

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	7
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	11
Chapter 1. The Project and its Development	13
<i>R.E. Jones, S.T. Levi, M. Bettelli, L. Vagnetti</i>	
1.1. Introduction	
1.2. The archaeological evidence	
1.3. The chronological framework	
1.4. The pottery classes	
1.5. Archaeometric analyses	
Chapter 2. Gazetteer of Sites	21
<i>L. Vagnetti, M. Bettelli, S.T. Levi, L. Alberti</i>	
2.1. Introduction	
2.2. Gazetteer of sites	
2.3. Updating	
Chapter 3. Building a Comparative Chronology between Italy and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age	59
<i>M. Bettelli, L. Alberti</i>	
3.1. Aegean-type pottery from Central Mediterranean stratified contexts	
3.2. The contribution of Italian type <i>impasto</i> and wheel-made Grey wares discovered in the Aegean	
3.3. Final Remarks	
Chapter 4. Characterisation and Provenance	101
<i>R.E. Jones, S.T. Levi</i>	
<i>with contributions by M. Bettelli, P.M. Day, D. Pantano, J.A. Riley, Y. Goren, M. Sonnino, J.L.L. Williams</i>	
4.1. Analyses: methods and procedures	
4.2. Geological environment and raw materials	
4.3. Results	
- Apulia	
- Basilicata	
- Calabria	

- Campania
- Molise
- Latium
- Tuscany
- Marche
- Veneto
- Sicily
- Sardinia

4.4. Aegean and other imports

4.5. Italo-Mycenaean fabrics

4.6. Archaeological overview: Aegean summary and illustration of samples

Chapter 5. Technological Investigations

363

S.T. Levi, R.E. Jones

with contributions by V. Cannavò, C. Moffa, E. Photos-Jones, A. Vanzetti et al.

5.1. Manufacturing process

5.2. Decoration and Firing temperature ranges

5.3. Firing structures

5.4. The Broglio experiment in reproducing 'Italian mixed products'

5.5. General Discussion

Chapter 6. Discussion and Perspectives

407

R.E. Jones, M. Bettelli, S.T. Levi, L. Vagnetti

6.1. Assessment of archaeological and archaeometric results

6.2. Typological classification of Italo-Mycenaean pottery

6.3. Implications

6.4. Looking ahead

Databases

465

1. AAS

2. INAA

3. ICP-ES

4. Petrographic-mineralogical data

5. XRF, SEM-EDAX

Appendix

525

R.E. Jones

1. Analytical methods

2. Inter-technique and inter-laboratory comparisons

Abbreviations and Bibliography

551

FOREWORD

The present volume is the result of nearly half a century of research related to the evidence concerning Aegean-Mycenaean finds in Italian Bronze Age contexts, carried out with the participation of the Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici (ISMEA) of the National Research Council (CNR), which in 2001 took the name of Istituto di studi sulle civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente (ICEVO). Since 2013 ICEVO became part of the new Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo antico (ISMA), with a much wider scope concerning research on ancient Mediterranean civilisations.

The present monograph is published in the series Incunabula Graeca, established by ISMEA in the 1960s.

Among the earliest activities on the subject in which ISMEA played an important role, we would like to mention the small exhibition, entitled I Micenei in Italia, held in Taranto Museum in 1967, edited by one of the authors of this monograph together with Santo Tiné (Tiné, Vagnetti 1967). A second exhibition on the same subject was held in 1982, again in Taranto Museum, on the occasion of the XXII Congresso di Studi sulla Magna Grecia dedicated to Magna Grecia e Mondo Miceneo (MGMM2). The exhibition and its catalogue (MGMM1) was based mainly on the results of new excavations undertaken in the late 1970s in particular on the island of Vivara in the Gulf of Naples by Massimiliano Marazzi and Sebastiano Tusa, at Broglio of Trebisacce in Northern Calabria by Renato Peroni, at Termitito in Basilicata by Salvatore Bianco and Antonio De Siena, and at Nuraghe Antigori in Southern Sardinia by Maria Luisa Ferrarese Ceruti.

The new excavations significantly expanded the geographical and chronological horizons, enormously increased the archaeological evidence of Aegean-type finds from Italy, well related to local archaeological contexts, and above all provided new material on which new archaeometric methodologies could be applied to ceramics.

Thanks to the far-sighted vision and the spirit of cooperation of the directors of the excavations and of the archaeological superintendents then in office, the four sites mentioned above became real research laboratories in which archaeology and archaeometry participated with equal dignity to the development of specific research strategies.

A first sampling campaign due to John Riley of the University of Southampton, was soon followed by a project carried out by Richard Jones, co-author of this monograph, as Director of the Fitch Laboratory of the British School at Athens, with the full consent and support of the then Director of the School, Hector W. Catling. The first results were presented by R.E. Jones in 1984, as part of the congress Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo. Problemi storici e documentazione archeologica, (TMM), attracting much interest and discussion (Jones 1986).

In the following years, it became possible through the excavations in particular at Broglio di Trebisacce which yielded an outstanding amount and variety of pottery classes related to Aegean technology and style – painted Mycenaean pottery and its later derivations, wheel-made Grey ware of Minyan technology, large containers inspired by Aegean-type pithoi (dolia) – to launch, thanks to the support of Renato Peroni, a wide-ranging strategy of archaeometric research, which also included a very detailed study of the local impasto pottery. The project was developed in situ especially by Sara T. Levi, with numerous national and international collaborations, the first phase of which was summarized in

her Ph.D. Thesis (*Tecnologia e organizzazione sociale della produzione ceramica nell'età del Bronzo dell'Italia meridionale*, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza', 1994) and soon after in a specific monograph (Levi 1999).

The authors gratefully acknowledge the special role played by Renato Peroni and Hector Catling for the development of the research in which archaeology and archaeometry have been co-actors of the same objective.

In the 1990s, ISMEA, in parallel with the development of archaeometric research outlined above, launched a project of systematic and thorough collection of archaeological, territorial and bibliographical data, concerning sites in peninsular and insular Italy, where evidence of Aegean-Mycenaean type material had been found. The relational database, called *Dedalo*, aimed to systematically collect what was known from the literature and, in some cases, from first-hand information available to members of the team, coordinated by the present author. During that time, several young scholars took part in the project; among them I would like to mention Licia Re, whose contribution to the first layout of the database structure and the first data collection was extremely useful (Vagnetti, Re 1996). Among the authors and collaborators of the present volume, Marco Bettelli, Sara Tiziana Levi and also Lucia Alberti have given their contributions at different stages. Marco Bettelli's activity has been particularly devoted to the contextual study of the Aegean-type finds from Italy as well as to the study of Italian-type material in archaeological contexts of the Aegean (Bettelli 2002).

An outcome of the *Dedalo* project are Chapters 2 and 3 of the present monograph, respectively dedicated to the 103 archaeological sites considered here and to the comparative chronology of the Aegean and Central Mediterranean areas. Chapter 2 has been developed in the present form by Lucia Vagnetti, Marco Bettelli, Sara Tiziana Levi and Lucia Alberti. The same Lucia Alberti has contributed, with her specific archaeological knowledge of the Aegean area in general and of Crete in particular, to define some aspects of the comparative chronology of the two areas.

Among those outside Italy whom we collectively want to mention is John Ll. Williams in acknowledgement of his pioneering petrographic study of Italian prehistoric pottery.

We turn finally to terminology. One of the most significant outcomes of the close collaboration between archaeology and archaeometry is the discovery that pottery of Aegean type and technology was produced at more than one site in Italy. The definition of Aegean-type pottery is broadly used to describe ceramics that are typical products of the Aegean area considered in its widest geographical extension. Within this area there are more specific regional units, such as Crete, the Greek mainland, the Cyclades and the Dodecanese, which at different historical moments are also characterised by their own aspects of the material culture.

When we talk of Aegean-type pottery we do not mean to enter into the precise identification and distinction between material manufactured in the Aegean and possible imitations manufactured in adjacent areas.

The progress of research has allowed a better definition of the various Aegean pottery classes and their regional variations, as well as their imitations produced in areas such as Northern Greece, the Anatolian coast, Cyprus, the Levant and the Central and West Mediterranean.

With regard to the Aegean-type pottery found in Italy, they were initially considered as imported from the Aegean, with occasional distinctions between possible provenances from Mycenaean Greece or from Crete, thanks to the familiarity of Italian archaeologists with the Bronze Age of Crete.

Lord William Taylour's book published in 1958, *Mycenaean Pottery in Italy and adjacent areas*, somehow consecrated the prevalence of the term 'Mycenaean' on other definitions, which subsequently entered the relevant literature extensively in Italian and other European languages.

Since the 1980s, as a result of new excavations and also the integration of an archaeometric dimension into archaeological research, the existence of pottery – often generically referred to as of 'Aegean-Mycenaean

type' – produced in Italy, coexisting with imports from the Aegean, has been ascertained. A second important development has been the possibility of differentiating, on the basis of archeometric analysis, the major production centres on peninsular and insular Italy.

The present volume, *Italo-Mycenaean Pottery: the Archaeological and Archeometric Dimensions*, summarises the results of thirty years of research and tries to describe and discuss them as an overall picture, but still 'in progress'.

The authors are clearly aware that the plurality of the regional influences and stylistic inspirations of Aegean-type pottery produced in Italy would make the label of Italo-Aegean pottery the most appropriate for the definition of such production. However, the term *Italo-Mycenaean pottery* has been chosen for the title of the book and is used throughout the text, on the basis of some considerations that can be summarised as follows:

1. The whole phenomenon of the interrelations between the Aegean and Italy as far as pottery is concerned takes place in the chronological sequence of what we call 'the Mycenaean civilisation', corresponding to the Late Bronze Age of Greece, which encompassed a substantial part of the Aegean area.
2. The earliest imported material, apart from some typical LH I sherds, can be referred to fabrics and techniques such as the Matt-painted and Minyan pottery, which are at home in Mainland Greece, starting in the Middle Helladic period, but also continuing into LH I, as the new data from Tsoungiza in the N.E. Peloponnese seems to confirm (J. Rutter pers. comm.).
3. The important presence of ceramic materials imported from Crete is essentially datable to a period not earlier than advanced LM IIIA and IIIB, when the island was strongly integrated into the Mycenaean cultural orbit.
4. The same consideration holds true for the pottery of local production imitating Aegean prototypes: the typological, stylistic and chronological references are consistent with the same areas of origin of the imports, mainly Mycenaean Greece and LM III Crete.

In the light of these considerations the authors feel justified, at least for the moment, in adopting the term 'Italo-Mycenaean pottery'. First of all, it follows a tradition of studies that has been consolidated over time; on the other hand, we would like to emphasise the idea that the present monograph should mark and summarise a phase of research, from which new paths may be developed, new questions may be formulated, a better understanding of the picture, both in detail and in its general overview, may be proposed, and also a more appropriate terminology could be established.

Lucia Vagnetti