

Summary

The study subject of this book aims to investigate in an exhaustive way the *impasto* pottery from two archaeological sites: Punta di Zambrone in the Calabria region and Lipari-Acropolis in the Aeolian islands, which are absolutely central in the historical reconstruction of the recent phase of the Bronze Age in the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy (Tyrrhenian Calabria, Aeolian and north-eastern Sicily). These two sites, in fact, can help to answer different questions, which concern both local and interregional historical and cultural phenomena, and are a keystone for understanding the relationship between the western and eastern Mediterranean. The study published in this volume is part of a vast international research project conducted at Punta di Zambrone. The fundamental purpose of this study is to create a typology for the Recent Bronze Age *impasto* pottery of the area, integrating in this typology materials from all the sites of the southern Tyrrhenian region. The aim is to provide a more precise definition of the local archaeological aspect of the Subapennine cultural group that is characteristic for the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy and can be called ‘Ausonian’, to pinpoint typical regional types and to define in a better way their chronology and duration. This may contribute to a refined interpretation of cultural processes taking place in the southern Tyrrhenian region between the 13th and 12th centuries BC.

The study focuses primarily on the conspicuous set of fragments of *impasto* pottery that can be dated almost completely to the Recent Bronze Age, found in the filling layers of the defensive ditch of the Punta di Zambrone site, formed mainly by thick deposits of ash and charcoal, but also by earth and collapsing stones. This pottery has been found during the excavations carried out between 2011 and 2013 as part of the above-mentioned international research project carried out by the University of Naples Federico II with funding from PRIN 2009, ‘Indagini archeologiche nei centri fortificati indigeni e nei relativi territori del promontorio del Poro e della Bassa Valle del Savuto’, in collaboration at first with the University of Salzburg (until 2012) and then the OREA Institute of the Austrian Academy of Sciences with funding by the FWF (Austrian Science Fund), ‘Punta di Zambrone – a Bronze Age fortified settlement on the Tyrrhenian coast of Calabria’ (project P23619-G19). The study of the new Subapennine pottery from Punta di Zambrone integrates with a complete re-examination of the stratigraphy and the ceramic finds from the Ausonian I settlement on the acropolis of Lipari, found in the 50s and 60s of the last century by Luigi Bernabò Brea and Madeleine Cavalier, in order to reconstruct the contexts and the internal chronological successions to which the typology of the finds can be linked. In addition, the study involves also the published materials from other sites of the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy, such as: Olivadi, Galluppi, Ciappetta, Pirara (promontory of Tropea) and Taureana di Palmi in Calabria, Capo d’Orlando, Milazzo-Viale dei Cipressi and Monte di Giove in north-eastern Sicily. The volume goes on two parallel tracks, flanking at the same time the study of the two main complexes, Punta di Zambrone and Lipari. The structure of the volume reflects this operating mode. Chapter I concerns a general overview of the history of studies on the definition and characteristics of the Subapennine cultural aspect and on archaeological research and human settlement in the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy. In all the territories of southern Tyrrhenian Calabria, northeastern Sicily and the Aeolian Islands, in fact, during the Recent Bronze Age we witness a radical reorganisation of the settlements and the abandonment of the previous villages of the Middle Bronze Age. In addition, the Middle Bronze Age ‘Thapsos-Milazzese’ material culture, which was of a Sicilian type, is substituted by a new one that is typical of the Italian peninsula, i.e. the Subapennine culture. Luigi Bernabò Brea designated this phenomenon with the term ‘Ausonian’, and explained it with the sudden and traumatic arrival in Lipari of new people coming

from the Italian mainland; it is probably the only case with plausible archaeological evidence of violent invasion for Italian protohistory. The archaeological record does provide evidence for a Bronze Age immigration in this region. For the promontory of Tropea, and particularly the site of Punta di Zambrone, archaeological data are also congruent with an arrival of foreign people. During the Recent Bronze Age, in fact, a new and complex territorial system developed on the promontory of Tropea. The area in this phase is densely occupied by different types of settlements depending on the features of the territory: i.e., there are six sites with agricultural propensity on the Poro plateau, while on the hills we can find sites in a defensive position, near to grazing lands and woodlands, such as Pirara, Mesiano Vecchio and Mancipa. On the coastline, by contrast, there are sites situated on promontories, but with harbours, like Tropea and Punta di Zambrone among others; those sites were dedicated to maritime activities and overseas exchanges. It is evident that in this area of southern Tyrrhenian Calabria, between the end of the Middle Bronze Age 3 and the Recent Bronze Age, there was a drastic reorganisation of the settlement pattern, with precise political and territorial planning. This phenomenon is due to the economic and political impact of the new population groups coming from the Italian peninsula, as has been described for the Aeolian Islands, even though there is as yet no known evidence of violent destructions or fires at the sites in Calabria.

After that initial premise, a specific chapter was devoted to each site. Chapter II, about Punta di Zambrone, in fact, provides all the information on the research project and excavations conducted there from 1994 to 2011–2013; a special section is dedicated to the analysis of the stratigraphy emerged in the recent campaigns, with an attempt to interpret them, aimed at better framing the materials under study. The Ausonian settlement of Lipari, on the other hand, is the subject of chapter III; here the history of the complex excavations on the acropolis of the site is dealt with in an exhaustive manner, and above all a complete revision of the stratigraphy is carried out in order to better define the contexts of origin of the materials examined, to reorganize the picture of the structures of the Recent Bronze Age that emerged on the acropolis of Lipari and to try to reconstruct the internal successions of the individual contexts. In particular, thanks to the re-examination of the publication of the site by Luigi Bernabò Brea and Madeleine Cavalier in 1980, it was possible to distinguish Ausonian I ‘pure’ contexts (with only pottery attributed to the Ausonian I phase), ‘mixed’ contexts (with more recent ‘Ausonian II’ materials or more ancient ‘Milazzese’ materials in secondary position) and ‘disturbed’ contexts (a minority of contexts disturbed by human activities in ancient or modern times). The complete re-examination of the stratigraphy of the Ausonian settlement on the Acropolis of Lipari can be found in chapter III.3.1, while the complete list of the contexts is in chapter III.3.2.

The synthesis of all the research carried out at the two main archaeological sites converges in chapter IV, concerning the typological classification of the Subapennine pottery of the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy. The main purpose of this typology, which serves as a reference point for studies on the Recent Bronze Age in southern Italy, is to contribute to the knowledge of the archaeological aspect of the southern Tyrrhenian region, which could be defined ‘Ausonian’, defining in detail its typological features and its chronological (with the intention of enucleating the two phases of the Recent Bronze Age) and geographical articulation. The method used to create the typology is described in detail in chapter IV.3, where the use of the widespread terminology in Italian prehistory and protohistory studies is also critically discussed. Specifically, the traditional terminology has been accepted almost in its entirety, making only the necessary small adjustments and adaptations to the peculiar situation of the contexts studied here; where the definitions adopted differ from those commonly used, they have been chosen trying to combine a morphological and a functional approach, in an attempt to connect, where possible, a different shape of the vessel to a different function of use, real or presumable. An example is that of the distinction between ‘tazze’ (cups) and ‘ciotole’ (bowls),³⁶⁸ terms that have been used in various ways, in opposition

³⁶⁸ For the English translation of the Italian terminology adopted here see Capriglione 2021.

or as synonyms to each other depending on the personal approach of the individual author. Since the application to the materials under examination of the methods based on a dimensional *ratio*, such as the Peroni method or the Belardelli index designed for the site of Broglio di Trebisacce (Fig. 24) proved to be ineffective, and since it was difficult to distinguish the two categories on a functional basis, it was decided to group them together creating the superordinate concept ‘tazza/ciotola’ (cup/bowl). In this way, 1204 fragments from Punta di Zambrone and 354 from Lipari, as well as some finds from other sites, have been included in the classification. The typological classification created is a rather wide mesh one; it is based primarily on the definition of 28 categories, indicated by Roman numerals, within which individual ceramic classes have been identified and designated by lower case letters. The next step was the creation, where possible, of typological families, gathering several types with similar features. For every type recognized and identified by an Arabic number, varieties or variations have also been identified, when needed; the first indicated with capital letters, the second with lower case letters. Finally, some *unica* were singled out, i.e. types without known parallels in the coeval ceramic production. Typological families and types follow a sequential numeration throughout the whole classification. In this way, 27 families and 159 types were distinguished, 8 of which were *unica* (Tab. 35–36). The actual classification is accompanied by a typological catalogue, which contains also those materials that, due to the scarcity of attestations or the scarce presence of indicative diagnostic elements, it was not possible to classify, presented in large groups (categories XXI–XXVIII). For each type or group identified, in addition to a description of its distinctive characteristics, a list of comparisons with other sites in Italy, mostly central-southern Italy, is provided with the relative chronological references.

In chapter IV.6, in order to complete the study of the Subapennine *impasto* pottery of the southern Tyrrhenian region, a statistical analysis of the *impasto* rims has been carried out, observing the distribution of the individual categories, families and types identified. The statistics took as a sample the 581 rim fragments found at Punta di Zambrone in the 2011–2013 excavation campaigns and the 140 rim fragments from Lipari-Acropoli included in the typological classification of this volume, for which it was possible to measure both the diameter in cm and the preserved portion of the rim in % (only for the site of Punta di Zambrone). The data obtained from this type of analysis are two: the number of rims (‘rim count’) pertaining to the sub-sample examined (macro-grouping, category, family, type) and for the same sub-sample the rim equivalents through the preserved percentage of the rim diameters (‘rim eves’ or ‘rim equivalents’). The comparison between the two data also allows an observation of the degree of fragmentation of the sample. The statistical analysis carried out, besides providing interesting food for thought about the composition of the pottery sample subject of this study (including the prevalence of open forms on closed forms, in particular of ‘tazze/ciotole’, and the degree of fragmentation inversely proportional to the diameter of the pots), also has the merit of being one of the first applications to a relevant *impasto* complex of the statistical method, devised by Bettina Bader for the ceramic inventory of site of Tell el-Dab’a in Egypt, based on the comparison between number and equivalent of the rims. In addition, the comparison between the two sites covered by this study, although based solely on ‘rim count’ statistics (number of rims), proved anyways to be of great interest, underlining the complementarity of the two sites within the typological classification. It was noted, in fact, that the most common categories, families and types in Punta di Zambrone are the least attested in Lipari and vice versa. This could indicate that each site contributed harmoniously to the overall character of the local ‘Ausonian’ Subapennine cultural aspect, contributing each with its own specificity. Moreover, the results of the comparison between the two sites of the southern Tyrrhenian region and the only other important protohistoric site in southern Italy for which a statistical analysis is available, Broglio di Trebisacce, are also quite interesting, although the statistical analysis was conducted with a different method. Since these are also sites with different stratigraphic characteristics (multi-layered settlements in the case of Lipari and Broglio, infill of a defensive ditch in the case of Zambrone), it was useful to select specific contexts to analyze in order to look for similarities and/or differences between the contexts, from which to draw clues to make a functional analysis of them. Within the sample of Punta di Zambrone two groups of contexts were

selected, including one exclusively the ashy layers of the ditch filling in Area C, the other the fill layers of the same ditch in the eastern part of Area B, characterized by layers of silty and sandy soil but not ashes (apart from narrow ash bands and lenses), together with the layers of Area C under the ashes. Subsequently, the rims of the two groups of contexts of Punta di Zambrone have been compared with the rims of two housing structures: the hut β IV of Lipari and the “Central House” of Broglio di Trebisacce, chosen because they are among the better preserved houses of the Recent Bronze age in those sites. In this way, it was possible to notice some differences that can be explained by the fact that the thick deposits of ashes making up most of the layers of the ditch filling in Area C of the Punta di Zambrone excavation, should be connected not so much to the daily life of the settlement that the ditch itself delimited (they cannot be interpreted either as domestic waste or as ashes resulting from a fire destroying the settlement, but rather to activities of a different nature, productive or, more probably, ritual. For example, while in Broglio di Trebisacce there is a slight predominance of closed shapes over open shapes, in Lipari and Punta di Zambrone there is the opposite situation; the predominance of open shapes appears particularly marked in the ashy layers of the ditch filling, where open vessels make up almost twice as many as closed vessels.

The typological study conducted on the impasto pottery of the southern Tyrrhenian region has made it possible to highlight a series of distinctive features of the Subapennine cultural aspect of the area in question (chapter IV.6), to detect the extent and scale of contacts with other Subapennine areas and at last to specify some chronological aspects, highlighting types and shapes that can be placed in the different phases of the Recent Bronze Age.

For instance, there is a very significant recurrence of a typological link between the southern Tyrrhenian region and the central-northern Adriatic coastline of the Italian peninsula, especially in the early stages of the Recent Bronze Age. This is evident in some types, such as: horizontal handles with couple of cylindrical projections (types 52–53) or with boot-shaped kind of cylinders (type 54), handles with bird head-shaped knobs (so called “anse di padelle”, type 56) and horizontal handles raised on the rim ending in diverging coils (types 59–61), which can be dated to the transition between Middle Bronze 3 and Recent Bronze 1 and geographically distributed in the central (Marche) and northern (Romagna) Adriatic regions. These types of configured endings of handles are widely attested in the area of the “Ausonian” aspect of the Subappennine facies, of which they constitute some of the most distinctive features. It is therefore possible to hypothesize contacts with the Adriatic coastline since the very early stages of the Recent Bronze Age, which led to a local elaboration of those types that continued during the most advanced phases of the period, as demonstrated not only by the presence of these types in the final layers of the Ausonian I settlement of Lipari, but also the attestation of other types, such as type 57 which is a *unicum* resulting from influences of different origins intertwined with local characteristics, and types 62–63 of handles with diverging coils that, on the other hand, are present mainly in the southern Tyrrhenian and more sporadically in central Italy, in particular in Abruzzo and Molise regions, during the Recent Bronze Age 2. Some of the most characteristic types of the Recent Bronze Age 2 are the handles with circular section raised on the rim, both simple (types 76–78) and with small knobs on the top of the handle (types 79–81), alluding to a horse head, present in large quantities in the southern Tyrrhenian region. In particular, at Punta di Zambrone it is possible to find a drop-shaped impression, placed on the internal face at the base of the handle (type 76B); it is a rare decoration, dating to an advanced phase of the Recent Bronze Age, and which can occasionally also be present on other types of handles (handle with diverging coils and strap handles), or even on horizontal handles of closed vessels. Types like shallow hemispheric bowls (types 7–8) are also characteristic of the local aspect of the later phase of the Recent Bronze Age. We must underline the strong presence of some ceramic classes in the ceramic repertory under study, like jars or amphorae, which are usually not so numerous and in such variety in Recent Bronze Age settlements. The presence of pithoi of Aegean tradition in this area of the Mediterranean during the Recent Bronze Age is also interesting, in particular the presence of pithoi with high, undecorated plastic bands with a flat or concave profile. This kind of decoration is very well known, and

it is more characteristic for the Recent Bronze Age along the Ionic coastline; so far, the presence of those pithoi in the region of interest was suggested only in Monte di Giove in northeastern Sicily, but in a chronologically uncertain context. The new addition of this study is that it was possible to find at least four different specimens in Lipari (never published so far) and two in Punta di Zambrone. A complete overview of the chronological collocation of every type defined for Punta di Zambrone and Lipari is available in two synoptic tables (Tab. 37–38)

Chapter V is dedicated to the catalogue of materials, also divided into two parts, one for each site. The catalogue is deliberately limited to the essential; in addition to the basic data (catalogue no., acronym, stratigraphic context, dimensions, type and plate no.), it contains brief descriptive references only in the case of peculiarities that distinguish the specific piece from the general definition of the type and other observations that cannot be deduced from the graphic representation, while referring to the definition of the type for a precise description of its formal characteristics.

The book concludes with a final chapter that investigates the relations between the communities settled in the southern Tyrrhenian region during the Recent Bronze Age and the different Aegean regions, within the broader framework of Italian-Aegean relations, through a comparison between the ‘Ausonian’ *impasto* pottery and the similar handmade and burnished ceramics found in the Aegean, the so-called Handmade Burnished Ware – HBW or handgemachte geglättete Keramik – HGK. Although the most characteristic forms of the ‘Ausonian’ aspect of the Subapennine facies are (so far) not present among the Aegean HBW/HGK of Italian typology, it seems evident, from the preliminary observations presented in chapter VI, that the Subapennine formal repertoire diffused in the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy was also known in the Aegean at the end of the 13th century and especially in the 12th century BC.

In particular, one can suggest a correspondence between the presence in the Western Peloponnese of HBW/HGK Aegean of Italian typology, with typological references to the Subapennine pottery of the southern Tyrrhenian region of Italy, and at the same time the presence at Punta di Zambrone of Mycenaean pottery imported from the Western Peloponnese. The latter is analytically proven by NAA, as mentioned in chapter VI.1, while the former assessment is supported by typological parallels found at Teichos Dymaion (the enlarged rim bowl with raised handle, parallel with the Ausonian type 10A, Pl. 177.A) or at Aigeira (the small jug, parallel with the Ausonian type 84, Pl. 179.A). Only new findings or the desirable complete edition of excavations can provide important data to enrich our understanding of the historical and cultural dynamics which affected the Mediterranean during the 12th century BC.