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

Citation for published version (APA):

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

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

Conclusions

Introduction

The main aim of this study is to identify and investigate variations in the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery found in the Levant, Cyprus and the Italian area. In chapter 3 I have extensively discussed the concept of cultural significance. Of particular importance for any such study is the social groups that used specific parts of the Mycenaean repertoire, the objects and activities with which these vessels were associated and the extent to which Mycenaean pots were part of social strategies at local, regional and supra-regional levels. For the Levant, Cyprus and the east Mediterranean these issues have been investigated in parts II, III and IV. In this chapter, I attempt to summarize the above research and to discuss the conclusions regarding the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery in each of the three regions.

In chapter 3, the conclusions reached for the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean are compared to each other. The basis for comparison is formed by the corresponding chapters of parts II, III and IV. The social groups to which Mycenaean pottery can be attributed, the differentiation in the presentation of various parts of the Mycenaean repertoire and the frequency of the Mycenaean pots. Occasionally, elements within the repertoire on the local levels will be referred to as well. The comparison between the three areas will identify similarities and differences in the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery. These similarities and differences and their interpretation constitute the main conclusions of the study. They will briefly be discussed in the context of Mediterranean long-distance trade in the next chapter. Before we finally introduce the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery on the Anatolian level, we need to discuss the similarities and differences in the reception of this pottery in the three areas.

Mycenaean pottery

The quantities of Mycenaean pottery at each of the three areas under consideration have been discussed in chapter 3. The Levant has the most sites with Mycenaean pottery, but the density is highest in Cyprus, i.e., the absolute number of pots. A common characteristic of the
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Variations in the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery

Introduction

The main aim of this study is to identify and investigate variations in the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery found in the Levant, Cyprus and the Italian area. In chapter 2 I have extensively discussed the concept of cultural significance. Of particular importance for my research are the social groups who used specific parts of the Mycenaean repertoire, the objects and activities with which these vessels were associated and the extent to which Mycenaean pots were part of social strategies on local, regional and supra-regional levels. For the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean, these issues have been investigated in parts II, III and IV of this thesis respectively. The regional analyses in chapters 8, 13 and 18 represent the conclusions outlining the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery in each of the three regions.

In this chapter the conclusions reached for the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean are compared to each other. The basis for comparison is formed by the corresponding subdivisions of chapters 8, 13 and 18: the social groups to which Mycenaean pottery can be associated, the differentiation in the appreciation of various parts of the Mycenaean repertoire and the funerary use of the Mycenaean pots. Occasionally, elements from the analyses on the local levels will be referred to as well. The comparison between the three areas will identify similarities and differences in the cultural significance of the Mycenaean pottery. These similarities and differences and their interpretation constitute the main conclusions of this study. They will briefly be discussed in the context of Mediterranean long-distance trade in the next chapter. Before we can fruitfully investigate the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery on the Mediterranean level, we need to discuss the similarities and differences in the repertoire of this pottery in the three areas.

Mycenaean repertoires

The quantities of Mycenaean pottery in each of the three areas under consideration have been discussed in chapter 3. The Levant has the most sites with Mycenaean pottery, but the density is highest in Cyprus, as is the absolute number of pots.¹ A common characteristic of the

¹ In the early 1970's Åström listed 2187 Mycenaean finds dating before LHIIIIC; in addition he counted 1258 pots of LHIIIC type, see Åström 1972b, 289-403; 1973, 123. Since then, thousands of additional Mycenaean finds have been made at sites such as Kiton (site no. 57), Hala Sultan Tekke (site no. 59) and Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96), to name only a few of the more important sites. Leonard (1994, 1) was able to list ca. 2300 Mycenaean finds in the Levant. It is difficult to assess the quantity of Mycenaean finds in the central Mediterranean. A major site such as Broglio di Trebisacce has produced more than six hundred Mycenaean-type finds, many of which are small sherds, see Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 412; Vagnetti pers. comm. Taylour (1958, 81-137) lists some 150 Mycenaean finds from Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300); Biancofiore (1967) discusses more than two-hundred of such pots from the same site and from others in the vicinity. When we consider that Lipari, Vivara (site no. 324), Termitito (site no. 302) and Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328) all have produced some three hundred Mycenaean finds, a total of ca. 2000 Mycenaean-type finds in Italy is probably a safe estimate.
distribution pattern in all areas is that everywhere a large number of sites has produced very few Mycenaean finds, while only a few sites have yielded substantial quantities of it. Several large urban centres along the Levantine coast, such as Ugarit (site no. 128, 129), Sarepta (site no. 150) and Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), have produced large amounts of this pottery. However, it also occurs in quantity at sites in the interior of the Levant, such as at Megiddo (site no. 175) and the Amman airport site (site no. 189). This was not the case in Cyprus, where extremely large quantities of Mycenaean pottery have been found exclusively at sites on the coast, such as Enkomi, Kition (site no. 57) and Hala Sultan Tekke (site no. 59). Just as the coastal cities of the Levant, all Cypriot urban centres with major deposits of Mycenaean pottery are towns which played important roles in regional and supra-regional trade networks. In Italy, too, the places which have produced substantial quantities of Mycenaean pottery can be understood as nodes where international and regional exchange systems coincided. In comparison with the Levant and Cyprus, however, clear shifts in time can be noted with regard to the sites in the central Mediterranean with large quantities of Mycenaean pottery. During the early period, Mycenaean pottery was concentrated on Vivara (site no. 324) and Lipari; later at Taranto-Scoglio del Tommo (site no. 300) and Thapsos, while Broglio di Trebisacce, Termititito (site no. 302) and Antigori (site no. 328) have produced large numbers of LHIIIB-LHIIIIC type material. The unequal presence of large quantities of Mycenaean pottery, which is characteristic of all areas, suggests that everywhere this pottery was imported in only a few places, after which it was distributed through regional exchange networks.

In Cyprus, a few LHI-LHIIA pots have been found, while some contemporary Minoan pottery is also present on the island. An increase in the Aegean imports in the island may be noted during the LHIB and especially during the LHIIA1 ceramic phases, of which substantially more finds have been made, even in places far away from the coasts. From LHIIA2 onwards, large quantities of Mycenaean pottery reached all parts of the island. This remained the case until an advanced stage of LCIIIC, when pottery in Aegean style began to be produced on the island itself and Aegean imports diminished.

The chronological pattern in the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant is similar to that in Cyprus, but not exactly. Apart from a LHIIA piriform jar found in a context dating to the end of the thirteenth century at the Amman Airport (site no. 189), Mycenaean finds dating to the beginning of the Late Bronze Age are absent in the Levant. A few isolated contemporary Minoan pots have been found, however, at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) and Tell Ta’ anek (site no. 177). LHIIB and LHIIIA1 finds occur somewhat more often in the Levant, but the quantities are very small, Ugarit possessing a relatively ‘large’ amount of six Aegean pots dating to these stylistic phases. Substantial numbers of Mycenaean pottery begin to arrive in the Levant only during LHIIIA2. Apparently, in the early stages of the import of Mycenaean

---

2 Marazzi 1988, 6-7.
3 A few LHI finds were made at Enkomi, while at Maroni (site nos. 98, 330) a LHIIA alabastron has recently been found. Toumba tou Skourou (site no. 116), Ayia Irini Palaeokastro (site no. 88) and Kouklia Palaeokastro (site no. 105) have produced LMI finds.
5 Hankey 1974, 145. A fragment from Minet el-Beida has been assigned to LHIIA/LMIB, while a jar from Ras Shamra has a LHIIA-LHIB date, see catalogue II nos. 161, 200. Two finds from Lachisch (site no. 213) have been ascribed to LHII, see Tufnell 1958, 211-212.
6 At Kamid el-Loz a LMB bridge-spouted jar has been discovered, see Adler 1994, 208-211. At Tell Ta’anek a LMB spouted jug has been found. It is of interest that both sites are situated far from the coast.
7 Elsewhere only one or two Mycenaean finds dating to LHIIIB-LHIIIA1 have been found, see chapter 3, p. 33; chapter 8, p. 144.
pottery, the Levant lagged somewhat behind Cyprus. The chronological pattern for the presence of Mycenaean pottery is similar for the Levant and Cyprus at the end of the thirteenth century BC, when Mycenaean-type vessels seem to have been imported from peripheral areas of the Aegean world, such as the Dodecanese and probably Cyprus. As in Cyprus, Mycenaean-type pottery appears to have been produced in the Levant at the end of LBII. LHIIIC-type pottery, which is abundant in Cyprus, occurs only at a restricted number of sites in the Levant, mainly in the southern coastal plain.

A completely different chronological pattern in the presence of Mycenaean pottery can be observed for the central Mediterranean. Large quantities of LHI and LHII pottery have been discovered on the Aeolian islands, as well as on Vivara (site no. 324). In addition, a range of sites along the Apulian coast have produced smaller quantities of contemporary Mycenaean pottery. Even though the number of sites with LHIIA finds in Italy is somewhat higher than those with earlier Aegean finds, many sites have produced small quantities only and there was a concentration of LHIIIA2-LHIIIB finds in a few centres such as Taranto-Scoglio del Tomno (site no. 300), Thapsos and Lipari. A sharp increase in the import of Mycenaean pottery during LHIIIA2, such as is visible in Cyprus and the Levant, is clearly lacking in the central Mediterranean. The extensive local production of Mycenaean pottery which has been demonstrated for various sites in the central Mediterranean appears to have been a feature from LHIIIB onwards.

Even though there are some differences between Cyprus and the Levant in the presence of Aegean pots from the various stylistic phases, it is clear that the chronological pattern in the import of Mycenaean pottery in these areas is roughly similar. Both areas reveal the sequence of introduction, growth and decline, that has been outlined by Gerald Cadogan. In contrast, the central Mediterranean shows a more disjointed pattern, with distinct regions and sites gaining prominence during specific periods. On this basis, it is likely that the cultural significance of Mycenaean vessels fluctuated more through time and space in the Italian region than in Cyprus and the Levant.

In each of the three areas which have been subject to analysis in this thesis, decorated fine wares constitute the majority of the Mycenaean repertoire. In the Levant and Cyprus, Aegean coarse ware vessels are almost exclusively large transport stirrup jars, which may be of Minoan origin. In Cyprus, these vessels are relatively widely distributed, with notable concentrations...
at Kourion-Bamboula (site no. 102) and Enkomi. In the Levant, this type of vessel is limited to large urban centres on the coast. In the central Mediterranean, coarse ware stirrup jars comparable to the vessels in Cyprus and the Levant have been found in Broglio di Trebisacce and in Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300).

Much larger quantities of Aegean-type coarse ware date to the earliest period of Mycenaean pottery in Italy and have been discovered on Vivara (site no. 324) and Filicudi (site no. 316). This type of pottery included a range of shapes, among which were storage and dinner vessels. Smaller quantities of Aegean coarse ware pottery have also been found in Punta le Terrare (site no. 292) on the Apulian coast and in Monte Grande (site no. 293) in Sicily. This Aegean coarse ware has been interpreted as one of the classes of Mycenaean pottery which circulated in Greece alongside decorated fine wares of LHII and LHIII type. As such, it should be compared to the matt-painted pottery of Middle Helladic tradition which has also been found in Italy, but which is absent in Cyprus and the Levant. The presence of matt-painted and coarse ware pottery in Italy should be related to the relatively large body of Aegean ceramics from the early Mycenaean period in this area in general. However, it also indicates that Mycenaean pottery arrived in Italy through a variety of contacts between Italic groups of people and inhabitants of the Aegean. Regional exchange networks in the two areas seem to have been interconnected. The presence of small quantities of exclusively Mycenaean decorated fine wares in Cyprus and the Levant suggests that during the same period this type of pottery did not arrive in these areas by similar interconnections between regional exchange networks.

In the Levant the relative proportions of Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels varied between individual sites. Urban coastal centres such as Ugarit, Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162) and Ashdod (site no. 206) yielded a majority of Mycenaean dinner vessels; elsewhere Mycenaean storage vessels were more abundant. Inland centres such as Hazor and Beth Shean (site no. 178) produced far fewer Mycenaean dinner vessels and a relatively narrow range of Mycenaean storage vessels. In general, the Mycenaean repertoire in smaller centres in more marginal areas, such as Deir ‘Alla, was restricted to a few storage vessels only. The coastal centres in Cyprus, likewise, yielded a large body of Mycenaean dinner vessels in addition to storage pottery of the same origin. In contrast with the Levant, sites in the interior of the island could also possess a wide variety of Mycenaean pots from LHIIIA1 onwards, including both dinner and storage types. In the central Mediterranean, Mycenaean dinner vessels, in particular cups and kylikes, were part of the Aegean ceramic repertoire from the earliest period onwards. In certain periods, specific areas could exert preferences for particular categories of Mycenaean pottery, as is indicated by the abundance of LHIIIA2-LHIIIB storage vessels in

18 For the distribution of this type of vessels in the island, see Åström 1972b, 335-336; see also above, chapter 13, pp. 249-250.
19 A concentration of six Aegean coarse ware stirrup jars has been attested at Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida, see catalogue II: nos. 408, 462, 474, 475, 477, 478. Eight of these vessels came from Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162), see Balensi 1980, 501-502. Isolated vessels have also been found in Ras Ibn Hani (site no. 130), Sarepta (site no. 150), Megiddo (site no. 175) and Tell Beit Mirsim (site no. 214), all sites in the vicinity of the coast, see Leonard 1994, 46-47.
20 For Broglio, see catalogue X: no. 12 It should be noted that the fragment was not decorated; however, decorated sherds possibly belonging to the same vessel were found in the near vicinity. Analyses by NAA indicated that the fragment was imported from the Peloponnesse, see Vagnetti & Panichelli 1994, 385 (no. 102), 399. For the coarse ware stirrup jar at Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto, see Biancofiore 1967, 44.
21 See chapter 18.
22 Panichelli & Re 1994.
Sicily. The widespread occurrence of Mycenaean dinner vessels in all three areas clearly shows that the ceramic vessels themselves were appreciated and not just the contents of containers.

The repertoire of Mycenaean pot shapes in Cyprus and the Levant is roughly similar: only a few vessel types which occur more than five times in Cyprus are absent in the Levant, while there are no vessel types occurring in substantial numbers in the Levant that have not been found in Cyprus. As has been observed in chapter 3, however, the proportions in which various Mycenaean vessel types occur in these areas may vary considerably. The mug (FS 225-226), for example, as well as conical and zoomorphic rhyta and figurines are present in far larger quantities in the Levant than in Cyprus. Other shapes, such as the LHIIB handleless cup (FS 210), are more frequent in Cyprus than in the Levant. All this indicates that Cyprus and the Levant obtained Mycenaean pottery from a common source, but that choices were made with regard to which vessels to import. The concentration of Mycenaean ceremonial vessels and figurines in Ugarit shows that such choices were made at a local level in the urban centres of the Levant. The variations that have been observed between the Mycenaean pottery in primary centres in Cyprus indicates that this was also the case in the coastal towns on this island. Because Mycenaean vessels became part of regional exchange networks in both Cyprus and the Levant, such local cultural choices had consequences for the regional distribution pattern of this pottery.

The fact that the Mycenaean repertoire in the eastern Mediterranean differs substantially from that in the Aegean itself has led to the term Levanto-Helladic, to indicate specific shapes which occur more often in the east than in the Aegean. The very existence of such a body of Mycenaean pottery may be taken as an indication that there was a specialised production and marketing of Mycenaean pottery for external markets. In contrast, the type of LHI-LHII pottery that is found in Italy encompasses a variety of cups and jars, which are not part of the Levanto-Helladic repertoire, but reflect the ceramic range of shapes in various parts of Greece. Among the LHIIA2 and LHIIIB pottery from Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300) there are several vessels which would fit into the Levanto-Helladic repertoire, such as a variety of piriform jars, an amphoroid krater and chalices. At most contemporary sites in Italy, however, such vessels are scarce. The LHIIA2 and LHIIIB vessels in the central Mediterranean comprise a range of alabastra, jugs, cups and kylikes which, even though not absent in the eastern Mediterranean, are not part of the Levanto-Helladic repertoire but are frequent in Greece as well. In addition, Mycenaean amphorae, both small (FS 58-62) and

25 See chapter 3, p.27-28 and note 33.
26 Gilmour 1992, 123. See his table 1 for differences of in the presence of specific Mycenaean vessel types between the Levant and Cyprus.
27 See, also, Van Wijngaarden 1999c.
28 Karageorghis 1965a, 204-228; see also chapter 3 above. See Leonard (1994, 6-7) for the problems associated with the use of this term. Typical shapes within the Levanto-Helladic repertoire are the large piriform jar (FS 36), the amphoroid krater (FS 53-55), the cylindrical jug (FS 139), the chalice (FS 278), the shallow bowl (FS 295-296) and zoomorphic rhyta.
30 At Lipari, for example, Vapheio cups (FS 224-225) are abundant, while two hole-mouthed jars (FS 100) occur as well; see catalogue VIII. At Vivara, likewise, Vapheio cups (FS 224-225) have been found, just as, for example, squat jugs (FS 87). See also Sherratt 1999, 194.
31 Taylour 1958, 128-133 (amphoroid krater and piriform jars); Biancofiore 1967, 44 (piriform jars), 55 (chalices).
32 At Lipari, an amphoroid krater has been found (catalogue VIII no. 50), as well as a few large piriform jars (catalogue VIII nos. 148, 154). At Thapsos one large piriform jar was found (catalogue IX no. 32). At Broglio di Trebisacce a locally-made amphoroid krater of LHIIIC date has been discovered (catalogue X no. 1325).
large (FS 68-69), occur in substantial quantities in Italy, whereas they are completely absent in the east.

Even though sites in the central Mediterranean did receive some Aegean vessels that were specially produced for overseas exchange, a much larger body of specialised products went to the east. The same phenomenon can be observed for other Mycenaean specialised ceramics. Only one conical rhyton has been found in the Italian area: in Nuraghe Antigori (site no. 328). Other ritual vessels are completely absent in the central Mediterranean. A concentration of Mycenaean pottery with pictorial representations has been found in Termitito (site no. 302), the only other specimens being three fragments from Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300). Only three Mycenaean figurines have been found in the central Mediterranean, one at Lipari (catalogue VIII no. 501) and two more at Taranto-Scoglio del Tonno (site no. 300). Obviously, specialised production of Mycenaean pottery was not primarily aimed at Italy. The fact that some specialised vessels did end up in this part of the Mediterranean demonstrates the strong interconnections between exchange networks in various areas. The concentration of Mycenaean pictorial pottery at Termitito shows the influence of local cultural choices on the international flow of goods.

The conclusion of this section is that the presence of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant and Cyprus was due to specialised production and marketing in international exchange. Archaeologically, these supra-regional strategies have resulted in a relatively clear-cut quantitative pattern of growth and decline in the presence of Mycenaean pottery and in a relatively homogeneous repertoire of pot shapes. In contrast, Mycenaean ceramic vessels arrived in the Italian area as part of much longer processes, in which regional distribution networks within the Aegean and in the central Mediterranean were connected to one another. Here, we see a much more disjointed quantitative and geographical pattern in the presence of Mycenaean pottery, in addition to a less homogeneous ceramic repertoire. In all three areas, cultural choices made in key places in the inter-regional distribution networks, could substantially influence the flow of Mycenaean pots on a regional level.

Social groups associated with Mycenaean pottery

The three areas which have been investigated in this study vary greatly with regard to their socio-political organisation. Even though urbanism seems to have declined somewhat in the Levant during the Late Bronze Age, a complex, differentiated society with large urban nuclei had already been in existence for a long time and there was a complex network of supra-local relationships. In spite of domination by foreign powers and growing internal oppositions between different population groups, palatial rule in most city states appears to have been stable. As has been shown in chapter 8, Mycenaean pottery was an integral part of this urban culture and was widely used by various population groups in the cities. Outside the main urban centres, however, Mycenaean vessels were quite scarce and their use was restricted to specific people and particular situations, as has become clear especially from the detailed analysis of the

---

37 Taylour 1958, 115.
38 In this respect, it is interesting that both the quantitative pattern of Mycenaean pottery in the east, as well as the ceramic repertoire, become less homogeneous when the specialised production and marketing seems to have ended in an advanced stage of LHIIIc, see Sherratt 1991, 192; 1999, 184. For the diminishing of the range of Mycenaean pot shapes at the end of LBII in the southern Levant, see Killebrew 1998, 161-162.
39 Falconer 1994; Bunimovitz 1995, 324.
Mycenaean vessels found at Deir ‘Alla. In Cyprus, urbanisation did not have such a long history and large urban centres, in fact, were not very common during most of the Late Bronze Age. In addition, they were restricted to the coasts. The development of supra-local polities precisely during this period shows that in Cyprus relationships between various population groups were much less stable than in the Levant. As has become clear from the detailed analysis of Enkomi-Ayios Iakovos, Mycenaean pottery was an integral part of the developing cosmopolitan material culture in the urban centres. Even at Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimritros (site no. 96), where there is evidence that Mycenaean pottery possessed a special significance, various groups in the society used small quantities of this class of ceramics. In contrast to the Levant, however, smaller regional centres and even tertiary production sites on the island could also acquire substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery, encompassing a wide ceramic repertoire.

The difference between the Levant and Cyprus in the extent to which social groups outside the urban centres made use of Mycenaean vessels is probably related to the different level of supra-local complexity. In the Levant opposition between urban groups connected to ruling elites and rural non-urban populations appears to have been quite strong. In addition, the degree to which foreign powers were present in the Levant enhanced differences in the material culture between sites along the coast and in the major valleys on the one hand and sites in more marginal areas on the other hand. These strong oppositions are visible in the extent to which non-urban groups were able to make use of Mycenaean pottery. The comparatively wide use of the same type of pots by non-urban groups in Cyprus indicates that oppositions between cities and rural regions were absent on the island, or, at least, were of a different nature.

The central Mediterranean, at best, can be called proto-urban during the period concerned. In fact, a process of increasing site hierarchy appears to have been related to the development of inter-regional contacts, as is evident from structures such as the defensive walls in Apulia or the large building at Scoglio del Tonno-Taranto (site no. 300) which are associated with Mycenaean pottery. In all periods during which Mycenaean pots are found in Italy they appear to have been used by various groups within societies. Such is clear from the relatively wide distribution of this material at Lipari, Thapsos and Broglio. At the same time, however, we need to realise that a coastal pattern in the distribution of Mycenaean pottery is more evident in Italy than elsewhere. This suggests that Mycenaean pottery was used mainly by groups that were part of regional exchange networks; these had been developing in various

---

41 Catling 1979, 199; Negbi 1986, 97; Keswani 1996, 217-220; Knapp 1997, 56-57. Only Enkomi, Toumba tou Skouro (site no. 116) and Kouklia-Palaeopolis (site no. 105) appear to have been large settlements already during LCI. Elsewhere, for example at Hala Sultan Tekke (site no. 59), Maroni-Vournos (site no. 89) and Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96) settlement began during LCIIA-LCIIIB. At Kition (site no. 57) urbanisation did not start before an advanced stage of LCIIIC.

42 South & Russell 1993.


45 The complex systems of relationships between sites that has been described by Keswani (1993) and Knapp (1997) presume a strong interdependence between groups living in various parts of the island.

46 Whitehouse 1973, 622-623; Marazzi & Tusa 1979a, 340-341; Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 171; Giardino 1994. It should be noted that features of complexity such as defensive works and status differentiations in tombs were well established in south-eastern Italy prior to the Aegean contacts, see Cipolloni-Sampò 1986, 32.

47 See chapter 3, p. 33. Sicily should be considered an exception to this pattern, as is the case for Sardinia during LIIIB.
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regions of Italy. Of course, for the central Mediterranean one cannot speak of oppositions between urban and non-urban sites. However, the virtual absence of Mycenaean pottery from sites in the interior is, in a way, comparable to the situation in the Levant.

In the urban centres in the Levant, Mycenaean pottery has not only been found in average domestic contexts and in contexts bearing evidence of craft production, but it could also be associated to social groups that possessed wealth and a high status. Indeed, Mycenaean vessels have been found in structures that can directly be related to the ruling élite, for example in the palaces at Ugarit and Hazor. It has also been shown, however, that within the urban communities, high-ranking groups did not make substantially more use of Mycenaean pots than other social groups. At Ugarit, for example, concentrations of Mycenaean pottery have not been observed in the palace, but in tombs in the harbour town. Those Mycenaean vessels which can be associated with palatial structures in the Levant appear to be evidence of the extent to which this pottery was part of the material culture. All indications are that Mycenaean pottery was used by urban inhabitants of various status.

A concentration of Mycenaean pottery among average urban social groups may also be seen in Cyprus at Enkomi, where this material was widely distributed as well. However, for Cyprus it was concluded that a distinction needed to be made between coastal sites with a complex, heterarchical social structure and a site such as Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96), which had a more hierarchical organisation. There is clear evidence at the latter site that large quantities of Mycenaean dinner vessels were assembled by the inhabitants that were associated with the exceptional building X. At Enkomi the use of Mycenaean pots was restricted only during an early period. I have argued that it was due to the competition between various population groups in this city that Mycenaean pottery became available to many people in the urban society. In contrast with the Levant, then, the use of Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus originated in the upper levels of society, even though during LCII it gradually became available to other groups.

In the central Mediterranean, during the first phase of Mycenaean pottery import, specific groups in the societies of Vivara (site no. 324) and Lipari appeared to have acquired more Mycenaean vessels than others. Considering the relation between the development of social complexity in this part of the Mediterranean and supra-regional exchange, we may assume that the social groups which managed to control access to Mycenaean pottery were among the emerging élites. LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB pottery seems to have been more homogeneously distributed. However, it has also been observed that such pottery was concentrated at relatively few large centres. Moreover, the inventory of tomb XXI/47 at Thapsos shows that an élite group could acquire a wider repertoire of Mycenaean pottery than other people. In the third phase of Mycenaean pottery import in Italy, there is again evidence that specific groups were able to acquire substantially more Mycenaean vessels than others. Obviously, during all

---

49 It remains to be seen whether the concepts of sub-élite and substitute-élite, which are employed by Sherratt (1999, 185) to refer to the groups at whom Mycenaean pottery was aimed, is valid in this respect. As is evident from the case of Ourtenu, in whose house at Ugarit various Mycenaean kraters have been found (catalogue II nos. 551-554), such pots could be assembled by a person who possessed considerable wealth and high status, but was not of royal lineage, see Yon 1995, 427.
50 South 1988; South & Russell 1993, 305-306.
51 Of course, the absence of large administrative buildings in any way comparable to the Levantine palaces makes it difficult to compare the social structure between Cyprus and the Levant. It should be noted, however, that one of the buildings in Cyprus, which does show some form of centralisation of power, building X at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios, possessed substantially more Mycenaean pottery than buildings elsewhere at the site. Such a situation has not been reported from any Levantine palatial site.
phases, the use of Mycenaean pottery was to some extent concentrated among elite groups on the coasts in the central Mediterranean. Other groups in the coastal settlements, however, appear to have had access to these pots as well.

Evidence for cult or other ritual activities within settlements is very scarce for the central Mediterranean in the period concerned. Such activities may possibly be associated with the exceptional building Δ IV (H 30) at Lipari. Even though Mycenaean pots have not been found on the floors of this structure, two fragments of Vapheio cups (catalogue VIII nos. 208, 210) and one handle fragment of a LHIIIB goblet (catalogue VIII no. 209) were found in the fill above the floor, associated with several miniature vases. If the association of the building with cult is correct, there is evidence that Mycenaean vessels were used in local rituals, even if only sporadically. It is very probable that during the Italian Bronze Age ritual practices continued to be carried out in caves, as they had during the Neolithic. Probably, such rituals were also carried out in the caves at Manaccora (site no. 342) in Apulia or Sassano (site no. 344) in Campania, each of which contained deposits from Neolithic times onwards. These two caves have produced small quantities of Aegean pottery, which indicates that Aegean vessels were used in cave rituals. Mycenaean pottery was certainly used in Levantine cultic rituals, as is clear from the evidence in Ugarit, Hazor and Deir ‘Alla, as well as from Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) and Lachisch (site no. 213). Indeed, I concluded in chapter 8 that Mycenaean pots were an integral part of religious practices at various levels in the urban societies of the Levant. A similar conclusion was reached for Cyprus, where the Mycenaean juglets in Athienou were evidence for religious use, as were the Mycenaean vessels from the cultic precincts at Kition (site no. 57) and Myrtou-Pigadhes (site no. 84). Obviously, the three areas under investigation in this study are similar in that Mycenaean vessels were included in cultic rituals. Of course, it is likely that the specific roles of these vessels within the rituals varied.

Differentiation within the repertoire of Mycenaean pottery

Above, I have commented upon the variations in the chronological build-up of the Mycenaean repertoire between the three areas. In the Levant not many LHII-LHIII A1 vessels have been found, but these were widely distributed. The concentration at Hazor of Mycenaean finds from this early period in an area where the palace was located and near the official temple in area H has been taken as evidence that their use was confined to specific circumstances and high-level social groups. The evidence from Ugarit, however, where such finds came from various contexts, indicated that this was not the case everywhere in the Levant. In Cyprus, both at Enkomi and in Tontuma tou Skourou (site no. 116), the use of Aegean pottery from the very first part of the Late Bronze Age was clearly restricted to specific groups of people. However, the wider distribution of LHIIIB-LHIII A1 vessels shows that during LCII this class of pottery gradually became available to more people.

Much more than in the Levant, in Cyprus one can observe a pattern in which the significance of Mycenaean pottery gradually changes from a rare, exotic prestige good to a commodity that is an integral part of the material culture at many sites on the island. Differentiations between settlements and regions were being forged in Cyprus precisely during

---

52 Malone, Stoddart & Whitehouse 1994, 188.
54 For Manaccora, see Baumgartel 1951; 1953. For Sassano, see Pellegrini & Piperno 1998. It should be noted that in both cases burials have also been found.
55 Twenty sites in all parts of the Levant have produced such pottery, mostly one or two finds only, see above chapter 3, Table IV and Map 3.
the period in which Mycenaean pottery was imported. It is likely that the close association of Mycenaean pots with Cypriot élite practices made these vessels suitable to be actively involved in sumptuary strategies between various groups on the island. This socially active role of Mycenaean pottery triggered processes of emulation, due to which this class of material became available to many people in Cyprus. A similar pattern is not visible for the Levant, where relationships between sites and regions during the Late Bronze Age were much more stable. Mycenaean pots appear to have been a less active component in the relationships between various groups in the Levant.

For the central Mediterranean, it was concluded that there was a clear chronological development in the use of Mycenaean pottery by various groups in the societies. In the first phase of Mycenaean contacts with Italy, imported vessels were widely used by various social groups, but some people managed to acquire more of it than others. Later, LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pottery seems to have been concentrated at a few major centres, which is indicative of regional strategies of restriction. In the third phase of the use of Mycenaean pots in Italy, élite groups seem to have been able to monopolise specific parts of the Mycenaean ceramic repertoire. As in Cyprus, then, Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean was actively involved in the changing relations between various groups in the society, both on the local and regional level.

In the Levant, there is clear evidence that some Mycenaean vessels could circulate for extremely long periods in regional exchange networks before they became part of the archaeological record. A similar observation has been made for Mycenaean pots in Cyprus. In the central Mediterranean such a phenomenon has not been observed. Objects that circulate for long periods of time, may become endowed with a variety of possible meanings related to former owners and situations of which they had previously been part of. Such biographical meanings can effectively transform the object in the sense that they make it special and personalised. Exchanges of goods in the Near East could possess a highly ceremonial character and even commercial transactions were often accompanied by gifts of a personal nature. All indications are that commercial and ceremonial aspects of exchange were heavily intertwined in the Levant, even if the emphasis could be on one of these aspects during any given transaction. The fact that Mycenaean pots in the Levant circulated as antiques indicates that they were transformed from purely functional commodities into personalised items endowed with biographical meanings. Obviously, in Cyprus Mycenaean vessels could be transformed in similar ways. The absence of evidence for the circulation of Mycenaean vessels as antiques in the central Mediterranean is probably due to the altogether different character of exchange in this area, which may have lacked the highly ceremonial aspects of Near Eastern trade.

In Cyprus Mycenaean dinner vessels could be used in ceremonies of conspicuous consumption. This has become evident in particular at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96), where Aegean dinner vessels were restricted to élite contexts. In centres with a more complex social

57 For the use of various classes of objects in Cypriot social strategies, see Knapp 1996a, 219-222.
58 On the subject of emulation, see Veblen 1899, 22-34; Appadurai 1986, 57; Glennie 1995, 180-181; Miller 1995, 27-28 (all with extensive bibliographies).
59 In the southern Levant, the Late Bronze Age can be characterised by de-urbanisation, which was due to Egyptian influence, see Bunimovitz 1995, 324. Another process which can be recognised in the Levant is the increasing opposition between urban and non-urban groups, see notes 43-44.
60 Marazzi & Tusa 1979a, 314-323; Bergonzi 1985, 359-369; Bietti Sestieri 1988, 46-49; Marazzi 1994, 92-93.
61 Gregory 1982, Parry & Bloch 1989 (both with extensive bibliographies).
structure, such as Enkomi, a special significance of Mycenaean dinner vessels could only be noted for earlier periods; the competition between various élite groups gradually devaluated the exclusivity of such Mycenaean vessels. By the end of LCIIIC, Aegean-type dinner vessels were widely used by many groups all over the island. Mycenaean storage vessels, apparently, were also used by many people in Cypriot society and were not exclusively associated with élite behaviour and sumptuary display. As a result, the appreciation of this type of pottery does not show a clear chronological development: small quantities of Mycenaean storage pots were widely dispersed from LHIIIA1 onwards. The fact that the Cypriot ceramic industry at the end of LCIIIC emulated dinner vessels in particular, is a clear illustration of the differences in attitude towards Mycenaean storage and dinner vessels on the island.

In the Levant, in primary centres such as Ugarit or Megiddo (site no. 175), there does not seem to have been a difference between the appreciation of Mycenaean storage and dinner vessels. However, at inland centres with a far more restricted Mycenaean repertoire, such as Hazor, Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) and Beth Shean (site no. 178), Aegean dinner vessels were confined to official, high level contexts. This indicates that the appreciation of Mycenaean dinner vessels in the Levant was highly dependant on their availability. The high appreciation of relatively ordinary Mycenaean storage vessels at Deir ‘Alla shows that a similar process took place with respect to storage vessels which were distributed to sites in more marginal areas, such as Transjordan and the Palestine uplands. To a far larger extent than in Cyprus the appreciation of various Mycenaean functional classes in the Levant appears to have been due to strategies of restricted regional distribution. In this respect, it is interesting that Levantine production of Mycenaean-type pottery which began only at the very end of the Late Bronze Age and was of limited scale, initially was confined to Mycenaean closed vessels such as stirrup jars and flasks. Both vessel types probably have to do with oil and were widely used and highly regarded in places far away from the coast.

In the central Mediterranean, during the first period of Aegean contacts, there does not seem to have been any difference in the appreciation of Mycenaean dinner and storage vessels. Indeed, it was the imported nature of the vessels, rather than their functions, which was of particular significance. During the period in which LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pottery was distributed in Italy, differences in the appreciation of dinner and storage pottery could occur, but were not a general phenomenon. In a later period, however, Aegean-type dinner vessels appear to have acquired a special significance, at least in southern Italy, as is clear from the concentration of this functional class in the complesso a monte at Broglio di Trebisacce. Apparently, the appreciation of Mycenaean vessels in the central Mediterranean increasingly depended on specific cultural practices with which they could be associated. In Cyprus and the Levant this was the case throughout the period during which Mycenaean pottery was imported. As such, Mycenaean dinner vessels could be part of dining and drinking ceremonies, while the appreciation of small storage vessels was related to activities to do with unguents and oils.
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64 Steel 1998, 294-296.
65 The vessel types which are most frequently mentioned as being produced in Cyprus from LCIIIC onwards are shallow bowls, deep bowls and ‘Rude’ or ‘Pastoral’ style kraters; see Sherratt & Crouwel 1987, 341-342; Kling 1987, 103, 106; 1989, 130, 170-173; Sherratt 1991, 191-193.
66 Killebrew 1998, 161-162. Levantine production of so-called Mycenaean IIIIC bowls began during a somewhat later period.
67 For the existence of such ceremonies in the Levant, see Carter 1995, 300-305. According to Steel (1998, 289), similar ceremonies took place in Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimtrios.
In the Cypriot coastal centres specific groups appeared to have used Mycenaean pictorial pottery, in particular large kraters, to distinguish themselves in their funerary ritual. It should be emphasised that it is difficult to identify these groups within Cypriot society: at Enkomi, their tombs were not notably more wealthy than others. The high appreciation of Mycenaean pictorial pottery at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96), however, suggests that this type of pottery was related to practices of consumption of Cypriot elite groups. A similar appreciation of Mycenaean pictorial pottery has not been encountered in the Levant. At Ugarit, such pottery was found in a variety of contexts in all areas of the site and the number of pictorial vessels from tombs was actually quite low. The fact that Mycenaean pictorial pottery is not very abundant at sites far away from the Levantine coast can be related to the strategies of restricted distribution which generally limit the Mycenaean repertoire at many sites. Although individuals living in the Levant certainly will have noted the pictorial representations on Mycenaean pots and may have had specific associations with them, a broader social significance of Mycenaean pictorial scenes was confined to Cyprus.69

Mycenaean pictorial vessels in Cyprus were not used exclusively in funerary practices.70 At Enkomi, such pottery was widely distributed in the settlement and it was not restricted to specific buildings or contexts. This indicates that the special significance of Mycenaean pictorial pottery was related to Cypriot burial practices. Not so much the pots and their decoration were special, but the fact that they could be included in funerary ceremonies of specific persons. A similar relationship between burial practices and Aegean pottery is to be seen with respect to coarse ware stirrup jars, which have been found in small numbers in tombs at various Cypriot sites. Obviously, the transportation vessels, with or without their contents, acquired a meaning beyond their functional use when they were deposited in a tomb. Coarse ware stirrup jars have also been found in a number of tombs at Levantine sites.71 All the same, the practice appears not to have been very widespread in either Cyprus or the Levant.

As has been demonstrated for Ugarit, Mycenaean conical rhyta and related ritual pot shapes were highly regarded in this coastal city.72 The evidence from the sanctuaire aux rhytons (R2) shows that these vessels were used in local rituals, which was also the case elsewhere in the Levant, such as at Tell Abu Hawam (site no. 162)73 and Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154).74 It is logical to assume that the high appreciation of these vessels in the Levant originated in their suitability to be included in local rituals. This is another example of cultural practices being responsible for the special significance of a Mycenaean vessel type. The fact that Mycenaean terra-cotta figurines in the Levant have been found primarily in domestic contexts indicates that

69 In this case it is of interest to note that the presence of Mycenaean pictorial pottery is not equal in those deposits in the Levant with extraordinary quantities of Mycenaean pottery. At Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154) a Mycenaean kylix decorated with an octopus was discovered in a tomb, but the varied Mycenaean deposit in the temple did not contain pictorial vessels, see Hachmann 1980, 43, 84, 88; 1982, 44; Marfoe 1995, 131 fig. 76. From the temple at Tell 'Sera (site no. 216) no Mycenaean pictorial pottery has been reported, see Oren & Netzer 1974. From the so-called 'Mycenaean tomb' at Tell Dan (site no. 158) came one Mycenaean chariot krater, see Gunneweg et al. 1992. Several sherds from Mycenaean pictorial kraters, however, have been found at the Amman airport site (site no. 189), see Hankey 1974, 147-149.

70 At various sites this type of pottery has been found in settlement contexts, for example at Enkomi, Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96) and Pyla-Kokkinokremos (site no. 52), see South 1997, 158; Karageorghis 1982b, 50. In addition, signs of wear and intensive use on pictorial kraters from tombs in Enkomi indicate that some kraters had been used extensively before being deposited in a tomb, see Keswani 1989a, 562.

71 As we have seen, this was the case at Ugarit for six Aegean coarse ware stirrup jars. In addition, such vessels occurred in a tomb at Megiddo (site no. 175) and Ras Ibn Hani (site no. 130), see Guy & Engberg 1938, 157; Touvier 1975, 68.

72 See also Van Wijngaarden 1999c.

73 Balensi 1980, 93, 441.

74 Hachmann 1980, 84, 87; 1982, 33.
the use of these items, likewise, was determined by local behaviour. In Cyprus, Mycenaean rhyta and figurines were more scarce than in the Levant. The deposition of a number of Psi-type figurines in a pit in temenos A at Kition (site no. 57), or the Mycenaean rhyta near the sanctuary at Myrtou-Pigadhes (site no. 84) indicate that these items could be associated with Cypriot cultic practices. It is likely that the use of such ceramic items in local rituals made them particularly subject to strategies of restricted distribution. The fact that by far the most Mycenaean rhyta and figurines have been found at Ugarit shows, firstly, the central position of this city in intra-regional exchange networks and its power to acquire and control highly desired items. Secondly, it demonstrates the extent to which local customs could influence the supra-regional circulation of Mycenaean pottery.

As has been stated elsewhere in this chapter, specialised Mycenaean shapes, with a few notable exceptions, are all but absent in the central Mediterranean. To a far larger extent than Cyprus and the Levant, however, different Aegean-type ceramic wares, such as matt-painted pottery in the first period of Aegean contacts and ceramica grigia in a later period, are present at Italian sites. These various classes of Aegean-type pots, generally, have been found together and there is no evidence that they were used by different groups of people. At the same time, it has been noted that these ceramic classes were not distributed equally among sites in the central Mediterranean. This suggests that there were regional preferences for specific classes of Mycenaean pottery. In contrast with the Levant and Cyprus, not so much local cultural practices, but the specific workings of internal systems of distribution should be regarded as responsible for the disparities in the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery in the central Mediterranean. Only in the later period, when there is evidence that élites in southern Italy monopolised Mycenaean-type drinking vessels, it is clear that the appreciation of Mycenaean pots became directly related to local cultural practices.

It is obvious that the cultural significance of different types of Mycenaean pottery was not the same everywhere. The meanings which were given to these pots varied highly according to time, place and vessel type. Mycenaean pots may be considered as ‘added value-products’. Neither the material of which these pots are made nor elaborate techniques of manufacture endowed these pots with intrinsic value. Susan Sherratt has recently suggested that Mycenaean vessels acquired significance through association with objects of different material, in particular metals and textiles. The range of Mycenaean vessels distributed in the Mediterranean, even though limited in comparison to the Aegean, consists of different pot shapes and types of decoration. Not all parts of this repertoire can be related to metals or textiles. The stirrup jar, for example, which is one of the most frequently occurring vessel types everywhere, is a purely ceramic form. Likewise, the decoration of most pots consists either of simple lines or of floral and abstract patterns which have a long history in Aegean (vase) painting.

Instead of a general association with objects of other materials, value seems to have been added to Mycenaean pots through their incorporation in varying social strategies and cultural practices on a regional and local level. In Cyprus, the importance of metal production and international maritime exchange gave products associated to these activities a special

75 Karageorghis 1985a, 98-99, 105, 170.
76 Taylor 1957, 1; Cadling 1957, 42: no. 187.
78 Sherratt 1999, 186-189. This would be evident from the pot shapes which have counterparts in metal and from decoration motifs, some of which are reminiscent of embroidery.
79 Haskell 1985, 222-223.
80 Crouwel & Morris 1985, 98.
The parallels between Mycenaean pots and metal vessels or between decorative motifs on ceramics and textiles, then, can also be understood as an aspect of the specialised production for an external market. As also seems to have been the case for pictorial pottery, this specialised production aimed specifically to enlarge the suitability of Mycenaean pots to be associated with Cypriot social strategies.

Funerary use
In each of the three areas under consideration, Mycenaean pottery has found its way into the tombs of the deceased. Even more so than is the case for settlement contexts, one should be very careful in comparing archaeological patterns relating to funerary behaviour of different culture areas. As archaeological deposits, tombs are the result of very specific rituals with a highly symbolic significance. Not only is it likely that such rituals varied considerably in time and space, they may not have been the same for different groups within one society. In general, funerary patterns can only be understood in their proper cultural context. Nevertheless, I feel that it is useful to compare the extent to which Mycenaean pottery was included in funerary contexts in the three areas. This may shed light on the suitability of Mycenaean pottery to be part of ceremonies of a symbolic nature. In particular, it may be useful to investigate the extent to which specific groups in the respective societies deliberately chose Mycenaean vessels as a means of expression in funerary behaviour.

The most marked pattern considering the funerary use of Mycenaean pottery is visible for the Levant. Many groups in the urban societies along the Syro-Palestinian littoral included small quantities of Mycenaean pottery in their tombs, in particular small storage vessels. These small storage vessels may be related to the uses of oils in Levantine funerary practices for which there is some epigraphical evidence. At various places, in the Levant, however, specific groups included large quantities of Mycenaean pottery in their tombs, usually encompassing a wide range of pot shapes and often associated with other imports. It seems that for some groups the imported nature of the Mycenaean vessels was a reason to assemble them and to display them ostentatiously in a funerary ritual. It is impossible to identify with certainty the groups in the Levant for whom imported Mycenaean vessels possessed such a symbolic significance. However, it has been established in chapter 8 that these groups were not part of the uppermost elite, but of the average urban population. Possibly, the same social groups were responsible for other situations in the Levant where large quantities of Mycenaean pots appear to have been assembled, such as in the temples at Kamid el-Loz (site no. 154), the Amman Airport (site no. 189), or Tell Sera (site no. 216).

In Cyprus the practice of including Mycenaean pots in tombs seems to have been even more widespread than in the Levant. Not only did such vessels occur widely in many tombs at

---

81 Knapp 1996a, 19-22.
82 Hodder 1982b, 141-146; Morris 1992, 9-10.
83 O'Shea 1981, 49-52; Morris 1987, 41-42. The ideological constitution which constitutes the rationale behind regularities in funerary behaviour may vary considerably in one and the same society.
84 As is the case elsewhere, we may safely assume that in all three areas investigated here funerals had a highly symbolic meaning as ceremonies referring to rites of passage; see Morris, 1987, 29-32; 1992, 9-10. The way in which this symbolism is conceived, however, may have been completely different.
86 Apart from Ugarit, the sites where such exceptional tombs have been discovered are Hazor, Byblos (site no. 144), Sarepta (site no. 155), Tell Dan (site no. 158), Megiddo (site no. 175), Tell es-Saidiyeh (site no. 186) and Ain 'Shems (site no. 210). Each of these can be considered to have constituted an urban centre.
87 Hachmann 1980, 43, 84, 88; 1982, 33.
88 Hankey 1974, 34 in particular.
89 Oren & Netzer 1974, 265.
Enkomi, they have been found in funerary deposits all over the island. At Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios (site no. 96) there is clear evidence that the inclusion of Mycenaean drinking vessels in tombs was restricted to elite groups, showing that funerary use of this type of pottery was related to behavioural patterns of the living.\textsuperscript{90} The wide occurrence of Mycenaean dinner vessels in tombs at Enkomi and other coastal centres can be explained by the devaluation of such pottery due to competition between various elite groups. The fact that specific groups at Enkomi seem to have included more pictorial kraters in their funerary inventories than other people probably indicates a specific sumptuary strategy in this continuous competition.\textsuperscript{91} Mycenaean storage vessels seem to have fulfilled a similar role at smaller sites.

The practice of including Mycenaean pots in tombs in Cyprus, then, seems to have been part of strategies in the competitions between various groups in the society of the living. The widespread occurrence of Mycenaean pots in tombs on the island indicates that specific elite practices became increasingly available to many people in Cypriot society. In contrast, in the Levant the close association of a specific group of people with Mycenaean pottery appears to have resulted in a highly specific funerary pattern restricted to a minority of graves. For the central Mediterranean, it is clear that Mycenaean pottery could be included in funerary ceremonies too. However, this practice may have been less widespread than in either the Levant or Cyprus. The extraordinary repertoire of Mycenaean (and Cypriot) vessels from tomb XXI/47 at Thapsos, as well as from grave 12 in the tumulus at Torre Santa Sabina (site no. 291), indicates that this pottery could be an active component of funerary strategies of display by elite groups.

Conclusions

In each of the three areas which have been the focus of this study Mycenaean pottery is completely different from the products of the local and regional potting-industries. In the Levant, during the Late Bronze Age, potters had returned to using the slow wheel for ceramic production and painted decoration was not very common.\textsuperscript{92} In Cyprus, even though a standardised wheel-made ceramic industry developed during LCIIIC, pottery generally was hand-made and comprised a comparatively restricted range of vessel types.\textsuperscript{93} Painted decoration, mostly consisting of abstract patterns, had a long history of the island, but most of the fine wares were left plain. In the central Mediterranean, the local impasto was also hand-made, with a plain burnished surface or with incised decoration.\textsuperscript{94} In comparison with the local pottery in each of these areas, the imported Mycenaean pots represented high-quality products: they were hard-fired, often elaborately painted and they came in a wide range of pot shapes. It is likely that these physical properties of the Mycenaean pots played a role in their attraction for consumers in the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{95} Likewise, we may assume that Mycenaean pots could fulfil specific functions which were relevant, such as storing oil or

\textsuperscript{90} South \& Russell 1993, 306; Steel 1998, 291 note 43 in particular.
\textsuperscript{91} Both in settlements and tombs at Enkomi Mycenaean pictorial pottery was rather widespread. On this basis, we may assume that various groups had equal access to this class of material. The decision to include substantial quantities of Mycenaean pictorial pottery in tombs - or not to do so - must have been a conscious one.
\textsuperscript{92} Leonard 1989, 20; Franken 1992, 149-152.
\textsuperscript{93} Sherratt 1991, 191-193; 1994a, 37.
\textsuperscript{94} Vagnetti 1999, 137.
\textsuperscript{95} According, to Miller (1987, 112-115) physical and functional characteristics always play a role in the way objects are used, although very often only a minor one. See also Hodder 1992, 201-207.
drinking liquids.\textsuperscript{96} As is clear from this concluding chapter, however, in each of the three areas Mycenaean imports had a significance that went far beyond their physical and functional characteristics.

In Cyprus the cultural significance of Mycenaean pots originated in elite practices in the coastal centres. The imported ceramic vessels, which were of better quality than native wares, were used by elite groups to distinguish themselves. This was the case especially for Mycenaean dinner vessels, which could directly be included in elite cultural practices such as ceremonial dining. The elite connotations of this class of pottery ensured that it became a symbol of a cosmopolitan life-style. As such, Mycenaean pottery could be an active component in the sumptuary strategies which defined relations between various social groups on the island. On a local level, this is visible for example in the concentration of Mycenaean pictorial kraters in a restricted number of tombs in Enkomi. On a regional level, the symbolism of Mycenaean pottery is apparent from the presence of a wide repertoire of such pots at smaller, secondary and tertiary sites. The active role of Mycenaean pottery in social competition led to emulation and redefinition of the status of these objects.\textsuperscript{97} As a result, we can see that during LCII Mycenaean vessels gradually became available to many groups everywhere on the island. The end-result of this process was that Mycenaean-type pottery became such an integral part of the Cypriot material record that it eventually was incorporated into the local ceramic industry.

In the Levant the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery originated not so much in practices of the ruling elite, but in its use by various groups among the urban populations. For such groups, the use of these imported items created possibilities to define their position in the complex social fabric of the Levantine city-states. The specific association of some people in the Levant with large quantities of Mycenaean pottery among other imports in funerary rituals shows that this pottery could be an active part of sumptuary strategies on a local level. Sites in the Levant situated far away from the coast have produced a far smaller range of Mycenaean vessels. This can be taken as evidence for an active role of Mycenaean pottery in strategies of restricted distribution, which defined oppositions between urban and rural population groups. Whereas in Cyprus Mycenaean pots were used to enhance the interdependence between primary centres and secondary and tertiary sites, the same pots were used in the Levant to emphasise differences between different types of settlement.\textsuperscript{98} Outside the large urban centres, Mycenaean pottery did not become an integral part of the material culture. As a result, the Mycenaean pottery had a limited effect on the local potting industry, which, in contrast to Cyprus and Italy, initially incorporated only a few container shapes.

In the central Mediterranean the presence of various classes of Mycenaean pottery was related to the importance of overseas contacts in this area. As such, the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery originated with the social groups on the coast who operated regional networks of maritime exchange.\textsuperscript{99} There is evidence that, initially, Mycenaean pots were symbols of relations with an international world. This indicates that the imported nature of the vessels was of prime importance for their significance. The presence of a varied body of Mycenaean pots in one tomb at Thapsos and in a grave at Torre Santa Sabina shows that this class of pottery could be an active component in funerary strategies on a local level. The concentration of large amounts of LHIIIA2 and LHIIIIB pots at a few sites such as Taranto-Scoglio del Tonno and Lipari shows that strategies of restricted distribution on a regional level

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Leonard 1981, 90, 94.
\textsuperscript{97} Cf. Bourdieu 1984, 208-225; Appadurai 1986, 21, 56-57;
\textsuperscript{98} For these differences, see Liverani 1987, 66.
\textsuperscript{99} For the regional networks of maritime exchange in the central Mediterranean, see Bernabò-Brea 1976-1977; Marazzi 1988; 1994, 19-23; Di Gennaro 1997, 423.
were at work as well. In a later period, when there is evidence that élites in southern Italy monopolised Mycenaean-type drinking vessels, it is clear that the appreciation of Mycenaean pots became intrinsically related to local cultural practices. The diminished significance of the imported nature of the Mycenaean pots is reflected in the development of local manufacture and exchange of Mycenaean-type pottery in various parts of the central Mediterranean.

Two observations have been made in this chapter which reveal supra-regional similarities in the cultural significance of Mycenaean pottery. In all three areas, a few large centres appear to have been crucial for the regional distribution of Mycenaean pottery. It is likely that all or most of the Aegean vessels were distributed in regional networks of exchange from these primary centres. Moreover, the variations in the Mycenaean repertoire between these centres, indicate that choices were made with regard to which Mycenaean vessels to import. Because of the active role of Mycenaean pots in strategies on a local and regional level in all three areas, the choices made on a local level in these coastal centres had supra-local consequences for the distribution of Mycenaean pots. In all places that have been subject to contextual analysis on a local level, local cultural practices were of prime importance for the appreciation of Mycenaean pots. The concentrations of Mycenaean rhyta at Ugarit, Aegean coarse ware at Kourion-Bamboula or pictorial sherds at Termitito demonstrate the influence of local consumers on the Mediterranean flow of goods.

A second observation valid for all three areas is that everywhere Mycenaean-type pottery eventually became part of the regional ceramic industry, even though in the Levant only on a relatively limited scale. It is of interest to note that such imitation, even though occurring earlier, in all three areas became widespread only when the LHIIIB style was well advanced. It has been argued that such a late development of regional ceramic industries of Mycenaean pottery is related to a scarcity of Mycenaean pots during this period. However, in a recent article, Susan Sherratt has implied that the scarcity of Mycenaean imports could be the result of conscious marketing strategies by Cypriot middlemen. The results of my research indicates that other factors than the availability of imported and imitated pots should also be considered. In Cyprus the manufacture of Mycenaean-type pots appears to have been the outcome of a long process in which the exclusiveness of such pots diminished to the point of being an integral part of the material culture. In Italy, Aegean-type vessels became increasingly related to local cultural practices. For both areas there is evidence that the imported nature of the vessels gradually ceased to be of prime importance to their cultural significance. In contrast to the Levant, where a similar pattern has not been detected, this opened the way for a large-scale local industry of this type of pottery in Cyprus and the central Mediterranean.

In the Levant, Cyprus and the central Mediterranean Mycenaean pots became part of social strategies and cultural practices operating at local and regional levels. These strategies and practices provided the Mycenaean vessels with associations which were specific to the cultural contexts in which they had been imported. Because of the large differences between the societies in the three areas which have been the subject of research here, the cultural significance of the imported Mycenaean vessels is different in each of them. It is difficult to identify factors determining the role of Mycenaean vessels, which may be considered to be

\[100\] For a relationship between local practices and Aegean ceramic imports, see also Vagnetti 1999, 148-149.


\[102\] For Cyprus, see Sherratt 1991, 191; for the Levant, see Killebrew 1998, 161-163; for Italy, see Vagnetti 1993, 147 (all with further references).


\[104\] Sherratt 1999, 184, 192.
supra-regional, or Mediterranean. One characteristic of all three areas is that Mycenaean pottery appears to have been part of symbolic cultic and funerary ceremonies. The acquisition of symbolic meanings is a general characteristic for manufactured objects that are imported into foreign cultural contexts.\textsuperscript{105} This may have been the case in particular for objects made from material with little intrinsic value.\textsuperscript{106} The variations in the cultural meanings that consumers attached to Mycenaean pots may be considered as the rationale behind the distribution of this pottery in the Mediterranean. Because of these variations, Mycenaean pottery could also serve in strategies on a supra-regional level, the mechanism of which was the long-distance exchange of goods.

\textsuperscript{105} Thomas 1992, 35-36; Strathern 1992, 177; Van Dongen 1996, 12-14.
\textsuperscript{106} Sherratt 1994a, 62-63; 1999, 178.
CHAPTER 20

The role of Mycenaean pottery in Mediterranean exchange

Introduction

The conclusions reached in the previous chapter have consequences for our ideas about the role of Mycenaean pots in Mediterranean exchange. These consequences are briefly explored in this final chapter. It has been established in the introduction to this thesis, that supra-regional exchange in the eastern Mediterranean was complex and conducted on various social levels. Many groups of people were involved in these exchanges, among whom were palace-based traders and independent merchantmen. Considering the complexity of supra-regional trade, the question of who exchanged and transported the Mycenaean ceramic vessels is not really relevant. It may be fruitful, however, to investigate the interest of particular groups in the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean. Due to the importance of Cyprus in the distribution pattern of Mycenaean pottery, I will focus on the role of the inhabitants of that island.

The motivations which constituted the rationale behind Bronze Age trade in the Mediterranean probably ranged from the purely diplomatic to the purely commercial, while different actors may not have had the same motivations at various points in the exchange networks. Since Mycenaean pots probably travelled through various modes of exchange before being deposited in the archaeological record, it is useless to ask about the type of exchange or the specific mechanisms of which these vessels have been part. Instead, it seems relevant to investigate the role of the Mycenaean pots in comparison to other trade goods. Finally, I will briefly comment on the position of the central Mediterranean in the complex international trade networks.

Role of the Cypriots

The island of Cyprus has produced the largest number of Mycenaean pots and the highest density of sites with such material. The large quantities of Mycenaean pots on the island, the size of which is small in comparison which such vast areas as Anatolia, the Levant, Egypt and the central Mediterranean, indicates that Cyprus played a special role with regard to the distribution of Mycenaean pots in the Mediterranean. Such a special role is emphasised by the observation that in the Levant and Egypt, Cypriot and Mycenaean pots are often found

---

1 See also Zaccagnini 1976, 468, 567; Knapp & Cherry 1994, 152-155; Artzy 1997, 7.
2 The discussions surrounding the ‘nationality’ of the Cape Gelidonya and Ulu Burun shipwrecks, both of which had cargoes with goods from many geographical areas, are examples of the difficulty to apply ethnic labels in the study of the complex trade networks in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, see Bass 1967, 165; 1991, 74; Pulak 1988, 37; 1997, 252-254.
3 In other words, what is ‘gift exchange’ for one, can be a commercial transaction for the trade partner. See, for example, Humphrey & Hugh-Jones 1992, esp. p. 14. On the arbitrariness of distinguishing between these two types of exchange, see Parry & Bloch 1989, 7-8.
together.\textsuperscript{4} Cyprus had a long tradition of pottery export to the Levant and Egypt and it seems logical to assume that the Mycenaean pots were supplemented to an already existing international circulation of Cypriot ceramics.

During the Late Bronze Age, a complex urbanised society developed in Cyprus which was related to the exploitation of copper resources for external exchange.\textsuperscript{5} Even though the material culture of the island shows a certain degree of homogeneity, there probably was not a unified state during this period, but several polities were organised around primary centres on or near the coast.\textsuperscript{6} The importance of copper production and of international trade for the development of complex societies in Cyprus gave items relating to these activities a special significance.\textsuperscript{7} It is for this reason that Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus could become a symbol of a cosmopolitan life-style and could fulfill the active roles in internal local and regional strategies that have been demonstrated in this study.

The active role of Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus originated in an élite life-style and was related to specific cultural practices, such as ceremonial dining and activities to do with unguents and oils. The specialised production in the Aegean of Mycenaean pottery for a foreign market, as is testified by the existence of the Levanto-Helladic class of pottery,\textsuperscript{8} was aimed specifically at these cultural practices in Cyprus. For this reason, the pictorial scenes on Mycenaean kraters, seem to have been socially relevant for burial practices in Cyprus, whereas this was not the case in the Levant. For Cyprus, then, it cannot be stated that pictorial kraters where primarily aimed at sub- or substitute élite groups, as has recently been argued by Susan Sherratt.\textsuperscript{9} Even if, through emulation and devaluation, these pots ended up among lower groups of the Cypriot population, their significance originated in élite practices.

The development of a complex urban society in Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age is rather late in comparison with neighbouring areas such as the Levant and Hittite Anatolia.\textsuperscript{10} In spite of references to the king of Alashiya in the diplomatic records of the Hittite area, the Levant and Egypt,\textsuperscript{11} it is unlikely that administrative centres comparable to Levantine or Mycenaean palaces ever developed in Cyprus. Even though the ashlar structures at Alassa, Maroni-\textit{Vournes} and Kalavasos-\textit{Ayios Dhimitrios} testify to the existence of hierarchical structured polities, these do not seem to have controlled the flow of goods in a manner requiring centralised administration.\textsuperscript{12} Instead, the movement of goods within Cyprus seems to have been based upon series of exchanges.\textsuperscript{13} The importance of trade in the island probably is reflected in the existence of increasingly powerful commercial groups in coastal centres such as Enkomi.\textsuperscript{14} The high concern of the king of Alashiya with the commercial aspects of the

\textsuperscript{4} Hankey 1967, 146. See also the various description of deposition contexts of Mycenaean pots in chapters 5-7, 10-12, 15-17.
\textsuperscript{5} Knapp 1985, 249-250; 1986b, 70-72; 1996a, 20-22; Keswani 1993, 78.
\textsuperscript{7} Keswani 1993, 79-80; Knapp 1996a, 19-22.
\textsuperscript{8} Sherratt 1982, 183; 1999, 182-184; Jones 1986, 599-600.
\textsuperscript{9} Sherratt 1999, 185.
\textsuperscript{10} Knapp 1997, 47; Keswani 1996, 217-220.
\textsuperscript{11} Hellbing 1979, 67; Knapp 1996, see, however, Merrillees 1987.
\textsuperscript{12} Keswani 1996, 235. In building X at Kalavasos-\textit{Ayios Dhimitrios} five clay balls have been found with Cypro-Minoan script, see South 1984, 40; Karageorghis 1990, 3-5. The ashlar building at Alassa has also been interpreted as a regional administrative centre; so far three seals and a number of seal impressions have been discovered, see Hadjisavvas 1996, 34-36. Even if the Cypro-Minoan script developed in response to a need to administer the movement of goods, the sporadic occurrence of tablets and clay balls in various places cannot be compared with centralised archives such as those of the Aegean and Levantine palaces. For an overview of the presence of Cypro-Minoan signs on a wide range of objects, see Palaima 1989.
\textsuperscript{14} Sherratt 1998, 297, 1999, 181-182 note 44.
ceremonial exchange with the pharaoh of Egypt also points to the particular importance of commercial exchange in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{15}

In the Levant, raw materials and manufactured goods found their way outside the sphere of ceremonial exchange and circulated among urban groups and lower strata of the population as exchange goods.\textsuperscript{16} Even though such transactions probably were not completely devoid of ceremonial aspects,\textsuperscript{17} commercial motives were the most important. The absence of pottery from the epigraphical record indicates that this class of material circulated precisely in such low-level exchange.\textsuperscript{18} The concentration of the use of Mycenaean pots among urban groups in the Levant, which is one of the conclusions of my research, is in accordance with such a pattern. It indicates that commercial exchange was conducted between urban inhabitants in Cyprus and comparable groups among the average population in the Levant and that Mycenaean pottery became part of these exchanges. The observation made above that the Levant lagged somewhat behind Cyprus in the beginning of the import of Mycenaean pots, indicates that the Levant, at least initially, relied on Cypriot initiative to acquire these vessels.

One conclusion of this study is that competition on a local and regional level among various groups within Cyprus devaluated the significance of Mycenaean pottery on the island. Mycenaean pots were part of a more varied body of paraphernalia relating to an international world, as is evident from the ivory rhyton, cylinder seals and a scarab found in Athienou and the collection of Cypriot-made ‘Mediterranean’ items in Apliki. We may assume that devaluation similar to the one observed for Mycenaean dinner vessels also affected other prestige items in Cyprus. Continuous competition in systems of exchange may have resulted in an increasing demand for an ever-widening repertoire of prestige goods.\textsuperscript{19} The large amounts in Cyprus of a wide variety of luxury imports such as jewellery, glass, faience and ostrich eggs are possibly the result of the active social role of imports.\textsuperscript{20} The most likely sources for these materials were the urban populations of Levantine city-states, with whom the Cypriot traders were in close contact. As such, the Mycenaean pottery became important to Cypriot urban social groups not only for its suitability to serve in local and regional sumptuary strategies, but also to acquire other valuables. Probably, it is this regional and supra-regional importance of Mycenaean pots, which caused Cypriots to be actively involved in the Aegean in the transport and even the production of Mycenaean pots.\textsuperscript{21}

The range of Mycenaean pots in the Levant and Cyprus is relatively homogeneous.\textsuperscript{22} Considering the comparatively large amounts of this type of pottery in Cyprus, it has been suggested that the vessels arrived in the Levant on ships which had previously put in at Cypriot harbours.\textsuperscript{23} The Mycenaean vessels in the Levant would then be left-overs from cargoes aimed at Cyprus. Such a scenario does not take into account the cultural choices made in large primary centres in both Cyprus and the Levant with regard to which Mycenaean vessels to

\textsuperscript{15} Zaccagnini 1973, 119-120. In comparison with other letters at Tell el-Amarna, those from the king of Alashiya are relatively informal and they ask directly for large quantities of silver as return gifts.

\textsuperscript{16} Zaccagnini 1984, 159.

\textsuperscript{17} Liverani (1972, 312) asserts that all exchanges had both ceremonial and commercial aspects, but the relative weights of each could vary.

\textsuperscript{18} Liverani 1986, 411; Sherratt 1999, 177-178.

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Campbell 1987.

\textsuperscript{20} See, for example, Knapp 1985, 149-150

\textsuperscript{21} This involvement can be deduced from the presence of Cypro-Minoan markings on Mycenaean pots in the Aegean; see Hirschfeld 1993, 313-315; 1996, 291-293. The active involvement of Cypriots in the transport of Mycenaean pottery can be seen from the wreck at Point Iria, see Lolos, Pennas & Vichos 1995; 1997, 329-331.

\textsuperscript{22} Gilmour 1992, 115.

\textsuperscript{23} Hankey 1967, 146-147. It should be noted that Catling (1980, 17-18) has raised the possibility that such ships first went to Ugarit, after which Mycenaean vessels were distributed to Cyprus.
import. I have argued in chapters 3 and 19 that the proportions in which various Mycenaean vessel types occur vary considerably between Cyprus and the Levant. Indeed, considerable variations in the Mycenaean repertoires have been observed between individual sites. Rather than the direct result of sailing routes, the circulation of Mycenaean pots in the Mediterranean was influenced by local cultural practices of which these vessels became part. The exploitation of the differences between these local practices may have enhanced the active role of Cypriot middlemen in the circulation of Mycenaean pottery. 24

The relation of Mycenaean pottery with other goods
The international economy in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean was probably based on the circulation of raw materials such as copper and tin. This may be concluded from the remains of three shipwrecks in the Mediterranean dating to this period, each of which contained large amounts of these metals. 25 In addition, as is especially clear from the wreck at Ulu Burun, various other raw material such as glass and ivory were traded, as well as a whole range of manufactured items. 26 In contrast to many other trade goods, decorated pottery is not made of a material that is scarce and its relative significance among trade goods is difficult to assess. It has been suggested that pots travelled as space-fillers or ballast in Bronze Age ships which transported a more valuable cargo. 27 However, the suitability of a breakable material such as pottery to serve as ballast or space fillers may be questioned. 28 In addition, one of the results of my research is that Mycenaean pots served relevant roles in the societies of the Levant, Cyprus and Italy. It is unlikely that the supply of such a culturally significant class of artefact depended on available space in ships carrying other cargoes.

Due to the significance of Mycenaean pottery in social strategies and cultural practices in the Levant, Cyprus and in the central Mediterranean, this class of pottery was exchanged and sought after in its own right. Even though a fair proportion of the Mycenaean ceramic vessels in all areas are dinner vessels, storage vessels are at least as numerous. 29 It is likely that the significance of Mycenaean storage vessels in exchange processes was related to its contents, which probably consisted of wine, oils and unguents. 30 Such substances appear to have moved in fairly large quantities all over the Mediterranean, as is clear from their frequent occurrence in the epigraphical record and from the distribution of a wide variety of small container vessels in clay, faience and stone. 31 The exchange of these substances often had a kind of 'coals to Newcastle' effect, in the sense that unguents and oils often appear to have been exchanged for similar substances. 32 It is likely that the containers added value and identity to these substances, as is also the case for modern perfumes. At Deir ‘Alla small Mycenaean stirrup jars and flasks had been in use for very long periods. Since it is likely that these had been refilled a number of

---

26 Among all the goods which are repeatedly mentioned by scholars as possible trade goods are wine, oils, precious stones and textiles; for an overview, see Cline 1994, 95.
29 The relative proportion of these two classes vary according to site, as has become clear from the various analyses in chapters 5-7, 10-12, 15-17.
32 Liverani 1972, 299-305.
times, it may well be that the ceramic containers themselves signalled the quality of their contents.

Mycenaean ceramic containers, dinner vessels and figurines were part of a body of manufactured objects that circulated widely over very large areas. A number of these objects may be recognised in the cargo of the Ulu Burun shipwreck: glass and amber beads, Egyptian scarabs and Mesopotamian and Levantine cylinder seals. A wide variety of objects of similar nature have been found in the Aegean, among which are the concentration of worn Cypriote and Levantine cylinder seals in Boeotian Thebes. In many contexts which have been investigated in detail in my study, similar objects were associated with Mycenaean pots: Cypriot ceramic vessels and wall brackets, Egyptian scarabs and amulets, Levantine cylinder seals, glass beads and bone combs. It is clear that there must have been substantial exchange of such objects, to which items of perishable material should probably be added. The importance of trade in such manufactured artefacts appears to have increased gradually as the volume and diversity of goods increased. Rather than depending directly on a trade in raw materials, Mycenaean pots appear to have been part of a growing body of manufactured objects that circulated widely and symbolised an international culture. As the results of my research indicate, the specific use of these symbols could be different at different places in the Mediterranean.

The extent of the international trading networks

The presence in the central Mediterranean of different categories of Aegean pottery dating to the very beginning of the Late Bronze Age indicates that regional exchange networks in this area were interconnected with networks in the Aegean. It has been suggested that during this early period Mycenaean trade was aimed at the central Mediterranean because the eastern Mediterranean networks were being monopolised by the Minoans and that only after the take-over of Knossos did the eastern routes become available to the Mycenaean. An argument against such a hypothesis is the fact that LMI-LMII pots in the eastern Mediterranean are not more abundant than contemporary Mycenaean pots. The repertoire of LHIIIA2-LHIIIB pots in Cyprus and the Levant, as well as the homogeneous chronological pattern in the deposition of these pots, indicate that at that time specialised production and marketing was responsible for the distribution of the Mycenaean vessels in the east. It is likely that such specialisation was necessary for Mycenaean products to become part of the complex network of exchanges in the eastern Mediterranean. The scarcity of LHI-LHII pots in the east probably indicates the lack of specialisation in the economy of the pre-palatial societies in mainland Greece.

The presence of substantial quantities of LHI-LHII pottery in the central Mediterranean indicates that the circulation of goods in this area initially was separated from similar processes in the east. It is likely that the Canaanite jar fragments found in Vivara arrived there.

---

33 Experiments conducted by Iphigenia Tournavitou (1992, 193) indicated that the porosity of the clay was considerable.
35 Lambrou-Philipson 1990a; Cline 1994, 133-233. Among the finds mentioned are Cypriot pottery, scarabs, seals and plaques, as well as a variety of metal and stone jewellery.
37 On the wide distribution of wall brackets and their Cypriot origin, see Caubet & Yon 1974; Bass 1986, 292.
38 See the various descriptions of closed contexts in chapters 5-7, 10-12, 15-17.
40 Cadogan 1973, 168; French 1986, 277; Cline 1994, 92.
41 Sherratt 1982, 183; Jones 1986, 599-600.
42 Marazzi 1988, 6-7; 1994, 33-37.
43 Re 1993, 332.
together with the Aegean wares through the interconnecting regional networks. In a later period, the specialised LHIIIA2-LHIIIB products intended for the eastern Mediterranean were never specifically aimed at the central Mediterranean. However, in some cases settlements in the central Mediterranean were able to acquire such specialised products, as is clear in particular from the concentration of Mycenaean pictorial sherds at Termititio and from the conical rhyton in Antigori in Sardinia. These examples indicate that during the Late Bronze Age the circulation of goods in the central Mediterranean increasingly became related to Mediterranean exchange, rather than just to Aegean regional networks. The number of objects in the central Mediterranean from other areas, such as the Cypriot-type vessels found in tomb XXI/47 in Thapsos, also indicate that the central Mediterranean, in the period contemporary to LHIIIB, more and more participated in long-distance Mediterranean networks of exchange. One of the conclusions of my research is that the significance of Mycenaean pottery in the Italian area during the same period increasingly became connected to specific cultural practices, as had already been the case in Cyprus and the Levant. It is likely that this change is related to the growing involvement of the Italian area in the wider international world of Mediterranean culture.

The picture which has emerged is that the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Mediterranean is testimony of the growth of complex networks of exchanges originating in the urban societies of the eastern Mediterranean. Various groups of people seem to have participated in these networks, among whom Cypriots must have played a pivotal role. The exchange networks appear to have operated on an essentially economic and commercial basis. It is possible that the commercial exchanges were subordinate to high-level ceremonial exchanges and to trade in large quantities of raw material. However, the various types of exchanges may also have been interrelated, as may be concluded from the diverse cargo of the Ulu Burun wreck. The commercial nature of growing exchange networks is likely to have stimulated continuous expansion and diversification, because of which an ever-increasing variety of goods became part of these trade systems. The incorporation of the Mycenaean world in the international circulation of goods is attested by the development of specialised pottery production. The central Mediterranean became part of the international networks at a later stage. Within these expanding trade networks, a body of goods emerged, including Mycenaean pots, which became symbols of international culture. As is the case for products of modern mass consumption, the significance of these artefacts varied in different places and regions in the Mediterranean.

44 For Canaanite jars in the Aegean during LHI-LHII, which are not many, see Cline 1994, 49.
47 See chapter 16, p.295.
48 This is also indicated by the increase in the number of Cypriot objects in Italy from the 14th century onwards, see Lo Schiavo, MacNamara & Vagnetti 1985, 62-63; Vagnetti 1986, 213; Vagnetti & Lo Schiavo 1989, 231. During the twelfth and eleventh centuries, contacts between Italy, and in particular Sardinia, seem to have been particularly strong. see Crielaard 1998 (with references).
49 For also Artzy 1997, 7; Sherratt 1999, 301-302.
50 According to Artzy (1997, 7), trade in the Late Bronze Age was specialised to the extent that instigators and financiers of exchange were not necessarily the same people as those who transported the goods.
51 Sherratt 1999, 176.