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Westernizing Aegean of LH III C

Francesco Iacono

Introduction
In the last decades Mediterranean archaeology has changed dramatically questioning some of its most basilar assumptions, as for instance the existence of large scale migrations à la Childe and prehistoric thalassocracies à la Evans. Yet despite this, when it comes to the interpretation of large phenomena of cultural change and interaction there are some axioms laying at the very core of the discipline which remain largely unnoticed and therefore almost completely unchallenged.

The most persistent and influential among those is undoubtedly that of directionality of culture change, from East to West, from the civilized to the uncivilized.

My aim in this contribution is to instil doubts about the inescapability of this trend. Can cultural influence travel the other way round?

In order to do that I will deal with an historical context in which the South-East/North-West cultural drift, as Andrew Sherratt (1997) named it, does not really fit with archaeological data. I am referring to the end of the palatial era and the post-palatial period in Greece (LH III B–C), corresponding roughly to Recent and Final Bronze Age in Italy and Bronze D and Halstatt A in the rest of Europe (Jung 2006, 216).

The title I choose evokes the well known Orientalizing period, a moment in which the cultural osmosis between the Greek ‘West’ and the ‘East’ is said to be at one of its higher point (Burkert 1992; Riva and Vella 2006).

The hypothesis that I will provocatively try to explore here by the means of a World System approach, asserts that a similar phenomenon in terms of width and strength of existing connections came about with regions which were located westward and north westward of the Aegean a few centuries before, in the last part of Bronze Age.

I will try to show in this paper that after the dissolution of mainland states a contraction occurred in the sphere of cultural influence of the Mycenaean ‘core’, leaving room for a variety of formerly peripheral elements to be accepted and become influential in Greece.

World System Theory, concepts and relationships
World System (WS) Theory has been already applied by a number of scholars to the analysis of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean (see Kardulias 1996 with previous bibliography). However I will not blindly adopt the theory as it was developed by Wallerstein in his first seminal work. It will be therefore necessary to introduce some of the basic concepts and relationships entailed by the approach adopted in this paper (Chase Dunn and Hall 1993; Schneider 1977; A. Sherratt 1993; Wallestein 1974). According to this perspective, the traditional relationships of core and periphery are defined by the relative level of capital accumulation, with cores presenting larger amounts (whatever its form) than peripheries (Frank 1993). These roles are of course relational and the same socio-political entity (be it a large polity, a hamlet or as far as the archaeological phenomena are concerned a site) might be a core in relation to some partners and a periphery vis-à-vis a larger core.
As the kind of interaction detectable in the archaeological record always entails a flow of capital (normally in the form of material cultural items), it is possible to analyze in terms of WS dynamics aspects which are often considered extraneous to economic interaction, such as diplomacy, political marriage and gift exchange (Chase Dunn and Hall 1993; 1997; Wilkinson 1987).

Methodologically it can be argued that in peripheral areas, privileged possession of material culture items from the core was possibly crucial as it signalled to the wider community the successfulness of local elites in establishing relationships with powerful partners. These items were then employed by elites in the peripheries as prestige goods in processes of competition over economic and political power. Afterwards they would slowly penetrate in the tissue of peripheral societies being adopted/imitated among larger sectors of the population (Friedman and Rowlands 1977; Veblen 1902).

Therefore, as a general criterion, it is possible to suggest that the larger the number of artefacts imported and/or imitated in a given area, the stronger is the influence of the core.

Naturally enough, systems are never static but continuously remodel and renegotiate their relationships creating cycles of growth and contraction which occasionally end up in major crisis and/or collapse (see Frank 1993; Hall and Turchin 2003; Tainter 1988). As an outcome of these crises former core-periphery relationship can be inverted producing an inversion of cultural influence that can be detected in the archaeological domain. This is possibly what happened to the Minoan/Mycenaean heartland toward the end of the palatial time. One aim of this paper will be that of addressing the effect of this process in a world systemic scale of analysis. In order to do that the first step to be made is assessing the nature of the relationship between the Aegean core and its western peripheries before this major crisis.

The Mycenaean WS and the West in LH I–III A

I do not have enough space here to discuss in detail the functioning of the Mycenaean core as regards to its western peripheries during the formative and the early palatial period, therefore the following discussion will be unavoidably selective.

Excluding the scant evidence of indirect relation offered by a few fragments discovered on the southern coast of Spain (Vianello 2005 with previous bibliography), the main area of Mycenaean interaction westward is represented by Italy (Bietti Sestieri 1988; Vagnetti 1983; 1999; Marazzi et al. 1986). The areas that returned the largest amount of Aegean materials are the Tyrrhenian, Sicily and, to a more limited extent, the Ionian arc. Much less intense, albeit already established, appear to have been interaction with the Adriatic area both on the Balkan and on the Italian side.1

In a more indirect fashion Mycenaean influence has been linked to various developments like craft production (introduction of new manufacturing techniques and local imitations), architecture and settlement patterns (MBA fortifications and development of coastal sites in Southeastern Italy) (Vagnetti 1999; Levi 2004; Malone et al. 1994; contra Cazzella and Moscoloni 1999).

Consumption patterns attested at a key context such as Lipari (Fig. 5.1.2) suggest that, although Mycenaean materials were not restricted to specific areas, some households had a privileged access to foreign materials (Wijngaarden 2002, 224). Furthermore the use of Mycenaean products as display items has been recorded in funerary contexts in Sicily, for example at Thapsos (Fig. 5.1.3) and in Southern Italy, at Torre S. Sabina (Fig. 5.1.1). In general, it looks as if, at least at some sites presenting the large concentrations of Mycenaean material in their region and that probably acting as main communication nodes with the Aegean world, Mycenaean materials (or, as far as Italy and Sicily are concerned, products contained by these materials) played an active role in societies’ internal competition.2

Overall it is possible to consider LH III A as the moment of maximum expansion of the Mycenaean core toward the Mediterranean.

No western elements and/or imports are attested in the Aegean up to this time. As far as the archaeologically detectable materials are concerned, the relationship between the Aegean and the West seems to have been a one-way one (S. Sherratt 1982; 1999; Vagnetti 1983; 1999).

Western items in Aegean Bronze Age, previous interpretations

During the more mature phase of the palatial era, corresponding to the subsequent ceramic phase LH III B, something changed. This change, however, is not dramatic and it is possible to fully appreciate its scope only paying the due attention to the big picture.

Two new classes of materials of western origin started to be attested in small quantities in Greek assemblages. I am referring to a class of handmade burnished pottery, also known as Barbarian Ware
(Bettelli 2002, 117–136; Rutter 1975; Pilides 1994) and to a heterogeneous group of bronze items often put together under the label of Urnfield Bronzes (Harding 1984; S. Sherrat 2000). These exogenous materials attracted archaeologists’ attention pretty soon and up to very recent times their interpretation has been quite regularly (with few notable exceptions: i.e. Borgna and Cassola Guida 2005; Harding 1984; Sandars 1978; S. Sherrat 1981; Small 1990; 1997) ethnically coloured and connected with historical and semi-historical events such as the arrival of the Dorians in Greece or Sea People’s raids across the Mediterranean (i.e. Rutter 1975; 1990; Deger-Jalkotzy 1977; Kilian 1978; 1985; Bouzek 1985; Bettelli 2002; Jung 2006; 2007, 353; Gentz 1997; French 1989). Since the beginning of the last century bronzes, and in particular the Naue II swords, were seen as the archaeological indicators of the coming of the dreadful Dorian warriors from the north (i.e. Milojčić 1948; Desborough 1964; contra Snodgrass 1971, 354–355). Albeit fundamentally recalibrated in their extent, more recent migratory hypothesis still present a culture = people model of explanation which is unsatisfying in many respects. My general objection to this sort of argument is that linking directly prehistorical archaeological data with the histoire événementielle is always a hazardous operation. Here I will try to consider western items in the Aegean as indicators of a broader economic relationship. I will focus primarily on Handmade Burnished Ware (HBW) although I will integrate also in the discussion the contextual distribution of Urnfield Bronzes.

Figure 5.1 Relations between the Aegean and the Central Mediterranean during LH III A: distribution of Aegean type pottery in Italy (after Vagnetti 1999, 140 updated). 1) Torre S. Sabina, 2) Lipari, 3) Thapsos.
Handmade Burnished Ware

HBW is a ceramic class attested not only in continental Greece (Jung 2006; Rutter 1990) and Crete (Hallager 1985; Jung 2006; Rutter 1990), but also on Cyprus (Pilides 1994) and in the Levantine area (Badre 2003; Mazar 1985), presenting three distinctive characteristics:

1) This pottery was handmade, whilst almost the entirety of ceramic production in the Minoan/Mycenaean world (including cooking wares) was wheel-made, since long time.4

2) Surface treatment (that is burnishing) as well as some morphological features represented in these pots had parallels in areas external to the Mycenaean world.

3) The relative frequency of this pottery has recently proved to be rather low in Greek sites.5

As far as the last point is concerned, it must be noted that although an endless list of comparanda has been proposed in the past for HBW, recent studies (and in particular those from Reinhardt Jung and Marco Bettelli) have demonstrated that there are some morphological elements among many specimen of this class, which clearly refer to handmade production of the central and western Mediterranean, above all to Southern Italy and to a much more limited extent to Northern Greece (Bettelli 2002, 117–137; Jung 2006; Kilian 2007, 55–56).

Additionally, provenance analyses have revealed that direct imports are not completely absent as perhaps in the case of Lefkandi (Lefkandi: Jones 1986, 474–476; Menelaion: Whitbread 1992; Cyprus: Jones 1986; Pilides 1994).

Putting aside the difference between imports and local imitations (I shall return to this issue later), what is immediately clear, observing HBW assemblages through time, is that there seems to have been very little chronological difference between the various shapes attested, as they all seem to have appeared at about the same time in the Aegean. Additionally, although, as noticed long ago by Jeremy Rutter, most of the possible functional categories seem to be represented in HBW, the shapes which truly reach an Aegean-wide diffusion are probably only the large jars (either plain or with finger-pressed and plain cordon) and carinated shapes (bowls and cups). As far as decorative techniques are concerned, the most widespread ones are plastic cordons (normally finger-pressed but also plain) which refers to Italian Subappennine traditions and, to a much more limited extent, Barbotine technique, which instead points toward Northern Greece (Fig. 5.2).

Western items as evidence of trade in metal

As mentioned before HBW is not the only class of ‘western’ items present in late palatial and post palatial times in Greece. In this same timeframe, a quite heterogeneous group of bronze items presenting a close ancestry with European productions often collectively put under the label of Urnfield Bronzes (UB) starts to be found in the Aegean (eventually becoming quite popular also on Cyprus and elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean). Among those items it is possible to find the notorious Naue II sword that will become the standard weapon of the end of the
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Bronze Age all over the Mediterranean, being also converted to iron later on (Foltiny 1964, 255; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993, 94–106; Sandars 1963, 163), together with other weapons like the Peschiera daggers (Bianco Peroni 1994; Harding 1984, 169–174; Papadopoulos 1998, 29–30) and work tools such as knives (Bianco Peroni 1976; Harding 1984, 132–134). As noted long ago by Anthony Harding, once again the closer typological terms of comparison for most of these items (particularly for weapons) are not to be sought in central Europe, rather in the Adriatic area, either on the Italian or on the Balkan side, the latter as in the case of socketed spearheads (for swords: Bietti Sestieri 1973, 406; Harding 1984, 162–165; for spearheads: Snodgrass 1971, 307; in general: S. Sherratt 2000; 84–87). Recent provenance analyses, although occasionally offering ambiguous results, have also proved the existence of direct imports from Italy, as in the case of the warrior tomb that recently came to light at Koubarà, in Aetolia-Acarnania (Fig. 5.2.7) (Koui et al. 2006; Stavropoulou-Gatsi, et al. 2009). Again, as with HBW, it is intriguing to note that taking in consideration the distribution of the UB, Argolid, Crete and Achaia have the lion’s share, with a particular concentration of artefacts on Crete and in Achaia (see Appendix).

But are HBW and UB in any way related? There is some overlapping between the distributions of the two categories but, to this extent, the evidence is far from being compelling, since they co-occur only at nine sites (see Appendix). A more useful approach to explore this hypothesis entails looking at contextual differences.

HBW has been found almost exclusively in settlement contexts (with only two exceptions: a jug from Pellana and another one from Perati, Fig. 5.2.8–9), conversely for UB funerary and cultic contexts are predominant.
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(see Appendix). We can at the same time observe that the contexts where bronzes and pottery are attested together are exactly, those that can be defined as the exception to the normal rule (Appendix). The same tendency for sites close to the coast which has been noted for HBW is reversed for bronzes, which tend to occur more frequently in inland locations.

In order to explain this second negative evidence, it is possible to recall the extremely low value that was normally attributed to pottery in LBA (S. Sherratt 1999). As a matter of fact this product was much more likely to be discarded in the place where it was used, whilst the valuable metal artefacts normally had a long life being moved far away from their place of origin.

Having established that it is possible to read some sort of link between these two classes of artefacts in the archaeological record, much more difficult remains the assessment of which areas of Greece were chiefly involved in this connection. Although some of the best explored regions of Greece such as Argolid and Crete seem to have played an important role, the discrepancies in the level of exploration of different Greek regions may severely hamper our understanding of distributional patterns. Some considerations are however still possible. For instance it can be noticed that an area that has been intensely investigated such as Messenia has actually yielded relatively little traces of this western connection.

Conversely a region that has been relatively little explored, such as for instance Achaia, returned a good number of find spots (primarily of UB but also of HBW, see Appendix and map at Fig. 5.2).

Therefore, we are dealing with two phenomena concentrated in the same areas, connecting the Aegean world with roughly the same western regions and contextually manifesting themselves in the archaeological record in opposite ways.

It is now perhaps possible to construct a general model according to which HBW is more likely to be found in coastal settings whilst metal objects can also penetrate inland, being acquired and used for long periods, eventually being put out of circulation in various ways among which are also cultic deposits and grave offerings.

The shift in the frequency of HBW attested from Chania to Tiryns is perhaps indicative of a shift in the role of major node in this exchange, taken up by the Argolid at the beginning of LH III C.

The case for a connection between *impasto* (the Italian name for HBW) and metal has been already put forward in the past by Vance Watrous. This scholar, analyzing the Sardinian material from Kommos (Fig. 5.2.10) in Southern Crete, noticed the coincidence of the diameter of bowls and large jars, suggesting that

![Figure 5.3 Distribution of features in various Handmade Burnished Ware assemblages.](image)

Each feature has been taken in consideration only if attested at more than one site. For a quantitative assessment of the various assemblages see the Appendix. (* buckets are distinguished from bucket shaped jars by their horizontal handle on the rim, ** plastic decoration includes horned, axe and bird handles).
the two vessels formed a transport package for metal from the Central Mediterranean Island. His point was strengthened by the fact that large containers similar to those found at Kommos were actually used in Sardinia as container for metal hoards (Rutter 1999; Watrous 1989; 1992, 163–168, 175 and 182). The recent re-dating of the Sardinian material to a horizon of LH III B has made what was happening in Southern (with Sardinian materials) and Northern Crete (with Italian and 'Adriatic' materials) even more credibly connected, as Kommos and Chania may represent the outcome of similar, roughly contemporary west-east connections (Rutter 1999; Shaw and Shaw 2006, 674).

To conclude, I am proposing that HBW was connected in some way with metal trade. This connection may have been direct, as at Kommos where Sardinian jars were possibly used as containers, or more subtle entailing only the knowledge in the local Mycenaean ‘market’ that the two material categories, namely bronze and pottery, were related to each other as well as to the West, the original source of metal. In the first case the increase of popularity of HBW during early LH III C should be considered as a sort of side effect of the popularity of UB and, therefore, HBW would have not been valued as prestige exotic in itself, being primarily concentrated in settlement contexts not far from the break-bulk area of trade. In the second case the pottery would have been charged of symbolical significance and because of its visual distinctiveness it may have been even used to signal association with eminent personages involved in trade activities.

In this perspective the difference between true imports and local imitation in HBW would cease to be meaningful as the really crucial factor would have not been actual provenance but rather external appearance of the items. It is not necessary to envisage these two possibilities as mutually exclusive alternatives. On the contrary, there are tenuous hints that they probably represented two consecutive stages, as attested by the finds of HBW in funerary contexts (at Pellana, Perati, see Fig. 5.2.8–9 and at Medeon, see Appendix) departing from LH III C. This trade and the acculturation processes entailed by it represented the economic motor behind the phenomenon of the ‘Westernizing Aegean’. In order to make sense of them, however, it will be necessary to place them in a World Systemic frame.

**From Periphery to Core: the West in LH III B–LH III C**

In a timeframe comparable to that of the appearance of HBW in Greece, a new trend in the distribution of Aegean type pottery in Central Mediterranean can be observed. This new trend is characterized by an increase of the number of find spots in continental Italy, perhaps paired by a relative decrease of attention towards the Tyrrhenian area (Smith 1987; Vagnetti 1983; 1999) with the exclusion of Sardinia (for which however at this time, a Cypriot connection has been argued, see Lo Schiavo 2003; Vagnetti 1999a). Two areas are chiefly interested by this dynamic, namely the Ionian and the Adriatic. In the Ionian area, evidence confirms a trend already established in LH III A. On the Adriatic side, in LH III B–C, Mycenaean pottery seems to be attested in relatively modest quantities (often not more than a handful of sherds), but in a vast number of coastal locales. This new trend is epitomized by the situation of Adriatic Apulia where it is possible to recognize findspots of Aegean type pottery placed at a distance ranging from 20–40 km from one another (Bettelli 2002, 38).

Interestingly, however, most of the pottery fragments found in this chronological span did not come from imported vessels, but rather from local imitations, whose production was by now well established in many southern Italian centres (Vagnetti and Jones 1988; Vagnetti 1999; Vagnetti and Panichelli 1994). In the light of this consideration, the distribution of Aegean type pottery seems more likely to be related with a development of local maritime activity rather than with a growth of Mycenaean frequentation (Broodbank forthcoming).

This process was perhaps also accompanied by a decrease in the use of pottery in funerary display, as, at this timeframe, pottery is almost exclusively found in settlements (Vagnetti 1999, 140).

Of extreme importance is, further North, the attestation of Mycenaean pottery at the large site of Frattesina (Fig. 5.2.1), placed in a strategic position at the mouth of the Po river. Findings at Frattesina are abundant encompassing not only Mycenaean pottery, but also materials which in a European context may be categorized as absolute exotica such as elephant ivory and faience, for which there are clear traces of in-place manufacture activities (Bietti Sestieri 1983; 1996; Bietti Sestieri and De Grossi Mazzorin 2001; Cássola Guida 1999; Henderson 1988, 440–441; Rahmstorf 2005).7

Metals played a capital role at Frattesina, as attested by the recovery of four hoards comprising various types of ingots with a wide Adriatic diffusion as well as numerous finished objects showing affinities with Urnfield productions found in Greece. Among those objects it is worth recalling the Allerona type swords which have been found also in the necropolis pertaining to the settlement (Cássola Guida 1999). Lead isotopes analysis performed on the metals from
Frattesina have returned ambiguous results, as the possible provenience of the copper was to be sought either in Etruria or in the Alpine area (Pearce 1999; Pellegrini 1995). This is not at all surprising as the background of what has been called the ‘Frattesina phenomenon’ is constituted by the area of the so called Terramare, wealthy agricultural embanked sites attesting clear connections (in metallurgy as well as in pottery productions) either southward with Etruria and northward with the Alpine area and the Peschiera horizon. It has been recently suggested (Cardarelli et al. 2004, 83) that during the Recent Bronze Age stone weights from the Terramare were in some way related to Aegean ponderal system. However is the very existence of weights that indicates that not only primary production but also trade and convertibility probably had a noteworthy importance for Terramare societies. Weights of the same class as those of the Terramare centres are also attested in Adriatic Italy (Marche and Apulia) in sites that returned Aegean-type materials.8

In an initial phase the Terramare system may well have constituted what Andrew Sherratt (1993) has defined as ‘buffer zone’, namely farming areas linking two chains of exchange, in this case the Alpine-European and the Mediterranean networks (Bernabò Brea et al. 1997; Bietti Sestieri 1973, 1996; Pearce 1999).

Afterwards, with the increase of metal circulation importance, during Italian Recent Bronze Age (roughly LH III B–LH III C early in Aegean terms) Terramare area experienced a rapid growth in the size of settlements which eventually ended up in a moment of major crisis towards the end of Recent Bronze Age (Bernabò Brea et al. 1997).

To this extent, however, it is important to highlight that the so called Grandi Valli Veronesi system, the group of settlements out of which Frattesina emerged, possibly did not experience a breakdown similar to that of the bulk of the Terramare sites. Here indeed, as indicated by various elements among which the recovery of LH III C middle/late pottery mostly of probable Southern Italian manufacture, occupation was protracted also in an advanced phase of the Recent Bronze Age and in a couple of examples to Final Bronze Age (i.e. Montagnana and Fabbrica dei Soci, see Jones et al. 2002, 225, 230 and 232; Jung 2006; Leonardi and Cupitò 2008). Therefore, as suggested by Mark Pearce, in the collapse of the Terramare system, the deep moment of environmental and economic crisis occurring around the end of Recent Bronze Age, may also have triggered a process of site selection on a regional scale, where sites more likely to survive were perhaps those less dependent on autarkic agricultural activity. This is probably the case of the Grandi Valli Veronesi polity where a number of other production are attested (above all bronze but also amber and glass) (Pearce 2007, 103 and 106).

At the apex of this process of selection is to be posed the Frattesina phenomenon, manifesting its full range of overseas contacts.9

Similar phenomena of site selection, although more limited in their extent, to those suggested for the Terramare area, can be recognized also in Apulia, starting already at the end of Middle Bronze Age and strengthening towards Recent Bronze Age (Bettelli 2002, 39–40; Gravina et al. 2004, 210–211).

Apulia indeed probably represented a key area in the trade dynamics entailed by the ‘Westernizing Aegean’. Quite surprisingly this region completely devoid of any metal resources produced from Recent Bronze Age to Final Bronze Age (LH III B/C in Aegean terms) the largest collection of bronze smith hammers in Italy, as well as a large number of stone moulds and metal hoards. Among this last category can be placed a hoard coming from the site of Rocavecchia contained by an impasto jar very close to those contemporarily ubiquitous in the Aegean and composed only by Northern Italian types (Guglielmino 2005, 644–645; 2006; 2008).10

It may be pertinent at this point to ask what was the rationale behind the encounter of the European and Mediterranean trade systems. The answer is that they acted one as complement for the other. In the first net (the Alpine-European), metal circulation and production was growing (as attested for instance by tons of slags calculated for the Late/Final Bronze Age smelting site of Acque Fredde in Trentino, see Pearce 2007, 76–77), whilst in the second circuit the need for metals was endemically high, being propelled by the necessity to maintain an high level of liquidity (A. Sherratt 1993; 2004).

The impressive amount of metal circulating in this period in the Alpine-European trade system provided the capital accumulation which is behind the phenomenon of the ‘Westernizing Aegean’.

To sum up, it can be argued that the Central Mediterranean phenomena of site selection and import replacement consistently increased during the Italian Recent Bronze Age, showing a new attitude toward exchange. Trade was no longer passively accepted, but rather local communities were now probably actively engaged in and competed for the control of the flow of traded goods. In this process a major role was probably played by societies positioned at the immediate interface of the Mycenaean core. These had indeed the possibility to take advantage of their intermediate position between Northern Italy/Europe
Reverberation of ‘Westernizing’ features

West–east ‘influence’ interested undoubtedly as first some of the main centres of the Minoan/Mycenaean world that for their nature of large communication/economic nodes where more likely to catalyze trade. The range of influence of these new precarious western cores, however, should not be overemphasized, as indeed, excluding main trade nodes, their prominence was probably very short, being stronger in the areas of Greece closer to the west such as Achaia. Indeed the existence of a strong relationship between this last region and southern Italy has been already noted on the basis of existing similarities between productions of Aegean type decorated pottery (i.e. Fisher 1988, 129–131).

Particularly in Achaia, although not only there, western metal artefacts (above all Naue II swords) started to be used as items of display in warriors' tombs, reproducing a dynamics similar to that attested in the west during Middle Bronze Age (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006; Papadopoulos 1999).

Western metal found its way eastward possibly through the Gulf of Corinth. It is very improbable that, even during LH III B when the palaces still existed, the channel used for entering the Mycenaean 'market' was the official palatial one possibly regulated by the rules of gift exchange and perhaps under the control of the authority of the palace(s). Indeed, the very multiplicity of UB models and shapes attested in the Urnfield Bronzes in Greece, as well as the fact that the bronze was not re-casted in Aegean shapes (which appears to be unusual if we consider the tight control that palatial economies exercised on weapons, see Hiller 1993) tells us that we are dealing with something less formal, which possibly implied the exchange of finished objects or scrap metal, something more similar to the cargo of the Cape Gelidonya ship than to that of the Ulu Burun wreck.

We are thus possibly dealing with a different social formation from that constituting the higher level palatial elite (S. Sherratt 2000, 87), an emerging class perhaps formed by low rank (palatial) elite and middlemen such as the so called collectors,11 which in the troubled post-palatial times were able to increase their economic (and possibly political?) relevance by the mean of trade with the West.

In Greece for a brief period, bronze shapes, as well as possibly a wider range of material culture which has not come to us, became the material symbol of this new emerging class.

Western features during this time span became even fashionable and many elements possibly originated in the HBW repertoire were reproduced in the standard Mycenaean productions. Rutter identified a number of these features (such as for instance the appearance of the carinated bowl FS 240) and, although for some of them it is possible to find an ancestry also in Mycenaean fine production, the chronological coincidence of the emergence of most of these features with the period immediately subsequent to the moment of maximal attestation of HBW remains nevertheless striking (Rutter 1990, 37–39; contra Kilian 2007, 53). Rutter's point seems even more credible considering some remarkable examples of cultural hybridity such as the Mycenaean carinated bowls surmounted by a Subappennine-looking bull's head found at Tiryns (Podzuweit 2007, Taf. 59). Excluding Mycenaean pottery, however, it is possible to suggest the existence of 'Westernizing' elements reverberating in various spheres of post-palatial material culture. For instance the widespread adoption of simple clay spools (for which again parallel is to be sought primarily in Italy) in textile production, used perhaps instead of traditional loom-weights, can be seen as a reflex of the introduction of new textiles in the Aegean (Rahmstorf 2003). A confirmation to this suggestion can be perhaps sought in the adoption or spread of violin bow fibulas and long pins, perhaps indicating the appearance of new ways of fasting clothes and thus of a new fashion (S. Sherratt 2000, 85).

A ‘Westernizing’ influence can be read also in the sphere of symbolism and particularly in the diffusion of symbols like the solar boat or the bird-motif on a wide range of media, like knives, Mycenaean decorated pottery or golden leaf. There is some discrepancy between the chronology of some of these items and the time of widest diffusion of HBW, as the former normally can be dated from LH III C middle onward. It looks however safe to consider these features as the last residual of the 'Westernizing Aegean' phenomenon (Bettelli 2002, 146–164; Mathäus 1980; Peroni 2004, 425–427).

People behind the system

So far I might have given the impression that the hypothesis of the ‘Westernizing Aegean’ is in stark contrast with any foreign presence in Mycenaean Greece, but this is simply not the case. For the dichotomy between movement of people and movement of
goods is a false one, as often the first one implied at least partially the second one, particularly in prehistoric and ancient times when the time required for travelling was huge and the season available for seafaring limited.

In his recent analysis of the HBW corpus from Tiryns, Klaus Kilian suggested that this class of pottery was to be related to a small nucleus of people coming from Appennine peninsula residing in Tiryns (Kilian 2007; see also Belardelli and Bettelli 1999). This is absolutely likely and the pattern of slow absorption of this group of foreigners in Tiryns’ society identified by the scholar adds a considerable historical depth to the dynamics entailed by the ‘Westernizing Aegean’. The question to which I have tried to answer in this work was exactly what was the rationale for this people to be there, and I think that trade is an answer that need to be taken more seriously in consideration.

Conclusions

In this work I hope to have been able at the very least to cast some doubts on the dominant archaeological narrative which sees the relationship between the Eastern civilization and the barbarian West in Late Bronze Age as sporadic and fundamentally irrelevant.

The reason why the importance of ‘Westernizing’ features in the archaeological record of the Aegean have not been fully acknowledged before has primarily to do with the pervasiveness of the ex oriente lux dogma, which still underlies the interpretation of much of the archaeological record of the late prehistoric Mediterranean, even if at a subconscious level.

As an example, suffice here to note that the largely accepted notion of a Late Bronze Age metallurgical koinê, albeit highlighting the wide range of the connections established during the last part of Bronze Age, de facto obscures the truly revolutionary nature of this exchange. Indeed, for the very first time in late prehistory, Europe and the western Mediterranean did not constitute a mere passive receiver of innovation but its main origin (Carancini and Peroni 1997; Müller Karpe 1962, 280).

Western influences appears to have been for at least some decades a critical factor in the shaping of late palatial/post-palatial cultural milieu and it has been possible to demonstrate their importance only by paying attention to large scale processes of social cultural and economic change in a wide Mediterranean setting.

Notes

2 As noticed by Van Wijngaarden (2002), among Mycenaean materials came to light in Sicily and Southern Italy there is a prevalence of storage vessels. For a different view on Southern Italian evidence see Bettelli 2002, 144.
3 Marginal groups in Mycenaean society have been often indicated as possible bearers of the new western material culture items. For Bankoff these groups where likely to be the ‘slave’ women attested in the well known set of Pylian tablets (Bankoff et al. 1996; Genz 1997). For Eder (1998) HBW was introduced by northern pastoralists responsible also for the reintroduction of cist graves in the Mycenaean heartland. For Bettelli (2002, drawing upon Drews’ (1993) warfare hypothesis for the fall of Bronze Age societies in the Eastern Mediterranean) instead, HBW and UB were likely to refer to groups of mercenaries hired by various Mycenaean and Near Eastern monarchs during the troubled days of the Sea Peoples.
4 Rutter 1975 contra Walberg 1976. As a consequence of these three criteria it is not possible to consider together with the rest of the HBW phenomenon areas presenting long standing traditions of handmade pottery production such as for instance Epirus (Tartaron 2004), Ionian Islands (Souyoudzoglou-Haywood 1999) and Central Macedonia (Kiriati et al. 1997; Hochstetter 1984).
5 To this extent the site of Kalapodi (Felsch 1996), that has often been mentioned in previous discussion on HBW (i.e. Kilian 1985), will not be considered as part of the HBW phenomenon. Many scholars have noted the peculiarity of this site (e.g. Rutter 1990). The unusual representation of HBW at this context prevent us from advancing any useful comparison with the rest of Greece. Handmade pottery at this site constituted almost the 40% of the coarse pottery assemblage and is concentrated only in one area close to a kiln. In addition, according to compositional analysis (Felsch 1996, 117–120), the local HBW, although presenting some peculiarities, under a technologic point of view can be grouped without any doubt with the other cooking ware of the site. All these elements, which are unattested in other sites of the Aegean, lead me (in agreement with Rutter 1990) to consider HBW at Kalapodi as the outcome of fundamentally different phenomena from these affecting the rest on the Minoan/Mycenaean heartland which need to be examined in their own terms.
6 Kilian 2007, 72–80; Rutter 1990. It is indeed possible to recognize containers (i.e. various kind of large jars: Catling and Catling 1981, fig. 2; Evely 2006, fig. 2.42.4; French 1989, fig. 4; Hallager and Hallager 2003, 253; Kilian 2007, 9–20; pithoid vessels: Catling and Catling 1981, fig. 4.33; Hallager and Hallager 2000, pl. 67d), vessels made for consuming liquid and solids (i.e. cups: i.e. Evely 2006, fig. 2.42.2–3; jugs: i.e. Andrlikou et al. 2006, 176, n. 154; French 1989, fig. 3; Kilian 2007, pl. 18.206; bowls: Hallager and Hallager 2003, 169, pl. 133 d2; Rutter 1975,
21–22, n.8,12) and cooking implements (i.e. Kilian 2007, pl. 21, 261–262).

7 The once remarkable gap in the distribution of Aegean type pottery on the coast of Adriatic Central Italy is being slowly reduced by new find spots (i.e. Moscosi di Cingoli and Cisterna di Tolentino, fig. 1.2.2–3), see Vagnetti et al. 2006).

8 At Moscosi di Cingoli and at Coppa Nevigata. A stone weight which came to light at Lefkandi looks also morphologically very similar to the Italian pesi con appicagnolo type (see Cardarelli et al. 2004, 82 and 87, fig. 3; Evely 2006, 275, fig. 5.5.4).

9 The recent acknowledgement of an early phase of occupation at Frattesina dating to the Recent Bronze Age seems to support the existence of some sort of continuity between the site and the Grandi Valli Veronesi system (Càssola Guida 1999, 487–488).

10 There are a number of comparisons between the impasto repertory retrieved at Rocavecchia and HBW of the Aegean. This is the case, for instance, of an impasto jar with plastic decoration (Pagliara et al. 2007, 338, fig. 38, iv.32) which is closely comparable to a similar vessel from Korakou (Rutter 1975, 18, no.1).

11 Studies by Jean-Pierre Olivier (2001) and Judith Weingarten (1997) have plausibly suggested that these figures were strongly connected not only with production, but also with trade and metal redistribution. It is this the case of collectors involved in oil production/collection and trade (attested also by inscriptions on coarse stirrup jars which at the very least travelled from Crete to Tiryns, see Olivier 2001, 151; Carlier 1993), or of the qua-si-reu of Pylus, whose connection with metal is recorded in the linear B tablets (Weingarten 1997, 530). It is worth of note that possible foreigners are attested among the collectors from Knossos (Olivier 2001).
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Addendum

While this chapter was in press a number of analyses have partially confirmed some of the trends tentatively identified in the article. These are primarily the result of the important research project on metal ingots and artefacts by Jung and others (see Jung et al. 2008; Jung 2009, 75) that has supported a possible Italian provenance for some of the metal objects retrieved in Greece (particularly in Argolid and Achaia). Also recent studies have proposed new explanatory hypotheses for the presence and distribution of HBW in Greece (Strack 2007; Lis 2008; Jung 2010) among which are to be mentioned the new syntheses by Bettelli (2009; 2011) that endorse a view similar to the one held here.
Appendix

Find spots of Handmade Burnished Ware (HBW) and Urnfield Bronzes (UB) in Greece. The number after UB indicates the number of bronze items attested. The number after HBW instead is an approximate quantitative assessment of the consistency of the assemblage: 1= the pottery constitutes a considerable proportion of the overall assemblage, 2= some vessels/fragments are attested (up to 20), 3= the pottery is only attested (one vessel/fragment), ?= unknown (after S. Sherratt 2000, updated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Settlement/ Hoards</th>
<th>Funerary/Cultural</th>
<th>Bibliography UB</th>
<th>Bibliography HBW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argolid and Corinthia</td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>HBW (?) and UB (8)</td>
<td>UB (3)</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 147 no B3; Catling 1956, 111 no. 3; French 1986, 281; Sandars 1963, 151 pl. 25, 37; Schlieman 1878, 144 fig. 221; Tsountas 1897, 110 pl. 83; Wace 1953, 78 fig. 45, 7.</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 183 no. 5; French 1989.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>HBW (1) and UB (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grossmann and Schafer 1971, 70, fig. 1; Karo 1930, 135 Pl. 37; Maran 2006; Papadopoulos 1998, 29 no. 139.</td>
<td>Belardelli and Bettelli 1999; Bettelli 2002, 122; Kilian 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>HBW (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frizell 1986, 83 fig. 29 no. 298–300.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korakou</td>
<td>HBW (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blegen 1921, 73–74 fig. 104, 105; Rutter 1975.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catling 1975, 9 fig. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>HBW (1) and UB (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davidson 1952, 200 no. 1522 pl. 91; Stillwell 1948, 119 pl. 48, 30.</td>
<td>Rutter 1979, 391.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboea</td>
<td>Lefkandi</td>
<td>HBW (2) and UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popham and Sackett 1968, 14 fig. 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Thessaly</td>
<td>Dhimini</td>
<td>HBW (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adriimi-Sismani 2003, 2006, 473, 475, 476–477 fig. 25.7, 25.8, 25.9, 25.10; Jung 2006, 18 fig. 34.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volos</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helaxolophos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 141 no. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>HBW (3)</td>
<td>UB (3)</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 139, nos 5–6; Kraiker and Kübler 1939 173; pl. 52.</td>
<td>Immewahr 1971, 141, 258 Pl. 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perati</td>
<td>HBW (3) and UB (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 147 no 4.1.3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teichos Dymaion</td>
<td>HBW (2) and UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papadopoulos 1979, 227 no. 209 fig. 317c–d.</td>
<td>Bettelli 2002, 122; Deger-Jalckotzy 1977, 31, 3.4.1, 3.9.2; Mastrokostas 1965, fig. 156, 157.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallithea</td>
<td>UB (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papadopoulos 1979, 228, nos. 222–223; fig. 320, a–b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousika</td>
<td>UB (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 158; Petropoulos 2000, 68, 75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangadi</td>
<td>UB (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papadopoulos 1979, 227–228, no. 209, 221 fig. 317 c, 320 c–d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerokomion</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papadopoulos 1979, 227 no. 204 fig. 316 b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Vergina</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Petsas 1962, 242, Pl. 146a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardina</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heurtley 1925, Pl. 19, 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>Mazaraki</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Vokotopoulou 1969, 196 fig. 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konitza</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vokotopoulou 1969, 197 fig. 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardikion</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagoroi</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>idem 184 fig. 2.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elafatopos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 149 4.1.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>Polis</td>
<td>UB (4)</td>
<td>Benton 1935, 72 fig. 20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakata</td>
<td>UB (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyparissès 1919, 119, fig. 36; Souyoudzoglou-Haywood 1999, 38–39, Pl. 21 A915.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocis</td>
<td>Schiste Odos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Tsountas 1897, 110 fig. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeon</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilides 1994, 27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>HBW (3)</td>
<td>UB (2)</td>
<td>Perdrizet 1908, 95 no. 456 fig. 126 a 327. Lerat 1938, 201, 205; Reber 1991, 44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeotia</td>
<td>Thebe</td>
<td>HBW (2)</td>
<td>Andrikou et al. 2006, 53–54 Pl. 6, 151–156.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agios Ioannis</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kilian 1985, 89.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Catling 1956, 113 no. 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis</td>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>UB (3)</td>
<td>Furtwangler 1890, 174 no. 1035 Pl. 64; Weber 1944, 146 Pl. 56.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>Palaiopyrgos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Catling 1961, 117 no. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menelaion</td>
<td>HBW (2)</td>
<td>Catling and Catling 1981.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclades</td>
<td>Grotta (Naxos)</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Kardara 1977, Pl. 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knossos</td>
<td>HBW (?) and UB (1)</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 141 no. 4; Catling 1996, 518, fig. 163 f7 Pl. 277 f7; Evans 1905, fig. 90; Warren 1983, 71 fig. 51.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agia Palagia</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td>D’Agata 2001, 346 n. 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kastelli/Pediada</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tylissos</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thronos</td>
<td>HBW (?)</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phaistos</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Milojić 1955, 156, 163 fig. 1, 13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karphi</td>
<td>UB (4)</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 149, 4.1.8; Pendlebury et al. 1938, 69, 95, 97, nos 540, 645 and 687 Pl. 28, 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mouliana</td>
<td>UB (6)</td>
<td>Catling 1956, 113 nos 13–14 Pl. 9 c; Xanthoudides 1904, 46, 48 fig. II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Episkopi</td>
<td>UB (1)</td>
<td>Bouzek 1985, 141 no. 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictean Cave</td>
<td>UB (14)</td>
<td>Boardman 1961: 17–18 no. 56; fig. 2; Pl. 9, 4, 5, 6, b–c; Bouzek 1985, 132, 148–149 nos 1, 2–5, 4.1.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Westernizing Aegean of LH III C
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