Molinello (site no. 308), Matrensa/Plemmyrion (site no. 311), Floridia (site no. 313) and Maiorana (site no. 314) Mycenaean storage vessels dating to LHIIB2-LHIIIB have also been found. Only at Cozzo del Pantano (site no. 312) has a LHIIBA2 open drinking vessel been discovered in a tomb; see the final section in the Thapsos chapter (notes 77-83) for references.

62 De Miro 1996, 998-999. At the nearby site of Madre Chiesa dell Gaffa (site no. 310) two finds may be dated to LHIIBA2: a large piriform jar and a large stirrup jar; see Castellana 1993-1994a, 49.

63 Lo Porto 1993, 10-11.

64 See note 56.

65 Lo Porto 1963, 337-339; 1964, 198-200. Cups and (deep) bowls occur, as well as some jugs. On stirrup jar and a collar-necked jar (FS 63) have also been found. It ought to be remembered that the Mycenaean material from this site is very fragmentary; many sherds could not be assigned to specific vessel types.

vessels appear to be more frequent, but storage jars have been found as well. At Punta Meliso di Leuca (site no. 295) most of the Mycenaean finds belong to an advanced stage of LHIII C. Among the earlier finds, a belly-handled amphora (FS 58) could be of LHIIIB-LHIII C date. From Torre Castelluccia (site no. 298), a variety of drinking vessels dating to LHIIIIB-LHIII C have been reported. At Termintino, where a regional production of Mycenaean pottery similar to that at Broglio di Trebisacce has been attested, dinner vessels seem to be more numerous than storage pots. In Latium, storage vessels appear to have been the most frequent, which may also have been the case at Antigori (site no. 328) on Sardinia.

From this overview it is clear that the Mycenaean ceramic repertoire in the beginning of the third phase of Aegean contacts with Italy was relatively homogeneous in comparison with the earlier periods. Differences in the relative proportions of storage and dinner vessels occur, but both classes have been found in fair numbers in southern Italy, Sicily and in the Tyrrhenian region; Latium and Sardinia show a distinctive preference for storage vessels.

Neither at Lipari, Thapsos or Broglio di Trebisacce have Mycenaean vessels been found which may be interpreted as of ceremonial types. In fact, such vessels are almost absent among the Mycenaean finds in the central Mediterranean. Only in room A at the Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328) has a LHIIIIB conical rhyton been discovered. Three Mycenaean terra-cotta figurines have been found in the central Mediterranean: one at Lipari and two more female Psi-type figurines were discovered at Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300). Apparently, these kind of specialised ceramics occurred only at sites with abundant Mycenaean imports.

Mycenaean pottery with pictorial decoration should also be considered to be of a specialised nature. Such decoration has not been found on the Aegean pots from Lipari, Thapsos and Broglio. Fish are visible on two sherds from Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300), another fragment from Scoglio probably shows the hind legs of a horse. A concentration of Mycenaean pictorial pottery has been found at Termintino (site no. 302). A fragment of a LHIIIIB krater from this site depicts a bull, while another fragment from an open vessel with light-on-dark decoration may show a similar animal. In addition, representations of horses, a bird and an octopus have also been found. Quite unique is the stirrup jar, which is depicted on a sherd from this site.

---

67 Vagnetti 1998, 274: one two-handled storage jar, two kraters and a jug have been reported. However, the Mycenaean finds from the settlement layers are very fragmentary, see also Coppola 1977; Coppola & Raimondi 1995; Coppola & Cinquepalmi 1998.
68 Benzi & Graziado 1996, 1524.
69 Taylour 1958, 147-148.
70 Jones & Vagnetti 1991.
71 De Siena & Bianco 1982, 75-76; De Siena 1986, 45.
72 At Casale Nuovo (site no. 325) a LHIIIIB-LHIIIIC stirrup jar has been found, as well as many sherds, see Angle & Zarattini 1987, 252; Angle et al. 1993, 201. At Luni sul Mignone (site no. 326), the LHIIIIB-LHIIIIC finds belong to a piriform jar and a stirrup jar, see Östenberg 1967, 128.
73 Ferrarese-Ceruti & Assorgia 1982, 172-176; Ferrarese-Ceruti 1986, 184-187: two kraters and a conical rhyton have been found in addition to a substantial quantity of storage pottery.
75 Taylour 1958, 115.
76 Ferrarese-Ceruti & Assorgia 1982, tav. XXII-XXIII; De Siena 1986, 51 figs. 5-6.
77 At Cannatello (site no. 289) a large stirrup jar with stylised octopi has been discovered, see De Miro 1997, 998. An octopus design may also be present on a kylix sherd at Borg en Nadur (site no. 283) on Malta, see Buchholz 1974, 328-329.
The Mycenaean pictorial pottery at Termitito shows that preferences existed with regard to the Aegean-type ceramics which were imported or manufactured. The high variation among sites in the extent to which Mycenaean dinner vessels dating to an early period have been found show that preferences were exerted already in the first phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy. During this phase the cultural choices whether to import Mycenaean dinner or storage vessels appear to have been determined on a local level. In later phases, however, the occurrence of these different ceramic categories reveals distinctive regional patterns. The concentration of Mycenaean pictorial pottery at Termitito, however, indicates that cultural preferences could also occur on a local level.

Social groups to be associated with Mycenaean pottery

The Capo Graziano settlement at the Lipari acropolis has been described as relatively undifferentiated, even though one building (H3) was substantially larger than other structures. Mycenaean pottery appears to have been used by all inhabitants at the site during this period, but the people living near structure H3 possessed more of it than others. On the nearby island of Filicudi, the Mycenaean material found in contemporary levels, was widely distributed as well, which suggests that many inhabitants used this pottery. However, a concentration of Mycenaean finds was attested in structure no. XXV on Filicudi, indicating that a particular group within society made more use of this material than others. Most of the Mycenaean pottery on Vivara (site no. 324) has been found at Punta d’Alaca at the western end of the small island. This concentration may have chronological reasons, since the site at Punta Mezzogiorno pre-dates the one at Punta d’Alaca. At both sites, Mycenaean drinking and storage vessels have been found in average domestic contexts, which may indicate that this type of pottery was not restricted to specific groups in the society. A concentration of this pottery, however, was discovered in association with two storage pits in Punta d’Alaca, which probably belonged to the single large building excavated in the area. It may be that also on Vivara a specific group in the society made more use of Mycenaean pottery than other groups.

At Molinella (site no. 286) a LHIIB fragment was found below the floor of a Middle Bronze Age hut, which yielded a variety of domestic implements. A LHI goblet was found on the floor of hut α at Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299), in which a matt-painted fragment was also found. Another matt-painted fragment derived from structure γ. A fragment dating to LHII from Capo Piccolo (site no. 306) also came from a domestic context. These examples indicate that during the first phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy Aegean pottery occurred in average habitation contexts. It is likely that such pottery was not limited to specific groups in society. At Monte Grande (site no. 293) in southern Sicily, a number of LHI–LHII sherds...
have been found in association with a sanctuary dating to the Sicilian Early Bronze Age (ca. 2000-1400 BC). This shows that Mycenaean pots could be part of activities with a high symbolic content. Possibly, the few Mycenaean finds which were found together with miniature cups in the fill of the large building H3 on Lipari testify of use in similar circumstances. The fact that some inhabitants of Lipari, Filicudi and Vivara made substantially more use of Aegean vessels than other people in the same societies may be related to such symbolic use of this material in native ceremonies.

During the Milazzese period, the use of Mycenaean pottery at Lipari was widespread and not concentrated among specific groups among the inhabitants of the settlement. At Broglio di Trebisacce, LHIIIa2 and LHIIICB finds, both imported and of local manufacture, have been found in trenches B and D and their extensions, which also suggests a wide distribution among the population. In the Thapsos cemetery, Mycenaean pots were discovered in a number of tombs, which also indicates that many inhabitants used this type of pottery. However, a concentration of Aegean vessels has been found in the wealthy tomb XXI/47, which suggests that for some people this material had special significance.

At Taranto (site no. 300) a large quantity of Mycenaean pots has been found at Scoglio del Tonno, in association with a large building. Habitation on this site extended to the peninsula of the città vecchia, where Mycenaean pottery has recently been found in trenches A and C at San Domenico, some 200 meters from Scoglio del Tonno. This wide dispersion of the Mycenaean material suggests that it was used by different groups in the society of Bronze Age Taranto. At Scalo di Furno (site no. 296), also in Apulia, a number of huts have been discovered, of which some may have served as workshops for impasto pottery. LHIIIa2-LHIIIB finds were made in several of these huts, which suggests that it was not restricted to specific inhabitants. These examples seem to confirm the picture from Lipari that Mycenaean pottery was not concentrated among specific groups in society. However, at the site of Capo Milazzese (site no. 320) on the island of Panarea, Mycenaean pottery has also been found distributed widely among several houses, but with a concentration in structures X and XI. Both huts also yielded a large amount of locally made pottery and have been considered as evidence for social stratification in the settlement. If true, it would indicate that Mycenaean pottery was more extensively used by local elite groups. At Cannatello (site no. 289) in southern Sicily, most Mycenaean finds were found in a disturbed layer with Thapsos-type material. A large rectangular hut has been discovered in layer 2, which produced most of the ceramic material at the site, including several Mycenaean pots. At both Capo Milazzese and Cannatello, the concentration of Mycenaean finds is associated with an abundance of local objects, which suggests that the Aegean pottery was part of processes in which many different goods were controlled by specific groups of people. This indicates the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was an integral part of the material culture during this period.

The LHIIIB and LHIIIIC pottery at Broglio di Trebisacce was concentrated at the complesso a monte in excavation area D. The smaller quantities found in area B indicate that this class of material could also be used by other groups in the society, but to a limited extent. We have observed a similar situation at Lipari, where the Mycenaean pottery from Ausonio I

90 Quagliati 1900, 417-420. A large hut was attested in the upper stratum, from which all the Mycenaean pots came as well.
95 De Miro 1996, 998-999; Deorsola 1996, 1033.
96 De Miro 1996, 997-999.
levels was concentrated in a few atypical buildings. At Coppa Nevigata (site no. 287) in Apulia, which had a distinctively urban organisation during the Late Bronze Age, most Mycenaean sherds from sub-Appennine levels came from a relatively restricted area near the top of the hill,\textsuperscript{97} which may indicate a restriction of this material to specific social groups. At Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291), Mycenaean pottery has been found in association with two structures, which were found adjacent to each other on the western shore of the stream Mezzaluna.\textsuperscript{98} Since no other huts have been excavated, it is difficult to investigate the distribution of this material within the settlement.\textsuperscript{99} In strata b and c at Porto-Perone (site no. 299) four oval huts dating to the sub-Appennine period have been discovered.\textsuperscript{100} On the floors of structure A lay six LHIIIB-LHIIIC sherds, while other huts did not produce such ceramics. In structure D, a complete LHIIIB stirrup jar has been found. At Termitito (site no. 302) a large deposit of LHIIIB-LHIIIC pottery was discovered in association with a pit, which has been interpreted as a silo serving purposes of ostentatious possession.\textsuperscript{101} Obviously, Mycenaean pottery could serve an important role in such a strategy. However, Mycenaean pottery has also been found elsewhere at Temititio, which shows that its use was not limited to symbolic display. At Luni Sul Mignone in Lazio (site no. 326) two of the three rectangular structures have yielded Mycenaean pottery and a concentration has not been attested.\textsuperscript{102} The same may be said for Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328) in Sardinia, where Mycenaean pottery has been found widely dispersed.

It is difficult to identify social groups in the population of central and southern Italy during the Middle and Late Bronze Age. It is generally recognised that these regions should be considered ‘proto-urban’, in the sense that a differentiation of wealth between settlements and concentrations of people in larger communities existed only to a limited extent.\textsuperscript{103} Nevertheless, the evidence of houses and tombs suggests that in most areas there existed hierarchies between groups and that dominant elites were able to control specific sectors of society, such as subsistence, trade and religion.\textsuperscript{104} The presence of warriors, attested by an increasing number of weapons, and the presence of specialised artists working with metals and pottery also suggest some differentiation within the societies.\textsuperscript{105}

The evidence presented above shows a development in the extent to which Mycenaean pottery may be associated with specific groups in the Italian Bronze Age societies. In the earliest period, Mycenaean vessels appear to have been used widely, but at some places specific groups were able to acquire substantially more of this material. Such concentrations have been attested in particular at Lipari, Filicudi and Vivara, which suggests that the symbolic significance of overseas contacts was of importance for the social use of Mycenaean pottery. In a later period, LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pottery appears to have been used everywhere among many different population groups and to have been an integral part of the material culture. At the end of the Late Bronze Age and in the beginning of the Final Bronze Age, Mycenaean pottery was

\textsuperscript{97} Cazzella & Moscoloni 1987, 141. It should be emphasised that contemporary levels elsewhere at the site have been excavated only to a limited extent.

\textsuperscript{98} Coppola & Cinquepalmi 1998, 161-162.

\textsuperscript{99} Coppola 1977, 74. During a survey of the site, all sub-Appenine material has been found in a restricted area west of the fiume della mezza-luna, including wheel-made sherds of possible Aegean origin.

\textsuperscript{100} Lo Porto 1963, 292-300.

\textsuperscript{101} De Siena 1982; 1986, 43-45.

\textsuperscript{102} Östenberg 1967, 128, 141-145. The middle structure, which was somewhat smaller, did not yield any Mycenaean pottery.


\textsuperscript{105} Bergonzi 1985, 359-365.
monopolized by specific groups in society in almost all regions. Apparently, this pottery served in social strategies by which elites distinguished themselves from other people.

**Differentiation within the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery**

The matt-painted pottery dating to the earliest phases of Aegean contacts with Italy has at Lipari been found together with 'lustrous' Mycenaean decorated pottery. Also, the matt-painted fragments have been found relatively widely distributed and not concentrated in or near specific buildings at Lipari. On Filicudi (site no. 316), likewise, matt-painted and coarse ware pottery have been found in several structures in association with 'true' Mycenaean vessels. On Vivara, one matt-painted fragment has been found in Punta Mezzogiorno, while all other fragments came from Punta d'Alaca, where such pottery was found together with other Aegean imports. At Punta Le Terrare (site no. 292) an Aegean fragment of probable red-burnished ware was found in proto-Appennine B levels, together with a fragment of Mycenaean decorated ware. In strata 1a and 2a at Monte Grande in Sicily (site no. 293) Aegean matt-painted sherds have also been found together with fragments with more lustrous decoration. It appears that in the first phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy, the appreciation for Mycenaean decorated vessels was not substantially different from that for imported vessels in Middle Helladic tradition. This indicates that it was the very fact that these classes of pottery were imported which determined their use and appreciation.

At Broglio di Trebisacce in the latest phase of Aegean connections with Italy, we have not been able to recognise any differences between the appreciation for genuine Mycenaean imports and for pottery of Aegean type that was locally produced. The locally produced grey ware at Broglio di Trebisacce, likewise, has been found in direct association with true Mycenaean pottery, as have large wheel-refined dolia. At the San Domenico site at Taranto (site no. 300) a stemmed bowl of grey ware was found together with a LHIIIB cup or bowl. At Porto Perone-Saturo (site no. 299) these different classes of wheel-made pottery have also been discovered together. It appears that the appreciation for wheel-made pottery of Aegean and non-Aegean type in the Late Bronze Age was similar. The imported nature of ceramic vessels does not seem to have been of any consequence for the way these vessels were used.

Above, in the first section of this chapter, I concluded that both Aegean matt-painted pottery, as well as ceramica grigia are unequally distributed among contemporary sites in Italy. The evidence presented here shows that there were no differences in use and appreciation between these two classes and true Mycenaean decorated types. This indicates that the unequal distribution of matt-painted and grey pottery is due to factors of availability and the extent to which these classes - each in its own period - were part of international and regional systems of distribution.

At Lipari, in both Capo Graziano and in Milazzese levels, Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels had predominantly domestic associations. A difference in appreciation for these two classes of imported ceramics has not been detected. This is different at Thapsos, where only tomb XXI/47 has produced open Mycenaean dinner vessels, while storage vessels were widely
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106 See, for example, catalogue VII: nos. 102 and 103, which occurred in Y VI (H10).
108 Re 1994: classes 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10 may be considered as matt-painted pottery. Only a class 5 fragment of a closed vessel (catalogue no. 338) has been found at Punta Mezzogiorno.
111 Bergonzi & Cardarelli 1982c; Buffa 1984a; Vagnetti 1999.
113 Lo Porto 1963, 332.
distributed in the necropolis. Evidently, within funerary rituals at Thapsos Mycenaean drinking vessels possessed a higher symbolical significance than storage vessels. A similar conclusion has been reached for Broglio di Trebisacce, where Aegean-type dinner vessels were concentrated at the *complesso a monte*.

On the island of Filicudi (site no. 316) the majority of Mycenaean pottery finds was very fragmentary and could not be assigned to specific vessel types. Only nine Aegean fragments have been assigned to open vessels, of which six were distributed among three different buildings.\(^{114}\) It may be of significance that three of these Mycenaean open shapes derive from building XXV. However, a number of fragments of closed shapes were also found in this structure. On Vivara, likewise, only a small minority of the Aegean finds could be assigned to an open pot shape.\(^{115}\) The silos α and β, which have been discovered at Punta d’Alaca, have produced varying quantities of Mycenaean open and closed vessels.\(^{116}\) According to Tusa, this indicates a functional differentiation between these two storage pits. A difference in the social significance between Aegean storage and dinner vessels is, however, not attested.

At Capo Milazzese (site no. 320) on the island of Panarea, Mycenaean open vessels have been found in three different structures - always directly associated with imported closed vessels.\(^{117}\) Structure XI produced two LHIII A fragments of LHIII A bowls or kylikes, while structure X yielded a LHIII A kylix. In structure XVI at the same site, a fragment of a bowl or kylix has been discovered. Considering the fact that all Mycenaean pottery at this site was concentrated in building X and XI, the distribution pattern of drinking vessels argues against a special significance for this functional class of Mycenaean pottery. At Porto-Perone Saturo (site no. 299), however, seven LHIII B cup fragments were found together on the floor of building A, in direct association with a variety of local cups and globular vases.\(^{118}\) This concentration of cups may indicate a special significance of such vessels at this site. The LHIII A2 and LHIII B finds at Cannatello (site no. 289) in Sicily have all been found together within one of the large buildings at this site and a differentiation in appreciation between storage and drinking vessels cannot be determined. Apparently, a high appreciation for Mycenaean drinking vessels during this period, as attested at Thapsos and possibly Porto Perone-Saturo, was a local phenomenon, which required specific circumstances - such as funerary ceremonies.

Termitito (site no. 302) has produced a large quantity of Mycenaean pottery, which is roughly contemporary to the finds at Broglio di Trebisacce.\(^{119}\) Much of this material came from a large silo, which yielded more Mycenaean dinner vessels than storage pottery. A large number of open vessels of local manufacture has also been found and the pit contained seeds and other evidence for food storage or consumption. Elsewhere on the site, a smaller silo yielded Mycenaean pottery of similar type. The fact that a relatively large proportion of Mycenaean dinner vessels was found in these structures indicates that such vessels had a special significance, as they did at Broglio. At Luni sul Mignone (site no. 326) or at Nuraghe

\(^{114}\) Vagnetti 1991, 263-277: cabin I from the Capo Graziano period produced a fragment of a Mycenaean cup and one of indeterminable shape; with cabin XI, which was disturbed, a fragment of an open shape has been associated; cabin XXV in Capo Graziano levels produced a cup fragment, one from a kylix and one from an indeterminable open pot shape.

\(^{115}\) Panichelli & Re 1994, 211-214; Re 1994.

\(^{116}\) Tusa 1994, 120, 122: fig 1. Silo α produced eighteen Mycenaean fragments of closed pot shapes, four Aegean fragments of open shape and fifteen fragments of local manufacture. Silo β produced eight Mycenaean fragments of closed pots, one open Mycenaean vessel and ten fragments of Canaanite jars.

\(^{117}\) Taylour 1958, 44-47: huts X, XI and XVI.

\(^{118}\) Lo Porto 1963, 298-299.

\(^{119}\) De Siena 1982; 1986. With the exception of one LHIII A2-LHIII B pictorial fragment, all Mycenaean pottery from Termitito has been dated to LHIII B and LHIII C. The LHIII A phase, of which examples are present at Broglio, appears to be missing here.
Antigori (site no. 328), however, both types of imported Mycenaean pottery have been found together and a difference in appreciation cannot be established. It appears that in southern Italy Mycenaean dinner vessels served a special role in the beginning of the third period of Aegean contacts with Italy. A similar role cannot be seen in central Italy and in Sardinia.

Above, I have argued that in the earliest phase of Mycenaean connections with Italy the use of Mycenaean pottery was widespread, but that at some places specific groups were able to acquire large quantities of this pottery. The equal appreciation for Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels during this phase indicate that such concentrations were not related to the functions of the Aegean vessels. Rather, there is evidence for this early period that the very fact that these pots were imported was of significance. In a later phase, LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pottery was used at all sites in Italy among many different population groups and it was an integral part of the material culture. The significance of different classes of Mycenaean pottery during this phase appears to have varied according to the way the regional distribution systems functioned. In the third phase of Mycenaean pottery in Italy specific groups appear to have monopolised Aegean-type pottery. For southern Italy, there is evidence that such monopolisation was related to a high appreciation for Mycenaean drinking vessels. Instead of the Mycenaean origin, it appears that in this period the function of the Mycenaean vessels was of crucial importance for their cultural significance.

Funerary evidence

Very few Bronze Age sites have been discovered in Italy with both a settlement and a necropolis. At Thapsos, the excavations of the settlement have not been published. The cremation burials at Lipari dating to Ausonio I and II have not produced any Aegean pottery. At Molinella (site no. 286) a dolmen has been excavated, but Mycenaean pottery has only been found in the associated proto-Appennine B settlement. Another dolmen (site no. 307), containing a LHI-LHIII cup, has been discovered some kilometres from the town of Giovinazzo. In the same town a proto-Appennine settlement (site no. 290) has been excavated. Even though the settlement and dolmen are contemporary, the distance between them shows that they should be considered separately. At Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291) a tumulus with some twenty-five graves has been discovered near the settlement, but the chronological relationship with the habitation site is not altogether clear. On the island of Filicudi (site no. 316) some fissures in the rock have been excavated, which had been employed as funerary caves; a few rather undiagnostic sherds have been found in these fissures. From Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328) in Sardinia a funerary cave has been reported, in which a cup of possible Mycenaean manufacture has been found; nothing else is known about this deposit. This overview shows that it is not possible to relate the Mycenaean finds from tombs to associated settlements; the funerary contexts can only be investigated separately. In addition to the sites mentioned above, Mycenaean pottery has been found in funerary contexts in Sicily at Matrensa-Plemmyrion (site no. 311), Cozzo del Pantano (site no. 312), Floridia (site no. 313) Buscemi (site no. 314) and Milena (site no. 315). On the Italian mainland, Bronze

120 The Ausonio II burials did produce two poppy-seed stone pendants which may be imports, see Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 115, Plate 43: no. 3.
121 Bernabò-Brea 1985, 167. The dolmen did yield a skeleton, but no grave goods.
122 Lo Porto 1967.
124 Lo Porto 1993, 12; Coppola & Cinquepalmi 1998 149-150. The Mycenaean finds from the tombs have all been assigned to LHIIIA or LHIIIB, while the settlement finds are predominantly in LHIIIC style.
126 Ferrarese-Ceruti & Assorgia 1982, 176. Lucia Vagnetti (pers. comm.) has doubts about the Mycenaean origins of this cup and thinks it is of local ware.
Age burials have been discovered either in monumental dolmens serving for collective burial, or in natural caves which were used for a long time. Apart from the dolmens which have been mentioned above, Mycenaean pots have been found in isolated caves in Grotta Manaccora (site no. 342), Praia a Mare (site no. 321) and Sassano (site no. 344).

The occurrence of Mycenaean pottery in the tombs at Thapsos indicates a widespread use of this class of material among the population. However, it has also been noted that one tomb possessed significantly more Mycenaean pottery, among which are open drinking vessels. In addition, tomb XXI/47 possessed a wealthy funerary inventory, comprising metal and glass objects as well as ceramic imports from Cyprus. The remarkable repertoire of Mycenaean pots in Thapsos tomb XXI/47 shows that these vessels were considered valuable enough to be associated with a wealthy inventory. The large quantities of Mycenaean pottery in this tomb and the comparatively wide repertoire of pot shapes shows the active role of this type of pottery in a symbolic strategy of funerary display.

In the dolmen of Giovinazzo (site no. 307) a LHI-LHII cup (FS 204) has been found in association with a variety of local drinking cups and bowls. This dolmen was very elaborate and included a tholos-type structure with a dromos of large stone slabs below a tumulus. The inclusion of a Mycenaean drinking cup in this structure shows that such a drinking vessel could be included in ceremonies of a highly symbolic content already at an early date. The same may be said for the early Mycenaean finds at Grotta Manaccora (site no. 342), which included matt painted sherds. At Sassano (site no. 344) in Campania, a matt-painted fragment of a closed vessel has been found in a cave with funerary deposits.

The number of LHIIIA2-LHIIIB vessels in the tombs at sites in eastern Sicily is relatively low, but the repertoire of pots is comparable to that of Thapsos. It was concluded above that the significance of Mycenaean pots in the Sicilian tombs is comparable to Thapsos. At the site of Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291) in Apulia a tumulus has been discovered which contained some twenty-five pit graves. The pits were rather small and hewn out in the natural rock of the site. Graves 10, 11, 13 and 25 were children’s burials and did not contain any grave goods. Fifteen other graves all contained single adults in squatting position, but no grave goods. Grave goods were also absent in pit 19, in which the remains of two adults were found. Grave number 5 yielded numerous human bones, which may testify of successive burials. A clay disk was the only other find in this grave. Pits 9, 15 and 21 contained one adult only and a limited repertoire of impasto vessels, in particular carinated cups. Of a special nature is grave 12, which was situated in the centre of the tumulus. This pit was somewhat larger than the others and one of the few with a small bench on which the head of the dead had been placed. This grave produced a LHIIIA2 cup and a LHIIIA2-LHIIIB alabastron. In addition, a one-handled jug has been discovered, which was most likely imported as well, even though it is of uncertain provenance. A bronze knife, possibly of Aegean origin, was also discovered in grave 12. Clearly, in the case of this grave, the Mycenaean finds were considered suitable to be involved in a ceremony of funerary display, in which other imports also functioned. Moreover, the absence of similar objects in the other graves clearly show that such...
display was limited to specific persons. From this example it is apparent that not only in Sicily, but also in Apulia ceramic vessels imported from the Aegean could play an active role in the funerary practices of high ranking groups of people.

Conclusions
The investigation of the cultural context of the Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean has not provided us with a homogeneous picture. There are local and regional differences in the repertoire of Aegean vessels, in the extent to which these were concentrated among specific groups in the societies and in the way they were appreciated by these people. Even more clear, however, have become the differences between the various phases of Mycenaean contacts with Italy. The conclusions for the successive phases with regard to the cultural significance of this class of material are summarised below. A few remarks which are valid for all phases can also be made. For example, it is clear that in all periods, only very few sites imported - or manufactured - large quantities of Mycenaean pottery. Such a pattern suggests that these ceramic vessels were part of regional distribution networks, in which a restricted number of central places played a dominant role. Consequently, only a few sites had direct contact with the Aegean world. The clear coastal pattern in the distribution, pattern of Mycenaean pots in peninsular Italy shows that the circulation of this class of pottery in the regional networks was not widespread, but relatively restricted. A second general observation is that dinner vessels constituted a substantial part of the Mycenaean-type pottery in Italy during all periods. This shows that the import of this class of pottery was not simply based on a demand for Aegean substances in ceramic containers, but also on the cultural significance of tablewares and the activities associated with it. Tombs bear testimony that Mycenaean pottery could be part of ceremonies with a high symbolic content from an early period onwards. Apparently, this material played an active role in the cultural practices of inhabitants in Bronze Age Italy.

Even though there are differences between the various regions in the central Mediterranean, a development towards some complexity in settlement hierarchy is recognizable in many places in southern Italy and Sicily during the second phase of the Early Bronze Age and the initial stages of the Middle Bronze Age. This is visible, for example in the defensive structures built at Coppa Nevigata and other sites on the Apulian coast at the end of the proto-Appennine period, in the movement of the Capo Graziano settlement at Lipari to a prominent position on the acropolis, and possibly also in the shift in settlement on Vivara from Punta Mezzogiorno to Punta d’Alaca. In addition, there is some evidence for social stratification within communities, such as the storage pits at Punta d’Alaca on Vivara, and tombs with relatively large quantities of weaponry. The distinctive coastal pattern in the evidence for increasing complexity indicates that maritime contacts played an important role in this
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135 Coppola & Cinquepalmi (1998 150) suggest that there may be a chronological cause for the concentration of status objects in grave 12. Considering the position of this grave in the centre of the tomb and its slightly more elaborate architecture, it is altogether probable that differences in the funerary practices are responsible for the variation among the graves.


137 Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 171. For the relative chronology, see Table I.

138 Cazzella & Moscolini 1987, 109; Bianco 1991-1992. Recently, defensive structures have also been discovered at Roca Vecchia; they are mentioned by Kuniholm 1998.

139 Bernabò-Brea & Cavalier 1960, 80-81.

140 Tusa 1994, 101-105.

141 Tusa 1991b, 87; 1994, 119-120.

This is highlighted by the role of the Aegean pottery, of which several classes circulated in regional exchange networks during this period. The unequal distribution of Aegean matt-painted and coarse ware pottery in comparison with Mycenaean decorated wares has been related to the availability of these classes of imported pottery in regional exchange networks. This suggests that strategies were at work on a regional level, in which access to this material was restricted. During this early period, Mycenaean pottery seems to have been used by many members within communities, but some groups were able to acquire more of this material than others. Apparently, this pottery was subject to sumptuary strategies also on a local level. The fact that there were no obvious differences in appreciation between matt-painted vessels and Mycenaean decorated ware, nor between storage and dinner vessels indicate that it was the imported nature of the pots which determined their social significance. We may conclude that during the early period Mycenaean ceramic vessels constituted symbolic references to relationships with an international world which were used in competitions between and within settlements.

On the Italian mainland, the settlement pattern in the Middle Bronze Age and the beginning of the Late Bronze Age shows much of the same characteristics as that of the earlier period, with a number of sites acting as central places in regional exchange networks. The large concentration of LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB pottery at Taranto and the relative scarcity of contemporary imported finds at other sites indicate that this central place had a firm grip on the regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery in Italy. Possibly, a similar situation existed on Lipari with regard to the Tyrrhenian area. In Sicily, the settlement pattern during the Middle Bronze Age changes significantly in comparison with the previous period and a distinct coastal preference with a hierarchy among sites becomes visible. Thapsos, and possibly Cannatello appear to have fulfilled functions as central places. Here too, there are large concentrations of imported Mycenaean pottery in comparison with most neighbouring sites. The increased capability of these central places to control the distribution of goods resulted in a distinctive regional pattern as regards the presence of Mycenaean pottery. On Sicily, for example, there was a marked preference for storage vessels, while elsewhere dinner vessels circulated in substantial amounts too. Mycenaean pottery appears to have been widely used among the inhabitants of several communities during this period. Even though the use of these vessels in the tombs at Thapsos shows their social significance, the tight grip by the central places may have decreased the possibilities for this imported material to serve in sumptuary strategies on a local level.

A number of important changes took place in southern Italy from an advanced stage of the Late Bronze Age onwards. There is a notable increase in settlements, which occur in fortified positions or have elaborate defence works. In addition, there are clear examples of craft specialisation, in particular in metal products, which begin to show typological similarities with objects in the Aegean. Craft specialisation may also be seen in the production of wheel-made pottery which has been attested at Broglio di Trebisacce, Termitito, Casale Nuovo and in Sardinia. Finally, there is evidence for a change in storage practices, not only by the presence
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143 Marazzi 1994, 18-23.
144 Peroni 1994b, 843.
145 Tusa 1983, 418.
147 Bietti Sestieri 1973, 408; 1983, 59-60. During the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, the metal production of southern Italy is related to the flourishing industry in the north and has typological connections with trans-Alpine Europe. In the course of the Late Bronze Age and particularly in the Final Bronze Age, the evidence for metal production shift from northern to central and southern Italy and begins to show inter-relationships with the Aegean industry.
148 Jones & Vagnetti 1991. The stirrup jar fragment from Casale Nuovo is probably produced in southern Italy.
of wheel-refined *dolia*, but also by the rectangular buildings at Thapsos, which included extensive storage spaces. These phenomena should probably be related to an increase in social complexity, of which one result may be the so-called *Anaktaron* at Pantalica in Sicily. This increased complexity may also be recognised in the distribution of Aegean-type pottery. Mycenaean ceramic imports and Aegean-type pottery of local manufacture seem to have circulated side-by-side. However, the distribution of local grey wheel-made wares is not the same as that of Mycenaean-type pottery. This shows that choices were being made with regard to which type of pottery to import or manufacture. The concentration of Mycenaean pictorial vessels at Termitito, likewise, is evidence of cultural choices made on a local level. These phenomena indicate that the distribution of goods between sites was controlled and that, just as in the earliest phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy, Aegean-type vessels served in strategies of restriction on a regional level. At the same time, we have seen that during the third phase, with the exception of central Italy and Sardinia, the use of wheel-made LHIIIB-LHIIIC style pottery was concentrated among elite groups. Moreover, Aegean-type dinner vessels seem to have acquired a special significance in most areas, with the exception of Latium and Sardinia. In southern Italy and Sicily Aegean-type pottery obviously was used in sumptuary strategies within settlements. However, it was not so much the imported nature which determined the social significance of these vessels, but their function as storage or dinner vessels. The use of these vessels in elite cultural practices such as dining provided local meaning to the pots. The different role of the same pottery in Latium and Sardinia is possibly related to different social realities in which competition among groups was less or of a different character.

Clearly, Mycenaean pottery played a socially relevant role in the development of the societies in the central Mediterranean during the Bronze Age. This role, however, varied not only geographically, but especially over time. Local and regional strategies between communities and between different groups within communities assigned very specific meanings to Mycenaean pots.

---

149 Vagnetti 1999.
151 Peroni 1994a, 261; Bernabò-Brea 1957, 162-165. This building has been dated to the Final Bronze Age. It should be remarked that A. Messina (1993) has raised the hypothesis that the *Anaktoron* dates not to the Bronze Age, but is a Byzantine fortified farmstead from the 9th century A.D.
152 A wheel-made fragment found at Casale Nuovo was probably produced in southern Italy, see Angle et al. 1993, 212-213.
153 d’Agata (1997, 457) states that social complexity was greater in southern Italy and Sicily than elsewhere in Italy. See Barker & Stoddart (1994, 154) for lack of evidence for settlement hierarchy in central Italy before an advanced phase of the Final Bronze Age.
A number of important changes took place in society during this period. Although changes in material culture, especially in the form of pottery, have been observed, the most significant changes were in social organization and institutions. This period is characterized by the emergence of more complex social structures, including the development of a more organized political system. The increase in the production of pottery suggests a shift towards a more sedentary lifestyle, with more permanent settlements.

In the context of the Late Bronze Age in the Near East, the development of more complex social structures is evident. The emergence of centralized governance, possibly under the control of ruling elites, is suggested by the increased elaboration of pottery and other artifacts. This change in social organization is also reflected in the development of urban centers and the establishment of trade networks, which facilitated the exchange of goods and ideas across different regions.

The importance of these changes can be further understood through the study of pottery. By examining the types and styles of pottery produced during this period, archaeologists can gain insights into the social and economic activities of the time. The changes in pottery production, with a shift towards more complex designs and techniques, reflect the development of new technologies and the adaptation of existing ones to meet the needs of a changing society.

In conclusion, the Late Bronze Age was a period of significant social and cultural change, marked by the emergence of more complex social structures and the development of new technologies. These changes had far-reaching implications for the development of societies in the Near East and beyond, setting the stage for the future developments of these civilizations.
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